# Project Zeno: Business Requirements

## 

## Overview

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.

For a discussion of project scope and system objectives, refer to the Case Management System Project Charter.
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## Scope

The current scope is to accomplish a complete replacement of the three existing case management systems by a single application. To that end, the following items are part of that implementation and are discussed in detail below:

##### People and Groups

* People and Group Search
* Conflict Check
* Person and Group Details

##### Case Management, Document Management, and Calendaring

* Case and Runsheet Management
* Document Management
* Calendar Management
* Facilitating Intra-Organization Collaboration on Cases

##### Reports and Research

* Static and Dynamic Reports
* Provide Access to Research Materials
* Dashboards
* Integrated Research Repository and Links

##### Administration

* Roles-based Security and Permissions
* Workflow Management and Business Rules
* Group Administration
* User Management

Having a well-defined and agreed-upon scope helps to minimize the risk of overloading the project; as part of the exercise of defining requirements, decisions about what can be reasonably done in the timeframe need to be addressed.

# Requirements

## Requirements Gathering Methods

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.

## High-level Requirements / General Themes

1. **Centralization.** All data should be stored and accessed centrally to assure all users are working on the most up-to-date data and to avoid the need for duplicate data entry.
2. **Mobile Access.** The majority of features, especially those useful to staff in the field, should be made available in a mobile-friendly format.
3. **Granular Data Collection & Flexible Data Elements.** Data collected regarding the particulars of a case (esp. court events) should be stored with more granularity/detail and the system should allow users to define and manage the collection of new data types.
4. **Security and Privacy.** There should be greater administrative control over user permissions, allowing for novel grants of permissions. Provisions should be made for data from external sources, so that they can be subject to special levels of security control (e.g., under our ethical obligations, HIPAA, etc.).
5. **Data Aggregation & Analysis.** In addition to accurately replicating existing reports, the system needs the ability to prep and export data for further analysis. Data must be trustworthy, accurate and consistent across all divisions and reports.
6. **User Interface & Workflow Support.** Major improvements are needed to the interface to improve user interactions and data entry. There is also an opportunity for the use of configurable workflow support -- being able to infer the current state of a case and then trigger rules and associate data assignment based on this state.
7. **Reliance and Reliability.** The current system suffers from technical reliability and data quality. The new system must be reliable and ensure that the data collected is consistent and high-quality.
8. **Transition and Training.** Current users have almost universally received no formal training on system use -- this should be a focus of any transition plan. Additionally, the porting of existing data to the new system is necessary to ensure complete adoption.

## 

## Scalability

The expectation of the scalability of the application is that the number of end-users is not projected to increase in the near term; the number of staff attorneys is relatively constant, and is not projected to increase. The solution must, however, be able to accommodate the current number of users, which is something that the current set of applications struggle to do.

To that end, the solution must be implemented in a way that adequately supports the hosting and maintenance of the current number of staff attorneys, along with the generation of documents and case collateral. Adequately provisioning sizes of virtual machines and databases is critical, as is the implementation of infrastructure redundancy.

In the long term, it is the intention of the organization to explore options for migration of compute capabilities to a cloud-based solution, in order to enjoy the benefits of scalability, redundancy, and disaster recovery.

## Security

Security and confidentiality of data is one of the highest priorities: users within the system must be able to control the information that is available to other individuals, both inside and outside the organization. To accommodate this, a role-based security model, that allows for flexibly assigning users to roles and groups, must be implemented. The makeup of groups within the organization, and the membership of users to those groups, changes over time, and the security implementations used in the current system are not able to handle those needs.

A security solution that leverages existing IT infrastructure for identity, and allows those identities to be assigned roles, abilities, and group membership as an administrative feature, must be implemented. Security authorization must be present and be part of the design from the beginning of the solution planning phase. The proper implementation of a security solution will include encryption of data at rest, as well as robust protections of user/client data as it is presented and transmitted to users. Proper authentication/authorization protocols will be met when users attempt to access systems and view information.

## Solution Feature Requirements

### Focus Area: People & Groups

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 1**  **Feature Name: People Search** | | | |
| Users should be able to generate a list of people known to the system based on how well they match a set of intuitive search criteria. These lists should include previews of contextually relevant data and links to detailed records for each person listed. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| The ability to determine if an individual is known to CPCS and to quickly access information about this individual is foundational to the agency’s core practice.  These abilities are the basis for conflict checks and serve as a general means of accessing case information absent case identifiers such as a docket or file number (through a search on involved parties).  Under the conflict check use case, this feature is universally required across all practice areas and utilized with great frequency (i.e., at least once for each person involved with a case). Consequently, improvements to efficiency on these tasks stand to greatly improve the overall efficiency of the agency. Additionally, such a feature is effectively mandated by our ethical obligation to clients to avoid conflicts. | | | The poor performance and design of the existing conflict check is the primary complaint of administrative staff across the agency (e.g., the need to run multiple checks to explore name variants and the loss of search results after exploration of individual details).  This feature will be used by admin staff, attorneys, and occasionally management. Improvements to workflow and the nature of results have been requested near universally by administrative staff, and many attorneys have expressed a desire for more flexibility, including mobile access (e.g., to run conflict checks at arraignment as opposed to “calling” back to the office).  The implementation of this feature fixes usability issues with the existing conflict check behavior, which is has proven unnecessarily burdensome.  Conflict checks act as a bottleneck on all other case work, making improvements to this feature a top priority. Many staff mentioned in their meetings it would be great to maintain a historical file to identify prior conflicts in system relating to client or case. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| Users should be able to generate a list of people known to the system based on how well they match a set of intuitive search criteria (personally identifiable characteristics).   * For example, using name and DOB, the search should be able to generate an ordered list of people with the most complete matches at the top. * This must account for the fact that some matches are better than others. For example, a John Doe with DOB 1/1/1997, should return results with 20 year old name matches at the top of the list. The greater the variation in age, the further down the list a result should go. Likewise, dissimilar name matches should appear further down the list. * This matching should work across multiple dimensions, e.g., a 19 yo Jon Doe would rank higher than a 50 yo John Doe or 20 yo James Doe. * Matching should account for incomplete data.   These lists should include previews of contextually relevant data and links to detailed records for each person listed.  When used in the context of conflict check, relevant data is likely to include things such as name, age, and one's role(s) in previous CPCS cases (e.g., client, AV, etc.). | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirement | |  | |
| Input | Personally identifying characteristics, including name, DOB, demographic information (e.g., race, gender, et al), and contact information (e.g., phone number). | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | It depends on all data entry features (complete and accurate system data). Workflow should require that all additions of people depend on it (i.e., the addition of a new person should occur only after the completion of a people search). THis is to avoid duplicating people entries. | | |
| Ongoing work | Defender Data is developing a people search functionality. | | |
| Performance | Requires access to real time or near-real time data. Important use case involves mobile conflict check in court so speed of query and accessibility are also of great concern. | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| * There is a risk in providing results that are either over- or under- inclusive. * There is a good deal of debate regarding the proper level of information that should be made available to users upon a conflict search, with those performing checks more prone to argue on the side of providing more information. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 2**  **Feature Name: Person Management (e.g., add, edit, merge/split)** | | | |
| Users should, given proper permissions, be able to add new people to the system and edit what the system knows about them, including the consolidation of multiple entries (merger) and the ability to break single entries in two. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| The need for complete and accurate information regarding people known to CPCS is mission critical. Currently two issues are of chief concern: (1) diffuseness of data; (2) structural sparseness of data; and (3) inconsistent entry across agency/user-enabled sparseness.  The creation of duplicate entries for individuals leads to diffuse data that impedes users ability to access complete and accurate information because it is spread across multiple entries (e.g., one can never be sure they are viewing the record with the most up-to-date info). Additionally, such duplication and concerns around completeness place a heavy load on those conducting conflict checks or searching for information on known parties. This duplication issue also affects external professional profiles (e.g., contact info for DCF social workers) and the ability to have a single entry (linked to a directory) has been requested by a number of staff, including SSAs/Social workers and one AIC.  The lack of sufficient data fields within a person’s record has led to sparse data that lacks the detail required by users. For example, a sparse data structure dictates that only the most recent phone number (not the history of numbers) is stored in CASEY data.  Staff complain about data being incomplete from office to office, indicating that some offices take the time to enter complete data on clients while others just enter very basic info. An improved workflow and design could serve to help mediate this issue by lowering the burden of data entry.  Consequently, it is necessary to reform the data model used by our system to include a more robust single entry per person, with the occurrence of multiple instances involving a pointer (link) to such. | | | Because of the far reaching implications re. data quality this is a high-priority feature. Duplication of people in-system underlie a number of the most frequent user complaints (e.g., having to sift through long lists on conflict check, having to re-enter data for a person, or update something we would already “know” if the agency truly acted a single entity).  Users have also requested: (1) that information tied to people include historical records of past values. For example, they would like to maintain a history of addresses or phone numbers as opposed to replacing old values with new; (2) that they be allowed to enter an arbitrary number of entries for most data fields (e.g., as many phone numbers or allies as they want); and (3) that there be more appropriate labels for and user friendly means of defining relationships between people.  Note: It would also be useful to track staff relationships external to cases. For example, when a staff member is a relation of an officer or DA. This would help facilitate avoidance of personal conflicts. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| This feature should allow for the addition and editing of all of a person’s in-system data.   * including: identifying, demographic, and contact information as well as relationships to other people, groups, and cases. * For example, one should be able to edit or add a name as well as that person’s relationships. * Such edits should also include the ability to merge records of multiple people into one and to split a single record in two. * Though merge and split features will become less relevant in the future as new entries come to require a people search pre-addition, it is a valuable tool in data maintenance and the cleanup of past entries.   Note: as described in feature 3, the presentation and focus on information will likely be user-specific (e.g., different for different divisions). In general, the edit interface should mirror the Details display. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Personally identifiable information, including demographic data and relationships to other entities (cases, people, organizations) | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | All features drawing on people records. | | |
| Ongoing work | Current maintenance of existing systems. | | |
| Performance | Real-time updates. This information is consumed by features with real time data needs (e.g., conflict check) and as such it requires the ability to make real time updates. | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| As with many user requests for additional information collection, the addition of full histories for things like contact information and residences comes at a cost, namely additional time for data entry, more complex data models, and the need for more thoughtful UI design. Consequently, there is a risk that the UI and data model design may strike the wrong ballance. Such a situation is arguably present in at least two of the current systems. This can also be said for the merge and split functions. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 3**  **Feature Name: Person Details/Research** | | | |
| Users with relevant permission should be able to access all information held by the system on a person in one place, including not only demographic information but also relationships to other persons and histories of case involvements et al. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| Access to accurate and comprehensive information regarding people known to CPCS is mission critical and ubiquitous across cases. Consequently, the ability to access and navigate such information is of the utmost importance and the efficient delivery of such stands to improve agency operation. | | | Issues of data quality relating to people records have found themselves primarily address above in feature 2. The presentation of such information, excepting that of reporting, is left to this feature where the primary request has been on the need to provide appropriate focus tailored to the end user. For example, some users may be looking to this feature as a directory while others need it to serve as a medical history or documentation of past court involvements. The system should allow for configuration allowing for the display of this information in such distinct flavors. Differing personas include not only different divisions (e.g., PD v CAFL) but different roles (e.g., attorney vs. investigator). |
| Feature Description | | | |
| This feature should allow for the navigation of an individual’s complete in-system record,   * including: identifying and demographic data; relationships to other people, groups, and cases (case histories) with links to same; * histories of contact and residency data; and * medical histories. * Summaries of the above could be presented as sections in a general details view with the ability to link into more detailed records like individual case files. * Network graphs could be used to show relationships among parties.   The exact UI, however, will need to be the subject of much consideration. See the Risks section below. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Unique identifier for the person in question. | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | It depends on all data entry features (complete and accurate system data). | | |
| Ongoing work | Current maintenance of existing systems. | | |
| Performance | Requires access to real time or near-real time data as this information is consumed by features with real time data needs (e.g., conflict check). | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| The navigation of a person’s entire record is a challenging design task and a risk attaches to the proper creation of such. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 4**  **Feature Name: Person Profile Narrative and Comments** | | | |
| For a subset of people (e.g., public repeat actors such as judges, DAs, officers, and vendors) it should be possible for system users to view and add narrative content (like a wiki entry) and user-rated comments (like Yelp comments). Note: ratings are on comments not people. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| The ability to capture information regarding repeat public actors (such as judges, DAs, officers, and vendors, including experts) in a centralized collaborative space, including staff impressions of said actors, is an expressed and currently unmet need. This need is most often expressed through reference to the idea of a “Bad cop list.”  Such an internally managed and partially crowd-sourced repository would allow for better formation and dissemination of institutional knowledge regarding such actors. | | | Multiple attorneys have expressed the wish for a “Bad cop list,” and a few for the creation of expert profiles with the facility for comment from staff familiar with their work. The latter has also been echoed by SSAs and social workers.  Currently, no such repositories existence in-house, and there is the impression by staff that a great deal of agency knowledge is being unnecessarily siloed in individual minds. The hope is that by connecting individual insights we could better leverage staff knowledge for the benefit of our clients. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| This feature should lay atop the person view and modification features (2 & 3 above), providing for a narrative bio/context section associated with the records of appropriate individuals (e.g., public repeat players).   * This section should allow for some special formatting (e.g., markdown) and be generally open to edit by all users as in a wiki. * Detailed edit histories should be stored and there should be an option to revert to past entries as well as to block individual users or groups from editing. * There should be a facility for users to add and vote up or down brief notes based on their answer to the question, “Did you find this comment useful?”   Nonpublic individuals (e.g., staff and clients) would not be subject to comments, and they should have different write permissions regarding their bio/context text (e.g., only staff could alter their own, whereas client and other people’s write permissions would coincide with their permissions for general modification. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Unique identifier for the person in question. Narrative text. User-generated comments. User feedback on preceding. | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | Displays of individual’s data. | | |
| Ongoing work | None | | |
| Performance | Though this information is consumed in use cases with real time data needs (e.g., researching a judge before argument), the nature of this data makes the need for truly real time updates somewhat less important. | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| * There is some debate about providing access to vendor information. A general list is not disseminated to allow internal gatekeepers to help best fit experts to a case’s needs, and to avoid the written dissemination of information (e.g., poor reviews), that some vendors may find actionable. * It is worth noting, however, that the feature envisioned here would work to provide consumers with information designed to assist in the assessment of potential vendor fit and that access would be limited to CPCS staff. * Similarly, some may object to the creation of written user comments as they relate to members of the judiciary. * It is worth noting that policy as well as technical solutions may be brought to bear in facilitating the creation of acceptable content. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 5**  **Feature Name: Group Search** | | | |
| Users should be able to generate a list of groups housed in the system based on how well they match a set of search criteria. These lists should include previews of contextually relevant data and links to detailed records for each group listed. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| Current systems fail to provide a centralized robust repository of group/organizational data. The creation of such a repository in-system would allow for a number of benefits (discussed more in feature 2). Given this, the ability to search and find groups known to the system becomes an efficient means of accessing this information. | | | A centralized repository of group/organizational information has been requested by attorneys (e.g., info on DOC facilities and court departments) and SSAs & social workers (e.g., info on a sober house or other resource provider). This feature would help provide access to such.  Currently, no such centralized repository existence in-house, and there is the impression by staff that a great deal of agency knowledge is being unnecessarily siloed in individual minds. By working off of a centralized repository we stand to improve the quality and efficiency of data collection and exploration re. groups.  This feature will allow for quick and convenient access to in-system group information. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| * Users should be able to generate a list of groups housed in the system based on how well they match a set of search criteria. * Results should include previews of contextually relevant data and links to detailed records for each group listed. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Identifying characteristics, including name and contact information (e.g., phone number or address). | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | It depends on all data entry features (complete and accurate system data). Workflow should require that all additions of new groups depend on it (i.e., the addition of a new group should occur only after the completion of a group search on the name or some other subset of characteristics). | | |
| Ongoing work | None | | |
| Performance | Requires access to real time or near-real time data. Important use case involves mobile lookup in court so speed of query and accessibility are also of great concern. | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| Given that groups can themselves belong to other groups, it will be important to pay special attention to the design of a search such that a search returns relevant and complete results consistent with user expectations. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 6**  **Feature Name: Group Management (e.g., add, edit, merge/split)** | | | |
| Users should, given proper permissions, be able to add new groups to the system and edit what the system knows about them, including the consolidation (merger) of multiple entries, the ability to break single entries in two, and the ability to define hierarchical relationships between groups. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| Groups consist of both internal and external groups. Internal group management is addressed in greater detail under the Administration Focus Area. However, it’s worth noting that the inclusion of CPCS group structure in-system allows for the system to build permissions around a contextual awareness of staff’s actual relationships with cases. Likewise, this contextual knowledge can be leveraged to provide insight into external group interactions.  Patterns of behavior that can only be seen in aggregate can easily be identified in-system. For example, we would be able to determine the efficacy of different resource providers, and patterns of behavior from repeat complaintants (e.g., a used car dealership that reports past due clients to the police as car thieves, using the courts as the collection agencies and police as their repo men). | | | The primary rationale for the existence of a centralized group information repository are expressed above in feature 5. The ability to easily add and edit such a repository, as allowed for by this feature, is necessary for the maintenance of data quality. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| This feature should allow for the addition and editing of all of a group’s in-system data.   * Including: identifying and contact information as well as relationships to other groups and cases (a person’s relationship to a group should be defined as one of that person’s attributes). * Editing should include the ability to merge records of multiple groups into one and to split a single record in two. * Though merge and split features are of minor concern given design choices to eliminate duplicate entry, it is a valuable tool in data maintenance esp. For instances in which a group’s internal structure changes.   Note: as described in feature 7, the presentation and focus on information will likely be user-specific (e.g., different for different divisions). In general, the edit interface should mirror the Details display. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Identifying and contact information as well as relationships to other entities. | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | All features drawing on group records. | | |
| Ongoing work | Current maintenance of existing systems. | | |
| Performance | Real-time updates. This information is consumed by features with real time data needs (e.g., in-court research) and as such it requires the ability to make real time updates. | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| As with many user requests for additional information collection, the addition of full histories for things like contact/location information comes at a cost, namely additional time for data entry, more complex data models, and the need for more thoughtful UI design. Consequently, there is a risk that the UI and data model design may strike the wrong ballance. This can also be said for the merge and split functions. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 7**  **Feature Name: Group Details/Research** | | | |
| Users should be able to access all information held by the system on a group in one place, including not only structural information but also relationships to other groups, persons and histories of case involvements et al. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| Access to accurate and comprehensive information regarding groups known to CPCS provides an important time-saving feature. Such information can also encompass more than contact information and so provide valid insight into individual practice (see examples cited in feature 2 business case). | | | Issues of data quality relating to group records have found themselves primarily address above in feature 6. The presentation of such information is left to this feature. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| This feature should allow for the navigation of an groups’ complete in-system record,   * Including: identifying and contact information; relationships to other people, groups, and cases (case histories) with links to same * Histories of contact data * Summaries of the above could be presented as sections in a general details view with the ability to link into more detailed records like individual case files. * Network graphs could be used to show relationships among groups and other parties.   The exact UI, however, will need to be the subject of much consideration. See the Risks section below. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Unique identifier for the group in question. | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | It depends on all data entry features (complete and accurate system data). | | |
| Ongoing work | Current maintenance of existing systems. | | |
| Performance | Requires access to real time or near-real time data as this information is consumed by features with real time data needs (e.g., in-court research). | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| The navigation of a group's entire record is a challenging design task and a risk attaches to the proper creation of such. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 8**  **Feature Name: Group Profile Narrative and Comments** | | | |
| For a subset of groups it should be possible for system users to view and add narrative content (like a wiki entry) and user-rated comments (like Yelp comments). Note: ratings are on comments not groups. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| The ability to capture information regarding repeat public actors (such as hospitals, sober houses, DCF offices, etc.) in a centralized collaborative space, including staff impressions of said actors, is an expressed and currently unmet need. This need is most often expressed through reference to its person-related analog, the idea of a “Bad cop list.”  Such an internally managed and partially crowd-sourced repository would allow for better formation and dissemination of institutional knowledge regarding such actors. | | | Multiple SSA and Social Workers have expressed the wish for for the creation of resource profiles with the facility for comment from staff familiar with their work.  Currently, no such repositories existence in-house, and there is the impression by staff that a great deal of agency knowledge is being unnecessarily siloed in individual minds. The hope is that by connecting individual insights we could better leverage staff knowledge for the benefit of our clients. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| This feature should lay atop the group view and modification features (6 & 7 above), providing for a narrative history/context section associated with the records of appropriate groups (e.g., hospitals and sober houses).   * This section should allow for some special formatting (e.g., markdown) and be generally open to edit by all users as in a wiki. * Detailed edit histories should be stored and there should be an option to revert to past entries as well as to block individual users or groups from editing. * There should be a facility for users to add and vote up or down brief notes based on their answer to the question, “Did you find this comment useful?”   Internal CPCS groups (e.g., offices and divisions) would not be subject to comments, and they should have different write permissions regarding their history/context text (e.g., only designated staff, whereas outside groups’ write permissions would coincide with their permissions for general modification. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Unique identifier for the group in question. Narrative text. User-generated comments. User feedback on preceding. | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | Displays of group’s data. | | |
| Ongoing work | None | | |
| Performance | Though this information is consumed in use cases with real time data needs (e.g., researching a resource provider), the nature of this data makes the need for truly real time updates somewhat less important. | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| As with vendor and judge profiles (see above), there may be objections to memorializing staff impressions of certain groups. Again, it is worth noting that policy as well as technical solutions may be brought to bear in facilitating the creation of acceptable content. | | | |

### **Focus Area: Case Management, Document Management, and Calendaring**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 1**  **Feature Name: Case Search and Filtering** | | | |
| Attorneys must be able to locate a unique case in the system quickly, using case information that they have readily available. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| Attorneys must be able to locate cases in the system in order to keep track of their past and present cases, review cases of their peers, and perform research. The capacity to perform these tasks directly impact the capability of attorneys to do their jobs effectively, and many of them have requested an increased capability to do so, above and beyond the capabilities of the present system.  To achieve that goal, end users have requested the capability to locate a case or group of cases, or filter down cases, based on information that they have readily available; this may not always be the case number or other unique identifier, but instead may be limited information about other parties who may be connected to the case, or other case particulars. This helps the business by giving users more complete and flexible access to the cases that CPCS has data about, in order to allow attorneys to perform meaningful research and coordinate with other attorneys. | | | Numerous end users across multiple offices have requested the capability to perform more meaningful case filtering. This directly improves their ability to perform case research and view history and information about relevant cases that already exist in the system.  Currently, there is a capability to filter and view cases based on particulars of the case, but that feature is often poorly understood and does not adequately filter every case particular that is required -- this feature is intended to resolve that need.  The capability to perform case filtering is not currently in the workflow that all attorneys perform, but would be a valuable addition, not only for research purposes, but also for future compliance needs and to meet any requests for information that the state legislature may make.  This feature is directly related to the user-requested capability to generate more meaningful reports, many of which would be metrics and statistics based on cases, that would be organized and filtered in a similar fashion to this feature. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| * The Case Search feature will provide the means to dynamically filter and view case information based on a set of chosen criteria. The criteria chosen will not necessarily be unique; instead, the feature will allow users to narrow down lists of cases based on characteristics of the case. * Some examples of this could be users associated with the case, the “matter” or charge(s) associated with the case, the outcome, motions applied to the case, or other criteria. * Since users may be looking for general information about number of cases, or looking to drill into more specific information matching those criteria, the feature should take the form of a dynamic page of cases that can be filtered based on criteria, with previews of relevant case information for each. * Users should be able to navigate into a page containing the details of any particular case, without losing the page of cases they have filtered. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | The characteristics of cases that a user wishes to filter on. | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | This feature depends on the relational information about cases, user assignments, and other related case details that CPCS possesses. | | |
| Ongoing work | This feature is related to the migration effort that has been undertaken, moving case information from the Tris/CMS database to the Casey system, and allowing conflict check to be done, as part of the Defender project. | | |
| Performance | Since users will be filtering large numbers of cases in a dynamic fashion, responsive performance is a must. Pagination of results and fast presentation of filtered results are necessary to drive adoption of the feature. | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| Discussions continue within the organization about what information various user types are permitted to have access to, including the following questions:   * Should attorneys be permitted to perform conflict checks? * Are current restrictions based solely on the limitations of the current applications? * How much case data should they be able to see? Perhaps general users should not be able to see the runsheet, but in Tris/CMS some procedural history is necessary to view a case path and ascertain conflicts. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 2**  **Feature Name: Case Details Management** | | | |
| Users must be able to create cases, view and record case details, and modify cases with as much or more usability and functionality as the current systems provide. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| While the current collection of systems (Casey, Tris/CMS) allow attorneys to create and maintain cases, the systems were not implemented with feedback from all end-users, and are difficult to use: information is able to be added to the system, but isn’t able to be used later; the systems are often difficult to use; and they are difficult to maintain and train people to use.  All of the above reasons have direct implications for the productivity of staff attorneys, and efforts to create a more usable replacement will pay dividends for staff. The capability to effectively create, view, and edit case details, and all ancillary case information, will allow attorneys and AA’s to more effectively handle their case workflows.  Additionally, the possession of an authoritative central “case file” will allow for centralization of efforts, and make auditing and data control more feasible. The implementation of this feature will also allow for greater flexibility in the level of detail of the data on cases that is captured, and what can be reported on. | | | The vast majority of attorneys have requested subsets of this feature, and comes up consistently in user interviews and surveys. It would be used by staff attorneys across the organization, including in the PD, YAD, CAFL, and Mental Health areas, as well as investigators, SSA’s/social workers who are affiliated with a case.  The implementation of this feature will help to improve multiple usability issues that users suffer from when trying to use the system. Further, there is a disconnect between functionality offered to different groups within the organization, and the level of adoption varies widely from group to group.  The implementation of this feature will drive the effectiveness of CPCS’ case data going forward; if data is not consistently and reliably gathered by this feature, it severely hinders the ability to report on statistics and respond to requests by the legislature for case information.  As a result of the above usage information and organizational needs, the use case this feature helps resolve is among the highest priority items for the organization.  This feature will be informed by a number of administrative tasks: data taxonomy with regards to relationships, individuals, motions, and other collateral; the data that must be recorded for various case types; and so on. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| The feature is intended to allow AA’s, attorneys, investigators, and other members of the organization to enter information associated with a case -- individuals, matters, groups, motions, and other collateral that are associated. This includes not just current state, but also case history, and how the case has changed throughout its lifetime. Users should be able to easily see who made changes to the case and when.  To accomplish this, the following are outlined:   * a page must be provided that logically lays out the above elements, with the capability to dynamically link to existing matters, people, and groups, or to provide the facility to create them if they do not already exist. * Managing access to cases is also part of the remit of this feature; users may wish to grant access to the case to other individuals in the organization. * During certain behaviors, such as when a case is closed, the system should have the capability to send notifications to individuals who have an interest in, or who are assigned to the case. * The feature must also be connected to other features, especially user, calendar, runsheet, and document management; managing these elements is also crucial to maintaining case state. * The case management page(s) will be configurable based on the type of case that is being created: advice call cases, bail hearings, and default cases will have different elements that need to be entered into the application. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Users, Groups, Matters, Documents, Motions, and other collateral associated with a case | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | * The court system will possess much of the information that must be entered into the system * The e-Bill/v-Bill systems will depend on some of the data entered into this feature | | |
| Ongoing work | Current maintenance of existing systems | | |
| Performance | Much of the page can be expected to take the form of a page or set of pages, but some elements that will exist within the system, such as users, groups, and matters that CPCS has recorded, should be able to be dynamically pulled in easily by a user. The dynamic elements, therefore, should be responsive in real time. | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| * There remains debate within the organization around the level of access that individuals should have as regards access to case details. For conflict purposes, the court assumes attorneys to have knowledge of cases handled by other staff attorneys within the organization, but in reality the level of access allowed may be more complex. * Additionally, the definition of what constitutes case status (e.g. open and closed) varies within the organization, both by location, division, and role. Will a consistent definition be determined for the purposes of implementing a new application? * The level of difficulty in managing multiple different case types is an area where there may be confusion created by end-users; steps will have to be taken in the design to ensure that these different types are presented clearly and effectively. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 3**  **Feature Name: Runsheet Management** | | | |
| Individuals associated with a case must be able to collaborate on recording events, case collateral, descriptions, and associated individuals in a shared runsheet. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| End users, such as attorneys and investigators, record events and interactions pertaining to a case in the case runsheet. This runsheet is crucial for cataloguing the progress of an underway case, and collaborating with other individuals on it.  Attorneys in many parts of the organization maintain details about their cases either on paper or with a combination of on paper and digital recording. Many attorneys have alluded to the desire to to maintain instead a “digital case record”, that allows them to store documents, notes, and other information in a centralized location. Supporting this goal will result in greater efficiency for users of the system, and a greater capacity for collaboration.  Further, the runsheet could be treated as the authoritative source of case data for archival purposes, improving the capability of CPCS to manage and track all information known about a case in one location. Having one location for all case particulars would dramatically improve auditing and reporting capabilities. | | | The vast majority of users who interact with the existing runsheet feature in TRIS/CMS have requested improvements to this feature. Users have difficulty managing large entries and monitoring progress in many cases.  AIC’s depend on reading effective runsheet entries to effectively exercise supervisory oversight.  Other individuals such as SSA’s/social workers and investigators rely on runsheets to quickly determine case particulars.  This feature relates to many other areas of the application: file attachments, notifications, administrative features, document attachment, and other case collateral.  The nature of the runsheet configuration will also be subject to administrative configuration; “dynamic labeling”, workflow management , and other management configuration will affect the nature of the runsheet feature. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| A runsheet feature must do the following:   * Have the capability to record events and details of the case in a consumable format. The events and details of the case may depend on the type of user who is accessing the system * Link to individuals, motions, and documents, in the course of adding a runsheet entry * The runsheet may link to a workflow management component that is an administration feature: any workflow steps associated with the maintenance of a case would be subject to modification in the runsheet * Upon modification of a runsheet entry associated with a user, or a user is linked to a runsheet entry, notifications should be automatically sent to that individual. There may be other types of notifications that can be sent, either by the user manually, or automatically by the system when a certain condition is met * The runsheet entries must support the capability to enter rich text with some formatting, to allow for the entries themselves to be more readable and parsable * The runsheet must be able to be generated and printed as a contiguous document | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Documents related to the case; motions; events pertaining to the case; client interviews; | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | Motions, individuals, groups known by CPCS | | |
| Ongoing work | Current maintenance of existing systems. | | |
| Performance | The feature will doubtless have dynamic components, to allow for associated items to be “pulled in” without impeding the flow of the runsheet narrative or the workflow of the individual entering data. As a result, this feature should be responsive in real time. | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| * Adoption of a “digital runsheet” for some members of the organization may be jarring and adoption of features will be an ongoing concern. * Further, there remains ongoing discussion about the amount of data users should be able to see -- what is the structure of access management Access management for associated individuals * How to provide case information to clients, if requested? * How much do we really need to know about a case? How do you strike the right balance between the information that is required as part of the case narrative, and how much of such recording is too onerous for attorneys and other individuals to maintain? Certain context is important for users to be able to effectively view case information -- phone numbers, motions, events, etc. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 4**  **Feature Name: Supervisory Oversight** | | | |
| An AIC or other supervising authority must possess the capability to provide case-specific contextual feedback that operates in an external channel. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| In the context of administrative oversight, supervisors must possess the capability to provide feedback that is related to a case, but is technically independent -- a means to provide this feedback allows for more close collaboration between attorney and AIC.  Further, an explicit separate channel for intra-organization communication allows for communication that clients would not be privy to, for information that would fall under staff confidentiality. The implementation of this feature would provide more security and efficiency in submitting this feedback. | | | As it stands, there is no means to provide administrative feedback in a secure, efficient way -- this is currently done in an ad-hoc fashion, through email, in-person, or in certain instances, on the runsheet itself. Users have had difficulty in adjusting to the needs of providing feedback in this way, and multiple AIC’s have requested a more effective means of providing review.  This feature depends explicitly on the case details. It may be that this feature is directly tied to a case, to allow for contextual feedback on runsheet entries, documents, or other particulars of a case.  Additionally, this feature may relate to the capability to send notifications, when feedback is submitted.  This feature would be used predominantly by the attorney responsible for the case and their AIC or supervisor. As a result, this feature is also related to the administrative capability to manage groups within CPCS; the people who would have permissions to access this feature would be driven by group configurations.  While this feature has been requested by users to allow for more effective feedback, there is no analog in the current system, and communication is able to be facilitated through other means, as well, making this a lower priority. It may be that improvements in case management or runsheets will affect the need for feedback to be provided in this way. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| This feature would include the following capabilities:   * Provide a means of communicating about a case in a context-specific fashion. This may involve the capability to provide comments that are “linked” to details about a case, or some other method of providing context-specific feedback. These comments would be able to break into a threaded conversation. * This feature would be confidential between the attorney responsible for a given case, and their supervisor; no others would need access to this information unless that permission is granted. * The feature may also have the capability to send notifications when feedback has been submitted, or a comment has been left on a case. * Additionally, it may also facilitate secure internal “texting.” | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Comments and feedback that a supervisor wishes to provide; further collaboration and communication between users associated with a case | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | The oversight structure of each group within CPCS dictates who has the capability to submit feedback on a case. | | |
| Ongoing work | N/A | | |
| Performance | This feature should be responsive and lightweight enough to not impede the regular functioning of case management, and data entry or interactions with case pages should not be more difficult than without this submitted feedback. | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| What information is to be considered external to the case? This should only be a forum for the attorney and AIC to communicate about a case and exchange feedback and advice. Any information that the client should, in theory, be able to have access to should not be communicated through this channel. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 5**  **Feature Name:** Template Management | | | |
| Users must be able to create and manage document templates within the system, and share them with other users | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| In the current environment, users in some offices often use the capability within TRIS to print documents based on templates. These templates can be created and added to the system, but an effective system to manage them does not exist.  A template management system would help to increase the value of the system to end users by providing additional flexibility to create boilerplates for new documents, by supporting addition, modification, and removal of templates. This would drive adoption of the new system and would increase attorneys’ efficiency.  Additionally, the capability to share templates with other users will provide benefits in promoting collaboration and knowledge sharing between attorneys in the organization. | | | Users have often requested this feature, especially in YAD/CAFL contexts, as document uploading exists mainly in Tris/CMS. More specifically, CAFL appeals and EdLaw requested the capability to share content, especially when the document would be contextually relevant. This would likely be the case for training groups as well.  This resolves the operational need to generate documents with greater flexibility -- users can’t remove old templates in the current system, or manage them if a mistake was made.  The ability to manage document templates is tightly related to the capability to generate those documents. Additionally, these templates should be able to be shared with other users, perhaps as an administrative feature, or granted to users via administrative action.  Further, this feature may be related to the administrative capability to manage workflow and business rules -- documents may be “linked” to those business rules and workflow steps.  While this feature has been requested frequently, it doesn’t exist in the current system and is not mission-critical. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| * This feature is intended to provide the capability to manage document templates for end users of the system. They must be able to create templates that the system auto-populates with information that it understands and knows about. * These templates often relate to elements within the system, especially case information, such as automatically-generated motion boilerplate. * Users must be able to view, create, and manage existing templates as they are updated and modified. Additionally, certain groups should have the capability to share created document templates with other users, especially where already produced (e.g., by appeals units for dissemination to appropriate attorneys). * Users must have the capability to link a document template to an existing workflow process: a motion template, for example, may want to be “linked” to a known workflow step that is defined in administrating case metadata. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | A created template document for entry or modification; the users with which a document template should be shared | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | Relational data contained within the system pertaining to the template (case information, or other relevant information) | | |
| Ongoing work | Ongoing maintenance of template system, which is limited in nature. | | |
| Performance | Since this feature is intended to be a document upload and management page, performance need not be real time here, and some asynchronous behavior here may be appropriate. | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| There is debate within the organization over the extent to which documents should be automatically generated for attorneys; should attorneys be able to share their document templates with other users of the system? Is sharing templates something that should be granted only to those who are responsible for helping to define policy, such as Appeals units and AIC’s?  Second, there is debate within the organization centering around the extent to which attorneys should be able to manage templates; creating motions and other documents is part of the duty of attorneys, and the extent to which that is able to be handled automatically for an attorney is up for debate. This is discussed further in the associated Document Generation feature below. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 6**  **Feature Name:** Document Generation | | | |
| Users must be able to generate documents based on their templates and information available about their cases. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| Attorneys often create the same basic documents for multiple different cases -- the capability to generate these documents saves attorneys time and improves their efficiency. Additionally, generating documents from a pre-created template reduces errors made while creating documents for external consumption. | | | This feature already exists in the current Tris/CMS systems and would ideally be preserved in the new system, in some fashion.  As such, being able to generate documents with more flexibility is frequently requested -- this feature is therefore linked to the capability to manage a more robust templating system.  This capability to generate documents is used in YAD/CAFL contexts, but many users to not realize that it exists, while others use it frequently. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| * A document generation process must be defined that allows end users to leverage pre-defined templates that they have access to to generate documents. * This process must be able to flexibly locate and pre-populate defined properties in a template based on information that the system understands. For example, if the template calls for the import of a case docket number, the system should be able to locate this for the case that the user is attempting to generate a document for. * These documents should primarily be generated as Microsoft Word documents to allow the end user to further edit these documents. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Relational data known by CPCS; the case or other element in question that is having a document generated for it | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | Template management system; the relational data in the application; the case or other associated entity a document is generated for | | |
| Ongoing work | PD Case Opening utility that integrates with Casey | | |
| Performance | Performance is of a medium priority for this feature; locating properties for and generating documents can be done asynchronously and served up to a user, but must still be delivered with relative speed | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| There is concern among some within CPCS that generated documents should not have the effect of making attorneys over-reliant on generated documents -- attorneys should be able to create documents manually without relying on a tool to do so, and reasonable contingencies should be provided in the event that the feature is inaccessible. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 7**  **Feature Name:** Document Search/Filter | | | |
| Users must have the capability to search through all documents they have access to and filter them based on key fields and their connection to a given case. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| Users have requested the capability to manage more of their documents within the confines of the system -- instead of searching through a shared drive, their efficiency would be increased by being allowed to search through their documents that the system has stored.  This will have additional benefit beyond the means to view information about a current case; ideally, this feature would allow a user to view all their previous documents associated with old or legacy cases to conduct case research and to refer back to previous collateral and motions.  Further, this feature will allow users to collaborate on and view documents that they are otherwise associated with but may not have created.  While this feature has come up tangentially as part of discussions of current attorney processes, and would be valuable to facilitate use of the system, most users did not explicitly request this feature. | | | There currently exists no good mechanism to view a user’s collected documents in the current system -- the shared drive is the common repository for these, but there is no consistent means of organization or access. Further, users often maintain documents outside the system via fileshare, presenting difficulties for backups and consistent storage. This feature should resolve these difficulties.  The document access feature is also related to the feature on viewing document details, but nothing necessarily depends on it -- document uploading and viewing could be navigated to via other means, such as on a case-by-case basis.  Document management, if done in a complete fashion, would also migrate documents that already exist on the shared drive to their related cases.  Additionally, users should be able to access these documents/files via mobile devices when the attorneys or other staff are offsite. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| * Documents should be able to be filtered based on filename, as well as other properties associated with a case, such as associated users, file type, the case the document belongs to, among other fields. * The feature should show a list of related documents, viewing critical information about each, with an easy way to navigate into the file details, as well as viewing or previewing the file. * Users must be able to see more documents than the ones they have personally created; they may be looking for documents they have access to that were created by other users (such as motions that won in front of the same judge), or documents that were explicitly related to them on a given case or matter. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Information known about a file being searched for, such as author, edit history, and permissions | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | The documents that are present in the current file storage solution are related to ongoing and legacy cases. | | |
| Ongoing work | The PD Case Opening utility is under development that will aid in standardization of the shared drive file hierarchy, to a limited extent | | |
| Performance | Must return document results quickly, with limited latency | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| * The files that are present only in the fileshare are an ongoing concern -- would migration of existing files be necessary in order to search on and see old documents as well? * File organization may additionally be an issue -- users are used to navigating their files through a hierarchical structure, and some users may wish to continue to have that capability in the new system * The capability to ensure that documents are able to be accessed and edited only by designated users is crucial, for policy and privacy reasons. Documents entering the wrong hands will be a risk within the application that will need to be managed. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 8**  **Feature Name:** Document Details | | | |
| Users should be able to view information about documents they have access to within the system. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| The capability to view documents and details a user has created or otherwise has access to allows users to more effectively support and track documents as they evolve in tracking. Having documents in a central location promotes being able to back up files, view audit and change tracking history about them, and ensure that data governance over sensitive files is maintained. | | | The capability to view document details is related to other features in the focus area -- being able to navigate to actors that are related to the document, as well as managing documents saved as collateral on runsheets, are inherent in this feature.  The capability to manage document details does not exist in the current set of applications, but users have requested this capability. This includes auditing details, such as the author of the document and edit history.  Because this feature does not exist in the current system, it could be considered a medium to low priority. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| * Allow for maintaining metadata and other information about an individual document. This metadata includes document-level permissions management and the file itself. * The feature must also allow for viewing audit information about a file: the author of the document, as well as the edit history of it. * The feature may also display other information about a file: the associated matter or other collateral that the file is connected to. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | * Associated case information, which may be a matter or other case collateral * Users associated with the document | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | * Associated matters, other case collateral * Users who are assigned to, or have modified the document * Documents brought into the system from outside sources, such as health documents and COREY documents * Files that are already present on the shared drive | | |
| Ongoing work | N/A | | |
| Performance | This feature should be able to manage and view information about a file in a page similar to a form; as a result, real time information is less important for this feature. | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| * The capability to ensure that documents are able to be accessed and edited only by designated users is crucial, for policy and privacy reasons. Documents entering the wrong hands will be a risk within the application that will need to be managed. * What are the data retention policies for documents that CPCS has requested or otherwise acquired, such as health documents and COREY documents? Should these be flagged for special treatment? * The system must have the capability to manage additional compliance needs for documents that will enter into the system. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 9**  **Feature Name: Event Search/display calendar for dates stored in system** | | | |
| Users must be able to search/display prior or upcoming event dates in-system in a user friendly calendar or agenda view, with a link to details for editing. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| Being able to view or search for dates will help attorneys and AA’s better identify when he/she or their colleagues are available to meet with others or to schedule court dates with clients and staff in a more effective and timely matter. The user must be able to edit a prior scheduled date, if changed.  It will be easier to manage other staff and schedule meetings when you can view others date/time availability even if they are not in your office. This will be a good feature for everyone to keep track of where staff are (in court, meeting clients, working at home, etc.). | | | This feature will be used by all staff (attorneys, AA’s, SSA’s, Investigators) when scheduling meetings, court dates, visits with clients, and office events/meetings with other staff.  Currently some offices keep track of 2 or 3 different calendars because they cannot see each others calendar within an office or division.  Some offices make use of something like a shared Google calendar in addition to their personal calendar which can cause problems when syncing data. Integration of a calendar feature within the system would help address such issues. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| * The calendar search and display feature must be in a user friendly view and intuitive for staff to search through prior or upcoming dates as needed. * Users should be able to search by date and also by staff name to see date commitments in a shared calendar or agenda view. * The calendar should present multiple displays (e.g., calendar and agenda views) and filters that can be reformatted for export, including printing. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Users will need to keep the calendar up to date. | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | Internal dependencies to sync calendar with other views. | | |
| Ongoing work | Maintenance of existing systems as related to events. | | |
| Performance | Updating and viewing of events in real time. | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| One debate would be who can see who’s calendar and in what office and at what detail. For example, supervisors currently must login to multiple offices to see their staff activities/cases if they work in more than one office. It makes it hard to manage staff that work in multiple office locations. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 10**  **Feature Name: Configure Calendar and Sync** | | | |
| Users must be able to configure access to calendars and sync calendar to different systems. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| The calendar will be synced and available to display in real time for all users as they are updated so that everyone is able to see their own and others’ scheduled commitments. This will save time for all staff.  Allow for users to be able to view collected calendar information in one place, which enhances the ability to organize staff; and ability to control access via group/individual also enhances collaboration. | | | This feature was requested by several users who experienced no longer being able to link to Google Calendars via the CPCS mobile app; many users curate a shared Google Calendar on an office-by-office basis for collaboration purposes.  The sync feature will be done automatically so there will not be a user interaction directly with this feature other than staff entering and updating commitment dates. Users will, however, be able to manage the items that their calendar will sync with.  This feature will dictate the items that are displayed on an individual’s calendar. Not only will syncing from external sources affect an individual’s calendar, but changing permissions may affect the calendar items that are viewable to users that a user shares their calendar with. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| The Configure and sync feature will be done automatically behind the scenes in the system so when users view a calendar it will display the most accurate and up to date information. The calendar should be accessible via other third party calendaring systems (e.g. Outlook, Google). Whether the synchronization is uni- or bi-directional is a design choice. The ability to manage permissions of viewing others’ calendars by groups, and by staff. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Users will need to keep the calendar up to date by entering and updating their commitments. | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | Internal dependencies to sync calendar with other views. | | |
| Ongoing work | Current system maintenance of events. | | |
| Performance | real time synchronization | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| The primary risk is that synchronization will fail and people will rely on inaccurate data. There is also likely to be debate about want information is appropriate to share with third-party systems. | | | |

### Focus Area: Reports

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 1**  **Feature Name: Dashboards** | | | |
| Upon login, each user should be presented with a configurable homepage/dashboard, with their most-used information available to them. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| Different divisions and roles have unique data needs and a one-size-fits all entry point places unnecessary friction on users seeking to access information. Allowing a customized view of a user’s most-used information is a necessity for user buy in and efficient operation. Further, giving users access to this information, such as their open assigned cases, up-front allows users to access information quickly and more efficiently. | | | Users have expressed that the system interface is often not tailored to their needs. This is presents most commonly as attorney-centric design, focusing on data of use to attorney and excluding that needed by other staff (e.g., social workers cannot tell at a glance who the attorney is).  This feature also addresses the different focuses of separate divisions and roles, and provides some measure of customizability based on role.  This feature must be relatively configurable to address the changing needs of attorneys and other individuals who use the system. It is related to other elements of the application, such as case information and person information, as well. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| * Upon login, each user should be presented with a configurable homepage/dashboard. Customization should take place across at least three dimensions: (1) the users division; (2) the user's role; and (3) the user's own preferences. * Divisions should be able to define unique default behavior for their user roles and users should have some facility for tweaking around the margins. * Dashboards need not be complicated. For example, an attorney’s might consist of a their open cases with relevant details pulled out for focus (e.g., next court date). Managers, might set theirs to display office numbers and subordinate caseloads. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | User settings, cases, documents, etc. that are | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | Dependent on a varying slice of existing data defined by the user or dictated as a consequence of their relationship to a case or membership in a group. | | |
| Ongoing work | N/A | | |
| Performance | Will rely on a mix of real time and historical data calls. | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| The ability to customize can lead to unnecessary complexity. Consequently, as with many other new features, there is a risk that designers could strike the wrong balance resulting either in a poor UX or unnecessary dev time. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 2**  **Feature Name: Fixed-criteria Reports** | | | |
| Users should be able to access displays and lists of aggregate information about cases et al. based on pre-existing templates (e.g., caseload reposts). | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| Access to complete, accurate, and consistent management metrics is necessary to aid in the supervision of staff and allocation of resources. That is, the ability to access standard reporting documents is of the utmost importance for the making of data-driven decisions.  Currently, such reports focus almost exclusively on the counting of case and assignment numbers across a set of distinctive groupings (e.g., division, office, attorney). Note: more nuanced aggregation will be addressed in Feature 3. | | | For administrative staff involved in the generation of reports, inconsistency across reports and concerns over reliability are among their chief complaints. Many of these concerns would be ameliorated by the proper execution of this feature and the use of common nomenclature.  Additionally, current reporting relies heavily on manual aggregation of reports. This introduces process errors and raises questions of reproducibility as the process of manual aggregation is poorly documented. The system should automate such aggregation to the greatest extent possible. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| * Users should be able to access a pre-defined set of lists and graphs showing a set of predefined aggregate reports (e.g., caseloads). * These reports would replicate the functionality of the current reporting system re assignments and case counts and remove the need for manual aggregation where possible. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Pre-defined combinations of datum stored in the system. | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | Depends on all data relevant to predefined aggregations. | | |
| Ongoing work | Existing reports, and Defender Data | | |
| Performance | Could run on historical records/data warehouse. | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| Risks include:   * Miscommunication or misinterpretation of data’s meaning. This is an issue with the current system in which the same word can have different meanings depending on the context of the report. * The need for new idiosyncratic reports. Note: feature 3 is an attempt to mediate this concern. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 3**  **Feature Name: Dynamic-Criteria Reports / DIY Queries** | | | |
| Users should be able to generate configurable displays and lists of aggregate information about cases et al. based on some logical combination of filter criteria (e.g., show list and trends for cases of X type out of office Y over time Z). | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| Management has come to rely on the accretion of “one-off” reports built up over the years for a number of reporting needs. Some of these reports are formalized via a reporting interface and some are done manually. What they share is a lack of coordination across the reporting system. Consequently, as with case counting reports, this constellation of reports suffers from issues of inconsistent nomenclature, poor documentation, and errors in process. This feature aims to address these by providing for a single tool with common nomenclature and logical options for aggregation, avoid the need for the creation of a new constellation of custom reports. | | | Multiple users have requested the ability to run their own reports on system data or to export data from the system so that they may make use of it. This feature would help facilitate such. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| * It should be possible for a user to produce a list of cases corresponding to a novel query, where the options for query parameters are nearly the whole set of data fields held in-system (e.g., all cases involving a 94C charge out of Middlesex where the defendant was non-white). * Such lists should be accompanied by a time series of matches so that one may see trends in the data. * It should be possible for the output of this feature to be formated in tabular form such that it could be the input for more advanced data analysis (i.e., doing more than looking for counts and trends in same, e.g., looking for correlations between case features and case outcomes). | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Any combination of datum stored in the system. | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | Depends on all data inputs. | | |
| Ongoing work | Current custom reports in CASEY and TRIS, and Defender Data | | |
| Performance | Could run on historical records/data warehouse. | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| Risks include:   * Overly complicated interface / information overload. * Enable poor use of inference (just because one can get a “count” that does not guarantee it means what they think it means). | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 4**  **Feature Name: Integrated Research Repository and Links** | | | |
| Users should be able to access CPCS-produced research materials housed in-system as well as links to relevant external materials (e.g., statutory language and jury instructions) from within the system. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| CPCS staff-produced resources are inefficiently disseminated to staff. In-system access and discovery would greatly work to improve on the status quo in which many staff are simply unaware of what materials exist. Additionally, it would remove some common rote tasks from work like case opening by collecting statutory language and jury opinions. | | | Staff responsible for the creation of training materials, practice guides and the like have expressed frustration at how rarely their work product is consulted. The ability to easily find such in-system stands to better utilize this important work product.  This feature will be tangentially related to case information, such as charges and motions -- being able to draw on that information in order to do meaningful case research. The feature also may possess its own standalone component, wherein it links to existing research sources. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| * When information such as a specific criminal charge is displayed, it should include a link to more information such as seriousness levels and statutory language. * When such information is housed externally such links may point to third-party sources, such as the MA legislature’s website or MyGideon. * Features may include an always running automatically generated list of resources customized to the facts of a case. For examples, the system could pull together links to statutes, jury instructions etc., practice guides, and sample motions for specific matters all displayed to attorneys viewing the case details page. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Contextual case data (e.g., charges, hearing types) | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | Is dependent on all relevant contextual data | | |
| Ongoing work | None | | |
| Performance | Dependant on eventual solution, likely near-real time but not real time. May take the form of contextual “hints”, which require responsive processing times. | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| The integration of contextually aware resource discovery is a sizable design challenge and a risk attaches to the possibility that users will be presented with and rely on incomplete or out-of-date information. For this reason content curation is a key area of concern. | | | |

### **Focus Area: Administration**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 1**  **Feature Name: User Permissions** | | | |
| Administrative or supervisory staff will be able to give CPCS users access to different features/views in the system and define what they can see and edit within each view based on the user’s role and relationships. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| In the user permissions feature administrative or supervisory staff will be able to identify what each user can see or be able to edit in the different views in the system, based in-part on their membership to groups, which they can define here.  Permissions can also be granted based on relationships. For example, one could set that in addition to group membership (e.g., what office someone belongs to) an attorney who is working the case can see the case file.  Supervisory staff need to have access to information on staff working in multiple offices in order to supervise them effectively and obtain reporting numbers on cases. | | | This feature will only be used by administrative or supervisory staff, not all users. They can give access to users on what they can view or edit and groups on a need basis or as applicable to their specific job roles. Staff will also need to be given access to specific groups within the agency in order to better manage permissions and access.  Supervisory staff need to be able to access data for specific staff in different offices in order to be able to supervise them. Currently supervisors there have no way to assign users to different locations and roles, which is an ongoing support issue.  This is a frequently-requested and support-intensive task, this is among one of the highest-priority items in the application. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| The user permissions feature will be available to administrative and supervisory staff, they will be able to identify what sections/views/groups users will have access to based on user’s group memberships and and other relationships. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Group memberships and other relationships | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | Identity management (e.g. active directory) | | |
| Ongoing work | Maintenance of roles in current system | | |
| Performance | real time | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| The will inevitably be debate over who decides who can see what. A risk would be that interplay of roles and relationships could lead to ambiguity of access rights. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 2**  **Feature Name: Business rules management** | | | |
| Administrative or supervisory staff will be able to configure rules for relevant workflow concerns and metadata assignment within the application, so that IT does not need to get involved for day-to-day configuration. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| The business rules section will keep track of matters, case metadata and workflow in the system.  Business rules allow for work to be done on the part of attorneys; structuring the process to allow for more automation of repetitive processes. For examples, at the start of every case of type X, produce these three documents. This allows the system to server as more than a static repository for data.  The need for flexibility in the application will require that rule changes to be done with a minimum of IT effort.  The system needs to be more responsive to changing needs of users: and allow for supervisory control over properties that may change over the life cycle of the application, there should be a way to assign these business rules without needing developers to make material changes to the application. This is something that was requested by a lot of people in order to maximize their performance and daily workflow. | | | The business rules feature will be used to configure and keep track of matters, case metadata and workflow in the system. Their is a current need for contextually triggered actions by system in order to help automate processes in system relating to documents and case-specific actions and help staff and clients better. An example can be if you have entered a court date, it would then ask you if it was a hearing or bail case. This way it can determine what next steps you need to take or what documents you need.  This feature will also configure case data so it can connect with the runsheet, case management and address current workflow concerns.  This feature does not exist at all in the current application; as it stands, IT has to make costly changes to an application in order to accommodate any material changes.  This feature was not explicitly requested by users that use the system, but their feedback consistently hints at some similar functionality: metadata, motions, and other collateral and business rules frequently change in the application as what CPCS needs or wants to report on evolves.  The priority of this feature is high since these configurations will impact staff workflow on a day to day basis. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| * The feature needs to be able to automate processes for users and enumerate labels to manage the “matrix” of motions in an extensible, flexible way. * Being able to manage matters is also important in the feature and ensuring that new matters, relevant ones are added and can be associated with existing cases. * This feature should be easy to access and users should be able to configure them by checking off options in a screen directly in the application:   + example, if the case is about a hearing then select specific motions relating to that hearing type.   + If, next steps are needed before closing a case, select what next steps need to be taken by case type. * The rules in this feature should be allowed for administrative and supervisory staff. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | The business rules need to be kept current by staff in order for the data to be more effective in users’ interaction with the system | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | Business rules management will depend with users interaction with other parts of the system | | |
| Ongoing work | N/A | | |
| Performance | Given that these rules will drive the workflow of many users, it is important that they take effect in real time. | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| * The debate here will be who is responsible for maintaining and updating the rules. These business rules need to be easy for non-technical staff to create and understand. * The implementation of this feature may be very labor-intensive; defining business rules that can be applied in an extensible, user-friendly way is challenging from a design and development perspective. It will likely be that some parts of this feature will be simpler to implement than others -- defining a matrix of motions, for example, will be simpler than defining a business rules engine that can be applied. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 3**  **Feature Name: Office Administration** | | | |
| Administrative and supervisory staff will be able to view and manage internal CPCS groups (e.g., offices and divisions) and keep track of their contact info, location, services, etc. Administrators will be able to manage CPCS group relationships and be able to capture and maintain the internal hierarchy of the organization. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| The group admin feature will keep track of groups contact info, services, different locations and staff at each location in order to better assign relationships in system.  The definitions of these groups will define in-part permissions throughout the system, allowing permissions to logically follow from real world relationships, and allowing the application to be more flexible without needing to make changes in-code to the application. | | | The group admin feature will be used by supervisory staff to assign relationships between groups and staff in system. The implementation of this feature will allow users in the system to be flexibly moved as the organization evolves, without needing to make hardcoded changes.  This feature does not exist in the current application, which is a constant pain point for administrators of the current systems -- there is no facility for users to belong to multiple groups, or move from one group to another.  Related to Calendar (may default calendar to a given group); Related to Cases (cases may be associated with a given group); Related to People (people may belong to one or more groups, which affects what they can see, and their permissions).  Related to case feature on administrative oversight, among other elements in the application -- a designated AIC/supervisor role must exist for most groups. |
| Feature Description | | | |
| The group admin feature will need to keep track of current group contact information and staff associated with the group and their relationships to said group (e.g., staff attorney, AIC, etc). By defining the relationships of groups to each other, this feature will make explicit the hierarchy of the organization, ensure appropriate user permissions for well established and ad-hoc groups within CPCS. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Groups associated with people or clients in CPCS need to be kept up to date. | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | Identity management (e.g. active directory) | | |
| Ongoing work | Maintenance of current system permissions | | |
| Performance | Realtime | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| Groupings should reflect actual agency structure, and also account for some flexibility to address for some changes in the current structure. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature Number: 4**  **Feature Name: Staff Administration** | | | |
| Administrative or supervisory staff will be able to add/edit information on staff, like contact info, title, CPCS office location, etc. and manage relationships of staff to groups. | | | |
| Business Case | | | Customer Case |
| The staff admin feature will keep track of staff contact info, location and how they are related to specific groups and allow for the management of relationships in system.  The definitions of staff relationships to groups will define in-part permissions throughout the system, allowing permissions to logically follow from real world relationships. | | | When staff information is up to date, you can trace where they work at even after several moves within CPCS and what their title/job duties are, also what groups they are related to then it’s easier to manage current and historical staffing info and relationships.  Related to groups (people may belong to one or more groups, which affects what they can see, and their permissions). |
| Feature Description | | | |
| Administrative and supervisory staff will need this feature to keep staff contact information up to date in a way that it can be easily related to the other CPCS groups and their most current contact info, job titles and locations. | | | |
| Dependencies and Requirements | |  | |
| Input | Users will need to keep staff information up to date in system. | | |
| Internal & External Dependencies | Identity management (e.g. active directory) | | |
| Ongoing work | Maintenance of current system staff information | | |
| Performance | real time | | |
| Debates, Issues, and Risks | | | |
| An issue would be when staff work in multiple offices or move to different roles within the agency and maintaining the contact info and relationships up to date in real time. Also, supervisors need to be able to view current attorney case information when they work in multiple offices in order to supervise. | | | |