CACC MEETING MINUTES DRAFT

COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Thursday, March 15, 2012
10:00 AM - 12:30 PM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Cisco webex

AUDIO PHONE NUMBER: 1-602-425-3192
AUDIO ACCESS CODE: 1112#

MEMBERS PRESENT

Kip Anderson*
Cathy Clarich
Mary Hawkins*
Donald Jacobson (*Jessica Cortes*, proxy*)
Phillip Knox
Patrick McGrath (*Ken Kung, proxy*)
Richard McHattie
Rona Newton
Patricia Noland*
Michael Pollard, *Chair*
Paul Thomas
Rick Rager (*Nancy Rodriguez*, proxy*)

MEMBERS ABSENT

Julie Dybas
Michael Malone

GUESTS

Steve Ballance, *Pima Superior Court*
John Barrett, *Maricopa Superior Court*
Charles Drake*, *PCCJC*
Gary Krcmarik, *GJ CMS Steering Committee*
Lauren Lupica, *City of Mesa*

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Melissa Hinojosa, *ITD*
Bob Macon, *ITD*
Adele May*, *ITD*
Jim Price, *ITD*
Renny Rapier, *ITD*

*** indicates appeared by telephone**

CACC MEETING MINUTES DRAFT

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Judge Michael Pollard, Chair, called the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. after confirming that a quorum existed. He then requested members' input regarding the February minutes.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes of the February 16, 2012, CACC meeting as written. The motion passed unanimously.

PACC UPDATE

No PACC meeting has taken place since the last CACC meeting.

REVIEW OF CHANGES TO MINDMAP THIS MONTH

MindMap printouts were made available for members' reference in the meeting. Staff member Stewart Bruner focused attention on several projects that had their deliverable dates or scope change during the month, leaving the detailed explanations to project managers later in the meeting. He also briefly mentioned a couple of projects implemented during the previous month, after which John Barrett elaborated on the pilot small claims implementation at Maricopa Justice Courts (MCJC).

PROBATION PROJECTS UPDATE

Bob Macon, Probation Automation Project Manager at the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), announced that a no-go decision was made for the April JOLTSaz/AGAVE/CAMMS implementation based on insufficient testing progress. The new target is May 21, a date with which Steve Ballance said his replacement, Myron Pecora, is comfortable.

Bob also described how AZYAS has been broken into two project phases. John Barrett then described steps being taken to resolve continuing problems that are slowing testing of the Maricopa interface on Phase I. Bob shared that Red Cedar has delivered product enhancements that form the basis of Phase II. In answer to a question, Bob and John described the differences between the two phases.

LJ CMS PROJECTS UPDATE

Adele May, limited jurisdiction (LJ) case management system (CMS) Project Manager for the AOC, updated members on progress with solidifying the AZTEC conversion strategy. Though a documented strategy now exists, Adele is adding time to the task to review it with court representatives at a couple of levels before designating the plan as officially complete.

Lauren Lupica, Project Manager for Mesa City IT, briefed members on reasons for the date slippage in creation of the local environment and clarified that it will be used for testing Mesa-specific items in AmCad builds. Paul Thomas added that Mesa has always intended to have a local production environment, as did all the large volume courts. Lauren informed members of Mesa's recent decision to go to bid for a bolt-on prosecutor solution; AmCad will now produce a prosecutor interface for all courts rather than a CMS module. Lauren also distributed a detailed project plan for the Mesa effort which Stewart offered to place on the CACC meeting webpage for reference by members.

POST-IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS

Renny Rapier, Project Manager for the general jurisdiction (GJ) AJACS CMS, reported on the Release 3.7 SR2 statewide implementation and the larger lessons learned about the importance of testing early in the release cycle to prevent date slips later. Applying that lesson, the AOC has determined not to deploy Release 3.8 in a bid to free resources necessary to keep 3.9 testing on schedule. Renny also spoke briefly about the recent FARE pilot in Pinal. Lessons learned there have extended the schedule length for each court, causing a staggering of the remaining county implementations.

Jim Price, AZTurboCourt Program Manager at the AOC, added his lessons learned to John Barrett's earlier report on the implementation of small claims e-filing at MCJC on February 22. In answer to a question, Jim walked members through the process of filing a small claim online in the 4 courts currently e-filing versus the 21 courts currently on the pay and print model.

STRATEGY FOR SETTING PRIORITIES FOR COT ANNUAL MEETING

The chair reported that COT has been moved to June 1, providing more time for CACC's preparation task. Based on a request last meeting, Renny submitted a list of 51 GJ-related AJACS enhancements from last year with a status for each. Fourteen items have not yet been completed or slotted for an upcoming release. Gary Krcmarik from the GJ CMS Steering Committee suggested that focusing on last year's items is not valuable and shared that obtaining accurate estimates from AmCad has proven to be problematic. In response, Karl Heckart suggested that ongoing enhancement funds be reserved as part of each annual budget presented at COT. The intent would be to cover "normal" enhancements required each year – significant changes in functionality or items that significantly affect business processes across courts would still need to come to COT to have specific funds reserved beyond the budgeted amount. Because those items would necessitate detailed analysis and pricing prior to presentation to COT, Karl felt that the approach would have to begin with the FY14 funding cycle. Members agreed, then discussed various project examples and implications for the COT priority projects listing.

ITEMS OF OLD OR NEW BUSINESS

Members asked about the funding needed for the eWarrant project. Karl responded that federal money is being sought, not court money, since courts are only one portion of the larger community handling the warrants. He agreed that the project needs to appear on the MindMap once a plan exists for developing a statewide solution.

Paul Thomas reported on a 6-month experiment underway in Mesa to compare quality assurance on every scanned image with some scanner quality and process standards that would require far less manpower. He'll report the findings to CACC at the end of the study. Stewart reminded members that the stringent QA requirement exists to protect other users of documents downstream from the court in which they are filed, making an enigmatic analogy to airport security screening throughout the country.

The next meeting will take place in **Room 106** of the **State Courts Building** on **April 19, 2012**.

The meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.