

Agency Name: Indiana Supreme Court  
Unit of Program Name: Judicial Technology and Automation Project  
Fund/Center: 48050 Indiana Supreme Court

The Indiana Supreme Court receives no General Fund appropriations and requests no General Fund appropriations for its Judicial Technology and Automation Project. This work is financed by court filing fees and by federal and state grants.

The Indiana Supreme Court established its Judicial Technology and Automation Committee (JTAC) in 1999 to provide leadership and governance regarding the use of technology in Indiana courts. Here are some of the highlights of this work:

- (1) CMS Project-“Odyssey.” JTAC’S biggest and most ambitious project is to equip all Indiana courts and clerks with a 21st century computerized case management system (CMS) called Odyssey to manage cases – and connect each court’s system with each other’s and with law enforcement, state agencies, and the public.
  - As of September 30, 2010, Odyssey has been successfully installed in 66 courts in 22 counties comprising approximately 27-1/2% of the state’s caseload.
  - These include virtually all courts responsible for traffic infraction cases in Marion, Allen, Hamilton, and St. Joseph Counties, the state's largest and third, fourth, and fifth largest counties, respectively.
  - Counties pay no license fees or annual maintenance costs for Odyssey. Information on cases in Odyssey is available at no cost to the public on the web.
  - Odyssey is a leading national case management system with special Indiana features for clerks’ financial duties and probation officers’ caseloads.
- (2) CMS Project-“INcite.” While Odyssey is being installed court-by-court, JTAC works closely with law enforcement and state agencies using a computer program called “INcite” to send certain critical data electronically to and from courts as follows:
  - Court traffic infraction data — to BMV (all 92 counties).
  - Domestic violence protection orders — to local police and state Protection Order Registry (all 92 counties).
  - Juvenile delinquency case data — to Department of Child Services from juvenile probation officers (available in 82 counties).
  - Tax warrant data from Indiana Department of Revenue — to clerks (42 counties).
  - Marriage license data — to Indiana Department of Health from clerks (64 counties).
  - Electronic traffic tickets issued using scanners — to courts, Indiana State Police and sheriff and police departments (172 departments; 23 more in planning stage).
  - Mental health adjudication data — to the FBI for background checks (all 92 coun-

- ties).
- Court statistical data — to Division of State Court Administration from courts (all 92 counties).
- (3) Local grants. JTAC has made grants of more than \$2.7 million to courts, clerks, and law enforcement for computer systems and technology equipment.
- (4) Research, education, web site, and other services. JTAC also provides the following at no cost:
  - LEXIS-NEXIS electronic legal research service for judges and clerks.
  - Computer classes at Ivy Tech for court and clerk staff.
  - On-line child support calculator.
  - Indiana judicial web site with information for and about courts and clerks.
  - County “jury pool” lists and jury management software.

This work is performed in close collaboration not just with counties, cities, and towns throughout our state but also with many agencies of state government. Indeed, JTAC believes that there is no state in this country in which there is a closer collaboration between the judicial and executive branches of government on technology issues than here in Indiana. Indiana courts exchange court information electronically with agencies throughout the Daniels Administration in a way that increases public safety and saves taxpayers money, including the Bureau of Motor Vehicles, Indiana State Police, Department of Child Services, Department of Health, Department of Revenue, Department of Natural Resources, Indiana Gaming Commission, and the Indiana Excise Police. In addition, the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute, Indiana Office of Technology, State Board of Accounts, Department of Homeland Security, and Department of Correction, all agencies within the Daniels Administration, have strongly supported the work of JTAC in improving court technology.

This work is financed by court filing fees and by federal and state grants; JTAC receives no state General Fund appropriations. The court filing fee statutes provide that an "automated record keeping fee" of \$7.00 be collected as part of the filing fee for certain cases filed in Indiana courts. IC 33-37-5-21. Generally speaking, the receipts from this fee (except with respect to fees collected in cases resulting in the accused person entering into a pretrial diversion or deferral program agreement) are appropriated to the Supreme Court for the "judicial technology and automation project." IC 33-37-9-4(b).<sup>1</sup> Under the terms of the statute, the fee is scheduled to be reduced to \$4.00 per case effective June 30, 2011. IC 33-37-5-21(b)(2).

The Court requests that the General Assembly amend the statutes governing the automated record keeping fee with the following considerations in mind:

1. If there is no change to current law and the fee drops to \$4.00 per case effective June 30, 2011, JTAC will be unable to install Odyssey in any additional

---

<sup>1</sup> Automated record keeping fees collected in diversion and deferral cases are deposited in the attorney general's homeowner protection unit account. IC 33-37-7-2 & 8, as amended by P.L. 182-2009(ss), §§ 395 & 396.

courts although it will be able to maintain and operate Odyssey for those courts in which it has already been installed.

2. If current law is changed to permit the fee to remain at \$7.00 per case, JTAC will be able to continue to install Odyssey at the current rate of approximately 25 courts per year.

3. If the current law is changed to increase the fee to \$10.00 per case – as the Court requested at the beginning of the current biennium, a request that was endorsed by the full House of Representatives and the Senate Judiciary Committee – JTAC would be able to accelerate the installation of Odyssey to approximately 50 courts per year.

**Specifically, the Supreme Court respectfully requests that the General Assembly adopt alternative #3 above – an increase in the fee to \$10.00 – and also requests that the provisions of the statute adopted during the 2009 Special Session with respect to fees collected in diversion and deferral cases be repealed. As in the past, the Court requests no General Fund appropriations in the 2011-2013 biennium.**

**If these requests are adopted,** the Court anticipates expenditures of approximately \$9.6 million in the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012 (FY 2012) and \$9.9 million in the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013 (FY 2013) for the CMS Project and the other technology projects.

**If the automated record keeping fee remains at \$7.00,** the Court anticipates expenditures of approximately \$6.8 million in the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012 (FY 2012) and \$7.0 million in the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013 (FY 2013) for the CMS Project and the other technology projects.

**If the automated record keeping fee drops to \$4.00,** the Court anticipates expenditures of approximately \$3.8 million in the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012 (FY 2012) and \$3.9 million in the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013 (FY 2013) for the CMS Project and the other technology projects.

The Court anticipates that grant funding from various sources will continue to be utilized for several JTAC initiatives. Grant opportunities will be pursued aggressively by the Court as they become available. However, because there can be no assurance that any grants will be received, JTAC does not budget any expenditures in anticipation of grant revenue.

**PART A.**  
**INDIANA SUPREME COURT JUDICIAL TECHNOLOGY AND**  
**AUTOMATION PROJECT: PURPOSE AND MISSION.**

The Indiana Supreme Court established JTAC in 1999 in recognition of the growing impact of computer technology and innovation on the business of, and the need for uniform policies on implementation of information technology within, the Indiana judicial system. The Committee's charge includes the development of a long-range strategy for technology and automation in Indiana's judicial system, including possible approaches for funding and implementation, as well as the development of standards for judicial information case management systems, judicial data processing, electronic filing, deployment and use of judicial information on the Internet, and for all related technologies used in the courts. In short, the primary role of JTAC is to provide leadership and governance, including advisory oversight of state budget requests, regarding the use of technology in the courts in an effort to better serve the people of Indiana.

The members of JTAC are:

- Justice Frank Sullivan, Jr., Chair – Indiana Supreme Court
- Judge Paul D. Mathias, Vice Chair – Indiana Court of Appeals
- Judge Christopher L. Burnham – Morgan Superior Court
- Judge Barbara A. Collins – Marion Superior Court
- Judge Jeffrey J. Dywan – Lake Superior Court
- Judge Sherry L. Biddinger Gregg – Knox Circuit Court
- Judge Michael G. Gotsch – St. Joseph Circuit Court
- Judge Frances C. Gull – Allen Superior Court
- Judge Kenneth G. Todd – Monroe Circuit Court

To pursue its mission, JTAC has established the following core goals:

**Goal #1:** Equipping every Indiana trial court with a 21st century case management system (CMS) called Odyssey.

**Goal #2:** Connecting individual courts' case management systems with each other's and with law enforcement, state agencies, and other users of court information.

**Goal #3:** Providing Indiana judges and court clerks and their staffs with additional computer resources to assist them in their work and better serve the public.

In furtherance of these goals, Part B-1 of this Budget Narrative describes the progress JTAC has made installing Odyssey. Part B-2 describes the progress JTAC has made toward establishing the critical interfaces between courts, law enforcement, and state agencies using INcite. Part B-3 reviews expenditure and other financial information related to Odyssey and INcite. Part B-4 describes other computer and technical projects that JTAC provides or finances for use by trial courts and clerks. Part B-5 describes JTAC's compliance with mandates contained in Public Law 110–2009 and Public Law 130–2009.

**PART B.**  
**INDIANA SUPREME COURT JUDICIAL TECHNOLOGY AND AUTOMATION PRO-**  
**GRAM: ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND CHALLENGES OVER THE LAST TWO YEARS**  
**AND OBJECTIVES FOR THE 2011-2013 BIENNIUM**

**PART B-1.**  
**UNIFORM STATEWIDE CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM — ODYSSEY (TRIAL**  
**COURT CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM)**

Most of the expenditures discussed in this Budget Narrative relate to the CMS Project. In late 2007 – six years after the Court committed itself to providing Indiana courts with a statewide CMS and two years after suffering a catastrophic setback – the CMS Project reached a dramatic milestone when ten Indiana courts and their clerks began using the JTAC-supplied CMS called “Odyssey” to manage their caseloads. In the approximately 33 months since then (as of September 30, 2010), Odyssey has been installed throughout the state so that 66 courts in 22 counties comprising approximately 27-1/2% of the state’s caseload now use it to manage their cases.

**(a) Background and Early History of the CMS Project**

In 2009, approximately 2,000,000 cases were filed in Indiana courts – cases ranging from speeding tickets to divorces to personal injury claims to major felonies. Meticulous records are kept of every development in each case – every document filed, every hearing held, every order issued, every verdict rendered – is recorded in a “docket” officially known as a “chronological case summary” or “CCS.” It is readily apparent that the CCS can contain extremely valuable and important information – information on criminal histories, criminal sentences, child abuse and neglect, driving records, tax warrants – on everything that gets recorded by the court in any case. A “case management system” is a computer program that enables a court to record all this information on all of its cases, store it and then make it available to those who need it. It is, in short, an automated docket or CCS in which all the information recorded on all the cases pending in the court can be readily searched and retrieved. Further, a “21st century case management system” takes the concept of an automated docket to the next level in the sense that it facilitates the management of the case through cause and effect relationships between events in a case, production of documents, and ticklers resulting from events, as opposed to just listing the history.

The formation of JTAC followed approximately six years of research and planning conducted by the Courts’ Division of State Court Administration (Division), with generous financial support from the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (CJI), to improve the way in which Indiana trial courts and court clerks manage their caseloads.

The Supreme Court turned its attention in the early 1990s to the question of improving technology in trial courts. With generous financial support from the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute, the court embarked on what was known as the AIMS Project, an effort to develop standards for individual county courts to use when acquiring case management systems. In 1999, the Court’s Division of State Court Administration (Division) requested that the Court establish a more structured way of addressing trial court technology and JTAC was born.

After JTAC studied with great care the work of the AIMS Project, it came to the conclusion that it was not in the best interests of the state to attempt to promulgate a set of standards and leave it to individual counties to acquire case management systems meeting those standards:

- First, as a purely practical matter, technology never stands still long enough for standards to be useful; no sooner is a standard promulgated than some technological development renders it obsolete or at least in need of change.
- Second, such an approach left the cost of acquiring such systems on local property taxpayers at a time of growing pressure on the property tax system to meet other local needs.
- Third, leaving it to individual counties to each acquire and operate their own systems would be extremely inefficient since hardware, software updating, and technical support would be duplicated from county to county to county.
- Fourth, leaving it to individual counties each to acquire and operate their own systems provided no method of assuring that the systems operated in accordance with applicable statutes, State Board of Accounts regulations, or Court rules.
- And fifth, having a substantial number of different systems (even today, 23 different systems are operating in Indiana) makes it extremely difficult to exchange court information with law enforcement, state agencies, and others who need and use court information, and it makes it impossible for courts to exchange court information with each other.

As a consequence of these considerations, JTAC concluded that only a uniform, statewide 21st century CMS, and not merely a set of standards, would be necessary to (1) enable Indiana trial courts and court clerks to manage their caseloads faster and more cost-effectively; (2) provide users of Indiana trial court information, notably law enforcement agencies, state policy-makers, and the public, with more timely, accurate, and comprehensive information; and (3) reduce the cost of trial court operations borne by Indiana counties.

In late 2001, JTAC recommended, and the Court concluded, that it would seek to equip all Indiana courts with a uniform statewide 21st century CMS. The Court adopted this recommendation. It concluded that if a uniform 21st century CMS was implemented statewide, substantial benefits would accrue to those who need and use court information. For example: (a) citizens and lawyers would be able to check the status of their cases over the Internet; (b) a court would be able to transmit electronically an order suspending (or reinstating) a driver's license to the BMV immediately after making the ruling; (c) the state would be able to have an extremely accurate electronic registry of all domestic violence protective orders issued by Indiana courts; (d) a judge facing a criminal defendant in one county would be able to determine electronically whether there are charges pending against that defendant in any other county; and (e) judges, court clerks, prosecutors, lawyers, and their staffs would be able to process electronically countless transactions that now are performed by hand.

With financing in place, the Supreme Court entered into a contract later in 2002 with Computer Associates, Inc. (CA), a major international computer services firm, to acquire, develop, and install a statewide CMS following a competitive procurement process that included a comprehensive review of over 30 responses to a Public Notice of Contracting Opportunity (PNCO) released earlier that year. Although substantial work was conducted throughout 2003, 2004, and 2005 pursuant to this contract, the Court and CA mutually terminated the contract in September, 2005. CA fully refunded all monies paid by the Court under the contract. CA also paid an additional amount for certain expenses incurred by the Court prior to the termination. All refunded monies, which totaled \$6,934,273.43, were deposited in the Fund/Center 6000/186300.

Why did the project with CA collapse? There were a number of reasons but the most important was that during this time period, CA experienced significant changes in terms of its overall business plan and concluded that it not only did not want to be in the Court CMS business, it did not want to be in the software development business at all.

**(b) CMS Project Following the Termination of the CA Contract**

In connection with the events leading to the termination of the CA contract, the Court had recognized the need for and established a “hands on” governing board to help with decision-making and eventual implementation of the statewide CMS. The Court had charged the CMS Statewide Governing Board (Governing Board) with guiding “the CMS project by making key policy and strategy decisions about its design, development and introduction to court systems statewide.” The following individuals sit on the Governing Board today:

Bonnie Austin	Court Administrator, Monroe Circuit Court
Hon. Kimberly Brown	Judge, Washington Township (Marion County) Small Claims Court
Sherry Brown	Harrison County Clerk of Court
Andy Cain	MIS Director, Judicial Technology and Automation Committee
Mary DePrez	Director & Counsel, Trial Court Technology, Indiana Supreme Court
Hon. Michael Gotsch	Judge, St. Joseph Circuit Court
Hon. Barbara Harcourt	Judge, Rush Circuit Court
Hon. John Kellam	Senior Judge, Division of State Court Administration
Deb LePere	Deputy Clerk, Hamilton County
Hon. Paul Mathias	Judge, Indiana Court of Appeals
Michael McConaha	Information Services Manager, Marion Superior Court
Lisa Plencner	Court Administrator, St. Joseph Circuit Court
Hon. John Rader	Judge, Warren Circuit Court
Hon. Geoff Robison	Judge, New Haven City Court
Cindy Spence	Hendricks County Clerk of Court

Amitav Thamba	Chief Technology Officer, Marion Superior Court
Elizabeth White	Marion County Clerk of Court
Hon. Mary Willis	Judge, Henry Circuit Court

Despite the substantial setback to its goals represented by the demise of the contract with CA, the Court, JTAC, and the Governing Board remained optimistic about achieving the state-wide CMS project's goals. In order to determine the best way to proceed, the Court in late 2005 began gathering information on recent developments in case management systems in general and case management system technology in particular. The staff of JTAC attended the national Court Technology Conference in Seattle, and hosted a day-long briefing by the National Center for State Courts' technology expert. In addition, the Court instructed the staff to invite trial court case management system vendors to demonstrate their systems to the staff during the next several weeks. These demonstrations were for information purposes only and were not part of any procurement process. The staff invited all vendors that had trial court management systems installed in Indiana courts and, in addition, other vendors known to the staff to have case management systems installed statewide in other states.

Based on this information, staff, the Court, JTAC, and the Governing Board came to three conclusions in early 2006:

- First, the original vision adopted by the Supreme Court and JTAC – to provide all Indiana courts with a 21st century case management system that connects each court's system with the others' and with those who need and use court information – was sound. It would provide more efficient and effective courts, savings for taxpayers, and improved law enforcement.
- Second, at the time of the original procurement in 2002, only our prior vendor, Computer Associates, had proposed a statewide case management system connected from a central data center over a high-speed network to local courts. It was this feature of the CA proposal that was most attractive to the Supreme Court and other stakeholders including The Indiana Association of County Clerks and Marion County who had assisted in the original procurement. In the intervening three years, all of the national vendors who made presentations had at least moved in this direction. The fact that the national vendors had adopted the same approach – a statewide case management system connected from a central data center over a high-speed network to local courts – as the Court had originally envisioned for the Indiana case management system helped validate the original vision in our minds.
- Third, in order to continue to pursue this vision, proposals for a case management system should again be solicited. The solicitation document, called a Public Notice of Contracting Opportunity ("PNCO"), should utilize the knowledge gained in the work with CA (including the detailed system requirements) but not be so prescriptive as to prohibit vendor creativity in their proposals.



**(c) Selection of Tyler Technologies as JTAC's CMS Vendor**

Prior to issuing a new PNCO, the Division solicited support for this approach and reviewed the details to the degree appropriate with key project stakeholders, in particular (a) leaders in the Executive Branch of State Government, (b) leaders in the Legislative Branch of state government, (c) county clerks and their statewide association, and (d) Indiana trial court judges. These discussions formed a large part of the basis for JTAC's decision to proceed with a new procurement. The court engaged Crowe Horwath LLP, a prestigious Indiana-based consulting firm to assist in the procurement.

In February, 2006, the Division of State Court Administration published a PNCO to procure a CMS. The Court received 14 responses to the PNCO. A thorough, rigorous review of the proposals began immediately. Qualified proposals were examined by multiple teams that included technical specialists, financial analysts, court experts and potential front-line users.

In May, 2006, a Joint Committee of the members of JTAC and the Governing Board ("Joint Committee") completed a recommendation of the selection of four finalists to the Indiana Supreme Court. The Court accepted the recommendation and named the following four finalists:

- Tyler Technologies
- Maximus
- Sustain Technologies, Inc.
- Computer Services, Inc.

On-site demonstrations and interviews were conducted in June and July. (During this period, Sustain withdrew its proposal from consideration.) Technical specialists, financial analysts, judges and clerks recently completed site visits to Minnesota, Massachusetts, and various locations within Indiana. At the conclusion of this exhaustive review process in the late fall of 2006, the Joint Committee recommended that the Court adopt Tyler's CMS product called "Odyssey" as Indiana's statewide CMS. The Joint Committee made this recommendation for the following reasons:

1. Odyssey was designed to operate on a centralized statewide basis.
2. Odyssey design, security features, and usability were superior.
3. Odyssey was web-based, simplifying network issues and costs.
4. Odyssey interface and data conversion methods were superior.
5. Odyssey used Microsoft products as did the Indiana Office of Technology (IOT) which would house the data center for the statewide CMS.
6. Other courts' experience using Odyssey was superior and its implementation in Minnesota was particularly impressive.

In November, 2006, the Court accepted the Joint Committee's recommendation and selected Tyler's Odyssey product as Indiana's statewide CMS, contingent on negotiating a satisfactory contract with Tyler.

Effective February 1, 2007, Tyler and JTAC entered into a limited contract to conduct a detailed assessment of the functions of Odyssey and the functions required by JTAC to assure that the time, effort, and cost of any additional application development work needed to meet the Court's functional requirements were reasonable and acceptable. Tyler began conducting interviews with Indiana users on local courts' and clerks' business processes and programmed Odyssey with many Indiana-specific codes. In mid-May, 2007, Odyssey as so modified was tested by Monroe County personnel in Bloomington. The results were successful and the Court authorized JTAC to negotiate and execute a definitive agreement with JTAC to license and install Odyssey as Indiana's statewide CMS. This contract, valued at \$15.9 million (including license fees, initial implementation, installation, testing, and training costs, estimated optional development services, and four years of maintenance and support services),<sup>2</sup> was signed with Tyler effective June 1, 2007.

**(d) Installation of Odyssey Case Management System in Pilot Courts**

The pilot courts for Odyssey implementation were the Circuit Courts of Monroe County and the Marion County Washington Township Small Claims Court. The Circuit Courts of Monroe County handle all of the judicial work in Monroe County, some 37,700 case filings per year. The Washington Township Small Claims Court handles 5,800 filings per year of only small claims cases. The court is one of a network of nine such specialized courts in Marion County that handle in the aggregate approximately 75,000 small claims filings per year. Together, these pilots comprised courts that well represented a multi-court system with jurisdiction over all case types and a single specialized court with jurisdiction over small claims cases (the state's second most frequently occurring case type).

Work in the pilot counties proceeded with gratifying speed. Less than six months after the definitive contract with Tyler was signed, Odyssey was up and running in the pilot courts:

- At the close of business on Wednesday, December 12, 2007, the Washington Township Court turned off its old CMS; on December 13, the old system's data was converted to Odyssey; and on December 14, the Washington Township Court began using Odyssey as its CMS.
- At the close of business on Friday, December 14, 2007, the Monroe County courts turned off their old CMS; over the weekend, the old system's data was converted to Odyssey; and on December 17, the Monroe County courts began using Odyssey as its CMS.
- Also on December 17, JTAC established a free public-access link to the case

---

<sup>2</sup> Payments to Tyler for January 1, 2007, through June 30, 2010, have totaled \$14,388,856. This includes payments for development of a "Supervision Module," to be discussed below, that was not part of the original \$15.9 million estimate. Payments to Tyler for the Supervision Module are expected to total \$1.1 million.

records in those courts.

This was a remarkable achievement for the entire JTAC staff led by Mary DePrez. Among the particular leaders of the Odyssey project were Donna Edgar, Mary Wilson, and Andy Cain. They were assisted by literally dozens of other men and women, some JTAC employees and some contract employees, including a full complement of Tyler's staff who spent much of the month of December away from their families getting Odyssey installed in Bloomington and Washington Township.

Turning on Odyssey in the nine courts in Monroe County and Washington Township was an extremely complicated undertaking. There are hundreds if not thousands of different types of transactions that a court case management system must be able to handle. And until JTAC actually turned the new system on, JTAC didn't know for sure whether the system was set up or "configured" to handle each of these transactions properly.

Adding to the complexity of the undertaking was the fact that, as noted above, JTAC converted the electronic data from Monroe County's and Washington Township's old case management systems into Odyssey. Some of the data on cases in the old system was not where it should have been (or where we thought it should have been) and this caused a number of difficulties. As such, one of the principal lessons learned from installing Odyssey in the CMS Project's two pilot counties was the importance of timely and accurate conversion of data from a court's prior CMS. Prior to deployment in the pilot courts, JTAC had planned to ask individual courts to bear the responsibility of converting their data to the new system. The difficulty and complexity of data conversion in the pilot courts caused JTAC to conclude that the proper operation of the new system and the integrity of its database required that JTAC assume the responsibility for conversion. This additional responsibility meant that the project require more resources be devoted to data conversion than originally anticipated.

Adding further to the complexity of the undertaking was the fact that the new system would be running over the Internet, with the main computer hardware not in Monroe County at all but in the data center of the Indiana Office of Technology (IOT) in Indianapolis. This created some problems as every keystroke entered into a PC in Bloomington needed to be carried over the Internet to Indianapolis, negotiate the firewalls and other security that IOT maintains to keep the State Data Center secure, and then recorded and stored in the bank of computers here.

Despite these start-up issues, the personnel in both Bloomington and Washington Township could not have been better partners. Much of implementation was extremely hard and disrupted their day-to-day routines in many respects. Courts and court users throughout Indiana will owe them a debt of gratitude for many years to come. As a small token of JTAC's appreciation for the extraordinary efforts of the people in the Monroe County Courthouse, JTAC placed an image of the historic Monroe County Courthouse alongside Indiana's State House on the Odyssey home page, visually conveying the debt of gratitude we owe our friends in Bloomington to all future Odyssey users.

**(e) Odyssey Deployments.**

As of September 30, 2010, Odyssey has been deployed and is being used in the following 66 courts in 22 counties which comprise approximately 27-1/2% of the state's caseload (based on 2009 filings):

<b>ODDYSEY DEPLOYMENTS THROUGH 30-SEPT-10</b>						
<b>Go Live Date</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Court(s)</b>	<b>No. of Courts</b>	<b>No. of Users</b>	<b>New Filings (2009)</b>	<b>Pct. Of All Filings</b>
14-Dec-2007	Marion	Washington Twp Sm Cl	1	6	5,887	0.30%
17-Dec-2007	Monroe	Circuit (9)	9	196	37,109	1.90%
26-Aug-2008	Warren	Circuit	1	11	1,861	0.10%
22-Sep-2008	Tipton	Circuit	1	14	2,164	0.11%
29-Sep-2008	Marion	Center Twp Small Cl	1	11	13,637	0.70%
1-Dec-2008	Marion	Franklin Twp Sm Cl	1	6	5,231	0.27%
8-Dec-2008	DeKalb	Circuit & Superior (2)	3	43	6,002	0.31%
2-Feb-2009	Marion	Superior (Traffic & Infrac)	1	53	207,779	10.62%
17-Feb-2009	Floyd	Circuit & Superior (3)	4	66	23,215	1.19%
13-Apr-2009	Johnson	Greenwood City Court	1	13	9,432	0.48%
1-Jun-2009	Parke	Circuit	1	16	3,804	0.19%
15-Jun-2009	Allen	New Haven City Court	1	9	11,280	0.58%
6-Jul-2009	Washington	Circuit & Superior	2	27	4,811	0.25%
3-Aug-2009	Owen	Circuit	1	26	4,888	0.25%
3-Aug-2009	St. Joseph	Superior (4) (Traffic & Infrac)	4	39	17,981	0.92%
22-Sep-2009	Hamilton	Circuit & Superior (6)	7	235	39,605	2.02%
13-Oct-2009	Marion	Wayne Twp Sm Cl	1	7	7,018	0.36%
23-Nov-2009	Hamilton	Carmel City	1	8	10,698	0.55%
1-Dec-2009	Rush	Circuit & Superior	2	20	5,779	0.30%
14-Dec-2009	Harrison	Circuit & Superior	2	35	6,994	0.36%
4-Jan-2010	Blackford	Circuit & Superior	2	15	2,514	0.13%
4-Jan-2010	Huntington	Circuit & Superior	2	36	6,743	0.34%
19-Jan-2010	Madison	Alexandria City Court	1	4	1,211	0.06%
1-Mar-2010	Benton	Circuit	1	14	2,071	0.11%
5-Apr-2010	Carroll	Circuit & Superior	2	19	3,380	0.17%
13-Apr-2010	Marion	Warren Twp Small Cl	1	12	7,002	0.36%
24-May-2010	Huntington	Roanoke Town Court	1	3	3,484	0.18%
21-Jun-2010	Clark	Circuit & Superior (3)	4	86	40,921	2.09%
16-Aug-2010	Posey	Circuit & Superior	2	25	4,042	0.21%
24-Aug-2010	Marion	Lawrence Township	1	8	7,145	0.37%
7-Sep-2010	Allen	Circuit & Superior 4, 5 & 6	4	52	32,275	1.65%
		<b>Odyssey Courts</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>1,115</b>	<b>535,963</b>	<b>27.39%</b>
		<b>State Total</b>	<b>401</b>		<b>1,956,749</b>	<b>100%</b>

At October 1, 2010, Odyssey deployment was underway in the following courts:

County	Court(s)	No. of Courts	No. of Users	New Filings (2009)	Pct. Of All Filings
Allen	Superior (6)	6	286	47,530	2.43%
Greene	Circuit & Superior	2	28	7,639	0.39%
Hancock	Circuit & Superior (2)	3	43	18,164	0.93%
Jackson	Circuit & Superior (2)	3	28	17,371	0.89%
Jasper	Circuit & Superior	2	45	7,739	0.40%
La Porte	Circuit & Superior (4)	5	89	33,225	1.70%
Madison	Circuit & Superior (5)	6	129	17,410	0.89%
Marion	Decatur Township Small Claims	1	8	8,743	0.45%
Scott	Circuit & Superior	2	28	6,167	0.32%
Shelby	Circuit & Superior (2)	3	21	11,681	0.60%
Steuben	Circuit & Superior	2	28	5,331	0.27%
	<b>Odyssey Pipeline</b>				
	<b>State Total</b>	<b>401</b>		<b>1,956,749</b>	<b>100%</b>

**(f) Deployment Issues and Challenges.**

The tables set forth above show that deployment takes place on a location-by-location basis with an average of about two courts per month “going live.” Each deployment requires a team of JTAC employees and contractors who work with the court and clerk employees to address the following issues and challenges:

1. Business Practices, Configuration, and Modification. Courts and clerks in Indiana are highly decentralized, with many unique business practices. While subject to various statutes, State Board of Accounts directives, and Supreme Court rules, courts and clerks in Indiana enjoy a high degree of autonomy and there is very little oversight. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that business practices of courts or clerks vary from court to court and clerk’s office to clerk’s office. The Supreme Court requires that Odyssey comply in all respects with statutes, regulations, and rules promulgated by the Legislature, Board of Accounts, and Supreme Court. If the JTAC deployment team discovers a court’s or clerk’s business practice that is not in accord with state statute, regulation, or rule (this is never deliberate; it is almost always a matter of unawareness of an applicable regulation or rule or of a change in the law), steps are taken to achieve compliance.

Beyond assuring compliance with such requirements, however, the decentralized nature of our court system also means that there are many business practices that vary from court to court and clerk’s office to clerk’s office that do not conflict with applicable law or regulation. Odyssey is an extremely flexible computer system; the technical people refer to this as it being “highly configurable.” Our JTAC deployment team needs to “configure” the system for each court. The bigger the court system, the more configuration required.

Beyond configuration, however, the decentralized nature of our court system almost inevitably means that there will be some business practices in a particular court or county that JTAC and Tyler did not anticipate when designing Odyssey. Sometimes the JTAC staff is able

to work with the clerk and the judges to modify the local practice to conform to Odyssey. Sometimes a local practice is such an essential part of the local legal culture that Odyssey needs to be modified. Because of Indiana's decentralized and autonomous court system in Indiana, installing a "uniform" case management system means that each deployment presents a unique set of issues that need to be worked through so that when Odyssey is turned on, it accommodates the needs of its local users.

2. Data Conversion. Conversion of the case data from a court's old or "legacy" case management system into Odyssey is no small matter. A principal feature of the Odyssey system – indeed, the one that causes it to be a truly statewide system, one in which each court using the system is connected with each other such court – is that all of the records on all of the cases from all of the courts is maintained in a central database to which all users, clerks, courts, and the public, are connected over the Internet. Said more succinctly, a uniform system is only as good as the quality of the data stored in it and only a uniform statewide system assures that quality.

Unfortunately, a surprising amount of the case data stored in legacy case management systems is inaccurate. This is in part a result of the legacy systems' permitting users to enter data without checks or controls. For example, in the course of deploying Odyssey in one county, we found that for several years the staff had been posting court costs and fines in criminal cases against the prosecutor in the case management system, rather than against the defendant. Since Odyssey is configured so that it doesn't permit costs and fines to be charged against the prosecutor, this data could not be converted without each one of these cases being corrected.

For data conversion to be done right, inaccuracies in legacy data must be "cleaned up" before that data is loaded into Odyssey. And where a county has had more than one case management system in the past, data conversion becomes even more challenging.

The Odyssey deployment team works with each court and clerk to determine the extent to which legacy data needs to be converted. In certain courts, no data conversion has been required, usually because either (1) the court had no legacy CMS at all and so there was no data to convert or (2) the court was willing to forgo data conversion in return for having Odyssey installed more quickly. Of the 66 courts in which Odyssey has been deployed (as of September 30, 2010), 20 of the courts (including the Marion County traffic court) did not require data conversion, as illustrated by the following table:

	No. of Courts	No. of Users	New Filings (2009)	Pct. Of Filings in Odyssey Courts
Conversion courts:	45	251	253,338	47.27%
Non-conversion courts:				
<i>Marion Superior (Traffic &amp; Infractions)</i>	1	53	207,779	38.77%
<i>All other</i>	20	811	74,846	13.96%
Subtotal non-conversion courts:	21	864	282,625	52.73%
Total Odyssey Courts:	66	1,115	535,963	100.00%

Sometimes the quality of the legacy data is such that it simply cannot be converted in the Odyssey data base. So that the courts and clerk's office will continue to have access to this data, JTAC has constructed a "Data Repository" where unconverted legacy data is stored. Authorized users can search both the Odyssey central data repository and the Data Warehouse in a single search when seeking historical case data. (This functionality also serves to comply with the Legislature's mandate that JTAC develop a standard protocol for the exchange of information between county court case management systems and Odyssey as further discussed in Part B-5 below.)

3. Continuing Operations. Courts and clerks can't put their day-to-day business on hold during Odyssey deployment. Often times, a major trial, an election, or some other event requiring extra time and attention in a courthouse will affect the speed at which deployment can take place. Time for training is a major challenge. The JTAC deployment team needs time with local clerk and court staff – and judges – to train them on the use of Odyssey. This is particularly important when it comes to training clerk personnel on Odyssey's financial management features. Odyssey operates at a much higher level of financial sophistication than existing book-keeping systems and this requires extensive training of clerk personnel to get them up to speed on the new, higher level system.

The issues and challenges set forth above exist to some extent in every deployment and explain why each deployment takes a measureable period of time to complete. Increased resources – in the form of additional deployment teams – is the only way to increase the pace of deployment.

#### **(g) Odyssey Enhancements**

While Odyssey deployment has been occurring, Tyler has made additional improvements or "enhancements" to the CMS at JTAC's request to improve its functionality for Indiana users. Major enhancements of this nature were installed with new releases of the software in mid-March, 2008, June and November, 2009 and April, 2010. One notable new feature – additional tools to assist the county court clerk to calculate accrued interest on judgments in civil cases – was rushed through in 2008 to meet Monroe County's needs. Other new features for Indiana include 1099 reporting to the Internal Revenue Service, automating traffic case events, and additional information available on Odyssey Public Access.

One of the advantages of having a contract with Tyler, which has contracts with not only Minnesota but many other state and major metropolitan court systems, is that any changes to Odyssey that Tyler makes at the request of any of its other customers are available to Indiana for free. (Of course, the changes that Tyler makes at our request become available to its other customers for free as well.) Periodically, Tyler issues a new "release" which JTAC has the option to accept.

In August, 2008, JTAC entered into a major amendment to its contract with Tyler. Valued at \$1.1 million, the amendment specified that Tyler would add additional features to Odyssey primarily for the benefit of probation officers and other court employees who perform extensive supervision of individuals under the jurisdiction of the court. These additional features are

called the "Supervision Module" and have been installed in Harrison, Warren, and DeKalb counties for use by their probation departments as pilot sites. Once the pilot testing is complete, JTAC will install the Supervision Module in all courts already using Odyssey that have probation departments and in conjunction with Odyssey in new Odyssey deployments.

One of the contemporary trends in America is for courts to perform much more intensive supervision over persons under the jurisdiction of the courts, be it through adult or juvenile probation or through so-called "problem solving courts" like drug courts, mental health courts, and re-entry courts. We believe that the Supervision Module will give courts in our state the ability to perform these functions at the highest possible level.

**PART B-2.**  
**UNIFORM STATEWIDE CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM —**  
**INcite (CRITICAL INTERFACES BETWEEN COURTS, LAW ENFORCEMENT,**  
**AND STATE AGENCIES)**

In 2005, the need for transmitting court information electronically to and from law enforcement, state agencies, and others who needed it was without question greater than ever. Yet for all practical purposes, because of the collapse of JTAC's relationship with CA, little progress had been made toward this goal. Recognizing that it would be years before the statewide CMS could be fully implemented, JTAC began work immediately establishing connections or "interfaces" to transmit and receive critical information to and from courts, law enforcement, and state agencies.

To transmit and receive critical information to and from courts, law enforcement, and state agencies, JTAC developed "INcite" (Indiana Court Information Technology Extranet) to serve as a single environment for hosting all of the web-based applications that JTAC currently provides or will provide in the future. Just as with Odyssey, INcite, as a centralized, web-based software, has many advantages over standalone software.

INcite is an "extranet," a website that an organization uses to exchange information with an external, often geographically disconnected group of users. INcite is a website that permits county- and city-level court and justice-related offices to share information with each other and with state-level offices. INcite employs security features such as data encryption and authentication to ensure only authorized users can see and use data. Court users must be given access to the system by JTAC, and they may only access job-appropriate information. For example, a court staff person who has access to INcite to file data electronically with the Bureau of Motor Vehicles does not automatically have access to file marriage license data. In situations where the same personnel need to complete multiple tasks through INcite, permission can be granted to access different applications.

Here are the principal ways in which INcite is being used to transmit and receive critical information between courts, law enforcement, and state and local agencies.



**(a) Bureau of Motor Vehicles (BMV) SR-16 Project**

JTAC and the Indiana Bureau of Motor Vehicles (BMV) are working together to help Indiana's trial courts and clerks meet federal rules requiring faster reporting of serious traffic violations by commercial drivers. The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act requires that these major offenses be reported within 10 days.

Before this project began, an average of more than 53 days elapsed between the time a court disposed of a traffic case and the time the disposition was entered into the BMV computer system. Today, as a direct result of the JTAC-BMV project, the average time has dropped to 8 days. If Indiana had not met the new reporting requirements, the state could have lost \$34 million a year in federal highway funds.

Phase I of this project was funded in part with a \$1 million grant from the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA). The grant was awarded to JTAC to create a system that allowed for the electronic transmission of infraction UTT (Uniform Traffic Ticket) information to the BMV. These reports may involve a conviction, judgment, or reasons for a license suspension. More than \$600,000 of the grant funds was distributed to courts and clerks in 70 of Indiana's 92 counties for upgrades to existing case management systems, training, new computers, copiers and fax machines.

Before implementation of this system, most reports (using a form called an SR-16) were sent to the BMV by mail. More than 10,000 paper forms were received by the BMV each week, requiring 20 full-time employees to enter the data into the BMV computer system. Since JTAC created INcite, processing time for SR16s has been cut by two thirds, and the number of courts sending information electronically increased from 30 when the project first began to 201 today—a 670 percent increase!

For Phase II of the project, JTAC was awarded additional grant funds from FMCSA to continue efforts to allow for even more electronic reporting, increasing efficiency and enhancing the safety of our highways by identifying dangerous drivers. The new work focuses on allowing courts to transmit more serious traffic violations in real time and to submit electronically the Affidavit for Probable Cause and the Order of Conditional Probation (form SR-17). This will ensure that appropriate driving privileges, suspensions, disqualifications and convictions will be posted on driver records in a timely manner as mandated by state and federal law.

Since JTAC began the BMV project, more than 2,207,000 SR-16s have been sent electronically from courts through INcite to the BMV from every county in Indiana. Courts are now sending more than 15,000 electronic SR-16s a week.

JTAC has built an interface between Odyssey and INcite, insuring that the BMV receives proper notice and saving additional data entry steps. When an Odyssey user disposes a charge on a traffic case, or specifically requests an SR16, Odyssey has been programmed to automatically forward the necessary SR16 data. An Odyssey user only needs to update the case within Odyssey, and the conviction or suspension data flows automatically from Odyssey through INcite to the BMV and onto the Driver Record the same day.

**(b) Protective Order Registry Project**

JTAC, together with the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute and Indiana State Police, received two federal grants to create and implement a statewide Protection Order Registry (POR) which makes judicial orders available to local, state, and national law enforcement agencies within minutes, all at no cost to counties.

In 2007, at least 75 Hoosiers died as the result of domestic violence and more than 8,000 adults and children went to an emergency shelter because it was not safe to stay at home. Protection Orders are a significant tool to help protect victims of domestic violence and their families, but court orders are ineffective unless the information reaches local and state law enforcement officers who need to enforce them.

The Indiana Protection Order Registry links Indiana courts issuing Protection and No-Contact Orders to the State Police's Indiana Data and Communication System (IDACS) and the FBI's National Crime Information Center (NCIC). Because orders are entered and available immediately, the POR accelerates information-sharing by providing complete records in a timely fashion; ensures data accuracy and consistency; enhances state and national databanks; increases protection across state lines as well as within Indiana; and reduces administrative work by local officers who currently re-type order into IDACS.

The POR works in the following way. When protective orders are issued, two things happen immediately. First, the protective order is entered into the system and electronically shared with IDACS and NCIC within minutes. Second, a notification of the protective order is faxed or emailed to local law enforcement agencies where the parties live and work. This ensures that all appropriate law enforcement agencies are immediately notified when a Protection or No-Contact Order is issued, modified, or revoked.

All 92 counties are currently using the system. During 2009, over 100,000 protective and no-contact orders were entered in the Registry. There is no doubt that lives have been saved or at least serious injuries have been prevented by getting these orders in the hands of police so much faster than in the past.

On July 1, 2009, JTAC implemented enhanced functionality for the Registry to include access for victim advocates. Advocates have been given the ability to enter the necessary information into the Registry to create a request for a petition for a protective order. Called 'Advocate Access,' advocates can assist victims of domestic violence to complete the necessary paperwork in the privacy and security of a shelter. There are more than 289 advocates utilizing Advocate Access and more than 2600 petitions have been created since the project began.

**(c) Electronic Citation and Warning System (eCWS) Project**

JTAC, the BMV, Indiana Criminal Justice Institute, Indiana State Police, Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Indiana State Excise Police, and local law enforcement agencies have worked together to give law enforcement officers statewide the ability to produce tickets electronically at the time of a traffic stop. Data can be transmitted electronically to appropriate law enforcement, courts, and state and federal agencies. This Electronic Citation and Warning System (eCWS) will also transfer the required data fields to a probable cause affidavit form for officers to complete in cases of serious criminal violations.

More than 700,000 traffic citations are issued in Indiana every year. Now that eCWS is in production, law enforcement agencies using the system can electronically print tickets at the time of a traffic stop. Other officers are still hand writing citations and the forms used vary from county to county. eCWS lets officers electronically record citation information in the field, eliminating the need for redundant manual data entry, drastically reducing administrative work, and increasing the safety of Hoosier roadways by quickly identifying dangerous drivers and reducing the time needed for a traffic stop.

Here is how eCWS works. Using a hand-held or laptop computer, officers use a scanner to read the driver's license and vehicle registration. A new citation is then generated in the eCWS system with the driver's information automatically entered. The officer records appropriate offenses and court information and then prints a paper ticket for the offender.

In cooperation with the U.S. Department of Transportation, eCWS produces a Uniform Traffic Ticket (UTT) that identifies Commercial Drivers. The electronic information recorded by the officer will be transmitted to courts and the Bureau of Motor Vehicles in later phases of this project. The citation and warning information will also be available to the appropriate judicial and law enforcement officials so the most up-to-date data is available. Because officers in multiple jurisdictions have access to more timely data, an officer will be able to determine that a warning is not appropriate because the same driver has recently received a warning in another jurisdiction.

The eCWS initiative is an addition to and the 'next step' in the JTAC-BMV project, which allows courts and clerks to transmit serious infractions by a commercial driver to the BMV electronically instead of by mail or fax.

Among the benefits of eCWS are that it eliminates handwritten tickets and the need to enter the same information into a separate database(s); enhances safety of Hoosier streets and highways by identifying dangerous drivers quickly; eliminates duplicate data entry by law enforcement, courts, clerks, ISP and BMV; increases accuracy of information—data fields pre-populated from license and registration; reduces errors because data is not retyped multiple times; gives officers more time to patrol by reducing paperwork; saves clerical time for clerks, courts and agencies because data is transferred electronically; and improves timeliness by making data available electronically

Indiana State Police officers have been using this system since January of 2008 and have

issued over 2 million tickets and warnings. Over 173 other police departments around the state are now using eCWS, pushing the total number of electronic tickets and warnings issued above the 2.5 million mark. There over 6,300 users of the Desktop, Mobile Handheld, and Central Repository applications of eCWS.

The bigger picture here is that traffic infractions used to require data entry over and over again at each stage of the process -- the issuing officer writing the ticket out by hand; information from the issuing officer's copy being entered at the prosecutor's office; information from the prosecutor's charge sheet being entered by a court clerk; the SR 16 being filled out by court staff following disposition; and then the SR 16 information being keypunched by the BMV. eCWS creates an almost fool-proof electronic record at the very start of the process which, assuming appropriate technology along the rest of the way, means that the record never has to be entered by hand at all!

To date, where the appropriate technology has been installed, over 217,460 traffic cases have been entered into the Odyssey CMS without any of the data having to be retyped in the prosecutor's office or the county clerk's office.

In addition to filing over 217,460 tickets into Odyssey, the Supreme Court's statewide case management system, JTAC has worked with third party law enforcement, court, and prosecutor vendors as it relates to their record management systems to share ticket data that is located in the eCWS Central Repository - the data repository that stores all electronic tickets and warnings written using eCWS software. JTAC has either completed or is working to complete an interface with the following third party vendors::

1. eCWS to 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Case Management System:
  - Keystone – Completed interface and there are ten Keystone courts now receiving ticket data from the eCWS Central Repository. There have been over 31, 200 tickets records sent to these courts.
  - Courtview/Lake County – Completed interface and over 41,000 ticket records have been sent Lake County Courts.
  - Courtview/Tippecanoe County – Working with vendor to complete interface.
2. eCWS to Prosecuting Attorney System:
  - Proslink – Completed first Phase and over 4,000 tickets records have been sent White, Sullivan, Adams, Fayette and Orange Counties.
3. eCWS to / from law enforcement record management system:
  - Z-Client – Completed interface between eCWS and Marion County's e-ticket system. There have been over 6,000 infraction and ordinance violations sent to the eCWS Central Repository and then e-filed to Odyssey.
  - OSSI – Coding has begun on OSSI's side. They have sent test files for JTAC's review.
  - Spillman – Finishing console application documentation to assist with their development efforts.

- Cisco Public Safety - Working with this vendor to complete interface
- CODY/DNR – Working with vendor to complete interface.

JTAC has completed a new version of the eCWS program that incorporates many enhancements suggested by law enforcement agencies that used the system. Enhancements include, but are not limited to:

- Easy to toggle Day Time / Night Time modes for officer safety
- Automatic synchronization of all tickets on a device
- Officers can set up multiple Easy Templates
- Local Ordinances Tables have been instituted
- Officers can perform text search for all violations types (IC Codes, Federal Codes, Local Ordinances)
- More than 4 violations can be written on same UTT
- Vehicle information can be auto-populated from previously written tickets
- Auto selection of Offense type (Complaint and Summons versus Information and Summons) based on violation selected by the officer
- GIS mapping system to capture exact location of where violations occur

JTAC continues to deploy eCWS to new law enforcement agencies that are interested in using the system. As of September 30, 2010, 26 new agencies are in the planning stage and JTAC continues to receive requests from additional agencies that are interested in receiving information regarding this initiative.

#### **(d) Tax Warrant Project**

JTAC and the State Department of Revenue (DOR) have collaborated to create a Tax Warrant interface that allows Clerks of Court to process tax warrants electronically, reducing manual data entry, making public records easily searchable, and providing accurate records in a more timely manner.

Almost one third of Indiana counties were processing tax warrants manually when this project started. That process begins when the DOR mails tax warrants to Clerks who hand write the information in a Judgment Book and mail back filing information to the DOR. The DOR also sends the Clerk a check for \$3.00 for each tax warrant filed. When the tax is paid, a Satisfaction of Lien is mailed to the Clerk who then has to look up the old tax warrant in the Judgment Book and record the Satisfaction.

Here's how the electronic tax warrant system works. Using the e-Tax Warrant application, the DOR provides an electronic file with tax warrants to be processed by Circuit Court Clerks. INcite picks up the file and creates an electronic Judgment Book record of the filing. The filing information is then sent back to the DOR electronically so staff there can send the \$3 per filing payment to the Clerks. This is much faster and Clerks can easily reconcile payments with outstanding filings. When the taxes are received by DOR, the satisfaction is electronically recorded against the original judgment.

For counties using Odyssey, the tax warrant case number, judgment and disposition is also recorded in Odyssey. As tax warrants are satisfied, the satisfactions are also sent to Odyssey.

The benefits of e-Tax Warrants include eliminating manual data entry, saving significant time for Clerks; timely filing and elimination of "snail mail," saving both time and money by Clerks and DOR; processing satisfactions immediately upon receipt, making records more accurate and up to date; public access to e-tax warrants made available through INcite; interface with Odyssey eliminates duplicate data entry; interface with Odyssey allows public records searching of data. The e-Tax Warrant application is provided to counties free of charge.

Forty-two counties are already using the e-Tax Warrant System. JTAC has processed 843,679 tax warrants electronically and 410,272 satisfactions since the application went into production in December, 2007.

### **(e) Marriage License Project**

JTAC, the Indiana State Department of Health (ISDH), and the Indiana State Library have automated the process for issuing Marriage Licenses at local Court Clerks' offices. The goal is to collect all the information required just one time and store records electronically so information is easy to retrieve and transmit for state agencies as required by Indiana law. The database is also searchable.

Every year, about 45,000 couples marry in Indiana and each must go to the clerk's office for a license. When the project began, the bride's and groom's names were each handwritten three times in a cumbersome, paper record book. That means names were written 270,000 times a year, equal to one name being written every other minute, every day of the year. That doesn't include the time it took to enter the records into ISDH or ISL databases.

Here's how the Electronic Marriage License System works. The Marriage License E-file System is a web-based application available free of charge through INcite. Clerks use the system to automate and expedite functions previously done by hand. The electronic Marriage License Application captures the information entered by the Clerk, who then prints an application for the couple to sign, attesting to the accuracy of the personal information. A Marriage License form for the officiant to sign upon solemnization is also created. The couple or the officiant simply returns the license after the ceremony, and the clerk electronically records the officiant's information, date, and location of the marriage.

The system gives clerks the ability to print a marriage license directly from the web-based system, eliminating the need to purchase costly paper record books. Clerks can also quickly search for marriage records statewide. When a marriage record is found, the county which originally produced the license may print certified copies without the need to search through stacks of record books.

The Marriage License E-File System ensures current and accurate information will be available to state agencies needing marriage data. JTAC provides system access to ISDH to allow retrieval of information as required by law (e.g., ISDH must have access to applicants' social

security numbers). This eliminates the need for counties to forward paper forms to the ISDH, saving duplicate entry time, postage and mailing costs. It also eliminates the need for duplicate data entry by ISDH.

JTAC is preparing to debut a new, Public Pre-Application website applicants can use before visiting the Clerk's office. They will be able to enter their application information online, at their leisure, which will dramatically reduce their time spent in the Clerk's office. This website will outline the identification requirements and the cost to obtain a marriage license, information which could save some couples an extra trip to the courthouse. Clerks will also benefit because the applicants' information will be available electronically.

In the near future, Marriage License E-File will also offer up-to-date public information to citizens via the Internet. ISDH will add its existing database of marriages since 1993 to the system and it is anticipated the State Library will also provide its electronic marriage data. This will allow JTAC to create a single searchable online database of public marriage data for research purposes.

Sixty-four counties are using this marriage license e-File System and nearly 40,000 marriage licenses have been issued.

#### **(f) Courts Online Reports Project**

The Division of State Court Administration is required by law to collect extensive case statistics and financial data on the activities of Indiana trial courts and compile them in an annual multiple-volume Indiana Judicial Service Report. Examples of data collected each year include: number of cases filed, pending, and closed; method of case disposition; court and probation expenditures; and juvenile and adult probation statistics and demographics.

In addition to reporting these statistics, the Division analyzes new case filings and judicial resources using Weighted Caseload Measurements (WCM). This allows the Division and trial judges to better understand workloads, and is one method used to compare the relative caseloads of one court to another. The WCM is also used to balance the distribution of cases between judges and determine how much assistance courts need to handle heavy caseloads.

To compile and analyze these millions of pieces of data, INCite allows trial courts, small claims courts, detention centers, public defenders and probation departments to submit statistical and financial data electronically. In addition to electronic submission of data, this system provides reports in real time on statistics and performance measures for court staff and the public.

Prior to 2007, all reports and forms—with the exception of the Quarterly Case Status Report (QCSR) — were completed manually by judges, clerks, and other court officers. Electronic versions of the forms could be downloaded from the Division's website and typed, rather than handwritten, but data from the forms is still collected manually. INCite allows courts to submit electronically statistical and financial data for the annual Judicial Service Publication and Indiana Probation Reports.

All courts are mandated to submit their forms through INcite.

**(g) DCS Probation System**

The DCS Probation System was developed to assist Indiana probation officers in complying with requirements of Public Law 146-2008, passed by the Indiana General Assembly and signed into law on March 14, 2008. Required information associated with juvenile placements and services for which the Department of Child Services (DCS) has been ordered to pay must be supplied by Probation Officers to ensure that those services are indeed paid for by DCS, thereby reducing the risk that the county will be billed and deemed liable for payment.

Most counties did not have the technology means necessary to comply with Public Law 146-2008 requirements, especially with an aggressive effective date of January 1, 2009. The system is being implemented in two phases. The first phase, which went live on January 1, 2009 includes IV-E eligibility determination for federal reimbursement of costs associated with juvenile out-of-home placements, such as residential treatment facilities and foster care, payment for services and juvenile placements, and Federal reporting to AFCARS (Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting Systems). Future releases will include advanced features such as notifications regarding cases that have already been submitted.

To date, 308 probation officers in 83 Indiana counties are using the application to submit required information to DCS. The remaining 9 counties submit their data to DCS via their local case management system.

**(h) Mental Health Adjudication (NICS) Application.**

Public Law 110–2009 required JTAC to establish and administer an electronic system for receiving information that relates to certain individuals who may be prohibited from possessing a firearm and transmitting this information to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for inclusion in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS).

In response to this mandate, JTAC developed an INcite application for courts, upon making certain mental health adjudications, to enter the case number, name of the individual to be reported, at least one numeric identifier, and other identifying characteristics. (No medical information is included.) An electronic record of the information is created and transmitted to the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) database. The NICS system then extracts data from the NCIC database. Licensed firearm dealers are required by law to notify NICS when an individual attempts to purchase a firearm. If the individual has been reported to NICS by the Mental Health Adjudication application, the purchase will be denied.

Mental health adjudications reported to NICS cover persons who have been civilly committed (does not include commitments for evaluation or observation); found mentally ill and dangerous or gravely disabled; found guilty but mentally ill; found not responsible by reason of insanity; found incompetent to stand trial; or found not guilty by reason of lack of mental responsibility according to the Uniform Code of Military Justice.



The Bureau of Justice Statistics provided a National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP) grant to JTAC through the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute to develop and implement the Mental Health Adjudication (NICS) Application. It is available to all Indiana courts making mental health adjudications. Since July 1, 2009, the effective date of the statute, 1,842 cases have been reported to NICS.

**(i) Public Defender Information System (PDIS)**

In partnership with the Indiana Public Defender Council, JTAC has designed and developed an INcite application that will be made available to public defenders through the Council. The system interfaces with the Odyssey Case Management System and will eliminate data entry tasks for public defenders and their staff. Several noteworthy features have been incorporated into the system, including:

- Notifications and alerts. Attorneys will be notified of upcoming hearings and alerted in instances in which a client has been rearrested, violates probation conditions, or has open warrants.
- Attorney assignment. The system will support assignment of clients to an attorney in a variety of methods, including automatic, manual, or bulk.
- Calendaring. Scheduling and calendaring functionality will be offered for attorneys, including conflict checking.
- Case and client demographic information. The system will provide access to data maintained in the judicial case management system (Odyssey CMS), as well as enable public defenders to maintain additional information about their clients.
- Forms and reports. Public defenders will be able to generate required or essential forms and reports out-of-the-box, such as caseload reports, statistics in case duration, change in pleas and offers, attorney success rates, etc.
- Witness information tracking. The system will enable public defenders to tracking information on witness, including interview notes and depositions.

The Public Defender offices in Monroe and Floyd Counties will begin piloting the PDIS application beginning in September, 2010. Additional functionality will be added in future releases before the end of the year.

**(j) Risk Assessment System (IRAS)**

In the later part of 2009, JTAC began to work with the Indiana Judicial Center to incorporate the newly developed Risk Assessment System (IRAS) into an INcite application, allowing risk assessments for both juvenile and adult offenders to be completed, tracked, maintained and updated by specialty courts, probation officers and Department of Correction officers. This system will allow courts to track an offender's risk and progress while under supervision. The IRAS will keep all risk assessments that are completed for a given individual and the information for that individual can be shared with others throughout the state who need and use this information for planning, treatment and sentencing purposes. The application will be piloted in Marion County and should be deployed statewide by the end of 2010.

**(k) Future Projects**

As the foregoing descriptions indicate, INcite is an extremely powerful and flexible resource that permits courts, law enforcement, and state agencies to exchange information electronically. JTAC has started to work with the Indiana State Police to provide criminal conviction information from Odyssey electronically. This will help ensure the completeness and accuracy of Criminal History data maintained by the State Police. JTAC is currently discussing using INcite to exchange information between courts and several other state agencies. While there can be no assurance that these projects will materialize, JTAC considers at least some of them to be likely if resources can be identified. (Just for the record, these projects might include Home Detention Data for Judicial Center, disproportionality data for ICJI, commitment and victim information to DOC, Report of Collections for Auditor of State.)

**PART B-3.**  
**FINANCING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE UNIFORM STATEWIDE CASE MAN-  
 AGEMENT SYSTEM**

The deployment of Odyssey has been financed primarily with receipts from the "automated record keeping fee" established by the Legislature in 2002. Certain federal and state grants have provided some funding for Odyssey deployment. On the other hand, development and implementation of INcite applications have been financed primarily by federal and state grants with limited funding from automated record keeping fee receipts.

**(a) Revenue.**

The following table sets forth the revenue received from the proceeds of the automated record keeping fee and state and federal grants for the periods indicated. The amounts are presented on a cash basis.

	<b>Automated Record Keeping Fee Receipts</b>	<b>Federal and State Grants</b>	<b>Total</b>
FY ending 30-JUN-2008	\$ 7,161,761	\$ 1,670,230	\$ 8,831,991
FY ending 30-JUN-2009	\$ 6,869,243	\$ 2,180,097	\$ 9,049,340
FY ending 30-JUN-2010	\$ 6,763,851	\$ 1,570,122	\$ 8,333,972
Average for prior three years	\$ 6,931,618.19	\$ 1,806,816.29	\$ 8,738,434

The following table sets forth in detail the federal and state grants received since 2005. JTAC acknowledges with particular appreciation the Indiana Criminal justice Institute for its assistance and support in this regard.

Project Name	Awarding Agency	Grant Dates	Project Amount			
			Total	Federal	Non-Federal	
Bureau of Motor Vehicles (BMV)	USDOT CD05	6/7/2005-9/30/2006	\$ 1,967,292.00	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ 967,292.00	
	USDOT CD06	10/1/2006-9/30/2007	\$ 879,499.89	\$ 331,721.92	\$ 547,777.97	
	USDOT CD09	4/16/2009-9/30/2011	\$ 450,000.00	\$ 450,000.00	\$ -	
Indiana Courts Online Reporting Protection Order Registry	DOJ-Bureau of Justice	9/1/2007-8/31/2008	\$ 52,040.46	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 2,040.46	
	NCHIP - through ICJI	10/1/2006-9/30/2007	\$ 519,754.04	\$ 259,877.02	\$ 259,877.02	
	VOCA - through ICJI	10/1/2008-3/31/2010	\$ 169,044.00	\$ 135,235.00	\$ 33,809.00	
	VOCA - through ICJI	3/1/2009-5/31/2009	\$ 35,211.00	\$ 28,168.80	\$ 7,042.20	
	Byrne Jag - through ICJI	6/30/2009-3/31/2011	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ -	
	SAVIN - through DOC	not available yet	\$ 75,953.00	\$ 75,953.00	\$ -	
	Byrne Jag CHRIS - through ICJI	4/1/2006-12/31/2007	\$ 668,539.99	\$ 505,100.58	\$ 163,439.41	
	NICS	NCHIP - through ICJI	10/1/2009-9/30/2011	\$ 235,056.78	\$ 188,045.42	\$ 47,011.36
CMS	CIP - Basic Grant	5/1/2008-9/30/2008	\$ 66,667.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 16,667.00	
	CIP - Basic Grant	10/1/2008-9/30/2009	\$ 66,667.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 16,667.00	
	CIP - Basic Grant	10/1/2009-9/30/2010	\$ 66,667.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 16,667.00	
	CIP Data Grant	5/1/2008-9/30/2008	\$ 86,667.00	\$ 60,000.00	\$ 26,667.00	
	CIP Data Grant	10/1/2008-9/30/2009	\$ 106,667.00	\$ 80,000.00	\$ 26,667.00	
	CIP Data Grant	10/1/2009-9/30/2010	\$ 86,667.00	\$ 60,000.00	\$ 26,667.00	
	STAD - CourTools	9/24/2009-9/23/2010	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 40,000.00	\$ -	
	ARRA -Byrne Jag Assistance	8/1/2009-9/30/2011	\$ 494,523.00	\$ 494,523.00	\$ -	
	Public Defender	Public Defender Council	N/A	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ -
		Public Defender Council	N/A	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ -
Public Defender Council - ARRA		MOU -not yet avail.	\$ 400,000.00	\$ 300,000.00	\$ 100,000.00	
E Citation	Section 408 (Year 1) - from ICJI	10/1/2006-9/30/2007	\$ 311,492.00	\$ 311,492.00	\$ -	
	Section 408 (Year 2) - from ICJI	10/1/2007-9/30/2008	\$ 83,807.86	\$ 67,046.29	\$ 16,761.57	
	Section 408 (Year 3) - from ICJI	10/1/2008-9/30/2009	\$ 193,160.50	\$ 154,523.60	\$ 38,636.90	
	Section 408 (Year 3) - from ICJI	10/1/2009-9/30/2010	\$ 135,882.00	\$ 135,882.00	\$ -	
	USDOT CD07 - through BMV	4/30/2007-9/30/2009	\$ 1,391,987.12	\$ 1,382,000.00	\$ 9,987.12	
USDOT CD 08 - through BMV	7/2/2008-12/31/2009	\$ 1,045,974.44	\$ 1,035,987.32	\$ 9,987.12		
USDOT - CD10	4/1/2010-9/30/2011	\$ 212,126.00	\$ 212,126.00	\$ -		
USDOT CDL Improvement	4/16/2009-9/30/2010	\$ 300,000.00	\$ 300,000.00	\$ -		
SaDIP - from ICJI	06/29-2007-12/29/2008	\$ 544,396.01	\$ 408,740.00	\$ 135,656.01		
SaDIP - from ICJI (GIS )	7/14/2009-10/31/2010	\$ 124,877.91	\$ 99,902.33	\$ 24,975.58		
Byrne Jag - CHRIS - from ICJI	4/1/2008-8/31/2008	\$ 122,833.00	\$ 92,126.00	\$ 30,707.00		
US Dept. of Homeland Security - from State Homeland Security	7/23/2007-7/22/2008	\$ 340,078.00	\$ 340,078.00	\$ -		
Risk Assessment Tool & Reporting	ARRA -Byrne Jag Assistance	10/1/2009-9/30/2011	\$ 273,566.65	\$ 273,566.65	\$ -	
	Byrne Jag - through ICJI	10/1/2009-9/30/2011	\$ 15,736.00	\$ 15,736.00	\$ -	
Criminal E Filing	NCHIP - through ICJI	10/1/2008-12/31/2010	\$ 325,000.00	\$ 260,000.00	\$ 65,000.00	
Marriage License Project	State Justice Institute	5/1/2008-7/30/2009	\$ 49,653.87	\$ 49,653.87	\$ -	
Public Defender	Public Defender Council		\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ -	
Benchbook Project	SaDIP -through Indiana State Police	5/1/2008-5/31/2009	\$ 40,279.20	\$ 32,223.36	\$ 8,055.84	
Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA)	USDOT - CD 07 (182)	4/30/2007-9/30/2008	\$ 140,683.65	\$ 140,683.65	\$ -	
	USDOT - CD 08 (182)	8/20/2008-12/31/2009	\$ 106,209.17	\$ 106,209.17	\$ -	
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$ 12,424,659.54</b>	<b>\$ 9,826,600.98</b>	<b>\$ 2,598,058.56</b>	

**(b) Expenditures.**

During the 3-1/2 year period beginning with the selection of the Tyler Technologies as the Odyssey vendor effective January 1, 2007, and ending June 30, 2010, JTAC expenditures on the Odyssey CMS and INCite projects have totaled approximately \$39.5 million, approximately 73% for personal services, 20% for licensing, maintenance, and support contracts with respect to Odyssey, and 3% for datacenter services. Because the two projects are commonly managed, use a common data center, and are closely integrated in other ways, financial information for both projects (including all overhead and administration) is presented together. If required to allocate the \$39.5 million between both projects, JTAC believes attributing approximately \$33.0 million (84%) to the Odyssey project and approximately \$6.9 million (16%) to the INCite project would be appropriate.

<b>JTAC UNIFORM STATEWIDE CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM PROJECT (Odyssey &amp; INcite)</b>				
<b>CUMULATIVE EXPENDITURES FOR 1/1/2008 THRU 6/30/2010</b>				
	<b>1/1/07-6/30/10</b>		<b>1/1/07-6/30/10</b>	
	<b>As</b>		<b>As Allocated</b>	
	<b>Adjusted</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Odyssey</b>	<b>INcite</b>
<b>Personal Services</b>				
<i>Salary, Wages &amp; Fringe Benefits</i>	7,388,530	18.7%	5,985,044	1,403,486
<i>Contractor Salaries</i>				
Tyler	6,656,505	16.9%		
Other	14,602,259	37.0%		
<i>Contractor Salaries Subtotal</i>	21,258,765	53.9%	16,833,963	4,424,802
<b>Total Personal Services</b>	28,647,294	72.6%	22,819,007	5,828,288
<b>Services by Contract</b>				
<i>Contracts for CMS</i>				
License	6,458,340	16.4%	6,458,340	
Maint & Support	1,274,011	3.2%	1,274,011	
<i>Total Contracts for CMS</i>	7,732,351	19.6%	7,732,351	-
<i>Total IOT Billback</i>	1,231,291	3.1%	984,423	246,868
<i>Other Contracts</i>				
Rent	815,623	2.1%		
Lexis Nexis	-			
Software Acq. & Maint. Contracts	271,581	0.7%		
Other Contracts	62,372	0.2%		
<i>Total Other Contracts</i>	1,149,575	2.9%	919,091	230,485
<b>Total Services by Contract</b>	10,113,218	25.6%	9,635,865	477,353
<b>Grants, Distributions, and Subsidies</b>	-			
<b>In-State Travel</b>	170,738	0.4%	136,506	34,232
<b>Other</b>				
<b>Equipment</b>	372,507	0.9%		
<b>Out-of-State Travel</b>	-			
<b>Services Other Than Personal</b>	124,618	0.3%		
<b>Materials and Supplies</b>	41,562	0.1%		
<b>Total Other</b>	538,688	1.4%	430,683	108,005
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	39,469,938	100.0%	33,022,061	6,447,877
<b>Percent</b>			83.7%	16.3%

Total JTAC expenditures for the period January 1, 2007, through June 30, 2010, totaled approximately \$43.2 million. The amounts presented in the table above have been adjusted to a total of \$39.5 million by excluding (1) grants made by JTAC to courts and law enforcement agencies (primarily for equipment), (2) certain costs not related to the Odyssey or INcite projects (Indiana judicial website; statewide contract with LEXIS for all Indiana judges; expenses related to an employee on loan to the federal government for which JTAC is reimbursed).

JTAC expects that the expenditure patterns reflected over the period presented will change significantly in this and the next few years because the period presented included (1) significant development expense and (2) labor-intensive pilot deployments. In addition, essentially all of the licensing fee for Odyssey has been paid. The JTAC expenditure budget and actual expenditures for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2010, and the budget for the fiscal year that began July 1, 2010, is set forth below and reflects those trends.

<b>JTAC UNIFORM STATEWIDE CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (Odyssey &amp; INcite)</b>				
<b>BUDGET AND EXPENDITURE ANALYSIS FOR 7/1/200 THRU 6/30/2011</b>				
		<b>FY Ending 6/30/2010</b>	<b>FY Ending 6/30/2010</b>	<b>FY Ending 6/30/2011</b>
		<b>Budgeted</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Budgeted</b>
		<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>
<b>Personal Services</b>				
	<i>Salary, Wages &amp; Fringe Benefits</i>	4,793,383	3,188,585	3,368,556
	<i>Contractor Salaries</i>			
	Tyler		1,190,424	
	Other	3,331,473	3,189,595	3,168,446
	<b>Contractor Subtotal</b>	<b>3,331,473</b>	<b>4,380,018</b>	<b>3,168,446</b>
	<b>Total Personal Services</b>	<b>8,124,856</b>	<b>7,568,603</b>	<b>6,537,002</b>
<b>Services by Contract</b>				
	<i>Contract Services - Tyler</i>			
	License		-	
	Software Modifications	250,000	1,291,670	250,000
	Maint & Support	1,708,340	590,341	1,259,906
	<b>Total Tyler</b>	<b>1,958,340</b>	<b>1,882,011</b>	<b>1,509,906</b>
	<b>Total IOT Billback</b>	<b>855,521</b>	<b>309,557</b>	<b>699,152</b>
	<i>Other Contracts</i>			
	Rent		244,083	240,000
	Lexis Nexis	127,339	136,500	126,000
	Software Acq. & Maint. Contracts	129,780	26,106	20,250
	Other Contracts	247,422	12,474	19,750
	<b>Total Other Contracts</b>	<b>504,541</b>	<b>419,162</b>	<b>406,000</b>
	<b>Total Services by Contract</b>	<b>3,318,402</b>	<b>2,610,730</b>	<b>2,615,058</b>
	<b>Grants, Distributions, and Subsidies</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>608,349</b>	<b>20,000</b>
	<b>In-State Travel</b>	<b>115,008</b>	<b>63,971</b>	<b>75,000</b>
	<b>Other</b>			
	<b>Equipment</b>	<b>53,000</b>	<b>19,475</b>	<b>53,000</b>
	<b>Out-of-State Travel</b>	<b>3,000</b>	<b>21,396</b>	<b>5,000</b>
	<b>Services Other Than Personal</b>	<b>196,875</b>	<b>33,016</b>	<b>43,000</b>
	<b>Materials and Supplies</b>	<b>11,458</b>	<b>13,183</b>	<b>14,000</b>
	<b>Total Other</b>	<b>264,333</b>	<b>87,070</b>	<b>115,000</b>
	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>11,842,599</b>	<b>10,938,723</b>	<b>9,362,060</b>

**PART B-4.**  
**OTHER TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS.**

**(a) The Indiana Judicial Website**

In mid-2000, the Indiana Supreme Court Division of State Court Administration assigned JTAC staff the duty of developing the Indiana Supreme Court website. Since that time, what was once a small, informative website for the Supreme Court has grown into a comprehensive site for all Indiana appellate courts, their clerk, and their agencies and programs, complete with a growing number of online services. This Indiana Courts website (courts.IN.gov) continues to grow today as JTAC strives to publish new content and services, in a user-friendly environment, including information about Indiana trial courts and circuit court clerks.

Among the features of the website are: Indiana trial court web pages, including local rules for each county and virtual courthouse tours for some counties; appellate opinions and live webcasts of oral arguments before the appellate courts; a comprehensive self-service legal center website and easy-to-use forms packages; several court blogs, bringing serial information to subscribed users via email and RSS feed; and several online databases and web applications delivering information and services to courts, attorneys, and members of the press and public. The site won two web site awards in 2005, including best court website in the nation by the National Center for State

As technology has advanced and the public's desire to interact with government and business online has increased, the court website has grown in size tremendously. JTAC is currently maintaining around 3,000 pages of content and thousands of documents online. As a result, the Supreme Court has approved the migration of the site to the state's content management system, RedDot, managed by the Indiana Office of Technology (IOT). This move will help reduce the growing cost of our website, in part because the system is offered to the Court by IOT at no cost.

**(b) LexisNexis Legal Research Initiative**

The LexisNexis legal research service is offered to all Indiana judicial officers and county clerks at JTAC's expense. LexisNexis is one of the largest online libraries of State and Federal primary law including case law, statutes and administrative/regulatory material. Additionally, the Nexis portion of the program offers access to a collection of domestic and international news sources. As the home of the Shepard's citations service, and with the Michie and Matthew Bender line of treatises, LexisNexis also provides secondary law coverage.

JTAC has been successful in extending the favorable pricing of its contract with LexisNexis to other government entities during its first procurement in 2001. The Court is committed to leverage its buying power whenever possible to benefit other branches of government. JTAC estimates that approximately 300 individuals in the executive and legislative branches are utilizing Lexis via JTAC's favorable pricing. The Court knows of no other state that has a contract inclusive of state and local government and the price is competitive for the number of users we guarantee.



**(c) Jury Pool**

With more than 2,000 jury trials in Indiana each year, a critical part of each trial is gathering an impartial jury as guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. The Court, JTAC, the Indiana Jury Committee, DOR, ISDH, and the BMV have developed a comprehensive repository of potential jurors for Indiana trial courts that now includes more than 99% of eligible jurors.

In the past, potential jurors were called using voter registration lists. Later, the Court mandated that juror names be drawn from a combination of the voter registration list and at least one other list. That process still did not reach all segments of the over-18 population and appeared to create a disincentive for some people to register to vote.

The list is created from a combination of BMV and DOR records which are merged after duplicates were eliminated. JTAC further filters the resulting list by removing individuals identified as deceased or underage for jury service and those who had moved out of state. Finally, the list is validated against U.S. Postal Service address data, which standardizes the form of addresses, adds the county for each address, and flags addresses that may have delivery errors.

The new list is more inclusive of Indiana's citizens, and has decreased the amount of undeliverable mail. Many courts have noticed a considerable increase in the diversity of jury pools.

Starting in 2007, JTAC made the lists available electronically over INcite.

In fall 2006, the Jury Pool project was honored with awards from the American Judicature Society and the American Civil Liberties Union of Indiana. In December, 2009, the Jury Pool project was recognized by the National Center for State Courts with a 2009 G. Thomas Munsterman Award For Jury Innovation.

**(d) Jury Management System**

The Court, JTAC, and the Indiana Jury Committee have developed a web-based Jury Management System (JMS) that is available to all courts at no cost. The JMS is available through INcite. Counties can select jurors randomly, assign panels, manage panels, and manage claims to pay jurors. The system prints labels and reports and exports data for use in other documents. In the future the system will provide a website for citizens to check if they are needed for service via the Internet instead of calling the courthouse.

Counties that do not use the jury management system still have the ability to export securely their Supreme Court approved master jury list or create jury pools from their master list through INcite.

Among the benefits of the JMS are that the system and maintenance is free to all counties; Supreme Court jury lists are automatically imported into the JMS; jury management operations are automated; juror information is easily searchable and updated; the system helps merge juror and trial information into documents; and a public website will permit potential jurors to check trial status.

Fifty Indiana counties currently use the JMS, and additional counties plan to begin using it in 2011.

**(e) Ivy Tech State College Employee Computer Training Program**

JTAC has an agreement with Ivy Tech State College under which Ivy Tech agreed to provide computer training at its 26 different locations for judicial employees. This arrangement was made to assist courts and county clerks to take advantage of technology available to them currently and in the future.

In conjunction with the Bureau of Motor Vehicles/JTAC initiative discussed above, JTAC extended this initiative to all City and Town Court and Clerk staffs. The proceeds of the grant from the federal Department of Transportation paid for this additional training. Since JTAC began this program in late 2001, hundreds of judicial employees from around the state have participated and have provided JTAC with a great deal of positive feedback regarding the value of the program.

**(f) Child Support Calculator**

JTAC has developed and published to the Indiana Courts website a series of child support calculators, allowing users to calculate support by applying the Indiana Child Support Guidelines to their specific circumstances. The Calculator for Parents is designed with extensive instructions and reference links; the Calculator for Practitioners is designed for fast data entry. Both calculators produce forms for use in court and allow calculations to be saved by the user. A new downloadable version of the Calculator for Practitioners will be published in late summer 2010.

The child support calculators have been a popular fixture on the Indiana Courts website since 2004, when Marion County transferred the code for its original child support calculator so JTAC could promote the tool statewide. Marion County's calculator and JTAC's first version of the calculator were developed by eGov Strategies, LLC, based in Indianapolis. In 2009, JTAC had to make changes to the calculators to meet amendments to the Child Support Guidelines effective January 1, 2010. Development was brought in house so these new calculators could be built on the same platform as all JTAC software and in accordance with established development standards and procedures.

According to website statistics, between January 1 and June 30, 2010, Indiana's child support calculator website was visited over 150,000 times. Nearly 75% of visits were from first time visitors.

**PART B-5.**  
**COMPLIANCE WITH MANDATES OF THE 2009 GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

Public Law 110–2009 and Public Law 130–2009 imposed certain mandates on the Supreme Court's Division of State Court Administration relating to JTAC's work. The deadline for compliance with these mandates was December 31, 2009. All of these mandates were complied with by that date.

**(a) Mental Health Adjudication (NICS) Application.**

Public Law 110–2009 required JTAC to establish and administer an electronic system for receiving information that relates to certain individuals who may be prohibited from possessing a firearm and transmitting this information to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for inclusion in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS). In response to this mandate, JTAC developed the Mental Health Adjudication (NICS) Application described in Part B-2 above.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics provided a National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP) grant to JTAC through the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute to develop and implement the Mental Health Adjudication (NICS) Application. It is available to all Indiana courts making mental health adjudications. Since July 1, 2009 the effective date of the statute through the end of August, 2010, 1,842 cases have been reported to NICS.

**(b) Protective Order Registry Protocol.**

Public Law 130–2009 required JTAC to develop a standard protocol for the exchange of information, by not later than December 31, 2009, between JTAC's protective order registry (POR) application (discussed in Part B-3 above) and county court case management systems. The statute also required JTAC to submit information concerning a standard protocol for county case management systems to interface with the protective order registry to each prosecuting attorney and court.

No funding was provided to develop this POR Protocol. JTAC used existing resources to develop a standard protocol for other case management systems (court or prosecutor) to interface with the Protection Order Registry. Work on the POR Protocol was completed prior to December 231, 2009. The POR protocol is available at: <http://courts.IN.gov/jtac/specs/>

**(c) E-ticket Protocol.**

Public Law 130–2009 required JTAC to develop a standard protocol, by not later than December 31, 2009, for, at the option of the county prosecuting attorney, JTAC's Electronic Citation and Warning System (eCWS) (discussed in Part B-3 above) to exchange of information with (1) a prosecuting attorney's case management system; (2) a county court case management system; and (3) Odyssey.

No funding was provided to develop this E-ticket Protocol. JTAC used existing re-

sources to develop a standard protocol for other case management systems (court or prosecutor) to interface with the JTAC Electronic Citation and Warning System (eCWS), subject to the legislation's stipulation that any E-ticket interface in each county be at "the option of the prosecuting attorney." Work on the E-ticket Protocol was completed prior to December 31, 2009. The eCWS protocol is available at: <http://courts.IN.gov/jtac/specs/>

**(d) CMS Protocol.**

Public Law 130-2009 required JTAC to develop a standard protocol for the exchange of information, by not later than December 31, 2009, between county court case management systems and Odyssey.

No funding was provided to develop the CMS Protocol. JTAC used existing resources to develop a standard protocol for other case management systems (court or prosecutor) to interface with Odyssey.

The CMS Protocol is conceptually different from the POR Protocol and the E-ticket Protocol. The purpose of the POR Protocol is to allow case information for protection and no-contact orders created by JTAC's POR Application to be exchanged with court and prosecutor case management systems. The purpose of the E-ticket Protocol is to allow electronic citations created by JTAC's eCWS Application to be filed in court and prosecutor case management systems. However, the purpose of the CMS Protocol is to allow authorized users of Odyssey, other court case management systems, and prosecutor case management systems to view the secure case in each other's case management systems, not to file those cases in each other's systems.

As discussed in Part B-1 above, as of September 30, 2010, Odyssey was managing cases in 66 courts in 22 counties comprising more than 25% of all new cases filed in all courts in the state and deployment is underway in an additional 35 courts. The data on cases in Odyssey is maintained in a central data repository maintained for JTAC by the Indiana Office of Technology (IOT). There are 23 other case management systems currently in operation around the state.

JTAC developed a second data repository (the "Data Repository") to comply with the CMS Protocol mandate and also provide a repository for legacy data not converted when a court installed Odyssey. Any court using any of the 23 other case management systems can be authorized and enabled to transmit its case data to the Data Warehouse either in batch or on a near-real-time basis. The CMS Protocol will permit users of both Odyssey and the other 23 case management systems to search both the Odyssey central data repository and the Data Warehouse in a single search. JTAC will provide court users with a user ID and password to assure proper security.

This functionality has been implemented for authorized users in Hamilton County with respect to legacy data that Hamilton County chose not to convert when Odyssey was installed in that county. JTAC anticipates that the CMS Protocol will be available for release during the first quarter of 2010. The CMS protocol is available at: <http://courts.IN.gov/jtac/specs/>

(e) **Interface Specifications.**

Here is a screen shot of the Internet page containing the links to the POR, e-ticket, and CMS protocols (<http://courts.IN.gov/jtac/specs/>):

**INDIANACOURTS**

Home Information Law Library Education Courts Programs Administration

Home > Supreme Court > State Court Administration > Itac > specs

**JTAC**

JTAC Home  
About  
News  
Initiatives & Programs  
Contact

Indiana Supreme Court  
Division of State Court Administration


Contact Information  
Technical Help  
Indiana Courts Home


**JTAC**

Judicial Technology and Automation Committee  
**Interface Specifications**

**eCWS Interface Specifications**  
Posted November 17, 2009


Pursuant to Public Law 130-2009, the links below are to documentation of the interface protocols for the Electronic Citation and Warning System. For questions please contact JTAC's MIS Director, Andy Cain, at [acain@jtac.in.gov](mailto:acain@jtac.in.gov).

 [Protocol for County Court Case Management Systems](#)

 [Protocol for Prosecuting Attorney Case Management Systems](#)


**POR Interface Specifications**  
Posted December 30, 2009

Pursuant to Public Law 130-2009, the links below are to documentation of the interface protocols for the Protection Order Registry. For questions please contact JTAC's MIS Director, Andy Cain, at [acain@jtac.in.gov](mailto:acain@jtac.in.gov). Read the memo announcing the publication of these specifications.

 [Protocol for Protection Order Registry Interface](#)

**Odyssey CMS Interface Specifications**  
Posted December 31, 2009

Pursuant to Public Law 130-2009, the links below are to documentation of the interface protocols for the Odyssey Case Management System. For questions please contact JTAC's MIS Director, Andy Cain, at [acain@jtac.in.gov](mailto:acain@jtac.in.gov).

 [Protocol for Odyssey CMS Third Party Interface](#)

Last modified on Thursday, January, 07, 2010

Home | welcome | about | contacts | help | policies | text only

Division of State Court Administration

**PART C.**  
**THE COURT'S BUDGET PLAN FOR THIS FUND/CENTER**

The following sections detail the Court's plan, within Fund/Center 6000/186300, to meet the goals and objectives of the Judicial Technology and Automation Project in the 2011-2013 Biennium.

**1. RESOURCES.**

The primary source of funding for implementation of a statewide CMS is the "automated recordkeeping fee" authorized by Ind. Code § 33-37-5-21. This is a fee assessed for filing any case in an Indiana court. The fee is established at \$2 until June 30, 2002; at \$5 from July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003; at \$7 from July 1 2003 through June 30, 2011; and at \$4 thereafter. As detailed at the outset of this Budget Narrative and in the concluding sections of Part B-1 and Part B-2, the Court seeks an increase in the amount of this fee to \$10, effective July 1, 2011. The Court estimates that at the \$10 level, this fee will generate approximately \$9.6 in FY 2012 and \$9.9 in FY 2013. These revenues, when combined with the estimated \$5.5 million balance at June 30, 2011, will create a \$25.0 million available fund balance at the end of the 2011-2013 Biennium. The Court has budgeted \$10,224,448 of this amount in FY 2012 and \$10,163,220 in FY 2013.

**2. EXPENDITURES**

Salary and Wages. The Court anticipates expenditures of approximately \$3,976,015 in FY 2012 and \$4,090,159 in FY 2013 for salary and wages for employees of the project.

Services Other Than Personnel. The Court anticipates expenditures of approximately \$44,000 in FY 2012 and \$45,000 in FY 2013 for non-personnel services for the Project.

Services by Contract. The Court anticipates expenditures of approximately \$6,020,433 in FY 2012 and \$5,842,061 in FY 2013 for contract services for the project. The majority of this money will be paid for contract employees.

Materials and Supplies. The Court anticipates expenditures of approximately \$14,500 in FY 2012 and \$15,000 in FY 2013 for project materials and supplies.

Equipment. The Court anticipates expenditures of approximately \$53,000 in each of FY 2012 and FY 2013 for Project equipment.

Grants, Distributions, and Subsidies. The Court anticipates expenditures of approximately \$20,000 in each of FY 2012 and FY 2013 for grants, distributions, and subsidies. These amounts do not include grants of equipment to local law enforcement agencies for the eCWS project which have been funded through federal grants. JTAC hopes to make similar grants in the 2011-2013 Biennium if such grant funding continues to be available.

In-State Travel. The Court anticipates expenditures of approximately \$91,000 in FY 2012 and \$92,000 in FY 2013 for employees' in-state travel for the project.

Out-of-State Travel. The Court anticipates expenditures of approximately \$5,500 in FY 2012 and \$6,000 FY 2013 for employees' out-of-state travel for the Project.

**PART D.**  
**CONCLUSION**

The primary role of the Indiana Supreme Court Judicial Technology and Automation Committee is to provide leadership and governance regarding the use of technology in the courts in an effort to better serve the people of Indiana. During the 2007-2009 A biennium, the Court's primary technology and automation project achieved a significant milestone when the Odyssey case management system began operating in 10 pilot courts. An aggressive schedule of implementing Odyssey in additional courts is underway during the current fiscal year.

In addition, JTAC developed and implemented a number of critical interfaces permitting the exchange of information between courts, law enforcement, and state agencies. This work, too, continues at an accelerated pace.

Further development and implementation of both the statewide CMS and critical interfaces is contemplated during the 2009-2011 Biennium. For this to continue at the pace that the Court believes necessary and in the best interest of its partners in law enforcement and state agencies, an increase in the dedicated funding source for the Judicial Technology and Automation Project is requested as part of this budget submission.

The Court and JTAC expresses its deep appreciation and admiration to its many partners in county courthouses and state agencies for the remarkable success that has been achieved this Biennium toward the ultimate goal of equipping all Indiana courts with a 21st-century case management system and connecting each court's CMS to each other's and two law-enforcement, state agencies, and others who need and use court information.