COT MEETING MINUTES

COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY

Thursday, October 9, 2008
9:00 AM - 11:30 AM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
Administrative Office of the Courts
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

CONFERENCE ROOM 106

GoToMeeting
https://www2.gotomeeting.com/join/281324705
AUDIO PHONE NUMBER: (602) 452-3193
AUDIO ACCESS CODE: 7002

MEMBERS PRESENT
Louraine Arkfeld
Kent Batty*
Michael Baumstark
Rebecca Berch, *Chair*
Robert Brutinel
Christopher Cummiskey
Michael Jeanes*
Roger Klingler
Gary Krcmarik
Martin Krizay*
Sheri Newman*
Catherine O'Grady*
Marcus Reinkensmeyer
John Rezzo*
Roxanne Song Ong
Ann Timmer *(Phil Urry, proxy)*
Garye Vasquez*

MEMBERS ABSENT
Elizabeth Hegedus-Berthold

GUESTS

Janet Cornell, *CACC*
Cathy Clarich, *CACC*
Charles Drake*, *PCCJC*
Joan Harphant*, *CACC*
Deb Jackson, *Maricopa County OET*
Don Jacobson, *CACC*
Mark Madden, *Yuma Justice Court*
Samantha Mounsey, *Scottsdale City Court*
Doug Pielter, *Phoenix Muni Court*
Michael Pollard, *CACC*
Rick Rager, *CACC*
Esther Reeves, *Phoenix Muni Court*
Lisa Royal, *PCCJC*
Jim Scorza, *CACC*
David Stevens, *CACC/TAC/PACC*
Mark Stodola, *Tempe Municipal Court*

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
William Earl, *ITD*
Karl Heckart, *ITD/TAC*
Janet Scheiderer, *CSD*
Adele May, *ITD*
Patrick McGrath, *CSD*
Stephanie Nolan, *ITD*
Jeanetta Waterbury, *CLD*

* *Indicates attendance via telephone*

COT MEETING MINUTES

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS	Hon. Rebecca Berch, Chair

Vice Chief Justice Rebecca Berch, Chair, called the special meeting of the Commission on Technology (COT) to order promptly at 9:00 a.m. She welcomed members and the public, then asked members in the room and on the phone to introduce themselves.

	MINUTES – September 5, 2008	Hon. Rebecca Berch

After confirming that a quorum existed, Justice Berch began the meeting with a consideration of the minutes from the September COT meeting. No issues regarding the minutes were raised by members.

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the September 5, 2008, Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed unanimously.	TECH 08-37

The chair then reminded members of the reason for the special meeting. The financial situation remains very tight and we fear that funds saved for future large-ticket items will be swept if they are not committed.

	LJ CMS ASSESSMENT RESULTS	Mr. Karl Heckart

Mr. Karl Heckart, chair of the focus group approved at the last COT meeting, provided the context for the selection of a statewide case management system (CMS) for limited jurisdiction (LJ) courts, beginning with the authorization of Tempe CMS development in 2004. He fast-forwarded to the selection of the general jurisdiction (GJ) CMS last year and summarized the work done to assess the performance of two candidate LJ systems, including a hands-on assessment by eventual users that showed the two systems to be roughly equal in terms of raw scores. Karl reviewed the composition of the focus group and described the members representing municipal courts, justice courts, limited jurisdiction court administration, and AOC staff.

The group has met seven times in the past six weeks. A straw poll conducted at the initial meeting indicated members preferred the approach Tempe had taken to address court needs. Following that, the team created a critical, “must have” list of 14 items that developers of the candidate systems were asked to demonstrate in detail. Examples included event-driven processing, flexibility in table code management, fine tuning of screens, check printing, batch processing, flexible reporting, adaptability to interface with outside systems, calendaring, forms processing, associating cases, protective orders, outstanding balance records, file tracking, and agency interfaces. Karl then listed the specific items contained in the Tempe system that team members favored over those in the AmCad system. Some of the discrepancy was attributed to AmCad’s more generic focus across multiple courts’ needs versus Tempe’s very specific focus. He then shared the broader set of pros and cons the team compiled for each of the candidate systems.

As a result of their analysis, the team arrived at a "blended" solution that might allow the courts to harness the advantages of both systems. The desire is to combine the stability and long-term sustainability of a vendor-supported application with the great functionality Tempe has engineered. Taking AmCad's base application, then leveraging development to apply Tempe's best features would meet most of the needs of the largest LJ courts, getting Arizona to a standard LJ CMS statewide. Karl then displayed a pros and cons chart and detailed additional benefits that the blended approach would yield.

Karl described the unique opportunity that currently exists to place a standard CMS in many courts having ageing systems that were not consolidated or standardized in the previous round of automation. Doing so now will require a clearly defined steering committee to prioritize the use of enhancement funds to ensure the system meets the needs of courts of all sizes and geographic locations. Within that steering committee, consortia could exist for courts having similar needs to pool their resources to construct necessary pieces that make their way into the baseline system, thereby becoming available to all courts in the state. More specific local innovations could be undertaken if the consortium did not agree that a particular enhancement would provide leveraged value.

Karl shared the vendor's proposed timeline to roll out two pilot implementations in Fall 2009 and begin general implementation in Spring 2010. The aggressive schedule precludes loss of knowledgeable vendor staff as the GJ CMS project switches from development to full implementation. On the courts' part, the effort requires a group of business analysts and subject specialists to participate in intensive design gap sessions over the next few months. He also proposed a second group to meet weekly to review the policy implications of development work and to ensure that the macro project remains on track.

In response to a question, Karl described the variables that make it difficult to determine a firm cost for a project of this magnitude. The vendor focused on current AZTEC courts in developing the range of costs presented, since so much less detail is presently known about the various non-AZTEC CMSs and their related data. He reminded members that though increased complexity always translates to increased costs, the value of leveraging a single solution across all LJ courts justifies the added cost.

Members expressed concern about the long-term future of the Tempe CMS effort, including support and ability to implement enhancements. Karl pledged to continue AOC aid to Tempe to bring the development project to its successful conclusion. Members and others present raised questions about continuing to rely on a vendor for staffing, the delta between Tempe's or AmCad's application alone and the hybrid approach, the reliability of the vendor's cost and time estimates, how much custom development can take place without creating an Arizona-specific system, whether the economic/funding picture supports pursuing the LJ CMS at this time, what the related costs would be to local courts, what structure is necessary to make the consortium model described really work, and the need for a five-year total cost of the approach.

After answering or attempting to answer all the questions raised, Karl stated that the focus group concluded with unanimous support for the hybrid system. Judge Song Ong observed that regardless of COT's decision, Phoenix Municipal Court must make a move to replace their

ageing CMS quickly and is sufficiently committed to the hybrid approach to commit resources to the project. GITA Director Chris Cummiskey summed up the various reasons to support the hybrid solution.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve the recommendation of the focus team for a hybrid case management system and to forward the recommendation to AJC. The motion passed unanimously with Louraine Arkfeld abstaining.**	**TECH 08-38**

The chair directed staff to capture discussion items assumed within the broader motion: (1) the need to return a detailed plan for construction of the project governance model at the November meeting and (2) presentation of the five-year costs and project budget to members at the January meeting.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC	Hon. Rebecca Berch

After hearing no request for further discussion from members or the public in response to her call, Justice Berch entertained a motion to adjourn.

Upcoming Meetings:	November 07, 2008	AOC – Conference Room 119 A/B
	January 09, 2009	AOC – Conference Room 345 A/B

MEETING ADJOURNED	10:45 AM