

Functional Review and Analysis of Juvenile Case Management System

Response to Questions Regarding RFP 180-13-01

Updated August 22, 2013

- 1. Have any previous reviews of the JCMS system been performed? If yes, will these be available to the vendor receiving the contract?**

Response: No prior reviews have been performed.

- 2. Please provide the locations of JCMS users and how many people using the system per location.**

Response: There are 15 users in the East Central Judicial District, all located in the city of Fargo.

There are 9 users in the Northeast Central Judicial District all located in the city of Grand Forks.

There are 13 users in the Northeast Judicial District located in the cities of Devils Lake, Grafton and Bottineau.

There are 11 users in the Northwest Judicial District with the majority located in the city of Minot and others located in Williston.

There are 13 users in the South Central Judicial District all located in the city of Bismarck.

There are 9 users in the Southeast Judicial District located in the cities of Wahpeton, Valley City and Jamestown.

There are 4 users in the Southwest Judicial District all located in the city of Dickinson.

- 3. How many sites and users of each site?**

Response: There are 12 sites and 74 users. Please refer to the response to question 2 for more details.

- 4. Is the current JCMS system up to a current release?**

Response: We are on version 4.5 which the vendor rolled out in 2008. The vendor has had some minor releases in the past few years but no version

upgrade since 2008. The vendor is in the process of developing a browser based version of JCMS and is expected to have the screens that are most widely used ready for rollout in the 1st quarter of 2014.

5. Will the vendors of the current systems be available for this assessment or is this to be completed independent of their insights?

Response: The vendor is not expected to be a participant in the analysis but we expect that they are willing to respond to inquiries about their current product and future plans for their product.

6. Have there been any customizations to the current JCMS system and are they documented? Will this documentation be available for the vendor receiving the contract? Can the scope of these customizations be provided?

Response: The only customization to the program has been the creation of management reports for internal use. Dynamic SQL is used to build queries and pull results. Examples of the types of reports that are regularly used are available as well as instructions on how to build the query and run the reports.

We have not found it necessary to request any customizations to handle the day-to-day requirements of logging case data, scheduling hearings, documenting results of hearing or managing conditions of probation.

7. Will all user and current system documentation be available to the vendor receiving the contract?

Response: Internally created user manuals and other documentation will be made available to the successful bidder. Vendor manuals and other documentation are proprietary materials and will be made available to the successful bidder with the permission of the vendor.

8. Will additional contacts from other states be provided upon a completed contract or is this limited to only the contacts that we are able to provide?

Response: We will provide you a contact list of states that have a similar adjudicative/supervision model.

9. Will the pricing/current contracts for software and support for the current JCMS software be available once the contract is in place?

Response: Yes. This information will be made available to the successful bidder.

10. Section 2.07 Project Budget states that the Court “will negotiate a Statement of Work with the selected vendor that will define activities and deliverables that will produce the highest valued benefit to the court.” Section 3.05 – Cost Proposal states, “Vendors should carefully consider the resources needed to successfully implement the proposed project and present a realistic budget that accurately reflects project costs.” Is the Court looking for vendors to provide a cost proposal consistent with the stated budget in Section 2.07, or should vendors provide a cost proposal that reflects the level of effort to complete the work outlined in the RFP with an understanding that the statement of Work will be negotiated with the selected vendor?

Response: Vendors will be expected to provide a cost proposal that reflects the level of effort to complete the work outlined in the RFP with an understanding that the Statement of Work will be negotiated with the selected vendor.

11. Sections 2.06 & 5.01: Please confirm the anticipated project/contract term. In Section 2.06 Project Timeline it notes a contract issuance date of October 30, 2013 with work to commence within 90 days and project completion by July 15, 2014. In Section 5.01 Contract terms it notes a contract state date of September 16, 2014 and a completion date of September 5, 2014.

Response: The contract issue date is October 30, 2013 and the project completion date is July 15, 2014. The contract terms in section 5.01 are listed as September 16, 2013 through September 5, 2014 to allow for an earlier start if we are able to reach an agreement quickly with a vendor and to allow the vendor some room for re-work or wrap-up work once the bulk of the project is completed.

12. Have similar services been acquired by the North Dakota Court System in the past? If so, would the court be able to provide a copy of the contract, including pricing?

Response: Yes, in 2006 we contracted for an analysis of a different software system and on a much broader scale. A copy of that contract is available upon request.

13. Will the Vendor have the opportunity to VPN or otherwise remotely connect into the North Dakota Court System, if required?

Response: Yes.

14. Who are the constituents who will be in the interview process, what are their areas of focus, and where are they located?

Response: The constituents will be court managers, juvenile court staff, judges, juvenile court directors and IT staff.

Initial requirements gathering meetings will be held in the cities of Bismarck, Minot, Grand Forks and Fargo. All other meetings will be held in the city of Bismarck. Beyond the requirements gathering phase, it is likely that most meetings will be held through interactive television, web conference or telephone conference.

15. What specific metrics does the North Dakota Court System anticipate using to best judge ROI and Cost/Benefit?

Response: Return on Investment – Estimate the approximate time savings for staff due to functionality gained by an updated or new system

Cost/Benefit Analysis – Amount of functionality gained and the cost to purchase, implement and maintain a new system versus the amount of functionality gained and the cost to upgrade or enhance the current system through the use of business intelligence tools and new interfaces with other systems.

16. Do you have a budget for a new system if one is selected? What is the timing of budget requests and decisions?

Response: No. Money to fund whatever solution we choose will need to be appropriated from the next legislature which meets in January 2015. The budget request for any future project will need to be made by the Court Technology Committee by mid-August, 2014. The Supreme Court will make a final decision on whether to accept the recommendation of the Court Technology Committee in early November, 2014.

17. Have you reviewed new systems, and if so, which ones have you explored?

Response: We have not reviewed alternate systems.

18. Which release of Odyssey are you currently using?

Response: We are currently on Version 2011. The intent is to move to 2012 and then onto 2013.

19. Is the successful vendor prohibited from bidding on any subsequent requirements documentation project?

Response: No. Work on this project will not disqualify a vendor from working on a subsequent gap analysis or documentation project needed to prepare an RFP for a replacement juvenile case management system or for any unrelated project.

20. Is the successful vendor prohibited from bidding on any subsequent implementation project?

Response: Yes. The successful vendor for this project is not eligible to be awarded a contract for implementation of any solution that is recommended as a result of this project.

21. Does the North Dakota Court System have documentation of existing JCMS functionalities at a detailed or semi-detailed level?

Response: We have user manuals only. These will be made available to the successful bidder with permission of the JCMS vendor. The successful vendor will have access to any manuals or training materials created by the North Dakota Court System for training purposes.

22. In section 2.04 Scope of Work, the RFP calls for the vendor to “document current business processes and the ability of the current vendor to meet those needs.” We assume that this requirement does not include the documentation of functional requirements. Please confirm.

Response: This requirement includes the documentation of current functionality as compared to the functional requirements for Juvenile Case Management Systems adopted by the National Consortium for State Court Automation Standards. The link can be found at: <http://www.ncsc.org/services-and-experts/technology-tools/~media/Files/PDF/Technology/JuvenileStandardsRev11-19-2003.ashx>. Generally, the comparison would be seen as a chart listing all required and optional standards with columns to reflect whether the current system meets the standard, does not meet the standard, or could meet the standard with modifications.

In addition to this comparison, the project envisions that the successful bidder will capture any functional requirements unique to North Dakota courts and the functional requirements that IT staff or end-users have identified as necessary but not currently available in the JCMS.

23. Is Juvenile Probation case management provided by the JCMS?

Response: Conditions of juvenile probation and out-of-home placements are monitored through the JCMS.

24. As a related question, do scope items 1-7 in Section 2.04 – Scope of Work include juvenile probation case management?

Response: Yes. The Scope of Work is intended to cover all aspects of the juvenile court system.

25. Is there a working group of stakeholders that have been involved in the discussions of the need for the proposed project? If so, who are they and to what degree will they be involved in the project?

Response: This project is under the auspices of the Court Technology Committee. The Court Technology Committee will have general responsibility for ensuring that the project is within scope, budget and schedule and will ultimately be responsible for recommending a course of action to the Chief Justice.

A smaller oversight group will be appointed to work directly with the vendor and to provide direct oversight of the project.

All juvenile court staff, referees, judges and IT staff will be invited to participate in the initial stakeholder meetings to discuss shortcomings of the current system and goals for the future.

To the extent needed, the Juvenile Policy Board will be asked to make decisions on business practices and policies. However, because this project is focused on the functional requirements of the software, it is expected that a need for policy interpretation or adjustment of business practices will be very limited.

26. To what degree is information shared or exchanged between the Odyssey Case Management System in district court and the Juvenile Case Management System in juvenile court?

Response: There is a need to share limited amounts of information between the two systems in regard to delinquency cases that are charged under the formal process and child welfare cases. Currently, there is no electronic data exchange between the two systems. Instead the information is manually entered into both systems by keying the data or by electronic filing of documents.

27. Will data dictionaries be made available to the successful vendor?

Response: Data dictionaries will be available with the permission of the current vendor.

28. What is the current support and maintenance process for the JCMS purchased in 1997? Is the vendor still under a support and maintenance contract? If not, is support supplied by JBIT or ITD?

Response: We have a current support agreement with Case Management Systems.

29. Is expanding the current Odyssey system to include juvenile case management considered an option?

Response: Only if it is determined to be the best solution for our needs.

30. What applications are used by the juvenile prosecution staff?

Response: It varies by location. Thirteen of the prosecutors (state's attorneys) are using the Justware prosecution model hosted by the North Dakota Criminal Justice Information Sharing agency (CJIS). There is no other dominant software application used by prosecutors.

It should be noted that CJIS is a key justice system partner for the court system and the anticipated hub for future data sharing between the courts, prosecution, law enforcement and probation.

31. What applications are used by juvenile detention?

Response: It varies by location.

32. What applications are used by juvenile probation?

Response: Juvenile Court Officers (probation officers) employed by the court system use JCMS to monitor out-of-home placement and conditions of probation. If custody of a child is transferred to the Department of Corrections, court supervision is transferred to the juvenile probation officers employed by the Department of Corrections which has a different case management system. Information about the Department of Corrections software will be shared with the successful bidder.

Bidders are also reminded that the juvenile court in North Dakota includes both delinquency and child welfare cases. The Department of Human Service's division of children and family services uses its own software

application to monitor cases. More information about the Department of Human Services software will be shared with the successful bidder.

Electronic data exchange between the courts and the Department of Corrections and the Department of Human Services is highly desired by all three entities.

33. How many people would we meet with to gather requirements? Will they be internal or external? How many locations/districts/positions will be included in the requirements gathering?

Response: The constituents for the requirements gathering will be court managers, juvenile court staff, judges and IT staff. Constituents will be invited to attend one of 4 regional meetings, to be held in the cities of Bismarck, Fargo, Grand Forks, and Minot.

34. Do you know how many general processes would be documented as part of this effort?

Response: Sixteen to twenty major functions with several sub-functions under each category, totaling approximately 300 separate processes. Please refer to the Juvenile functional standards document linked to the RFP.

35. Will the interviews be required to be onsite vs. remote?

Response: There will be four requirements gathering meetings in which the vendor is expected to be onsite. Follow-up interviews and other meetings may be conducted remotely.

36. How much of the project work do you anticipate being performed onsite vs. remote?

Response: We prefer that vendors minimize their travel in order to devote more resources to research, analysis, and document preparation. It is expected that most meetings can be accomplished through interactive television, web conferencing or telephone conferences.

37. What is the reason for the analysis and viability review? Are there reported challenges or inefficiencies that are prompting the review? In other words, what is driving the need to review or analyze the existing environment?

Response: Some of the driving factors behind the review include the aging of the system, the need for an increased ability to capture complete data for the purposes of internal analysis and electronic data exchanges, the desire for a

more robust supervision model, and anticipated efficiencies and quality control through use of smart computer processing.

38. To what extent are juvenile court and juvenile probation business processes enumerated and documented?

Response: We have internal user manuals created by the court system that document how juvenile cases are to be entered, processed and monitored in the JCMS as well as in the Odyssey case management system.

39. Will this documentation be made available to bidders so they can estimate how much additional work must be done for the project?

Response: Yes.

40. Is a JCMS user manual available for inspection?

Response: Yes, the official manual will be made available with the vendor's permission. Documents created by the court system for training purposes will be available to the selected bidder.

41. Approximately how many pages of documentation exist in these areas?

Response: The vendor's user manual is approximately 500 pages. The vendor's administrator manual is approximately 100 pages. The court system's training manual is approximately 50 pages. Additional documentation of processes may be available in the form of best practices, policies, memos or other training materials.

42. Are North Dakota court technology staff familiar enough with the application and the application environment to provide information needed for the project, or will it be necessary for the successful bidder to work with the vendor to answer questions?

Response: North Dakota technology staff is familiar with the application and the environment and should be able to provide a lot of assistance.