



Notice of Document Purpose

The following information outlines the Judiciary-wide Strategic IT Plan developed from the six individual Council Strategic IT plans. This information is in the process of being presented to the Councils. The Councils are being asked to continue their support of plan activities by providing planning resources, as well as to integrate the Judiciary-wide IT planning concept to operate in conjunction with their individual planning process.


At an appropriate time in the review process GCAC will present the Judiciary-wide Strategic IT plan to the Judicial Council for their consideration.

This version of the document is provided in draft form for Council member review and information to support the ongoing communication activities with the individual councils continues.



State of Georgia

Judiciary-wide
Strategic Information Technology (IT) Plan
January, 2008



Contents

➤ Executive Summary	3
➤ Approach Overview	8
➤ Judiciary Interactions	9
➤ Internal/External Influencing Factors	12
➤ Strategy Articulation Map Development	15
➤ Vision/Mission/Guiding Principles/Attributes	16
➤ Strategic Objectives of Judiciary-wide Plan	20
➤ Prioritization Considerations	21
➤ Key Initiatives	22
➤ Measures of Success	28
➤ Strategy Articulation Map	36
➤ Concerns	37
➤ Next Steps	39
➤ Appendices	42



Executive Summary

Executive Summary




Executive Summary Judiciary-wide Planning Approach

During 2005 and 2006, each court council developed its own Strategic Information Technology Plan. There were common goals and needs, along with a number of related initiatives, contained in the respective plans. In November, 2007, a Strategic Planning Group of representatives from each class of court met to develop a Judiciary-wide Strategic IT Plan. In developing the Judiciary-wide plan, the Strategic Planning Group met to:

- Review and analyze strategic goals and key initiatives from the court councils' plans;
- Define goals and initiatives applicable on a Judiciary-wide basis, as well as those required to manage and implement a Judiciary-wide Strategic IT Plan;
- Provide strategy map to be used to support Judiciary-wide technology needs and budget activities in a format consistent with the other courts' Business and IT Strategic Plans; and,
- To define an action plan for incorporating the Judiciary-wide Strategic Planning process into the planning processes adopted by the individual councils and GCAC.

With the completion of this effort, a Strategic Vision and Articulation Map was developed that will enable the Judiciary to prioritize and address common technology needs in a consistent and effective manner by leveraging resources and identifying opportunities to consolidate budget requests for the benefit of all classes of court. The Strategy Articulation Map resulting from this activity is on the following slide.

Note: See Appendix A for attendees list.





Executive Summary Plan Summary and Next Steps

The Strategic Objectives related to automation, standards, and education correlate closely to objectives in each court council's plan. The Planning Group established specific objectives related to governance and funding that address unique issues associated with managing and implementing the plan on a Judiciary-wide basis.

The Planning Group recommended that GCAC coordinate and manage the plan activity until such a time, if any, that an alternate Judiciary-wide governance model is implemented to manage this Strategic Plan.

Additionally, an action plan was developed that outlines the next steps required for the GCAC and the Planning Group to communicate the Judiciary-wide Plan. Likewise, an approach to address the individual court councils in order to seek the participation and support of the councils in the Judiciary-wide planning and implementation activities was developed.



Judiciary-wide Strategic Planning Approach

Judiciary-wide Strategic IT Plan

Planning Approach



Approach Overview

The GCAC and individual court councils began the Strategic Planning process three years ago by developing strategic IT plans that provide a strong foundation for GCAC and the court councils to deliver against their respective charters. The Judiciary-wide Strategic IT Plan builds upon that foundation to consolidate GCAC and court councils' plan components that are applicable on a Judiciary-wide basis and that will benefit all levels of courts.

Using facilitators to guide the Judiciary-wide planning process, representatives from each class of court met in a four day off-site session to:

- Review and analyze strategic goals and key initiatives from the court councils' plans;
- Define goals and initiatives applicable on a Judiciary-wide basis, as well as those required to manage and implement a Judiciary-wide Strategic IT Plan;
- Provide strategic map to be used to support Judiciary-wide technology needs and budget activities in a format consistent with the other courts' Business and IT Strategic Plans; and,
- To define an action plan for incorporating the Judiciary-wide Strategic Planning process into the planning process for the individual councils and GCAC.

Note: See Appendix A for attendees list.




Judiciary Interactions

The session began with a review of the suppliers and customers that interact with the Judiciary. Each court council's Strategic IT Plan contains a list of such suppliers and customers. The following slides provide a consolidated list of suppliers and customers from the court councils' plans.

Suppliers
(Influencers)

- See Judiciary Supplier Interaction Slide



- Juvenile Court
- Magistrate Court
- Municipal Court
- Probate Court
- State Court
- Superior Court

Customers
(Beneficiaries)

- See Judiciary Customer Interaction Slide



Judiciary Supplier Interactions

The Judiciary is impacted by and interacts with a broad range of supplier organizations including:

Suppliers (Influencers)

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| 1. Administrative Office of the Courts | 34. Crime Labs | 67. Interstate Compact | 100. Probate |
| 2. Adult Jails | 35. Date Fund | 68. Jail Construction & Staffing Account | 101. Probate Court |
| 3. Advocacy Groups | 36. Defendants | 69. Jail Fund | 102. Probation Department |
| 4. Alternative Dispute Resolution | 37. Department of Corrections | 70. Job Corps | 103. Probation Offices (Private) |
| 5. Animal Control | 38. Department of Driver Services | 71. Judges | 104. Prosecutors |
| 6. Appellate Courts | 39. Department of Family and Children Services | 72. Jurors | 105. Public Defender |
| 7. Attorney General | 40. Department of Juvenile Justice | 73. Jury Manager | 106. Schools (City & County) |
| 8. Attorneys | 41. Department of Natural Resources | 74. Juvenile Admin | 107. Secretary of State |
| 9. Auditors | 42. Department of Revenue | 75. Juvenile Clerk | 108. Sentencing Review Panel |
| 10. Banks / Financial Institutions | 43. DHR | 76. Juvenile Court | 109. Service Providers (Drug, MH) |
| 11. Beneficiaries | 44. DHR - Child Support Enforcement | 77. Labs | 110. Sheriff Retirement Fund |
| 12. Bonding Companies | 45. District Court Administrators | 78. Law Enforcement Agencies City/County/State | 111. Sheriff's Office |
| 13. Child Abuse Protocol/Child Fatality Review | 46. Employers | 79. Law Library | 112. Software Vendors |
| 14. Children and Youth Coordinating Council/Grant Providers | 47. FBI | 80. Local Business | 113. Special Masters |
| 15. Citizen Panels | 48. Federal Court | 81. Local Mental Health Services | 114. Special Police |
| 16. Citizens | 49. Federal Courts (Probation) | 82. Magistrate Court | 115. State Appointed Attorney General |
| 17. City Council | 50. Finance Department | 83. Marshals Office | 116. State Bar of Georgia |
| 18. City Marshall | 51. Fire Department | 84. Mental Health Regional Hospital | 117. State Board of Pardons and Parole |
| 19. City Police | 52. Foreign Governments | 85. Military Recruiters | 118. State Court |
| 20. Clerk | 53. Foster Parents | 86. Municipal Court Judicial Council | 119. State Patrol |
| 21. Code Enforcement | 54. Garnishee | 87. Municipal Courts | 120. State Probation |
| 22. Council Juvenile Court Judges | 55. GBI | 88. National Crime Information Center (NCIC) | 121. Superior Clerks Authority |
| 23. Council of Magistrate Clerks and Secretaries | 56. GCIC | 89. Other GA State Courts | 122. Superior Court |
| 24. Council of Magistrate Court Judges | 57. General Assembly | 90. Other Juvenile Courts | 123. Superior Court Clerks Retirement Fund |
| 25. Council State Court Judges | 58. General Fund (County) | 91. Other Magistrate Courts | 124. Treatment Providers |
| 26. County Commissioners/ Manager | 59. Georgia Municipal Association | 92. Other Probate Courts | 125. US Bankruptcy Court/Trustee |
| 27. County Departments | 60. Georgia Supreme Court | 93. Other State's Agencies | 126. Vendors |
| 28. County Finance | 61. Governor's Office | 94. Parents | 127. Victim |
| 29. Court Appointed Special Advocate | 62. Governor's Office of Highway Safety | 95. Peace Officers and Annuity Benefit Fund | 128. Victims Assistance |
| 30. Court Personnel | 63. Guardian Ad Litem | 96. Plaintiffs | 129. Vital Records |
| 31. Court Reporters | 64. Immigration | 97. Press and Media | 130. Warrant Dept |
| 32. Court Staff | 65. Institute of Continuing Judicial Education | 98. Private Process Server | 131. Witness |
| 33. Credit Agencies | 66. Intake Office | 99. Pro Se | 132. Youth Detention Center |
| | 67. Interpreters | | |



Judiciary Customer Interactions

The Judiciary is impacted by and interacts with a broad range of customer organizations including:

Customers (Beneficiaries)

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| 1. 911 | 33. Criminal Defendant | 65. Local Business | 98. Software Vendors |
| 2. Administrative Office of the Courts | 34. Defendants | 66. Local Mental Health Services | 99. Special Masters |
| 3. Adult Jails | 35. Department of Corrections | 67. Local Probation | 100. Special Police |
| 4. Alternative Dispute Resolution | 36. Department of Driver Services | 68. Magistrate Court | 101. State Appointed Attorney General |
| 5. Animal Control | 37. Department of Family and Children Services | 69. Marshals Office | 102. State Bar of Georgia |
| 6. Appellate Courts | 38. Department of Juvenile Justice | 70. Media Requests | 103. State Board of Pardons and Parole |
| 7. Attorney General | 39. Department of Natural Resources | 71. Mental Health Regional Hospital | 104. State Court |
| 8. Attorneys | 40. Department of Revenue | 72. Military Recruiters | 105. State Department of Treasury |
| 9. Auditors | 41. DHR - Child Support Enforcement | 73. Municipal Court Judicial Council | 106. State Patrol |
| 10. Banks / Financial Institutions | 42. District Court Administrators | 74. Municipal Courts | 107. State Probation |
| 11. Board of Equalization | 43. Federal Court | 75. National Crime Information Center (NCIC) | 108. Superior Clerks Authority |
| 12. Bonding Companies | 44. Finance Department | 76. Other GA State Courts | 109. Superior Court |
| 13. Children and Youth Coordinating Council/Grant Providers | 45. Fire Department | 77. Other Juvenile Courts | 110. Tax Commissioner |
| 14. Citizen Panels | 46. GBI | 78. Other Magistrate Courts | 111. Treatment Providers |
| 15. Citizens | 47. GBI | 79. Other Probate Courts | 112. US Bankruptcy Court/Trustee |
| 16. City Marshall | 48. GCIC | 80. Other States (Child Support/Custody) | 113. Vendors |
| 17. City Police | 49. Georgia Supreme Court | 81. Parents | 114. Victims Assistance |
| 18. Clerk | 50. Guardian Ad Litem | 82. Peace Officers and Annuity Benefit Fund | 115. Vital Records |
| 19. Clerks Retirement Fund | 51. Institute of Continuing Judicial Education | 83. Plaintiffs | 116. Warrant Dept |
| 20. Council Juvenile Court Judges | 52. Intake Office | 84. Press and Media | 117. Witness |
| 21. Council of Magistrate Clerks and Secretaries | 53. Interpreters | 85. Private Process Server | 118. Youth Detention Center |
| 22. Council of Magistrate Court Judges | 54. Interstate Compact | 86. Pro Se | 119. Code Enforcement |
| 23. Counseling and Risk Reduction | 55. Judges | 87. Pro Se | |
| 24. County Commissioners/ Manager | 56. Jurors | 88. Probate Court | |
| 25. County Departments | 57. Juvenile Admin | 89. Probation Department | |
| 26. County Finance | 58. Juvenile Clerk | 90. Probation Offices (Private) | |
| 27. County Finance | 59. Juvenile Court | 91. Prosecutors | |
| 28. Court Appointed Special Advocate | 60. Labs | 92. Public Defender | |
| 29. Court Personnel | 61. Law Enforcement Agencies | 93. Schools (City & County) | |
| 30. Court Reporters | 62. Law Library | 94. Secretary of State | |
| 31. Credit Agencies | 63. Legislature | 95. Sentencing Review Panel | |
| 32. Crime Labs | 64. LEXIS/NEXIS | 96. Service Prov (Drug, MH) | |
| | | 97. Sheriff's Office | |



Internal/External Influencing Factors

Next, the Planning Group discussed the factors, both internal and external to the Judiciary, that have an influence on the prioritization and implementation of the Judiciary-wide Strategic IT Plan. The following influencing factors were identified:

- **Leadership** – No single CEO-like authority to provide direction and management to support and implement the Judiciary-wide Strategic IT Plan.
- **Elected Officials** – High percentage of elected officials with ability to exercise political power and control. Account for frequent change in officials.
- **Number of Stakeholders** – 159 Counties. Multiple court classes in each county. Plan should address common problems and needs across stakeholders.
- **Funding** – Provided at state, county, and local level. Funding strategy is essential for execution of Judiciary-wide Plan.
- **Judicial Role and Responsibility** – Judicial responsibility to maintain impartiality and appropriate confidentiality.



Internal/External Influencing Factors (Cont.)

- **Governor** – Supports or restricts funding. Supports or influences based on perception of the Judiciary.
- **State Legislature** – Provides or restricts funding. Set standards and goals of the Judiciary. Establishes laws that impact Judiciary.
- **Judicial Council** – Buy-in. Supports and influences. Structure that includes all Judiciary resources.
- **Court Councils** – Buy-in. Supports and Influences adoption of Strategic Plan. Supports and executes Strategic Plan.
- **Superior Clerks Authority** – Influences various stakeholders. Maintains judicial information. Provides data and infrastructure.
- **Public Defenders/ Prosecuting Attorneys Councils** – Buy-in. Benefits from having information made available.
- **Public** – Expects service on par with private sector. Support influenced by perception of courts.



Internal/External Influencing Factors (Cont.)

- **County Commissioners** – Buy-in, Funding.
- **City Councils** – Buy-in. Funding. Relies on courts as funding source.
- **Judges** – Buy-in. Supports or resists change. Views access to information both positively and negatively depending on use.
- **Court Staff** – Buy in. Supports or resists change. Provides practical understanding of operational issues. Benefits from improvements resulting from initiatives.
- **Local Information Technology Departments** – Controls local court technology systems. Operation is impacted by change to supported systems.
- **Law Enforcement** – Accesses information. Possesses significant political power. Has access to funding. Unique role as initiator of the criminal case process.
- **Vendors** – Responds to needs of the courts. Seeks increased profit through servicing more courts.



Strategy Articulation Map Development

Once a common understanding of interactions and factors was verified among the group, the focus shifted to the development of individual components of the Judiciary-wide Strategy Articulation Map. The development of each component of the map incorporated feedback from the entire Planning Group.

The activities included to develop the components of the Strategy Articulation Map included defining and/or revising a:

- **Vision** – What do we aspire to?
- **Mission Statement** – Why are we here?
- **Guiding Principles** - How will we operate and what rules guidelines will we use?
- **Unique Attributes** – Points to remember that guide our work.
- **Strategic Objectives** – Groupings of what we want to do.
- **Key Initiatives** – Projects or major activities to be done.
- **Measures of Success** – How do we measure the success of our objectives?

The following slides contain the results of the group discussion in each of the above areas. These points were individually agreed upon by the group in order to confirm that consensus among the group was achieved.



Judiciary-wide Vision

Vision

**Sound Information Solutions
Supporting Justice**



Judiciary-wide Mission

Mission

To advance the administration of justice for the citizens of Georgia through effective access to information



Judiciary-wide Guiding Principles

Guiding Principles

- **Judiciary-wide Applicability**
- **Beneficial to Judicial System Stakeholders**
- **Achievable Consensus**
- **Sustainable**
- **Measurable Results**



Unique Attributes of the Judiciary-wide Plan

Unique Attributes

- **Non-unified/ Non-uniform Courts**
- **Multiple Funding Sources**
- **Diversity and Disparity of Courts and Stakeholders**
- **Lack of Clearly Defined IT Governance**



Strategic Objectives of Judiciary-wide Plan

The Planning Group reviewed the strategic objectives of the individual court councils and considered objectives that are necessary to effectively apply the plan on a Judiciary-wide basis. This resulted in objectives related to automation, standards, and education that correlate closely to objectives in each council's plan. The Planning Group also established objectives for governance and funding that address unique aspects necessary to manage and implement the plan on a Judiciary-wide basis. The Strategic Objectives are:

- **Advocate for the Automation of Secure Court Processes**
- **Monitor the Establishment and Implementation of Standards**
- **Seek and Secure Sustainable Funding**
- **Establish Effective Collaborative IT Governance**
- **Educate and Communicate**




Prioritization Consideration

In order to prioritize the initiatives identified by the Planning Group within each objective, the participants first had to agree on the key drivers behind the priorities. The following criteria was established and adopted by the group:

High: Must Do Now (Need to Implement)

Medium: Can Do Now (Resources and Capability Available)

It should be noted that a potential “Low” criteria was initially available for consideration, but was not used. Low priority initiatives will remain as components of each court council’s plans to be addressed on an individual council basis or elevated if priority and Judiciary-wide applicability exists.



Key Initiatives

Next, the Planning Group reviewed key initiatives within the individual council's plans to identify, review, and consolidate initiatives that had Judiciary-wide applicability. Using the consolidated list of initiatives, the Planning Group then aligned the initiatives to specific strategic objectives.

The mapping of initiatives to specific Strategic Objectives and associated priority is provided on the following slides.



Prioritized Key Initiatives – Advocate for the Automation of Secure Court Processes

➤ High

- Information Security/Data Integrity
 - Paperless Judicial Process
 - Forms Document Collaboration
 - Self Help Kiosks
 - Digital Electronic Signature
 - Electronic Evidence
 - Automate the Generation of Court Orders
 - Electronic Fine and Fee Payments
- Remote Court Appearances
- Initiate Enabling Legislation to Support Automation Initiatives



Prioritized Key Initiatives – Monitor the Establishment and Implementation of Standards

➤ High

- Online Public Access to Courts and Court Information (E-Judiciary)
- Disaster Recovery/Business Continuity
- Inventory of Current Resources
- Strategic Plan Management
- Standards-Related Legislative initiatives
- Adoption of NIEM
- Judiciary-wide IT Support for Standards

➤ Medium

- Data Definitions Maintenance



Prioritized Key Initiatives – Seek and Secure Sustainable Funding

➤ High

- Funding Strategy and Sourcing Initiatives
 - Legislation
 - Grants
 - Federal Initiatives
 - Technology Fees
 - Multi-state
 - Multi-agency

➤ Medium

- Surplus Equipment and Software Management/ Distribution



Prioritized Key Initiatives – Establish Effective Collaborative IT Governance

➤ High

- Creation of Governance Model and Charter
 - Roles and Responsibilities
 - Membership
 - Governance Contracting Capabilities
- Legislative Initiatives to Enable Governance Model, if Necessary
- Ongoing Prioritization of Key Judiciary-wide IT Needs



Prioritized Key Initiatives – Educate and Communicate

➤ High

- Communication and Marketing of Judiciary-wide IT Plan to:
 - Judiciary
 - Legislature
 - Executive
 - Local Government
 - Public
 - Other Stakeholders

- Training
 - Judiciary
 - Stakeholder



Defining Success

Next, the group discussed how it would track and measure success in addressing the strategic objectives. Based on the anticipated time period required to achieve a particular success measure after formal adoption of the Judiciary-wide Strategic Plan, the measures were grouped into the following classifications:

- **Near Term** – those measures that are expected to be achieved within 6 to 12 months.
- **Medium Term** – those measures that are expected to be achieved within 12 to 24 months.
- **Long Term** – those measures that are expected to require more than 24 months to achieve.

The measures for success are detailed by strategic objective on the following slides.



Measures of Success (Targets) – Advocate for the Automation of Secure Court Processes

Measure	Near Term	Medium Term	Long Term
Data Integrity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of Data Integrity Issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritized Data Integrity Issues • Begin to Address some High Priority Data Integrity Issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resolve High Priority Data Integrity Issues • Resolve some Medium and Low Priority Data Integrity Issues
Electronic Judiciary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish Baseline Measure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent Increase in Implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued Percent Increase
Legislation to Support Automation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation Submitted and Passed • Time to Pass Legislation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification and Creation, and Passage of Legislation to Support Future IT Needs



Measures of Success (Targets) – Monitor the Establishment and Implementation of Standards

Measure	Near Term	Medium Term	Long Term
Public Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish Baseline Measure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percent Increase in Implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued Percent Increase
Disaster Recovery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish Baseline Measure of existing plans Measure effectiveness of tested plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percent Increase in Implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued Percent Increase
Inventory Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish Baseline Measure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Match Needs to Resources Establish Resource Management Guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Match Needs to Resources Guidelines Monitored
IT Strategic Plan Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GCAC Monitoring of Complete Initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring of Complete Initiatives Percent Initiatives Complete Plan Initiatives Updated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring of Complete Initiatives Percent Initiatives Complete Plan Initiatives Updated



Measures of Success (Targets) – Monitor the Establishment and Implementation of Standards

Measure	Near Term	Medium Term	Long Term
Legislation to Support Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legislation Submitted and Passed Length of Time to Passage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification and Creation, Submission, and Passage of Legislation to Support Future Standards Needs
NIEM Adoption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adoption of Standard by Judicial and Court Councils 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Usage by Procuring Agencies Usage by Vendors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% Compliance
IT Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify Support Needs and Resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of Support Requests Effectiveness and timeliness of response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of Support Requests Effectiveness and timeliness of response
Data Definitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active Council Participation in Maintenance Number of Contributions Number of Stakeholders using Data Definitions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active Council Participation in Maintenance Number of Contributions Increasing Number of Stakeholders using Data Definitions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active Council Participation in Maintenance Number of Contributions Increasing Number of Stakeholders using Data Definitions



Measures of Success (Targets) – Seek and Secure Sustainable Funding

Measure	Near Term	Medium Term	Long Term
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY09 Appropriations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriations in Future Fiscal Years to Support Initiatives • Effectiveness of Budget Information Provided for Appropriation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriations in future fiscal years to support initiatives • Effectiveness of Budget Information Provided for Appropriation
Surplus Equipment/Software Redistribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish Baseline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redistribution Rate • Costs Avoided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redistribution Rate • Costs Avoided



Measures of Success (Targets) – Establish Effective Collaborative IT Governance

Measure	Near Term	Medium Term	Long Term
Governance Model and Charter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model Established • Meeting Chief Justice (Current and Future) • Meeting with Key Influencers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members Appointed • Charter Adopted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective Implementation of Judiciary-wide Initiatives
Legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation Submitted, if needed • Legislation Passed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification and Creation, Submission, and Passage of Legislation to Support Future Governance Needs
Needs Prioritized	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs Documented and Tracked 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of Prioritized List of Needs • % of Needs Addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of Prioritized List of Needs • % of Needs Addressed




Measures of Success (Targets) – Educate and Communicate

Measure	Near Term	Medium Term	Long Term
<p>➤ Coordinated Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinated Plan with Councils and Stakeholder Associations • Court Councils Endorsement of Judiciary-wide Strategic Plan by July 2008 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judicial Council Adoption of Judiciary-wide Strategic Plan by December 2008 • Establish Participation by Court Councils 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued Participation by Court Councils



Judiciary-wide Strategy Articulation Map

As each of the components of the Strategy Articulation Map was developed and agreed upon, the map outlining the IT strategy for the Judiciary for the next 3-5 years was completed and is provided on the following page.





Concerns

Prior to developing the action items to support adoption and implementation of the plan, the Planning Group discussed potential concerns from the perspective of key suppliers and customers of the Judiciary that would impact the plan adoption and implementation. Potential concerns were often raised in the form of a question. These potential concerns included:

Governance

- Will this plan require a new legislatively created group to manage and govern the plan?
- Is the planning or governance structure a duplicate of existing group(s)?
- Is this an attempt to centralize Judiciary management and decision-making?

Funding

- Will this require significant funding over a long period of time?
- Will this compete against other Judiciary funding?
- How much will this cost the State and what is the County-level funding role?
- How will this impact existing systems that are in place?



Concerns (Cont.)

Benefits

- What kind of change will this plan effect?
- What benefit will the stakeholders see from this plan?
- What is the benefit to the citizens of Georgia?

Data Security

- How will this plan ensure that private data is protected and public data is made available?
- What is the risk of inappropriate data exposure?

While each potential concern was valid, the Planning Group determined that the plan components, along with the councils' plans provided the necessary basis of information required to address these concerns as GCAC and the court councils implement the Strategic IT Plan.



Next Steps

Future Use of Plan:

- Judiciary-wide strategic planning represents an extension of GCAC and the individual council's strategic planning process. It will be used to identify and manage plan components that will benefit multiple classes of court.

Approval/Endorsement of Plan:

- Seek approval of plan by GCAC at December, 2007 Commission meeting
- Present to Class of Court Councils by July, 2008
- Seek Judicial Council approval in December, 2008

Stakeholder Group:

- Owner: Judiciary-wide Planning Group and GCAC
- External: All Justice System Stakeholders

Ongoing Maintenance

- Update Frequency: Annually



Next Steps Plan Adoption and Approval

Task	Owner	Due Date
Consolidate Judiciary-wide Planning Session Notes and Distribute	North Highland	12/21
Seek GCAC Approval of Draft Plan	GCAC	12/12
Judiciary-wide Planning Group Feedback	Planning Group	12/31
Publish and Distribute Final Plan	North Highland	1/11
Review with each Court Council	Planning Group	01/08-06/08
Review with Presiding and Future Chief Justice	GCAC / Planning Group	01/08-05/08
Judicial Council Presentation	Planning Group	06/08
Judicial Council Approval	GCAC / Planning Group	12/08



Next Steps Plan Implementation

Task	Owner	Due Date
Identify and Establish Implementation Group to Address Specific Initiatives	Planning Group/ GCAC	02/2008
Develop Progress Reporting Method	GCAC	02/2008
Locate Municipal Courts' Previous Survey	AOC	02/2008
Status Review of Plan Activities	Planning Group	02/2008
Compile Technology Inventory Surveys Establishing Council-level Baseline	GCAC/ AOC	06/2008
Review Existing Legislation that Might Impact Plan	Planning Group	06/2008
Develop High-level Budget for FY10	Planning Group	07/2008
Develop and Approve Communication Plan	GCAC	11/2008



Appendices


Appendices



Appendix A - Participants


The following individuals participated in the four day facilitated session:

- **Jorge Basto – AOC**
- **Carla Brown – Magistrate Court**
- **Michael Cielinski – Municipal Court**
- **Steve Ferrell – Superior Court**
- **Gayle Gazaway – Magistrate Court**
- **Vince Harris – AOC**
- **Betsy Kidwell – Magistrate Court**
- **Joe Iannazzone – State Court**
- **George Nolan – GCAC**
- **Jody Overcash – Superior Court**
- **Keith Parkhouse – Juvenile Court**
- **Robin Shearer – Juvenile Court**
- **Tammy Stokes – Municipal Court**
- **Ken Van Horn – Probate Court**
- **Cindy Walker – State Court**
- **Keith Wood – Probate Court**



Facilitators:

- **Jim Poulakos – North Highland**
- **Steve Hagan – North Highland**



State of Georgia

Judiciary-wide
Strategic Information Technology (IT) Plan
January, 2008