

**STATE OF OREGON
LEGISLATIVE FISCAL OFFICE**

900 COURT STREET NE
STATE CAPITOL, ROOM H-178
SALEM OR 97301-4048
PHONE 503-986-1828
FAX 503-373-7807



KEN ROCCO
LEGISLATIVE FISCAL OFFICER

DARON HILL
DEPUTY LEGISLATIVE FISCAL OFFICER

Date: May 6, 2013
To: Ways and Means Public Safety Subcommittee
From: Robert L. Cummings, Principal Legislative Analyst (IT)
Subject: **OJD – eCourt Program SB5701-A (2012) Budget Note Progress**

Background

During the 2012 Legislative Session, OJD was requested to continue working with the legislature on: a) the outstanding remaining work on the Oregon Judicial Department (OJD) eCourt Program Agreement between the Chief Justice and the Co-Chairs of the Joint Committee on Ways and Means; b) needed planning work related to the implementation of Tyler’s Odyssey Software Package in the five initial pilot and earlier adopter sites (Yamhill, Linn, Crook, Jefferson, and Jackson); and c) preparations for the major implementation of the Odyssey product in the Multnomah County Circuit Court. The legislature documented its specific expectations in two budget notes for SB5701-A (2012) which are provided in Attachment #1 – OJD eCourt Program Budget Note - SB5701-A (2012).

Budget Note Progress

The specific purpose of the first budget note was to have OJD document the remaining work that needed to be completed on the Agreement between the Chief Justice and the Co-Chairs of the Joint Committee on Ways and Means in the SB5516 (2011) budget report. At the time, OJD had made significant progress on this 37 item Agreement, but there were a number of outstanding remaining items that needed to be scheduled and completed. OJD was requested to identify this work, to schedule it out over 2012, and to report back to the Chief Justice and the Co-Chairs of the Joint Committee on Ways and Means on the status of deliverables and progress. During the March through September 2012, timeframe, OJD worked closely with the LFO to schedule and complete the remaining Agreement work.

At the December 2012 Joint Legislative Committee on Legislative Audits and Information Management & Technology (JCLAIMT), OJD and the LFO reported that with the exception of Item #37, the independent performance and financial audit of the eCourt Program, that all remaining Agreement work (36 items) were completed, reviewed, and accepted by the eCourt Program Legislative Oversight Committee (Senator

Devlin, Representative Richardson, and Representative Harker). The independent eCourt Program audit was scheduled for completion by the end of the 2013 Legislative Session (and it is on schedule for completion by the end of May 2013).

The second budget note requested that OJD formalize its initial trial court implementation plan and “lessons learned” efforts to ensure that sufficient initial front-end planning (with success measures) was done prior to implementing the Odyssey product in each of the initial five pilot and early adopter trial courts. The purpose of this budget note was to not only assure that appropriate planning was done prior to each trial court implementation, but to also make sure that actual performance against pre-defined success measures was used in the evaluation of each court implementation. In addition, the second budget note required that the “lessons learned” in each trial court implementation were utilized in the planning for each subsequent Odyssey implementation.

OJD was requested to develop a separate implementation plan, success measures, post implementation review, and lessons learned analysis for each of the five initial trial court implementations. Beginning with the initial implementation of Odyssey in the pilot Yamhill Trial Court on June 14, 2012, OJD methodically developed all requested planning and evaluation materials for each of the four remaining “early adopter” trial courts which followed. Each of the remaining four trial courts were also implemented on schedule (Linn, Crook, and Jefferson on December 10, 2012; and Jackson on March 11, 2013), and each implementation went much smoother than the previous implementations, as OJD learned the “in’s and out’s” of implementing the Odyssey product.

Preparations are now in progress for the Multnomah County Circuit Court, which typically handles a very high percentage of the total trial court caseload (all case types including parking) for the State of Oregon. In 2011, Multnomah County Circuit Court processed 35% of all statewide circuit court findings (this percentage included most violation types with the exception of parking). The Multnomah implementation was originally planned as a “by case-type,” rather than “all case types at once” (as was done in the initial five smaller trial and early adopter trial courts). However, during the lengthy planning process for Multnomah, it was decided that a “by case-type” approach was not practical, and a phased modified “big bang” approach was selected as the best way to implement Odyssey into the Multnomah County Circuit Court.

The only area where OJD has struggled some in the initial eCourt Program installations of the Odyssey product, is related to the availability of OJIN and Odyssey data to vendors who have traditionally purchased this type of data from the OJIN database. Assuring timely access to OJD data was an issue following the first couple of trial court implementations of Odyssey, due to a variety of reasons (i.e. changes in OJD security requirements; the expanded capabilities of the new Odyssey product; improvements in OJD’s hardware infrastructure, etc.). OJD has already implemented several changes to deal with the initial vendor data access problems, and is looking at further possible solutions. For example, over the past three to four months, OJD has been reviewing the feasibility of developing a separate “mirrored database,” which could provide a solution that would minimize a vast majority of any remaining data access issues, and could ultimately provide a far superior data access capability to these vendors.

Conclusion

OJD has done an excellent job of responding to the budget notes related to SB5701-A (2012). Other than the remaining independent audit (which is scheduled for completion by May 31, 2013), all deliverables related to the eCourt Program Agreement have been “signed off.” In addition, OJD has completed the implementation of the Odyssey product on schedule in the initial five pilot/early adopter trial courts, and is well into the planning efforts for the Multnomah County Circuit Court implementation of Odyssey. The excellent foundational planning work that OJD completed over the past 2-3 years, and OJD’s well-thought-out planning efforts for the initial trial court implementations, have resulted in excellent results in the pilot/early adopter sites, and reflect very positively on the leadership and staff of the eCourt Program.

Attachments: Attachment #1 – OJD eCourt Program Budget Note - SB5701-A (2012)

cc Ken Rocco
Daron Hill

Attachment #1 – OJD eCourt Program Budget Notes - SB 5701-A (2012)

The following budget notes were adopted relating to the Oregon eCourt Program.

BUDGET NOTE

The Judicial Department is requested to work with the Legislative Fiscal Office to prepare a revised schedule for completing the deliverables that were defined in the Agreement between the Chief Justice and the Co-Chairs of the Joint Committee on Ways and Means in the SB 5516 (2011) budget report. The Judicial Department and the Legislative Fiscal Office are also requested to establish a regular meeting schedule to review the deliverables and the status of Oregon eCourt. The parties will report to the Chief Justice and the Co-Chairs of the Joint Committee on Ways and Means periodically on the status of the deliverables and the Oregon eCourt program. The Judicial Department will also report as requested to the Joint Committee on Legislative Audits and Technology on the deliverables and the status of the Oregon eCourt program.

BUDGET NOTE

The Oregon Judicial Department (OJD) is requested to develop, by no later than April 1, 2012, a detailed implementation and evaluation plan to manage the pilot court and early adopter court Oregon eCourt implementations. For each trial court, the plan must include a clear definition of the implementation goals & objectives, processes, timelines, and costs; success evaluation criteria and measures for proving successful execution of each plan; and a plan to incorporate the lessons learned after each trial court implementation into subsequent implementations. If OJD determines that the implementation goals & objectives, schedule, or costs should be revised or rebaselined, OJD must immediately provide documentation of any adjustment to the Legislative Fiscal Office (LFO) so that the impact can be calibrated to the affected trial court implementation plan.

LFO will work with OJD to evaluate the success of each pilot and early adopter implementation against the plan. Factors that will be considered will be agreed upon by LFO and OJD and will be documented in each trial court implementation plan. The plan for the initial trial court will specifically include an initial evaluation of the usability of the Odyssey product. Each of the subsequent four early adopter implementations will further test the scalability of the product, and additional components of Oregon eCourt that may have been added; the configurations that have been established; the business functions that have been integrated with the Odyssey product; the system interfaces; and the data conversion plan and implementation.

LFO will request that OJD report after the pilot court and each early adopter implementation on its implementation including a post implementation review of outcomes, success measures and costs, and the lessons learned analysis. OJD should provide recommendations based on these reviews for the next early adopter court. Once all four of the first early adopters are completed, OJD should conduct a major review to verify that the product(s) and all the methods involved in the implementation for the first five pilot and early adopter courts are sufficient for a successful implementation in Multnomah County. Because Multnomah County is being implemented via a

Attachment #1 – OJD eCourt Program Budget Notes - SB 5701-A (2012)

‘by case-type’ methodology, rather than all case types at once, like the first five trial courts, OJD should provide a Multnomah County-specific implementation and evaluation plan to guide the Oregon eCourt product(s) implementation. Upon completion of this implementation, LFO and OJD will review the Multnomah County implementation against the detailed implementation plan and the OJD assessment to evaluate the success of this implementation. This review will provide the basis for determining readiness of OJD and the contractor for implementing Oregon eCourt in the remaining trial courts.