

The Supreme Court of Ohio

DRAFT CMS Standards – Position Paper

For

Commission on Technology & the Courts

CMS Standards Work Group

Contents

Section 1. CMS Standards Work Group.....	2
CMS Standards Background.....	2
The Need for Standards.....	2
Timeline Requirements	2
Initial CMS Standards Project Scope	3
Initial Project Deliverables	3
Out of Scope or Excluded	3
Project Reporting Requirements	4
Section 2. Preliminary Recommendations	4
1. Target Areas Recommended Standards Development.....	4
2. Recommendation for Master Codes & Local Code Modifiers..	4
3. Standards Development & Approval Process	4
Section 3. Next Steps	5
Section 3. Appendix	6

Introduction

This document will address the work and focus of the CMS Standards Work Group of the Supreme Court of Ohio Commission on Technology and the Courts. The work group is comprised of a diverse cross section of representatives from local courts. A full roster can be found in the appendix.

By standards, we do not mean mandated rules – instead, we mean targets of commonality that courts and vendors can move toward over time. The standards are intended to provide commonality that will allow for meaningful data exchange, while permitting customization to meet local needs. The standards are expected to assist all courts in current and future case management system deployments.

Section 1. CMS Standards Work Group

CMS Standards Background

The Supreme Court of Ohio (SCO) engaged Gartner Consulting in late 2014 to assist the SCO in exploring the viability of, or alternatives to, the adoption of a statewide court case management system (CMS) by local courts in Ohio. The SCO sent a web survey to Ohio courts and clerks requesting input, in order to assess the interest level in different statewide case management system solutions and service alternatives. Gartner presented the survey findings and its recommendations to the Commission on Technology and the Courts (CTC) in October 2015. Gartner reported that, based on their analysis, the “Standards-Based CMS” approach best addresses the needs expressed in the survey responses, and recommended that the SCO adopt a standards-based approach in which a court-specific implementation of any vendor's case management system would incorporate SCO-developed standards that facilitate data exchange and reporting, and standardized process flows where appropriate. The CTC and SCO staff agreed that the appropriate next step was to create a CMS standards work group (work group) to further explore the standards-based approach by establishing and prioritizing a list of target areas for standards development and developing a process for standards creation and adoption.

The Need for Standards

As courts implement and rely upon electronic data systems, the need for establishing a set of standard codes and workflow processes is important to facilitating electronic reporting and exchange of court information. One of the most glaring examples of this is the lack of standardization for how the Ohio Revised Code (ORC) is managed across court CMSs. Although there is one common ORC for the state, there are many ways that courts are currently formatting their ORC codes (e.g. dots, dashes, brackets, capital letters, lowercase letters, etc.) The ORC codes and descriptions across court CMSs in the state vary significantly. As a result, developing electronic data exchange systems and aggregating data for reporting is extremely complex and costly. Establishing a set of standard codes and descriptions that every court CMS uses would facilitate the development of electronic data exchange and reporting systems that can work with any CMS while being far less costly and complex.

Standards will also facilitate more robust aggregation and analysis of data and measures that will support other value-added opportunities such as best practice development and justification for program funding.

Timeline Requirements

There is no specific timeline established for completion of the work group's tasks. However, the work group plans to continue convening at least monthly so that the initial list of target areas for standards can continue taking shape.

Initial CMS Standards Project Scope

The primary objectives of the work group are:

- discuss the potential target areas where state-wide CMS standards would be appropriate and valuable.
- establish a list of prioritized target areas for standards development.
- determine how to engage the CMS vendor community for input and inclusion in standards development/implementation.
- recommend a process for creating the standards.

The long term goal is to have all case management systems in the state adopt standards over time that would facilitate more efficient data exchange, process flow, training, and system updates.

Initial Work Group Focus

The work group has determined that the initial areas of focus will include:

- a. Define the standards categories to be considered (e.g. data standards, code standards, process flow standards, reports, etc.).
- b. Define the target areas within each category to be considered standards (e.g. Ohio Revised Codes and descriptions, charges data structures, sentencing data structures, disposition data structures, etc.) Prioritize the standards categories and/or target areas to establish the order in which the standards should be developed.
- c. Define the role of CMS vendor community in the process.
 - i. Should the vendors be included in the work group, or as a separate advisory team to the work group?
 - ii. How can the courts build on the relationships that have been established with vendors through the OCN implementation process to assist with the implementation of standards over time?
 - iii. What current de facto standards may already be included in the vendor CMS products?
 - iv. From the vendors' perspective, what standards will have the most positive impact on future data exchange capabilities, maintenance and upgrades, etc.
 - v. Are there other standards categories or target areas that the vendors would consider important?

Future Opportunities

Define the minimum feature sets that should be included in CMS products. Determine what, if any, financial and fund management standards should be included.

Out of Scope or Excluded

The CTC and SCO realize that an effort to develop statewide CMS standards is a long-term process and commitment, and ultimately may involve decisions around governance and rule making. The work group is not expected to address long-term governance and/or impact on court rules. Rather, the focus is on developing the target areas of standards which will likely result in the need for additional expertise and resources to develop and implement.

Project Reporting Requirements

The work group will regularly provide status reports and recommendations to the Commission on Technology and the Courts.

Section 2. Preliminary Recommendations

The work group began meeting in April 2016 with a primary focus on developing the initial list of target categories for standards and establishing an order of priority for developing the standards. The work group also invited CMS vendors to a meeting to discuss the concept of standards development and how the vendor community can participate as partners in the standards development and implementation process. The following is a summary of the work group's preliminary results and recommendations to the CTC:

1. Target Areas Recommended Standards Development

The work group created a list of target area categories that should be the focus for standards creation. The work group also recommended that "charge related code structures" be the initial priority for standards development based on the number of data exchange and reporting processes associated with this category. The complete list of target area categories is included in the Appendix.

2. Recommendation for Master Codes and Local Code Modifiers

The work group discussed the fact that implementing standards will require changes within each local court and vendor system, some of which may be significant. In order for future standards to be adopted, an implementation plan and path will need to include strategies for transition. One such strategy recommended by the work group is the concept of developing master codes that include local code modifiers. The standard master codes for any standards target category would be the same for all courts, while local modifier codes can be unique for each local court.

The use of local code modifiers will allow a court to implement standard code structures over time while preserving the historical code systems already in use, and will provide a method for courts to establish more granular code structures for local workflow and reporting needs.

3. Standards Development & Approval Process

Both the work group and the CTC recognize that the development, implementation, and maintenance of standards will require a robust process of communication and governance, developed over time. In order to move the standards development process forward, the CTC recommended that the initial governance process follow a model similar to that of the Rules Commission. The basics of the recommended process are:

- a. Proposed standards will be submitted to the CTC for review and discussion.
- b. CTC will communicate proposed standards to local courts; CMS vendors; and associations, and post for comment.
- c. After consideration of comments, the CTC will submit final versions of the standards to the Supreme Court for review and publication.
- d. Recommendations for new standards or changes to existing standards may be submitted to the CTC for consideration.

Section 3. Next Steps

As stated above, the work group will continue to develop a list of standards for code structures to further define the standards development process, with an initial focus on charge related codes. The immediate goals include understanding how to ensure local court involvement, determining the best way to partner with the CMS vendor community, and providing effective communication to all courts and stakeholders.

At the next phase, the work group will request input from stakeholders on the selection of future standards to be developed.

Section 3. Appendix A - Target Standards Areas

1. Case Related Code Structures

- 1.1. Case numbering scheme
- 1.2. Case types & sub-types
- 1.3. Case statuses
- 1.4. Case disposition
 - 1.4.1. Case disposition codes
 - 1.4.2. Case disposition descriptions
- 1.5. Dates and date formats
- 1.6. Counts of Charges
- 1.7. Specialized Dockets Handling
- 1.8. Court identification

2. Person Related Code Structures

- 2.1. Person name convention
- 2.2. Entity name convention
- 2.3. Party type
- 2.4. Person Identifiers (SSN, BCI, FBI, etc.)
- 2.5. Person race
- 2.6. Person ethnicity
- 2.7. Person sex
- 2.8. Person eye color
- 2.9. Person hair color
- 2.10. Person feature type
- 2.11. Person role
- 2.12. Person alias' [FUNCTIONAL]

3. Charge Related Code Structures

- 3.1. Ohio Revised Codes
 - 3.1.1. Charge statute code structure
 - 3.1.2. Charge statute description
 - 3.1.3. Special reporting identifiers (e.g. BMV transaction reporting, Pharmacy board reporting, etc.)
 - 3.1.4. ORC Charge Modifiers
- 3.2. Local Codes
- 3.3. Charge degree
- 3.4. Charge plea
- 3.5. Charge Disposition
 - 3.5.1. Disposition codes
 - 3.5.2. Disposition descriptions

4. Sentencing Related Code Structures

- 4.1. Sentencing type/category
- 4.2. Sentence parameters
- 4.3. Common measure for sentencing (days, years, fractional years, etc.)
- 4.4. Fines/Fees parameters
- 4.5. Probation Data

5. Other Miscellaneous Code Structures

- 5.1. Protection Order type
- 5.2. Protection Order status

- 5.3. Probation type
- 5.4. Probation status
- 5.5. Warrant Class
- 5.6. Warrant Status

6. Financial

- 6.1. Disbursement Codes
- 6.2. Disbursement Priorities

7. Minimum Functional Requirements of CMS

- 7.1. Output/Reporting
 - 7.1.1. Registries to which clerks report: sex offender, arson, habitual drunk driving, indigent counsel
- 7.2. Audit Trails
- 7.3. Connectivity to other systems (probation, e-filing, etc.)
- 7.5. Workflow

8. Security

- 8.1. Security levels and granularity
- 8.1. Data Integrity
- 8.2. Internal Controls
- 8.3. Auditing

Section 4 Appendix B – Work Group Roster

Ms. Sherry Bova, Applications Analyst, Franklin County Clerk of Courts
Mr. Greg Brush, Montgomery County Clerk of Courts – Co-Chair
Ms. Robin Cutright, Project Manager, Cleveland Municipal Court
Mr. Garrett Gaston, Director, Information Technology, Cleveland Municipal Court
Ms. Suzie Horlocker, Assistant Director of Business Operations, Franklin County Clerk of Courts
Ms. April Hughes, Assistant Director of Information Technology, Franklin County Clerk of Courts
Mr. Nick Lockhart, IT Director, Delaware Municipal Court
Mr. Tim Lubbe, Court Administrator, Lorain County Common Pleas Court
Ms. Teresa Nickle, Union County Clerk of Courts
Ms. Nicole Rodriguez, Chief Deputy Clerk, Miami County Juvenile Court
Mr. David Soros, Network Administrator, Garfield Heights Municipal Court
Mr. Ken Teleis, Court Administrator, Summit County Domestic Relations Court – Co-Chair
Ms. Lori Tyack, Clerk, Franklin County Municipal Court
Magistrate C. Michael Walsh, Court Administrator, Ninth District Court of Appeals
Ms. Tammy Wurthmann, Court Administrator, Richland County Common Pleas Court
Ms. Renae Zabloudil, Madison County Clerk of Courts