

Senate Unified Court Technology Study Committee SR 986

September 5, 2014

Presented by: Wendy Hosch
Judicial Council Staff



Challenge

“Courts and their stakeholders and customers experience daily limitations resulting from incomplete information and records.”



Core Solutions:

“We believe information systems upgrades should focus on real-time intra and intergovernmental data exchanges for state and local governments. These upgrades should be based on mandatory, statewide standards for criminal, civil and domestic relations data, allowing all justice agencies to share data efficiently.”



Key Areas

1. Mandatory Data Standards
2. Real Time Data Sharing
3. Local Government Technology Investment



Why focus on data standards?

Data driven decision making:

“the practice of basing decisions on the analysis of data rather than purely on intuition.”

What if that data is incorrect, incomplete, improperly labeled or miscounted?

Poor data leads to poor decision making and missed opportunities, unmitigated threats



Mandatory Data Standards

Filing and Disposition Forms

Case Type	Exist ?	Status:	Action Needed:
Civil	✓	Out of Date	Update of statutory language
Domestic	✓	Out of Date	Update of statutory language
Criminal	✗	Does not Exist	Create statute similar to civil

Benefits:

1. Improved data consistency and reporting
2. Ease of completion and translation



Data Sharing

▶ Access data in real time

- Improve data information
- Reduce time lag in data

▶ Reduce manual processing

- Improve data quality
- Reduce cost of counting data multiple times
- Reduce errors, missing, incomplete data

▶ Utilize funds wisely

- Improve evaluation capabilities at all levels of government
- Increase skill set of human resources

▶ Improve Efficiency, Effectiveness, Timeliness

- Direct focus on high priority considerations
- Access to larger pool of data
- Standardize data structures and definitions



Local Government Investment

Obstacles

Benefits

STATE	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Manual entry errors2. Missing data3. Delayed data reporting	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Most current data for analysis2. Improved decision making3. Common standards and benchmarks
LOCAL	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Disparity in CMS2. Increased costs	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Improved reporting for local needs assessment2. Reduction in repetitive reporting3. Local determination

Potential Solutions:

**Court Technology Fee
Provider of Last Resort**



Where do we go from here?

- ▶ **Local determination guided by statewide standards**
 - Invest in appropriate technology that supports need at the state level for decision making across all judicial system parties
 - Web services, integration of information
- ▶ **Standardized data sources** by making it easy
 - Forms
 - Criminal
 - Civil
 - Domestic relations
 - Supports needs – translation / self represented litigants
- ▶ **Data sharing** improves the information upon which decisions are made



Areas of Exposure (Risks)

- ▶ Continued lack of funding
- ▶ Lack of agreement among justice system parties
- ▶ Lack of enforcement of standards at the state level



Recap of Key Areas

1. Mandatory Data Standards
2. Real Time Data Sharing
3. Local Government Technology Investment

Questions: Wendy Hosch,
Judicial Council Staff

