JTC 101 – Agenda

- Organizational Structure and Documents
- Court Technology Framework
- JTC Court Technology Standards
- Next-Gen Standards
- Working Groups and Assignments
- Priorities Exercise

NOTE: Much of the information shared in this presentation may be found on the JTC website at http://www.ncsc.org/About-us/Committees/Joint-Technology-Committee.aspx.
JTC Organizational Structure and Documents

David Slayton
JTC Vision, Mission and Goals

**Vision**
Courts will leverage technology to:

• Provide justice quickly, fairly and economically
• Interact with the public, justice organizations, employees, and the private sector while balancing access, privacy and security
• Enhance access to justice
• Promote public trust and confidence

**Mission**
To improve the administration of justice through technology

**Goals**

• Develop and promote technology standards for the courts
• Improve court processes and business practices through technology
• Ensure adequate education and training for court leaders in technology
• Collaborate with the justice community and other stakeholders
JTC Organizational Structure

Fourteen voting members
• Five from COSCA (one designated co-chair)
• Five from NACM (one designated co-chair)
• Two from CITOC
• Two from NCSC

One ex officio member
• FACT (non-voting)

Recognized liaisons
• COSCA Statistics Committee
• DOJ/OJP/BJA
• Global Advisory Committee
JTC Organizational Documents

• Memorandum of Understanding
• Vision, Mission and Goals
• Statement of Purpose and National Agenda
• Resolution 13: Implementation of Automation Standards
Court Technology Framework

Craig Burlingame
Jim Harris
Court Technology Framework (CTF)

http://www.ncsc.org/ctfwiki
CTF Goals and Objectives

• Provide an organized view of the increasingly complex landscape of technologies and related standards

• Define a standard set of components and interfaces that make up a comprehensive court IT environment

• Help courts more readily identify opportunities for improved efficiency and cost savings through the use of technology

• Promote alignment of IT initiatives with business goals of the court
One way CTF is being Used – “Profiles”

CTF Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder perspectives</th>
<th>Relevant standards and resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business function or problem of interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important questions</td>
<td>Best practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lessons Learned from Real-World Projects

Statutes, Rules, Court Policies

Technology Standards

Technology Framework
JTC Court Technology Standards (Process, Matrix and Next-Gen)

Craig Burlingame
Jim Harris
JTC Standards Process

- **Concept**: Review and vet an idea for a standard, paper, guidelines, etc.; JTC Project; Working Group
- **Development**: Working Group development activities; Draft Work Product
- **Review**: Public review and process feedback; Recommended Standard
- **Adoption**: Submit to COSCA and NACM Boards; Adopted Standard
- **Evaluation**: Implementation review and feedback; Implemented Standard
JTC Standards

• [JTC Court Technology Standards](#) (new page on JTC website)
  • Court Case Management Functional Requirements
  • Other Standards and Guidelines reviewed and recognized by the JTC
  • Information Sharing Initiatives and Standards recognized by the JTC

• Detailed [Standards Matrix](#)
JTC Standards – Brief History

• Functional requirements for court case management systems
  
  ▪ Largely successful
    ▪ Best thinking of court and vendor communities
    ▪ Saved courts time and effort
    ▪ Improved quality of requirements
    ▪ Raised the bar for vendors
  
  ▪ Weaknesses
    ▪ Issues with ambiguity and granularity
    ▪ Compliance is no longer a significant differentiator between vendors
    ▪ Not as relevant to configurable systems
    ▪ Missing newer technologies and methodologies

• Other standards
  
  o Electronic filing
  o Information exchange
  o Guidelines and best practices
Next-Gen Standards – Guiding Principles

• **Perspective:** business driven
• **Comprehensive:** cover all areas of functionality
• **Adaptable:** simple for a court to adapt and use
• **Dynamic:** use with rapidly changing business needs supported by changing technologies
• **Flexible:** reflect local terminology and practice
• **Disciplined:** follow established business process improvement disciplines
• **Harmonious:** build upon and complement existing initiatives (e.g., CTF, NIEM, ECF, ...)

Next-Gen Standards

• Ongoing Development and refresh of Court Technology Standards

• Start with “Court Capabilities”
  • Statute and rule changes
  • Emerging technologies

• Jury example
Next-Gen and the CTF

** Court Capabilities **
- Business Processes

** Technology Opportunities **

** Information Model **
- Application Capabilities

** Component Design **

** Applications **
- CTF Profiles:
  - Guidelines
  - Important Questions
  - Best Practices
  - Stakeholder perspectives
  - Relevant standards
  - Lessons Learned
Next-Gen Roadmap
JTC Strategic Planning, Priorities and Working Groups

Kevin Bowling
JTC Strategic Planning and Priorities Exercise

• Identified and prioritized pain points and topics of interest to courts
• Organized into high-, medium- and low-priority topics
• Created strategic working groups to focus on high-priority topics
• Mind map (extracted from July 2012 meeting notes)
IT Governance

• Decision-making
• Standardization
• Prioritization
• Strategic and tactical plans
• Implementation guidance
• Leadership transition/continuity
• Change management
Data Management

- Quality
- Timeliness
- Usability
- Performance measures
- Consistency
- Accuracy
- Access
- Security
- Privacy
- Demand
- Filtering
Electronic Courts

- Public access
- Judicial tools
- Staff tools
- Records retention
- Digital record
- Information sharing
- Digital divide
- E-commerce
- Managing expectations
JTC Working Groups

• Strategic Working Groups
  All JTC members serve on at least one working group
  ❖ IT Governance
  ❖ Data Management
  ❖ Electronic Courts
  ❖ Communications

• Other Working Groups/Task Teams (as needed)
  SMEs, Technologists, and at least one JTC liaison
  ❖ CTF
  ❖ Jury Standards
  ❖ Judicial Tools (new)
Working Group Assignments

Data Management
• Jorge Basto (Chair)
• Paul DeLosh
• Pam Harris
• Robin Sweet
• Judge Michael Trickey
• Tom Clarke (NCSC Staff)

Electronic Courts
• David Slayton (Chair)
• David Byers
• Judge O. John Kuenhold
• Yolanda Lewis
• Kelly Steele
• Jim Harris (NCSC Staff)

IT Governance
• Marlene Martineau (Chair)
• Raymond Billotte
• Craig Burlingame
• Laurie Dudgeon
• Paul Embley (NCSC Staff)

Communications
• Kevin Bowling (Chair)
• Jorge Basto (Data Management WG)
• David Slayton (Electronic Courts WG)
• Marlene Martineau (IT Governance WG)
• Alan Crouse (CITOC)
• Brent Wigen (FACT)
• Yolanda Lewis (NACM Communications)