IT Community Development Workstream

FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DOCUMENT VERSIONS

Version	Date	Name/link	Version Description	Sections
1.7.4	4/20/2020	ITAC	Report approval	All
1.7.4	5/11/2020	JCTC	Report approval	All
2.0	6/10/2020	JCIT	Removed watermark; updated version number in footer; publication to website	All

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0   EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1   Overview

With scarce resources in a decentralized organization, the judicial branch recognizes the value of working together to drive technological change. In recent years, the branch has proven that working together as an information technology (IT) community allows courts and the branch to do more than what they are able to do independently. With this in mind, and in direct support of the branch *Strategic* and *Tactical Plan for Technology* goals, the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) convened the IT Community Development Workstream to make recommendations to optimize technical staff resources through resource sharing, promote professional development through education, and increase collaboration through technology tools usage.

The workstream used a variety of data-gathering methods, including focus groups and surveys, to collect input from a wide range of stakeholders, such as judicial officers, court executive officers (CEOs), and court information officers (CIOs). Courts of all sizes and geographic locations were engaged to provide information to help the workstream identify and prioritize areas of focus for its recommendations.

Findings from the outreach showed that courts generally agree that they could share resources and that models for an efficient approach to do so are vital to success. Additionally, the workstream uncovered specific needs for additional technology-related education for *all* branch personnel. And finally, courts are very interested in exploring options for the exchange of information via collaborative tools.

The workstream's recommendations reflect the information provided by the branch to the workstream during its multifaceted outreach. The proposed action items represent the main themes from the branch feedback and will, if approved and implemented, facilitate collaboration and the exchange of knowledge and best practices, and will enhance the ability of branch personnel to proactively and confidently engage in local technology-related activities to improve access to justice.

1.2   Recommendations

The IT Community Development Workstream's study resulted in nine recommendations that provide tactical next steps in support of the advancement and adoption of technology within the next two years. The first two recommendations are overarching and support overall implementation; they are followed by recommendations that are specific to the workstream's three areas of focus: resources, education, and tools. The scope of the recommendations may be scaled minimally or maximally depending on available resources. These recommendations are summarized below and are further detailed in the report.

The workstream recommends that ITAC, with the approval of the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC):

1. Direct the workstream executive sponsor, with support of the Judicial Council Information Technology (JCIT) office, to *facilitate and track the enactment of these recommendations*.

2. Direct JCIT to *develop a budget change concept for funding to support these recommendations* to provide (a) technical resources for shared resource pooling, as defined; (b) planning for and delivery of expanded educational programming; and (c) technology collaboration tools.

Related to optimizing and sharing resources

3. Direct ITAC CIO members to *partner with stakeholders to propose specific resource-sharing models* (e.g., court-to-court, JCIT-to-court, consortium) for four IT focus areas: security, infrastructure, case management, and database administration, *and report back to branch CEOs for consideration.*

Related to education and professional development

4. Propose that the Center for Judicial Education & Research (CJER) and JCIT *create a plan to identify and obtain resources* to enhance technology and innovation-related education throughout the branch by:

    a. Reviewing trainings for opportunities to *incorporate technology and innovative thinking within the scope of the CJER education plan* priorities;

    b. Assessing the needs and determining an *approach and timeline for expanding judicial officer technology-related training* and resources; and

    c. Increasing the frequency and further promoting available *project management training opportunities for court operations management and staff*.

5. Request that ITAC judicial and CEO members promote *increased in-person sharing of technology-related information and challenges* through focused agenda items, workstream roadshows, and improved communications.

6. Direct JCIT to provide expanded training opportunities for branch IT leaders:

    a. Partner with court IT leadership to *deliver training on technology planning processes and budget considerations* to promote alignment throughout the branch.

    b. Offer expanded *opportunities for court IT leaders to participate in educational events* and forums.

Related to collaboration tools

7. Direct JCIT to research, create, and *host a shared, web-based repository for exchange of technology-related project knowledge* within the branch.

8. Direct JCIT to *expand the Judicial Council's branch-hosted IT Security resource site*, including branch contributions and broadening the audience.

9. *Participate as an early adopter of the Judicial Council's efforts to expand Granicus* technology to automate meeting management and increase access through video streaming.

The remaining report provides the workstream approach, objectives, activities, detailed recommendations, and rationale in full detail.

2.0 BACKGROUND

The Judicial Branch *Tactical Plan for Technology 2019–2020* identifies that, although there are experienced technological staff branchwide, technology resources are insufficient to meet the needs of all courts. Skilled technologists who understand the work of the courts and court systems are a unique and treasured resource. The branch is also competing with private industry for talent. These realities call for creative solutions to the technology resource challenges throughout the branch.

Many courts are pursuing digital court initiatives that are transforming courts from requiring physical access and using manual procedures to conducting court business electronically. To further support this transformation, judicial officers, court executives, staff, and IT leaders can benefit from continual access to education and training resources that incorporate technology and innovative thinking.

The branch has adopted an IT governance model that relies on collaboration. Many branch technology initiatives are explored through statewide workstreams or other collaborative models, where groups work together throughout the branch, representing diverse roles and locations. To further support this collaborative model, tools that streamline project work and provide access to information are needed. Access to information about the experiences of others and the adoption of a collaborative workspace can support the continual efforts to increase technological maturity throughout the branch.

The IT Community Development Workstream was initiated to support the advancement and adoption of technology in the California courts. This workstream's intent was to focus more on the "people" side of technology adoption by looking at the technical staff resources needed to implement and support technology in the courts, what staff and judges need to know to use it, and how collaboration tools can be used to share experiences and promote innovation.

3.0 GOAL ALIGNMENT

Branch IT initiatives are governed by the branch four-year *Strategic Plan for Technology*. To provide a road map for achieving the goals in the strategic plan, ITAC develops a two-year *Tactical Plan for Technology*. ITAC then develops its annual agenda to implement the tactical plan initiatives.

The *Strategic Plan for Technology: 2014–2018* identified the goal to "Optimize Branch Resources," which was updated to "Innovate Through IT Community" in the 2019–2022 plan. The corresponding initiative in the tactical plan is "Expand Collaboration Within the Branch IT Community," which ITAC included as a project in its 2018 annual agenda to be accomplished by the IT Community Development Workstream.

4.0 WORKSTREAM SCOPE & OBJECTIVES

The workstream's scope, per the ITAC annual agenda, was largely research and investigation. The workstream held its first meeting on July 20, 2018, with the following objectives grouped by focus area (see also Appendix A):

Resource-sharing focus

(a) Survey the courts to identify their interest in exploring opportunities to share key technical resources; report findings.

(b) Assess court CEO/CIO interest in an IT peer consulting program and develop recommendations.

Education focus

(c) Assess needs and make recommendations for expanded opportunities for technology-related education for judicial officers, CEOs, CIOs, and court staff. Consult with CJER for educational planning considerations.

(d) Survey the courts to identify IT leadership and resource development needs and priorities; report findings.

Tools focus

(e) Identify, prioritize, and report on collaboration needs and tools for use within the branch.

(f) Evaluate and prioritize possible technologies to improve advisory body and workstream meeting administration; pilot recommended solutions with the committee.

5.0   WORKSTREAM STRUCTURE

The workstream formed three tracks to complete its work: Resources, Education, and Tools. Additional branch participation was solicited to provide input within these focus areas and in the delivery of outcomes. The Education Track divided into three areas of focus: Court Administration and Operations, Judicial Officers, and CIO Development. For detailed workstream and track membership lists, please see Appendix B.

6.0   OVERARCHING RECOMMENDATIONS

As the workstream completed its work, two overarching recommendations were identified that, if adopted, would support the enactment of the remaining individual track recommendations.

Recommendation	Details
1. **Direct the workstream executive sponsor, with support of JCIT, to facilitate and track the enactment of these recommendations.**	The IT Community Workstream covered a broad range of topics, resulting in a considerable number of recommendations. To ensure that the approved recommendations are prioritized and launched successfully, a focused effort is necessary. The executive sponsor is intimately familiar with the details of these recommendations and, with the support of JCIT, can help track and facilitate the next steps toward enactment.
2. **Direct JCIT to develop a budget change concept for funding to support these recommendations.**	A budget change concept will need to be developed by JCIT to provide: (a) technical resources for shared resource pooling, as defined; (b) planning for and delivery of expanded educational programming; and (c) technology collaboration tools. *Specific activities to be funded could include:* IT consultation and support to review existing and new curriculum for opportunities to strengthen or insert technology; Potential expansion of education specifically for judicial officers; Expanded project management course availability; and Tools and staff resources to expand the branch collaboration capabilities with Microsoft SharePoint or a similar platform.

The remaining recommendations are described below within the context of each individual sub-track.

7.0   RESOURCES TRACK

Providing secure and remote digital access to the courts requires court professionals with an understanding of the complex work of the courts and their associated technological systems. Having

knowledgeable technical and operational staff is essential to designing, implementing, and supporting the breadth of technologies required for courts to run effectively. Courts of all sizes face the challenge of obtaining adequate resources to meet these needs. The challenge is acutely keen in small and medium-sized courts, which strive to close resource gaps in areas of technology requiring specialization. Continued branchwide development of strategies to further leverage key available resources and services wherever possible is critical to meet these increasing demands.

7.1 Objectives

To achieve the desired outcome to identify strategies to leverage available resources and services, the Resources Track had two objectives:

- Survey courts to explore opportunities for sharing key technical resources.

- Solicit interest in an IT peer consulting program.

7.2 Activities

To gain insight into opportunities and interest, the Resources Track solicited input through discussions and surveys from the two major stakeholder groups: CEOs and court IT leadership.

- *Identified possible resource-sharing methods.*

Method	Details
Court-to-Court	Two courts share resources (e.g., Butte and Glenn sharing IT support services, including costs).
Court Consortiums	Collaboration between multiple (more than two) courts, guided by branch standards (e.g., Placer court serving as a case management system host for six peer courts; and joint and shared development efforts for case management system extensions between Monterey, Santa Clara, Orange, and Los Angeles).
JCIT-Court Partnership	The Judicial Council working directly with a court on a specific solution (e.g., Next-Generation Hosting consultation, applying an approved framework to courts in need of the service and assisting with refining business process)
JCIT Services	The Judicial Council providing opt-in resources or programs available branchwide, in which courts in need may

participate (e.g., providing court IT security assessments, remediation assistance, and road-mapping)

- ***Discussions and survey with court executives.*** A session was facilitated with the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) to preliminarily determine whether trial court CEOs thought that efforts to determine possibilities for sharing court technical resources would be worth pursuing. Following the discussion, in early 2019 the workstream surveyed trial court CEOs for additional input and to evaluate whether there was interest in exploring opportunities to share IT resources across the state in a court-to-court, court collaboration, or centralized manner.

- ***Discussions with court IT leaders.*** Court Information Technology Management Forum (CITMF) participants provided feedback on potential areas of focus for resource sharing from a technical perspective. The goal was to seek input from the practitioners on what resources might be the most practical to pursue sharing.

7.3   Key Observations

The following key observations were identified through the trial court CEO survey results and are incorporated in the recommendation below:

- Twenty-six (26) respondents completed the survey (representing nearly 50% of courts).
- Of those, 90% indicated that they had internal IT staff (three courts did not).
- Twenty-three (23) respondents indicated that IT staff resources could successfully be shared among courts.

The following list identifies the order in which the focus areas were ranked as having the greatest potential for successful sharing:

1. Information security
2. Network infrastructure
3. Case management systems
4. Database administration
5. General IT consulting
6. Application development and website expertise (related/complementary)
7. Cloud computing
8. Document management
9. Collaborative tools
10. Business intelligence
11. Digital evidence

The survey also identified the following preferences for resource-sharing methods:

- Information security—Facilitate through JCIT or in a JCIT-court partnership.

- Network infrastructure—Facilitate through a JCIT-court partnership.

- Case management systems resources—Facilitate through a consortium of courts (50 percent of respondents thought that, of the options provided, a consortium would offer the best opportunity for success).

At the conclusion of the survey, approximately 75 percent of respondents indicated an interest in exploring this subject further. The recommendation below also supports further exploration.

7.4   Recommendation

This recommendation is for the further exploration of interest and opportunities for sharing key technical resources within the branch.

Recommendation	Details
3. **Direct ITAC CIO members to partner with stakeholders to propose specific resource-sharing models (e.g., court-to-court, JCIT-to-court, consortium) for four IT focus areas—security, infrastructure, case management, and database administration—and report back to branch CEOs for consideration.**	ITAC CIO members, in partnership with trial court CIOs and JCIT, shall recommend opportunities and methods for resource sharing in the four areas of greatest potential: • Information security • Network infrastructure • Case management systems • Database administration For each area, identify a model for resource-sharing (court-to-court, JCIT-to-court, consortium, etc.), a recommended priority, and any associated costs. The resulting efforts should be provided to the ITAC CEOs to communicate to CEAC for consideration of next steps, because CEOs are the key stakeholders needed to endorse any resource-sharing strategies.

8.0   EDUCATION TRACK

8.1   Objectives

For courts to achieve their strategic technology goals and more quickly adapt to change, it is essential that leaders throughout the branch understand the role and use of technology and that judicial officers and staff are well trained in its implementation and use. To accelerate the adoption of technology, the branch should strive to continually evolve as a learning organization that actively pursues and embraces professional development and technology-related education for its judicial officers, leaders, and staff. ITAC is charged with making "proposals for technology education and training in the judicial branch" (Cal. Rules of

Court, rule 10.53(b)(5)) and is the entity best suited to identify and prioritize technology-related education gaps and needs.

To achieve these desired outcomes, the Education Track had two objectives:

- Assess needs and make recommendations for expanded opportunities for technology-related education for judicial officers, CEOs, CIOs, and court staff. Consult with CJER for educational planning considerations.

- Assess IT leadership development needs and priorities.

8.2   Activities

To address the broad needs of the branch, the Education Track took a multifaceted approach to identifying, researching, and making recommendations for the following sub-tracks:

Sub-Track	Area of Focus in Support of Technology and Innovation
1. **Court Administration and Operations**	Education for CEOs, other court leaders, and staff
2. **Judicial Officers**	Education specific to judges, justices, and commissioners
3. **CIO Development**	Ongoing efforts to develop and refine skills needed for technology leaders

Throughout the Education Track, each of the sub-tracks obtained broad input to support their work. Sub-track members—including judicial officers, CJER and JCIT management and staff, and trial court CIOs and CEOs—were people with a variety of roles, as well as multidisciplinary participants. In addition, the methodologies used by the sub-tracks to assess needs and arrive at recommendations included the following:

- **Determined methodology to obtain input from stakeholders and information to be gathered.** Because the sub-track members desired responses that included personal thoughts and feedback on the topic of education, they thought that the organic discussions of focus groups would be more effective than surveys in soliciting positive, negative, and neutral feedback. This approach also allowed for better provision of context and rephrasing of questions, as needed. Each track identified applicable questions to be used to conduct the stakeholder focus groups, as well as volunteer

facilitators for each respective group (i.e., CEOs, judges, CIOs), because sub-track members felt that it would be important to have a peer gather feedback.

- **Conducted focus groups.** Five (5) focus groups helped identify the technology-related training needs throughout the branch for judicial officers, court administration, and operations. The tracks selected a handful of volunteers who have an interest in the topic, met with them before the focus group to explain objectives, and asked them to help identify potential focus group members. Selected participants represented both reviewing courts and trial courts of varied sizes and locations. The focus groups were conducted via web conferencing (WebEx).

- **Prioritized and delivered initial training.** For the CIO Development sub-track, the lead CIOs developed an approach to gather input, determine priorities, and conduct training with court CIOs and IT leaders throughout the branch.

- **Consulted with CJER staff.** Although all track participants were valuable contributors, having CJER staff participate to provide the educational perspective and insight into aligning additional technology-related training needs with current CJER planning efforts was extremely beneficial.

For detailed workstream and track membership lists, please see Appendix B.

8.2.1 Court Administration and Operations Sub-track

The needs assessment and recommendations were developed for this sub-track from the perspective of trial court executive officers and appellate court administrators.

8.2.1.1 Activities

Three focus groups were held to gather input on the current state of technology-related education for court administration and operations in California. The groups were geographically diverse and came from small, medium, and large courts. The members were identified by participating CEOs. The participants answered the following questions:

1. Do you feel you have enough training to develop a technical strategy plan in support of your court's operational needs?

2. Do you need education/training to help develop a technology road map to support that strategic plan?

3. What are the top concerns and fears about using and adopting technology?

4. Do you hear feedback from court users or staff that points to issues technology might address/opportunities for technology implementation?

5. Are there training opportunities (offered either locally or by the Judicial Council) that you feel are needed?

6. Other court areas where technology systems could be implemented?

7. Staffing and financial resources aside, do you feel adequately informed and knowledgeable moving to electronic case files within your court?

8. Is there interest in learning about trends and advancements in technology?

9. What digital services would you like to see the court offer to the public that currently are not offered?

10. How can the branch's resources and educational offerings effectively (or more effectively) complement the court's goals as it relates to technological advancement?

8.2.1.2   Key Observations

The following key observations related to operations and administration were identified through the information-gathering process and are incorporated in the recommendations below:

- ***There is an increased need for project management expertise,*** because of the continual expansion of technology within the courts. This need exists for both operational and technical staff.

- ***There is value in sharing technology-related information and challenges.*** Court leaders have learned to navigate the challenges in technology adoption through their own experiences and lessons learned. Although a lot of ad hoc sharing and consultation is occurring, currently no centralized means is in place for information sharing and/or training new leaders on proven strategies for technology adoption (e.g., determining the business case and return on investment, developing or leveraging requests for information or proposals, and developing vendor contracts or project plans). In the absence of recommended training, new and future leaders risk "reinventing the wheel" and being unable to leverage the experience, knowledge, and lessons learned "the hard way" by predecessors.

8.2.2   Judicial Officers Sub-track

The needs assessment and recommendations were developed by the sub-track's participating judicial officers.

8.2.2.1   Activities

Two focus groups were held to gather input on the current state of technology education for judges in California. Although small, the groups included both trial judges and appellate justices. They were geographically diverse and came from

small, medium, and large courts. The members were nominated by court CEOs in response to a request by the sub-track. The participants answered the following questions:

1. On a typical day, what computer services do you use?

2. What computer services might help in your daily operations?

   - In chambers?
   - On the bench?
   - At home?

3. In your role as a judicial officer, in a perfect world what would computer services be able to do?

4. What is the biggest frustration regarding the use of technology in daily operations?

5. Are you comfortable using electronic/digital case files?

6. Do you hear feedback from court users/staff that points to an issue that technology issue that might address?

7. Are there training opportunities (either offered locally or by the Judicial Council) that you feel are needed?

8. Are you interested in learning about trends and advancements in technology?

9. What digital services would you like to see the court offer to the public?

10. What role, if any, do you think the judicial officers have in the adoption of technology within the courts?

See Appendix C for focus group results.

8.2.2.2 Key Observations

The following key observations related to judicial officer education were identified through the information-gathering process and are incorporated in the recommendations below:

- *More training is needed.* It was apparent from the focus groups that the judges surveyed were generally unhappy with the extent of judicial training regarding IT skills and that they wanted more.

- *Offerings should be tailored to the bench.* It was also apparent that they generally felt that the nature of the training they had been given was well meaning but ineffectively tailored to the needs of the judicial officers.

- *More study is needed to serve judicial officer needs.* Given these observations, the workstream sub-track believes that further exploration of this topic should be undertaken with a goal of significantly improving the extent and nature of the training of judicial officers regarding the use of IT resources.

8.2.3   CIO Development Sub-track

The work of the CIO Development sub-track was done by its participating CIOs.

8.2.3.1   Activities

The following activities were conducted in support of the CIO Development sub-track:

Date	Activity	Details
Fall 2017	**Classroom observation**	Key sub-track team members observed the Gartner Public Sector CIO Corporate Executive Board IT Leadership Academy that was hosted by the Superior Court of Los Angeles County to gain exposure to modern teaching concepts and current IT leadership topics.
Spring 2018	**Court IT leader brainstorm**	A brainstorming session was conducted at the quarterly CITMF meeting to identify potential education topics and priorities for court IT leaders.
Spring 2018	**Course framework development**	Leveraged materials were created independently on a national scale and customized for the audience.
Summer 2018	**Self-assessment and program framework**	The first education session was conducted at CITMF to introduce the framework of a CIO development program, including a leadership self-assessment and information on leadership types and levels.
Fall 2018	**Survey to identify priorities**	After the education session, a follow-up survey was distributed to court IT leaders to determine the highest training priorities for the group. The survey contained the potential education topics previously identified by the group. Participants were asked if they thought that a CIO development program would benefit them or a fellow colleague. The following priorities were identified: • Create a strategic view. • Create a strategic plan. • Be the change agent. • Pick the right leadership style for the situation.

		• Understand and navigate the culture: use agility as a tool.
		• Embrace emotional intelligence.
As of July 2019	**Courses delivered**	• Strategic Thinking and Planning (two sessions)
		• Art of Communication
		• Enterprise Contributors

8.2.3.2   Key Observations

The following key observations related to CIO Development were identified through the information-gathering process and are incorporated within the recommendations below:

- ***Good source material but requires adaptation or licensure.*** The Los Angeles–sponsored Gartner IT Leadership training was a helpful starting point to identify potential education topics that were relevant to the California courts' IT leaders.

- ***Overwhelming support for a CIO development program.*** The results of the CITMF brainstorming and survey showed that 100 percent of survey participants (17) either strongly agreed (53%) or agreed (47%) that they would benefit from participating in a CIO development program.

- ***Dedicated time allocated by target audience, demonstrating interest and commitment.*** Because of the widespread interest within the group for educational opportunities, the desire was for the training to start as soon as possible. For the past year, the group has allocated either a half a day or a full day to training sessions that are adjunct to existing meetings or gatherings in pursuit of professional development.

8.3   Recommendations

The following recommendations are aimed at increasing technology-related educational opportunities for judicial officers and court administration and operations, including leadership and staff, throughout the branch:

Recommendation	Details
4. Propose that CJER and JCIT create a plan to identify and obtain resources to enhance technology and innovation-related education throughout the branch.	The Center for Judicial Education and Research covers a broad scope of education for the branch. This recommendation is broken down into three areas of focus addressing operations, administration, and judicial officers. To address each of these areas, it is recommended that the ITAC liaison assigned to CJER, with support from JCIT, be directed to work with the CJER Advisory Committee to develop an approach to enact these recommendations. **a. Review trainings for opportunities to incorporate technology and innovative thinking within the scope of the CJER education plan priorities.** Existing trainings can be modified and new trainings created, as appropriate, with a focus on, for example, familiarizing operations staff with the types of opportunities and efficiencies that technology can provide. In addition to planned CJER training initiatives, this could also include discussion topics such as "counter to courtroom" trainings or forums to create opportunities to share experiences about leveraging technology in daily or regular duties. ITAC CEO members could then work with CEAC to identify and pursue potential innovation and technology-related training opportunities. **b. Assess the needs and determine an approach and timeline for expanded judicial officer technology-related training and resources.** • *Determine resources to champion this effort.* Resources will be required to support this effort of research, assessment, curriculum identification, delivery methods, and timeline development. • *Conduct a judicial officer education survey.* Survey judicial officers throughout the state to identify training needs, skill levels, and preferred delivery methods. See Appendix D for sample questions. • *Evaluate results to identify gaps.* The Superior Court of Los Angeles County has an extensive training program for judges that could serve as a baseline to compare commonality for the types of training desired by judicial officers statewide. Although courts may have different case management systems, bench tools, and the like, there may be a common framework or topics that apply to all courts that could increase the adoption of technology throughout the branch. Ideally, the survey results will also indicate priority based on common needs throughout the state. • *Determine training approach and timeline.* Explore how best to deliver some or all the desired training, and incorporate results within appropriate training plans. This analysis should examine how best to deliver the identified training, including whether classes should be delivered locally or statewide; who would develop the training materials; and who should provide the training. It has been identified that for certain topics, judicial officers prefer one-on-one training from

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>other judges. Depending on the topic, however, options could include classes by CJER or another designated entity, regional classes sponsored by one or more county courts, classes by outside providers such as private entities or other governmental agencies that provide IT training, and online training videos from contract providers on discrete topics that could be referenced as needed.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>**c. Increase the frequency and further promote available project management training opportunities for court operations management and staff.**

Consider funding additional offerings of the Institute for Court Management's "Project Management for Courts," as well as potential updates, promotion, or creation of additional training or workshops that would give hands-on, end-to-end skills in project work, for example. Training should familiarize attendees with the tools, resources, processes, and procedures available to facilitate the development and execution of projects (such as waterfall, agile, and similar project management frameworks and practices).</td></tr>
<tr><td>**5. Request that ITAC judicial and CEO members promote increased in-person sharing of technology-related information and challenges through focused agenda items, workstream roadshows, and improved communications.**</td><td>Request that ITAC judicial and CEO members communicate, through their respective peer forums and meetings, the interest in sharing success stories, lessons learned, and technology strategy throughout the courts.

Meetings and forums:

• Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC)

• Court Executives Advisory Committee

• California Appellate Court Clerk Administrators

Options for consideration:

• Include technology or innovation or both as a standing or periodic item on agendas.

• Submit requests from members on items of interest, and follow up.

• Feature innovative initiatives in quarterly newsletters.

• Prepare "roadshow" or toolkit packages, including job aids and tools, at end of a workstream for subsequent distribution and delivery.

• Periodically survey courts to ask what's new; feature or spotlight topics at meetings or through other means.</td></tr>
<tr><td>**6. Direct JCIT to provide expanded training opportunities for branch IT leaders.**</td><td>An incredible opportunity exists for JCIT, in partnership with court IT leadership, to pursue expanded training opportunities for IT leaders throughout the branch, such as:

a. Partnering with court IT leadership to deliver training on technology planning processes and budget considerations to promote alignment throughout the branch.

During the work of the Education Track, a specifically requested topic was related to long-term technical roadmap training. This recommendation was derived from the Court Administration and Operations sub-track. Courts are interested in having JCIT provide</td></tr>
</table>

	a web conference or other training outlining the technology planning process, timelines, and budget considerations, including: • Judicial Council Technology Committee's (JCTC's) creation and maintenance of the branch *Strategic Plan for Technology* (every four years); and • ITAC's creation and maintenance of the *Tactical Plan for Technology* (every two years). • The updating of JCIT and court technology roadmaps for their defined priorities. **b. Offer expanded opportunities for court IT leaders to participate in educational events and forums.** In recent years, JCIT has offered the following opportunities for courts: • *Membership to the Court Information Technology Officers Consortium*—court CIOs nationwide supporting efforts to implement appropriate technology to improve the management and administration of courts • *Access to Gartner subscriptions*—including CIO Leadership, Technical Professionals, and Risk Management—which provide content-rich websites on relevant technology leadership topics as well as access to live analysts • *Registration for the annual Gartner Catalyst Conference*—providing an in-depth review of technical trends and topics affecting technical professionals, and offering live content where attendees ask questions, vet ideas, and proactively problem-solve

9.0 TOOLS TRACK

9.1 Objectives

The third track of the workstream, the Tools Track, focused on the use of collaboration tools to maximize opportunities to share innovative solutions and technical best practices within the Judicial Branch. The purpose of a collaboration platform is to provide a means for disparate teams throughout the court IT community to work together more cohesively.

The research for this track included a brief look at ways to improve meeting facilitation, and the possibility of creating a repeatable model to support public committee meetings using technology.

The Tools Track's specific objectives were the following:

- Identify, prioritize, and report on collaboration needs and tools for use within the branch, including coordination and planning with JCIT for operational support.

- Evaluate and prioritize possible technologies to improve advisory body and workstream meeting administration; pilot recommendations with ITAC.

9.2 Activities

The track membership comprised several trial court CIOs, as well as participants from various areas of JCIT representing a broad set of perspectives including:

- Enterprise Architecture
- Program/Project Management Office
- Security
- Web Services

The team gathered input from various stakeholders, participated in education sessions, and obtained insight into how another state court has approached collaboration.

In addition to learning about collaboration tools from an industry and state court perspective, the track also surveyed trial court CEOs and CIOs for input into opportunities and potential priorities for sharing. To develop the recommendations, the information was gathered and analyzed to determine which of the ideas received might provide the broadest impact.

- An IT leadership focus group was conducted at a CITMF meeting to identify items of interest for sharing.

- Track participants inventoried and categorized the list of needs identified to evaluate the current method of sharing, the types of collaboration needed, and the intended audience. This information was used to determine the recommendations and priorities. (See Appendix E.)

- The track held two consultative calls with Gartner Inc. analysts on trends and adoption of collaboration tools and enterprise content management. The team heard from industry analysts about how others are approaching collaboration and how that type of collaboration could apply to the distributed nature of the California court environment.

- Two web conferences were also conducted with staff of the Indiana state courts, who demonstrated how they have leveraged tools to support collaboration throughout their courts for the past decade.

For the task of evaluating possible technologies to improve advisory body meeting information, the sub-track consulted the Judicial Council Web Services team to understand

what is currently being used by the council for broadcasting meetings, captioning, posting agendas and materials, and serving as a repository of recordings and minutes, and the like.

9.3   Key Observations

Throughout the track activities, the following key observations were made about the adoption and use of collaboration tools:

- ***Start small to drive adoption.*** The most significant observation is that *adoption* of any collaboration tool or platform *is invariably the hardest part*. According to Gartner, the key is to pursue incremental improvement because the "big bang" approach typically fails; it can petrify stakeholders, and even the most motivated people return to old habits when they are overwhelmed by a new solution. For this reason, the workstream recommends starting with a proof of concept and expanding existing efforts rather than attempting to implement a solution that tries to meet all needs identified up front.

  Experiments with workstreams bear this out: four workstreams, including the Education Track of this workstream, created SharePoint sites but found it very difficult to motivate team members to use the tool to its fullest extent. At best, the sites have become document repositories, maintained exclusively by IT staff. One new workstream is experimenting with having a SharePoint site in place from the beginning, emphasizing the expectation that members will use the site for collaboration and driving traffic to the site for organizational tasks.

- ***Efficiencies can be gained.*** This workstream's Education Track met exclusively by remote means, using WebEx to conduct meetings. Doing so was both efficient and cost effective, allowing remote participants to discuss and view real-time editing of materials.

- ***Centralized place for knowledge sharing is needed.*** Both the Education Track and the Tools Track identified a desire for a centralized information repository, where courts can, for example, contribute to and access past, current, and future project information to increase peer-to-peer sharing and learning while reducing duplicative research. This is different from current static websites that do not include the option to exchange information and upload documents in real time.

- ***Many tools exist, with Microsoft common among courts.*** Many collaboration technology options exist, including those that are embedded within existing applications. Some courts in California and nationally have moved to Microsoft SharePoint or Microsoft Teams as a collaboration platform—the latter a more dynamic workspace, including messaging, discussion threads, and real-time sharing. They each have their purpose, and one does not preclude the other.

- ***Skilled resources are key.*** Along with established ownership, dedicated skilled resources are needed to build collaboration sites and support the organization by understanding and

promoting the available functionality, including opportunities for interoperability and ongoing content management and information life cycles.

- *Content management is required.* One of the challenges of any information repository is determining how to manage redundant, outdated, or trivial data. The workstream recommends a facilitated proof of concept so that standards can be set for what is shared centrally and for how the lifecycle of the information is managed.

- *Meetings tool is in place at Judicial Council and may expand usage.* The Granicus platform is currently being used by the Judicial Council and some Courts of Appeal. Granicus is an open government platform and toolset used to manage meetings and agendas. Functionality includes web posting of agendas and materials, workflow processes to manage content, and streaming of video and bookmarked recordings. Judicial Council Support has indicated that there have been conversations about the possibility of deploying Granicus to other internal committees and/or advisory bodies.

9.4 Recommendations

The following recommendations are intended to promote sharing of innovative solutions and technical best practices while using accessible technology solutions to do so.

Recommendation	Rationale
7. **Direct JCIT to research, create, and host a shared, web-based repository for exchange of technology-related project knowledge within the branch.**	To accomplish this directive, JCIT would research and evaluate opportunities to increase sharing of project experiences and artifacts. The vision for this repository would be to enable council staff and courts to contribute to and access past, current, and future project information to increase peer-to-peer sharing and learning, while reducing duplicative research.
	This effort should be approached in phases, beginning with a shared site in support of the next workstream launched (as a pilot). The JCIT would facilitate the use of the workstream site and administer access accordingly, including orientation and ongoing support for workstream participants and committee chairs, as needed. Once a workstream concludes, final materials would be made accessible in a consistent way in the project information repository for access throughout the branch.
	Following this pilot and including other research, a design template would be developed.
	Design requirements and principles for the repository should include:
	• It would serve as a centralized repository resource, including folding in, consolidating, or updating existing Innovation Knowledge Center to avoid duplication
	• It would be easy to access with easy-to-find information
	• It contains content for past, current, and future projects

	• It includes documents, project artifacts, and possibly calendars
	• JCIT would host and manage, with the courts contributing content
	• It is scalable to include non-workstream efforts
	Suggested startup activities for JCIT:
	• Select new workstream(s) as proof of concept candidates.
	• Acquire advanced skill set for platform; establish service team to help the project team use it successfully.
	• Design proposed templates for workstream usage; establish key principles for design (e.g., usability, simplicity, level-one design, and replicability).
	• Conduct proof of concept.
	• Create repeatable onboarding tools and process for administering new sites.
	• Present proven design and workflow to ITAC, CITMF, and stakeholders for feedback.
	Future phases would include:
	• Deployment to all new workstreams
	• Incorporation of historical workstream content
	• Incorporation of innovation center content
8. **Direct JCIT to expand the Judicial Council's branch-hosted IT Security resource site, including branch contributions and broadening the audience.**	The workstream recommends that the online IT Security Resource Library (currently hosted by JCIT in SharePoint) be expanded to provide additional court IT security program information, policies, templates, and samples and models created for use. Courts would be encouraged to contribute local policies as well, so that information currently shared via listservs and informal one-off requests would become easy to find and access.
	The workstream recommends that the site remain branch facing and for court use; users would include CEOs, CIOs, and IT security professionals at the court and Judicial Council. User access would be managed by a JCIT Network & Security program lead or designee. The audience could expand based on the content provided and the evolving needs of the audience.
	Furthermore, the workstream recommends that the following steps be included in the expansion of the library:
	• Identify a content owner.
	• Define the site's intended scope of content and user access policy; publish this information to the site.
	• Preview contents with a focus group to gather input on usefulness and design; incorporate feedback into delivery strategy.

	• Launch and communicate the site's availability, and provide access to the site for the full CIO community. It is recommended that this effort be addressed within the Branchwide Information Security Roadmap Workstream and that the ITAC annual agenda be modified as needed.
9. Participate as an early adopter of the Judicial Council's efforts to expand Granicus technology to automate meeting management and increase access through video streaming.	The workstream recommends that JCIT follow up with Judicial Council Support about any further discussions regarding the deployment of Granicus to include advisory bodies and, if any, to volunteer ITAC as an early adopter as the use of the technology expands. As an early adopter, the committee would potentially: • Post agendas and materials; • Broadcast meetings and store recordings; • Introduce automated workflow; • Provide feedback to improve usability; • Study whether the technology assists the group in being more efficient and improving access; and • Assess the cost to effectively expand the service.

10.0 CONCLUSION

This concludes the recommendations of the IT Community Development Workstream. The workstream members believe that endorsement to move forward with these recommendations will support the critical "people" side of the advancement and adoption of technology in the courts.

By determining how to share scarce resources, expand technology-related education, and adopt tools to work better together as an IT community, we will further support the stated technology goals of the branch to better meet the needs of the people of California.

APPENDIX A – 2020 Annual Agenda

7. IT Community Development	*Priority 1*
	Scope category(ies): **Possibilities**

Project Summary: Expand collaboration and professional development within the branch IT community.

Key Objectives:
(a) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, as appropriate.
(b) Provide recommendations for next steps based on findings.
(c) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1.

Objectives Met or Resolved:
- *Survey the courts to identify (i) their interest in exploring opportunities to share key technical resources and (ii) IT leadership and resource development needs and priorities; report findings.*
- *Assess court CEO/CIO interest in an IT peer consulting program and develop recommendations.*
- *Assess needs and make recommendations for expanded opportunities for technology-related education for judicial officers, CEOs, CIOs, and court staff. Consult with CJER for educational planning considerations.*
- *Identify, prioritize, and report on collaboration needs and tools for use within the branch.*
- *Evaluate and prioritize possible technologies to improve advisory body and workstream meeting administration; pilot recommended solutions with the committee.*

Origin of Project: Tactical Plan for Technology 2017–2018 and 2019–2020.

Status/Timeline: April 2020

Resources:
- *ITAC: Workstream, Sponsor: Ms. Jeannette Vannoy*
- *Judicial Council Staffing: Information Technology*
- *Collaborations: CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee*

APPENDIX B
Membership of the IT Community Development Workstream

Executive Sponsors

- Hon. Alan G. Perkins, Judge, Superior Court of Sacramento County
- Ms. Jeannette Vannoy, CIO, Superior Court of Napa County

Project Manager

- Ms. Jessica Craven Goldstein, Senior Business Systems Analyst, Judicial Council IT

Tracks (leads in italics)

1. Resources

   - *Ms. Jeannette Vannoy*, CIO, Superior Court of Napa County
   - *Mr. Darrel E. Parker*, CEO, Superior Court of Santa Barbara County

2. Education

   - *Hon. Alan G. Perkins*, Judge, Superior Court of Sacramento County
   - *Mr. Mark Dusman*, Principal Manager, Judicial Council IT

   Sub-tracks

   Court Administration and Operations—*Mr. Jason B. Galkin,* CEO, Superior Court of Nevada County

   CIO Development—*Ms. Heather Pettit,* Director/CIO, Judicial Council IT

   Judicial Education—*Hon. Alan G. Perkins*, Judge, Superior Court of Sacramento County

   - Ms. Jeannette Vannoy, CIO, Superior Court of Napa County
   - Hon. Brian M. McNamara, Judge, Superior Court of Kern County
   - Ms. Daphne Light, Manager, Judicial Council IT
   - Ms. Camilla Kieliger, Sr. Business Systems Analyst, Judicial Council IT
   - Ms. MaryAnn Koory, Sr. Education Developer, Judicial Council CJER

3. Tools

   - *Ms. Jeannette Vannoy,* CIO, Superior Court of Napa County
   - *Ms. Jamel Jones,* Information Systems Supervisor, Judicial Council IT
   - Mr. Paras Gupta, CIO, Superior Court of Monterey County (CATUG, Workstreams)
   - Mr. Brett Howard, CIO, Superior Court of Orange County (CITMF)
   - Mr. Mark Gelade, Information Systems Supervisor, Judicial Council IT
   - Mr. Matt Nicholls, Information Systems Supervisor, Judicial Council IT
   - Mr. Haresh Thevathasan, Sr. Business Systems Analyst, Judicial Council IT
   - Mr. John Yee, Enterprise Architect, Judicial Council IT

APPENDIX C
Findings From Judicial Officer Focus Groups

Currently Used Digital Services

All participants report frequent use of email/Outlook, word processing, and their court's case management system (CMS).

Additionally, some use a digital workflow to process and sign warrants, and others use Adobe for signatures and approval workflow.

Finally, a few report using local applications, such as a bench jury selection app.

Two judicial officers responded that their courts are generally paperless.

Identified Service Needs

All participants would like to be able to access bench and chambers views from home. To facilitate and support a better remote access working environment, participants suggested establishing a 24/7 helpline dedicated to that purpose.

Identified Training Needs

The focus group participants suggested the following areas for technology training:

- Going paperless
- Tech tips newsletter highlighting changes that affect workflow and technology tools
- Incorporation of training on technology into new assignment training, Judicial College, and NJO
- Reinforcement of statewide training at the local level

Suggested Training Delivery

Focus group participants agree that training should be *peer-delivered* where possible. Training should also be available in different modes, from in-person instruction to self-directed.

Practical training and support are critical to the adoption of technology by judicial officers. Instruction should focus on how the technology is used, how it applies to a judicial officer's work, and how it makes that work easier. On-demand follow-up training and support to reinforce the training should be available.

Role of Judicial Officers

CMS deployment has demonstrated the need to involve judicial officers in the process. It is an enormous transition for everyone in the court, and the judicial officer voice is necessary for a successful rollout and acceptance in the court. Involving judicial officers in the process also prepares them to train other judicial officers going forward.

The focus group agrees that a "training strike team" for and by judges would be of great value.

Digital Services for the Public

The focus group participants identified many technologies that they see as beneficial for increasing the public's access to justice and for streamlining court resources, such as the following:

- "Self-service" avatar/chat technology (traffic and other)
- Online payment of fines, and—in collaboration with law enforcement agencies—the addition of instructions on *Notice to Appear* forms
- Voice-to-text translation devices
- Jury service apps: Selection, remote initial voir dire, etc.
- Apps for courtroom lawyers: Scheduling reminders, log in, etc.
- Video appearance

The focus group participants suggested that having a technology governance group of judges could help push technology locally while exerting some budget control.

Other Observations

Courts are generally very far behind technologically. Like many organizations, judicial officers and court staff get comfortable with existing technology and find it challenging to adapt to and keep up with new versions or modern technology.

APPENDIX D
Sample Judicial Officer Education Survey

1. How familiar are you with the various systems (case and document management systems, digital jury instructions, legal research tools, bench guides, etc.) available to aide judicial officers in their day-to-day work?

   - Very familiar
   - Somewhat familiar
   - Not at all familiar

2. How satisfied are you with the training options available to judges on the use of court systems and technology?

   - Very satisfied
   - Somewhat satisfied
   - Not satisfied
   - Comments: _____

3. What systems would you like more training on?

   - Judicial use of case and document management systems
   - General office applications (i.e., word processing, email)
   - Legal research tools
   - Benchguides
   - Other: _____

4. What do you think is the best delivery method for you to participate in training *(select all that apply)*?

   - Professional IT trainer
   - Fellow judicial officer
   - Online training
   - Other: _____

5. Are you interested in participating in efforts to improve technology-related education available for judges?

APPENDIX E
Tools Track List of Needs

#	List of needs	Description	Intended Audience	Comments
1	Case Management System (CMS) User Group Materials	CATUG: Tyler-hosted SharePoint site; may be others.	Court operations and admin; court IT	Enables courts to share/leverage business process, configs, reports; strong potential for sharing of work products. Check in on appellate/ACCMS current practices. Current CATUG site is not used—still relying on email as the distribution—organized, but also distributed via email to recipients—promote going to website for information. Challenge: currently vendor hosted, integrate with court solutions—not vendor based. Ideally solution would use ID Mgmt. to simplify access. Ensure site has high value content to attract users to site.
2	JCIT Security Program Information/Policies and Templates	Ultimate goal to be branch facing and for court use; provides models/ samples. Template and internal/Judicial Council policy.	CEOs, CIOs, court IT security professionals	Audience could expand based on content provided. Potentially local courts can post Concept; lead provides direction, others to contribute Proof of concept of how courts can contribute. Possibly additional information as program rolls out.
3	MSAs, LPAs, and Procurement Materials	Easy access to master/statewide agreements that exist; including topics, actual contract (terms/ content). Standard template for domain areas (e.g., SaaS).	CEOs and CIOs; branch management, including Judicial Council	Should include contact person—possibly leverage that to share procurement document, security needs to be considered. Understand what the software will do to determine opportunities (JCIT).
4	Workstream Materials—in-progress work products	Interactive chat Workstream, incl. repository for materials, discussion site, research, etc. Examples in use: Intelligent Chat and IT Community workstreams, SRL for content (Orange SP), DR for content (Monterey SP), Data Exchange, Voice-to-text using MS Teams.	Workstream participants (courts, Judicial Council staff, external), and others with interest	Non-participants are commonly interested in what other groups have done/are doing; artifacts often help teams to get ahead; relates to/becomes model for other projects 15 active workstreams and drives development of branchwide strategy Concept to have everything in one location to support workstreams - a tool to help the workstream stay organized (i.e., SP or Teams site)
5	Workstream Results (published work products)	Not sure if everything has been published? ITAC deliverables are on *courts.ca.gov*—JRN both IT and ITAC, looking at current organization	Everyone in IT community and more	Determine appropriate location dependent on content/data classification (e.g., considering security). Important to have visible results of what workstreams

#	List of needs	Description	Intended Audience	Comments
		of JRN to make content more user accessible Privacy resource guide, Next-Gen.		producing and associated tools available. Two aspects: published and then by subject.
6	Court IT Management Forum (CITMF) Meeting Materials	Nice to have materials available "online"; possibly still send out (meeting invites, etc.), but repository to memorialize what was discussed.	CIOs and possibly other participants	Valuable for new CIOs.
7	Discussions	Centralized, categorized, collated in one spot, Available so people can look back and find info on that topic; put into context Need access to archive.	IT professionals- JCIT, CIOs, localized/court IT	Recommendation: utilize discussion functionality within collaboration tools for specific projects/subjects.
8	Registrations for Events and Meetings	CITMF, Meet-Ups, IT Symposium, CMS user groups, Other? CVENT used by CJER - Sm Court Tech Conference, registration via email, IT Summit - conference services use another tool (possibly Cvent) - CEAC/TCPJAC, Options of which to attend.	Everyone in IT community and more	Gain efficiencies, reduces LOE, provides consistent Team web forms?
9	Technology-Related Standards	Addressing compliance (e.g., NIEM, websites/accessibility, JCC standards for solutions for project requests, PCI statement, etc.)—not the tech itself. Have a landing page that points people to authority; maintain links.	JCIT and localized/court IT	Anticipated for JCC security area; don't want to depend on NIST site. When I think of standards I want to go directly to authority. Tied to policies; based on policy, what standards are we adopting? (industry or otherwise) Directs user to where they need to be Medium because it drives and informs of what is coming down the line; important awareness.
10	Technology-Related Policies	Branch and local central access point/library (e.g., local rules/policies for digital evidence, remote video, cell phone use)—excluding security NOT ideal due to difficulty searching, etc. Primary need: Info exchange between leadership/management in development policies. Future need: Have policies available for end-user/consumer. Includes model and	Presiding judges (PJs), CEOs, CIOs, HR/Ops, and secondary employees	Variation on how this is organized: by subject/topic or by type (policy, standard, rules). Process to determine what policies are applicable. Design comes next—e.g., separating out procedures, etc. Key is who will be the custodian. Use model policy/template as a starting point.

#	List of needs	Description	Intended Audience	Comments
		existing DR and IT Security Framework.		
11	Technology-Related Rules	Often asked on Listserv 'Does anyone know the rules on digital evidence/projection?' Discussion and reference information for branch and localized rules of court.	PJs, CEOs, CIOs	Maybe in the form of a knowledge-base or discussion forum; or referencing discussion thread.
12	Document Repository—General	Benefits, version control, CEO/PJ group meeting materials (15 HyperOffice folders active).	PJs, CEOs, CIOs, JC staff	Not sure what group within the JC currently supports this, not necessarily IT Community related, although CEOs would have access to IT Community-related materials.