**Project Zeno: Business Requirements (Executive Summary)**

CPCS currently maintains three separate “case management” systems for use by staff (i.e., CASEY, TRIS, and CMS). They share a core set of functionalities, mandated by statute and ethical obligation. They also attempt, with varying degrees of success, to address a separate tier of functions aimed at improving staff efficiency and practice, as well as the allocation of resources. The agency’s recent growth and a desire to better leverage our data for the good of our clients has resulted in the addition of functions to this separate tier. Design of the current systems, however, impedes implementation of such expanded functionality.

Due to deficiencies in the current system design and the lack of standard data input practices, the majority of data collected for purposes other than case “counts” (i.e., everything except case numbers and runsheet narratives) is of poor quality, and in their current form they do not seem to be either complete or accurate. The data are inconsistent when considered across multiple offices/working groups (even within the same division), as various groups adhere to differing practices. Additionally, the current system introduces demonstrably unnecessary work and complexity (e.g., duplicate data entry). As a consequence, users have had to adapt their workflows to the system rather than having the system support the best workflows.

Based on the above deficiencies in the current systems, it is necessary to construct a system built on a more robust understanding of our data and user needs. The purpose of this document is to outline the business requirements for such a solution, one that would replace the existing systems with a single, well-designed system capable of ensuring the following:

* Improved efficiency: ensure that users are required to enter data in the system only once, and that they can enter what they need, and that they can easily find the information they require
* Improved data quality: create robust data validation mechanisms that ensure the system can use the data that users enter
* Effective, user-friendly design: ensure that users are able to easily view necessary system information, and navigate seamlessly through the system
* Improved system flexibility: ensure the system is adaptable to the evolving needs of CPCS.

**PROCESS**

For the past four years we have collected data on user needs regarding case management. This has involved both formal and informal conversations, including insights gained from direct user feedback, multiple listening tours, surveys, and formal meetings for the Gideon Project. Since May, we have conducted thirty six new interviews, and five group lunch talks, as part of site visits. Interviews have included sessions with Deputy Chief Counsels, Managing Directors, AICs, AAs, SSAs, Social Workers, Investigators, Directors of SSAs/social workers, PD’s lead investigator, and a paralegal. These recent meetings included members from PD, CAFL, YAD, MH, and A&O in offices across the commonwealth, including Boston, Lawrence, Norwood, Quincy, Roxbury, and Worcester. All told, it is estimated that the entire multi-year process has involved in-person meetings with roughly a hundred staff members in offices from Boston to Pittsfield. This is in addition to a little over two hundred anonymous survey replies. Consequently, we have spoken with members of every practice area, including representatives of every user type. All of these have served to inform the current set of functional requirements.

**FINDINGS**

We have identified eight high-level themes that apply to the system as a whole and four areas of focus that help to define specific groupings of features. The focus areas are themselves comprised of specific requirements and a summary is presented below. A more detailed description of our findings can be found in the main [Business Requirements](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CSESlbskhazFIjm9hdYiiZmJ18xHSybxGUy4P0Ka4Ns/edit#) document.

**Themes**

* Centralization (Facilitates Collaboration and Avoids Duplicate Data Entry)
* Mobile Access
* Granular Data Collection & Flexible Data Elements
* Data Aggregation & Analysis (e.g., Standard Reporting and Predictive Modeling)
* User Interface & Workflow Support
* Permissions, Security, & Privacy
* Reliability of Data and System (Including Technical Performance and Data Quality)
* Smooth Transition to a New System (Data and Training)

**Focus Areas & Features**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **People & Groups** | | | | |
| Requirement(s) | In Current? | Complexity | Impact | Priority |
| The ability to find, edit, and add information on people and groups, including the relationships of people to each other, to cases, and to groups. | in part | med | high | high |
| Radically improved search: fuzzy/statistical search/match (esp. conflict check) | no | high | high | high |
| Public person and group profiles w/ user comments | no | low | med | low |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Case Management, Document Management, and Calendaring** | | | | |
| Requirement(s) | In Current? | Complexity | Impact | Priority |
| The ability to find, edit, and add information on cases. Such information includes:   * Relationships of people and groups to cases * Runsheets, including fine-grain action tracking (e.g., did you argue a motion today?) * Calendars * Documents (external and internal) * Matter dispositions and procedural history | in part | high | high | high |
| The system should be capable of producing documents from user-defined templates. | in part | high | high | med |
| Improved collaboration:   * In-system referrals (investigators et al.) * Separate communications channel for supervision * Internal notifications of involved parties (e.g., letting SSA know when a runsheet entry was made) | in part | med | high | high |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reports & Research** | | | | |
| Requirement(s) | In Current? | Complexity | Impact | Priority |
| Standard reporting nomenclature (e.g., agreement on what one counts when counting cases) | no | med | high | high |
| Static reports (e.g., trends & counts by office, emplyee et al.) | in part | med | high | high |
| Dynamic Reports (e.g., boolean queries of most data fields) | in part | high | med | high |
| The ability to export or make available via API information for consumption by external systems (e.g., export to csv, Excel) | in part | low | high | high |
| Access to CPCS research material (e.g., training and synced charge info) and pointers to external resources (e.g., linking to statutory language or model jury instructions). | no | med | med | low |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Administration** | | | | |
| Requirement(s) | In Current? | Complexity | Impact | Priority |
| Permissions, based on relationships to cases and groups’ membership (roles) | no | med | high | high |
| Workflow management & business rules   * Contextual delivery of best practices (e.g., serving up appropriate documents and presenting links to additional resources) * Data entry support | no | high | high | low |
| Flexible nomenclature | no | med | high | high |
| Adaptive presentation   * Custom Home Screen / Dashboard * Data filters for specific roles and divisions | no | med | med | high |