



Judicial Council of California · Administrative Office of the Courts

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courtinfo.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: February 25, 2011

Title	Agenda Item Type
California Court Case Management System: Status Update and Demonstration	Information Only
Submitted by	Date of Report
Court Case Management System Program Management Office	February 9, 2011
Mark A. Moore, Executive Director	Contact
Keri G. Collins, Manager	Jessica Craven, 818-558-3103
Jessica Craven, Senior Business Applications Analyst	jessica.craven@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

This is a status and summary report that will be accompanied by a demonstration of California's Court Case Management System at the meeting. Interim versions of CCMS are in use at seven courts and process more than 25 percent of the state's civil cases. CCMS will support courts of all sizes and be maintained at a statewide level through the California Courts Technology Center. In December 2010, CCMS governance was augmented to provide broader participation from the judicial branch, bar, and justice system partners. The Judicial Council has directed the AOC to develop a single case management system to be deployed in all 58 superior courts and is the executive sponsor of CCMS. CCMS is managed by the CCMS Program Management Office.

Description of Court Case Management System (CCMS)

The Court Case Management System (CCMS) is an integrated case management system using a single application that will support courts of all sizes. It is an essential component of the judicial branch's strategic plan for technology improvement.

CCMS will be used by 90 percent of court staff and judicial officers and will improve the processing of cases from inception to disposition. Its overall goal is to transform court operations from a paper-based process to a branchwide electronic document management system. Transitioning from paper to electronic documents will result in efficiencies across all courts. New functionality, including electronic filing, electronic calendars, self-service case inquiries, and self-service payments, will change the way courts do business.

CCMS will improve public safety and the quality of justice rendered in California's trial courts by providing the public, attorneys, judges, and litigants with immediate access to case information. State agencies that interact with the courts, including the Department of Justice, Department of Social Services, Department of Child Support Services, and California Highway Patrol, will be able to interact with a single case management system to improve efficiency, eliminate redundant data entry, avoid data entry errors, and reduce system costs. Attorneys and the public will have increased options and improved service time frames for conducting business with the courts.

CCMS supports the following goals:

- To support courts of different sizes and demographics;
- To efficiently manage system enhancements, including those that arise from legislative changes;
- To establish standard procedures that will make it easy for courts to use a common solution with minimum customization;
- To utilize a common approach for all case categories based on best practices, contemporary information technology architecture, and technology;
- To create venue transparency, allowing judicial officers access to information, irrespective of jurisdiction; and
- To provide the opportunity to implement shared services in the future through a single system that can be used at all courts.

The final CCMS development will consist of an integrated case management system for all case types, statewide reporting, court interpreter and court reporter scheduling, and integration with justice partners. CCMS will support courts of all sizes and be maintained at a statewide level through the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC), the judicial branch data center. The needs of court users will be managed statewide while local courts will have sufficient flexibility to configure the application to meet local requirements. The judicial branch owns the application source code for CCMS and will not have to rely on costly vendor contracts to make functional and legislative enhancements. The technological advancements afforded by CCMS will bring the service levels provided by the California court system into alignment with the service quality achieved in the private sector and other areas of government.

Previous and Recent Council Action

The Judicial Council of California directed the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) to develop a single case management system to be deployed in all 58 superior courts. In August

2002, the Judicial Council directed AOC staff to develop a comprehensive administrative infrastructure for the trial courts. In February 2003, the Judicial Council reaffirmed its directive to the AOC to develop and implement necessary infrastructure to support the trial courts' provision of efficient, cost-effective, and reliable statewide administrative services.

In December 2010, the Executive and Planning Committee approved the current CCMS governance model, which was developed to provide broader participation by the judicial branch, State Bar of California, and justice system partners. The council has assumed the role of executive sponsor and has designated the Administrative Director of the Courts as the lead executive for the CCMS project.

In December 2010, Administrative Director of the Courts William C. Vickrey named Mark A. Moore as Executive Program Director of the CCMS Program Management Office, which is managing the project, and created a new governance committee to oversee the project's completion. The governance committee will be assisted by three advisory committees: (1) the CCMS General Administrative Advisory Committee, (2) the CCMS Operational Advisory Committee, and (3) the CCMS Justice Partner Advisory Committee.

The new governance structure for the CCMS program involves extensive judicial oversight. Justice Terence L. Bruiniers chairs the CCMS Executive Committee. Eight of the 13 members of this committee are justices or judges. Membership of the entire governance structure includes 27 trial courts, 20 trial court judges, 19 court executives, 3 appellate justices, and representatives from justice system partners and the bar. A combined committee kickoff event was held at the AOC offices in San Francisco on January 31 and February 1, 2011. The purpose of the event was to acquaint the committee members with the history of CCMS, review its status and the committee charters, and begin development of committee work plans. See Attachments B–F for rosters of the CCMS Executive Committee and advisory committees.

Recommendations From California Technology Agency

Following a hearing on CCMS in October 2009, the Legislature requested that the Office of the State Chief Information Officer (OCIO recently renamed the California Technology Agency) conduct a review of the CCMS project. In April 2010, *Review of the California Court Case Management System* was published. The report noted the size and complexity of the CCMS project and significant benefits that may accrue to the state when the system is completed. The report included approximately 20 recommendations, including the project's expanded governance plan. The Progress Report, Attachment A, shows that 11 recommendations have been implemented to date.

The remaining recommendations will be implemented at the appropriate point in the project life cycle. AOC executive leadership has continued to meet with the California Technology Agency as part of an effort to increase information and collaboration between the executive and judicial branches.

Status of Development and Implementation

Interim Civil Case Management System

In 2010, a new software release of the interim civil application, Release 10.02, was installed in six civil, small claims, probate, and mental health case management system courts (Superior Courts of Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Joaquin, and Ventura Counties). This release includes the ability to process e-filed documents. In total, the six courts using this case management system represent approximately 25 percent of all civil cases processed statewide. This interim case management system is currently in maintenance mode, and future releases will address judicial branch requirements and legislative changes.

E-filing. In June 2010, e-filing for civil cases was successfully deployed in the Superior Court of Orange County. E-filing functionality includes electronic case filing and clerk review, digital stamping and endorsing, electronic notification of filing, return of endorsed documents, and system verification that data elements are complete and accurate. In the first six months, the court processed close to 20,000 transactions involving more than 32,000 documents. Three additional courts, the Superior Courts of Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura Counties, are considering deployment of e-filing later in fiscal year (FY) 2010–2011.

Technical support. Technical support for the interim civil case management system will transition from Deloitte Consulting to the AOC Information Services Division in 2011. After factoring in knowledge transfer costs and the use of parallel teams for several months during the transition, savings are projected at approximately \$2.5 million through June 2014.

CCMS

Product development is nearing completion and preparations for deployment are under way.

Vendor testing. The AOC and the courts were closely involved in vendor testing of the core product, which began in August 2010 and has just been completed. Product acceptance testing started in February 2011 and is scheduled to be completed by April 30, 2011. The external components, such as the statewide reporting data warehouse, data exchanges through the Integrated Services Backbone, and the Internet portal, will be phased into the final product, tested, and accepted by July 31, 2011.

Cost-benefit analysis. In October 2010, the AOC engaged Grant Thornton LLP to perform a cost-benefit analysis for developing CCMS and deploying it to all 58 trial courts. This analysis was completed in February 2011. The AOC will use the results of the analysis and the underlying cost-benefit model to inform the statewide deployment strategy for CCMS.

Implementation in early adopter courts. CCMS will be deployed in three “early adopter” courts, the Superior Courts of San Diego, Ventura, and San Luis Obispo Counties. This approach is consistent with recommendations by the California Technology Agency in its 2010 review of

CCMS. Deployment planning is currently in progress at the three pilot courts. The early adopter courts are expected to be operating on CCMS by the end of 2012. Statewide deployment to the remaining 55 courts will continue, depending on available funding, and priority will be given to courts with the most urgent case management needs, courts with failing systems, courts with systems that are no longer supported, and courts that can demonstrate the greatest return on investment by upgrading from their current systems. The CCMS Program Management Office is working with the AOC Finance Division and the governance entities to develop strategies to absorb funding reductions resulting from the Governor's budget plan.

By deploying to one early adopter court within each size classification (large, medium, and small courts) the three-court pilot will demonstrate application operation in a broad range of court environments. Throughout the approximate 18-month deployment cycle, program goals and structure will be further refined to demonstrate the viability of the deployment approach and to build a strong foundation for future deployments. The goal is to use the early adopter pilot to establish repeatable processes for long-term deployments. The branch can reduce overall deployment costs by creating processes once and reusing them multiple times statewide. This in turn will drive increased standardization and allow for more effective management of court operations in the current constrained financial environment.

In 2010, the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) team began to design, plan, and build out the first technology environment for the three CCMS early adopter courts in the Omaha Data Center. Following deployment to the early adopter courts, these environments will be reused in subsequent court deployments.

Next Steps

Anticipated future actions include the following:

- The CCMS Executive Committee and advisory committees will set annual work plans.
- The core CCMS product will be delivered and is planned to be accepted by April 30, 2011.
- External components, such as statewide reporting data warehouse, data exchanges through the Integration Service Backbone, and the Internet portal, will be phased into the final product, tested, and accepted by July 31, 2011.
- The first pilot courts are expected to be operating on CCMS by the end of 2012.
- Statewide deployment to the remaining 55 courts, utilizing available funding, will continue, with priority given to courts with the most urgent needs and courts that demonstrate the greatest return on investment by upgrading.

Policy and Cost Implications

Total expenditures through FY 2010–2011 for the CCMS project are estimated at approximately \$330 million. Estimated additional costs not considered part of the CCMS project—i.e., costs attributable to the development, deployment, and maintenance and support of the interim criminal and traffic system (V2); maintenance and support of the interim civil system (V3); and maintenance and support of CCMS—will be approximately \$215 million, for an estimated total of \$545 million through the end of FY 2010–2011.

It is important to distinguish between CCMS-specific costs and additional costs when assessing expenses incurred to date. The V2 and V3 interim systems, like other court interim and legacy systems, will be replaced by CCMS. Therefore, as with the costs for other legacy systems, including licensing, maintenance, and support, the V2 and V3 costs described above are not included as CCMS project costs. V3 development and deployment costs, however, are included as CCMS project costs and reported as such because both V3 functionality and system architecture were used in the design of CCMS. V3 serves as the platform on which CCMS was designed, so these costs are considered and reported as costs properly accounted for as CCMS project costs. Additionally, including ongoing operations and maintenance costs as CCMS project costs would inappropriately overstate the actual project costs. The AOC and the courts are taking steps to expand the information reported to estimate and account for costs incurred by the courts that are not otherwise captured.

The most recent annual report to the Legislature identifying CCMS costs clearly set forth both total project costs, estimated at \$1.3 billion at project completion, as well as other costs, including ongoing operations costs that are properly not included as project costs, and costs of some of the interim systems (V2 and V3) that CCMS will replace. In total, these project and nonproject costs are estimated to total \$1.9 billion.

Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives

This project directly supports the Judicial Council's Strategic Goal VI, Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence, to create a branchwide infrastructure for service excellence, consistent with the strategic plan of California's judicial branch of government. CCMS also supports the following related strategic goals of the judicial branch:

- Goal I, Access, Fairness, and Diversity;
- Goal III, Modernization of Management and Administration; and
- Goal IV, Quality of Justice and Service to the Public.

Attachments

1. Attachment A: CCMS Governance Model (November 2010)
2. Attachment B: CCMS General Administrative Advisory Committee Roster (February 2011)
3. Attachment C: CCMS Operational Advisory Committee Roster (February 2011)
4. Attachment D: CCMS Justice Partner Advisory Committee Roster (January 2011)
5. Attachment E: CCMS Executive Committee Roster (January 2011)
6. Attachment F: OCIO Recommendations Progress Report (January 2011)

CCMS Governance Model



November 2010

Authors

Sheila Calabro

Regional Administrative Director, Southern Regional Office,
Administrative Office of the Courts

Mark Moore

Executive Program Director, California Court Case Management System,
Administrative Office of the Courts



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE COURTS

CCMS Governance Model

Overview

The judicial branch is currently developing the California Court Case Management System (CCMS), a single case management system that will be implemented in all 58 superior courts throughout California. This system will support all case types, replacing a myriad disparate commercial and custom-built applications in use throughout the state that are in various states disrepair.

CCMS consists of the following modules:

- **Core Case Management Application.** This application supports case processing for all case types, including case initiation, workflows, bail schedules, 121 statewide/local justice partner data exchanges, reports, e-filing, forms, and notices.
- **Statewide Data Warehouse.** This single database contains case management data and statistical information for all California superior courts.
- **Justice Partner/Public Portal.** This website is available to justice partners and the public, allowing them to access case information and interact with the superior courts. Data access is controlled using state-of-the-art security and user profiles, ensuring that individuals and entities using the portal access only the information they are entitled to see based on their user profile.

CCMS has been constructed using requirements and functional design specifications provided by trial court subject-matter experts, executives, judges, and commissioners, ensuring that CCMS will meet the needs of the courts. Superior court judges, commissioners, executives, and subject-matter experts reviewed and approved the CCMS functional design.

Deloitte Consulting, the contracted application developer of CCMS, has substantially completed the system's development. Deloitte is now engaged in several stages of application testing. Once the testing is complete, the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and trial court subject-matter experts will execute its testing scenarios, resulting in acceptance of the application once the test exit criteria have been met. The core application is scheduled to be completed (accepted) in April 2011. The remaining external components are scheduled for completion by July 2011.

The Superior Courts of Ventura, San Diego, and San Luis Obispo Counties have been selected as the first courts for deployment of CCMS (early adopters). Deloitte Consulting has been contracted to complete a readiness assessment for each early adopter court. It is anticipated that the three early adopter courts will be using CCMS for all case types by the end of calendar year 2012.

As CCMS transitions from application development to statewide deployment, the Administrative Director of the Courts has determined that it will augment the governance and management

CCMS Governance Model

structures for the CCMS program in order to provide overarching direction and guidance to the program, ensuring its successful implementation across the state.

The new CCMS governance structure will consist of the following:

- **CCMS Executive Sponsor.** The Judicial Council of California has directed the AOC to develop a single case management system to be deployed in all 58 superior courts. As such, the council will assume the role of Executive Sponsor and has designated the California Administrative Director of the Courts as the lead executive over the CCMS project. The Administrative Director shall appoint all members of the CCMS Executive Committee and its three advisory committees.
- **CCMS Executive Committee.** The executive committee is the overarching authority responsible for oversight of the CCMS program, which includes all aspects of the program including, but not limited to, the program budget, application functionality, implementation priorities, court deployment schedules, and e-business initiatives that leverage the capabilities of CCMS.
- **CCMS General Administrative Advisory Committee.** The administrative committee will assist the executive committee in performing its program oversight responsibilities regarding program scope, budget, scheduling, and program portfolio management.
- **CCMS Operational Advisory Committee.** The operational committee will assist the executive committee in evaluating opportunities and formulating recommendations in the areas of best practices in trial court operations, business process reengineering, and other technical aspects of CCMS.
- **CCMS Justice Partner Advisory Committee.** The justice partner committee shall advise and make recommendations to the executive committee to ensure that the implementation of CCMS and its data exchanges proceed smoothly and communicates anticipated benefits and cost savings to justice partners.
- **CCMS Program Management Office (PMO).** This new office is responsible for all aspects of the day-to-day management of the CCMS program, including application development, testing, trial court deployments, budget forecasts, project management reporting, ongoing CCMS maintenance, support, hosting, and e-business portfolio management. The PMO will serve as staff to the executive committee and three advisory committees. The PMO is led by an executive program director who reports to the AOC Chief Deputy Director.

CCMS Governance Model

CCMS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Summary Charter

The CCMS Executive Committee is the overarching authority responsible for oversight of the CCMS program, which includes all aspects of the program, including, but not limited to, the program budget, application functionality, implementation priorities, court deployment schedules, and the e-business initiatives that leverage the capabilities of CCMS. The CCMS Executive Committee will be assisted in discharging its responsibilities by three advisory committees focused on general administration, trial court operations, and justice partner coordination aspects of the CCMS program. These advisory committees will make recommendations to the executive committee on CCMS program areas consistent with their respective charters. The executive committee is solely responsible for acting on any recommendations made by the advisory committees. The executive committee shall be responsible for all interactions and recommendations made to the Administrative Director and the Judicial Council regarding the CCMS program portfolio.

Composition, Term of Service, and Voting

The CCMS Executive Committee will consist of a chair, a vice-chair, and 11 additional appointed members. All appointments to the executive committee shall be made by the Administrative Director. See Exhibit A for a committee organization chart.

All appointed committee members will serve a full term that continues throughout the life of the CCMS program, until CCMS has been deployed in all 58 superior courts or the member vacates his or her current position. The term of service will ensure that there is continuity and consistency in the leadership and strategic direction of the CCMS program.

Each committee member shall have one vote. All actions requiring approval of the committee shall be subject to a vote of the members. Actions and motions shall be deemed passed with a simple majority of the membership present at the time the motion or action is brought to the committee for a vote.

The executive committee shall refer all matters that it cannot resolve to the Administrative Director for resolution, action, or referral to the Judicial Council.

Standing Meeting Schedule

The executive committee shall meet at least once a calendar quarter or more frequently if needed. The following persons may request an off-calendar-cycle meeting:

- Administrative Director of the Courts
- Chair or vice-chair of the CCMS Executive Committee

CCMS Governance Model

- CCMS Executive Program Director, through the chair or vice-chair of the executive committee

Duty Summary

- The executive committee shall publish an annual work plan that establishes and communicates the strategic objectives for the CCMS program in the coming year. The committee's annual plan will incorporate the high-level objectives of the three advisory committees, ensuring that all four annual committee work plans are well coordinated and aligned with the objectives of the Judicial Council, which is the CCMS program's Executive Sponsor. The committee will prioritize activities, including any program enhancements, against the available budget. The annual work plan shall be submitted to the Administrative Director for final approval. The committee shall publish a progress report to the Administrative Director twice a year that details the committee's progress and challenges in carrying out the annual plan.
- The executive committee shall review and approve the annual work plans of the three CCMS advisory committees.
- The executive committee shall review and approve the annual CCMS program budgets. The budgets shall be prepared by the CCMS PMO. The approved budget shall be submitted to the AOC Project Review Board for subsequent action.
- The executive committee shall review the quarterly program management report package submitted by the CCMS General Administrative Advisory Committee. The program management report package will summarize the health of the program from a scope, schedule, budgetary, and resource perspective along with any specific recommendations from the administrative committee that the executive committee should consider. Recommendations could include changes in scope, schedule, resources, budget, or other actions to achieve program efficiencies or mitigate identified program risks. Changes to the program budget that would increase the total cost of the program through completion will require approval of the AOC Project Review Board and the Judicial Council.
- The executive committee shall review and approve the CCMS deployment strategy and schedule, ensuring that CCMS can be implemented within budgetary and scheduling constraints as determined by the Administrative Director. The CCMS PMO shall be responsible for developing deployment strategies for the committee's consideration.
- The executive committee shall review and act on recommendations from the CCMS PMO and the CCMS Operations Advisory Committee that foster the adoption of standard trial court business processes, standard configurations, and reengineering efforts that will fully leverage the capabilities of CCMS.

CCMS Governance Model

- The executive committee shall review and act on recommendations from the CCMS PMO and the CCMS General Administrative Advisory Committee relating to changes to legislation and rules of court that may be required to implement a specific CCMS program or e-business feature.
- The executive committee shall work with the CCMS PMO and the three CCMS advisory committees to evaluate, prioritize, and implement a CCMS program portfolio strategy, creating a master blueprint for the implementation of e-business services that build on the capabilities of the CCMS application. These e-business services include, but are not limited to, e-filing portal, electronic (“smart”) forms, enterprise document management, e-filing service provider certification program, e-citations, and the California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR).

CCMS GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Summary Charter

The CCMS General Administrative Advisory Committee will assist the executive committee in performing its program oversight responsibilities regarding program scope, budget, scheduling, and program portfolio management. At the direction of the executive committee, the administrative committee will review CCMS program management reports, budget information, change management requests, and monthly Independent Validation & Verification (IV&V) reports, providing analysis and recommendations to the executive committee for its consideration and subsequent action.

Composition, Term of Service, and Voting

The CCMS General Administrative Advisory Committee will consist of a chair, a vice-chair, and 14 additional appointed members. All appointments to the administrative committee shall be made by the Administrative Director. See Exhibit B for a committee organization chart.

All appointed committee members will serve a full term that continues throughout the life of the CCMS program, until CCMS has been deployed in all 58 superior courts or the member vacates his or her current position. The term of service will ensure that there is continuity and consistency in the leadership and strategic direction of the CCMS program.

Each committee member shall have one vote. All actions requiring approval of the committee shall be subject to a vote of the members. Actions and motions shall be deemed passed with a simple majority of the membership present at the time the motion or action is brought to the committee for a vote.

CCMS Governance Model

The administrative committee shall refer all matters that it cannot resolve to the executive committee for resolution, action, or referral to the Administrative Director or the Judicial Council.

Standing Meeting Schedule

The administrative committee shall meet at least every other month or more frequently, if needed. The following persons may request an off-calendar-cycle meeting:

- Chair or vice-chair of the CCMS Executive Committee
- Chair or vice-chair of the CCMS General Administrative Advisory Committee
- CCMS Executive Program Director, through the chair or vice-chair of the administrative committee

Duty Summary

- The administrative committee shall publish an annual work plan that establishes and communicates the committee's objectives as directed by the executive committee or issues that the administrative committee believes are consistent with its charter. The annual work plan shall be submitted to the executive committee for approval. The committee shall publish a progress report to the executive committee twice a year that details the committee's progress and challenges in carrying out the annual plan.
- The administrative committee shall work with the CCMS PMO to develop recommendations to the executive committee regarding the CCMS program portfolio, including project strategies, priorities, and schedules.
- The administrative committee shall review the monthly IV&V reports and produce a quarterly report to the executive committee on the effectiveness, performance, challenges, and risks to the CCMS program as detailed in these reports.
- The administrative committee shall review the monthly management reports produced by the CCMS PMO and publish a quarterly report for the executive committee on the overall health of the CCMS program, including the budget, resources, schedule, and scope of the project. The report may contain specific recommendations for the executive committee's consideration and subsequent actions that address risks or opportunities to improve the CCMS program.
- The administrative committee shall review and forward an annual CCMS program budget to the executive committee along with specific recommendations for improving the budget to accommodate program needs or identified financial constraints.

CCMS Governance Model

- The administrative committee shall review any specific recommendations from the CCMS PMO regarding changes to the scope, budget, schedule, or resources required to support the CCMS program portfolio. The administrative committee shall forward the change requests to the executive committee for action along with any comments or recommendations.

CCMS OPERATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Summary Charter

The CCMS Operational Advisory Committee will assist the executive committee in evaluating opportunities and formulating recommendations in the areas of standard (best practice) trial court operations, business process reengineering, CCMS common application configurations, venue transparency, application support and hosting service levels, standard reports, forms and notices, CCMS user acceptance criteria, annual CCMS release plan (enhancement releases), and the development and approval of CCMS functional designs (enhancements after deployment).

Composition, Term of Service, and Voting

The CCMS Operational Advisory Committee will consist of a chair, a vice-chair, and 11 additional appointed members. All appointments to the operational committee shall be made by the Administrative Director. See Exhibit C for a committee organization chart.

All appointed committee members will serve a full term that continues throughout the life of the CCMS program, until CCMS has been deployed in all 58 superior courts or the member vacates his or her current position. The term of service will ensure that there is continuity and consistency in the leadership and strategic direction of the CCMS program.

Each committee member shall have one vote. All actions requiring approval of the committee shall be subject to a vote of the members. Actions and motions shall be deemed passed with a simple majority of the membership present at the time the motion or action is brought to the committee for a vote.

The operational committee shall refer all matters that it cannot resolve to the executive committee for resolution, action, or referral to the Administrative Director or the Judicial Council.

Standing Meeting Schedule

The operational committee shall meet at least every other month or more frequently if needed. The following persons may request an off-calendar-cycle meeting:

- Chair or vice-chair of the CCMS Executive Committee

CCMS Governance Model

- Chair or vice-chair of the CCMS Operational Advisory Committee
- CCMS Executive Program Director, through the chair or vice-chair of the operational committee

Duty Summary

- The operational committee shall publish an annual work plan that establishes and communicates the committee's objectives as directed by the executive committee or issues that the operational committee believes are consistent with its charter. The annual work plan shall be submitted to the executive committee for approval. The committee shall publish a progress report to the executive committee twice a year that details the committee's progress and challenges in carrying out the annual plan.
- The operational committee shall work with the CCMS PMO to develop strategies for developing and implementing a set of standards in the area of trial court operations. These practices may result from business process reengineering efforts initiated to fully leverage the capabilities of CCMS.
- The operational committee shall work with the CCMS PMO to develop and implement a strategy governing a set of common CCMS configurations and encourage adoption of these configurations through the branch.
- The operational committee shall work with the CCMS PMO to identify a set of services that could be provided centrally using a subscription-based shared services model. These services would be offered to all trial courts on an as-needed basis to be determined by local trial court leadership.
- The operational committee shall work with the executive committee and the CCMS PMO to identify strategies for implementing venue transparency. These strategies may require the combined efforts of the CCMS committees and the PMO, but the operational committee shall take the lead in developing the strategies to be presented to the executive committee for approval.
- The operational committee shall work with the CCMS PMO and the AOC Information Services Division to establish service level agreements (SLAs) for CCMS application and data center hosting performance. These SLAs shall be presented to the executive committee for final approval.
- The operational committee shall review the CCMS PMO's process and criteria for user testing and acceptance of CCMS application enhancements. The operational committee shall submit the criteria to the executive committee along with its recommendations for subsequent approval.

CCMS Governance Model

- The operational committee shall collaborate with the CCMS PMO to establish an annual plan for enhancements to the CCMS application within budgetary constraints and adhering to the strategy forth by the executive committee. The annual CCMS development plan shall be submitted by the operational committee to the executive committee for approval.
- The operational committee shall work with the CCMS PMO and the trial court to provide subject-matter experts as may be required to develop requirements for CCMS enhancements included in the annual CCMS development plan. The operational committee shall also review and approve the final functional designs for any enhancements before passing them on to the executive committee for final approval.

CCMS JUSTICE PARTNER ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Summary Charter

The CCMS Justice Partner Advisory Committee shall advise and make recommendations to the executive committee to ensure that the implementation of CCMS and its data exchanges proceed in a manner that maximizes state and local justice partner participation; minimizes disruptions to existing automated processes between the trial courts and their justice partners; provides a mechanism for justice partners to influence the future evolution of CCMS and related e-business initiatives; and, wherever possible, provide specific information regarding the anticipated benefits and cost savings to justice partners as CCMS and related e-business initiatives are deployed.

Composition, Term of Service, and Voting

The CCMS Justice Partner Advisory Committee will consist of a chair, a vice-chair, and 15 additional appointed members. All appointments to the justice partner committee shall be made by the Administrative Director. See Exhibit D for a committee organization chart.

All appointed committee members will serve a full term that continues throughout the life of the CCMS program, until CCMS has been deployed in all 58 superior courts or the member vacates his or her current position. The term of service will ensure that there is continuity and consistency in the leadership and strategic direction of the CCMS program.

Each committee member shall have one vote. All actions requiring approval of the committee shall be subject to a vote of the members. Actions and motions shall be deemed passed with a simple majority of the membership present at the time the motion or action is brought to the committee for a vote.

CCMS Governance Model

The justice partner committee shall refer all matters it cannot resolve to the executive committee for resolution, action, or referral to the Administrative Director or the Judicial Council.

Standing Meeting Schedule

The justice partner committee shall meet at least every six months or more frequently if needed. The following persons may request an off-calendar-cycle meeting:

- Chair or vice-chair of the CCMS Executive Committee
- Chair or vice-chair of the CCMS Justice Partner Advisory Committee
- CCMS Executive Program Director, through the chair or vice-chair of the justice partner committee

Duty Summary

- The justice partner committee shall publish an annual work plan that establishes and communicates the committee's objectives as directed by the executive committee or issues that the justice partner committee believes are consistent with its charter. The annual work plan shall be submitted to the executive committee for approval. The committee shall publish an annual progress report to the executive committee that details the committee's progress and challenges in carrying out the annual plan.
- The justice partner committee shall review the CCMS deployment schedule and high-level data integration plans for each court as they are developed to provide feedback and recommendations to the CCMS PMO to reduce risk, increase adoption of the available data exchanges, and improve the overall efficiency of data sharing between the trial courts and their justice partners.
- The justice partner committee shall review strategic plans for the future development and implementation of CCMS enhancements (the annual development plan summary) and e-business initiatives that will encourage the exchange of data between the judicial branch, its justice partners, and the public. The justice partner committee shall submit its feedback and recommendations to the executive committee for consideration and subsequent action.
- To the extent possible, the justice partner committee shall facilitate the quantification of administrative and financial benefits accruing as a result of CCMS deployment or application enhancement. This data shall be used by the CCMS PMO to perform cost-benefit analysis and project prioritization.

CCMS Governance Model

CCMS PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OFFICE

Summary Description

The new CCMS Program Management Office (PMO) is responsible for all aspects of the day-to-day management of the CCMS program, including application development, testing, trial court deployments, budget forecasts, project management reporting, ongoing CCMS maintenance, support, hosting, and e-business portfolio management. The PMO will serve as staff to the executive committee and three advisory committees.

The PMO shall be led by an Executive Program Director reporting to the AOC Chief Deputy Director.

Organizational Structure

The PMO shall consist of the following four departments:

CCMS Product Development and Management. This department includes the following three units:

- ***CCMS Product Development.*** Includes CCMS business requirements development, user group support, e-services branding strategy, legislation and rules of court, and product strategy.
- ***CCMS Trial Court Services.*** Includes CCMS central helpdesk, business process reengineering, training support, configuration management and maintenance, liaison to statewide justice partners and associations, trial court relationship management, and service level agreement management.
- ***CCMS Product Assurance.*** Includes CCMS product acceptance testing and user acceptance testing services.

CCMS Project Management and Reporting. Includes participation in the AOC Community of Practice (COP), a program for establishing and maintaining project management best practices; project management responsibilities; CCMS project portfolio management; project reporting; liaison to the State Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) for CCMS; liaison to the AOC Project Review Board for CCMS; liaison to IV&V staff; responsibility for ongoing IV&V process; staffing the CCMS governance committees; financial management and reporting for the CCMS program portfolio; oversight for deployment; and CCMS program communications.

CCMS Deployment. This includes AOC managed trial court deployment; deployment vendor (Deloitte) oversight; development and maintenance of consolidated deployment plans using PMO tools; monitoring, reporting and mitigating project risks; serving as the primary point of

CCMS Governance Model

contact for trial court management and staff; and coordination of AOC Information Services Division (ISD) services to support deployment.

Case Management Systems Development and Maintenance. This includes the following four units:

- *Data Integration Services.* Includes vendor (Tibco) common services, National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) standards and CCMS exchanges, justice partner support, and vendor (Deloitte) oversight for external component development.
- *Application Services.* Includes vendor (Deloitte) oversight for core CCMS development, vendor oversight for interim civil case management system support, transition services from Deloitte to the AOC ISD for V3 and CCMS, application architecture standards and development, database administration services, CCMS development planning, systems analysis and technical design, application development, quality assurance, and release management.
- *Infrastructure Services.* Includes infrastructure readiness, trial court bandwidth, LAN/WAN and California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) connectivity, network monitoring, security standards, network security monitoring and response, and firewall administration.
- *California Courts Technology Center.* Includes traffic and criminal interim system (V2) environments, civil interim system (V3) environments, CCMS production and staging environments, and development environments.

CCMS General Administrative Advisory Committee

Attachment B

Date: 2/2/2011

Hon. James E. Herman (Chair)

Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Santa Barbara
4285 California Blvd, Suite B
Santa Maria, CA 93455
jherman@sbcourts.org
805-614-6579

Mr. Alan Carlson

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of Orange
P. O. Box 1994
Santa Ana, CA 92702-1994
acarlson@occourts.org
657-622-7017

Hon. Kim Garlin Dunning

Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Orange
P. O. Box 1994
Santa Ana, CA 92702-1994
kdunning@occourts.org
657-622-7011

Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of Shasta
1500 Court Street
Redding, CA 96001-1685
mfowler-bradley@shastacourts.com
530-245-6761

Ms. Diana Herbert

Clerk/Administrator
Court of Appeal, First Appellate District
350 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102-3600
diana.herbert@jud.ca.gov
415-865-7264

Mr. Alex Calvo (Vice-Chair)

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of Santa Cruz
701 Ocean Street, Room 110
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
alex.calvo@santacruzcourt.org
831-420-2401

Ms. Sherri R. Carter

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of Riverside
4050 Main Street
Riverside, CA 92501
sherri.carter@riverside.courts.ca.gov
951-955-5534

Mr. Richard D. Feldstein

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of Napa
825 Brown Street
Napa, CA 94559
rick.feldstein@napa.courts.ca.gov
707-299-1111

Hon. Adrienne M. Grover

Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Monterey
240 Church Street
Salinas, CA 93901
grovera@monterey.courts.ca.gov
831-775-5422

Ms. Rosa Junqueiro

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin
222 East Weber Avenue, Room 303
Stockton, CA 95202
junqueiro@courts.san-joaquin.ca.us
209-468-2539

CCMS General Administrative Advisory Committee

Date: 2/2/2011

Ms. Tressa S. Kentner

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino
351 North Arrowhead Avenue
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0240
tkentner@sb-court.org
909-382-7687

Mr. Brian Taylor

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of Solano
600 Union Avenue
Fairfield, CA 94533-5000
bktaylor@solano.courts.ca.gov
707-207-7467

Ms. Tania Ugrin-Capobianco

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado
2850 Fairlane Court, Bldg. C
Placerville, CA 95667
tania@eldoradocourt.org
530-621-5155

Mr. James B. Perry

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of Yolo
725 Court Street
Woodland, CA 95695
jperry@yolo.courts.ca.gov
530-406-6838

Ms. Kim Turner

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of Marin
P.O. Box 4988
San Rafael, CA 94913-4988
kim_turner@marincourt.org
415-444-7398

CCMS Operational Advisory Committee

Attachment C

Date: 2/4/2011

Hon. Glen M. Reiser (Chair)

Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Ventura
4353 East Vineyard Avenue, Courtroom J6
Oxnard, CA 93036
Glen.Reiser@ventura.courts.ca.gov
805-981-5982

Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton

Judge
Superior Court of California, County of San Diego
P.O. Box 122724
San Diego, CA 92112-2724
Jeffrey.Barton@sdcourt.ca.gov
619-450-7069

Hon. Curtis E.A. Karnow

Judge
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco
400 McAllister Street Dept. 608
San Francisco, CA 94102-4514
ckarnow@sftc.org
415-551-3944

Hon. Richard J. Loftus, Jr.

Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara
191 North First Street Dept. 19
San Jose, CA 95113
rloftus@scscourt.org
408-882-2310

Hon. Cindee F. Mayfield

Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Mendocino
100 North State Street
Ukiah, CA 95482
ciryjema@mendocino.courts.ca.gov
707-467-2509

Mr. Michael M. Roddy (Vice-Chair)

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of San Diego
P.O. Box 122724
San Diego, CA 92112-2724
mike.rodny@sdcourt.ca.gov
619-450-5478

Ms. Tamara Lynn Beard

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of Fresno
1100 Van Ness Avenue
Fresno, CA 93724-0002
tbeard@fresno.courts.ca.gov
559-457-2025

Mr. Joseph A. Lane

Clerk/Administrator
Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District
300 South Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90013
joseph.lane@jud.ca.gov
213-830-7112

Ms. Susan E. Matherly

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of San Luis Obispo
1035 Palm Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
Susan.Matherly@slo.courts.ca.gov
805-781-5421

Hon. Brian L. McCabe

Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Merced
627 West 21st Street
Merced, CA 95340
brian.mccabe@mercedcourt.org
209-725-4172

CCMS Operational Advisory Committee

Date: 2/4/2011

Hon. William J. Murray, Jr.

Associate Justice
Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District
621 Capitol Mall, 10th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814-4869
william.murray@jud.ca.gov
916-654-0115

Ms. Mary Beth Todd

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of Calaveras
891 Mountain Ranch Road
San Andreas, CA 95249
mtodd@calaveras.courts.ca.gov
209-754-6142

Hon. James D. Otto

Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
415 West Ocean Boulevard, Room 209 Dept. 6
Long Beach, CA 90802
jdotto@lasuperiorcourt.org
562-491-6253

Ms. Kiri S. Torre

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of Contra Costa
649 Main Street
Martinez, CA 94553
Ktorr@contracosta.courts.ca.gov
925-957-5607

CCMS Justice Partner Advisory Committee

Attachment D

Date: 1/26/2011

Hon. Douglas P. Miller (Chair)

Associate Justice
Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Two
3389 Twelfth Street
Riverside, CA 92501
DouglasP.Miller@jud.ca.gov
951-248-0325

Hon. Stephen H. Baker

Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Shasta
1500 Court Street Room 205
Redding, CA 96001-1685
sbaker@shastacourts.com
530-245-6761

Mr. Reginald Chappelle

Chief, Information Management Division
California Highway Patrol
601 North 7th Street
Sacramento, CA 95811
rchappelle@chp.ca.gov
916-843-4000

Mr. José Octavio Guillén

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of Sonoma
600 Administration Drive
Santa Rosa, CA 95403
jguillen@sonomacourt.org
707-521-6855

Mr. Lee Seale

Deputy Chief of Staff
California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
1515 S Street
Sacramento, CA 95811
Lee.Seale@cdcr.ca.gov
916-327-7010

Hon. Sherrill A. Ellsworth (Vice-Chair)

Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Riverside
4100 Main Street
Riverside, CA 92501
sherrill.ellsworth@riverside.courts.ca.gov
951-955-4074

Mr. Harry W. R. Chamberlain II

Attorney at Law
Buchalter Nemer
1000 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1500
Los Angeles, CA 90017-2457
hchamberlain@buchalter.com
213-891-5225

Mr. Adrian Farley

Chief Technology Officer & Acting Director of Technology Services
California Technology Agency
1325 J Street, Suite 1600
Sacramento, CA 95814
Adrian.Farley@state.ca.gov
916-403-9618

Ms. Christine D. Odom

Chief Probation Officer
County of Sutter, Probation Department
595 Boyd Street
Yuba City, CA 95991
codom@co.sutter.ca.us
530-822-7320

Ms. Laurie Smith

Sheriff
Santa Clara County Office of the Sheriff
55 West Younger Avenue
San Jose, CA 95110-1721
laurie.smith@sho.co.scl.ca.us
408-808-4900

CCMS Justice Partner Advisory Committee

Date: 1/26/2011

Ms. Becky Stilling

Chief Information Officer/Deputy Director
Department of Child Support Services, Technology
Services Division
11120 International Drive
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
rebecca.stilling@dcss.ca.gov
916-464-5472

Mr. Gregory D. Totten

District Attorney
County of Ventura
800 S. Victoria Avenue
Ventura, CA 93009
greg.totten@ventura.org
805-654-2500

Mr. Steve Noel Williams

Attorney
Consumer Attorney
SF Airport Office Center, 840 Malcolm Rd #200
Burlingame, CA 94010
swilliams@cpmlegal.com
650-697-6000

Vacant Position - Appointment Pending

Attorney
Family Law Attorney

Mr. Bill Stobie

Chief Information Officer, DCJIS Director
Department of Justice
4949 Broadway
Sacramento, CA 95820
william.stobie@doj.ca.gov
916-227-3043

Mr. John A. Wagner

Director
California Department of Social Services
744 P Street, MS8-17-11
Sacramento, CA 95814
john.wagner@dss.ca.gov
916-657-2598

Mr. Gary Windom

Public Defender
County of Riverside
4200 Orange Street
Riverside, CA 92501
gwindom@co.riverside.ca.us
951-955-6011

CCMS Executive Committee

Attachment E

Date: 1/25/2011

Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers (Chair)

Associate Justice
Court of Appeal First Appellate District, Division Five
350 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102-3600
terence.bruiniers@jud.ca.gov
415-865-7398

Hon. Ronald E. Albers

Judge
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco
850 Bryant Street, Room 101, Dept. 13
San Francisco, CA 94103
ralbers@sftc.org
415-551-2808

Ms. Kimberly Flener

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of Butte
One Court Street
Oroville, CA 95965
kflener@buttecourt.ca.gov
530-532-7013

Hon. William A. MacLaughlin

Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
111 North Hill Street, Dept. 89
Los Angeles, CA 90012
wmaclaughlin@lasuperiorcourt.org
213-974-6207

Hon. Gary R. Orozco

Assistant Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Fresno
1100 Van Ness Avenue
Fresno, CA 93724-0002
gorozco@fresno.courts.ca.gov
559-457-6348

Ms. Sheila Calabro (Vice-Chair)

Regional Administrative Director
AOC - Southern Regional Office
2255 N. Ontario Street, Suite 200
Burbank, CA 91504
sheila.calabro@jud.ca.gov
818-558-3020

Mr. Mark W. Dusman

Director
AOC - Information Services Division
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
mark.dusman@jud.ca.gov
415-865-4999

Hon. Ira R. Kaufman

Assistant Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Plumas
520 Main Street, Room 104
Quincy, CA 95971
ira.kaufman@plumas.courts.ca.gov
530-283-6233

Hon. Robert James Moss

Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Orange
P. O. Box 1994
Santa Ana, CA 92702-1994
rmoss@occourts.org
657-622-5223

Mr. Michael D. Planet

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of Ventura
P.O. Box 6489
Ventura, CA 93006-6489
michael.planet@ventura.courts.ca.gov
805-654-3160

CCMS Executive Committee

Date: 1/25/2011

Hon. Kenneth K. So

Judge

Superior Court of California, County of San Diego

P.O. Box 122724

San Diego, CA 92112-2724

kenneth.so@sdcourt.ca.gov

619-450-5055

Hon. Allen H. Sumner

Judge

Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento

720 Ninth Street, Dept. 42

Sacramento, CA 95814

sumnera@saccourt.ca.gov

916-874-5672

Mr. David H. Yamasaki

Court Executive Officer

Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street

San Jose, CA 95113

dyamasaki@scscourt.org

408-882-2714



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

Attachment F

CALIFORNIA COURT CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OFFICE

OCIO Recommendations – Progress Report

ID	Recommendation Summary	Complete	In-Progress
1	Consistent with SBX4 13 (Statutes of 2009), the AOC should submit IT project concepts with an estimated cost of \$5 million or more. The OCIO will review and analyze these concepts allowing the Judicial Branch to leverage IT efforts underway in Executive Branch agencies as well as benefit from a broader pool of experience and expertise.	✓	
2	The AOC and the CCMS project team should fully define, baseline, and document the extent to which the system will be deployed, and the timeline and resource requirements for the entire deployment phase.		✓
3	The AOC should enhance the project and contract management resources dedicated to the CCMS project to ensure the state's interests are being met by the vendor responsible for developing and implementing the system.		✓
4	The AOC should adopt a common methodology and tool set for project management across the Judicial Branch and use these to provide transparency into the project including costs.		✓
5	The governance plan for CCMS should be augmented to ensure the commitment of the county superior courts to adopt and use the system. To ensure efficient resource allocation, the governance plan should assess the business value of partial deployment of the system if total deployment is not feasible.		✓
6	The AOC and the CCMS project team should develop a well documented Concept of Operations and implement a Change Control Management solution that addresses quality and testing issues that is commensurate to the complexity of the CCMS product application stack.	✓	
7	The AOC should deploy CCMS V4 from a central data center.	✓	
8	The AOC should expand the scope of the Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) and Oversight vendor's responsibility to include review of planning and management of post CCMS V4 development activities. All oversight reports should be publicly available.		✓
9	Exit criteria for Integration Testing and entrance criteria for Product Acceptance Testing should be developed, approved, and strictly adhered to.	✓	
10	Future releases of CCMS should include performance and stress testing during User Acceptance Testing (UAT) in the production environments prior to acceptance of the system.	✓	

OCIO Recommendations – Progress Report

ID	Recommendation Summary	Complete	In-Progress
11	Courts using the CCTC should be given database access and the ability to build query reports just as counties that self-host have database access.		✓
12	Sacramento should be given priority status for the rollout of the CCMS-V4. Sacramento's critical functional issues should be given appropriate consideration for resolution in CCMS-V3.	✓	
13a	The AOC should determine which courts have DMS and factor the finding into the overall deployment plan.	✓	
13b	Factor DMS survey results into deployment plan.		✓
14	The AOC should develop a mitigation plan to address the staffing risk and determine how to staff the project for success, possibly by using court staff from beyond the six initial participants in CCMS.	✓	
15	The AOC should not accept or deploy the V4 system beyond the first county superior court in the pilot phase of the system deployment until it is fully operational and utilizing live data.	✓	
16	The CCMS project team should ensure that all system testing activities and procedures are adhered to and completed in the live environment prior to the start of the vendor warranty period.		✓
17	Success of the pilot installation should include testing of the original goals of the court processes, and justice partner and public access to data within the system.		✓
18	Final testing criteria should include data and image response time Service Level Agreements (SLAs) and the SLA should be understood by and agreed to by the courts. Metrics against these SLAs should be available to the courts and published on a regular basis.		✓
19	All testing should be complete and the system fully accepted before the vendor warranty period begins.	✓	
20	Prior to the pilot implementation, the AOC should develop a plan for transition of the system during the maintenance and operations period.	✓	