

STATE OF MINNESOTA

IN SUPREME COURT

C4-84-2150

Order Promulgating Trial Court
Information Systems Development Policy

WHEREAS, the Minnesota Court system is committed to the economical and efficient development of automated information systems.

WHEREAS, the development of new systems and the modification of existing systems are a shared and interdependent responsibility between local judicial districts and state court administration both ultimately responsible to the Chief Justice in his responsibility of supervising the administrative operations of the courts as provided in M.S. 2.724.

WHEREAS, rapidly advancing technology necessitates that long term planning for court information systems be flexible, economic, clearly defined, and mutually advantageous to both local judicial management and statewide court administration.

WHEREAS, the compatibility of court information and its utility and integrity is achieved in the most cost effective manner through the adoption of a standard information system.

WHEREAS, both manual and automated versions of the Trial Court Information System (TCIS) have been developed since 1979 by state court administration, with extensive trial court participation, and have been and continue to be pilot tested in a number of counties throughout the state and in both appellate courts.

WHEREAS, it is the intention of this Court, subject to the concurrence of the Conference of Chief Judges, to promulgate TCIS as a standard court information system for trial courts.

WHEREAS, advance notice of the anticipated promulgation of TCIS as a standard court information system is being given to encourage continued trial court participation in the enhancement of TCIS and to enable trial court personnel to anticipate and plan for the implementation of TCIS, so as to avoid unnecessary resource expenditure.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

The State Court Administrator shall establish in writing minimum requirements and standards relative to automated trial court information systems and data interchange between trial courts and this Court and other state agencies. These standards shall encompass and elaborate the concepts and criteria hereby established and shall be placed on file with this Court.

Conversion of existing court information systems to TCIS shall not occur except as the result of the mutual agreement of the majority of judges of the trial court, after consultation with the clerk(s) of court and judicial district administrator, and the state court administrator.

A new court information system or enhancement to an existing system at the local level shall either be the Trial Court Information System (TCIS) developed by state court administration or a local court information system which meets the following criteria:

- a. Compatible with the information needs and standards of the Supreme Court or its offices as outlined by the State Court Administrator.
- b. Funded solely by local government including the initial and on-going cost to state court administration and other state agencies of maintaining data linkages.
- c. Cost effective in comparison to TCIS.
- d. Flexible to changing needs and standards.
- e. Defines its data elements in a manner which is technically and substantively consistent with comparable data elements used in automated TCIS.
- f. Provides for adequate security, recovery, and backup of court record data, computer personnel, and computer hardware.
- g. Formally endorsed by a) a majority of the judges of the trial court after consultation with the clerk(s) of court and the judicial district administrator, and all county governments funding the system.

With respect to cost effectiveness, the proposed court information system effort must demonstrate, using accepted standards of development methodology and documentation, that any or all of the functional areas to be designed, which also are supported by TCIS, can be automated without development costs redundant with TCIS development costs; or that proposed development and operating costs can be justified against potential cost savings or increased benefits not achievable from TCIS. Functional areas to be included in this analysis shall be set forth in the minimum requirements and standards established by state court administration and shall include at least:

- a. Recordkeeping
- b. Financial Management
- c. Caseload Management
- d. Calendaring and Assignment
- e. Indexing
- f. Reporting to SJIS and to related state agency information systems within the TCIS network

In addition, the following criteria shall be applied:

1. The date TCIS would be available to the trial court may alter the above cost-benefit analysis. If TCIS is not available in the near-term and if future conversion to TCIS does not involve excessive cost, approval of the new local court information system effort is more probable.
2. Proposed court information systems that are either multi-function, multi-casetype, multi-county, multi-user, or that require extensive custom application programming shall bear a greater burden of proof for approval than pre-packaged or single function, single casetype, single county, single user court information systems (e.g., typically microcomputer based systems). Proposals for single function or single user systems may submit an abbreviated documentation

which includes a statement documenting the need for the system; its intended design; a plan to implement minimum system requirements such as data integrity and backup and program maintenance; and other material requested by state court administration.

Non-TCIS court information systems development, enhancement or implementation work or information system transfers may be initiated, and local contracts executed by court officials for data processing equipment or services may be authorized only upon the prior review as set forth in this order and written approval of the Chief Justice.

There is hereby established a Trial Court Information Systems (TCIS) Board which shall determine the trial court TCIS development priorities and work schedule for the Information Systems Office of state court administration. This Board shall be comprised of seven members who shall be selected as follows:

1. Two members shall be selected by the Minnesota Association for Court Administration, at least one of which shall come from a trial court where automated TCIS is implemented.
2. Two members shall be selected by the District Administrators' Association, at least one of which shall come from a district where automated TCIS is implemented;
3. Two judges shall be selected as members by the Conference of Chief Judges, at least one of which shall come from a trial court where automated TCIS is implemented; and
4. One member shall also serve as Chair who shall be selected by the State Court Administrator.

The Information Systems Office of state court administration is directed by this order to provide staff for all meetings and activities of the TCIS Board.

Court information systems are hereby defined to include automated trial court systems using microcomputers, mini-computers or mainframe computers which perform the following functions: subject-in-process, recordkeeping, indexing,

calendar, assignment or scheduling, violation bureaus, and accounting. Until incorporated into the minimum requirements and standards established by state court administration, office management functions including personnel and budget management, jury management, vital statistics, management analysis, and word processing shall be excluded from this definition of court information systems. In addition, computer-based projects that are intended to have a life span of under six months shall be excluded from this definition of court information systems.

Enhancement is hereby defined as the automation of all or a substantial part of a functional area of court operations to be added to an existing court information system; or, any planned development work on an existing system which contemplates the expenditure of more than one-tenth the normal current budgeted cost of operation and maintenance.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this policy be provisionally effective until further order of this court which is anticipated will follow discussion by the Conference of Chief Judges.

Dated: *Dec 13, 1984*

BY THE COURT



Douglas K. Amdahl
Chief Justice

OFFICE OF
APPELLATE COURTS
FILED

DEC 13 1984

WAYNE TSCHIMPERLE
CLERK