

A
Preliminary
Strategic Plan for
Improving Public Safety
and the
Administration of Justice
with Information Sharing

2002-2009

Arkansas Integrated Justice Information Systems

Prepared for the **IJIS Coordinating Council**

Arkansas Crime Information Center ♦ Administrative Office of the Courts
Arkansas State Crime Laboratory ♦ Department of Correction
Arkansas Sentencing Commission ♦ Department of Community Correction
Arkansas State Police ♦ Department of Information Services
Office of the Prosecutor Coordinator ♦ Public Defender Commission
Department of Human Services Division of Youth Services

by the
Arkansas IJIS Office
501 Woodland Drive, Suite 303
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

May 9, 2002

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	3
1.1. Background	3
1.2. Mission and Goals.....	4
1.3. Strategic Plan	5
1.4. Pilot Project.....	5
1.5. Other Projects	5
1.6. Risks.....	5
1.7. Conclusion	6
2. Strategic Goals.....	7
2.1. Capture data at the source event, reducing or eliminating redundant data entry.	7
2.2. Build on existing criminal justice information systems.....	7
2.3. Promote consistent standards in criminal justice information systems.	8
2.4. Integrate criminal justice data at all levels and branches of government.	8
2.5. Enhance interagency access to adult and juvenile justice data.	9
2.6. Encourage the sharing of communication technology and infrastructure.	9
2.7. Provide guidance on the planning and administration of criminal justice information systems.	10
2.8. Enable more useful management information statistics.	10
2.9. Establish priorities and architectures that will accommodate future integrated justice information systems.	10
2.10. Optimize the funding of criminal justice information systems.....	11
3. Planning Strategy.....	12
3.1. Build Support for Integration.....	12
3.2. Document Requirements.....	12
3.3. Identify Immediate, Short-term Projects.....	13
3.4. Develop Data Standards.....	13
3.5. Design Information Sharing Architecture.....	13
3.6. Develop Statewide Implementation Plan.....	14
3.6.1. Select Integration Solution.....	14
3.6.2. Identify Priority Projects	14
3.6.3. Secure Funding	14
3.6.4. Implement the Solution.....	14
4. Pilot Project	15

Arkansas Integrated Justice Information Systems

Preliminary Strategic Plan

5. Coordination with other Projects	16
5.1. Arkansas Court Automation Project	16
6. Risks	17
6.1. Agency Participation and Cooperation	17
6.2. Keeping Technology in Perspective	17
6.3. Schedule Risks	17
6.4. Funding Risks	18
7. Timeline	19
8. Appendix	21
8.1. Data Dictionary Comparisons – Defendant’s Name.....	21
9. References.....	22

1. Executive Summary

The Arkansas Integrated Justice Information Systems program is preparing for statewide, seamlessly interfaced criminal justice information systems. The program's goal is for local law-enforcement agencies, prosecuting and defense attorneys' offices, state courts, the various correction facilities, and other affiliated state agencies to be able to electronically share data, eliminating duplicate data entry and delays in providing criminal justice data to each other.

This program is led by the *Integrated Justice Information System Coordinating Council*, established by Arkansas [Act 848 of 1999](#) and [Act 1272 of 2001](#). This council includes the directors of the following state agencies.

- Arkansas Crime Information Center
- Administrative Office of the Courts
- Arkansas State Police
- Department of Correction
- Department of Community Correction
- Department of Information Systems
- Department of Human Services Division of Youth Services
- State Crime Laboratory
- Arkansas Sentencing Commission
- Public Defender Commission
- Office of the Prosecutor Coordinator

1.1. Background

In Arkansas, there are a variety of computer systems at the city, county, and state levels that have been implemented by individual criminal justice agencies. Unfortunately, there is not an overall structure in place that allows information in these computers to be shared among all those criminal justice agencies.

Today, when a defendant proceeds through the criminal justice system, information on that individual is re-entered over and over into multiple databases. Not only is there a great waste of time in making these duplicate entries, but it also leads to errors and delays. By repeatedly re-creating files, criminal justice officials are diverted from their real job. In addition, with separate and independent systems, there is not an automated way to keep track or generate a complete profile on an individual offender.

Furthermore, it is possible for a criminal to operate in more than one jurisdiction, with this criminal activity unknown to each set of local authorities. For example, a person can

Arkansas Integrated Justice Information Systems

Preliminary Strategic Plan

be arrested and released on bail in one county without the authorities knowing that the same person was arrested and released on bail just days before in another county.

To resolve these problems, there must be connectivity and linking of the various information systems, so that data can be shared outside of the individual agency that creates it. Data should be captured at the earliest opportunity, with additions being made at each decision-point during criminal justice processing. It should become a seamless record on the individual as he or she goes through the criminal justice system and should be made available *instantly* to anyone who needs it.

The advantages of sharing information include:

- **Increased Public Safety** by making timely, accurate and complete offender information available to all criminal justice decision-makers.
- **Improved Accuracy** of information by having data entered once at its source.
- **Improved Productivity** of staff by reducing redundant data collection and by eliminating paper-based processing.

1.2. Mission and Goals

Since there was no funding appropriation for the study of justice information systems, the council sought inclusion in the Governor's Technology Initiative, which provided planning assistance in workshops led by Nortel Networks in December 1999 and January 2000. Although the contract between the state and Nortel was cancelled and only two of the IJIS workshop series were held, the workshops assisted the council in identifying the problems that can be solved by integrating the various state agencies' information systems and allowed them to define their mission and goals.

IJIS Mission

We will create and maintain integrated criminal justice information processing with accurate, complete, and timely data on individuals and events, to promote and support the effective administration of justice in a timely and cost-effective manner at all levels of government in Arkansas.

The goals established in this strategic plan directly support the mission and are the focal point for all IJIS related efforts. These goals were summarized from data gathered through several months of meetings as well as the Nortel Workshops. The analysis of the information resulted in ten strategic goals that added structure to the direction set in the mission.

Many factors drove the identification of the Strategic Goals, including:

- Innumerable data entry points for criminal justice information at all levels of the system

- Lack of an effective method to capture current, complete status on an individual in the criminal justice system
- Disjointed hardware/software architecture supporting the systems
- Business processes not focused on taking full advantage of the power and flexibility that a computerized criminal justice information system can provide

1.3. Strategic Plan

This document describes the steps we will take to plan for an integrated criminal justice systems. The process will begin by documenting the existing systems and the flow of criminal justice data through these systems. Data standards will be established to ensure uniform interpretation of data. Development of an infrastructure model and architecture will occur, and then attention will be turned to acquisition and implementation. Each step of this planning process will require revisions to the previous step, as is to be expected. Assuming availability of resources and funding, the implementation phase could begin as soon as First Quarter 2003.

1.4. Pilot Project

A unique Federal funding opportunity has permitted a pilot project, which will provide invaluable aid during the planning for statewide data sharing. This project will also allow for an early success that can create synergy and support for the broader statewide effort, and will provide the creation of a model for other counties to follow. The goal of the pilot project is to integrate the Faulkner County offices of the Sheriff, the Prosecuting Attorney, Circuit Courts, and the Detention Facility. This project began January 7, 2002 and is scheduled to be completed December 2003.

1.5. Other Projects

During the planning of integrated systems, no moratorium will be, or can be, placed on new projects. For example, the Arkansas Supreme Court Committee on Technology has initiated the Arkansas Court Automation Project. The IJIS Coordinating Council and the ACAP office must closely coordinate their projects.

1.6. Risks

As with any undertaking of this magnitude, there are associated risks. These risks can be reduced primarily by ensuring players maintain an eye on the strategic goals rather than short-term tactical gratification. Risks come in four general areas: technical, scheduling, funding, and agency participation. A potential risk is the effect of technology. This great

Arkansas Integrated Justice Information Systems

Preliminary Strategic Plan

capability must be kept in perspective. Technology cannot be the driver to the solution. The solution must determine the technology employed.

The IJIS Coordinating Council has authority through out the 2002-2003 biennium. There is the risk the 2003 Arkansas General Assembly will not enact legislation authorizing the continuation of the council.

Schedule, funding, and technical risks are a concern, but no more so than with any other project. Maintaining a schedule that requires the cooperation of several agencies is difficult and can become frustrating. Continuous communications among all parties and a focus on the project schedule and potential impacts to it must be maintained with zeal. Funding is an ever-present risk. Building and following an accurate, realistic budget is elemental, and the ability to foresee potential pitfalls with the budget is essential.

1.7. Conclusion

Providing for the safety and security of our citizens is a fundamental and primary responsibility of Arkansas government. Accurate and timely criminal justice data leads to a safer state for our citizens. In addition to the criminal justice agencies at all levels of government, many individual citizens use this data and depend on its accuracy and completeness. Other states are recognizing the need for all organizations involved in the justice system to share complete and current information on criminals and criminal suspects. This need transcends the criminal justice process. Information sharing is equally important to child support, child and elder abuse and neglect cases, emergency management services, Driver Control, and Office of Motor Vehicles.

Arkansas has a statewide governmental commitment to e-Government and public access to data and services. Researchers at the Taubman Center for Public Policy at Brown University recently ranked Arkansas 19th of the 50 states in the evaluation of 1,680 state government websites.¹ In a survey by the Center for Digital Government on how information is being harnessed by states for transportation management purposes, Arkansas ranked in the top 10 for the use of geographic information systems.² Arkansas was one of the first states in the country to implement electronic filing of income tax returns. Integration of the criminal justice information systems will directly support the effort of the State or Arkansas to use technology to provide services and safety to its citizens.

¹ Darrell M. West, "State and Federal E-Government in the United States, 2001", Brown University. Available at: www.insidepolitics.org/egovt/01us.html#Overall_State_Ranking.

² Center for Digital Government, "2001 Digital State Survey". Available at: www.centerdigitalgov.com/center/media/Top25-DSSPart4Rankings.xls.

2. Strategic Goals

2.1. Capture data at the source event, reducing or eliminating redundant data entry.

Single points of data capture must be established wherever an individual enters the Arkansas Criminal Justice System. This data, once entered, should be available to all other agencies and should not be re-entered as the individual moves within the system. Agencies should only have to add supplemental data that supports their specific business needs.

The current process is extremely labor intensive. Criminal data is obtained and entered at nearly every point in the process. The same data is repeatedly recorded and stored on each individual in stove-piped systems. The potential for error is considerable in a system that cannot tolerate administrative mistakes regarding individuals potentially involved in criminal activity. A typical example begins at the initial point of arrest. Data is captured at that point by the arresting officer on a hand-written citation and again on the officer's incident report. Much of the process is repeated following handoff to the detention facility. As the subject moves through other processes (Prosecution, Trial, AOC, DOC or DCC) data is continually re-entered into their respective systems. Should social work be required, the same data is re-entered yet again. These separate points of data capture need to be fully integrated to reduce the labor effort and provide an element of data integrity to the system.

Strategic Goals

- *Capture data at the source event.*
- *Build on existing systems.*
- *Promote consistent standards.*
- *Integrate at all levels and branches of government.*
- *Enhance inter-agency access to adult and juvenile justice data.*
- *Encourage the sharing of communication technology and infrastructure.*
- *Provide guidance on the planning and administration of criminal justice information systems.*
- *Enable more useful management information statistics.*
- *Establish priorities and architectures that will accommodate future integrated justice information systems.*
- *Optimize funding.*

2.2. Build on existing criminal justice information systems.

Numerous legacy systems exist within agencies of the criminal justice system. These systems were designed to support what may be outdated processes and are primarily for use within the individual agency. These legacy systems can not all be replaced, nor should they be; some are new systems based on latest technology. The State has a large amount of dollars invested in the existing legacy systems and to require new systems or

to create another data center is not feasible. But very few were designed with data sharing needs in mind. In the Computerized Criminal History area, for example, the criminal history provided for an individual may be only a partial history. This is due in part because AOC systems were not designed to automatically send disposition data to ACIC, as well as the lack of automated means for law enforcement agencies to report arrests. We must determine what can be done to enhance these systems to support data sharing.

Many organizations lack the basic automation tools needed for their job. Many of the state's prosecuting and defense attorneys rely on manual processes to manage their caseloads; very few have tools available to them to obtain or share data via electronic means. While most law enforcement agencies own desktop computers, they often have no actual records management system and are not networked.

2.3. Promote consistent standards in criminal justice information systems.

The development of data standards will be important to the integration effort, since so many agencies and various levels of government will be involved. Sharing information can be difficult, if not impossible, if key fields cannot be used to match records across systems. Arrests cannot be easily matched to dispositions because the arresting agency uses a different number than the courts to track the charge. By identifying data standards, systems can be built that conform to the standards, facilitating the sharing on information. As long as systems meet the standards, agencies can pursue development and implementation efforts knowing that their system will be compatible with others.

There are national work groups addressing this issue. In addition, the State's Information Architecture Work Group is developing Enterprise Data Architecture Model Definitions. The Coordinating Council plans to adopt the recommendations of these groups.

A survey on "Defendant Name" in the data dictionaries for eight state agencies revealed 10 definitions (see Appendix 8.1). This is not surprising, but does demonstrate the need for a common data element definition.

2.4. Integrate criminal justice data at all levels and branches of government.

An IJIS systems architecture must be put in place, which will provide for the capture, collection, storage, distribution and sharing of data to a wide variety of criminal justice users within the state. This system must use state of the art technology, have open standards to accommodate change and update, and be flexible enough to accommodate a variety of user equipment. System availability must 24/7 to support law enforcement officers, pre-trial services needs, and the needs of all other criminal justice users.

Presently, there is no fully functional data sharing management environment within the state. The current environment exists as a series of nearly isolated islands of information, some elements of which are collected many times and only occasionally shared through the State's Criminal History database. The result is the capture of large amounts of valuable information, but with limited or non-existent access which hampers the use of the very information needed to aid public safety.

2.5. Enhance interagency access to adult and juvenile justice data.

Interagency integration refers to the ability to access and share critical information at key decision points throughout the justice process. This is usually accomplished by providing the ability to:

- **Query** local, regional, statewide and national databases to determine the criminal justice status of a person (e.g., whether a person is currently wanted by another jurisdiction);
- **Push** information to another agency, based on action taken within the originating agency (e.g., reporting arrest information to the state and national criminal history repositories; passing arrest information from a law enforcement agency to the prosecuting attorney's office);
- **Pull** information from other systems for incorporation into the recipient agency system (e.g., populating a correctional information system with offender information captured in the pre-sentence investigation and court proceedings);
- **Publish** information on people, cases, events and agency actions (e.g., scheduled court events, criminal history records, sex offender registries, etc.);
- **Subscribe** to a notification service (e.g., probation officers *subscribe* to a notification service that will automatically notify them whenever one of their clients is arrested or otherwise is involved in the justice system).

2.6. Encourage the sharing of communication technology and infrastructure.

Technology components shall be designed for use by all criminal justice agencies. For example, network investments in integration technologies like middleware could be leveraged to support integration needs in other business areas, provided adequate security for criminal justice data is maintained. Technology investments should be made in such a way as to leverage the investments.

We are beginning to see some progress in this area. Historically, each state agency operated independently, with no direct sharing of technologies, except through the state's Department of Information Services. However, there currently is an on-going project

with the Department of Correction and the Department of Community Correction to share an Offender Management System as well as the hosting hardware.

2.7. Provide guidance on the planning and administration of criminal justice information systems.

To make business processes more effective, an evaluation is required of those processes within the individual agencies that comprise the IJIS Coordinating Council. Also important is an evaluation of the business processes that are fundamental to the sharing of data and resources which will define the IJIS process.

2.8. Enable more useful management information statistics.

Better statistical measures can provide much improvement in government officials' decisions regarding policies and programs designed to reduce and control crime problems. Crime statistics are used as the basis for many grant program awards. Statistics project the needs of future resources, such as detention facilities, law enforcement agencies, drug treatment programs, etc.

The lack of a computerized way to share information has hampered many crime fighting and prevention initiatives in Arkansas. For example, the U.S. Department of Justice in a evaluation of a program it sponsored to evaluate and curtail methamphetamine production and usage in our state, stated that deficiencies with regard to proposed information sharing across local agency partners via a shared computerized information system hindered the program.³

2.9. Establish priorities and architectures that will accommodate future integrated justice information systems.

Justice data integration will cross many political and jurisdictional boundaries and levels of government. The integration solution must respect the autonomy of these various criminal justice agencies, and must not function as the operational system for any one agency. In fact, existing legacy systems and the management requirements of multiple criminal justice agencies preclude the construction of a single, massive information system to link criminal justice agencies. The integration solution must be based on widely accepted and available Open Systems Architecture, which is characterized by Open

³ U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, "An Evaluation of the COPS Office Methamphetamine Initiative", Institute for Law and Justice and 21st Century. July 2000.

Communication Standards, Open Operating System Standards, Open User Interface Standards, and Open Database Connectivity (ODBC) Standards.

The existing legacy systems are based on varying types of architecture and degrees of openness, from non-existent to latest designs.

2.10. Optimize the funding of criminal justice information systems.

Because of limited resources, it is imperative that project funding be planned and targeted to efforts that provide the most value. Rather than planning separately, criminal justice agencies should share their individual plans and incorporate them into a comprehensive blueprint for criminal justice information sharing. By sharing planning information, agencies will recognize opportunities for joint efforts to increase benefits and reduce costs.

Typically, each agency provides funding for its own IT initiatives. To fund the integration project, each agency must contribute to the overall funding, in the form of budget line items or partnering on grant applications.

3. Planning Strategy

The following tasks have been identified as preliminary steps to the development of a comprehensive design for sharing information.

3.1. Build Support for Integration

We must find champions who can galvanize support for our integration project. The champion should be someone who holds the respect of others in his or her own agency, as well as counterpart agencies. Champions can help build support by talking about the project among their colleagues, in the community, and to key decision makers.

Points of leverage need to be found. A human tragedy that occurred because critical data was unavailable can become a powerful call to action. Leverage can also be found in broad assessments of how certain investments can reap multiple benefits. For example, many justice applications benefit from geographic information systems, but so do economic development, environmental quality, and county or municipal services.

3.2. Document Requirements

It is first necessary to inventory existing systems and document the system-wide view of the data and how it flows through the criminal justice system. By documenting who creates the data, who uses the data, and the reason for its existence, all stakeholders will have a more informed view of their role in maintaining the accuracy and timeliness of the data.

Input will be provided by all member agencies as well as the members of the Local Government Advisory Group (LGAG). Results of this analysis will be a Requirements Document including data flow diagrams, process charts identifying data exchange points and events that trigger information sharing, and agency specific objectives for integration. Recommendations will be developed to reduce duplication and improve the timeliness and accuracy of the data.

SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, has developed a research tool to capture detailed information regarding the events, agencies, information and exchange conditions associated with justice information integration. This tool, which has been tested in five states, is now available for production use. We have applied to SEARCH for the tool and training on its use. SEARCH has indicated availability to us during the summer of 2002.

3.3. Identify Immediate, Short-term Projects

The long term planning and implementation of a statewide integrated criminal justice system will take years. In this day and age of rapidly changing priorities and technology, short-term projects are needed that can promptly demonstrate benefits of integration. We will identify projects that can provide “quick wins” under the current environment. Some of the more obvious choices could be simple interfaces between systems to replace manual submission of data.

3.4. Develop Data Standards

The development of data standards will be important to the integration effort, since so many agencies and various levels of government will be involved. There are national work groups addressing this issue and creating national standards for criminal justice information sharing. In addition, the State’s Information Architecture Work Group is developing Enterprise Data Architecture Model Definitions. The Coordinating Council plans to adopt the recommendations of these groups.

3.5. Design Information Sharing Architecture

We must build a solid infrastructure upon which integration and future applications can be built. This infrastructure includes computing platforms, database systems, communications networks, office automation software, application development environment, support staff, standards, and security. It is the environment in which user applications operate. A defined infrastructure will provide a model for adoption by all criminal justice agencies at all levels.

For information sharing projects to succeed, a uniform approach needs to be adopted and specific requirements defined for participation in the integration sharing. The technical architecture will describe the hardware, software, and network components necessary at the state and local levels for efficient sharing of information. Because of the number of agencies and organizations involved, the architecture will need to accommodate the sharing of information among distributed and sometimes disparate systems.

The Arkansas Information Systems Act of 1997 gives the *Office of Information Technology* the authority to define standards, policies, and procedures to manage the information resources within the state. This is accomplished through work with a multi-agency working group known as the Shared Technical Architecture Team. The documents published by this office apply to all state agencies, which includes the IJIS Coordinating Council. The IJIS Technical Committee will develop the technical architecture to meet the needs of integration, within the guidelines established by the OIT, including issues related to privacy, security, and public access. In addition, many

states and their local governments are working on integration projects and we will be able to learn from their experiences.

3.6. Develop Statewide Implementation Plan

Up to this point, the Planning Strategy has outlined the steps to *define* and *prepare for* statewide integration. The following steps address the development of the long-term plan to *implement* statewide integration.

3.6.1. Select Integration Solution

There are many proposed solutions to statewide integration, ranging from consolidation of systems to coordination of systems. Each has its benefits and short comings. During this step, we will review proposed solutions from workgroups, industry vendors, and solutions implemented in other projects; and will select a design that best fits our needs and requirements.

3.6.2. Identify Priority Projects

It is unlikely that total funding and other resources will be immediately available to implement the comprehensive plan. Identifying priority projects will provide information necessary to find resources and obtain funding to implement the plan in a priority of projects or in phases.

3.6.3. Secure Funding

As with most projects of this magnitude, funding strategies must be in place for successful technical integration. This requires us to be flexible, persistent and creative in our quest for funding sources. Funds can come from a variety of places such as local, state and federal grants, legislative appropriations, and individual agency budget line items.

3.6.4. Implement the Solution

After prioritizing projects and securing funding, we will begin the implementation of the solutions. This, no doubt, will require consulting and contract services and the procurement of the technology required. For each project, we will define a target start date and duration.

4. Pilot Project

In early 2001, a unique Federal funding opportunity became available, requiring an immediate and relatively short-term project (18-24months) that would contribute directly to improving information sharing among some of the law enforcement and criminal justice agencies. Since a completely integrated criminal justice system includes integration at the local level, where the criminal justice process begins, the Coordinating Council decided to select a single county that would serve as a pilot county where integration could be implemented and lessons could be learned from a small but representative project of integration.

A pilot project will allow for an early success that can create synergy and support for the broader statewide integration. This pilot project will allow the creation of a model for other counties to follow. Once success can be demonstrated, it is believed that many counties will want to implement integration projects, and that funding will be made available by the appropriate legislative bodies. In addition, it provides experience and opportunities that will enhance the development of the statewide sharing plan.

It was determined that Faulkner County should be the pilot county. This is a medium sized county in the center of the state, near Little Rock, the state's capitol. The County Judge (the county's top executive administrator) and all criminal justice administrators there have enthusiastically agreed to be the pilot county.

The goal of the pilot project is to integrate the offices of the Faulkner County Sheriff, the Prosecuting Attorney of the 20th Judicial District, the Faulkner County Circuit Courts, and the Faulkner County Detention Facility. This project began January 7, 2002 and is scheduled to be completed December 2004.

Funding was applied for and received from the National Governors Association in cooperation with the Bureau of Justice Assistance of the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs. This grant will fund the Arkansas IJIS project office and the pilot project through October 2003.

Additional information and current status can be found at
http://www.ijis.state.ar.us/pilot_program/pilot_program_p1.html

5. Coordination with other Projects

During the planning of integrated systems, no moratorium will be, or can be, placed on new projects. However, a coordinated effort must exist, and all new criminal justice IT projects not directly a part of IJIS should be presented to the IJIS Coordinating Council for informational review.

The importance of this type of communication can not be overstated. For example, the IJIS Project Director was named by the National Governors' Association and the U.S. Dept. of Justice, Office of Justice Programs (OJP) as the State's IT Point of Contact. All OJP grants applications require applicants to notify their state point of contact that they will be developing or implementing an information system.

5.1. Arkansas Court Automation Project

The Arkansas Supreme Court Committee on Technology has initiated the Arkansas Court Automation Project. The initial goals of this project are to implement a statewide court case-management system on a statewide court network infrastructure. Since every aspect of the criminal justice system from arrest to incarceration to release of defendants involves the courts, the IJIS Coordinating Council and the ACAP office must be completely coordinated in their efforts.

To accommodate this coordination, the IJIS Office and the ACAP Office are sharing an office suite. This allows constant communication and familiarity of each project.

Additional ACAP information and current status can be found at <http://courts.state.ar.us/courts/acap/index.html>.

6. Risks

This section provides a discussion of some issues that present a considerable risk to the IJIS implementation. These risks are presented within this Strategic Plan to raise awareness of the issues and to ensure that we take the necessary steps to minimize the potential impact of these risks. Constant communication, joint planning and decision making, and long-term perspective will go a long way toward mitigating the risks associated with this project.

6.1. Agency Participation and Cooperation

Perhaps the greatest risk to the entire project lies in the area of inter-agency cooperation and participation. For this effort to succeed, an extraordinary level of cooperation and trust is required among all parties. Inevitably each agency will encounter circumstances in which pressing internal organizational needs create pressure to divert resources and attention from the joint information sharing effort. Although participation is voluntary, it is critical to the success of the project.

6.2. Keeping Technology in Perspective

Across the various agencies, there is a need to leverage information technology tools to expand business capabilities, capitalize on current business trends, and move forward with business-to-customer services. However, technology must not be allowed to drive the solution; rather, the solution will define the technology to be employed. To do otherwise would put the success of the program at risk. It must also be acknowledged that technologies are constantly changing, oftentimes faster than a strategic plan can adjust.

We have an excellent opportunity to introduce progressive technology to criminal justice agencies, thus enhancing their ability to provide their specific services and bringing them in line with current industry standards. For example, in the interest of eliminating the widespread use of paper forms and improving turnaround time for agency documents, automated case management and electronic records management should be encouraged. However, if we require everyone to deal with integration in the same way, we effectively quash the possibility that a better way will be found.

6.3. Schedule Risks

Schedule risk exists in any project, especially one involving numerous agencies and numerous efforts over a multi-year horizon. Any number of factors can adversely impact the project schedule, the most common being the following:

- Sporadic or insufficient funding
- Poor planning
- Loss of a key team member
- Insufficient infrastructure
- Change in direction or lack of support from senior leaders
- Late deliveries from vendors

As planning begins on the IJIS implementation, the Coordinating Council must be aware of the dependencies of various projects and the critical path within the high-level project plan that will impact success and the ability to achieve targets and milestones. Failure to focus on priorities and critical path efforts will result in delays and possible project failure. The project schedule must receive timely and repeated attention.

6.4. Funding Risks

Funding risk is always present. Funding in the proper amounts and at the proper time is critical to this project. Sponsoring management and legislative personnel must be prepared to provide IJIS funding as a steady stream. IJIS is a strategic effort that incorporates business process and technical changes, as well as the introduction of new technology. These improvements come at a cost that should be well planned and budgeted.

Arkansas Integrated Justice Information Systems

Preliminary Strategic Plan

7. Timeline

The following time table provides a conceptual time frame for the integration project. This is not a static schedule. This timeline assumes that resources and funding will be available on the Begin Date. There is also the assumption that during the 2003 Arkansas General Assembly, legislation will be passed authorizing the continuation of the Coordinating Council. This timeline must be updated as the project progresses and more details added, such as assigned resources, funding source, etc., as the project becomes more defined.

Strategy • Task	Time Frame	Duration
Build Support for Integration		
• Find Champions to Galvanize Support	Begin immediately	36mo
• Find Points of leverage	Begin immediately	12mo
• Develop Business Cases	Begin immediately	12mo
• Create Publicity Material	Began 2 nd Qtr 2002	24mo
Document Requirements		
• Inventory Existing Systems	Begin 2 nd Qtr 2002	2mo
• Document Business Data Flow	Began 2 nd Qtr 2002	6mo
• Identify Data Exchange Points and Trigger Events	Begin 3 rd Qtr 2002	2mo
• Define Agency Specific Objectives for Integration	Begin 3 rd Qtr 2002	2mo
• Develop Recommendations for Improvements	Begin 3 rd Qtr 2002	1mo
Identify Short-term Projects		
• Identify Short Term Projects	Begin 3 rd Qtr 2002	0.5mo
• Develop Implementation Plan for Short Term Projects	Begin 4 th Qtr 2002	0.5mo
Prepare Report to the Governor as required by Act 1272 of 2001	Begin 3 rd Qtr 2002 due Sept. 30, 2002	1mo
Develop Data Standards		
• Review Enterprise Data Architecture Model Definitions	Begin 3 rd Qtr 2002	0.5mo

Arkansas Integrated Justice Information Systems

Preliminary Strategic Plan

Strategy	Time Frame	Duration
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Task 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Data Standards from Other Integration Projects 	Begin 3 rd Qtr 2002	1mo
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop Data Standard Document 	Begin 4 th Qtr 2002	3mo
Design Information Sharing Architecture		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Industry Workgroup Recommendations 	Begin 4 th Qtr 2002	0.5mo
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review other's integration projects 	Begin 4 th Qtr 2002	1mo
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review vendor solutions 	Begin 4 th Qtr 2002	1mo
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design Information Sharing Architecture Model 	Begin 4 th Qtr 2002	2mo
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop Privacy Policy 	Begin 4 th Qtr 2002	2mo
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop Security Policy 	Begin 4 th Qtr 2002	2mo
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop Public Access Policy 	Begin 4 th Qtr 2002	2mo
Prepare Continuing IJIS Legislation	Begin 4 th Qtr 2002	6 mo
Develop Statewide Implementation Plan		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select Integration Solution 	Begin 1 st Qtr 2003	2mo
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify Priority Projects 	Begin 1 st Qtr 2003	2mo
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secure Funding 	Begin 1 st Qtr 2003	60mo
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement the Solution 	Begin 3 rd Qtr 2003	72mo
Faulkner County Pilot Project	Began 1 st Qtr 2002	22 mo

8. Appendix

8.1. Data Dictionary Comparisons – Defendant’s Name

Agency	Variable Name	Type, Length	Description
Division of Youth Services	LastName FirstName	Char 30 Char 25	Last Name First Name
Prosecutor Coordinator	Last_Name First_Name Middle_Name	Char 30 Char 20 Char 15	Defendant Last Name Defendant First Name Defendant Middle Name
Department of Community Correction	Last_Name First_Name Middle_Name	Char 20 Char 15 Char 15	Defendant Last Name Defendant First Name Defendant Middle Name
Crime Lab	Suspect Last Name Suspect First Name Suspect Middle Name	Char 18 Char 15 Char 15	Suspect Last Name Suspect First Name Suspect Middle Name
Administrative Office of the Courts	Deflast Deffirst Defmidd	Char 18 Char 10 Char 10	Defendant Last Name Defendant First Name Defendant Middle Name
Arkansas Sentencing Commission	Deflast Deffirst Defmidd	Char 18 Char 10 Char 10	Defendant Last Name Defendant First Name Defendant Middle Name
Arkansas Crime Information Center	NAM		Name-last, first, middle initial
Department of Correction	CMALSTNM CMAFSTNM CMAMIDIN CMSCLSTN CMSCFSTN CMSCMIDN CICLSTNM CICFSTNM CICMIDIN	Char 20 Char 11 Char 15 Char 20 Char 11 Char 15 Char 20 Char 11 Char 15	True/Alias Last Name True/Alias First Name True/Alia Middle Name Commitment Last Name Commitment First Name Commitment Middle Name Current Committed Last Name Current Committed First Name Current Committed Middle Name

January 2000

9. References

- Center for Digital Government, “2001 Digital State Survey”. Available at: www.centerdigitalgov.com/center/media/Top25-DSSPart4Rankings.xls.
- Center for Technology in Government, “And Justice for All: Designing Your Business Case for Integrating Justice Information”, University at Albany, SUNY, New York.
- Commonwealth of Kentucky, “Unified Criminal Justice Information System Strategic Alliance Services Request For the Commonwealth of Kentucky”, March 2001.
- State of Delaware, “Delaware Criminal Justice Information System Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2002-2005”.
- State of Nebraska, “Nebraska Criminal Justice Information System Strategic Plan”, March 1997.
- State of New Mexico, “Justice Information Sharing Project Strategic Plan for Calendar Years 2000-2002”, February 2001.
- State of North Dakota, “North Dakota Criminal Justice Information Sharing Plan”, March 2001.
- Threatte, Jim, “Integrated Justice Information System Architecture Building Blocks Construction”, PriceWaterhouseCoopers LLP, May 2001.
- U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, “An Evaluation of the COPS Office Methamphetamine Initiative”, Institute for Law and Justice and 21st Century, July 2000.
- West, Darrell M., “State and Federal E-Government in the United States, 2001”, Brown University. Available at: ww.insidepolitics.org/egovt01us.html#Overall_State_Ranking.