MEMORANDUM

Date March 8, 2016	**Action Requested** Review and approval
To Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair Judicial Council Technology Committee	**Deadline** March 14, 2016
From Mark Dusman, IT Director/CIO Information Technology	**Contact** Virginia Sanders-Hinds, Principle Manager Information Technology 415-865-4617 Virginia.sanders-hinds@jud.ca.gov
Subject Jury Management System Grant Program FY 2015 – 2016 Grant Requests and Proposed Grant Allocations	David Koon, Manager Information Technology 415-865-4618 David.Koon@jud.ca.gov

Background

The budget for the Jury System Grant Program is funded by royalties from selling jury instructions which are deposited in the Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund. These funds can only be used for jury-related projects. The Judicial Council approved $465,000 in funding for the Jury System Grant Program in FY 15-16.

JCC-IT has funded Jury grants since FY 2000-2001. Initially, the fund allocations were designed to help courts migrate from DOS based systems to Windows based systems. With the advent of the one day one trial program, these grants evolved into helping courts become more efficient in jury management with Interactive Voice Response (IVR)/Interactive Web Response (IWR) systems, Imaging, check writing and a variety of other modules that reduce court costs and improve jurors' experiences.

The FY 2015-2016 jury management system application process began on October 16, 2015 and concluded on December 18, 2015. At the close of the application deadline, the Judicial Council had received jury management system grant requests from 19 trial courts for 27 projects, totaling $777,307. Recognizing that there is only $465,000 in funding available, it was

necessary to prioritize the jury grant projects and provide a framework from which to allocate the monies. (Attached is the spreadsheet listing the jury grant requests and proposed allocations for FY 2015-2016)

Objectives
There were several objectives which served as the underlying foundation when reviewing the jury management system grant requests and assigning a priority. These goals included:

- Assist those courts which indicated they had a jury system, or module, that was failing or at significant risk of failure due to aging technology, infrastructure or a system that was no longer supported by the vendor;
- Fund as many different courts as possible given the limited budget;
- Fund enhancements and modules that reduce the court's costs; and
- Minimize the court resources needed to provide information to jurors and provide jurors with greater access to information as well as improve the jurors' experience.

Prioritization Categories
Listed below are the categories used to assign a priority to each of the 27 jury projects from which a recommendation for funding could be made. These 27 jury projects were submitted by the trial courts after a solicitation was sent by the JCTC Chair to all trial court Presiding Judges and Court Executive Officers.

1. Risk of System Failure: Existing system functionality identified as either failing or significant risk of failure.

2. Interactive Voice Response (IVR)/ Interactive Web Response (IWR) Enhancements/Modules: These project requests for IVR/IWR enhancements offer cost savings to the court by reducing the court resources needed to provide information to potential jurors while also providing potential jurors with a convenient way to obtain jury information.

3. Short Message Service (SMS): This module provides jurors with reminder information via text/phone messages which improves jury responses.

4. Self Check-In: This module offers different levels of functionality depending upon the specific jury grant proposal but in general allows jurors to perform some level of self-check in when reporting to the court.

5. Imaging: Automates court staff responses to paper documents and other correspondence, phone calls for postponement, permanent excuses, and qualification/disqualification.

6. Peripheral Hardware: Includes items such as scanners, printers and surface pro tablets used to assist with processing jury summons.

7. Other: These were jury grant requests which did not fit into one of the other categories.

Other Considerations
In addition to the prioritization framework identified above, there were other factors in determining which projects to fund. These considerations include:

> 1. Ongoing items such as software maintenance, support, and training were removed from the funding requests as ongoing costs are not funded as part of the jury grant program;

> 2. As part of the review of jury grant requests submitted by the courts, vendor quotations and RFP estimates were reviewed for reasonableness and compliance with the objectives of the jury system grant program. Ultimately, any reimbursement from the jury grant program will only be made for the amount supported by vendor invoices submitted by the court;

> 3. If a court submitted more than one jury grant project in their request, the top project as identified by the trial court was given consideration for funding; and

> 4. A limit of no more than 10 percent or $465,000 was awarded to any one court in an effort to fund as many different project requests as possible.

Proposed Jury Grant Funding Metrics
Using the framework described above, it is recommended to provide some level of funding to all 27 of the requested projects. In so doing, all 19 courts who submitted funding requests will receive some level of funding assistance for their requested jury technology projects. A listing of the funding requests by prioritization category is shown below:

Priority #1: Risk of System Failure – 7 projects
Priority #2: IVR/IWR– 6 projects
Priority #3: SMS (text messaging) – 1 project
Priority #4: Self Check-In – 9 projects
Priority #5: Imaging – 1 project
Priority #6: Peripheral Hardware – 2 projects
Priority #7: Other – 1 project

Staff Recommendation
Staff recommends to distribute the funds as indicated in the table below.

	Court	Description	Requested Allocation	Proposed Allocation	Priority Category
1	Alameda	Finish conversion to AgileJury	$58,000	$46,500	#1 Risk of System Failure
2	Fresno	Enhance SMS	$4,500	$4,500	#3 SMS
3	Inyo	IWR	$16,036	$16,036	#2 IVR/IWR
4	Lake	Express check-in kiosks	$9,382	$9,132	#4 Self Check-In
		Upgrade to Web Gen	$22,540	$20,261	#4 Self Check-In
5	Los Angeles	Replace IVR system	$250,000	$46,500	#1 Risk of System Failure
6	Madera	Upgrade hardware and IVR software	$29,670	$27,797	#1 Risk of System Failure
7	Mendocino	Upgrade operating system, virtualize server and upgrade database	$3,661	$3,661	#1 Risk of System Failure
8	Merced	Upgrade to Web Gen	$38,150	$33,813	#4 Self Check-In
		Self check-in kiosks	$8,917	$8,917	#4 Self Check-In
		Jury + Mobile.	$1,830	$1,830	#4 Self Check-In
9	Nevada	Upgrade IVR/IWR	$29,509	$29,509	#1 Risk of System Failure
10	Placer	Hardware for new JMS	$53,534	$46,500	#1 Risk of System Failure
11	San Benito	Add Touch Tone to IVR	$3,120	$3,120	#2 IVR/IWR

	Court	Description	Requested Allocation	Proposed Allocation	Priority Category
12	San Bernardino	JMS enhancement to calculate juror mileage	$3,448	$3,448	#7 Other
13	San Diego	Replace existing IWR with JSI IWR, no hardware costs	$32,982	$28,352	#2 IVR/IWR
		Upgrade to WebGen	$79,786	$18,148	#2 IVR/IWR
14	Stanislaus	Procure IWR from ATI/JSI partners	$21,775	$21,775	#2 IVR/IWR
15	Tehama	Replace Jury server UPS and Jury printer	$4,482	$4,482	#6 Peripheral Hardware
16	Tuolumne	Replace Jury IWR servers	$12,823	$12,823	#1 Risk of System Failure
17	Trinity	Laptop with dedicated printer for dedicated jury check in	$1,550	$1,550	#6 Peripheral Hardware
18	Tulare	IWR	$25,725	$23,785	#2 IVR/IWR
		Self check in	$1,400	$1,400	#4 Self Check-In
		Imaging	$6,600	$6,600	#5 Imaging
19	Ventura	JSI self check in module (software)	$2,450	$2,200	#4 Self Check-In
		Three self check in kiosks (hardware)	$11,387	$11,387	#4 Self Check-In
		Upgrade to WebGen	$44,050	$30,973	#4 Self Check-In

Next Steps
Present the proposed allocations to the Judicial Council Technology Committee for review and approval. Once approved by the JCTC, notify each court of the approved allocation and prepare Inter-branch Agreements (IBAs) with each court for their jury grant.