



## INTERSTATE COMMISSION FOR JUVENILES

### Information Technology Committee Meeting *Minutes* October 24, 2018 2:00 p.m. ET

---

#### **Voting Members in Attendance:**

1. Tony DeJesus (CA) Chair
2. Judy Miller (AR) Designee
3. Summer Foxworth (CO) Commissioner
4. Anne Connor (ID) Designee
5. Maxine Baggett (MS) Designee
6. Natalie Dalton (VA) Commissioner

#### **Voting Members Not in Attendance:**

1. Sherry Jones (MD) Commissioner
2. Jacey Rader (NE) Commissioner
3. Nate Lawson (OH) Commissioner

#### **Non-Voting Members in Attendance:**

1. Bob Lemieux (MA)
2. Abbie Christian (NE)
3. Candice Alfonso (NJ)
4. Gladys Olivares (NV)
5. Raymundo Gallardo (UT)

#### **Guests in Attendance:**

1. Sherry Miller (NJ)
2. Mike Jacobson (SEARCH)

#### **Staff in Attendance:**

1. MaryLee Underwood, Executive Director
2. Jennifer Adkins, Project Manager
3. Leslie Anderson, Administrative and Logistics Coordinator

#### **Call to Order**

Chair DeJesus called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m. ET.

#### **Roll Call**

Director Underwood called the roll and a quorum was established.

## Agenda

**A. Connor (ID) made a motion to amend and approve the agenda to move the SEARCH: RFP Review to the first item of discussion. N. Dalton (VA) seconded. The motion carried.**

## Minutes

**J. Miller (AR) made a motion to approve the July 17, 2018 meeting minutes. A. Connor (ID) seconded. The motion carried.**

## Discussion

### SEARCH: RFP Review

- Chair DeJesus (CA) opened the floor to Jenny Adkins to provide an overview of the history and recommendation processes of the data system project. J. Adkins introduced Mike Jacobson of SEARCH to the committee.
- Chair DeJesus (CA) opened the floor for the committee to ask M. Jacobson any questions regarding the Request for Proposal (RFP) developed by SEARCH.
- Chair DeJesus (CA) asked if potential vendors would be required to outline a detailed plan in their proposal explaining exactly how they will meet the requirements. M. Jacobson advised yes. Vendors will be required to be clear and concise in their proposals with how they plan to develop a solution and how they plan to execute that solution for managing users, enforcing the compact rules, ensuring work flows are easily navigable and what the projected cost of carrying out and maintaining the system will be. M. Jacobson advised that SEARCH is willing to assist in interviews and demonstrations with the potential vendors to ensure their products and solutions meet the requirements.
- J. Miller (AR) asked if the current RFP includes any information on actual costs. M. Jacobson advised there is a scoring criteria in the document based on cost. It is a matrix to provide a breakdown of 6 items to include design and development, project management services, hosting services, updated transition plan, training, and the added total cost of ownership over 5 years.
- C. Alfonso (NJ) asked how the 4 bifurcated states will be impacted. J. Adkins advised the RFP describes how they are currently using JIDS and requires that solutions be addressed. C. Alfonso (NJ) noted areas of the document for possible language amendments to ensure consistency.
- Regarding advertising for possible vendors, M. Jacobson advised that the RFP will be posted through Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS), which is a membership organization of vendors that work to improve public safety through sharing criminal justice information via technology-based platforms and systems. SEARCH also will be publishing the RFP on the SEARCH website and the ICJ website.
- Chair DeJesus (CA) discussed the updated time line for this project with assistance from J. Adkins.
- Director Underwood advised that the proposed contract amendment would be presented to the Executive Committee at their next meeting to approve SEARCH's continued involvement through the vendor selection process.
- Chair DeJesus (CA) with the assistance of J. Adkins discussed the creation of a RFP Team to review vendor proposals, interview vendors, and take part in demonstrations. J. Adkins will send out a document outlining the expectations of an

RFP team member. Any interest in the team should be referred to the National Office.

- Chair DeJesus (CA) advised further discussion on the SEARCH RFP Team is to be discussed during the November meeting.

#### New Request to Apprehend Juvenile Return Workflow

- Chair DeJesus (CA) opened the floor for discussion regarding the return workflow reconfigurations that were tabled at the July 17, 2018 meeting.
- J. Adkins provided an overview of the proposed Request to Apprehend Juvenile Workflow discussing the holding state and home/demanding states responsibilities, options and time frames. J. Adkins commented that the Travel Plan submission is removed from all proposed return workflow configurations. This ensures that the 5-business days are not interrupted within the return workflow and would put the assignment on the holding state's assignments page for review, rather than an email notification only.
- J. Miller (AR) asked about what the timer for "Unable to Locate Juvenile" box is.
- J. Adkins replied that the holding state has 4 workflow options to choose from, one being "Unable to Locate Juvenile". There is a 60-day timer to complete any one of the four work flow options. This timer serves as a reminder only and is not tied to compliance.
- J. Miller (AR) asked for clarity on the box discussing the "Requisition Approved or Form III Signed" process.
- J. Adkins clarified that the holding state has a 30-day timer to hold the hearing. During that 30-day timer the holding state has 5 work flow options. One of those options is for the juvenile to sign the Form III. When this occurs the file automatically transitions to the edited Voluntary Return workflow to begin the 5-business day timer for the return.
- J. Miller (AR) inquired if any rules would need to be amended to support the Workflow.
- J. Adkins reported that that would not be necessary because the proposed work flows are more in line with our current rules than the currently used workflow process.
- Committee members agreed that the 60-day email reminder was useful.

#### New Juvenile Apprehended Workflow

- J. Adkins explained the proposed workflow process.
- S. Miller (NJ) inquired if this process is only created after correspondence with the other state, and if so, whether this should be built in to include this correspondence process for tracking purposes.
- Committee members discussed the 2-business day correspondence process and scenarios that can occur during that time frame, including whether capturing these correspondences would be beneficial for tracking purposes.
- Chair DeJesus (CA) explained that these correspondences take place before anything takes place in JIDS. The purpose of the proposed workflow is to track the 5 to 10-day return process in JIDS. He stated that this workflow accurately reflects that and is what was requested by the committee last year.
- The committee members agreed that it currently accurately reflects what was requested.

- J. Adkins continued to explain the remainder of the proposed workflow and its capability, dependent upon the scenario, to switch to Voluntary Return or Non-Voluntary Return workflows in the background and determine the necessary timers automatically to ensure accurate tracking.

#### New Travel Plan Workflow

- J. Adkins commented that the Travel Plan submission has been removed from all proposed return workflow configurations and is proposed to occur optionally as an independent new Travel Plan Workflow to ensure the Travel Plan workflow does not interfere with the 5 business days to return timers.

#### Return for Failed Supervision

- J. Adkins explained the Travel Plan workflow had been removed so that it would not interfere with the 5-business day timer. She requested clarification from the committee on if they want the sending state to have the authority to approve the return or deny the return.
- Chair DeJesus (CA) noted that in the previous meeting the discussion was what would be an appropriate time frame for the sending state to determine if they approve or deny the return before it falls under failed supervision.
- A. Connor (ID) requested to view ICJ Rule 5-103 as it pertains to this workflow. After review, she stated that there does not appear to be a direct time frame connected to a failed supervision. There is a disconnect between the violation and return time frames. She inquired as to if it is possible to have the Return for Failed Supervision workflow built without the time frames listed and then add them after clarification from the Rules Committee.
- J. Adkins responded that this was possible.
- A. Connor (ID) recommended amending the workflow to read that the receiving state receives a notice and goes to a 5-day timer on the sending states page until further clarification can be gained from the Rules Committee.
- Chair T. DeJesus (CA) and J. Adkins discussed the quotes and service hours available to utilize to cover these proposed workflow edits and report edits.
- J. Adkins expects mid-December would be an estimated go live date for these changes, after some training in November via Webex.
- **A. Connor (ID) moved to place these edits into sandbox before the committee officially approves them. J. Miller (AR) seconded. The motion carries.**
- Chair DeJesus requested that due to time constraints a motion be made to table the discussion topic for JIDS Enhancements.
- **S. Foxworth (CO) moved to table the JIDS Enhancements discussion to the next meeting. A. Connor (ID) seconded. The motion carries.**

#### Old Business

- There was no Old Business.

#### New Business

- A. Connor discussed adding the position on all the regions and committees of Vice Chair. If anyone is chair eligible and interested in serving in this position, please contact A. Connor (ID) or Chair DeJesus (CA) within the next few weeks so that a Vice Chair can be named at the next meeting.

#### Adjourn

**Chair DeJesus adjourned the meeting by acclamation at 4:27 p.m. ET.**