

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

In the Matter of:)
)
AMENDING ARIZONA CODE OF) Administrative Order
JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION § 1-501:) No. 2012 - 04
COURT AUTOMATION STANDARDS) (Affecting Administrative
) Order No. 2001-08)
)
_____)

An amendment to the above-captioned section of the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration having come before the Arizona Judicial Council on December 15, 2011, and having been approved and recommended for adoption,

Now, therefore, pursuant to Article VI, Section 3, of the Arizona Constitution,

IT IS ORDERED that Arizona Code of Judicial Administration § 1-501 is amended as indicated on the attached document. All other provisions of § 1-501, as originally adopted, remain unchanged and in effect.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, notwithstanding the requirements in § 1-501(C)(2), Maricopa and Pima Superior Courts are exempted from participation in the central document repository as long as their local repositories meet the requirements of § 1-507, and they fulfill requests for access to documents made from the statewide public access portal.

Dated this 11th day of January, 2012.

REBECCA WHITE BERCH
Chief Justice

ARIZONA CODE OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION
Part 1: Judicial Branch Administration
Chapter 5: Automation
Section 1-501: Court Automation Standards

A. Automation of Courts. All courts shall automate their business functions, including, at a minimum, case management, court financial cash management, document management and statistical reporting.

B. State Sponsored and Authorized Systems. Courts shall use state sponsored and authorized automation systems except as provided in subsection C below. The state sponsored and authorized systems include but are not limited to the following:

- Arizona Court Automation Project Software Application
- Juvenile On-Line Tracking System
- Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System
- Appellamation
- JURY+
- AZTurboCourt

C. Existing Automation Systems.

1. Courts operating on systems other than state sponsored and authorized systems prior to January 1999 which otherwise meet the minimum standards for automation and reporting are not required to replace existing systems. These courts shall migrate to state sponsored systems when they replace their current systems except as provided in subsection D.

2. Pursuant to plans adopted by the Commission on Technology (COT), these courts shall participate in mandated statewide automation initiatives with no expectation for state funding. These initiatives include but are not limited to statewide projects such as:

- Electronic statistical reporting
- Electronic filing
- Electronic public access to data
- Central data repository
- Central document repository
- Justice integration
- Electronic document management

D. New Automation Systems. A court may petition for the adoption of a new state sponsored and authorized system due to deficiencies in existing ones. The petitioning court shall prepare a functional needs justification and perform a business case analysis of both the state and local return on investment. The process is as follows:

1. The court shall submit needs and investment analysis documents to COT in a format COT prescribes.
2. COT shall review court submitted documentation and develop a recommendation. The recommendation shall be forwarded to the chief justice for consideration.
3. The chief justice shall determine whether to approve the adoption of a new state sponsored and authorized system, or to take other actions recommended by the COT or believed to be in the best interests of the judiciary.

E. Automation Funding. The administrative office shall fund court automation and technology projects that are part of the state sponsored and authorized systems and initiatives, if funds are available. For court automation projects that are not part of the statewide initiative or to support participation in mandated statewide initiatives which are listed in section C.2, courts shall secure local funds unless state funds are granted.

F. Annual Information Technology Strategic Plan. The administrative director on behalf of the supreme court, the chief judges on behalf of each division of the court of appeals, and the presiding judge on behalf of the municipal, justice and superior courts of the county shall ~~annually~~ submit a three year information technology strategic plan to COT for review and approval, on a schedule determined by COT. Each plan shall include a description of all automation and technology projects and any plans for required migration to state sponsored and authorized systems. COT shall specify the plan format.