

- I. 2000-2001 Grand Jury report on COUNTY-WIDE DATA SHARING: BETTER WAYS TO SHARE
- II. Published June 20, 2001
- III. The Grand Jury investigated both current and proposed projects for collecting, storing, and accessing data. Three alternatives were identified, each of which may compete for significant County funding. Because the County cannot fund all needs, it must select what appears to be the highest priority. This report seeks to give focus to what appear to be the most promising and cost effective approaches.
- IV. Key Grand Jury Recommendations where there is disagreement or need for follow up:

Recommendation 5e: The Board of Supervisors (BOS) should support these important Data Sharing efforts with commensurate, incremental increases in Departments' operating budgets.

BOS Response: Requires further analysis. If, as the Grand Jury suggests, successful data sharing efforts will result in decreased costs, increased operating budgets may not be justified. If costs are not decreased, and additional resources are required, budget increases would need to be weighed against the expected benefits and other County priorities. This analysis will take place as needed during the budget development process for FY 2002-03.

2001-2002 Grand Jury comment: This response did not include a timeframe for the matters to be presented to the relevant decision maker as required by California Penal Code Section 933 (b) (3). The maximum time allowed by law for this process is 6 months from the report publication date.

Recommendation 18c: The Employees University (EU) should pursue an alliance with SBCC to offer a broader range of specialized technical courses. The EU should organize and act as fiscal agent for inter-departmental technical courses provided by outside vendors at the request of the Departments involved.

BOS Response: Will not be implemented. ITS already performs this role. Specialized technical training is not the mission of the EU. The EU, however, has an on-going alliance with both Allan Hancock College (AHC) and Santa Barbara City College and is collaborating on computer training to be provided at its joint use facility on the Calle Real Campus in south county and computer classrooms run by AHC in north county. The EU has assisted departments in researching specialized training for computer applications and made referrals. The EU does

not have a mechanism in place to act as fiscal agent for courses provided by vendors. While EU offers “Just In Time” customized classes for subjects like MS Project, the EU will not implement specialized technical classes for Information Technology staff (ITS) at this time. This is currently being done by ITS.

Recommendation 19a: All Departments should undertake a process study, based on the Probation model, as part of the planning process prior to any implementation of technology projects. This data-sharing process should be conducted with clerical and line-staff and should include data survey, IT management conferences, and formalized agreements.

BOS Response: Will not be implemented. Departments routinely implement process studies as part of technology project planning and prior to all technology implementations. However, they use a model that is appropriate to their business and accepted process improvement industry standards, which may differ from Probation’s. The Probation Department model worked very well to meet the needs for a new case management system. The process included a very deep and thorough study of all “business” systems, and it required the participation of a large cross-section of staff within the Probation Department and other agencies with whom they share or receive data. The County and other departments are in the best position to determine if this is the process to be followed.

V. Synopsis:

This report contains 42 recommendations with requests for comments from 20 respondents.

Number of responses to recommendations required – 127

Number of responses to recommendations in which the respondent agreed with or implemented the recommendation – 83

Number of responses to recommendations in which the respondent disagreed with the recommendation – 25

Number of responses to recommendations in which the respondent requires analysis or study to finalize position – 18

Number of responses where respondent answered as being not responsible -- 1