



Vermont Judiciary

Next Generation Case Management System

Office of the Court Administrator
Research and Information Services
112 State Street, Floor 5
Montpelier, VT 05609

Next Generation Case Management System Project Manager Statement of Work - Request for Proposal July 9, 2015

1 ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

1.1 RESPONSIBILITY FOR SOW-RFP AND SOW AGREEMENT

Jeff Loewer, Chief Information Officer and Director, Research and Information Services; Office of the Court Administrator, Vermont Judiciary

1.2 SOW AGREEMENT

After an evaluation of your response to this SOW RFP, we may enter into a specific SOW Agreement which will outline all requirements and proposed prices.

1.3 SOW PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS

Submit your proposal by: **Friday, July 31, 2015; 3 pm**

Proposals must be submitted by email to: jeffery.loewer@state.vt.us and copy to sean.thomson@state.vt.us.

Contractor proposal must be fixed price, including hours and hourly rate, for the Project Management role outlined below.

1.4 NON-DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT

Contractors will be required to sign a standard non-disclosure agreement if there is not already one on file.

2 SCOPE OF WORK

2.1 BACKGROUND

The Vermont Judiciary, recognizing that its legacy Case Management System is no longer able to support its current and future organizational objectives and imperatives, has begun a comprehensive program to implement a Next Generation Case Management System. This initiative, which will transform the case management processes of the Judiciary from its current paper-based system to an electronic-focused model, will enable us to better serve the needs of the public through standardized and streamlined business processes and supporting systems.

The Vermont Judiciary is a unified court system, operated by the Supreme Court in accordance with the Vermont Constitution, Ch. II, Section 4, which provides that “the judicial power of the State shall be vested in a unified judicial system...”

This system consists of the Supreme Court, the Superior Court, and the Judicial Bureau.

- The Supreme Court is the court of final appeal in Vermont. The court hears appeals from the Vermont Superior Court and from certain administrative agency proceedings. The five justices of the Supreme Court render decisions in approximately 450 cases per year.
- The Superior Court is the statewide trial court of general jurisdiction. There is a unit of the Superior Court in each county. The Superior Court has five divisions: criminal, family, civil, probate, and environmental. [The environmental division operates statewide and is not organized into county units.] Each unit of the Vermont Superior Court is managed by a Superior Court Clerk appointed by the Court Administrator and a Presiding Judge [chosen from among the Superior Judges] appointed by the Chief Superior Judge. Court Operations Managers in each unit, who report to the Superior Court Clerk, manage court staff. Approximately 45,000 cases are filed each year in the Superior Court.
- The Judicial Bureau has statewide jurisdiction over civil violations. Police and other government officials have authority to charge civil violations, such as traffic violations, municipal ordinance violations, fish and wildlife violations, and various other civil violations set forth in Vermont statutes. The Judicial Bureau processes approximately 80,000 civil violation complaints per year.

Vermont has a centralized Court Administrator’s office. This includes the Planning and Court Services division, Trial Court Operations division, Finance and Administration, and the Research and Information Services (RIS) division, which is responsible for the support of Technology at the Judiciary.

The Judiciary acts as a crucial hub of information for over 20 separate governmental and non-governmental entities, including tightly defined integrations of process and data,

inbound and outbound interfaces of data, regular outputs to information consumers, and ad-hoc information portals.

2.2 CURRENT BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT

The Judiciary's current case management systems are all based on the original text-based Vermont Automated Docketing System (VTADS). VTADS was built by Relational Semantics, and has been maintained and enhanced by the Judiciary's Research & Information Services Division (RIS) since 1990. VTADS has worked well but its decentralized configuration does not allow for viewing data on a statewide basis, does not easily provide court statistics and management reports, and does not fully meet data requests from state agencies and/or the public.

In 2000-2001, the Judiciary implemented a data warehouse to combine data specifically from the District, Family and Superior Courts to support statistic generation, data access, and sharing among the courts and state agencies. A web-based application called Vermont Case Access System (VCAS) allows end-users to search for court case information on a statewide basis. But while the data warehouse has provided improved functionality in some areas, the underlying case management system continues to limit the ability of the Judiciary to move ahead with the necessary flexibility inherent with today's technologies.

In 2009 – 2012, the Judiciary embarked on a project to replace VTADS and implement electronic filing. This project was halted by mutual consent with the vendor over serious concerns about whether project objectives could be achieved within original parameters.

A Next Generation Case Management System will enable our users to more easily accomplish the work of the Judiciary with an architecture that encompasses web and mobile based user interfaces, flexible workflow, comprehensive definition of business rules, and robust security features. The system will feature tight integration with electronic filing and document management, and will specifically target the strategic goals of the Judiciary as follows:

- Improved access to justice for our citizens
- Enabling electronic filing, electronic forms, and document management functionality will ease interaction with the Courts for all participants.
- Greater support for the electronic interchange of information between the courts and external stakeholders will enable greater access to accurate and timely Judicial information.
- Improved inter-agency communication
- The Judiciary, the State of Vermont, and the Federal government all share the goal of improving the timeliness and effectiveness of inter-agency communication through the increased use of standards. Our new CMS will enhance the Judiciary's

role as a hub of information for over 20 separate entities, including tightly defined integrations of process and data, inbound and outbound interfaces of data, regular outputs to information consumers, and ad-hoc information portals. This strengthens the entire justice system through better, faster, accurate communication and tighter data integration.

The Judiciary continues to be under great pressure to become more efficient and to live with fewer resources for its operation. Our current case management system and the processes required to support its operation, including paper-based records, redundant data entry, and multiple disparate data sources, is a hindrance to business process improvement efforts. The 2010 Court restructuring, with its promise to increase management flexibility and operational efficiency, has been hindered and its benefits have not been fully realized due to a lack of enabling technology. This transformation to an electronic-focused business model will allow us the flexibility to utilize available resources to accomplish needed work without the constraints of geography, place and courthouse. Leveraging these technologies with automated case data intake, processing and electronic records storage will free our resources from tedious clerical work by directing filing and initiation tasks appropriately into the hands of the filers.

The Judiciary is at risk for failure of its main record keeping and source of information by continuing with its current case management system that is more than 25 years old. Our most significant risk related to the application would be to simply do nothing. Implementing a single, modern CMS is expected to yield improvements in the usability of the Judiciary systems in virtually every major functional area. Today we live with the legacy of separate case management systems for each and every court, which constantly creates issues for viewing data on a statewide basis and does not easily provide court statistics, management reports or fully meet data requests from state agencies. Reliance on an outdated application with no external support as the backbone of our court operation poses increasing risks to courts and to the public due to the ongoing possibility of system failure, from which the Judiciary may not recover.

2.3 TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

2.3.1 PROJECT APPROACH

- Focus on organizational and business process transformation
 - We have learned from prior efforts that establishing and enacting standard, consistent business processes across the Judiciary is a critical component in the success of our organizational and business process transformation. This transformation, as guided by our 2010 restructuring and by the diligent work of numerous committees, is impeded by our reliance on legacy systems and technology that are unable to adapt and evolve towards needed change.
 - Rather than embarking on the traditional software development process that focuses on building a system through analysis and documentation of as-is processes, to-be processes, and the resulting gap analysis, we need to select a

solution and/or partner for our Next Generation Case Management project that arrives with a proven best-practice catalog of standard business processes and solutions. This best-practice-based buy versus traditional-build approach results not only in upgrading our software and systems functionality but in organizational and business process transformation driven by technology.

- This redirects the focus of the project from rebuilding our current legacy processes to implementing a solution that drives the transformation of the way the Judiciary works. The Judiciary's legacy business processes have grown organically over many years, their complexity a result of decades and centuries of nuances and exceptions, each representing a need or priority at the time it was implemented by rule, statute or by local court custom. There will be, of course, configurations and customizations that need to be made with any delivered solution. However, this approach means we can concentrate our efforts on a limited set of functional gaps that address true strategic differences in the way the Vermont Judiciary works rather than the overwhelming set of functional customizations that would be traditionally addressed.
- This methodology will inevitably drive instances where rules and/or statutes, having been crafted to support our legacy business model, will need to be changed as we evolve and transform. We will seek the support of the Supreme Court and Legislature as we encounter these instances and draft new rules and/or statutes to support our future best-practice business model and ultimately support the strategic goals of the Judiciary and the State of Vermont.
- Rigorous project planning and governance
 - Establishing a solid governance, process and planning structure is essential for successful project execution. This structure includes an identified project steering committee; plans for project communication and change management/risk management; stated commitment from the core and extended project teams; and a detailed project plan. Also included will be documentation of detailed requirements, final evaluation of the viability of buying a solution, and the execution of the procurement process, including a Request for Proposal (RFP) and independent expert review.
 - This independent expert review will utilize the services of a third-party intermediary to assess the project's acquisition cost, technology architecture, implementation plan, and cost analysis. The intermediary will also provide assistance with procurement negotiation.
 - The project will be managed in alignment with the methodology outlined by the Vermont Department of Information and Innovation Enterprise Project Management Office in their Project Process, which is based on Project Management Institute (PMI) definitions.

2.3.2 PROJECT MANAGEMENT

PROJECT MANAGEMENT SERVICES

All proposed SOW Agreements for Project Management Services shall be submitted to the State of Vermont Office of the Attorney General for a determination in accordance with 3 V.S.A. 311(a)(10) that such engagement is not contrary to the spirit and intent of the classification plan and merit system principles and standards provided by Chapter 13 of Title 3 of the Vermont Statutes.

The Contractor shall follow project management methodologies that are consistent with the Project Management Institute's (PMI) *Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK) Guide 5th Edition*. All projects under this Agreement will be managed in alignment with Vermont DII EPMO Standard Project Process (SPP) outlined here:

http://epmo.vermont.gov/project_process.

The Contractor shall produce the minimum required set of project deliverables in accordance with the EPMO SPP, using the corresponding standard EPMO required templates or agreed-upon equivalents. PDF versions of these templates can be previewed here: <http://epmo.vermont.gov/templates>.

The Contractor will produce project deliverables using Microsoft Office products in v2007 or newer (Word, Excel, Project, Visio, etc.), and Adobe PDF, or other mutually acceptable formats that can be utilized by the Judiciary without needing to purchase additional software applications.

2.3.3 DELIVERABLES

SCOPE OF PROJECT WORK

Project Management of Next Generation Case Management System for the Vermont Judiciary for the Phases as outlined below:

❖ **Project Phase: Initiation**

- **Activities/Milestones**
 - Establish Project Management Structure
 - Assign Project Manager
 - Identify Stakeholders - Internal and External
 - Draft Project Charter
 - Identifies scope, deliverables, high level timeline with major milestones, risks, assumptions and constraints, stakeholders, and a high level project approach
 - Acts as agreement between the Project Sponsor, Stakeholders and Project Manager
- **Judiciary Staff**

- CA, CIO, CFO, RIS Application Manager, Dir of Trial Ct Ops
- RIS BA's, Court SME's
- Extended Stakeholders
 - Tech Oversight
 - Supreme Court
- Partners
 - Project Manager
- Timeframes
 - Projected July – August 2015

❖ **Project Phase: Planning**

- Activities/Milestones
 - Develop project governance structure
 - Identify project steering committee
 - Develop project communications structure
 - Develop project change management/risk management plan
 - Identify core project team and extended project team
 - Develop project plan
 - Document detailed requirements
 - Evaluate viability of building a solution vs. buying a solution
 - Include build options in RFP process?
 - Develop and execute RFP/Procurement Process
 - Include independent review if appropriate
 - Kick-off project
- Judiciary Staff
 - CA, CIO, CFO, RIS Application Manager, Dir of Trial Ct Ops
 - Core project team and extended project team
 - RIS BA's, Court SME's
 - Steering committee
 - Extended Stakeholders
 - Tech Oversight
 - Supreme Court
 - Justice Partners
- Partners
 - Project manager
 - Business process and or subject matter expert consultants
 - Selected solution partner (post-RFP)
- Timeframes
 - Projected September 2015 – March 2016

❖ **Project Phase: Execution**

- Activities/Milestones

- Execute project plan
 - Technical track
 - ◆ Validate the detailed requirements
 - ◆ System design, build and/or configuration
 - ◆ System testing
 - ◆ System implementation
 - ◆ Provide hyper-care support
 - Business track
 - ◆ Training
 - ◆ Documentation
 - ◆ Identification and implementation of operational changes
 - ◆ Roll-out planning
 - ◆ Communications
 - ◆ Provide hyper-care support
 - Project Management track
 - ◆ Project meetings
 - ◆ Status reporting
 - ◆ Resources management
 - ◆ managing the Project Plan
 - ◆ Risk and issue management
 - ◆ Change management
 - ◆ Budget management
 - ◆ Project documentation
- Judiciary Staff
 - CA, CIO, CFO, RIS Application Manager, Dir of Trial Ct Ops
 - Core project team and extended project team
 - RIS BA's, Court SME's
 - Steering committee
 - Extended Stakeholders
 - Tech Oversight
 - Supreme Court
 - Justice Partners
- Partners
 - Project manager
 - Selected solution partner
 - Infrastructure partner
- Timeframes
 - Projected June 2016 – June 2019

❖ **Project Phase: Closure**

- Activities/Milestones
 - Final Sign-off /User Acceptance on all Project Deliverables

- AAR/Document Lessons Learned
- Finalize & Archive Project Documents
- Transition from hyper-care to operation support
- Judiciary Staff
 - CA, CIO, CFO, RIS Application Manager, Dir of Trial Ct Ops
 - Core project team and extended project team
 - RIS BA's, Court SME's
 - RIS Applications Team
 - Steering committee
 - Extended Stakeholders
 - Tech Oversight
 - Supreme Court
 - Justice Partners
- Partners
 - Project manager
 - Selected solution partner
 - Infrastructure partner (DII?)
- Timeframes
 - Projected July 2019

SCOPE OF PROJECT MANAGER WORK

- The Project Manager will be directly responsible for the management of all tasks, activities and outcomes related to the Next Generation Case Management System initiative. This includes:
 - a. Development of the Project Charter.
 - b. Development and execution of the RFP/procurement process.
 - c. Development of the project communications structure, project change management and risk management plans.
 - d. Development of a Life Cycle Cost Analysis that outlines the 5 year cost of the project
 - e. Working with the project team and solution partner to build and maintain an effective project plan, in an agreed-upon tool such as Microsoft Project, that includes:
 - i. A detailed schedule
 - ii. A detailed work breakdown structure, including milestones, activities, tasks and resource assignments
 - iii. Identification of task relationships, dependencies and critical paths
 - iv. Resource allocation, both within the Judiciary and with external partners
 - f. Scheduling, agendas, facilitation and minutes for project team meetings (including Kick-off meeting(s))

- The Project Manager will provide weekly written status reports to Judiciary and RIS management.
- The Project Manager will identify and track all project risks and issues and also monitor the project constraints of scope, cost, and schedule.
- The Project Manager will notify the Judiciary, RIS management and/or the project sponsor of any high-level risks or issues that require intervention or specific action be taken beyond what the project team already engaged can accomplish. They will recommend specific corrective actions that can be taken to resolve the issue or risk.
- The Project Manager will track all project deliverables and monitor budget versus actual expenses.
- The Project Manager will provide vendor and contract management activities as required for the project and will maintain the master project plan with coordination and input from solution partners and vendors.

2.3.4 REQUIRED PROJECT POLICIES, GUIDELINES AND METHODOLOGIES

The Contractor shall be required to comply with all applicable laws, regulations, policies, standards and guidelines affecting Vermont Judiciary information technology projects, which may be created or changed periodically. It is the responsibility of the Contractor to insure adherence and to remain abreast of new or revised laws, regulations, policies, standards and guidelines affecting project execution.

2.4 INVOICING and PAYMENT

All work performed by the Contractor must be approved in advance by the Judiciary. Once work has been completed, delivered and accepted by the Judiciary, invoicing can occur. The Judiciary payment terms are net 30 days and payments are processed as an EFT.

2.5 CHANGE ORDERS

As change orders become necessary, they must be authorized by the Judiciary in writing before such work can proceed.

2.6 REFERENCES

Provide the names, addresses, and phone numbers of at least three companies or State Agencies with whom you have transacted similar business in the last 12 months. You must include contact names who can speak knowledgeably about performance and deliverables.

3 SOW PROPOSAL FORMAT

3.1 FORMAT

Email PDF's or Microsoft Word documents to the individuals listed in 1.3 above.

A SOW Proposal shall provide the following:

- 1) Proposed Services – Work Plan
 - i) A breakdown of the Project Management services that will be provided along with the cost of those services. Given the length of this initiative, proposals that are Project Phase-based will be accepted.
- 2) Proposed Personnel
 - i) Identify all personnel by name and skill set who will be working on the project, include resumes
 - ii) Certification that all proposed personnel meet the minimum required qualifications and possess the required certifications to complete the work as required.
- 3) Subcontractors
 - i) Identify all proposed subcontractors and their full roles that may be involved completing the Scope of Work. Note: no work shall be subcontracted without knowledge of and approval by the Vermont Judiciary.
- 4) State Assistance
 - i) Provide an estimate of expectation concerning participation by Judiciary personnel.
 - ii) Provide an estimate of workspace needs, including office space, conference space, and electronic workspace to house all project related materials.
- 5) Confidentiality
 - i) A Contractor should give specific attention to the identification of those portions of its proposal that it considers confidential, proprietary commercial information or trade secrets, and provide justification why such materials, upon request, should not be disclosed by the Judiciary under the State’s Public Records Law . Contractors are advised that, upon request for this information from a third party, the SOW Procurement Officer will be required to make an independent determination regarding whether the information may be disclosed.
- 6) Transmittal Letter
 - i) The Contractor must submit a signed letter acknowledging the terms and conditions of the contract and any special requirements that may be included in a specific statement of work.

REQUIRED PRICE PROPOSAL RESPONSE

All pricing must be inclusive of all expenses and fees. The pricing proposal must include estimated effort hours, hourly rate for proposed personnel, projected timeline, including timing expectations for the Judiciary functional and technical resources and be submitted as a separate document from the rest of the proposal.

EXAMPLE of
PRICE PROPOSAL FORM
(Not inclusive of all requirements defined above)

PRICE PROPOSAL FOR SOW-RFP PROJECT NAME _____

Deliverables	Expected Completion:	Price
Deliverable I	Date	
Deliverable II	Date	
Deliverable III	Date	
Combined Bid	Date	

The Price Proposal form must use the same deliverables as outlined in the Request from the State.

4 PROCEDURE FOR AWARDING A SOW AGREEMENT

4.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA

The responses will be evaluated based on the following:

- Quality of proposal content
- Cost
- Prior experience with management of a Court CMS solution project. Preference will be given to those candidates who have an intimate knowledge of the CMS business requirements and technical architecture for the Vermont Judiciary.
- Timeline for completion of work to be performed

The Contractor choice will be made in the best interest of the State Government.

4.2 COMMENCEMENT OF WORK UNDER A SOW AGREEMENT

Commencement of work as a result of the SOW-RFP process shall be initiated only upon issuance of a fully executed SOW Agreement and Purchase Order.

4.3 Contracting

In no event shall any SOW Agreement or any document proposed by the Contractor (a) require indemnification by the Judiciary of the Contractor; (b) waive the Judiciary's right to a jury trial; (c) establish jurisdiction in any venue other than the Superior Court of the State of Vermont, Washington County Unit; (d) constitute an implied or deemed waiver of the immunities, defenses, rights or actions arising out of State's sovereign status or under the Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution; or (e) limit the time within which an action may be brought hereunder. Further, there shall be no limitation of liability, including a waiver of consequential, indirect, special, punitive or exemplary damages, or disclaimers of warranty without approval from the Office of the Attorney General.