

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #05-03
Page 1 of 2

| Agency | Project | FY2005-06 | FY2006-07 |
|---------------|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Supreme Court | Trial Court Automation Strategy | \$ 125,000.00 | \$ 125,000.00 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

JUSTICE, the current trial court automation system, was designed and built in the early 1990s. Dramatic changes in technology have occurred, but JUSTICE has not been modified to include many of those advances. The Court asks for funds to retain an expert, independent consultant. The result will be a review of how well JUSTICE satisfies the needs of trial courts, and will provide guidance in deciding how long to expect to continue to use JUSTICE and when the Court should move to a new automation system using the latest technology.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| | Estimated Prior Expended | FY2005-06 (Year 1) | FY2006-07 (Year 2) | FY2007-08 (Year 3) | FY2008-09 (Year 4) | Total |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| 2. Contractual Services | | | | | | |
| 2.4 Other | \$ - | \$ 125,000.00 | \$ 125,000.00 | | | \$ 250,000.00 |
| TOTAL COSTS | \$ - | \$ 125,000.00 | \$ 125,000.00 | | | \$ 250,000.00 |
| General Funds | | \$ 125,000.00 | \$ 125,000.00 | | | \$ 250,000.00 |
| TOTAL FUNDS | | \$ 125,000.00 | \$ 125,000.00 | | | \$ 250,000.00 |

PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 13 | 14 | 11 | 12.7 | 15 |
| IV: Project Justification / Business Case | 14 | 20 | 20 | 18.0 | 25 |
| V: Technical Impact | 16 | 18 | 20 | 18.0 | 20 |
| IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 6 | 7 | 8 | 7.0 | 10 |
| VII: Risk Assessment | 9 | 8 | 8 | 8.3 | 10 |
| VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget | 13 | 15 | 16 | 14.7 | 20 |
| TOTAL | | | | 79 | 100 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|--|---|--|
| III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The goals and projected outcomes are clear. The proposed study is an essential part of the life cycle of IT investments. A periodic evaluation of requirements, costs, best practices, and options is important. - Goals, etc. are well defined. Door to enhancing existing Justice System was left open. Development of a long range technical plan is critical to the success of the trial court system. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project outcomes should include a cost benefit study of the different options under consideration (modify JUSTICE, build a replacement system, buy a replacement system, or do nothing). The study should look at potential changes to processes that would improve the operations of county and district courts. - Measurement methods are too general to assure that the consultant is progressing successfully. In reviewing the Supreme Courts IT Comprehensive Plan, I could not find direct discussion about the need to take a comprehensive look at the trial court system. |
| IV: Project Justification / Business Case | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This section should list specific deficiencies with JUSTICE cited in the studies by the National Center for State Courts and National Center for Juvenile Justice. How significant are these |

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #05-03
Page 2 of 2

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|--|---|
| | | deficiencies? What are some of the major features of the ASFA as they impact courts? - While this section discussed the benefits of a "revitalized" trial court system, it did not answer the question "Why use an outside consultant?". Likewise the other solution did not discuss the use of existing court staff to perform the analysis. |
| V: Technical Impact | - Analysis projects of this type do not typically have an immediate technical impact, so I awarded all points. | - The impact on other systems that share data with JUSTICE should also be addressed. |
| VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | - Project sponsor was identified. At this point in the project definition stated milestones and deliverables are adequate. | - What is the projected timeline for the study? Will external stakeholders (attorneys, prosecutors, law enforcement) be involved? - There was not a statement that the stakeholders have "bought into" participating in the project. |
| VII: Risk Assessment | - Risks were well stated. | - Each risk could have been addressed individually with respect to mitigation. |
| VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget | | - Will the \$250,000 amount be adequate for the scope of services? Some comparison with other studies would help to determine if this amount is reasonable. Section VII indicated that the State Court Administrator would provide temporary court staff to allow participation of senior staff in the study. Is this cost included in the \$250,000? - Detail was not provided to determine if costs such as travel, lodging, etc. are included in the cost projection. Detail was not provided to determine whether temporary staff costs are included. Location in budget request not identified. |