

CACC MEETING MINUTES

COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Thursday, January 20, 2011
10:00 AM - 12:30 PM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007



AUDIO PHONE NUMBER: 1-602-425-3192

AUDIO ACCESS CODE: 1112#

MEMBERS PRESENT

Cathy Clarich
Julie Dybas*
Mary Hawkins*
Donald Jacobson
Phillip Knox*
Patrick McGrath
Richard McHattie*
Rona Newton
Michael Pollard, *Chair*
Lisa Royal
Paul Thomas

GUESTS

Mohyeddin Abdulaziz*, *Court of Appeals, Div 2*
Jennifer Gilbertson, *Phoenix Municipal Court*
Carol Merfeld*, *Pima Superior Court*
David Stevens, *Maricopa Superior Court*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Kip Anderson
Timothy Dickerson
Joan Harphant
Patricia Noland
Rick Rager

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Karl Heckart, *ITD*
Adele May, *ITD*
Alicia Moffatt, *ITD*
Jim Price, *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 just after 10:00 a.m. Staff confirmed that a quorum existed. The chair recognized Joan Harphant for her many years of service to various courts in Arizona and the AOC in addition to statewide committees. He read a letter of appreciation sent by Chief Justice Berch and distributed cards for members to sign for Joan, since she had a last-minute conflict and could not be present. He then requested members' input regarding the minutes from the previous meeting.

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

REVIEW OF CHANGES TO MINDMAP THIS MONTH

Staff member Stewart Bruner briefly reported on specific changes made by managers of both statewide and local projects received since last meeting. The chair added that any project manager not submitting a spreadsheet update would be added to the meeting agenda and ordered to attend to provide a verbal update, as a matter of course. Otherwise, there is no way to determine whether scope and date changes were occurring with any project.

LJ CMS AND PHOENIX GAP EFFORT PROJECT CHANGES UPDATE

Adele May, Limited Jurisdiction (LJ) Case Management System (CMS) Project Manager at the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), reviewed where the task for the data conversion strategy stands and why the date has moved back by one month. The approach still involves making closed cases available through ROAM rather than converting them in bulk. She emphasized that courts need to be provided an "import on demand" capability. Members debated the meaning associated with various codes used by courts to "close" cases in AZTEC. Jim Scorza provided detail about the issues with financial processing raised in Phoenix's gap activities and AmCad's agreement to address the items. No scope or impact assessment has yet been completed.

Jennifer Gilbertson then brought members up to date with the activities of Phoenix Municipal Court. She described the functionality gaps in person matching and sentencing. The Chair pressed her for a completion date for the work since courts having end-of-life CMSs have ever-increasing risk of failure and the sweeping of the funds. Jennifer clarified that person matching and sentencing represent only two functional gap areas (one easy and one hard) out of an eighteen-item list of critical gaps identified. An additional work order will be required to have the vendor address the other critical items on the list. Jennifer stated that the additional work is necessary to bring the AmCad system up to the level of functionality required by limited jurisdiction courts as a whole and then further for the high volume courts like Phoenix. In response to a member's question, Adele stated that she still anticipated having a baseline for AZTEC replacement defined at the end of March.

Members and guests then spoke on various aspects and implications of Jennifer's statement that AJACS is not an LJ system and whether the financial issues needed to be addressed for all courts or only Phoenix. Karl Heckart asked for the specific list of items that preclude use of the system for current AZTEC courts. Members debated various functional items that were or were not

needed by various sizes of courts around the state in the baseline and questioned what had been done in the gap analysis process. Jim Scorza described various baselines that could exist, depending on how rapidly any particular court needs to implement; a longer timeline would enable a more feature-rich baseline. Karl emphasized that courts need to provide AOC the defined list of minimum functionality, not the other way around. Rona Newton suggested that users should ultimately test the potential baseline to verify that it accomplishes what AZTEC currently does, regardless of timeline.

Focus turned to the steering committee for discussion of specific functions that needed to be included in an AZTEC replacement. It was decided that the steering committee was a more appropriate venue than CACC.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to direct Adele May to convene the LJ CMS Steering Committee to discuss the expectations, definitions, and product delivery dates for the AZTEC-replacement system in the wake of the CACC discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

The chair stated that he expected Adele to return to the March 17 meeting to report the decisions of the steering committee. Pat McGrath reported that the financial issues team reviews he participated in have shown that the general jurisdiction courts are functioning at a level beyond what AZTEC provided. He felt that the addition of the necessary interfaces, LJ-specific table codes, and calendar functionality in Version 3.6 would meet the needs of the majority of AZTEC courts. Judge Pollard mentioned that the “elephant in the room” is the notion that local courts must recognize that business processes will sometimes need to change in order to align with the automation provided and not the other way around.

AZTURBOCOURT AND ICIS INTEGRATION PROJECT CHANGES UPDATE

Jim Price, AZTurboCourt Project Manager at the AOC, updated members on progress being made with e-filing implementation at the various courts or levels of court. Pima civil e-filing remains on track for a mid-May implementation. The infrastructure items are now in place and being tested. Jim shared a concern about a new requirement for designating documents as being submitted for judge review that necessitates development work on the vendor’s part.

Volume is steadily increasing for appellate and Maricopa civil e-filings. It will mushroom as law firms receive training and begin e-filing on a phased schedule in advance of an anticipated May 1 date for mandatory e-filing in both courts. The added volume is exposing issues like file-stamping inconsistencies that are being worked through.

David Stevens provided details on the progress of Maricopa Justice Courts (MCJC) toward small claims e-filing now that the infrastructure is all in place. They have proven the ability to send data from MCJC to the AOC via MQ but a question exists about how transactions from the e-filing portal will be making their way from AOC to MCJC. Work continues on finalizing the OnBase Online implementation with OSAM and the Court Record MDE construction by Intresys. The project remains on track to start a pilot implementation with the four courts housed at the North Regional Justice Center on March 21.

PACC UPDATE

Rona Newton reported on the progress being made at implementing the business input and feedback process mentioned at previous meetings. Items forwarded to Rona thus far fall into one of two categories: general questions that can be redirected to someone within the AOC and suggestions for consolidation of functions between the two probation automation systems that require some research before bringing to the automation groups or CACC for consideration. She reviewed the two areas with PACC members at their last meeting. They were comfortable with Rona's approach.

POST-IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS

No post implementation reports were made.

ITEMS OF OLD OR NEW BUSINESS

A question was raised about progress with the statewide electronic document management system for limited jurisdiction courts and why no publicity is making its way to courts. Stewart explained that an automated, closed records purging strategy must be established before any courts beyond Apache Junction Justice are allowed to submit documents. He detailed the progress on the closed records strategy to date. That effort will also require a change to the AZTEC barcode sheet to capture case type as input for assigning the appropriate retention period in OnBase. Adele stated that a brochure has been posted on the AZTurboCourt information website (<http://supreme22/azturbocourtinfo/>) for courts to become familiar with the disconnected scanning process, but no communication blitz has occurred. For the moment, Stewart instructed interested courts to contact him and stated that justice courts will be given preference because of the timetable for e-filing implementation.

The next meeting will take place in **Room 106** of the **State Courts Building** on **February 17, 2011**.

The meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m., before Stewart could inform members that the COT meeting scheduled for February 11 has been turned into an e-Court "all hands" meeting by Justice Hurwitz.