Court Technology Modernization Funding FY21-22

Review of Process and Potential Funding Models Judicial Council Technology Committee August 20, 2021



Topics

- Summary of Data
- General methodology review (requirements, framework, subteams)
- Process takeaways / Key approaches
- Review workstream recommendations
- Review of funding approaches / models
- Next steps
- Discussion



Request Summary by Court 3D Program Category

Court 3D Category	Number of Projects Proposed	Total Funding Requested
Branch & Court Developed Architecture and Solutions	;	\$520,500.00
Case Management Systems (CMS)	10	\$6,361,777.72
Collaboration & Office Tools	:	\$375,430.00
Courthouse	38	\$8,099,803.94
Cyber Security	1	\$2,584,680.00
Data	!	\$681,298.60
El ectronic Fi ling	:	\$668,500.00
Electronic Records Management (ERM)	3	7 \$13,147,677.00
Financials		\$532,185.00
Human Res ources (HR)		\$227,994.22
Infrastructure	24	\$2,086,614.16
Interactive Customer Service		\$835,000.00
Jury Management Systems (JMS)		7 \$893,079.00
Notifications and Reminders	:	\$182,500.00
Online Dispute Resolution (ODR)		\$770,000.00
Online Traffic Adjudication		\$200,000.00
Remote Appearances	1:	\$2,396,251.63
Remote Records Access and Search	!	\$868,052.00
State and Local Integrations	:	\$1,510,575.00
Web Solutions	•	\$695,930.00
Grand Total	20.	1 \$43,637,848.27



General Methodology for Project Review

- Divide and conquer: evaluate (key requirements) 201 applications from 50 courts
- No court is evaluating its own request
- Each subteam included mix of Large, Medium, and Small
- Matching of regional and collaborative courts (i.e., the group and individual court requests together)
- Some less 'mature' courts coupled with evaluation teams so they may be able to provide some mentorship
- Evaluated projects, not budget



Key Requirements

Projects must:

- Benefit the public
- Comply with branchwide policies and standards
- Be vetted and approved by the Technology Committee
- Fall within at least one of the approved program categories
- Commence project activities soon after funds are allocated
- Expend or encumber funds by end of FY 21-22
- Show demonstrable progress before January 2022
- Have measurable successful outcomes (reported quarterly)





COURT 3D: Physical, Remote, & Equal

Court 3D provides the public with physical, remote, and equal (including multi-lingual) access to court services, and enhances partner services through branch solutions.



Core Systems

Case Management System

Electronic Records Management

Jury Management

Courtrooms & Facilities

Financials

Human Resources

Collaboration & Office Tools



Digital Ecosystem

Branch & Court

Development

Vendor Development

State & Local Integrations

Data —

Public & Partner Services

self-service



\$ Payments

■ Text Notifications

Remote Records Access & Search

■ Virtual Cust. Service Center

Electronic Filing

Remote Proceedings

Online Dispute Resolution

... Branch Solutions

live-interaction



Security & Infrastructure



Subteams

- Representation included at least one judicial officer, CIO, CEO on each team
- Subteams received an average number of projects to review
- No subteams reviewed applications from their own court
- Subteams met independently and reported results through their leads

Team A - 16 courts, 71 projects

- Lead: Jeannette Vanoy, CIO, Napa
- Hon. Robert Hawk, Santa Clara
- Shawn Landry, CEO, Yolo
- Paras Gupta, CIO, Monterey
- Micah May, CIO, San Bernardino

Team B – 17 courts, 65 projects

- Lead: Mike Baliel, CIO, Santa Clara
- Hon. Michelle Williams Court, Los Angeles
- Jason Galkin, CEO, Nevada
- Greg Harding. CIO, Placer
- Deon Whitfield, CIO, Tulare
- Wyatt Horsley, IT, Lassen

Team C - 15 courts, 64

- Lead: Rick Walery, CIO, San Mateo
- Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, San Bernardino
- Stephanie Cameron, CEO, Tulare
- Michelle Duarte, CIO, Santa Cruz
- Brett Howard, CIO, Orange

Subteam Key Approaches

- Adhered to overall key requirements
 - For example, screened out projects with minimal public benefit, spanning multi-years, or requesting payment for staff
- Upheld branch standards
 - If project diverged from branch standards, then recommended court fund locally
- Supported modernization over refresh
 - Some efforts were IT refresh/upgrades or similar maintenance and operations costs, which do not rise to true modernization; in which case recommended that courts budget for those separately
- Flagged projects with minimal direct public benefit
 - Some projects (e.g., common in security, infrastructure, and HR proposals) had minimal/indirect public benefit, in which case they were flagged unless the results tied to more public-facing systems (e.g., automated testing tool vs. digitizing HR records)
- Flagged cases of alternative funding or branchwide programs
 - When recommending alternate sources, teams noted to be careful not to mislead (e.g., not guaranteed, or enough); also in some cases team recommended consideration of a new branchwide program (such as for security)

Summary data

Recommendation	Project Count
Possible Alternative Funding	21
Not recommended	42
Yes, recommended	138
Grand Total	201



Review of Funding Approaches

Total Available: Approximately \$15 million

- Option A: Workload Based
- Option B1: CMS projects (funded first) + Workload Only
- Option B2: CMS projects (funded first) + Workload & Small Court Priority 1 Projects
- Option B3: CMS projects (funded first) + Workload & Flat \$40K to Small Courts
- Option C: CMS & Small Court Priority 1 Projects (funded first) + Workload



Next Steps



Step 1 Preparations →

(April/May)
Solicit Workstream
Members; Technology
Committee
seeks branch input on
categories

Step 2

(May)
Technology Committee
finalizes categories and
workstream membership;
staff begins preparing
request for funding
applications (RFAs)

Step 3 Applications

(June)
Workstream kickoff;
Workstream finalizes
category measurements,
Technology Committee
publishes RFA, courts
submit applications

Step 4 Workstream Review

(July)
Workstream evaluates
projects and makes
recommendations

Step 5 Tech Committee Review

(August)
Technology Committee
reviews projects and
allocations

Step 6 Judicial Council Review

(September)
Judicial Council reviews
and approves trial court
allocations

Step 7 Distributions

(October) Create IBAs and distribute funds

Step 8 Reports

(January 1)
Progress report

Step 9 Assessment

(January)
Reassess projects and
allocations for
redistributions



