



# Technology Investment Council



State of Delaware  
Technology Investment Council Meeting Minutes  
June 14, 2011

## Technology Investment Council Attendees

Name	Organization	Attendance	Represented by
James Sills	DTI	Present	
Russ Larson	Controller General	Present	
Ann Visalli	OMB Director	Represented	Ruby Katcher
Dr. Lillian Lowery	DOE	Represented	Karen Field Rogers
Myron Steele	Chief Justice	Represented	Marianne Kennedy
James Canalichio	Dixon Valve & Coupling Company	Present	
Dan Grim	University of Delaware	Present	
Carlos Vieira	Bank of America	Present	
Kris Younger	82 North LLC	Not Present	
Glenn Tascione	Barclay's Bank	Present	

### **Call to Order:**

Secretary Sills called the meeting to order at approximately 9:00 am.

### **Welcome:**

Secretary Sills welcomed everyone, and introductions were made at the Dover and Wilmington Video Teleconference (VTC) locations. Gene Mitchell from the Kid's Department also participated via VTC. TIC members' attendance was noted, as shown in the above table. Others in attendance included DTI Senior Staff, DTI Team Leaders, IRM Council Representative, DTI Customer Relationship Specialists, DTI Project Managers, and Major Project Managers/Sponsors.

### **Old Business:**

Jim Sills asked if all the members received and reviewed the March 8, 2011 TIC meeting minutes and requested for a motion to approve them. With no comments or questions, Glenn Tascione made a motion to approve the minutes as written, and Carlos Vieira seconded the motion. With no opposition, the motion was carried.

### **IT Consolidation Update: MSP ~ Bill Hickox:**

The Managed Service Provider (MSP) mandatory-use contract was awarded on May 2, 2011 for any IT staff augmentation resource. Under the MSP network, a standard rate card across the state will be implemented. There was a two month transition time to convert existing contractual resources over to the new MSP. As of May 2<sup>nd</sup>, all new IT resource requests have gone through the MSP. We have transitioned 23 out of 26 existing vendors to this model. Fifty eight (58) total vendors are now on the MSP contract. Our opportunity to gain resources has doubled. We do not expect there to be a significant business impact associated with this effort as we continue to support all system requirements. We anticipate the State will save approximately \$500,000.

### **IT Consolidation Update: Agency Status ~ Bill Hickox:**

Department of State (DOS): Phase I is complete. DOS Townsend data resources have migrated into DTI at the William Penn facility and are providing system administration support. As a part of this transition, DTI ensured these resources were welcomed and blended into DTI, an exempt agency, while still remaining merit employees. In addition, the

Developers from the Division of Corporations are reporting into the DTI Apps Delivery team. The service desk and desktop support for the Bankers Commissioner's Office was also successfully migrated to DTI. With the closing of the Townsend Data Center and the consolidation of the staff, we have saved DOS \$364,000 in maintenance, operating, and contractor support costs. We are currently preparing for Phase II which includes bringing the balance of the desktop and service desk functions from the outlying DOS agencies into DTI. The goal of ITC is to make the state more efficient, reduce costs, and provide better service.

Department of Finance (DOF): The inventory and physical assessment of the systems and infrastructure are complete. We are still waiting on some final information from the Skills Assessment Survey. The first version of the Recommendations document has been drafted. These recommendations will be vetted internally to ensure cost savings and improved efficiency. We will then meet with the DOF, review the recommendations, come to an agreement, and lay out the implementation plan. We are behind in our original timeline because we uncovered some concerns and issues related to maintaining the integrity of the state.

*Glenn Tascione ~ Do you have a revised timeline on how long it is going to take to get the final recommendations?*

*Bill Hickox ~ Yes, the recommendations were supposed to be ready in April but were pushed back about 6 weeks.*

Department of Transportation (DelDOT): DelDOT is a very large and diverse department, so the inventory and physical assessment has been a big challenge. One of the bigger challenges we are finding in DelDOT and some of the other agencies is the lack of systems design diagrams for every system. Without understanding what is potentially impacted, we cannot move systems or make changes. DTI has dedicated a full-time resource to DelDOT to work on the system design diagrams with their staff. In some cases, the only knowledge base of these systems is held in their contractors who could leave at any time. This is a significant vulnerability that some agencies are faced with. Part of the ITC effort is to get a handle on mitigating that risk and leveraging the skill sets across several agencies to provide support for those Legacy systems that the State heavily relies on contractual resources for today. We anticipate the recommendations will be developed and drafted next month.

*Carlos Vieira ~ As you are going through this are you finding reluctance getting help from people? Do you think they are feeling less valuable?*

*Bill Hickox ~ One of the things that we found from the beginning is that there is some embarrassment by some of the existing staff. They feel maybe this is something they should have focused on before now. And now we are coming in and there is some hesitancy as folks are trying to gather the information that is needed. Not resistance from people thinking they will be out of work but a hesitancy to open up and show what they have because they may not be as compliant to standards as they should have been.*

Department of Education (DOE): We have a signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and are receiving great cooperation from DOE. Our initial engagement is underway. We are working through some of the timeline issues; they have a number of critical items they want to make sure are not negatively impacted as part of this process. We are working cooperatively with them to ensure we do not impact the "Race to the Top" initiative.

### **Enterprise PC Procurement ~ Mike Hojnicky**

As a result of Executive Order 20, the Purchase Order review process identified a lack of standard desktop and laptop configurations and inconsistent discount levels among the agencies. Under the existing GSS mandatory use contract, the Executive Branch, Judicial Branch, and other elected offices are covered. Legislative and K-12 School Districts are optional. After reviewing Delaware's procurement history, we found that, on the Executive Branch side, DELL was the prominent vendor. By reviewing DELL's model, we identified a contract option called "Premier Savings Program". This program was already available under the mandatory use contract but was not widely used by the agencies. By comparing current purchase orders with the model pricing, we were able to identify savings from \$75 - \$343 per computer. After consulting with the IRMs, it was determined to leverage the existing GSS/OMB contract agreement, called the "Western States Contract Alliance (WSCA) Premier Savings Program", and implement it effective June 7, 2011. This program includes a six month configuration and pricing refresh cycle, monthly contract

review meetings hosted by North Dakota, and an annual vendor performance review. The benefits of utilizing this program are: it maintains a set of statewide standard configurations for all agencies, improves DTI's ability to support agencies through the ITC, receives the highest possible discount regardless of quantity, and reduces procurement time. In addition, DTI's Service Desk team will become DELL-certified which will provide a higher level of support.

*Russ Larson ~ Is this for lease and purchase?*

*Mike Hojnicky ~ Yes, in the lease they utilize the state contract but we negotiate the price ourselves for the hardware. The hardware is the same if you are leasing it or purchasing it outright.*

*Glenn Tascione ~ How many PC's are you talking about?*

*Mike Hojnicky ~ About 1,700 desktops and 600 laptops. As the economy improves we will start to see an increase in hardware. We will also be working with the agencies to improve deployment.*

*Deb Lindell ~ Will the Dell certification training be available to other agencies?*

*Mike Hojnicky ~ Yes, but at a charge. They will cover only our DTI staff.*

### **IRM Engagement ~ Mike Hojnicky**

In an effort to strengthen and improve our relationship with the IRMs, DTI held an offsite Executive Branch IRM Briefing on March 2, 2011 at Buena Vista. In a casual, interactive atmosphere, DTI provided updates on strategic initiatives. It was agreed to continue these meetings every six months. The next meeting is scheduled for September 20, 2011. At this meeting, we hope to identify key agency business drivers and request the IRMs to suggest two strategic initiatives that are important to their agencies.

*Deb Lindell ~ I thought the meeting was extremely effective and a good use of our time. A lot of eyes were opened on both sides, and we are trying to work together which is a good thing.*

### **Information Security Program – Cloud Computing Update ~ Elayne Starkey**

We are asking our customers to consider the cloud as we deploy new applications. Cloud computing promises a credible alternative to traditional IT delivery models. It produces significant cost savings, enhanced scalability, agility, and rapid delivery. However, it also reduces control and introduces risks that need to be managed. We are asking our customers to think of these risks as they are considering Cloud engagement. Items to consider are the classification of the data, the criticality of the system, and the recoverability. We are also encouraging our customers to be very assertive with the vendors by asking them questions and suggesting certain contractual clauses. For the last several months, DTI and our Deputy Attorney General have been vetting a set of security clauses that we are recommending to be considered in any type of cloud engagement. We suggest proceeding cautiously with vendors to ensure our State interests are protected.

*Russ Larson ~ Is there a recommended list of Clouds? How does that work when an agency is looking into this use; how do they know one is more secure than another?*

*Elayne Starkey ~ Basically, it is looking at their contractual agreement; we are recommending they look at their terms and conditions. Get beyond the sales flash and get down to the nitty gritty of what it is that they are going to be responsible for, what we are going to be responsible for, and compare it with the over 20 conditions that we suggested.*

*Secretary Sills ~ Elayne, can you outline a couple of the terms that are important to you?*

*Elayne Starkey ~ The recommended direction is that the data does not leave the borders of the United States, any type of transport of non-public data is encrypted, and anyone involved in the project must provide evidence of a clear background check.*

*Secretary Sills ~ This is a hot topic right now throughout the industry. We are trying to stay ahead which is very difficult because it evolves every day. There are a lot of vendors out there that are pushing this platform, and state agencies are signing up when they really do not have an understanding of the implications of moving their data to the Cloud. We are trying to work with the Information Resource Managers and Information Security Officers so that they are aware of the risks of moving applications and data into the Cloud.*

*Russ Larson ~ Which raises the question, is there a point in which the monetary value of using the Cloud is dwarfed by the security problems that may be associated with it?*

*Bill Hickox ~ The issue, when you consider going to the Cloud versus internally building your own server and infrastructure, is the dial up dial down model doesn't exist when you are doing it yourself. You have to invest in hardware and infrastructure and you cannot sell it back if you are not using it. If you are in the Cloud you can dial up based on what you are using. The support model is a lot easier because you don't have to deal with all the personnel, changing technology, upgrading, and the disaster recovery. The financial model is very significant which is why the Cloud is so hot and everybody is looking to move to the Cloud. It is potentially enormous.*

*Carlos Vieira ~ The benefits you mentioned are very important, however, security breaches can be drastic so you have to be very paranoid of security issues. It is also important to be flexible to adjust to all the changes of what is going on and be able to take advantage of all the new things that are happening in technology. You have to look at this from different perspectives. You want all the other things and you want the security. Creating a standards contract will be very helpful in terms of what you need and you can always do trade-offs when it makes sense.*

*Karen Field-Rogers ~ When will the contract terms be available?*

*Elayne Starkey ~ They are available now on our website.*

#### **Information Security Program – Statewide Information Security Training Proposal ~ Elayne Starkey**

DTI is currently working on a proposal that would require all Executive Branch employees with an email account to complete an annual mandatory information security training class. As of September 1, all new employees will be required to take this online training within the first 30 days of employment as a condition of hiring. A pilot is underway which provides about 3,000 existing employees within nine different agencies access to a computer-based training tool. It is taking on average about 2 hours to complete this training. It is designed for an eighth grade education level and is not too technical. The objective of this training is to provide a consistent level of education and awareness to our state employees. Strong information security requires attention to people, process, and technology. The weakest link in the chain is people. By the end of the summer, the pilot results will be reviewed by DTI and OMB, and we will continue the deployment for the rest of the State.

*Carlos Vieira ~ One of the things that we offer in our organization is the option to test out for those employees that know the information. That may help with the adoption of the program.*

*Elayne Starkey ~ That is a good idea for future years.*

*Secretary Sills ~ Was there a certain threshold to test out?*

*Carlos Vieira ~ Yes, it depended on the course, but anything over 80.*

*Deb Lindell ~ Elayne and I have talked previously about the time commitment. We have to pay Correctional employees overtime to take them off the floor because they cannot do it while they are trying to watch inmates. The most they can give to these things are about 20 minutes, and some of these modules can't be done in 20 minutes; some take up to 45 minutes. We are hoping there can be some adjustments or realignments made. We cannot afford overtime or increased staffing. We will have to work together to figure it out.*

*Elayne Starkey ~ I would like Corrections to be part of the pilot, so we can figure out what works and the different ways to deploy it in your unique environment.*

### **Major Projects Update ~ Matt Payne**

A quarterly Major Projects Review Meeting was instituted to review highly visible, high dollar projects; the first meeting took place on April 27, 2011. Seven projects were reviewed with a total budgeted amount of over \$200 million. Each project was reviewed in detail with the objective of presenting best practices. Items discussed during this meeting were: the ongoing support model when the project is completed, the structure of the project team, planning for needed education and training, the role of the functional support resources, the criticality of business requirements, vendor management, and historical data conversion. Other projects' issues and risks that were reviewed were: timeline, milestones, lessons learned, and review of their budget. After the reviews, a decision is made if the project should be presented in the next TIC meeting. Three projects were chosen to be presented at this meeting: FACTS II, DCAP (formerly COTS), and EDINS.

### **"FACTS II" Family and Child Tracking System, II ~ Gene Mitchell (DSCYF)**

The objective of FACTS II is to replace the Kid's Department (DSCYF) 17+ year old Family and Child Tracking System with a new system, built on current technologies, that integrates services provided by the Department's Family Services, Prevention and Behavioral Health and Youth Rehabilitative Services divisions. DSCYF has reviewed and updated the project requirements and obtained Administration of Children for Families (ACF) approval for three FACTS II-related RFPs. The RFPs were released late last fall for Design, Development, and Implementation (DD&I), Quality Assurance (QA), and contracted project management (PM). Proposals have been received in response to all three RFPs. The Project Manager has been selected, approved by ACF, and has a start date of July 1, 2011. The QA Contractor has been selected, and contract negotiations are underway. The DD&I proposals are being evaluated by FACTS II teams. The total project budget is \$25.6 million, and as of March 1, 2011, \$0 has been expended. FACTS II Issues/Risks are: identification and availability of technical and functional resources within DSCYF, approval for staffing flexibility to supplement project and agency staff, OMB cash flow from original budget may not match bidder payment schedule, potential Medicaid funding availability, stakeholder data sharing, and identifications of minimum proposed system functions and requirements for contract negotiations. FACTS II is on schedule. The contract negotiations were finalized in June, the work space is being prepared and has been leased in the DeIDOT Wilmington building, and the projected start date for the FACTS II DD&I contractor is late July 2011.

*Matt Payne ~ Can you elaborate on the sixth bullet under the issues/risks; what does that mean?*

*Gene Mitchell ~ We want to find out what our minimum functions and requirements are as we begin contract negotiations. That will be an internal process.*

*Matt Payne ~ So you feel good that you have granular detail of the requirements?*

*Gene Mitchell ~ Yes.*

*Matt Payne ~ How are you doing with the progress in terms of your resources? I remember the functional folks' availability was a big concern.*

*Gene Mitchell ~ That is one of the things we are working on and will be discussing with the Director's this afternoon.*

### **DCAP Delaware Courts Automation Project – Marianne Kennedy (Courts) ~**

The Courts have been working on establishing a change in government structure, and a new Project Manager has been hired with a starting date of June 20<sup>th</sup>. Within the next month, interviews will take place to identify a functional and technical lead for this project. Project 0 start up/planning activities have begun which is preparation for the new direction of the project. A significant amount of training has taken place with the support staff. This week, the administrative level training with Software AG has been completed. The Project Manger is not onboard yet, but activities have begun with requirement definitions in key areas such as automation of the bail check writing/processing. The total project budget is \$15.7 million, and as of May 31, 2011, \$12.5 million has been

expended. Project Issues/Risks include: establishing major changes in their governance structure, realigning funding and staff resources to address new requirements, and renegotiating relationship with ACS, the vendor that provided the COTS system. There has been a lot of progress with ACS, and we have been negotiating the final maintenance costs. The end of June has been targeted to finalize the document to close out the contract.

*Russ Larson ~ The name COTS changed into DCAP. I can't make a connection between COTS and this project. Are they the same thing?*

*Marianne Kennedy ~ They are the same thing. We are moving in a different direction. The off-the-shelf product that we bought was implemented in the civil system and is working well in those areas. However, it is not a good fit for criminal, so we are going to utilize the best parts of that system (we bought that system and own the source code) as well as utilize other things throughout the state to move to a more custom development for criminal. We want to take advantage of all the current tools we have available in Delaware and leverage our current investments. We have such a significant investment in DELJIS and some of our existing Legacy systems that we want to take care in moving in a new direction and leverage those existing systems. This is a change to a more custom development; taking advantage of the COTS system as well as other existing systems.*

*Russ Larson ~ Wasn't the decision made last year or two years ago to not pursue the criminal side of this?*

*Marianne Kennedy ~ We are not going to pursue it with the off-the-shelf package.*

*Russ Larson ~ But you are going to pursue it?*

*Marianne Kennedy ~ Absolutely.*

*Russ Larson ~ Is Justice Steele onboard with this?*

*Marianne Kennedy ~ Yes he is and also the second sponsor, Justice Ridgely. They recently put together a whole new executive directive for the project.*

*Carlos Vieira ~ From a budget perspective, you have about \$3 million left. Is that going to be sufficient to get through this part of the project?*

*Marianne Kennedy ~ One expense will be the Project Manager. We have funding for that position. We have enough to cover the expenses for the closeout the current project. Our expectation at this point is that available funding will be enough since we are using current resources for the additional development. We are also leveraging our existing infrastructure: the COTS system infrastructure, the hardware, Oracle, and other software purchases. So we have substance in terms of our infrastructure that we will not have to replicate, for which we will not have to add any additional funds. There will be some costs for Software AG support, but system development will be taken over by internal resources. At this point, we will be looking at putting together a funding plan. Other resource and vendor costs will be included in that plan.*

*Secretary Sills ~ The \$3.2 million that is remaining - is there a target amount you are setting aside as part of your negotiations with ACS or are you saying you don't want to pay ACS anything over \$2 million?*

*Marianne Kennedy ~ At this point, we are looking at an estimated amount of \$1.2 million. Half of that is for maintenance costs because we owe them in arrears for last year. We want to change the arrangement and begin paying them in advance for maintenance and other items. We are looking at between \$600,000 to \$700,000 just for maintenance and about \$650,000 to \$700,000 to close out the current contract. The remainder will be budgeted for resources. We have obligated money for the Project Manager, and we have estimated costs for the support that Software AG will give us for the first year. We will be looking to get additional support from them for the first year, but for out years there will be a lot of training for our own staff to take it over.*

*Secretary Sills ~ So you think your funding will last approximately two years or so? If you need more funding do you plan to go back to the legislature?*

*Marianne Kennedy ~ Our plan at this point is to have the bulk of the criminal development done by 2013, so we should have a major system component in place in the next two years. Additional incremental development after that should be able to be handled by our internal staff. Our plan is to get the majority of the work done in two years taking the incremental approach.*

*Russ Larson ~ If I understand what is being said here, we had a COTS project budgeted at \$15.7 million. The Criminal side we decided not to do, but that has changed and we now decided to do it. We are changing software vendors to be able to do it. We will spend the other \$3.2 million that is available, and then something is going to be necessary beyond that? Is that correct?*

*Marianne Kennedy ~ Actually, let me clarify. We always needed the criminal development. We are choosing to do the criminal development in a different way. We are just not using the vendor for the primary support. Their generic system won't work for criminal, but pieces of that system will fit very nicely for what we need for criminal. For example, there is entire financial component coming from the top Oracle-based system that has already been interfaced with FSF, and we are going to take the code from that and adapt it for criminal use. We always intended to move forward with criminal, we are just modifying our approach by taking more of a custom approach using the baseline COTS system but not using the vendor. Our plan is to use the balance of our money to help move us in a different direction, and our JIC technical group will be available to support it in the future. At this point we are not expecting to have to come back to the JFC for any additional funding.*

*Russ Larson ~ For any part of this? So civil and criminal will be taken care of around 2013 and no new money will be appropriated, is that correct?*

*Marianne Kennedy ~ That is our expectation.*

*Secretary Sills ~ I would like to make a few comments on this project: they have hired an experienced Project Manager, and the judges are actively involved in this. Justice Ridgely has put forth the right oversight on this initiative, and they have the right governance in place. Matt has been involved in all their monthly meetings. I think the risk is them trying to leverage their in-house development to build this app in addition to doing their regular work at the same time. I think eventually, in my opinion, they will have to come back to get additional funding to finish the project. That is my view.*

*Russ Larson ~ It was my understanding through the years that the problem with the criminal side was that the judges were reluctant to change the way they do business. The change orders required on the software were too extensive to bother with, and it just got hung up there. It was understood that we wouldn't get much further without some major changes from the judges. I haven't seen or heard of that happening.*

*Marianne Kennedy ~ We actually made a lot of changes. When we moved into the civil system, we moved to standardize a lot of the different processes, and we have been very successful with that. It is not a judge issue; it's the way we do business in Delaware. We have some unique processes that we put into place that just don't fit into a generically built system. For example, our sentencing structure; we have some very complicated laws for sentencing and our codes are very complex. The generic product just does not have all the pieces we need for our sentencing model. If we wanted to get all the different components of sentencing into the system, we would have to get custom development. It is just not the best fit. What we do have is a legacy system for our sentencing piece. It is old technology, but we can upgrade that component using a technology available on the COTS system and it provides the judges with what they want. It is very difficult to put the Delaware processes into the generic system. For example, all the interfaces we have between the police, Department of Corrections, and all the other agencies within the state. Delaware really is the only state with that kind of integration. We are in an incredibly unique situation with the way we leverage information. I don't know of any other state that has charges put into a police car that automatically*

*updates Court systems. We do not want to lose any of that, and it is just not supported in a generic model. That is the direction we are moving in to take advantage and leverage all those existing systems and not lose anything.*

*Matt Payne ~ On the positive side, Marianne and Pat have brought strong leadership to the project team. I think the restructuring of the project team is going to benefit the project. If anybody can work on negotiating the contract with our existing vendor, they are the best group to do it. My concern is we do not have a defined end state yet. We have a couple of efforts we are working on with the vendor, and they are being laid out well and will be executed well by the new partner, but it is not the end state. It is hard to say definitively that this is the end time and this is the end dollar amount if you don't have the whole end state totally laid out. To my knowledge, it is being worked on but has not been done yet. If you are going to use a lot of different components and a lot of different technologies for the solution, then the performance of the many different pieces is always a concern. The direction, structure, and leadership are positive, and the mindset of the people working on it is much improved. But I think it is still going to be a challenge without a definitive end state.*

*Russ Larson ~ How do we get to a definitive end state?*

*Matt Payne ~ Marianne and her team are working with all the different courts and are laying out the different pieces. They are going to attack it that way. You have three pieces defined already, correct Marianne?*

*Marianne Kennedy ~ The first portfolio is defined. We expect to have five different portfolios for different projects that will lead us to the end state. We have the first one completely finished and have started working on the others.*

*Jim Canalichio ~ Clearly we are going in a different direction here and it sounds like the best choice. Was the original \$15.7 supposed to cover this portion of the project?*

*Marianne Kennedy ~ Yes*

*Jim Canalichio ~ So the expectation of maybe needing additional funding is probably a little underestimated?*

*Marianne Kennedy ~ We do not have a clear answer on all the funding we will need in the long run because we don't have everything defined at this point. When you look at the money that was put into place, remember that some of the funding was approved 10 years ago. So the 10 years ago dollars were more than enough to complete this project with the current vendor, but the delays have taken us down a long term continuum.*

*Matt Payne ~ The other part of the answer is that you are going to be reusing existing resources to try to get some of these things done. We have inconsistency in the state on how we fund the projects. Some include the people, some do not, some include the facility, and some do not include the facility. As we look at the seven different major projects, there is not a consistent existing model across the enterprise. Sometimes, if you use state resources they actually include that as part of the project budget, but others do not include those at all. The model in this case is using existing resources that are already funded. This is what they are going to be dedicated doing, and that money is outside of the dollar figure. And the thought is that they can leverage a lot of that to get the work done. Is that correct Marianne?*

*Marianne Kennedy ~ That is correct.*

*Russ Larson ~ Aren't the business cases supposed to be consistent?*

*Matt Payne ~ To me, at the State level that is what we would want. Again this is much bigger than DCAP, but during my two years here I do not see consistency.*

*Russ Larson ~ I am fairly certain that was the original goal for the business plan was to have consistency. The other issue I have is on the remaining \$3.2 million on this project. I certainly don't have a problem with moving ahead, but I sure would like to have a defined end point before we spend any more money.*

*Marianne Kennedy ~ In terms of the defined end point; we have a lot of work to do defining how we are going to move in this new direction with our current staffing and the custom development. But we had originally defined what we wanted out of the criminal system in the original RFP, and we are still on target. All of the major components will be incorporated in where we want to be with our end state. That hasn't really changed significantly, we are just going to do it in a little bit of a different way. We still need the same interfaces and the same basic functionality. A lot of that is part of our path forward and our vision of where the project will end up.*

*Mike Hojnicky ~ Russ, as part of the business case process you referenced, we are now getting to a better view of what goes on because of the PO review and coordination with OMB. We are starting to get the insight which will eventually bring us that consistency.*

*Russ Larson ~ I am not going to try to stop this project, but the whole idea of the business plan was it was supposed to be consistent. All you need is a few columns to say how much is this going to be, what you are trying to get to, how much staff you need, and so on. In terms of this project, I am wracking my brain thinking back to whether or not this TIC group actually killed the criminal side, but Jim [Canalichio] is telling me we probably just put it on hold.*

*Jim Canalichio ~ I thought we said it was to be put on hold because we were not going to spend any more money on the criminal side without doing more investigation. That was my recollection.*

*Secretary Sills ~ We did recommend that they pause the project for six months. They went back and looked at all the requirements, needs, and processes. The Presiding Judges Group decided to move forward in this direction. All the judges were there, and it was their decision. We were involved, but they have the right oversight, controls, a new Project Manager, new governance, and are leveraging existing resources, I think they are okay. When we get to our September meeting, we need to know a little bit more of what that end state is and tie it to a financial number. When you make a statement that you are not going to need more money, I get worried because I think you are going to need more money, but you are so definitive. I would rather you say, in September, let me define the end state, finalize the negotiations with ACS, and look at the remaining budget, then come back and say you don't need any additional money.*

*Secretary Sills ~ Every eight weeks we are reviewing these projects, and Matt is involved with this particular one. He is attending their monthly meetings and has been consulting with them on a weekly basis. We have better insight into this initiative than we did 12 months ago. We just have to stay tuned, and Marianne will come back to us with the end state.*

*Deb Lindell ~ DOC is one of the primary stakeholders in the success or failure of this project, and the need for it has never been greater. We do about 26,000 holds and releases each year and all of that comes to us on paper. So the availability of having that interface created electronically is so urgent. DOC has pledged to give to the Courts any coding that we have already done or accepted calculations, which takes into account a lot of that sentencing structure that Marianne alluded to. So we are all working together to make this work at the lowest cost possible. All of us in the law enforcement community are pledged to make this work as quickly as possible.*

### **EDINS - Education Insight – Karen Field Rodgers (DOE) ~**

“Education Insight” is a set of approximately eight interrelated projects designed to foster data-driven decision making among Delaware educators, with the goal of improving education outcomes for all students. This is an integral component of “Race to the Top” application and “WIN”. Two of the key components of that are: creating the data warehouse where we are taking all of the current data systems and putting the information together, and the dashboard or portal which will allow different people access to the data depending on their role. Both the warehouse and the dashboard contracts have been awarded to ESP Solutions and Wireless Generation, respectively. Wireless Generation also received the contract for our data coaches, which are the people that are going out into the schools to help collect data for teachers, so there is a good alignment between the person developing the portal and the people that are actually out in the schools implementing the data. The warehouse and the data dictionary software are being installed. The process of preparing for the dashboard focus groups, which will gain information on what the end users want in

the portal, is currently taking place. There are approximately 250 educators scheduled to attend the focus groups, and they are about 98% complete. The total project budget is \$6 million, and about \$1.5 million has been expended. Project risks/issues include: coordinating between the two projects is integral, and the teacher portal is on a tight time frame and needs to be complete by next spring. This means the first component to be put in has to be the teacher information in the warehouse. It needs to fit with the rest of the “Race to the Top” goals and timeframe in order to meet the 2014 goals. A few other issues/risks are: coordination of the warehouse and dashboard touch points, status meetings are integrated, and making sure the work on the ITC fits in with the set timeframe. Dashboard focus group results are expected in July as well as the initial metric definitions and Dashboard Interchange design.

*Matt Payne ~ In the ongoing model do you think there are dollars for the vendor for ongoing support or will your team take over the support?*

*Karen Field-Rogers ~ Our team will take over the support.*

*Matt Payne ~ Do you have all the technical skill sets you will need?*

*Karen Field-Rogers ~ They are working on that now. I will definitely come back with that.*

*Matt Payne ~ When do you need the longitudinal data done by?*

*Karen Field-Rogers ~ There are so many components to the longitudinal data; it will be in pieces. We are looking at the teacher portal first because we need to get the information out to the teachers so that they can start looking at this data. The ultimate goal is to improve student achievement. We are then going to move it out to administrators and parents. Some of this plan involves coordination between virtual work of coordinating data, but that requires a lot more integration with Health and Social Services, Department of Labor, and others.*

*Secretary Sills ~ Are there any questions or feedback?*

*Carlos Vieira ~ I would like to see relative to the budget and timeline, the key next steps and if the project is on budget or not.*

**Upcoming Meeting Dates:**

Tuesday – September 13, 2011 (VTC)  
Tuesday – December 13, 2011(TBD)  
Tuesday – March 13, 2012 (TBD)  
Tuesday – June 12, 2012 (TBD)

**Conclusion ~ Secretary Sills:**

Secretary Sills thanked the members for their participation and informed the Council that the next scheduled TIC Meeting will be on Tuesday, September 13, 2011. It will be held in two video teleconference locations in the Dover and Wilmington.

**Adjournment – Secretary Sills:**

With no further business to be conducted, Carlos Vieira made the motion to adjourn, and Glenn Tascione seconded the motion. With no opposition, the motion was carried. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:35 am.

:iik