June 13, 2016

Chief Justice Paula M. Carey
Court Administrator Harry Spence
Executive Office of the Trial Court
One Pemberton Sq, 1M
Boston, MA 02108,

Dear Chief Justice Carey and Court Administrator Spence,

The Massachusetts Court Technology Visiting Committee is pleased to forward the findings and recommendations we developed through our recently-concluded review. We hope that our observations will help to inform Trial Court leaders, as you proceed with your strategic planning efforts. Our discussions with internal and external constituents confirmed our expectations that effective implementation of technology is essential in expanding the Trial Court's ability to serve court users.

We applaud your commitment to seeking an external perspective and we were honored to serve in this role. We greatly appreciate the support we received from Chief Information Officer Craig Burlingame who leads the Judicial Information Services Department with distinction. We were impressed with the dedication and commitment expressed by everyone with whom we met. The review has been a valuable and rewarding experience for each of us and we thank you for this opportunity to serve the judiciary.

Anne Margulies	John Letchford	Donald Oppenheimer	John Grossman
CIO	CIO	CIO	CMAB Liason
Harvard University	MIT Sloan School	Harvard Kennedy School	

cc: Supreme Judicial Court
     Court Management Advisory Board

<div align="center">

Report of the
Massachusetts Court Technology Visiting Committee
Spring 2016

</div>

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Massachusetts Court Technology Visiting Committee convened in early 2016 to meet with stakeholders in an effort to assist the Judicial Information Services Department (JISD) and court leaders through a review of JISD and the use of information technology (IT) in the court system to make recommendations for improvements. A charter (Attachment 1) was developed to guide the Committee's review, which was requested by Trial Court Chief Justice Paula M. Carey, Court Administrator Harry Spence and the Court Management Advisory Board. The Committee members and review activities are identified in Attachment 2.

The Committee applauds the Judiciary for conducting an open and thoughtful review of information technology during a time when IT is increasingly important to the court system's ability to deliver on its mission. The timing of this review should enable the Trial Court to incorporate Committee recommendations into Strategic Plan 2.0, a blueprint for the next three years that is now being developed.

We deeply appreciate the helpful background materials on the court system and court technology that were prepared for our visit. Over the course of our work, we met with more than 70 individuals who provided us with valuable insights and candid views, while demonstrating a deep commitment to the courts of the Commonwealth.

The Committee focused primarily on opportunities for improvement, however, we would be remiss not to note the accomplishments made over the last decade to deliver a single, common case management system, which has not been possible in a number of states. As a result of this accomplishment, it is more important than ever that the court system builds on this foundation to provide truly integrated systems and data to enable the efficient and timely delivery of justice.

We believe that an effective IT organization is essential to advancing the mission of the Massachusetts Court System. The Committee offers key findings and three-to-five-year recommendations, as we underscore the importance of moving forward with a sense of urgency.

Key Findings

We believe that the key components of an effective organization are a clear and well understood IT strategy, timely and effective execution of the strategy, a responsive and flexible structure and a high performance IT culture[1]. Our meetings with internal and external stakeholders served to identify a number of recurring, high-level findings, which we have organized by these key components:

IT Strategy	- The implied direction of the courts toward real time, paperless, user centric and seamless administration of justice can be significantly accelerated by strategic implementation of information technology. - User needs and expectations for IT exceed the human and financial resources available to deliver. Currently, the technology components set forth in the Trial Court's Strategic Plan (1.0 issued in June 2013 and 2.0 under development) are aligned with the Court's direction, but unrealistic given the current level of funding. - Lack of common business practices and standards creates a challenging IT environment that significantly limits the ability of IT to advance the Court's overall strategy.
Execution	- IT projects are often late and under deliver because too many projects are managed with too few resources. - A common case management system is an essential foundation for efficiencies, however, MassCourts' fragmented implementation limits the benefits delivered. - The Probation Department requires enhanced IT support and communication to enable effective case management.
Structure	- The decentralized or "federated" nature of the Court's organization, as well as 100+ physical locations, make it difficult to implement common IT solutions. - There is no overall technology governance structure to set priorities across the court system. Balancing the needs of large and small departments inherently creates conflicts for resource allocation. - JISD staff have highly specialized technology knowledge but the department lacks key functions such as project management, information security and change management. - A lack of JISD resources forces other departments to implement IT projects on their own.

---

[1] Framework adopted from *What Really Works,* Nohria, Joyce and Roberson, HBR, 2003.

Culture	- Court staff have highly variable IT skills across all levels, which creates a major challenge for technology implementation and training. - Court staff lack understanding of overall court system processes beyond their functional and geographic silos, or of the data requirements of external partners. - Court staff lack awareness of IT planning and changes that are underway, and receive insufficient training on using technology.

Recommendations

The Visiting Committee identified nine major recommendations that will enable court leaders and JISD to focus on discrete areas of improvement and together significantly improve the administration of justice across the courts.

IT Strategy	1. Develop a three-year rolling IT strategic plan 2. Pursue IT capital funds and continue to increase the IT operating budget
Execution	3. Implement and enhance key technologies 4. Establish meaningful performance metrics
Structure	5. Develop an organization and staff development plan in JISD with a focus on increasing staff resources and capabilities in a few key technical and functional areas 6. Establish and rely on a clear IT governance structure 7. Extend and leverage limited IT resources within the court system with partnerships with external parties and vendors
Culture	8. Embrace a user-oriented approach in JISD and throughout the court system 9. Improve communications and training

Rapid technology changes (consumer, cloud, social and mobile technologies) over the next three-to-five years will require significant changes in the way the court system uses and delivers technologies for court staff and court users. These recommendations will help the courts catch up and will position the courts for even bigger changes that will be needed in the future to support a real time, paperless, user centric and seamless court system.

The Committee strongly believes that the right investments in IT are essential to ensuring the court system's ability to operate as effectively as possible given anticipated, ongoing state budget constraints.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

IT Strategy

We recognize that formal consideration and articulation of strategy has appeared to be something of a luxury for JISD in light of the seemingly continuous imperative to complete the roll-out of MassCourts, unpredictable funding streams that are often tied to year-end infusions of resources, and the very structure of the Trial Court itself. Nonetheless, we believe that the time is now ripe for JISD and court leaders to invest the time into developing and publicizing a strategic plan, defining and using a robust governance structure and making a more disciplined case for investment in IT.

1. Develop a three-year rolling IT strategic plan

Technology played a prominent role in the Trial Court strategic plan in 2013, and JISD developed a detailed work plan to describe, execute on and track the vision briefly articulated in the plan. The Trial Court is currently working on a new strategic plan and one working group is focusing on "Next Generation Technology."

However, it is imperative that JISD build on these broader mandates to develop its own three-year rolling IT strategic plan to be updated annually and serve as the basis for evaluating other opportunities that arise, plan procurements, and limit competition for resources across Trial Court departments. Such a plan will not only provide guidance to JISD activities, it will:

- allow JISD to explicitly align its work with the Trial Court mission of "Justice with Dignity and Speed" and the Supreme Judicial Court's (SJC) vision of having real-time information drive user-centric, seamless and more efficient courts;

- engage the highest levels of court leaders in establishing consistent Trial Court-wide business processes; and

- provide a needed opportunity to communicate JISD's priorities and their implementation status regularly across the court system. The IT strategic plan should consider the impact of the Trial Court's goal of moving to electronic filing and digitization of records, as well as the fact that a large portion of IT staff is now or soon will be eligible to retire.

The experience of the Appellate Courts (the SJC and Appeals Court) in successfully creating, communicating and following an IT strategic plan with a team of users and IT professionals in order to guide implementation and adoption of new technologies in those courts may prove instructive.

2. Pursue IT capital funds and continue to increase IT operating budget

The implementation of technology to accelerate the mission of the Trial Court and facilitate the work of court staff has been restricted by a lack of financial resources in at least three ways. First, there has not been dedicated IT capital spending outside of the $75 million dedicated to implementation of a case management system in 1997. This has led to under-investment in other aspects of technology and an inability to plan long-term technology projects as operational spending is so unpredictable. Second, as shown in the chart below, IT spending as a function of total Trial Court spending consistently has been approximately 25% less than the 2.6% benchmark identified for state and local governments.[2]

IT & Total Trial Court Expenses -- Operating, Capital and One-Time			
Fiscal Year	IT Expenses ($m)	Trial Court Expenses ($m)	IT Expenses as % of Total Trial Court Expenses
2015	$ 12.9	$ 625.6	2.05%
2014	$ 12.5	$ 607.5	2.05%
2013	$ 12.0	$ 573.5	2.10%
2012	$ 10.4	$ 577.2	1.80%
		Total	2.00%

Third, much of the discretionary IT spending each year has been the result of "vacancy savings" that may accumulate during the year. While this re-allocation of budget to IT is an indication of the high priority placed in this area by court leaders, it has limited the ability of Trial Court and JISD to plan for IT spending, as it is unpredictable and unreliable.

We recommend that, especially as MassCourts is now nearly 100% implemented, the court system seek IT capital funds to allow investment in long-term technology needs, such as the infrastructure necessary to implement e-filing and digitization and to maximize the utility of MassCourts to facilitate sharing of data across and outside the Trial Court. We further recommend that JISD track the savings correlated with implementing technological solutions and/or the return on investment to justify additional IT investment. Finally, we commend the Trial Court leaders for allocating end-of-year savings to IT and urge them to continue to do so. The goal should be to reach a level of spending comparable to that of the highest performing court IT systems in the country.[3]

---

[2] According to Gartner IT Key Metrics Data the average IT investment for state and local governments is 2.6%. Gartner IT Key Metrics Data (December 2014).

[3] Committee discussion with the Arizona Judiciary CIO reflected an IT budget of approximately 3.0% of the total court budget, which is funded through fines/fees legislatively designated for automation, and which services a population of 6.7 million people, with 2 million case filings.

Execution

In addition to planning for and procuring the technologies that best meet the needs of the courts, it is essential that systems are implemented that are easy to use, work well together and produce data to support decision-making. The recommendations that follow describe both the technologies we understand to be most important to meeting the needs of the court system and, based on lessons learned from MassCourts, how they should be implemented.

3. Implement and enhance key technologies

Improve Case Management Platform Functionality
While stakeholders acknowledged that significant effort has been spent in implementing MassCourts as a common, web-enabled platform, issues were highlighted around the existence of numerous different user configurations of MassCourts across the court departments. We recommend that priority be given to moving all users toward a single configuration that is more easily supportable, can better enable collaboration, and allows a more streamlined approach to introducing new functionality going forward. To achieve this, court department leadership will need to be involved to focus on the review and modification of existing end-to-end business practices.

We heard from some end-users and support staff that the implementation of MassCourts has introduced additional steps in many business processes. We suggest that JISD engage end users from across the court system in a usability review of the most frequently used functions within the MassCourts platform with the aim of identifying and reducing the number of steps required for frequently-used functions where possible.

Internal metrics for MassCourts performance indicate reasonable average page load times for end-users (~ 2.2 seconds). However, some users expressed frustration with performance at certain times of the day, or from certain geographic locations. Consideration should be given to expanding the current level of synthetic transaction monitoring in order to gather more granular data around end-user response times that may help pinpoint specific areas of frustration that can be addressed.

The Probation Department is using docketing functionality of the MassCourts system to meet individual case management needs. The department has been poised for some time to begin using an additional platform, Northpointe, to address broader gaps. We heard differing perspectives from stakeholders around the status of the effort and the expected rollout schedule for this solution and believe it would be helpful to level set expectations between JISD and the Probation Department.

Implement E-filing and Digitization
The Visiting Committee would like to recognize the ongoing efforts of the "Next Generation Technology" Strategic Plan 2.0 working group for identifying e-filing and digitization strategy as key priorities. We support this direction. Given the challenging scope of this work we would encourage the following lessons from the MassCourts implementation to be considered:

- define and communicate clear scope and business goals broadly across the court system to help drive consensus around the approaches and expected outcomes for transitioning to a more digitally-based operation;

- establish both e-filing and digitization efforts as programs with dedicated resources and appropriate governance models, similar in structure to that instituted for MassCourts;

- incorporate change management into program methodologies from the beginning to ensure that business processes are designed from users' perspectives and that users are adequately trained as processes move from being paper-based to digital; and

- implement standard approaches and business practices across the court system to enable technology solutions to be deployed and supported in a consistent and predictable manner.

Improve Data Sharing and Integration Across Systems
The IT strategy should account for integration between systems, and how data is shared with and within the court system, with emphasis on the following:

- assign specific roles for data management and quality control at various levels in the organization to provide an appropriate level of focus;

- align with external stakeholders around what data formats and standards should be adopted to make interfaces more efficient by reducing the amount of unstructured data that is transmitted;

- align with external stakeholders around the types of interfaces that should be developed – user portals for accessing data may be preferred for some constituents, other external parties might prefer directly accessible application programming interfaces, or messaging based interfaces may be preferable to file uploads;

- build on the recent integration of the Appellate and Trial Court IT organizations to address important needs such as digital transmittal of records of appeal; and

- accelerate the move to making data accessible to the public, but with appropriate consideration to constituent privacy implications, guided by the rules around public access to court data that are in development.

Improve Reporting Capabilities

While access to an enterprise view of data across the court system is now beginning to enable key policy questions to be answered, end users are voicing frustrations around limited access to operational reporting. We recommend that the Trial Court:

- develop and communicate a plan for making reports available across the court system that addresses both policy and operational needs;

- adopt shared reporting standards and provide commonly requested reports at all levels of the organization, with appropriate training;

- enable end-users through tools and training to generate reports themselves for local site analysis (as long as this does not undermine broad-based reporting standardization); and

- continue to explore alternative approaches to delivering the 'DataMart' solution given lack of progress and concerns around the vendor.

Expand Core Networking Infrastructure Capabilities

Networking capabilities will continue to be pressured by the increasing demands for using technology and data inside and outside of the court system. This Committee strongly supports the plan to increase capacity of network circuits to 10Mb across all sites of the court system, as well as the expansion of the early VOIP deployment (currently 20 sites) and encourages the continued advocacy for IT capital funding to enable that effort.

The adoption of wi-fi has been very limited thus far and should be expanded if possible. We commend the Next Generation Technology working group for identifying this as a clear priority and for their work to formulate a roll-out strategy.

Expand Availability of Productivity & Client Software

The in-house, open-source mail platform Zimbra is considered by most users to be functional but many expressed frustration with the 500Mb quota limit and limited integration with other client software. Concerns were also raised about the challenges with finding technical support experts in the marketplace.

Microsoft Office has been rolled out, but due to budget constraints is not currently available to all users, thus limiting the ability of users across the court system to collaborate effectively.

For web browsing, users cited the requirement of using Internet Explorer (IE) for key MassCourts functionality, while others described the need to utilize Firefox for specific reporting capabilities. Given that Microsoft has announced that IE version 11 is the last version of that browser (though it will remain supported through Windows 10) and the current need for multiple browsers, we feel a clearer path forward is needed.

While recognizing that specific client solutions like WordPerfect may remain in use for the foreseeable future, we believe collaboration across the court system would be dramatically improved by implementing and supporting a standard suite of client software and productivity tools to all users. We would strongly encourage exploration of cloud-based solutions to provide more integrated, easy to use, productivity software for email, calendar, web access and file sharing for all users.

Collaboration would also be enabled with the proposed implementation of a new intranet portal and knowledge base to replace the static PHP bulletin boards currently utilized by some Trial Court departments. We support JISD's plan for such a platform to be dynamic, searchable and user-community oriented.

4. Establish meaningful performance metrics

The diversity and granularity of operational metrics reporting is impressive. We would encourage improving upon existing reporting of operational metrics by:

- supplementing measures with service level targets where possible (eg. page load times);

- replacing absolute measures with % measures to provide a better perspective of the proportion of work completed vs. remaining (e.g., digital documents); and

- continuing to expand on the existing usage of longitudinal analysis to reveal trends rather than snapshots.

In addition to operational measures, we recommend expanding reporting to include measuring progress against strategic goals. As an example, moving all users towards a single configuration would be facilitated by developing quarterly targets for reducing the total number of configurations and reporting actuals against those targets.

Structure

A high performing IT organization must have a broad set of technical and functional capabilities, consistent processes and engaged governance in order to deliver solutions to a large and diverse user base.

5. Develop an organization and staff development plan in JISD with a focus on increasing staff resources and capabilities in a few key technical and functional areas

A number of information technology trends are impacting the type of roles, expectations and demands being placed on centralized IT departments across all types of businesses and organizations in both the private and public sectors, including JISD. The role of IT departments is shifting from one of developing and maintaining all IT infrastructure and application solutions to one of being a trusted advisor and change agent to help users leverage technology to more effectively do their jobs.

Increasingly, users have more technology choices available and are more knowledgeable about IT. Both of these realities are positive and challenging for organizations. The users, as a result, are at the same time more independent and more demanding, adding challenges for the IT department.

Other current and emerging technology trends, like rapidly increasing information security threats, the availability of cloud services and other third party solutions, and the challenge of information overload (resulting in the current buzz for big data solutions), also have an impact on the need for JISD to begin to "retool" the department and fill in some key gaps. We recommend that priority be given to adding expertise and experience in the following areas:

- Information security
- Business process redesign
- Project and change management
- Vendor management
- Data management and reporting
- Applications and data integration
- User training

We recommend that the Trial Court Human Resources Department work with JISD to assess current IT job families, salary grades and recruiting practices to support these efforts and strengthen the hiring and retention of JISD staff.

6. Establish and rely on a clear IT governance structure

The implementation of MassCourts has been overseen by a governance committee consisting of representatives from throughout the Trial Court, as well as committees within each Trial Court department. At its best, this committee has served to provide guidance to JISD, has provided a channel to communicate with the teams in the 100-plus courts throughout the Commonwealth, and reflects an intention to give court staff a voice in IT issues. MassCourts governance also includes an external committee of outside stakeholders, although that group has not met in approximately two years.

We recommend that the Trial Court establish and rely on a similar governance structure for JISD's overall activities. The first task of a governance committee would be to write the strategic plan referenced above. We also would urge the committee to establish a rubric for prioritizing requests from different departments and adopting court-wide business practices. Such a rubric needs to balance the fact that change in some departments will impact more users with the needs of smaller, specialized courts.

The experience of the Arizona Court System is instructive. There, an IT governance committee is chaired by the Vice Chief of the Supreme Court (who then succeeds to the Chief position), and the Arizona Court CIO attributes that involvement at the highest levels of the judiciary to its ability to successfully implement technology change.

7. Extend and leverage limited IT resources within the court system with partnerships with external parties and vendors

Recognizing the practical reality that resource constraints will continue to inhibit the ability to satisfy all IT requirements and expectations across the court system, it is critical that JISD seek opportunities to leverage external resources and capabilities. Illustrative examples of possible opportunities for cost-effective partnerships to evaluate, include:

- State and Local Government: Building infrastructure and platform capability in areas like telecommunications, network and wireless services, videoconferencing. At a May 2016 conference on the Emerging Digital Commonwealth, state leaders discussed the development of strategies for protecting data in an era of risk. This is certainly one area ripe for collaboration with the newly-formed MassIT organization;

- Other State and Federal Court Systems: Joint development and sharing of key application solutions;

- Technology and Cloud Service Providers: Outsource commodity or utility-like services to third party vendors.

Culture

To be successful, IT organizations must understand the "business" of their users and be guided by a genuine service mindset throughout the organization. Additionally, IT organizations must communicate, train and help users adapt to the changes technologies drive and enable.

8. Embrace a user-oriented approach in IT and throughout the court system

It is not unusual for IT organizations to be technology centric in the way that they implement and deliver services. Technology centric organizations tend to select systems and solutions that fit their IT expertise and skills and sometimes lose sight of the impact of new systems on the user. For example, we heard that Zimbra was chosen as the email platform because JISD "is a linux shop." We also heard that MassCourts makes some staff jobs more difficult than they were before. While underlying technology architectures are important, it is essential that the impact on the user be in the forefront in making technology selections.

We recommend that JISD implement specific training and other programs to help the information technology staff deepen user-focused skills, such as empathy, collaboration and accountability. Senior IT staff should model these user-focused values and recognize staff when they are exemplified.

9. Improve communications and training

It became clear over the course of our visit that court staff have highly variable IT skills and are generally unaware of IT plans and changes underway. In fact, we heard completely different understandings of what is currently available and what is to be rolled out and when. This occurs both

on major project rollouts, such as Northpointe for the Probation Department, as well as day-to-day individual needs. For example, one manager expressed a need for and a willingness to personally acquire voice recognition software, unaware that it is currently available to a small number of users on an as-needed basis. We strongly recommend that JISD commit IT resources to communications and basic training, as well as coordinate with Trial Court resources that might support these efforts, such as the Judicial Institute and the Executive Office of the Trial Court.

Often the IT function is the only part of an organization that has the complete view of an overall process and how data are used by outside organizations. JISD should assume the role of building awareness of the importance of data and how it is used across groups.

III. CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

Throughout the Visiting Committee's work with the court system, we were very impressed by the level of dedication that was evident among all with whom we met.

We recognize that for more than ten years the Trial Court's focus on MassCourts prevented important progress on other technology development. We appreciate that the court system remained steadfast in its commitment to this complex implementation, despite limited resources and various hurdles along the way.

Significant changes in technology combined with expected budget constraints make it more important than ever that the Commonwealth provide technologies to make justice more efficient and accessible to the public it serves.

Massachusetts Court Technology Visiting Committee
Review Charter

Background and Case for Review

As technology has advanced over the past three decades, Information Technology (IT) activities have moved from supporting "back office" clerical activities to becoming integral to "mission-critical" court operations. Quite simply the courts cannot effectively function without IT support and excellence. MassCourts has completed its final department conversion as the common case management system for the State. While the process was at times frustrating for all involved, the deployment of MassCourts provides a foundation for future IT initiatives. Expectations of MassCourts to deliver new information and make employees' jobs easier have naturally risen as reported to the Court Management Advisory Board (CMAB) by court users. At the same time, there is a persistent sense of dissatisfaction around MassCourts' capabilities and the IT department (Judicial Information Services Department, or JISD) responsiveness, in general.

It is not clear whether this dissatisfaction is a vestige of old systems or how much of it is traceable to practices that JISD can control. The CMAB believes that an outside review of JISD is necessary to sort through these issues, to help JISD and court leaders learn from the recent past and to focus JISD leaders on the necessary and feasible improvements. This is a particularly opportune time for such a review as the Trial Court learns to use MassCourts for policy development, program evaluation and decision-making and before embarking on the next major IT implementation -- eFiling. It is important that the lessons from past challenges be incorporated into JISD and Trial Court practices now, particularly as current and future implementations such as eFiling will require changes in behavior by court employees as well as customers of the court.

The SJC, Trial Court and CMAB believe that this topic is of such significant importance as to warrant the formation of an external visiting committee to conduct an independent review of the Trial Court's IT practices. In partnership with the Trial Court, the CMAB has developed a process for chartering the visiting committee and facilitating the review. This document serves as the charter for the visiting committee outlining the focus and scope of the effort.

Trial Court Coordination and CMAB Contact

The Executive Office of the Trial Court will coordinate scheduling and data collection. John Grossman from the CMAB will help facilitate the process when necessary.

Process Overview

The visiting committee should be comprised of external subject matter leaders who have experience in the topics and issues identified in this charter. The committee may choose to request advance information and determine appropriate interviews or panels. After its review, the visiting committee should formulate its findings and recommendations and deliver its report directly to the Trial Court leaders (with copies to the SJC and the CMAB) by mid-2016. The report should also identify which topics warrant more in-depth investigation.

Focus and Scope

The CMAB has solicited input from JISD and its customers regarding this review. The CMAB has combined that feedback with its own questions to address eight areas. We have identified focusing questions within each of the areas of inquiry. We don't expect the visiting committee to answer all of these questions in the short amount of time the committee will apply to this effort. Rather the questions can serve as a guide for its consideration inside each of the eight areas.

1. Economics and Resource Allocation
   a. Are we spending the right amount of money on IT?
   b. How can we increase the value received for the money spent?
   c. Do we have the appropriate staffing levels?
   d. Are our IT resources (staff and equipment) assigned to the most important court imperatives?
2. Planning
   a. Are we headed in the right direction?
   b. Are we moving at the right pace?
   c. What capabilities are needed to support the 21st century courts?
   d. Do we have clear short, medium and long range plans?
   e. Are IT users sufficiently engaged in developing JIS plans?
   f. Are we integrating the technological possibilities with the business practices and processes of our unique court departments?
   g. Are there opportunities to outsource specific IT activities that should be considered?
3. Current Operations
   a. Are our communications and information technology and systems such as Mass Courts up-to-date and in good operating condition?
   b. Is the requisition and procurement systems streamlined?
   c. Are our systems reliable and available?
   d. Do court IT users know where to go to get answers to their questions?
   e. Is JISD responsive to court user requests for help?
   f. Do IT capabilities support remote work arrangements for Trial Court users?
   g. Is the communication between JISD and the department effective in resolving IT issues and planning?
   h. Are we coordinated with our outside stakeholders, justice partners, and other interested parties regarding the type of interfaces and data exchanges?
4. Data, Security, Disaster Recovery
   a. Are our data secure?
   b. Do we have appropriate back-up and recovery plans and procedures?
   c. Are there any major risks?
   d. Could the Visiting Committee please address and recommend best practices i.e. independent security officer / group reporting to senior managers outside of the JISD?
   e. What can be done to improve data quality?
5. Discipline and Accountability
   a. Do we have the appropriate project management and operations disciplines to execute on the current and future imperatives?
   b. What should be the areas of an IT performance scorecard?

    c. Are we delegating decisions effectively to the appropriate level?

    d. Are there effective accountability systems in place?

    e. Are our internal and external department communications effective?

6. MassCourts

    a. What are the lessons learned from the Mass Courts implementation?

    b. Are we up-to-date on MassCourts?

    c. Do court employees know how to employ IT resources to add value to their activities?

    d. Is the Trial Court ready to move to digitization?

    e. Is the plan for implementing eFiling reasonable?

    f. What is the vision for the digital courthouse and courtroom and how it should operate?

7. Talent and Organization

    a. Do we have the right people in the right roles?

    b. Are we organized properly to support the courts?

    c. Are we attracting the appropriate talent to JISD?

    d. Is our pay competitive with other Massachusetts public sector IT organizations?

    e. Are we developing our IT professionals to assist their career advancement and grow the next generation of leaders?

8. Governance and Oversight

    a. Is there effective governance and oversight of JIS?

    b. Should governance of IT activities be changed to include some set of customers?

    c. Describe the governance structure and process for information system development for existing and future IT systems.

    d. Are technology resourcing and priority setting decisions understood and effective?

    e. How should the Trial Court develop and propagate timely, relevant, enforceable policies that can be embraced by the entire user community?

Massachusetts Court Technology Visiting Committee Members

Anne Margulies, Chair
Harvard University Vice President and Chief Information Officer

Anne is responsible for technology plans, policies, and services that support Harvard University's mission of teaching, learning, and research. In addition to her institution-wide technology planning and coordination role, Anne directly oversees Harvard University Information Technology (HUIT), which provides IT services to 30,000 educators, students, and staff.

Anne previously served as Assistant Secretary for Information Technology and CIO for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. She oversaw $500 million in annual IT spending and led an IT community of more than 2000 professionals providing statewide computing, networking, and applications development services.

Prior to her service with the Commonwealth, Anne was founding Executive Director of MIT OpenCourseWare, MIT's internationally acclaimed initiative to publish the teaching materials for their entire curriculum openly and freely over the Internet. From 2004 to 2010, Anne served on the inaugural Court Management Advisory Board.

John Letchford
Chief Information Officer, MIT Sloan School of Management

As CIO and Executive Director of Sloan Technology Services, John has responsibility to create a cohesive, forward-thinking and progressive technology environment that can be the lever for innovation, visibility and value at MIT Sloan. Prior to joining MIT in 2014 John worked at Tufts University to assist with the strategic transition toward an integrated IT operating and shared services delivery model as part of a university-wide effort to transform administrative processes and practices.

John served as the Chief Information Officer for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in 2010 to 2013 where he chaired the state's IT governing body, the CIO Cabinet, and served on the State 911 Commission and the board of the Mass Broadband Initiative. He served on the Executive Committee of the National Association of State CIOs.

Prior to his service in state government, John worked for Procter & Gamble in Belgium, China, and the United States where he led major enterprise technology development and implementation initiatives.

Don Oppenheimer
Associate Dean and Chief Information Officer, Harvard Kennedy School of Government

Don has responsibility for Information Technology, Telecommunications, Media Services and Library and Knowledge Services at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government (HKS). His background includes 30 years of general management, information technology and organizational strategy experience in the private sector.

Prior to joining HKS in 2008, Don was an independent consultant providing advice and counsel to leading law firms in North America, primarily in the areas of information technology and knowledge management. He had previously spent ten years as CIO at two large, global professional service firms, including Goodwin Procter, the Boston-based law firm, and 15 years as a management strategy consultant and Partner at Mercer Management Consulting, a leading global management consulting firm.

John Grossman, Court Management Advisory Board Liaison to Visiting Committee
Co-President and General Counsel, Third Sector Capital Partners

John is the co-president and the general counsel at Third Sector Capital Partners, Inc., a nonprofit advisory firm focused on developing and financing pay for success contracts between government and the social sector. Its mission is to "accelerate America's transition to a performance driven social sector."

Before joining Third Sector in 2012, John spent over fifteen years working for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He most recently served as the Undersecretary for Forensic Science and Technology within the Executive Office of Public Safety and Security ("EOPSS"). Prior to joining EOPSS, he served for twelve years in the Office of the Massachusetts Attorney General, leaving as the Deputy Chief of the Criminal Bureau after leading the prosecution of all types of white collar crime and starting up the nation's first statewide computer crime unit.

By appointment of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, John served on the Court Management Advisory Board from 2010 to 2016.

Massachusetts Court Technology Visiting Committee Activities

February 25, 2016
- Preliminary Committee Meeting
- Met with Court Management Advisory Board Chairs Lisa Goodheart (incoming) and Glenn Mangurian (outgoing)
- Discussed the Committee charter from Chief Justice Paula Carey, Court Administrator Harry Spence and the Court Management Advisory Board

March 23, 2016
- Committee Orientation
- Met with Chief Justice Carey and Court Administrator Spence
- Met with CIO Craig Burlingame and senior staff of the Judicial Information Services Department
- Visited Brooke Courthouse
  - Met with Juvenile Court Clerk Donna Ciampoli and observed use of MassCourts in Clerk's Office and Courtroom
  - Met with Boston Municipal Court Clerk Dan Hogan; Observed use of MassCourts in Clerk's Office; Observed and discussed the Electronic Application for Criminal Complaint with court staff and the Boston Police Officer working at the court

April 29, 2016
- Met with Supreme Judicial Court Chief Justice Ralph Gants and Justice Margot Botsford
- Video conference call with the Chief Information Officer of the National Center for State Courts, and the CIOs for the Arizona and Kentucky Courts

May 2 and 3, 2016
- Hosted 10 panels of 5-6 members to represent:
  - Appellate Courts
  - Trial Court Judges
  - Clerks & Registers
  - Administrative Support
  - Probation
  - Office of Court Management & Data Management
  - IT Staff
  - External Stakeholders – Court Users
    - Committee for Public Counsel Services, District Attorney's Office, Bar Associations, Legal Services
  - External Stakeholders -- Data Sharing Partners
    - Executive Office of Public Safety & Security, Department of Revenue, Mass. Police Chiefs Association, Boston Police Department, Department of Children and Families
  - Next Generation Technology Strategic Plan 2.0 Team Leaders