

CACC MEETING MINUTES

COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Thursday, November 19, 2015
10:00 AM - 11:15 AM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

AUDIO PHONE NUMBER: 1-602-425-3288
AUDIO ACCESS CODE: 2035#

MEMBERS PRESENT

Kip Anderson*
Cathy Clarich
Julie Dybas
Christopher Hale
Donald Jacobson
Phillip Knox
Rona Newton*
Ron Overholt*
Michael Pollard, *Chair*
Janie Randall*
Paul Thomas

GUESTS

Alexis Allen, *Tempe Muni Court*
Cheryl Danna, *Tempe City IT Dept.*
Jennifer Gilbertson*, *Phoenix Muni Court*
Hon. MaryAnne Majestic, *Tempe Muni Court*
Clint Potts, *Mesa City IT*
Hon. Matt Tafoya, *Mesa Muni Court*
Hon. Don Taylor, *Phoenix Muni Court*
Debi Schaefer, *Tempe Muni Court*
Christy Visca, *Tempe Muni Court*
Jeanette Wiesenhofer, *PV Muni Court*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jeff Mangis

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Eric Ciminski, *CSD*
Susann Holland, *ITD*
Mary Kennedy, *ITD*
Bob Macon, *ITD*
Adele May, *ITD*
Renny Rapier, *ITD*
Jim Price, *ITD*
Jason Shumberger, *ITD*
Christie Weigand, *CSD*

* indicates appeared by telephone

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Judge Michael Pollard, Chair, called the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) meeting to order promptly at 10:00 a.m. After calling attention to the handout of finalized 2016 meeting dates and confirming that a quorum existed, the chair asked for a motion regarding the minutes of the October 15 meeting that also included the Mesa case management system (CMS) demonstration.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the October 15, 2015 CACC meeting as written. The motion passed unanimously.

TEMPE FARE ADOPTION STATUS

MaryAnne Majestic, the presiding judge of Tempe Municipal Court, briefly reviewed with members the wording describing the discussion on September 17 **questioning whether they should pressure Tempe into implementing FARE**. She shared her concerns regarding the original language about the discussion which was subsequently amended. **She stated she received three questions only three business days prior to the meeting and advised she could not prepare answers to two of the questions due to timeliness, but was prepared to answer the question regarding the status of FARE in Tempe. Several members clarified the context of their discussion about Tempe and FARE as well as their motivation for desiring the status update.**

Judge Majestic circulated a handout and described Tempe's history with FARE adoption before and after the implementation of THEMIS in May 2009. No programming for FARE had yet occurred when the AOC resources departed from the project following CMS implementation, though cases had been recalled from the court's contracted collections vendor **during implementation of the CMS. However, other collections processes were still being utilized. The City of Tempe subsequently questioned why the court had not rejoined their citywide collections solution. Given Tempe's robust fines enforcement program and collections performance history, minimum staffing, and priority of projects on the CMS matrix, the FARE interface was neither designed nor programmed. FARE remains on the development planning matrix.** Judge Majestic emphasized that the departure of AOC resources is not the sole reason for delays in the adoption of FARE.

A member pointed out that Tempe has been using the statewide tax intercept program for several years. Members thanked the judge for her explanation and requested that Tempe revisit the situation following completion of Mesa's integration code and FARE adoption.

REVIEW OF CHANGES TO MINDMAP THIS MONTH

Staff Member Stewart Bruner briefly informed members of several changes to the MindMap made since the October meeting, but did not detail any areas since project managers would be providing updates later in the meeting. Members were also provided an updated priority projects listing for reference.

PROJECT UPDATE: CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

Clint Potts, project manager for Mesa's continuing CMS development/enhancements, detailed efforts toward implementation of remaining statewide interfaces from the new CMS, specifically interfaces with FARE and CPOR. He indicated that the protective order interface tasks are

turning out to require more resources than previously planned. The currently projected end date will very likely slip. Extensive discussions are underway with AOC FARE resources and a 28-week project plan has now been identified. The plan accounts for all tasks at both the court and the AOC necessary to transition onto FARE. Mesa court administrator Paul Thomas informed members that the tax intercept file discussed in previous meetings, the court's highest priority, will be sent on November 23. Members then questioned Paul and Clint about the relative smoothness of using the new CMS day by day and the success of the paperless court processes. Christy Weigand, AOC's Consolidated Collections Unit Manager, briefly addressed members concerning the AOC's side of the FARE equation.

Chris Hale updated members on the decision to delay AJACS implementation at Tucson City Court by 30 to 60 days while awaiting a newer release of the software to address various issues experienced in testing and dry runs of data conversion. The delay also provides time for the Xerox pre-adjudication payment interface to be completed and tested, though Tucson continues coding their own as a backup. Chris noted progress with training for the new software and the generally positive comments staff is making about it. Judge Pollard added his positive personal impression of the training regimen and usability of the software. In answer to a question, Chris listed a few items that still make him nervous about the changeover from AZTEC to AJACS.

The chair then introduced Julie Dybas in her role as president of the Limited Jurisdiction Court Administrators' Association (LJCAA) to provide background about a handout listing 22 AJACS issues the association referred to CACC to be addressed before any further courts adopt the software. Chris Hale, who also attended the LJCAA meeting, added that the association's concern centered on inattentiveness to issues promoting local workarounds that lead to non-standard codes and unique processes being implemented, as happened with AZTEC.

Seeing the handout for the first time, members suggested a triage effort be undertaken to appropriately categorize the 22 items and ensure the truly systemic and critical ones move forward for action. Adele May, the limited jurisdiction (LJ) CMS project manager, indicated that she had not received the list on the timeline Julie had indicated and was not prepared to provide any detailed responses. Specific members then shared their perspective about various items on the list that caught their attention. Chris Hale shared the progress being made on Tucson's "showstopper" issues with AJACS adoption. Members expressed concern about the underlying communication issue that motivated the LJCAA to formally forward the list to CACC. Adele described her recent efforts to revisit the implemented courts and follow up on issues or provide additional training. Stewart shared that he had not received the list either and agreed to append it to the minutes once he receives it in electronic form.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to direct the AOC to study, categorize, and respond at the December meeting to the issues listed by LJCAA. In addition, AOC is directed to address the underlying communication issue with AJACS courts that prompted submittal of the list to CACC. The motion passed unanimously.

Adele then answered AJACS-related questions raised by members in previous meetings and provided progress with including warrants and bonds in conversion activities, as members requested. While a few issues have been identified with the end-of-month financials, Adele has

verified that courts as a whole are indeed balancing. She has not yet been able to meet with the Apache Junction Muni court administrator about specific issues with financial processing unique to that court. In response to a question, Adele described the manner in which AJACS software updates are being delivered to the implemented courts.

PROJECT UPDATE: eBench, eAccess, eUniversa

Eric Ciminski brought members up to date on the progress of loading documents and data into the eBench product begun November 5 and divulged his latest timeline for making eBench available for local testing by judges in the first three divisions of Yavapai Superior Court. In answer to a question about eBench slowing network response times, Eric described testing at AOC that simulated performance for the lowest bandwidth courts in the state. The spikes in utilization seen were not high enough or frequent enough to pose a threat to other applications.

Jim Price, eUniversa Project Manager, reported on the decision to promote the product for local user testing beginning December 21. Jim and Eric described the interaction of three products all being tested simultaneously in Yavapai Superior Court. Jim also provided a brief update on a grant-funded prototype for criminal e-filing using simulated prosecutor and court CMSs, focused at the message level. Members pressed Jim to include law enforcement filings in the scope of the prototype, since they represent around ten times the volume of prosecutor filings. Jim assured members that law enforcement will be provided a specification that facilitates successful e-filing regardless of the records management system used.

POST-IMPLEMENTATION REPORT: APETS BONSAI IMPLEMENTATION

Bob Macon covered the post-implementation status of the statewide APETS release nicknamed “Bonsai” completed November 16. No significant issues have been reported and no “fix” build is presently planned, the first time in the history of the application. The chair congratulated the APETS team on a job well done.

ITEMS OF OLD OR NEW BUSINESS

No items of old or new business were presented.

The next meeting will take place on **December 17, 2015 at 10:00 AM** at the State Courts Building in Phoenix.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

APPENDIX: LJCAA'S LIST OF AJACS ISSUES

To: Honorable Judge Pollard, Court Automation Coordinating Committee Chair; Stewart Bruner, Strategic Planning Manager and Court Automation Coordinating Committee Staff

From: Limited Jurisdiction Court Administrators Association

Regarding: Statewide Limited Jurisdiction Case Management System (AJACS) Concerns

Date: November 11, 2015

On October 29, 2015, the Limited Jurisdiction Court Administrators Association (LJCAA) held a quarterly meeting and during that meeting a number of concerns were raised regarding AJACS. As a result, a motion was made, and unanimously approved, to provide Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) a list of concerns related to the AJACS rollout and request the Administrative Office of the Court (AOC) to address these concerns prior to any additional courts converting to AJACS.

The courts which have converted to AJACS have raised numerous issues and concerns, some of which are present in all courts. It should be noted that AOC has been advised of these issues and has recently met with the respective court administrators to attempt to resolve some of the issues with upcoming releases.

The association is providing the CACC the most serious concerns and is requesting this information be placed on the agenda for the November 19, 2015 CACC meeting.

1. Lack of or limited training, training documentation, and/or AJACS user guide.
2. Delayed response from AOC with regards to AJACS changes or issues once the product is rolled out.
3. Court concerns communicated via email are not responded to for days or weeks or not at all.
4. Entering cases into AJACS that fallout at conversion.
5. ROA not opening for some cases (showing exception errors).
6. Tickler dates either showing as satisfied when they are not or not showing satisfied when they should.
7. Small bugs in the Case Worksheet; mainly on the fine/fee assessments.
8. Rule 3.1(c), ARCrP warrant option not available.
9. Case status errors; some cases remain open when they should be closed.
10. Duplicate cases appearing in the search screen.
11. Not being able to scan documents into converted cases.
12. Issues with warrants on converted cases.
13. No statistics or reports which affect the ability to report on case processing standards.
14. Issues with Security Settings; initially everyone could do everything (including deleting a cases) and then most staff can't view a juvenile case or receipt a payment on it.
15. Forms in general have many issues such as:
 - a. Incorrect information, typos, insufficient information.
 - b. Sentencing forms are very time consuming if more than standard fine imposed, with numerous issues amending charges.
 - c. Guilty Plea Proceeding Form not able to populate with range of sentencing and other information that has to be manually entered by clerk.

- d. Probation and Jail Commitment forms and MVD abstract go to Demand Batch Queue instead of Forms in Sentencing.
 - e. The Jail Commitment form creates a suspended jail time.
 - f. JSO should not be a “fluid” document. Once the document is created it has to be saved as a PDF copy and imported back in the case.
- 16. Warrants do not have law enforcement agency report number (DR#) on them.
 - 17. MVD Abstract does not merge all the necessary information.
 - 18. Numerous financial issues such as:
 - a. Not able to reconcile and balance end of month funds
 - b. State surcharges not accurately assessed on local fees.
 - c. Can only access contract from Contract Search; cannot access contract while in case.
 - d. Fees adding twice.
 - e. FARE fees readjusted at conversion and with payments (only converted cases.) The system should not be changing the balance because of rounding or recalculation of the FARE fees repeatedly.
 - f. 83% Aggregated Surcharge breaks out for an amount different than actually receipted every day; have to report money by accounts daily to finance department; staff have to add the numerous (seen 60) different GL accounts that are all deposited into one of 16 external account numbers.
 - 19. Delinquency process not working correctly.
 - 20. Cases are only going into FARE manually.
 - 21. Many issues with converted cases-either need to address a prior sentencing order (incarceration order, probation, etc.) or case without next action. Have years of cases that have restitution liens that are showing in MWQ even though there won't be any more court action.
 - 22. Demand Batch Queue (DBQ) issues; forms generated in Demand Batch Queue have to be processed out even if not using; Civil traffic suspensions do not display in DBQ if the case had a prior suspension and therefore not able to monitor cases that are reporting 55 or 58 to MVD. Have had a case with a zero balance get a 55 disposition and didn't know it because it didn't appear in DBQ

CC: Karl Heckert Chief Information Officer, Adele May, Project Manager