



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm
jctc@jud.ca.gov

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

February 26, 2019
11:30 AM - 1:30 PM

Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair; Hon. Kyle S. Brodie; Hon. Ming W. Chin; Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin; Hon. Rebecca Wightman; Ms. Nancy Eberhardt; Ms. Rachel W. Hill; and Ms. Andrea K. Rohmann

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Gary Nadler, Vice-Chair

Others Present: Mr. Rob Oyung; Ms. Heather Pettit; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Mr. Michael Derr; Mr. David Koon; Ms. Daphne Light; Ms. Jamel Jones; Ms. Jessica Goldstein; Ms. Rica Abesa; Ms. Kathy Fink; Mr. John Yee; Mr. Richard Blalock; Ms. Camilla Kieliger; Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic; Ms. Laura Speed; and Ms. Marcela Eggleton

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order, took roll call, and advised no public comments were received.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Chair Report

Update: Hon. Marsha Slough, Chair of the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC), welcomed and thanked everyone for attending. Justice Slough reviewed the agenda for the meeting, as well as provided updates on recent meetings in which she and other members represented the JCTC or reported on the JCTC activities.

Item 2

Technology Budget Change Proposals

Update: Ms. Heather L. Pettit, Chief Information Officer for the Judicial Council of California, provided a report and overview on the potential six technology related Initial Funding Requests (IFRs) for Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) for funding beginning FY 20/21.

Actions: The committee asked questions and discussed the technology related IFRs and potential BCPs including potential criteria to use in ranking the proposals. The committee then took the following actions, voting unanimously on each:

1. Established the following evaluation criteria and then evaluated the six concepts based on these criteria:
 - Was it a prior request or deferred?
 - Was it tied to an active, next phase, or completed workstream from the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)?
 - Was the item previously funded (i.e., to carry forward)?
 - What is the breadth of impact (e.g., branch, justice partners, public)?
 - Did it involve security?
 - What is the viability for the future?
2. Removed one proposal (Digital Evidence in the Court – Pilot) as the committee believed it would benefit from further refinement;
3. Determined the remaining five proposals would be of great benefit to the branch and ranking them in the following order:
 1. Electronic (Intelligent) Judicial Council Forms Solution
 2. Productizing California Court Innovation Grants
 3. Disaster Recovery Consulting Services Solutions – Pilot
 4. Digitizing Documents Phases 2 – 3
 5. Next Generation Data Hosting Consulting Services;
4. Directed Judicial Council Information Technology staff to forward the completed IFRs to the Judicial Council Budget Services staff; and
5. Provided the criteria and ranking of the technology related BCP IFRs to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (JBBC) so that this committee may consider the JCTC's ranking. (The JBBC would be ranking all judicial branch BCPs at a future meeting.)

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.