

JOINT TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

DRAFT Minutes (not yet approved)
Casa Monica Hotel, St. Augustine, Florida
December 2, 2009

Meeting Participants and Guests

Joint Technology Committee (JTC) Co-Chairs

Bridenback, Michael, Thirteenth Judicial Circuit Court for Hillsborough County, FL (NACM Co-Chair)
Hollon, Steve, Supreme Court of Ohio (COSCA Co-Chair)

JTC Members

Byers, David, Arizona Supreme Court
Hassel, Warner, Davidson County Tennessee General Sessions Court
Kuenhold, Judge O. John, Alamosa Combined Court
Marroney, Gerald A., Colorado Judicial Department
Olivier, John, Supreme Court of Louisiana, National Conference of Appellate Court Clerks
Roggero, Jim, Missouri Office of the State Court Administrator
Soles, Linda Romero, Stanislaus County Superior Court
Titus, Ron, Nevada Administrative Office of the Courts
Trickey, Judge Michael, King County Washington Superior Court
Warfield, Ron, Senior Judicial Systems Consultant
Wessels, Bob, Harris County Texas Criminal Courts
Uecker, Chelle

Ex-officio Members

Crawford, Chris, FACT (Forum on the Advancement of Court Technology)

Recognized Liaison

Greeves, Bob, U. S. Department of Justice

NCSC Staff

Clarke, Tom
Embley, Paul
Harris, Jim
Lodding, Debby
Murphy, Larry
Strickland, Shauna

Regrets

Collins, Dr. Hugh, Supreme Court of Louisiana
Roper, Dr. Bob, Colorado Judicial Branch

To jump directly to the “Action Items,” click [here](#).

JTC Introductions & Welcome

Introductions were made and JTC’s newest member Linda Romero Soles, a NACM representative, was welcomed to the group.

Court Technology Framework (CTF) Update & Working Group Activities

Judge Kuenhold presented slides showing CTF working group activities and how framework components fit together (filename: CTF update - JTC meeting - Dec 2009.pptx). He asked for feedback from JTC on what next steps should be taken. [LISTSERV](#) was suggested as a possible method for collaboration. The purpose of the analytical diagram tool will be to help policy makers ensure that staffers have a plan, and it serves as a guide for courts and vendors to effectively direct research and development money in the right areas. The diagram is intended to make certain people understand that standards matter.

There was some confusion over the term “mapping,” which is being used to explain how pieces fit into the diagram. It was agreed the working group needs to clearly define what is meant by “mapping” in this context. Disaster recovery, business continuity, privacy, governance, culture, and security are other areas noted that the working group will define and address.

Consensus was that mapping e-filing standards is a good first step to help illustrate relationships and how they spread through the framework layers, and it will highlight what needs attention. It was agreed that [definitions](#) and terms will be added to this effort rather than making the diagram more complex. If this exercise is successful, JTC will roll it out for public comment.

The working group has built a [wiki](#) website to share documents, status, and links, and Judge Kuenhold encouraged JTC’s members to contribute feedback:

http://www.ncsconline.org/wikis/ctf/index.php?title=Main_Page.

DOJ Update

Bob Greeves provided a summary of DOJ opportunities and [initiatives](#) and believes that Section 2 of OJP’s 2010 Program Plan, “Breaking the Cycles of Mental Illness, Substance Abuse, and Crime,” would be of particular interest to JTC: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ProgramPlan/toc.htm>. He also reported that the *Strategic Action Plan for 2010-2012* is currently in the draft stage; it is expected to be available within a week. Other priorities include GLOBAL; JRA; federated identity; family services; NIEM domain; public safety; EMS and fire scene analysis; computer aided dispatch; national data exchange; National Motor Vehicle Title Information System; crime enforcement training and technical assistance; and fusion centers with focus on warrants. Leveraging corrections with emphasis on reentry is a secondary focus.

National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) Update

Shauna Strickland reported that NCSC has partnered with SEARCH to analyze court data and fill gaps for the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS). The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) met with NCSC and SEARCH in October to plan and set expectations for this project. At the meeting, NCSC

learned that BJS expects a rolling 20-year estimate, and there are funding penalties for states that choose not to report. BJS understands there will be different models for various states. NCSC will be participating in a NICS conference December 15-17th where preliminary data analysis will be presented.

At this time, NCSC's data entry is complete, and effort has begun to determine reasonableness of current estimates. The problem is trying to determine the estimation model, and NCSC is looking to see if any patterns can be found across states. The FBI intermittently changes their processes on what they will and will not accept, which could be frustrating for states that are trying to provide input.

JTC offered a [letter](#) of support stating that statistics work needs to be done in an organized fashion by an organization such as the NCSC. Mr. Marroney moved that JTC distribute the NICS proposal and ask for an email vote showing endorsement from NACM & COSCA members. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bridenback.

Paul Embley shared information related to a proposal on how courts interface with their state [criminal history repository](#) to report required criminal data to the FBI (filename: National Court Toolbox.docx) and encouraged JTC's feedback.

State Court Organization Update

The last edition of the *State Court Organization* was in 2004:

<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/sco04.pdf>, and Shauna Strickland reported that NCSC's Research Division has received a 30-month grant to provide a web-based data collections and reporting update. In the 2004 edition, technology was not addressed, but the new edition will include this topic along with more frequent updates. One person from each state will be responsible for providing data; then NCSC will verify submittals. Minimally it will be reviewed yearly. NCSC is looking at JTC for ideas on what tables would be useful. Ron Titus and Hugh Collins are Court Statistics Project (CSP) representatives who will [coordinate input from JTC](#).

Court Information Technology Officers Consortium (CITOC) Update

Jim Roggero reported that from CITOC's perspective, CTC 2009 was fabulous this year. It was well attended, vendor participation was good, and folks were more engaged than in the past.

CITOC met in Denver immediately after CTC where nominations were made for three vacant positions. Election results are expected by January, which will include a formal chair announcement. It has been decided that piggybacking CITOC's annual meeting with other events (e.g., CTC) is not the best plan because CIO's were away from their home states for too long and back-to-back meetings and events are tiring.

Issues below were discussed at [CITOC's September meeting and JTC's feedback was encouraged](#):

- Tight budget conditions are a focus. Automation can help, but IT people need to "be at the table" to provide input—even if they're not invited.
- Concerns were expressed that requirements are made without money being put on the table.
- Re-engineering operations with training is an example of how to move people around to other positions.
- Borrow tools if you don't have the tools in your branch.

- Brokered links can be helpful—more needs to be done in this area.
- IT directors are looking for ways to approach telecommuting with their leadership. From an IT perspective, you need 24-hour coverage. Because others are going to be looking at telecommuting, CITOC needs to be ready to give guidance.
- Technology dependencies were discussed as they relate to business applications (i.e., technology driving business).

Funding and grant indications are that funding will get better, but it is unclear as to how stimulus funding will impact funding decisions because balancing the budget comes into play.

Managing Vendors

Chris Crawford discussed managing vendors in the coming year and how to increase the yield of collaboration between public and private sectors, which is a 2010 deliverable for FACT. There is a need for “rules of engagement” between courts and vendors in order to have productive relationships. An alliance between CITOC and FACT is on the radar to help bridge these gaps:

- 1) What IT standards are working (or not)?
- 2) How do we proceed with procurement reform?
- 3) Can POD serve as a model to share product development strategies with the private sector?

Standards

Jim Harris discussed the standards’ status

http://www.ncsconline.org/d_tech/jtc/documents/standards_matrix.pdf (filename: Standards-JTC meeting-Dec 2009.pptx), which includes pending proposed standards, consolidates standards, and appellate standards and asked for [JTC guidance](#).

Pending Proposed Standards

Six pending proposed standards are wrapping up conversion to NIEM. The arrest warrant standard is ready, and five others are near completion:

- Protection Order
- Sentencing Order
- Traffic Citation
- Charge Document
- Disposition Reporting

They will undergo public review in accordance with the standard process:

http://www.ncsconline.org/d_tech/jtc/documents/standards_process.pdf.

Consolidated Standards

Feedback is that there are gaps in the consolidated standards, and vendors need a business reason for using them. The Court Technology Framework Working Group has discussed identifying new products and implementation guidelines and expects to lay out vendor opportunities.

Appellate Standards

Paul Embley provided the JTC with an electronic copy of the 2001 Appellate Standards (filename: 2001 Appellate Standards.pdf). After discussion it was agreed that the appellate standards are on hold. Between now and July, these standards will be discussed and a vote will be made to put appellate standards to rest. In the meantime, NCSC will [assess](#) the level of effort required to provide updates.

E-Everything Updates

Larry Murphy has been working in conjunction with CITOC and NCSC on the Paper on Demand (POD) project and presented four case studies for JTC feedback: e-filing, e-payments, e-juror, and e-citation. It was agreed that this is a JTC priority and NCSC [resources should be devoted](#) to this project. Much has been done and the membership believes this should be packaged as a whole and final product. Do not add more “e-things,” but advertise this work showing cost savings and how it can leverage technology during tough times.

The following feedback and guidance was given:

- Clarify “centralized states.” It should be routing and efficiencies to law enforcement.
- Who do folks contact when these are published? Who is the clearinghouse? Find out if the courts have someone willing to take the queries.
- Add visuals (e.g., dollar signs) showing savings and include personnel time, which should have extra dollar signs.
- Market the green value.
- Up front show what’s in it for the readers.
- Highlight that POD is taking something off the clerk’s desk.
- Show cost savings for ticket storage. Less facility is needed for storage and not having to transport tickets to court is a benefit.
- If vehicles are outfitted with computers, then laptop costs are not there, but you’d need printers and other hardware. Address this cost issue.
- There’s other law enforcement funding out there. Help states identify funding sources.
- How are states getting information on the web?
- Show benefits of handling less money, fewer people coming in, fewer reconciliation problems, and revenue increases.
- E-payments observation: annualize the last three bullets in parentheses, or use a graphic or table.
- Add a list of questions that were not addressed because of the similarity of the states.
- Follow-up questions should go back to the states.
- Seek out states that were not similar in how they did e-everything.
- Show when a jurisdiction demands the paper. What’s the degree of demand for paper?
- The heading should read: “while we reduce by x%, here’s why paper is needed.”
- When you’re trying to persuade people to move toward POD, diffuse confrontation by explaining that you can have paper any time—POD is an option.
- Say what you observed in the document as a summary—e.g., this virtually eliminated the paper need. This is a series of articles on POD. This series shows how to get rid of paper as much as you can.

- Explain how these documents are going to be used.
- Add information about allowing the jury to change a jury date if that's applicable.
- Does this application of POD address national reporting on charities?

New Ideas & Concerns

Consensus was that CTF is JTC's first priority. It's essential that this effort be continued over the next six months with emphasis on e-filing as a sample. The second priority is getting PODs out at the rate of one per month or every six weeks as a sales point showing products over the next six months. The third priority is that we have monthly leadership call and quarterly membership calls to follow up on progress of these activities. At the July meeting JTC will decide how to proceed with standards.

Mr. Warfield moved that JTC table the 2001 Appellate Standards indefinitely, or until analysis information is provided from Mr. Olivier. The motion was seconded by John Olivier. A status report will be given at the July 2010 JTC meeting in New Orleans.

Mr. Marroney will be presenting to COSCA and CCJ in 2010 on technology and asked the membership for suggested topics for the chief justices. The following ideas were proposed:

- Court Technology Framework (CTF), POD, and e-filing
- Snorri Ogata's Orange County presentation
- What is e-filing going to do to your culture?
- 10 Ideas in 10 minutes by state. Then chief judges can follow up if there is interest.

The last item of business was recognition of Bob Wessels' outstanding JTC leadership since 2004 as JTC's Co-chair. He has graciously agreed to continue serving on the committee through December 2010 to advise the new Co-chair, Mike Bridenback.

Action Items

JTC

1. Provide a [letter of support](#) from JTC to let OJP know that NICS needs to be done in an organized fashion. Distribute the NICS proposal and ask for support/vote by email showing endorsement.
2. Titus, Collins, and Warfield coordinate [JTC's input](#) to the "State Court Organization" update that is being published by NCSC's Research Division.

CTF-WG

3. Add [definitions](#) to the CTF diagram rather than adding additional detail. Map a business function, not a standard.

NCSC

4. Look into creating a CTF [LISTSERV](#) to facilitate dialog and make recommendations.
5. Consider providing a report at semiannual JTC meetings showing where OJP and JTC activities [overlap](#) and explain the relationship between NCSC awards and JTC activities.
6. Find the white paper that addresses criminal history repository [disposition](#) reporting and send it to JTC for feedback.
7. Add the CTF-WG [wiki](#) link to the JTC page.
8. Incorporate JTC's feedback into the [POD](#) case studies. Provide JTC's membership with final POD versions before they are published, and get them out at the rate of one per month or every six weeks as a sales point showing products over the next six months
9. At the July JTC meeting, provide the number of [standards web hits](#) so the membership can decide how to proceed.
10. Come up with a [NICS](#) disposition white paper (Schauffler).

CITOC

11. After the election, [consider allowing JTC to view CITOC's work from their website](#) to encourage dialog with JTC.

Prepared by: Debby Lodding, NCSC