APPENDIX A: Features of Eight Case Management Systems

The chart below provides a basic overview of the features of each CMS reviewed during this report. The information in the chart was obtained primarily from the vendors themselves, and supplemented by the observations of the authors during the system demos as well as by the user interviews.

The authors worked hard to reconcile discrepancies between the vendors and users through extensive consultation with the vendors and users during the creation of the chart.[1] In the end, there were very few close calls, but in those cases, the authors used their best objective judgment regarding whether the CMS actually offered the feature or not.

Beyond any dispute about whether a feature actually exists, however, the chart cannot provide much by way of subtle qualifications to any yes or no answer.[2] Thus, the authors have provided an additional page of information on each CMS with annotations to the chart. The information in the annotation pages is taken primarily from user interviews, with some information coming directly from the vendor or from the demonstrations viewed by the authors. Not every CMS annotation page contains annotations for every feature in the chart; annotations are only provided when there was additional relevant information beyond that included in the chart.

Several additional issues should be kept in mind when reviewing the chart and the annotations. First, the authors interviewed current legal services users of these systems. For some systems, only one program was using the system. For most of the systems the authors interviewed the staff of at least two programs, but in some cases the CMS had only been used for one or two years. These facts necessarily limited the information available in this review.

Also, in some cases, the authors were unable to determine whether a particular feature actually works for users because no programs were using it for their work. We have noted these instances in the annotations.

Finally, new versions of most of these systems, as well as smaller patches, are released on a regular and ongoing basis. Only the versions of these systems being used at the time of the interviews have been reviewed. The

---

[1] The gap between the functions systems have and the functions programs believe they have is a problem that vendors might consider addressing through better documentation and training.

[2] The "reports" section of Chart A illustrates the problem. Reports are a critical function of case management systems. Whether programs can extract the information they need from their CMS in the format they want varies from system to system. However, all of the systems have some reporting system, and all can be used in conjunction with Microsoft Access or Crystal Reports. Still, some systems provide programs with more realistic ability to extract reports easily or in more forms. Some systems provide built in reports that are relatively easy to run, but do not provide a good way to develop additional reports. Others provide fewer pre-built reports but offer multiple ways to develop new reports. This complexity, while important, is not reflected in the chart at all, due to its binary nature.

report did not review unreleased versions, even those scheduled for imminent release (or, in one case, even when installation of a new version was taking place during our review), because programs had not yet had a chance to use those systems. The annotations include some information regarding additional functionality that will be made available in new versions being released now or soon, but these new versions have not been used and the authors cannot know whether they will work as the developer intends. Before making your CMS decision, be sure to obtain updated information from the vendor and any current users of the new version.

Case Management System Review Appendix A - Chart	CASS	Kemps / Clients	Legal Files	Legal Server	Pika	Practice Manager	ProLaw	Time
Time-keeping								
▪ Automatic timer[3]	√		√	√	√	√	√	
▪ Notes on time slips become part of case notes		√	√	√	√	√	√	
▪ Automatically tracks the type of activity in which the user is engaged (writing a letter, sending an email, etc.)			√	√		√	√	
▪ Can associate time with particular grant or office function such as PAI		√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Calendar / Tickler Systems								
▪ Tickler system	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Calendar	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	
▪ Able to view multiple calendar groupings as user chooses (individual, managers only, office only, etc.)		√	√	√	√	√	√	
▪ Fully integrated with other calendar programs such as Outlook			√	√		√	√	
▪ Automates scheduling based on pre-set rules (such as court rules) for different types of cases		√	√	√		√	√	
▪ Items on tickler list and to-do list carry over until completed and can be removed by user	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	
Contact management								
▪ Can create contact file for persons other than clients and adverse parties		√	√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Can link persons other than clients and adverse parties with case involvement without double entry of information			√	√	√	√	√	
▪ Can track, search and report on each contact's involvement with program, including donations			√	√		√	√	
▪ Automates search for appropriate referral based on variables such as problem code, county, etc.	√	√	√	√		√	√	√
▪ Fully integrates with other software such as Outlook			√	√		√	√	

[3] Starts automatically when electronic file is opened without user having to push any buttons. One timer can be paused while another timer runs.

Case Management System Review Appendix A - Chart	CASS	Kemps / Clients	Legal Files	Legal Server	Pika	Practice Manager	ProLaw	Time
Intake, Eligibility, Opening and Closing Cases								
▪ Automatically calculates poverty percentage	√	√	√	√	√		√	
▪ Asks for and calculates appropriate deductions or exclusions if over-income	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Asks for and calculates assets and indicates if within maximum asset level	√		√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Can choose from list of “eligible alien” options	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	
▪ Names of fields can be customized		√	√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Supports creation of intake questionnaires to help guide less experienced intake staff and to gather particular types of information	√	√	√	√		√	√	√
▪ Supports creation of dynamic intake questionnaires that use branching logic				√		√	√	
▪ Can have more than one intake open at once	√		√	√	√	√	√	
▪ Able to search by “sounds like”		√	√	√	√	√	√	
▪ Able to search by wildcard	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Able to input unlimited aliases in searchable fields			√	√		√	√	
▪ From intake screens able to input unlimited additional household names in fields that will be searched by the conflict checker	√			√	√		√	
▪ Can input address, SSN and phone number for non-clients in fields that will be searched by the conflict checker			√	√	√	√	√	
▪ Allows tracking of outcomes	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Conflict Checking								
▪ Automatically checks database for conflicts	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Conflict check function can check all other contacts in database, including household members, witnesses, aliases & other individuals, in addition to clients, former clients and adverse parties			√	√	√	√	√	
▪ Can check conflicts from case notes or other non-intake module	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Conflict check allows search by multiple	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	

Case Management System Review Appendix A - Chart	CASS	Kemps / Clients	Legal Files	Legal Server	Pika	Practice Manager	ProLaw	Time
identifiers for (name, SSN, address, phone)								
Maintaining electronic casefiles / document management								
▪ Can keep electronic case notes	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Can create word-processing documents without leaving CMS			√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Can e-mail from within the CMS			√	√		√	√	√
▪ Documents and emails created in CMS are automatically stored in or linked to the casefile from which they were created			√	√		√	√	√
▪ Can drag link to documents and emails into casefile			√	√		√	√	
▪ Can search full text of casenotes		√	√	√	√	√	√	
▪ Can search full text of all searchable documents associated with casefile[4]			√	√	√	√	√	
▪ Tracks date and author of all casenotes and documents in casefile	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	
▪ Permits creation of matter/activity (non-case) files	√	√	√	√		√	√	√
▪ Can assign multiple individuals different roles in cases, i.e. track involvement of intake worker, supervisor, pro bono, staff attorney		√	√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Support development of checklists or instructions for different types of cases		√	√	√		√	√	√
▪ Supports creation of dynamic intake questionnaires that use branching logic for different problem types or other criteria				√		√	√	
Document assembly								
▪ Provides pre-formatted document templates	√		√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ No page limit on document templates	√		√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ User can easily edit all portions of pre-formatted documents (ie, they are pulled up within a word processing program for the user)	√		√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Average user can create new document templates			√	√	√	√	√	√

[4] Some systems can search emails as well as text documents; others cannot. Only searchable PDF files can be searched.

Case Management System Review Appendix A - Chart	CASS	Kemps / Clients	Legal Files	Legal Server	Pika	Practice Manager	ProLaw	Time
▪ IT specialist or other specially trained person can create new document templates	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Document templates can include the official letterhead for any program or office	√	√	√	√		√	√	√
Pro Bono Support								
▪ Can search attorneys by name, city, county, and specialty		√	√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Can search attorneys based on last time a case was taken		√	√	√		√	√	√
▪ Can track and report on pro bono attorney time		√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Reporting								
▪ Provides pre-loaded LSC reports	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Permits creation of customized reports within CMS program itself		√	√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Permits creation of customized reports through Crystal Reports	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Permits creation of customized reports through Microsoft Access	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Grants Management/Resource Development								
▪ Permits users to assign a funding source to each case	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Permits users to assign more then one funding sources to an individual case, i.e., to divide each case into percentages to be applied to its hours and expenses			√	√			√	
▪ Integrates with accounting packages	√		√	√		√	√	
▪ Tracks donations		√	√	√		√	√	
▪ Tracks pledges			√	√		√	√	
Access / Security								
▪ Able to access from all offices in program	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Able to access from other computers after installing client software such as Citrix	√	√	√		√	√	√	√
▪ Able to access fully through any internet connection without installing any client software or plug-in				√	√		√	

Case Management System Review Appendix A - Chart	CASS	Kemps / Clients	Legal Files	Legal Server	Pika	Practice Manager	ProLaw	Time
▪ Individuals able to access multiple records at one time	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Multiple individuals able to input and save data into the same record at the same time	√		√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Can hide fields, tabs or pages based on program		√	√	√		√	√	
▪ Can hide fields, tabs or pages based on user		√	√	√		√	√	
▪ Able to control user access to specific data regardless of what tabs or pages they have access to	√		√	√	√	√	√	√
▪ Able to download data to PDA			√			√	√	

Chart Annotations

1. CASS

The authors interviewed the only two programs using CASS. The programs were interviewed together because they use the system in partnership and to coordinate work, so it is counted for this report as one interview.

CASS is a system that was developed largely with hotline functions of a program in mind. It is currently more oriented toward case reporting than case management. The developers are willing to add components to enhance case management.

Timekeeping: Users report that the timekeeping screen has a drop-down list with only some rather than all of the advocate's cases, making entering case time more difficult for cases not listed.

Calendaring / Tickler Systems: Not yet being used in the field.

Contact Management: Has extensive referral function, with contact information for referral entities, including case acceptance criteria. System screens for appropriate referral based on several factors including county and problem code, but not for income eligibility. Can enter other persons associated with case, but cannot create separate contact file with contact information and associations with other cases.

Intake, Eligibility, Opening And Closing Cases: Users report they can add more fields for intake, but not fields that involve calculation. No one has used the questionnaire function. Can enter but not search for aliases. Call-back screen is separate from intake screen and some data must be entered again onto intake screen after call-back.

Conflict Checking: Cannot search for conflicts using social security number. Users report conflict checking is slow when multiple users are on. Conflict checks include adverse parties, clients and former clients, and their spouses only.

Maintaining Electronic Files/Document Management: Users report case notes function is easy to use, but there is no spell-check function and notes made on same day are listed alphabetically, not chronologically. Additional case-handling tools, including intake questionnaire function and links to other tools, have not been used in the field.

Document Assembly: The system automates envelope label printing with client's name, address, and code for client-oriented publications to be inserted (publications are chosen by intake specialist from drop down list associated to problem code). While users like this function, the rest of the document assembly function has not been used by the program after initial problems.

Pro Bono Support: Not being used in the field for pro bono support at present. Referral system described above could be used for some functions of pro bono program.

Reporting: Users have not yet tried to use Access or Crystal Reports to create reports, although the vendor says that is a possibility. Right now, developer creates new reports as needed, and users find the vendor to be responsive to requests.

Grants Management / Resource Development: Users must export data to allocate costs to grants.

Access/Security: Client-server SQL database; not yet accessible over the internet without using Citrix or similar software. CASS expects to release a web-accessible version next year.

2. Clients for Windows

The authors interviewed four programs using Clients for Windows. One of those programs was using the ASP version of Clients 2000; two were using the SQL version of Clients 2000; and one was beginning to use Prime, a new version that is just being rolled out, although most of their answers were based on their use of Clients 2000. Because so many programs were interviewed for Clients, because it has been around for a long time, and because it has the largest market share, users had more to say about Clients than about other systems. The authors believe this unique situation may have resulted in more negative comments about the system; on the other hand, users were very familiar with the system, and the authors found that familiarity with software reduced certain other types of negative comments.

This system is one of the earliest CMS software packages and is the only real survivor of the first wave of systems. Initially developed along the case reporting model and oriented toward the needs of LSC grantees, it features an intake system geared to LSC requirements and an extensive library of preformatted reports for LSC reporting and other functions. While the developer is now trying to enhance its case management features, users report that the intake and reporting features are still more robust than the newer features, which are all fairly basic.

Timekeeping: Some users find stopwatch system confusing and use only the batch system, which most find very easy to use. Some users report that it is difficult to run their own time reports.

Calendaring / Tickler Systems: Most users do not use the Clients calendar as their primary calendar, some because they find it "unwieldy" and others because they prefer Outlook. Some use the tickler function as an adjunct to their primary calendar. Users would like to see the calendar and tickler functions integrated with Outlook.

Contact Management: System has comprehensive referral tools. Also, pro bono coordinators can use the system to match cases with pro bono attorneys by jurisdiction and specialty. Other than for referrals, most users have not used other contact management features.

Intake, Eligibility, Opening and Closing Cases: Users find it too easy it is to skip a field or leave something out. IT staff report that they have to check and clean data frequently. Users do not seem to understand how to reset default settings. Users say that the system often freezes up, which requires them to get out of the module and then get back in. The CMS provides various preformatted sets of questions for users, but users are not taking advantage of them.

Conflict Checking: There is some discrepancy between the vendor and users regarding whether the conflict check permits initial searching by other criteria in addition to name.

Maintaining Electronic Files/Document Management: Users report that if two people are in the same file at the same time, the system will lose new case notes entered unless some very specific steps are followed, yet the system does not warn a user when another user is in the file. Also, some users find that case notes can easily get highlighted by accident, resulting in easier accidental deletion. Some users believe they do not have sufficient control over the format of the casenotes. While Clients 2000 does not have document management features, the new Prime version will have some features of this nature.

Document Assembly: Many users do not use the preformatted documents, or if they do, they use them in a very limited way. Users find it problematic that the system does not automatically save documents created with templates into the case file. Users consider the template system cumbersome. Some ASP users are not using this function because it is too slow over the internet connection. The vendor says any letterhead can be used but a number of users report that they can only use the letterhead preformatted in the system. The new Prime version will have a much more robust and flexible document assembly system but it has not yet been used in the field.

Pro Bono Support: While CMS allows tracking pro bono time, users say it does not calculate the total time spent based on certain lengths of time (such as annual totals).

Reporting: This CMS contains a vast library of preformatted reports. Some users feel overwhelmed and want a better system of organization for them. The system integrates well with Microsoft Access. Some users complain that certain LSC-required preformatted reports do not generate the right data for that report. Many users would like to edit the queries in preformatted reports without having to use Access. Users sometimes get different results for the same variable in different reports.

Grants Management / Resource Development: While it can be done, users find it difficult to assign more than one funding source to a case. Does not calculate total pro bono dollar value or dollar value totals for outcomes.

Access/Security: There are three versions of Clients available now: two in-house versions (one using Access and the other using SQL); and an ASP version hosted by a company called Venture. The ASP requires installing a thin client (small piece of software) onto users' computers before the system can be accessed over the internet. Users report that while the security controls allow administrators to hide certain tabs from users quite easily, data can often be accessed through more than one tab, so it is hard to ensure that any particular user will be barred from any particular piece of information. While the ASP system is convenient, it requires downloading software and therefore cannot be accessed by just any computer with web access. Also, users report that the outside vendor hired by Kemp's Case Works to serve the ASP system has had ongoing downtime problems that sometimes limit their access to the system.

3. Legal Files

The authors interviewed one statewide program using Legal Files and also interviewed in one day four additional programs in another state that purchased and use the system in partnership with each other.

Developed for private sector needs, Legal Files is primarily oriented toward case management. It has robust capabilities for document management, calendaring, and contact management. The intake module was developed specifically for legal services, but is now a permanent part of the system. Legal Files does not offer many preformatted reports, and most of the reporting is done through integration with Crystal Reports, which is a robust tool yet one that requires some training, meaning that most staff members cannot design their own reports from scratch.

Timekeeping: Some users find it difficult to run time reports.

Calendaring / Tickler Systems: Many users do not use the calendar system as their primary calendar because it does not fully integrate with Outlook. Some do use it as a tickler system in addition to their outside calendar.

Contact Management: Right now, the only way to know what county a client is in is for the intake worker to input the county. Users wish that the system would automatically recognize county from zip code.

Intake, Eligibility, Opening and Closing Cases: Users report some difficulty with navigation, and they also report that intake is not "intuitive." The system features a number of keystroke shortcuts but almost no users know about them. The system does not spellcheck case notes. Names entered into special fields during intake (such as a pop-up window for names of other household members) do not automatically create name cards for those people, requiring duplicate data entry for those names if the user wants them included in the overall database. Users especially like the "alert" feature on the intake module that can flag issues of importance for managers or others reviewing the intake sheet.

Maintaining Electronic Files/Document Management: This feature is not used extensively by most users, in part because the CMS cannot create subdirectories, and users are accustomed to that feature from Word and WordPerfect.

Document Assembly: Users report that creating new templates is too complicated, in part by so many choices of fields that are not organized optimally. Some users also feel that preformatted templates are not formatted "nicely" for their printer; it is not clear whether that is a problem caused by the CMS or by the way the program has installed the CMS or configured the print function. Users report some coding problems when cutting and pasting from WordPerfect into Legal Files.

Pro Bono Support: This CMS does not have tools that were created exclusively for the purposes of supporting pro bono, so it requires some customization before being able to use effectively for pro bono activities.

Reporting: The selection of preformatted reports is very limited. Most users do their reporting through Crystal Reports, but only people trained on that software can design the reports. Vendor will build complex customized reports for an additional charge.

Access/Security: While Legal Files is primarily a client-server system that uses a SQL database, more features are gradually being made accessible over the internet.

4. Legal Server

This system is still very new. The authors only interviewed one program using Legal Server, and it was a hotline program that does not do any extended representation. While several full-service legal services programs have purchased Legal Server in the past year, none have yet fully converted to it.[5] Thus, the observations of this system rely more heavily on the demonstration product and cannot provide as much information about how the system works in reality.

Legal Server is a fully modular system that can support either a case reporting or case management orientation. The developer works closely with customers to develop or modify modules the program wishes to use, so each system is essentially customized from the very start.

Timekeeping: Current user has system configured only to track time on cases, so the time function for non-cases has not been used in the field.

Calendaring / Tickler Systems: Only the tickler and to-do system has been used in the field, so other features of the calendaring system such as pre-set rules and integration with Outlook are not yet being used.

Contact Management: Has comprehensive referral function which screens for eligibility based on income, zip code and problem type.

Intake, Eligibility, Opening and Closing Cases: The "sounds like" search has not been used in the field.

Maintaining Electronic Files/Document Management: The function linking documents to case file has not yet been used in the field, nor has anyone used the branching logic function.

Document Assembly: Users automate envelope label printing with client's name, address, and code for client oriented publications to be inserted (the attorney chooses the appropriate publications from a drop down list associated with problem codes). The rest of the document assembly function has not been used in the field.

Pro Bono Support: The system is not currently being used in the field to support pro bono.

Reporting: Users are not fully satisfied with the preformatted reports available for internal management purposes, but are satisfied with reports for funders (the program is not an LSC-funded program so those preformatted reports have not yet been used in the field). The system has XML and GIS mapping capacity but those capacities are not being used in the field.

[5] One specialized legal services program has been using Legal Server but declined to participate in this review.

Grants Management / Resource Development: Features that permit assignment of multiple funding sources, integration with accounting packages, and tracking of donations and pledges are not being used in the field.

Access/Security: This system is run as an ASP and is fully accessible through any computer with a web browser. However, the only program interviewed is using it from a single office location. Security controls are untested.

5. Pika

The authors interviewed two programs using Pika.

While not as new as Legal Server, Pika is still a fairly new product. While current functions better support case reporting than case management, the developer is now working on other features that will help the system evolve more evenly. Most new functionalities are being created in response to specific customer requests. Pika is an open source product and programs can customize the system as much as they would like.

Calendaring / Tickler Systems: Users would like to be able to see the entire office calendar at once. Improved calendar and tickler system expected in upcoming new release.

Contact Management: While CMS has some contact management features, most users are not using them for that purpose.

Intake, Eligibility, Opening And Closing Cases: Users report that some drop down lists are difficult to use due to excessive length. Some users do not like order of intake screens. Users want spellcheck and better error checking. Pop-up flags that can alert others to important issues on the intake screens are a popular feature.

Conflict Checking: Only checks clients and adverse parties, not others in household, witnesses, etc.

Maintaining Electronic Files/Document Management: Current release requires users to take more steps than they would like to associate documents with case file. Next release will be improving on this.

Document Assembly: CMS provides some preformatted templates, but users say it does not handle WordPerfect well. Better document assembly system coming in next release.

Reporting: Most users find the reporting function difficult. Does not provide extensive library of preformatted reports. For building reports, users would like to see fields in alphabetical (or some other sensible) order. The next release is planning to address some of those concerns.

Access/ Security: Pika is accessed through a web browser, and the website can either be hosted in-house or by the vendor in an ASP model. Users say the security provisions meet their needs.

6. Practice Manager

The authors interviewed two statewide programs using Practice Manager.

Practice Manager is a case management system originating in the private sector with an intake module that has been developed just for legal services. The case management features are robust. Some users reported that the intake module had a different look and feel from the rest of the system, but other users did not seem to notice any difference. Practice Manager offers some built in reports but not an extensive library. Because it relies on Crystal Reports, ordinary users generally cannot design their own reports without assistance.

Calendaring / Tickler Systems: Most users wanted the system to integrate better with Outlook. While the calendar feature integrates with Outlook, users are more likely to use the workflow feature for tickler and to-do purposes which currently do not integrate with Outlook (and the calendar and work flow sections are separate). The new release does integrate Outlook fully, but it has not yet been used in the field.

Intake, Eligibility, Opening and Closing Cases: Users like the intake module but believe it is generally too complex for volunteers to use. Questionnaire function not being used much. Intake module would benefit from use of more drop-down lists. Function that reviews data and provides list of appropriate funding sources is not being used. Intake module does not automatically convert weekly or monthly to annual income. Persons who are a “junior” have their name listed out of alphabetical order at the end of persons with that same last name, making it difficult to find Tom Smith, Jr., for example.

Maintaining Electronic Files/Document Management: Can send but not receive email from within CMS in current version. Users cannot create folders/subdirectories in the document management area, which leads to less use of this feature. The full text search function in new version has not yet been used in the field.

Document Assembly: Users (even IT staff) find creation of templates to be difficult and time-consuming. Once the templates that have been created, however, users like them a lot.

Reporting: Does not have many preformatted reports. Also, the CMS prefers to refer to filters rather than reports, and it is not clear that users understand the distinction or lack thereof. Most users are still relying on IT staff or the vendor to create reports using Crystal Reports.

Grants Management / Resource Development: No one is using the features that permit assignment of multiple funding sources or integration with accounting packages.

Access/Security: This SQL server system cannot yet be accessed fully over the internet. Users like the security features.

7. ProLaw

The authors only interviewed one legal services program regarding ProLaw, as it is the only current user.

ProLaw is a case management system originating in the private sector. There is less focus on intake than any other system reviewed here, with its screening and intake module built as a special feature. The system has very robust case management features with a focus on integration with other software. Not many preformatted reports. Many aspects of the system integrate with other software currently being used by the program.

Timekeeping: User has limited experience with timekeeping because they only use it for potentially fee-generating cases.

Calendaring / Tickler Systems: Users like the fact that the CMS has built in local court rules which automate the calendaring of pre-trial events dictated by local rules, based on the entry of a trial date.

Contact Management: Program can customize screen for type of contact, i.e. gather different data about expert witnesses or judges.

Intake, Eligibility, Opening and Closing Cases: Intake module requires customization by vendor. Users are not using the intake module much because they still create paper intake forms first and then enter the data. Intake questionnaires are not being used in the field. Branching logic is not being used in the intake module but it is used in other functions including calendar.

Conflict Checking: Will check case notes in addition to name fields.

Document Assembly: This feature is used extensively, but some users report problems in determining how best to organize and name the templates so they are easily located by all staff. CMS offers its own document assembly package or can integrate with HotDocs.

Pro Bono Support: Not being used for pro bono support at present.

Reporting: Does not have preformatted reports; everything must be built custom either in Crystal Reports or Microsoft Access. Program reports that 50% of support needed for the CMS is in the area of reports. Program requests new reports from vendor and then modifies those reports as needed. Reports can be scheduled to run automatically at appropriate intervals.

Grants Management / Resource Development: Accounting package that is part of system is not being used in the field. System can be customized to track both donations and pledges.

Access/Security: A SQL server system that is not yet accessible over the internet. Users are happy with security features.

8. TIME

The authors interviewed two programs using TIME.

TIME is a case reporting system with limited case management functions. Preformatted templates and reports are numerous and are oriented toward the needs of LSC-funded programs.

Calendar/Tickler System: Has tickler system but does not have calendar. One user can tickle another, but the person receiving the tickle cannot delete it.

Contact Management: Referral tracking is for reporting purposes only; it does not become part of the case file. Referral function is not being used by programs interviewed. Information about other persons involved in a case is contained in case notes, which are not searchable. Contact information for persons other than clients and adverse parties is not linked to cases.

Intake, Eligibility, Opening and Closing Cases: CMS does not screen for eligibility for non-LSC funding sources. Users are unable to enter additional household names in searchable fields and report that no aliases are allowed.

Conflict Checking: Only checks clients and adverse parties, not other names. Users can search by name or social security number but not other information (they can collect address but not other information for adverse parties).

Maintaining Electronic Files/Document Management: Notes are not automatically ordered chronologically. Users report cut-and-paste feature often makes case notes overwhelmingly long. Users do not like maintaining three separate files for cases: in TIME, Word, and Outlook for email. Users also report difficulty in reading the case notes because they are unable to format notes, there is no spellchecker function in the case notes, and it is difficult to track other persons related to cases (witnesses, judges). Some users say that built-in word processor is too limited.

Document Assembly: Users report that document generation function is often not used, in favor of similar function in WordPerfect or Word. Conflicting information from users and vendor regarding ability to use program's letterhead and ability to create documents longer than 47 lines. Some users expressed a desire for TIME to integrate with Word.

Reporting: System has many preformatted reports but users cannot create any custom reports themselves. Users complain that developer is sometimes slow in responding to requests for additional reports. Integration with Access and Crystal Reports has not been used by programs interviewed.

APPENDIX B: Other Important Characteristics of the Eight Systems

This appendix provides some additional detail on the characteristics discussed in Section V of the report for each of the eight systems reviewed. The information contained in this appendix was gained through the authors' interviews with users of the systems as well as from information contained in the vendor surveys. The information here is not meant to be a comprehensive description of each of the characteristics. Rather, this appendix is simply an effort to ensure that the information gained during the interviews with users is memorialized for those who might be considering buying or using one of these systems.

1. USER FRIENDLINESS

- ✓ **CASS:** Users report that CASS is easy to learn and use. Some consider the intake module inefficient.

- ✓ **Clients for Windows:** Some users find this CMS easy to use, while others say it takes a fair amount of training to become proficient, in part because it does not use an interface that looks like Windows. Most users realize that they are not using all of the system's features, and they believe that they would need a lot more training before they were able to do so. As one user put it, "No one person here [in our program] has a full grasp on what it can do."

- ✓ **Legal Files:** Many users report that the intake module is not intuitive. Users find the other features easier. Users are split evenly on whether they feel they have a handle on the overall system or not, but the authors observed that most are not using all the features, generally because they do not know what there is to use. One user noted, "I can feel the thing pulsing with power, but I'm not sure how to access it." Crystal Reports is powerful but not usable by most staff.

- ✓ **Legal Server:** Hotline users find this CMS generally easy to use, although some stress the importance of initial training. Users familiar with web browsers find it especially intuitive. The system is also used by volunteers, which suggests that it is relatively simple.

- ✓ **Pika:** Users all praise Pika for being particularly user-friendly. As a web-based system, it is quite intuitive for those familiar with surfing the internet, but even less technologically sophisticated users reported finding it easy to learn. Both programs interviewed had previously used another CMS, and considered Pika to be better than previous systems on this characteristic. One manager said that buying Pika "was a major change that created a lot of net happiness."

- ✓ **Practice Manager:** Most users say that using Practice Manager requires a fair amount of training and practice. Although a few simple features such as timekeeping are considered relatively easy to use, others are still largely not understood. Many report that navigation could be easier.

- ✓ **ProLaw:** Users give ProLaw mixed reviews on how easy it is to learn. Some say it is relatively complicated; others got up to speed quickly. Some features are not used much, in part because the system integrates with preferred software such as Outlook.

- ✓ **TIME:** Most users report it is intuitive and easy to train new users. Users are using a limited number of features, but that appears to reflect more on the limited nature of those features than on their user-friendliness.

2. TRAINING

- ✓ **CASS:** Cass offers in person or web-based training.

- ✓ **Clients for Windows:** Kemp's Caseworks offers initial on-site training and two to four national trainings per year in Atlanta or New Orleans. There is a large manual available but it is not often used. There are also help screens in the system that are used frequently by some and not at all by others. There is an active users group on an email listserv.

- ✓ **Legal Files:** Legal Files offers training designed for various levels of users and training for trainers on-site and remotely. Users report that on-going hands-on training is necessary to fully use the system. Users also say that more program trainers were necessary for the train the trainer model. Some users complained that Legal Files trainers did not understand legal services work. Users reported that a dedicated "Legal Files expert" (or "power user") on staff to answer questions was very helpful. While user manuals are available, customers are not using them very much.

- ✓ **Legal Server:** Legal Server offers on-site and remote training.

- ✓ **Pika:** Pika offers on-site training and remote training. Some groups of users took training twice. Users reported that they needed little training to use the basics of the system but they could use more hands-on training to use the system more fully. During conversion to Pika, users benefited from being able to use the system for two weeks before the program fully switched over. Pika has a demonstration website that users can play with. There is no written manual for end-users, although there is documentation for IT staff. There is an active Pika users group that IT staff find helpful.

- ✓ **Practice Manager:** Practice Manager offers training on-site or over the internet. Programs may choose a "train the trainer" model. Users report that this model worked best when the persons trained by Practice Manager were actually good trainers as a general matter. Program staff report a need for additional training beyond the initial training. One program has developed a series of tutorials for staff members on various features. Users report that on-going hands-on training is necessary for staff to fully use the system. Some users reported that the training sessions would have been much better if the trainers better understood the work of the legal services program. Manuals are available but customers are not using them very much; some programs have created their own manuals for staff.

- ✓ **ProLaw:** ProLaw offers on-site and remote training. Users report that many had little training and still are able to use basic functions. More complex functions require more training. There is an active ProLaw users group (non-legal services) that users find helpful.

- ✓ **TIME:** Time offers on-site training. Users reported that the system was easy to use and little training was necessary.

3. STABILITY

- ✓ **CASS:** The one program using this CMS reports significant instability related to the size of the database (apparently it was larger than developer anticipated). Some users say it freezes up daily; others report that it does so at least once a week. Data is occasionally lost. While stability has improved, there are still problems that affect the attitude of the users and the usefulness of the system.

- ✓ **Clients for Windows:** Programs using every version of this system report some instability. Most IT staff blame the problem on the continued use of Microsoft Access for the front end of the system. Users note that upgrades tend to create stability problems and data loss. ASP users also complain of instability, although they are not certain whether the problem lies with Clients or with with Venture (the contractor used by Kemp's Caseworks to host the ASP).

- ✓ **Legal Files:** Users report that there was some initial instability that was likely due to problems with Citrix rather than the CMS. Users claim the stability is now much better than it was at first.

- ✓ **Legal Server:** Users report that this web-based system is very stable.

- ✓ **Pika:** Users claim that this web-based system has never crashed in the history of its use. There is occasional slowness, however, at times when the internet is particularly slow.

- ✓ **Practice Manager:** A few users report repeated crashes, but most consider the system fairly stable compared to previous systems. Both programs interviewed have had problems with Citrix that staff blame incorrectly on the CMS.

- ✓ **ProLaw:** Users do not report stability problems, but say that certain features can be slow when accessed by multiple users.

- ✓ **TIME:** Users report that database does go down from time to time, and one time went down for an entire week. Problems have abated since the system is now accessed over the web. System can still be slow at times.

4. CUSTOMIZATION

- ✓ **CASS:** CASS allows for little customization. CASS does use several user-defined fields which allow programs to gather additional demographic and case information. CASS also allows programs to enter information regarding program-specific information such as referrals and community legal education materials.

- ✓ **Clients for Windows:** Clients allows for a good amount of customization, but it is much easier for IT staff with some programming background to do than for general users.

- ✓ **Legal Files:** Legal Files requires some customization to maximize use of all of its features. Legal Files provides tools so that programs can customize how the system looks and is used, but these tools are mainly used by IT staff, who report that customization is relatively simple.

- ✓ **Legal Server:** This CMS is custom-designed for each customer. Because the vendor builds a system to the customer's specifications, most modifications are already incorporated into the system.

- ✓ **Pika:** Pika provides a product that requires little customization in order to use the product but current programs have customized it fairly extensively, in part because Pika is an open source system that provides the underlying code to its customers. Some additional features have been developed by one Pika user and shared with other Pika users.

- ✓ **Practice Manager:** Practice Manager requires some customization to maximize use of all of its features. Users reported that customization is complex and must be done by IT staff.

- ✓ **ProLaw:** ProLaw requires some customization to maximize use of all of its features. ProLaw provides tools so that programs can customize how the system looks and is used.

- ✓ **TIME:** TIME allows for little customization. TIME does use some user-defined fields that permit the gathering of additional demographic and case information.

5. VENDOR SUPPORT

- ✓ **CASS:** Users reported general satisfaction with the quick responsiveness of the vendor. As an example, when the program needs a new report from the vendor, the turnaround time is 24 hours. However, development and implementation of low priority, more complex CMS functions have met with some difficulties and delays.

- ✓ **Clients for Windows:** Many users expressed concern about vendor support, regardless of the version of Clients used, in large part because they find the vendor is difficult to reach by phone and that employees other than the CEO are often unable to assist. ASP users are confused about the respective roles of Kemp's Caseworks and the role of Venture, and often get bounced from one to the other. Vendor does not regularly distribute patches to all customers (changes or corrections are made on a program-by-program basis). There is an active user group that users find extremely helpful.

- ✓ **Legal Files:** Users currently find the vendor to be responsive and helpful. There was a short period of turnover at the vendor when there were some delays, but overall satisfaction with vendor service is high. Vendor initiates periodic check-ins with customers to see how things are going. Patches are distributed regularly.

- ✓ **Legal Server:** Users find vendor to be accessible and responsive. Because vendor customizes the system for each customer, the account managers have considerable knowledge of how each customer's program works.

- ✓ **Pika:** Users consider vendor to be highly responsive and flexible. Although the vendor is a one-man shop, which was an initial concern of some users, his response time to problems is fast. Users say that vendor is sometimes limited in how quickly he can develop new modules or features, but due to the open source nature of the CMS, programs can obtain development elsewhere (including their own IT staff) if desired. There is an active user group that is doing a fair amount of cross-pollination.

- ✓ **Practice Manager:** Vendor is currently considered responsive. However, in the past there were some complaints that problems were not being fixed quickly enough. Vendor says there is a user group but programs do not appear to know about it.

- ✓ **ProLaw:** Users say vendor provides excellent support and is responsive to concerns. There is not a users group just for legal services, but users find the general users group helpful nonetheless.

- ✓ **TIME:** Users consider vendor accessible and friendly. Some users report that the vendor is very responsive; others complain that "it takes forever to get things done."