



**Texas Conference of Urban Counties
Adult Case Management System
Strategic Plan**

May 2011



INFORMATION
SERVICES
GROUP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	2
Background	2
ACMS Phase 1 Project Objectives	3
Planning Approach	4
Document Purpose and Scope.....	9
II. SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS	9
Stakeholder Interview Approach.....	10
Common Interview Themes	12
Interview Observations – Adult Case Management System.....	15
Interview Observations – Electronic Criminal Case Filing	19
ACMS Guiding Principles	20
III. INVENTORY OF CURRENT NEEDS	23
Application Architecture and General System Features	23
Prosecutor/District Attorney Intake	24
Grand Jury	25
Criminal Courts Case Management	26
Indigent Defense and Public Defender.....	28
Jail Management and Intake	28
Pretrial Services	29
Probation.....	29
External Reporting.....	30
Business Intelligence and Analytics	30
Technical Architecture.....	31
Help and System Documentation	32
IV. POTENTIAL COLLABORATION OPPORTUNITIES	32
Definition of Potential ACMS Development Projects	32
Prioritization of Potential ACMS Development Projects	40
Proposed Implementation Plan	42
APPENDIX A- STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE	45
APPENDIX B- ACMS SUMMIT PARTICIPANTS	47

I. INTRODUCTION

Background

The Texas Conference of Urban Counties supports and coordinates communications among member counties, studies policies and programs of the State of Texas that affect urban counties, advocates county issues (primarily at the state level), and provides training and education programs appropriate for urban county officials. It is composed of 35 member counties, representing nearly 80% of the population of Texas.

One of the initiatives of the Urban Counties is the TechShare program, which seeks to develop software to meet the common needs of its member counties and other governmental entities that work closely with county government. TechShare projects are collaborative efforts where participants save money by sharing the cost of research and development. Projects can produce applications, systems, or other technology assets owned by the Urban Counties and available to all members. Projects to date have involved both the collaborative acquisition and customization of commercial off-the-shelf software and the development of custom software to meet jointly-identified needs of participating counties.

The Common Integrated Justice System (CIJS) is one of the major TechShare projects currently underway. This project is intended to provide a set of functional applications that will enable the effective and efficient administration of justice for the members of the Urban Counties. It is designed so as to be based on a common architecture that will provide rapid sharing of justice information across county lines while providing each member county with advanced justice management capabilities.

A strategic planning document known as the Urban Counties CIJS Roadmap was created in May 2005 to define the strategic direction for the CIJS program. The CIJS project to date has moved forward based on this Roadmap, which was approved by the CIJS Oversight Board and the Urban Counties Board of Directors in May 2005.

Several of the largest member counties (Bexar, Dallas, Harris and Tarrant) have now determined that the CIJS Roadmap will not meet their needs for adult criminal justice case management. In addition, Travis County has determined that its strategic direction for integrated justice will change because of decisions their current vendor has made regarding future support for their Court Case Management and Justice Integration components. Recent events on the part of member counties related to Adult Case Management include:

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ Dallas, Tarrant and Travis Counties, respectively, have determined that they have a need for a new court system for adult criminal justice. Whatever system is developed or procured should also be capable of being used in other courts such as civil/family, juvenile, Justice of Peace, etc;
- ◆ Dallas County also has determined that it has a need to replace its custom-built adult jail management system known as the Adult Information System (AIS);
- ◆ El Paso County is implementing the Tyler Justice System following the current CIJS roadmap;
- ◆ Tarrant County is developing a Criminal Courts Case Management System (CCCMS), a new version of the integrated criminal justice program formerly known as the Electronic Case Filing System (ECFS);
- ◆ Harris County has recently entered into a contract with AimCad to evaluate the AimCad solution for integrated justice for use in the county; and
- ◆ Bexar County is in the process of evaluating responses to a Request for Proposal (RFP) for an integrated justice solution that was issued by the County in the winter 2010.

ACMS Phase 1 Project Objectives

At the same time, there was considerable interest expressed by these counties in working together on an Adult Case Management System (ACMS) if a suitable approach can be found for collaborative system development, acquisition and implementation. The first step was determined to be an update to the CIJS Roadmap and development of a five year strategic plan for implementing an Adult Case Management System.

The ACMS strategic planning effort, also known as ACMS Phase 1, had the following objectives:

- ◆ Provide an assessment of the current environment for integrated justice among the Urban Counties membership;
- ◆ Provide an assessment of the strategic direction for integrated justice in Texas;
- ◆ Evaluate the current justice initiatives among the larger member counties to determine how the counties might benefit from pooling resources or working together in a collaborative way toward improved justice systems;
- ◆ Develop a strategy for moving toward integrated justice through an update to the Urban Counties CIJS Roadmap; and
- ◆ Prepare a five-year strategic plan for the ACMS effort.

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

In parallel with the ACMS strategic planning efforts, the Urban Counties was asked by the Supreme Court of Texas' Judicial Committee on Information Technology (JCIT) to provide input on a proposed set of rules for electronic criminal case filing. JCIT has the responsibility for advising the Office of Court Administration (OCA) on technology related topics including electronic filing, court case management systems and data standards. The preparation of these draft rules for submission to JCIT was also included as part of the ACMS Phase 1 project effort.

Seven counties are participating in the ACMS Phase 1 planning effort including:

- ◆ Bell;
- ◆ Dallas;
- ◆ Denton;
- ◆ Galveston;
- ◆ Midland;
- ◆ Tarrant; and
- ◆ Travis.

STA Consulting was engaged to assist the Urban Counties in this planning effort.

Planning Approach

The ACMS strategic planning project was designed to be a highly collaborative process including:

- ◆ Upfront data collection through interviews and meetings with various stakeholders;
- ◆ An ACMS Summit meeting to bring stakeholders together to synthesize information and confirm direction; and
- ◆ A strategic planning process completed based on input and direction from the ACMS Summit.

The ACMS strategic planning process consisted of nine (9) major tasks including:

- ◆ Task 1: Project start-up;
- ◆ Task 2: Confirm business objectives;
- ◆ Task 3: Document current needs;
- ◆ Task 4: Evaluate opportunities for collaboration;
- ◆ Task 5: Prepare draft rules for electronic criminal case filing;

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ Task 6: Plan and conduct ACMS Summit;
- ◆ Task 7: Prepare updates to CIJS Roadmap;
- ◆ Task 8: Prepare five year strategic plan;
- ◆ Task 9: Develop initial project proposals; and
- ◆ Task 10: Manage project.

Exhibit 1 on the page below provides a summary of key deliverables by task. Each of the tasks is then described in further detail below.

Exhibit 1: Summary of Key Project Deliverables by Task

Task	Key Deliverables
Task 1: Project Start-up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiation meeting • Project work plan • Project kick-off meeting via webinar
Task 2: Confirm Business Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder interviews • Draft and final summary presentation of current situation and business drivers
Task 3: Document Current Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strawman list of Needs • Work sessions at ACMS Summit to review strawman list of needs • Finalized list of needs
Task 4: Evaluate Opportunities for Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial list of opportunities for collaboration to be further evaluated • Evaluation criteria • Summary of analysis of potential opportunities for collaboration and proposed go-forward recommendations • Work session at ACMS Summit to review, validate potential opportunities for collaboration • Updated recommendations as appropriate based on input at ACMS Summit

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

Task	Key Deliverables
Task 5: Prepare Draft Rules for Electronic Criminal Case Filing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional stakeholder interviews as required • Initial draft rules for electronic criminal case filing • Webinars to review initial draft rules with stakeholders • Updated draft rules for submission to JCIT
Task 6: Plan and Conduct ACMS Summit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two-day ACMS Summit
Task 7: Prepare Five Year Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft and final five year strategic plan document
Task 8: Develop Initial Project Proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft and final proposal for initial projects
Task 9: Manage Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Periodic project updates and other presentations to ACMS Oversight Board • Project work papers

Task 1: Project Start-up

This task involved activities required to initiate the project effort. It included a project initiation meeting with the Urban Counties Project Manager and other Urban Counties staff. It also included a project kick-off meeting with staff from the participating counties and Urban Counties staff. The objective of this project kick-off meeting was to review the project scope, approach and schedule and ensure there is a common understanding about the project objectives and the type and timing of involvement that will be required from all of the project stakeholders. This project kick-off meeting was held by webinar on October 25, 2010.

Task 2: Confirm Business Drivers

The goal of this task was to evaluate the current situation regarding integrated justice among the Urban Counties members, with an emphasis on the largest counties. Based on this current situation, the primary business drivers or objectives for the definition of the ACMS strategic plan were then identified and delineated.

This task involved the collection and review of CIJS-related information from among the participating counties through a series of stakeholder interviews.

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

Based on these interviews, STA developed a set of guiding principles to provide the framework for the strategic planning process. STA also used these interviews as a key input to the development of the list of current needs.

Task 3 Document Current Needs

This task involved documenting at a high level the current needs of participating counties. The goal of this task was to document the needs at a level of detail appropriate for facilitating an evaluation of the various potential options for collaboration among the participating counties for moving forward with the ACMS program. To accomplish this task, the STA team leveraged the information gained during the interviews with participating counties, the knowledge of our Justice subject matter expert subcontractor and our review of other initiatives to develop an initial draft or “strawman” list of needs. We then provided this draft to staff from participating counties and reviewed and revised this list of needs through workshop discussions at the ACMS Summit held in Austin in January 2011.

Task 4: Evaluate Opportunities for Collaboration

In this task, STA identified and evaluated potential options for collaboration among participating counties in proceeding with the ACMS program. These potential collaboration opportunities or projects were then reviewed and prioritized during the ACMS Summit meeting.

Task 5: Prepare Draft Rules for Electronic Criminal Case Filing

In this task, STA assisted the Urban Counties and participating counties with the development of a set of draft rules for electronic criminal case filing for consideration by JCIT. Two webinars were held to obtain input on the key elements which should be included in the draft rules. STA then developed an initial draft of the rules, which was provided to participating counties in January 2011. This initial draft was then revised and refined through a series of webinars and conference calls held from February 2011 to April 2011.

Task 6: Plan and Conduct ACMS Summit

In this task, STA planned and conducted a two-day workshop with staff from the participating counties to review and validate the guiding principles, the inventory of current needs and the list of potential collaboration opportunities. The ACMS Summit was intended to:

- ◆ Confirm STA’s understanding of the current situation in the participating counties (primary emphasis) and other member counties (secondary

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

emphasis) based on the information received through the fact-finding interviews;

- ◆ Confirm the key business drivers underlying the CIJS Roadmap update as identified through the fact-finding interviews;
- ◆ Review, validate and prioritize the list of guiding principles underlying the ACMS strategic planning process;
- ◆ Review and discuss national and state justice initiatives and the impact of these initiatives on the ACMS strategic planning effort;
- ◆ Review and validate the strawman list of current needs; and
- ◆ Review, validate and prioritize the list of potential alternatives for collaboration.

The ACMS Summit was held at the TechShare Development Center in Austin on January 20-21, 2011. Appendix B contains a list of participants in the ACMS Summit.

Task 7: Prepare Five-Year Implementation Plan

Based on the identified needs and the prioritization of collaboration opportunities, STA then prepared a high level implementation plan for implementing the ACMS program through a series of projects over approximately a five year period.

Task 8: Develop Initial Project Proposals

STA then developed project proposals for the first two projects outlined in the five-year strategic plan. These projects are ACMS Prosecutor and ACMS Criminal Courts Phase 1. Each of these project proposals documented the following elements:

- ◆ Proposed project scope;
- ◆ Project development approach;
- ◆ Required resources from participating counties, Urban Counties, and external consultants;
- ◆ Potential acquisition strategies;
- ◆ Proposed project schedule;
- ◆ Project budget; and
- ◆ Anticipated benefits for participating counties.

The two project proposals were developed in collaboration with various stakeholders from Dallas and Tarrant Counties. Both of these counties have

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

expressed considerable interest in participating in funding these two proposed project efforts.

Task 9: Manage Project

This task involved the ongoing management of the project, including managing day-to-day project activities, monitoring project status, and conducting quality assurance reviews on the project.

Document Purpose and Scope

The remainder of this document provides a summary of the ACMS planning effort. It consists of the following sections:

- ◆ **Section II - Summary of Stakeholder Interviews:** This section summarizes key findings from the stakeholder interviews. It also documents the guiding principles which were established to guide the ACMS planning process. These guiding principles were defined in part based on the findings from the stakeholder interviews.
- ◆ **Section III - Inventory of Current Needs:** This section provides an inventory of the current Adult Case Management System needs. This inventory of current needs was developed based on the stakeholder interviews and then validated and updated based on group discussion at the ACMS Summit.
- ◆ **Section IV – Collaboration Opportunities:** This section highlights potential collaboration opportunities which were identified based on the ACMS guiding principles and the inventory of current needs. It then outlines the prioritization of these opportunities by the participating counties. Based on the prioritization of the various collaboration opportunities, a high level multi-year implementation plan of proposed projects is then presented.

II. SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

One of the first tasks in the ACMS planning effort was the conduct of a series of interviews with a range of stakeholders across the adult criminal justice environment in the participating counties. The goal of these interviews was to identify common needs, as well as potential opportunities for collaboration among the counties.

This section summarizes the main themes and observations gathered by the STA team through the interview process. It also documents the guiding principles which were established to guide the ACMS planning process. These guiding principles were defined in part based on the findings from the stakeholder interviews.

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

The remainder of this section consists of the following:

- ◆ Stakeholder Interview Approach;
- ◆ Common Interview Themes;
- ◆ Interview Observations – Adult Case Management System;
- ◆ Interview Observations – Electronic Criminal Case Filing; and
- ◆ ACMS Guiding Principles

Stakeholder Interview Approach

The primary goals of the stakeholder interviews were to:

- ◆ Evaluate the current situation regarding integrated justice among the Urban Counties members, with an emphasis on the largest counties;
- ◆ Identify primary business drivers or objectives for the update of the CIJS Roadmap and development of the ACMS strategic plan;
- ◆ Identify and document common system needs;
- ◆ Identify potential opportunities for counties to collaborate in developing ACMS components; and
- ◆ Obtain stakeholder feedback on the key elements which should be included in the draft rules for electronic criminal case filing.

STA conducted 98 interviews across the seven participating counties. In addition, STA interviewed the Chair of the TechShare CIJS Technical Architecture Committee from Collin County. Most of these interviews were conducted on-site, although a few interviews for scheduling reasons were conducted via conference call. To ensure consistency of information collection, a standard interview framework was utilized as the basis for the interviews. A copy of the stakeholder interview questionnaire has been included as Appendix A.

A range of stakeholders involved in various aspects of the adult criminal justice process were interviewed across the participating counties including:

- ◆ County commissioners;
- ◆ Members of the Judiciary;
- ◆ County Clerks and their staff;
- ◆ District Clerks and their staff;
- ◆ District Attorneys and their staff;

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ Sherriff's office staff;
- ◆ County administrators;
- ◆ Court administration staff;
- ◆ Court coordinators;
- ◆ Information technology staff;
- ◆ Public defender's office staff;
- ◆ Pretrial Services staff;
- ◆ Probation department staff; and
- ◆ External stakeholders representing the defense bar and the bail bond industry.

Exhibit 2 summarizes the interviews by participating county and the function of interviewees within the adult criminal justice process. The remainder of this section summarizes the key themes and observations from these interviews.

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

Exhibit 2: Summary of Stakeholder Interviews by County and Function

Function	Bell	Dallas	Denton	Galveston	Tarrant	Midland	Travis
Bail Bondsman		√					
County Clerk	√	√	√		√	√	√
Court Administration		√			√		√
Commissioners Court						√	
County Administrator					√		
Defense Bar		√					
District Attorney	√	√	√		√	√	√
District Clerk	√	√	√		√	√	√
Information Technology	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Judiciary		√			√	√	
Pretrial Services			√				
Probation		√	√				
Public Defender		√					
Sherriff	√	√	√		√		√

Common Interview Themes

Through the interview process, a number of common themes emerged in discussion with the various stakeholders in each county. These common themes include:

Single source of information about the individual for all cases

Many stakeholders expressed the need to have the capability to pull an individual or case and have the ability to view all information, documentation, and related cases concerning the individual in question. Many stakeholders expressed that in their current environments, it is often necessary to toggle in and out of several

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

applications and databases to retrieve all the pertinent information necessary to have a full picture of the individual's history and make decisions accordingly.

Workflow driven process/system functions

The interview participants also expressed the desire to have a system that was smart, in that it knew where the next step in the work process was to occur. For instance, once a disposition was entered, the system should know what information needs to be sent to the department(s) that required it.

Electronic data exchange between all stakeholder groups

Stakeholders consistently expressed the need to have electronic data exchange across all system functions. This includes:

- ◆ Data that follows a predetermined track from incident report, to charge, to disposition and then finally to probation;
- ◆ Electronic data exchange between stakeholder groups which allows for case information to easily flow between appropriate and designated departments within the county;
- ◆ Electronic filing of incident reports from law enforcement agencies to the District Attorney;
- ◆ Electronic discovery functions which allow for input, storage, retrieval and output of discovery documents, images or audio between the District Attorney and the defense bar based on appropriate security and business rules; and
- ◆ Electronic criminal case filing including both integration with Texas Online and a county managed electronic filing portal as an alternative to Texas Online.

Streamlining/automating external agency reporting

Rules for submitting data to the Office of Court Administration (OCA) and the Department of Public Safety (DPS), while stringent and based in statute, can also be very dynamic based on legislative or policy changes. All of the counties interviewed expressed that the current external reporting process is both manually intensive and time consuming. Stakeholders expressed a strong desire to streamline and further automate this process as part of ACMS, with an emphasis on making the functionality as configurable as possible to provide the flexibility to address future changes in reporting requirements.

Collections

Due to the amount of court fees and other revenues that flow into the counties during the criminal justice process, stakeholders indicated it is critical that any ACMS application(s) have the ability to properly track and report revenue. This

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

functionality must have the ability to integrate with existing county specific financial systems to ensure accurate accounting and reporting.

Bail bond management

There is a need to capture, store, transfer, track and reconcile bond information from initial setting through case disposition. This includes managing the accounts of bail bondsmen within a county and monitoring each bail bondsmen's bonding capacity. It also includes online access for bail bondsmen to certain appropriate case information and electronic notifications for certain events for individuals that have bonded out.

eSignature capability (Judiciary and staff)

The members of the Judiciary who were interviewed expressed the desire to have eSignature capability within the system. This would reduce the need for printing out documents, signing them and then scanning them back into the system. It would also help expedite the process flow within the court room. The members of the Judiciary also expressed the need for some of their staff members (for example their court coordinator) to have similar capabilities to assist in managing the flow of work when a Judge is absent, etc.

Biometric capturing and identification

The capability to capture fingerprints, palm prints, etc., in the courtroom or the Clerks' offices and integrate these biometrics into the system would allow for more expedient and accurate processing of defendants in the system throughout the life of the case.

E-scheduling /notifications for courts and probation

Several interviewees expressed the need to provide the public with access to court schedules via the Internet, as well as a notification portal to inform appropriate parties (defendants, witnesses, victims, etc.) of important dates related to a case. Internet appointment scheduling and electronic notification of appointments was also documented as a need for Probation departments within a county.

Dashboards with key performance indicators

Managers and supervisors indicated a need for the capability to establish and track performance measures about the business processes specific to their functional area. Interviewees also expressed a need for a way to track the performance of individual cases including being able to easily monitor management of cases and case information throughout the system. As an example, workflow and timers could be built into the system to track work progress.

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

Business intelligence capabilities

Several stakeholders identified the need for business intelligence capabilities. This includes:

- ◆ An enterprise-wide data store to link information from diverse sources and make the information accessible for management reporting and analytics;
- ◆ Various management reports; and
- ◆ Analytical and decision support tools including trend identification and forecasting.

Two specific examples of these capabilities identified during the interviews were

- ◆ Sentencing support tools, often called “SmartSentencing” tools, which utilize statistical analysis to provide decision support tools for use by Judges as an input to their sentencing decisions. Sentencing decision tools and models utilize statistical analysis to predict outcomes for potential sentences based on historical outcomes for similar offenders, sentenced for similar crimes; and
- ◆ Jail population analysis including forecasting and trend analysis capabilities.

Flexibility to support a hosted solution

Several interviewees expressed an interest in being able to manage and operate ACMS in a hosted solution environment. This could include a hosted solution operated by a vendor and utilized by many counties. Alternatively, some interviewees also suggested that the system could be operated as a “government cloud”. One such model would be operating ACMS in one or more regional data centers where several counties share the cost of operating the system and the data center is managed by a regional authority.

Interview Observations – Adult Case Management System

Based on the stakeholder interviews, the STA team also compiled a number of other observations, which were utilized as inputs to the remainder of the ACMS planning process. These observations include:

Three distinct sets of needs exist within the counties participating in the ACMS planning process

There are three distinct sets of needs across the participating counties which should be addressed by the ACSM planning process. These three categories of needs are:

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

1. Counties who have already committed to the Odyssey platform, but may need additional functionality that is not currently available in the Odyssey platform

Counties in this category include Denton County and Galveston County. Denton County is currently implementing Odyssey for criminal courts, but has a strong interest in enhanced prosecutor functionality including electronic filing of charges and incident reports from law enforcement agencies. Galveston County has implemented Odyssey for civil courts and is beginning implementation of Odyssey for criminal courts. During the interviews, Galveston County expressed an interest in some capabilities such as enhanced prosecutor functionality and external reporting which could integrate with and extend Odyssey capabilities.

2. Counties who are looking for a collaborative turnkey ACMS solution

Counties in this category include Dallas County and Tarrant County. Both Dallas County and Tarrant County would like to replace most of their current adult criminal justice systems over the next several years with a highly integrated adult case management solution. While both counties have implemented Odyssey for some courts, each has determined to this point that the Odyssey solution will not meet their needs for adult criminal case management.

3. Counties with existing legacy court systems which need to be replaced, who need to make decisions about the best direction for their county

Counties in this category include Bell, Midland and Travis. Bell County's system was developed in-house on a now aging technology platform. Bell County is currently re-platforming the application; however, the county has determined this is an interim solution pending the implementation of an enterprise courts application.

Midland County's current courts system is highly functional and appears to do an excellent job of meeting the needs of its user community. However, the technical architecture has proven difficult to integrate with other applications, limiting the opportunities for establishing an integrated justice environment within the county.

Travis County currently utilizes Tiburon Justice for its courts application. The vendor has announced it will be de-supporting this application and as a result Travis is analyzing potential solutions for replacing the Tiburon system.

There are potential implementation challenges under a modular ACMS development approach

One goal of ACMS is to define a vision of an end-to-end solution, but develop the system in discrete modules to promote incremental delivery of business value. However, there will likely be a number of challenges in designing and delivering

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

modules so that they can be implemented by individual counties within the context of their own justice environment.

There are many counties with existing justice systems that are already integrated to some extent with other systems in their county. Special care must be taken to ensure that any module created in an ACMS could easily integrate with systems that each participating county wanted to keep. In addition, the system must be architected to allow implementation of one ACMS component and integration with other existing county systems even if that existing county system may eventually be replaced by another ACMS component at a later point. This type of architecture is integral to supporting a phased development and deployment of ACMS capabilities.

Components of ACMS must be designed so that they can either be integrated into a collaborative ACMS or into other systems utilized by a county

There is a need to design most ACMS components so they can either be part of an integrated, collaborative ACMS and/or plug-ins to another system implemented by a county. It was apparent that there were a number of common requirements and needs that many counties have. However, within each county, there are potentially existing systems or components within that county's criminal justice environment that would require connections to any new ACMS module/function. Examples of potential ACMS functions which would most likely fit both as part of an integrated ACMS solution and as modules which could be easily adapted by a county on a one-off basis and integrated with existing systems in a county include:

- ◆ Electronic filing of incident report and charges from law enforcement agencies;
- ◆ Electronic discovery portal for defense bar;
- ◆ County managed electronic criminal case filing portal as an alternative to Texas Online;
- ◆ Electronic scheduling and notifications portal;
- ◆ External reporting engine for Department of Public Safety, Office of Court Administration and Department of Criminal Justice; and
- ◆ Business intelligence and analytical capabilities.

There is a need for solution mapping for counties whose existing systems support more than the anticipated scope of ACMS

While the scope of the ACMS planning effort is focused on adult criminal justice, some of the counties who have existing systems which could potentially be replaced by ACMS support other courts through these systems such as civil and

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

juvenile. This is true for both the existing Bell County and Midland County court systems. Thus, as part of the planning process, it will be important to give consideration to how ACMS fits into the total solution mapping which may be available through the TechShare program to meet the various court system requirements of participating counties.

Data ownership and data security must be addressed as part of any development effort

One of the needs expressed consistently in the stakeholder interviews is to provide a single source of information about the individual and all of that individual's interactions in the justice system. Likewise, there was a strong desire expressed by the stakeholders we interviewed to promote data sharing including electronic data exchange to the extent possible between all stakeholder groups.

At the same time, there was concern expressed by a number of interviewees regarding data ownership and sharing of data within ACMS. There was recognition by interviewees of the need to manage the overall security of the data and to fully support the fiduciary responsibility of various stakeholders to manage and maintain different types of information.

There are certain data elements within the system that are considered under the custodial control of particular departments. Considerable planning will be required and business rules and data sharing agreements will need to be established in order for data to be exchanged between system functions.

Buy-in and ongoing stakeholder involvement by participating counties is essential

Stakeholders consistently recognized that for any facet of the ACMS program to be successful, it will require the participation and "buy-in" of all of the key stakeholders in the adult criminal justice process. This includes everyone from elected officials, who can commit funding and other resources to end users who have deep knowledge of their individual business processes.

Stakeholders generally indicated support for a project development model for ACMS similar to that employed by TechShare for JCMS. This development model includes extensive subject matter expert involvement from staff of the participating counties. The staff from the participating counties would work closely with Urban Counties staff and any consultant staff as an integrated project team. In addition, the STA team was specifically urged, by almost every county interviewed, to involve court coordinators and other pertinent court administrative staff in any enterprise courts system development effort. This involvement was viewed as integral to achieving judicial support for the new application.

Interview Observations – Electronic Criminal Case Filing

In addition to preparing the ACMS strategic plan, the STA team also assisted the Urban Counties with development of a draft set of rules for electronic criminal case filing. Consequently, the project team also gathered input on the draft rules for electronic criminal case filing as part of its stakeholder interview process.

Some of the key observations from the stakeholder interviews related to electronic criminal case filing include:

Need for strong stakeholder involvement in developing the draft rules

There was a consensus among the stakeholders interviewed that there must be involvement from the appropriate stakeholders in each county in developing the rules to ensure that the rules meet individual county requirements and can be implemented in a cost effective manner.

Proposed fee structure must consider all county implementation costs

Several interviewees who have been involved with the implementation of the electronic rules for civil case filing strongly expressed the need to ensure that the portion of the electronic filing fee allocated to the counties truly covers all county related costs. For example, this includes considerations such as:

- ◆ Any cost of developing and maintaining electronic “connectors” to the county’s court system; and
- ◆ Any cost absorbed by a county for electronic filings on behalf of indigent defendants.

At least one county we interviewed has been able to document that electronic filing is much more expensive for the county than traditional filing and that the county’s cost is significantly higher than the county’s portion of the electronic civil filing fee. A primary reason for this cost is the amount of manual intervention required to download the electronic filing from Texas Online, print it to paper, scan it, and then upload it to the county’s own courts system.

Need for a strong business case to encourage adoption of electronic filing

It was also noted, based on experience with the civil e-filing program, that in order for all attorneys and bar associations to be expected to participate in a criminal electronic filing program, a strong business case has to be developed and marketed to the defense bar.

Based on experience with the electronic civil filing effort, stakeholders indicated that proving to the end user that these new rules would be cost-effective would present a challenge since law firms do not typically break down or analyze their

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

actual cost of filing a motion at a granular level (mail cost or cost of a courier or a staff member walking it into the clerk's office, etc.)

One area that was identified as being a capability which could improve the business case for the defense bar would be establishing e-service as the preferred form of delivery notification to opposing counsel. Serving documents on the opposing party typically represents a significant cost for a law firm. However, it was also noted that this capability is currently not widely utilized as part of the civil e-filing program.

Need to support multiple filing platforms

Stakeholders indicated a preference to allow a county the option to receive electronic filings through either Texas Online, which is currently utilized as the common statewide portal for electronic civil case filings or through a county operated electronic filing portal. Stakeholders also stressed the need to develop electronic integration between Texas Online and the individual county courts systems in order to eliminate the need for any manual intervention to process an electronic filing.

Robust time stamping capability is critical to user acceptance

Time stamping was identified as a critical capability within any electronic filing system or solution that may be developed. Most court filings must be submitted by a certain date or time. Stakeholders indicated that it is imperative that the criminal e-filing process is architected to accurately record, archive and publish the time stamp for a filing. Both district clerk staff and the member of the defense bar we interviewed in Dallas County indicated confidence by the legal community in this capability was essential to encourage support for and adoption of electronic criminal case filing.

ACMS Guiding Principles

This subsection outlines a set of guiding principles which were established to provide a framework for the ACMS strategic planning process. These guiding principles were defined through the stakeholder interviews and then validated and prioritized during the ACMS Summit. The ACMS guiding principles are as follows:

- ◆ Provide a single source of information about the individual and all of that individual's interactions in the justice system;
- ◆ Promote data sharing, while ensuring and maintaining each stakeholder's fiduciary responsibility for various types of information;

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ Support electronic data exchange to the extent possible between all stakeholder groups from incident report to charge to disposition to probation;
- ◆ Define a vision of an end-to-end solution, but develop the system in discrete modules to promote incremental delivery of business value;
- ◆ Design and deliver modules so that they can be implemented by individual counties within the context of their own justice environment;
- ◆ Ensure intellectual property is vested with the Urban Counties on behalf of participating counties;
- ◆ Leverage existing components developed by participating counties where practical;
- ◆ Allow for sharing of maintenance and operations; and
- ◆ Ensure policy maker and stakeholder commitment by participating counties.

During the ACMS Summit, these principles were provided to the participants to rank as a county in order of importance from one (1): most important to nine (9): least important. All scores were then tabulated to come up with composite ranking for the list of guiding principles. Exhibit 3 outlines the relative priority of these guiding principles as established by the participants in the ACMS Summit.

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

Exhibit 3: Prioritization of Guiding Principles

Guiding Principle	Bell	Collin	Dallas	Galveston	Midland	Tarrant	Travis	Total
Ensure policy maker and stakeholder commitment by participating counties	1	4	1	6	4	1	5	22
Support electronic data exchange to the extent possible between all stakeholder groups from incident report to charge to disposition to probation	6	7	2	3	1	5	3	27
Define a vision of an end-to-end solution, but develop the system in discrete modules to promote incremental delivery of business value	9	1	3	4	5	2	4	28
Provide a single source of information about the individual and all of that individual's interactions in the justice system	3	8	6	5	2	7	1	32
Design and deliver modules so that they can be implemented by individual counties with the context of their own justice environment	5	5	4	2	6	4	6	32
Promote data sharing, while ensuring and maintaining each stakeholder's fiduciary responsibility for various types of information	4	6	5	9	3	6	2	35
Ensure intellectual property is vested with the Urban Counties on behalf of participating counties	2	2	9	8	7	9	7	44
Leverage existing components developed by participating counties where practical	8	9	7	1	9	3	8	45
Allow for sharing of maintenance and operations	7	3	8	7	8	8	9	50

III. INVENTORY OF CURRENT NEEDS

This section provides an inventory of the current Adult Case Management System needs. This inventory of current needs was developed based on the stakeholder interviews and then validated and updated based on group discussion at the ACMS Summit.

The inventory of current needs consists of a series of high level needs statements that define the general scope of the various functional areas within a proposed ACMS. It also includes needs statements concerning application architecture, general system features, technical architecture and various supporting components such as online help, user procedures and technical procedures. These needs statements will be utilized as a starting point to help establish the scope for proposed ACMS projects.

The categories within the inventory of needs include:

- ◆ Application architecture and general system features;
- ◆ Prosecutor/District Attorney intake;
- ◆ Grand jury;
- ◆ Criminal courts;
- ◆ Indigent defense;
- ◆ Jail management and intake;
- ◆ Pretrial services;
- ◆ Probation;
- ◆ External reporting;
- ◆ Business intelligence and analytics;
- ◆ Technical architecture; and
- ◆ Help and system documentation.

Each of these categories is outlined below.

Application Architecture and General System Features

Application architecture and general system features refer to capabilities which would be expected to be incorporated across all functional modules within ACMS.

Needs identified in this category include:

- ◆ Provide a suite of fully-integrated application modules;

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ Data captured or updated in one module and visible throughout system;
- ◆ One stop-shop of information about an individual and all cases involving that individual;
- ◆ Shared data repository with ownership and access to information controlled by clearly defined roles and responsibilities;
- ◆ High degree of usability/ease of use;
- ◆ Work-flow driven processes and system functions;
- ◆ Electronic exchange between all stakeholder groups throughout the system;
- ◆ Pre-defined entry and exit points to facilitate data exchange between ACMS modules and other county systems;
- ◆ Integration points and links to county specific document management systems;
- ◆ eSignature capability for court officers;
- ◆ Biometric capture and identification;
- ◆ Integration with LiveScan;
- ◆ Dashboards with key performance indicators for managers and supervisors;
- ◆ Support for data exchange between counties based on established business rules;
- ◆ Support for National Information Exchange Model (NIEM);
- ◆ Table-driven architecture with online screens to control system parameters;
- ◆ Edit checking and business rules tables which are configurable by each county;
- ◆ Editing of all system input and data validation according to user defined business rules;
- ◆ Real-time transaction processing displaying the most current element value;
- ◆ Public portal capabilities which provide the flexibility for each county to define what information is delivered and how; and
- ◆ Compliance with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and other legal requirements for data confidentiality and protection.

Prosecutor/District Attorney Intake

Functional needs identified within the Prosecutor function include the following:

- ◆ Electronic filing from law enforcement agencies;

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ Offense/case review (scanned images, video, audio, etc.);
- ◆ Workflow with law enforcement agencies to receive filings, request additional information and return cases to law enforcement agencies which are not accepted by the prosecutor;
- ◆ Case acceptance, rejection or hold;
- ◆ Magistration;
- ◆ Offense coding;
- ◆ Prosecutor assignment and transfer;
- ◆ Indictment preparation;
- ◆ Victim services;
- ◆ Victim notification;
- ◆ Protective order tracking;
- ◆ Hot checks;
- ◆ Misdemeanor case filing with County Clerk;
- ◆ Electronic data exchange between the District Attorney's Office and the Grand Jury;
- ◆ Grand Jury scheduling including officer and other witness notification;
- ◆ Subpoena creation and notification;
- ◆ Internet-based electronic discovery portal for use by members of the defense bar to access discovery information and to facilitate communication between the prosecutor and the defense bar related to potential plea agreements;
- ◆ Prosecutor case management and trial preparation support;
- ◆ Plea offer;
- ◆ Case archiving; and
- ◆ External reporting requirements for prosecutors.

Grand Jury

Needs identified to support grand jury operations include:

- ◆ Grand Jury docketing including officer and other witness notification;
- ◆ Issuing and approving subpoenas;

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ Recording grand jury disposition; and
- ◆ Filing of indictments with District Clerk.

Criminal Courts Case Management

The identified needs for criminal courts case management include the following:

- ◆ One stop-shop of information about an individual and all cases involving that individual;
- ◆ Full case history including integration with county specific document management systems;
- ◆ Judge/Clerk/Court Coordinator and administrative staff functions;
- ◆ Criminal courts case management including:
 - Case assignment,
 - Docketing/case calendar including managing the dockets of diversion and specialty courts,
 - Jail status – docket appearance list,
 - Case jacket,
 - Jury charge,
 - Subpoena filing with the clerk.
 - Tracking of subpoena service delivery by constables,
 - Bench warrants,
 - Plea filing with the court, and
 - Case disposition and sentencing;
- ◆ Bond processing performed by Clerks' offices including:
 - Recording of bonds,
 - Processing bond forfeiture, and
 - Processing bond revocation;
- ◆ Criminal courts motions/orders/dispositions including:
 - Filing of motions/orders,
 - Processing appeal events,
 - Processing competency/insanity trials,
 - Processing judgment/sentence, and
 - Processing post-conviction writs;
- ◆ Property and evidence management;

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ Management of fee collections including:
 - Determining appropriate fees and court costs,
 - Recording, receipting, and depositing monetary and non-monetary payments,
 - Suspension and re-instatement of collection on assessments,
 - Managing delinquent fee collections,
 - Integrating with external collection agencies,
 - Disbursing funds to a claimant,
 - Distributing payments/credits (both monetary and non-monetary) against assessments/fees, and
 - Preparing various required management reports on financial activities for internal and external reporting;
- ◆ Additional Clerk functions including records management capabilities, diversion tracking and cash bonds;
- ◆ Document generation and management;
- ◆ Various electronic notifications such as email notification of the assigned court date to the attorney of record; notification to victims and witnesses of changes in court dates, etc.;
- ◆ External reporting by Clerks' offices to the Office of Court Administration (OCA) and the Department of Public Safety;
- ◆ eSignature capability for court officers;
- ◆ Biometric capture and identification;
- ◆ Integration with LiveScan in the court room;
- ◆ Reporting of court performance data;
- ◆ Public information portal with information on court schedules, case history, etc.;
- ◆ Required integration with the proposed ACMS Prosecutor and Grand Jury functions to support electronic filing between the prosecutor, grand jury and the courts;
- ◆ Required integration with existing county justice and financial applications; and

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ Data conversion architecture components including appropriate transform and load routines to support the migration of data into the new Criminal Courts module from participating counties' existing systems.

Indigent Defense and Public Defender

The needs identified in the area of indigent defense and support for the public defender's office includes the following:

- ◆ Attorney wheel;
- ◆ Co-defendant and past attorney conflict check;
- ◆ Attorney payments; and
- ◆ Public defender case preparation/case support.

Jail Management and Intake

Jail Management and Intake needs include the following:

- ◆ Book-in including:
 - ◆ Personal property inventory;
 - ◆ Mental/physical evaluation;
 - ◆ Biometrics – fingerprinting;
 - ◆ Mug shots;
 - ◆ Magistration; and
 - ◆ Divert Courts
- ◆ Positive ID and alias and record reconciliation;
- ◆ Classification;
- ◆ Gang keep away – placement in jails;
- ◆ Detention;
- ◆ Bond entry;
- ◆ Pre-Trial release;
- ◆ Transfer to TDC/paper ready;
- ◆ Population counts and reporting;
- ◆ Visitation;
- ◆ Jail chain
- ◆ Work release;

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ Staff scheduling and management;
- ◆ Jail incidents;
- ◆ Integration with commissary system;
- ◆ Inmate transportation;
- ◆ Video hearings and notifications; and
- ◆ Warrant status (recalls).

Pretrial Services

The needs identified to support Pretrial Services include the following:

- ◆ Case information;
- ◆ Defendant/case history;
- ◆ Bond management;
- ◆ Bondsman services;
- ◆ Personal bond (pledge and finance);
- ◆ Release on own recognizance;
- ◆ Diversion programs including:
 - ◆ Delayed prosecution, and
 - ◆ Restitution;
- ◆ Bond conditions (compliance);
- ◆ Electronic monitoring;
- ◆ Collections/accounting; and
- ◆ Integration and user exits to county specific financial management systems.

Probation

The needs identified to support Probation include:

- ◆ Case information;
- ◆ Defendant history;
- ◆ Case management;
- ◆ Pre-sentence investigation report;
- ◆ Risk management assessment;

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ Provider interface for drug and other testing labs;
- ◆ Fees and collections including integration with county finance systems;
- ◆ Fee monitoring for fines still due to Courts;
- ◆ Restitution;
- ◆ E-scheduling/notifications for probationers including Internet access to schedules and electronic notifications;
- ◆ Self-service check-in via Internet or kiosks for low risk offenders;
- ◆ Court interface for notification of court activity involving probationer;
- ◆ Jail interface for notification of contact with law enforcement/arrests, etc;
- ◆ Preparation of motions to revoke and adjudicate with electronic work flow to support review and filing by District Attorney; and
- ◆ Transfer of jurisdiction.

External Reporting

External reporting needs were identified in the following areas:

- ◆ Department of Public Safety;
- ◆ Office of Court Administration;
- ◆ Department of Criminal Justice;
- ◆ Victim Information and Notification Everyday System (VINES); and
- ◆ Texas Data Exchange (TDEx).

Business Intelligence and Analytics

Business intelligence and analytics needs include the following:

- ◆ Enterprise-wide data store to link information from diverse sources and make the information accessible for management reporting and analytics;
- ◆ Pre-defined management reports;
- ◆ Ad-hoc reporting;
- ◆ Trend identification;
- ◆ Forecasting;
- ◆ Sentencing support tools;

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ Jail population analysis;
- ◆ Performance management;
- ◆ District Attorney caseload monitoring;
- ◆ Court caseload/performance;
- ◆ Geographic Information System (GIS) interfaces; and
- ◆ Crime mapping.

Technical Architecture

Technical architecture needs are capabilities related to the technologies incorporated into the system and the tools used to build the system which are expected to be implemented across the various ACMS functional modules. These needs include:

- ◆ Architected to support either a hosted solution, regional cloud or standalone county implementation;
- ◆ Architected to allow for modular development and implementation;
- ◆ User exit points to facilitate integration with commercial off the shelf courts packages or county specific custom solutions;
- ◆ Solution based on distributed systems architecture to allow for the separation of various system components on different software/hardware platforms. As examples, a distributed systems architecture could enable the reporting environment to be separated from the production transaction environment to facilitate performance or the Internet based functions to be separated from internal county transaction functions for security and performance reasons;
- ◆ Solution based on a service oriented architecture (SOA) which packages system capabilities into a set of interoperable services or modules which can be utilized across a number of different business processes – as an example an electronic notification function could be developed and utilized as a “service” across a number of system functions including Prosecutor; Grand Jury, Courts, Jail and Probation;
- ◆ A vendor-independent design that does not require proprietary application software components;
- ◆ Scalable to support counties with various case loads/transaction volumes;
- ◆ Scalable to allow for incremental increases in system usage over time;
- ◆ A high availability application;

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ A high performing application;
- ◆ Construction of the application using current but mature industry-standard application development tools, techniques and standards;
- ◆ Support for Windows for application, database or web servers;
- ◆ Support for industry leading database environments;
- ◆ Delivery of content via multiple platforms appropriate to the user's need;
- ◆ Purge and archive capability as required in each business function based on user defined retention schedules and criteria;
- ◆ Audit trail capability as required in each business function; and
- ◆ Solution architected to allow the data to be fully replicated and recovered to prevent data loss.

Help and System Documentation

This subsection outlines needs in terms of end user help and system documentation which are expected to be implemented across the various ACMS functional modules. These needs include:

- ◆ Context sensitive, field level on-line help;
- ◆ User documentation that is comprehensive, clear and easy to use;
- ◆ Comprehensive technical system documentation and technical manuals;
- ◆ Implementation planning guides to support system deployment in each participating county; and
- ◆ Replicable and re-usable training materials.

IV. POTENTIAL COLLABORATION OPPORTUNITIES

This section highlights potential collaboration opportunities which were identified based on the ACMS guiding principles and the inventory of current needs. It then outlines the prioritization of these opportunities by the participating counties. Based on the prioritization of the various collaboration opportunities, a high level multi-year implementation plan of proposed projects is then presented.

Definition of Potential ACMS Development Projects

This subsection highlights potential ACMS development projects which were identified based on the ACMS guiding principles and the inventory of current needs. These collaboration opportunities were initially defined based on the

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

stakeholder interviews. These potential opportunities were then reviewed, validated and refined during the ACMS Summit meeting in January 2011.

The potential ACMS development projects identified during the strategic planning process included:

- ◆ Prosecutor (including District Attorney/Prosecutor and Grand Jury functionality);
- ◆ Criminal Courts Phase 1 and External Reporting;
- ◆ E-Filing Portal;
- ◆ Criminal Courts Phase 2;
- ◆ Jail Management;
- ◆ Indigent Defense;
- ◆ Pretrial Services and Bond Management;
- ◆ Probation;
- ◆ Business Intelligence and Analytics – Jail Population Tools; and
- ◆ Business intelligence and Analytics – Sentencing Tools.

Each of these potential ACMS development projects is defined in further detail below.

Prosecutor

This project will include prosecutor and District Attorney intake functionality including electronic filing from law enforcement agencies. It will also include support for Grand Jury operations; electronic data exchange between the District Attorney's Office and the Grand Jury; and data exchange between the Grand Jury and the District Clerk. It is envisioned that this project will be built upon Tarrant County's Criminal Courts Case Management System (CCMS) which is currently under development.

Tarrant County has implemented a portion of the proposed ACMS Prosecutor functionality through development of its Electronic Case Filing System (ECFS). It is currently re-developing and expanding the available functionality through the CCMS effort. Subsequently, Midland County has acquired from Tarrant County the rights to implement the CCCMS application.

A new version of CCCMS is currently under development by Tarrant County. This release will meet most of the requirements of the ACMS Prosecutor module. However, some additional functionality would likely need to be developed as part

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

of this next version of CCCMS to more fully meet the needs for ACMS Prosecutor functionality as identified during the ACMS strategic planning process.

It is proposed that the Urban Counties work with Tarrant County to complete development of the CCCMS application to meet the range of needs identified by the counties for prosecutor functionality during ACMS Phase 1. The Urban Counties will assume responsibility from Tarrant County for completing the development of the proposed ACMS Prosecutor application including development of functionality which has already been planned for development by Tarrant County and any additional functionality required to meet the essential requirements of participating counties. The Urban Counties TechShare program would also be responsible for managing other project activities such as implementation planning, training and documentation and transition planning related to the transformation of the CCCMS application to the ACMS Prosecutor module. The Urban Counties would then take responsibility for the on-going support, maintenance and enhancement of the resulting product, which would become the ACMS Prosecutor module.

An ACMS Prosecutor module will provide a number of benefits to participating counties including:

- ◆ Providing a mechanism to support electronic case filing from law enforcement agencies (LEAs) to the prosecutor's office, resulting in substantial time and labor savings for both the prosecutor's offices and for LEAs;
- ◆ Increased accuracy and timeliness of information provided by law enforcement to prosecutors, reducing required follow-up and data correction efforts by prosecutors;
- ◆ Integration with LiveScan to give prosecutors improved access to criminal history information while reviewing charges filed by law enforcement, thus providing prosecutors with more information upon which to base their initial decision on whether or not to proceed with a case;
- ◆ Providing a series of tools to assist prosecutors in complying with statutory filing timelines and to facilitate prosecutor decision making on individual cases, thus enabling counties to better manage their jail populations;
- ◆ Providing additional automation for indictment preparation, plea negotiations and trial preparation, thus increasing the overall efficiency and effectiveness of prosecutor staff; and
- ◆ Providing the capability for electronic exchange of case information from the prosecutor and the grand jury to the county and district clerk;

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

Criminal Courts Phase 1 and External Reporting

This project will include enterprise courts management functionality, with a focus on internal County stakeholders. It will also include external reporting to various State agencies.

The scope of the proposed ACMS Criminal Courts module includes criminal court case management functionality and related external reporting to the Office of Court Administration (OCA) and the Department of Public Safety (DPS) performed by the county clerk or district clerk in each county. The goal of the project effort is to deliver initial functionality to participating counties within fifteen (15) months of project start. To achieve this goal, functionality identified during the ACMS strategic planning process was divided into essential requirements to be delivered in a Phase 1 project covered by this project scope, with other functionality deferred to future versions of the ACMS Criminal Courts module and/or to other ACMS modules expected to be developed in the future.

The Urban Counties previously developed detailed requirements for a common integrated justice system in 2005, including criminal courts functionality. Fourteen (14) counties and the Texas Association of Counties participated in this collaborative requirements development effort. The requirements for criminal courts functionality were then updated through a follow-up project effort in 2007. In addition, the Urban Counties has requested access to an additional set of functional requirements for courts functionality developed by the Texas Association of Counties in 2010-2011. These requirements efforts would be extensively leveraged to help jump start the ACMS Criminal Courts project effort.

An ACMS Criminal Courts module will provide a number of benefits to participating counties including:

- ◆ Facilitating review of case information by judges by providing a single point of access to information about a defendant and all of their current and previous interactions with the criminal justice system;
- ◆ Increased productivity for court and clerk staff by:
 - Reducing the amount of required data entry,
 - Facilitating electronic exchange of information with and between various stakeholders, the clerks' offices and the courts, and
 - Automating and streamlining the flow of information associated with a case;
- ◆ Providing the capability for the county clerk and district clerk to receive electronic filings from the prosecutor, grand jury and defense bar;

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ Enhanced docketing capabilities allowing counties to better manage court schedules, which contributes to better management of jail populations; and
- ◆ Reducing significantly the amount of manual effort required by county staff to prepare reports for submission to OCA and DPS.

E-Filing Portal

This project will include development of a County operated web portal to support electronic filing by members of the defense bar with the District or County Clerk. This application would be designed to meet the range of capabilities required by a certified electronic filing service provider (EFSP) as envisioned in the draft rules for electronic filing.

Harris County has implemented an e-filing application to support filing with the county's civil courts. One potential approach for developing the e-filing portal is to adapt all or some elements of this application as the framework for a county operated e-filing portal to support electronic criminal case filing.

Potential benefits of the proposed e-filing portal include:

- ◆ Increased productivity for court and clerk staff by:
 - Reducing the amount of required data entry,
 - Facilitating electronic exchange of information with and between various stakeholders, the clerks' offices and the courts, and
 - Automating and streamlining the flow of information associated with a case; and
- ◆ Providing the capability for the county clerk and district clerk to receive electronic filings from the prosecutor, grand jury and defense bar.

Criminal Courts Phase 2

This project will extend the functionality developed in the Criminal Courts Phase 1 project. It will include development of the remaining elements defined in the list of needs which are not included in ACMS Phase 1. This includes a range of advanced e-scheduling and electronic notification capabilities for external stakeholders who have various interests in receiving notifications and updates about case status.

Potential benefits of this project include:

- ◆ More timely information exchange between court staff and stakeholders regarding case status and information;

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ Further streamlining and automating of the flow of information associated with a case; and
- ◆ Increased court staff productivity by reducing the amount of information which needs to be provided to case parties and other stakeholders manually or through email or other offline systems.

Indigent Defense and Public Defender

This project will provide indigent defense and public defender functionality. The scope would include the attorney wheel and billing and administration for indigent defense services. It would also include public defender case management and trial preparation functionality.

As originally defined and presented at the ACMS Summit, the scope of this project also included magistration. However, this function has been incorporated into the Prosecutor project since the Tarrant County CCCMS application already has magistration functionality.

Potential benefits of this project include:

- ◆ Reduced manual effort by staff to select attorneys for indigent defendants through automation of attorney wheel functionality;
- ◆ Reduced cost to manage indigent defense services through enhanced automation of required billing and support processes;
- ◆ Improved staff efficiency for public defenders through enhanced case management and trial preparation capabilities.

Pretrial Services and Bond Management

This project will provide support for pretrial services including bond management and electronic access for bail bondsman.

Functionality to be developed within this project will include:

- ◆ Case information;
- ◆ Defendant/case history;
- ◆ Bond management;
- ◆ Bondsman services and electronic portal;
- ◆ Collections/accounting;
- ◆ Integration and user exits to county specific financial management systems; and

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ Management reporting supporting Pretrial Services.

Potential benefits of this project include:

- ◆ Improved timeliness and accuracy of bond management process through increased automation;
- ◆ Increased efficiency by eliminating duplicate systems and manual processes currently required to support bond management processes;
- ◆ More timely information exchange between pretrial staff, court staff and other stakeholders regarding case status and information; and
- ◆ Further streamlining and automating of the flow of information between pretrial staff and the Courts.

Jail Management

This project will include development of the full range of jail management functions and capabilities. Functionality developed within this project will include:

- ◆ Book-in;
- ◆ Classification;
- ◆ Detention;
- ◆ Bond entry;
- ◆ Pre-Trial release;
- ◆ Transfer to TDC/paper ready;
- ◆ Population counts and reporting; and
- ◆ Other management reporting supporting jail operations.

Potential benefits of this project include:

- ◆ Increased efficiency by eliminating duplicate data entry of information between jail and court management applications
- ◆ More timely information exchange between jail staff, court staff and other stakeholders; and
- ◆ Improved and timelier access to information to assist counties in managing their jail populations.

Probation

This project will include development of capabilities required to support the operations of county Probation Departments. This includes:

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ Case information;
- ◆ Defendant history;
- ◆ Case management;
- ◆ Pre-sentence investigation report;
- ◆ Provider interface for drug and other testing labs;
- ◆ Fees and collections including integration and user exits to county specific financial management systems;
- ◆ E-scheduling /notifications for probationers including Internet access to schedules and electronic notifications;
- ◆ Self-service check-in via Internet or kiosks for low risk offenders;
- ◆ Court interface for probation revocations and other decisions;
- ◆ Jail interface for notifications when probationers are incarcerated, etc.; and
- ◆ Management reporting supporting Probation Department operations.

Potential benefits of this project include:

- ◆ Increased efficiency of Probation Department staff through:
 - Elimination of manual entry of information being passed from the courts and jail systems, and
 - Ability to better leverage staff member time through increased automation such as e-scheduling and automated notifications to probationers; and
- ◆ More timely information exchange between Probation Department staff, court staff and other stakeholders regarding case status and information.

Business Intelligence and Analytics – Jail Population Analysis

This project will include development of management reporting and analytical tools to support monitoring, forecasting and performing trend analysis on a county's jail population. The anticipated benefits of this project include:

- ◆ Allowing counties to reduce cost through improved management of their jail populations.

Business Intelligence and Analytics – Sentencing Tools

This project will include design and development of “smart sentencing” decisions tools for use by the Judiciary as an input to their sentencing decisions. The anticipated benefits from sentencing tools include:

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ Providing judges access to statistically based tools to use in making sentencing decisions. This will ultimately contribute to improved management of jail populations by providing the ability to more easily identify low risk offenders who may not need to be incarcerated.

Prioritization of Potential ACMS Development Projects

The potential ACMS development projects were prioritized by the participating counties as part of the ACMS Summit. Participating counties were asked to prioritize each initiative based on whether it was a short-term priority, which was rated as a one (1), an intermediate term priority which was rated as a two (2) or a longer-term priority which was rated as a three (3).

Exhibit 4 provides a summary of the prioritization of the potential ACMS development projects. It shows the relative rank for each potential project based on the total score for each item. The total score for each item was calculated by adding each participating county's individual scores for that item.

Exhibit 4: Summary of Prioritization of Potential ACMS Development Projects

Potential ACMS Development Projects	Rank
E-Filing Portal	1
Prosecutor	2
Criminal Courts Module Phase 1 and External Reporting	3
Criminal Courts Module Phase 2	4
Indigent Defense and Public Defender	4
Pretrial Services and Bonds	6
Business Intelligence and Analytics – Jail Population Analysis	7
Business Intelligence and Analytics – Sentencing Tools	7
Probation	9
Jail Management	10

Exhibit 5 provides the individual ranking of each project by the participating counties, as well as the rating from the Chair of the TechShare CIJS Technical Architecture Committee from Collin County. It also includes the total score for each project.

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

Exhibit 5: Prioritization of Potential ACMS Development Projects by Participating County

Potential ACMS Development Projects	Bell	Collin	Dallas	Denton	Galveston	Midland	Tarrant	Travis	Total
E-Filing Portal	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	10
Criminal Courts Module Phase 1 and External Reporting	1	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	12
Prosecutor	1	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	12
Indigent Defense and Public Defender	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	3	14
Criminal Courts Module Phase 2	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	1	15
Pretrial Services	1	3	2	2	1	3	2	2	16
Business Intelligence and Analytics – Jail Population Analysis	3	1	3	3	2	2	3	1	18
Business Intelligence and Analytics – Sentencing Tools	3	1	3	3	2	2	3	1	18
Probation	3	1	3	2	2	3	2	3	19
Jail Management	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	21

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

Based on the prioritization process, E-Filing Portal, ACMS Prosecutor and Criminal Courts Phase 1 were determined to be the highest priorities. As a result, the ACMS Oversight Board requested that project proposals be created for the Prosecutor and Criminal Courts Phase 1 projects as part of the ACMS strategic planning process. It was determined that it would be appropriate to wait until the 2011 Legislative session was completed and the rules for electronic filing in a criminal case were finalized before the project proposal for the E-Filing portal is developed.

Proposed Implementation Plan

Based on the prioritization of potential ACMS development projects, a proposed implementation plan was established. STA worked with the participating counties and the ACMS Oversight Board to develop this preliminary implementation plan for the various development projects. Exhibit 6 outlines the proposed ACMS Implementation Plan. This schedule includes:

- ◆ ACMS Prosecutor and ACMS Criminal Courts Phase 1 beginning in the summer of 2011;
- ◆ E-Filing Portal beginning upon completion of the 2011 Legislative session and approval of the statewide rules for electronic criminal case filing;
- ◆ Pretrial and Bonds and Indigent Defense and Public Defender beginning in early 2013;
- ◆ Criminal Courts Phase 2 beginning in the fall of 2013 following the completion of Criminal Courts Phase 1;
- ◆ Business Intelligence and Analytics beginning in early 2014; and
- ◆ Probation and Jail Management beginning in mid 2015.

In addition to the relative prioritization of each development project, the STA team considered the following factors in constructing the proposed schedule:

- ◆ Complexity of the proposed project;
- ◆ Size of the proposed project, with a goal to complete a project and deliver functionality in a 12 -18 month period to the extent possible;
- ◆ Total annual development cost;
- ◆ Amount of effort that can realistically be managed in parallel;
- ◆ Impact on shared resources such as policy makers, executive management, business resources and information technology resources from participating counties, etc.;

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

- ◆ Opportunities for shared economies of scale;
- ◆ Project risk; and
- ◆ Overall program risk.

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

Exhibit 6: Proposed ACMS Implementation Plan

ID	Task Name	Start	Finish	Duration	2011		2012				2013				2014				2015				2016					
					Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		
1	ACMS Prosecutor	7/11/2011	8/24/2012	295d																								
2	ACMS Criminal Courts Phase 1	7/11/2011	7/26/2013	535d																								
3	E-Filing Portal	9/1/2011	9/28/2012	282d																								
4	Pre-Trial and Bonds Management	1/14/2013	6/30/2014	381d																								
5	Indigent Defense and Public Defender	1/14/2013	6/30/2014	381d																								
6	ACMS Criminal Courts Phase 2	10/7/2013	10/31/2014	280d																								
7	Business Intelligence and Analytics	4/1/2014	3/31/2015	261d																								
8	Probation	7/6/2015	8/30/2016	302d																								
9	Jail Management	7/6/2015	8/30/2016	302d																								

APPENDIX A- STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Appendix A provides a copy of the Stakeholder Interview Questionnaire used to conduct the initial fact-finding interviews.

Texas Conference of Urban Counties Adult Case Management System (ACMS) Phase 1 Participating County Site Visits: Fact-Finding Interviews

The Salvaggio, Teal and Associates (STA) team will be conducting one-day site visits to each of the counties participating in the Adult Case Management System (ACMS) Phase 1 project. The goal of these site visits is to meet with a range of ACMS stakeholders to obtain input on each participating county's key business drivers and their current needs from the perspective of integrated justice. We also expect to obtain inputs for the draft rules for electronic criminal case filing. The specific agenda for the day will likely vary somewhat by county, but the team would expect to conduct one-hour fact-finding interviews with the following types of individuals:

- The participating county's ACMS Phase 1 Oversight Board Member (County Commissioner or senior administrator);
- Representative(s) from the District Clerk's office;
- Representative(s) from the County Clerk's office;
- Representative(s) from Sherriff's department;
- Representative(s) from the District Attorney's office;
- Chief Information Officer/Information Technology Director; and
- Information technology staff member(s) leading integrated justice efforts

Interview Questions

1. Please briefly describe your role and responsibilities with the County, with an emphasis on those activities related to justice systems?
2. How long have you been in this position and with the County? What other positions have you held at the County?
3. Please briefly describe some of the strategic business drivers or objectives of your organization?
4. How could an enhanced ACMS help to enable your organization to achieve these business objectives?

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

5. From your perspective, what are the major challenges with the County's current adult case management business processes and systems?
6. From your perspective, what capabilities would you consider most important to include in an enhanced ACMS?
7. From your perspective, what would you consider the key business benefits of an enhanced ACMS?
8. From your perspective, what should be the key elements or capabilities of an electronic criminal case filing process?
9. What risks or implementation challenges do you see with either (a) an electronic criminal case filing process or (b) a new ACMS?
10. What lessons learned do you have from past business change projects (at the County or statewide initiatives, etc.) that should be considered in scoping the ACMS program and developing a multi-project implementation plan?
11. In terms of this initial planning project, what specific outcomes are you looking for to view the ACMS Phase 1 project effort as a success?
12. Are there any other areas related to ACMS we have not asked you about that you would like to discuss?
13. Are there any other individuals (at your County or with other counties) that you would recommend that we speak with during this planning process?

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

APPENDIX B- ACMS SUMMIT PARTICIPANTS

Appendix B provides a list of the ACMS Summit participants by county, along with each participant's role in their county.

Exhibit B-1: ACMS Summit Participants by County

Participant	County	County Role
Virginia Etherley	Dallas	District Clerk's Chief Deputy (not at first meeting)
Dana Wrisner	Dallas	Criminal District Courts' Manager
Lincoln Monroe	Dallas	Administrative Chief, District Attorney's Office
Tommy Hutson	Dallas	Director of Technology, District Attorney's Office
Marlene James	Dallas	Sheriff's Data Mgt. Unit Manager
Dave Manigold	Dallas	CIO (interim)
Patsy Barker	Dallas	Sheriff's Office – Warrants
Clay Jenkins	Dallas	County Judge
Joe Costa	Dallas	Sheriff's Office - Chief Deputy
Mike Cantrell	Dallas	Dallas County Commissioner
John Warren	Dallas	County Clerk
Gary Fitzsimmons	Dallas	District Clerk
Buckley Chappell	Dallas	Representative from Bail Bond Firms
Rodney Christian	Dallas	IT Assistant Chief
Ron Giblin	Dallas	Bail Bondsman
G.K. Manius	Tarrant	County Administrator
Kurt Buchert	Tarrant	Sr. Project Manager - Integrated Justice
Steve Smith	Tarrant	Chief Information Officer
Jeff Nicholson	Tarrant	Deputy County Clerk
Romey Willis	Tarrant	Project Manager - Integrated Justice
Mary Louise Garcia	Tarrant	County Clerk
Clete McAlister	Tarrant	County Court Administrator
Doug Gowin	Tarrant	Chief of Operations - District Clerk
Mark Kenneth	Bell	Interim CIO
Robin Donnelly	Midland	County Commissioner
Teresa Clingman	Midland	District Attorney
Sandra Edge	Midland	Assistant District Attorney
Heather Ferrell	Travis	Sheriff's Office
Janice Brown	Travis	Information Technology
Mark Erwin	Travis	Criminal Court Manager

Adult Case Management System Strategic Plan

Participant	County	County Role
Michelle Brinkman	Travis	Chief Deputy - County Clerk
Neomia Bailey	Travis	County Clerk's Office
Robin Osborn	Travis	Sheriff's Office
Rod Brown	Travis	Information Technology
Don Castiglione	Travis	District Attorney's Office
Tonya Watson	Travis	Criminal Court Administration
Darie Gordon	Travis	District Attorney's Office
Emily Dorsett	Galveston	Information Technology
Ken Clark	Galveston	County Commissioner
Caren Skipworth	Collin	Director of Information Technology