

CACC MEETING MINUTES

COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Thursday, October 21, 2010
10:00 AM - 12:30 PM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007



AUDIO PHONE NUMBER: 1-602-425-3193
AUDIO ACCESS CODE: 1126#

MEMBERS PRESENT

Kip Anderson*
Cathy Clarich
Julie Dybas
Joan Harphant (*Julie Bower**, proxy)
Mary Hawkins*
Donald Jacobson*
Phillip Knox*
Patrick McGrath
Richard McHattie*
Patricia Noland
Michael Pollard, *Chair*
Lisa Royal

GUESTS

Steve Ballance, *Pima Superior Court*
Randy Smiley, *Phoenix Muni Court*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Timothy Dickerson
Rona Newton
Rick Rager
Paul Thomas

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Karl Heckart, *ITD*
Bob Macon, *ITD*
Adele May, *ITD*
Alicia Moffatt, *ITD*
Jim Price, *ITD*
Renny Rapier, *ITD*

* indicates appeared by telephone

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Judge Michael Pollard, Chair, called the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) meeting to order just after 10:00 a.m. and confirmed that a quorum existed. He then briefly recapped the discussion at COT on September 24 about changes in CACC's approach. For the benefit of project managers attending the meeting he clarified that the focus is on interdependencies rather than individual projects and not on grading the performance of any individual project or deliverable, but determining what items need priority or would benefit from CACC's help. He passed along COT's charge to look at automation in the state as a whole entity in which every project is affected by or affects other projects.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes of the September 16, 2010, CACC meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

EXPECTATIONS FOR MANAGERS OF LOCAL PROJECTS

Judge Pollard explained the reasoning behind adding the project managers of local projects that are depended upon in some way by statewide projects. He presented the example of AZTurboCourt's reliance on the central case index (CCI) which, in turn, relies on several case management systems (CMSs) to supply the specific case information against which subsequent filings are validated. He added that his ultimate goal is to encourage the 3 C's: collegiality, cooperation, and communication.

Staff Member Stewart Bruner described his technique of reducing each MindMap item to three columns on a spreadsheet to use in the process of updating the graphic for members with the help of local project managers. The intent is not to create a vehicle that impedes progress but rather to briefly report whether specific business functions being delivered in specific projects remain on track since the last meeting or have had date or scope changes. He related some of his conversations with the local project managers he contacted over the past couple of weeks. Karl Heckart added that the communication process works both directions and that the regular review of interconnections and the dialog about the impact of changes comprise the vital essence of CACC's responsibility. Karl will call together all the project managers to the record their baseline data in the spreadsheets before the November CACC meeting.

Members raised concerns about the complexity of the map and the lack of prioritization among the projects displayed. They requested an additional cover sheet that would display a macro view of COT priority items along with their scheduled and revised delivery dates. This would then be reviewed in advance of the meeting and would guide the decision about the specific projects discussed in the meeting each month.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Stewart explained that this agenda item was in place for the non-AOC project managers to request clarity regarding CACC's expectations. Only Phoenix Municipal Court sent a local project manager to the meeting.

PACC UPDATE

Rona Newton was unavailable, but sent word via Stewart that she will report on both upcoming COP and PACC meetings next month.

STATEWIDE E-FILING UPDATE

Jim Price, e-Filing Project Manager at the AOC, focused on the various activities underway to implement e-filing at various levels of court or specific jurisdictions, including

- Maricopa Justice Courts' gateway to TurboCourt, OnBase Online implementation, and upcoming four-court pilot,
- Pima civil case initial and subsequent filings as the model for the statewide general jurisdiction (GJ) system,
- Supreme Court and Division One filing pilot on November 1 to support multiple directly filed case types from three (or so) law firms,
- Construction of the central support applications behind TurboCourt and facilitating integration between it and the case management systems,
- ROAM technology which is being used to relieve the programming burden on CMS owners, and
- Meetings being held to collect ideas for enhanced functionality desired in future releases.

Patti Noland informed Jim that she was not comfortable with the February implementation date shown on the MindMap for Pima Superior Court's e-filing effort. Members asked when ROAM would become available to solve problems beyond e-filing.

AJACS RELEASE CONTENT CHANGES

Renny Rapiere, project manager for the AJACS GJ CMS effort, walked members through the movement of certain functionality from the 3.5 release to the not-yet-numbered future release following 3.5. Renny also reviewed progress on the table validation and conversion data cleanup efforts mentioned last month. Members were concerned about the movement of probation integration to a later release. Renny described the role and upcoming work of the FIT team which now includes Ken Kung, who formerly handled minimum accounting standards for AOC Court Services Division. Patrick McGrath contributed the names of the AJACS courts the team is planning to visit.

POST-IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS

Nothing was reported this month.

ITEMS OF NEW BUSINESS

Patti Noland asked for an explanation of why the date slip in JOLTSaz implementation did not appear on the MindMap and had not been discussed in the meeting. Bob Macon stated that the news broke too late for the monthly update cycle and the team was still quantifying the amount of the slip. He felt certain a date would be determined and communicated before the next meeting. As a result of this scenario, members asked to be informed as soon as a project manager discovers that a date change is inevitable, even if the full analysis hasn't completed to determine the new delivery date. Members would also like to be informed about whether the affected project managers have been communicated with at the time.

The next meeting will take place in **Room 106** of the **State Courts Building** on **November 18, 2010**. Dates are being reserved for 2011 CACC meetings and will be posted once determined. The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.