

COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Thursday, May 27, 2010
9:30 AM - 12:30 PM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
1501 E. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

AUDIO PHONE NUMBER: (602) 452-3193
AUDIO ACCESS CODE: 1112

MEMBERS PRESENT

Kip Anderson*
Cathy Clarich
Timothy Dickerson*
Julie Dybas (*Daniel Edwards, proxy*)
Joan Harphant
Mary Hawkins*
Patrick McGrath
Rich McHattie
Doug Pilcher (*Jennifer Gilbertson, proxy*)
Michael Pollard, *Chair*
Rick Rager
Paul Thomas

GUESTS

Steve Ballance, *Pima Superior Court*
David Stevens, *Maricopa Superior Court*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Donald Jacobson
Phillip Knox (*Peter Kiefer, proxy*)
Patricia Noland
Lisa Royal

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Keith Kaplan*, *CSD*
Bob Macon, *ITD*
Adele May, *ITD*
Alicia Moffatt, *ITD*
Jim Price, *ITD*
Renny Rapier, *ITD*
Jim Scorza, *ITD*

* indicates appeared by telephone

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Judge Michael Pollard, Chair, called the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. After taking a roll call to confirm that a quorum existed, he asked for a motion regarding the minutes of the previous CACC meeting

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes of the April 22, 2010, meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT FROM COT ANNUAL MEETING

Judge Pollard updated members on discussions at COT earlier this month and requested members' input regarding next steps following COT's direction for improving the coordination among the various automation projects affecting the trial courts in the state. COT directed him to return September 24 with a plan and materials. Various members contributed their ideas and concerns. Suggestions included sharing a member or members with CACC and TAC, creating a master project plan that displays the timelines for all statewide projects and local projects with statewide impact or dependencies, having a mechanism for gathering input from the users of the automation rather than the project managers, changing the feel of the group from punitive to lessons learned, and placing projects in categories of reporting based on certain criteria. Members were largely perplexed about how to characterize and oversee the various integrations among automation systems in the state.

Discussion turned to strategies for inventorying projects and constructing the necessary framework for recording the key items CACC needs to perform the coordination role. Stewart Bruner holds the list of projects submitted with IT plans (he estimated 246) as well as the projects seeking grant funds (50 percent of which are not in IT plans) to use as a starting point. These can be filtered by whether they have statewide impact or appear on COT's priority list, then sorted by time to implement. The list might help with creating categories of projects that interest CACC.

The chair stated that additional discussion will take place in an upcoming meeting of the PACC and CACC chairs, staff members, Karl Heckart, and the AOC managers of statewide projects.

MARICOPA CLERK'S FINANCIAL SYSTEM UPDATE

David Stevens, project manager for the RFR replacement portion of the iFIS project, focused his update on an issue related to the recent pullback of subject matter experts from the reporting side of the project. He will be meeting with the Clerk's Office to examine options and estimate the impact to the project schedule. Overall, work still remains on schedule.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the project dashboard update as delivered. The motion passed unanimously (Rich McHattie abstaining).

In a roll call vote, members characterized the project's overall health as green.

LIMITED JURISDICTION CMS UPDATE

AOC Consultant Jim Scorza opened the update by describing the strategy for achieving an "enhanced baseline" limited jurisdiction (LJ) case management system (CMS) product. Adele

May, project manager for the LJ CMS effort, described changes she made in the dashboard to reflect the revised project activities Jim described through two additional software releases. The goal for pilot implementations is now summer 2011. Both Jim and Adele asserted that the COT-approved end date differs from the contractual end date that has appeared on the dashboard since the beginning of development. Adele also clarified the transition from the current AmCad development contract to a new one that will cover items not yet accepted from previous builds at no additional cost while the enhanced functionality will be included but largely financed by Phoenix, depending on items that result from the supplemental gap analysis effort. Jennifer Gilberston described several training sessions being held to prepare supplemental gap participants for the upcoming effort. Jim recommended that CACC monitor the implementation plans of courts constructing local environments for eventual deployment of the LJ CMS.

Members questioned Adele, Jim, and Jennifer at length about various items of concern including the amount and quality of documentation being provided by the vendor, being able to penalize the vendor for late delivery of development items, whether local courts were being given the option of implementing the system or not, whether sufficient input is being received about civil processing requirements in justice courts, and whether a final decision has already been made to not convert AZTEC data. The chair requested that project updates include progress being made on civil case processing going forward.

Judge Pollard then turned attention back to the consideration of the dashboard.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the LJ CMS development status report as delivered. The motion passed unanimously (Pat McGrath abstaining).

In a roll call vote, members present characterized the project's overall health as "green" (10 green to 2 yellow).

Jim Scorza requested that staff combine the large volume enhanced project update with the LJ CMS update in future meetings.

GENERAL JURISDICTION COURTS POST-IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Renny Rapier, AOC's General Jurisdiction (GJ) CMS Project Manager, announced the completion of the 13 court rollout and briefed members on the ensuing cleanup and enhancement effort. The focus will be on improving OnBase integration, standardizing validation tables, providing additional reports, and addressing the highest priority bugs and defects. AJACS Release 3.4.1 represents substantial system changes from the current release, though it has been tested and trained on extensively. The plan is to implement Yuma and La Paz as pilot courts in July before sweeping through the other 11 courts over a short period.

Renny also described the approach to using SSRS "boot camps" to create the most needed ad hoc reports as well as the ROAM product to create detailed statistical reports. Members were concerned that the same resources are being simultaneously claimed by different AOC projects: GJ CMS enhancement, LJ CMS deployment, probation interfaces, and e-filing. Renny stated that Adele is in the process of hiring six business analysts and has also received back the AOC resources that were working on the Tempe CMS.

CODE STANDARDIZATION UPDATE

Keith Kaplan, AOC's Data Standards Manager, provided specific numbers of codes requested, approved, denied, and tabled from the most recent meeting of the GJ group. On the LJ side, work continues on case hierarchy and the team will be seeking approval from the larger group soon. In answer to a question, Keith promised to provide Stewart with the URLs for the code standardization websites by level of court.

- <http://www.azcourts.gov/courtservices/AutomationServicesUnit/CodeStandardization/GJCodeStandardization.aspx>
- <http://www.azcourts.gov/courtservices/AutomationServicesUnit/CodeStandardization/LJCodeStandardization.aspx>

STAFF UPDATE

Staff member Stewart Bruner outlined the challenges of moving the COT and related subcommittee's websites to the new Supreme Court website, since all subcommittee materials are published exclusively to the web. The move must be accomplished by the end of the fiscal year. Alicia Moffatt is in the process of inventorying the pages and attached documents from the past ten or so years and comparing what exists to the approved retention schedules to ensure only the necessary pages/documents are moved. As a specific consequence of complying with the retention schedules, only the final reports of any workgroups not appointed by an administrative order will appear on the new website. Stewart proposed to display these on a new "historical reports" page. Members did not take issue with the approach.

STATEWIDE E-FILING UPDATE

Jim Price, e-Filing Project Manager at the AOC, announced that law firm Snell & Wilmer is now e-filing subsequent documents in civil cases to the Maricopa Clerk's Office, including documents that require payment of a filing fee. After Fennemore Craig is added **and consensus to proceed has been reached**, the system will be opened to any law offices wishing to e-file. User fees will then begin to be collected. Jim then described the order of courts implementing case initiating e-filing and the associated clerk review method they will employ. Early courts are using the e-filing vendor's clerk and judge review interface; AJACS' e-filing interface is being built into a later release of the CMS. The various case management systems in use and their various expectations for messages from the e-filing system are complicating factors. Jim mentioned that Appellate e-filing is also nearing completion for all case types except rules petitions and review.

The June 17 meeting of CACC has been canceled by the chair. The next CACC meeting will take place in Conference Room 230 of the State Courts Building on **July 22, 2010**, at **10:00 a.m.**

After the chair confirmed that no other business existed, the meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.