

Policy & Communications Workgroup Breakout

March 24, 2017

Minutes

Present: Rolf Eckel, Kyle Bryson, Tina Mattison, Scott Slade

Absent: Josh Halverson

The Workgroup reviewed a list of suggested topics related to the topics the Workgroup's input is sought. (See worksheet for Policy & Communications Workgroup for 3.24.17 meeting and the *draft* Court security Assessment Checklist)

The Workgroup discussed the Security Assessment checklist, which as a postscript, had also been discussed by the Committee as a whole at the Committee's meeting earlier in the morning.

In addition, to a recommendation by the Committee as a whole that the AOC consider including a section in the Checklist on personal security, the Workgroup shared the following input and suggestions:

- The Workgroup shared with Don Jacobson items in the checklist they recommended be re-drafted in the affirmative voice
- The Workgroup suggested that a matrix be developed that weights each section of the checklist. It was suggested this weighting system would allow courts the ability to quickly see how their security measures stack up overall as well as see what areas that are the lowest scoring which will help the Court security committees and the court itself identify where to focus improvement to meet the Security Standards.
- (The Funding Workgroup shared that the suggestion overlapped with their suggestion to weight the standards themselves in relation to requesting and awarding monies from the proposed Court security Fund)

The Workgroup also discussed the Standards related to Incident Reporting.

The first phase of the implementation fo the Security standards involves Standards 4 & 5, both of which are related to incidents and reporting of them. Incident reporting was discussed in pre- and post-incident terms.

Members from the Judicial Security Department of Maricopa County discussed what they call the "Green Dot" system. This is a system that exists within their case management system. Certain court employees are able to enter notes related to potential issues, incidents, and threats that exist in relation to a case or party (or parties). Security gets a report each day that states what cases have those notations and are scheduled for hearings in coming days. Security then can contact the court personnel that will interact with the matter and persons involved and make a security plan. This plan can be as simple as making sure security is alerted there is a potential high conflict matter in a specific court on a specific date and time to security personnel being stationed in a particular location or courtroom.

Members from the Superior Court of Pima County, particularly the Juvenile Court discussed a simple calendar system used in a similar fashion for moitoring when cases with potential security risks are set

and making a plan with security related to those matters. Because it is a smaller volume court that system is manageable currently for them.

The Workgroup discussed working with Maricopa's Judicial Security team to obtain their process, policy and procedures around their system and to review those for possible model policies and procedures and for investigating whether other case management systems have similar capabilities.

The Workgroup then discussed that a system of determining what types of incidents should be shared with the AOC; develop a standard for compiling incident data locally and statewide; creating an alert process (including policies on who would be able to enter and to receive alerts).

Finally the Workgroup discussed Standard 1 – the formation of Court Security Committees. It was suggested that it may be most beneficial if there could be Security coordinators for each county, like the training coordinators. Those persons could assist with implementation efforts from development of Court security Committees to development and providing local security-related training to being the point person for receiving and reporting security alerts and incidents.