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The Arizona Judicial Branch is using technology to reach its goals of connecting with and protecting the community. Having built the basic infrastructure to support information gathering and sharing, the judiciary is now working to provide the public, the media, law enforcement, and the legal community convenient access to appropriate court information, especially on such sensitive topics as criminal case dispositions and domestic violence matters as well as general case information.

Chief Justice Ruth V. McGregor provides direction for both the courts’ business and technology efforts. Her vision for the Arizona Judicial Branch is embodied in the publication *Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona’s Courts 2005-2010*. Having built a robust infrastructure and key “back-office” functions, Arizona court automation is now making major improvements through implementation of “second generation” automated systems, continuing the journey to exploit process efficiencies and economy of scale to better serve citizens.

- At the state level, the supporting infrastructure includes the Arizona Judicial Information Network (AJIN), various database and application servers, and the attached PCs with desktop software.
• Back-office functions at the state level include the limited and general jurisdiction case, cash, jury, juvenile and adult probation and other record management systems statewide, email, Internet/Intranet access, and the central data repositories for public access, statistical reporting, and analysis.

• For larger courts, especially those jurisdictions having their own self-contained tracking systems, back-office functions include continued maintenance, enhancement, and development of local systems, networks, and desktop environments.

Maintaining, operating, and enhancing this infrastructure and back-office functionality remains a priority to allow courts to keep better records, perform case management functions more efficiently and effectively, and promote greater accountability. Some of these back-office applications have reached the end of their useful life and require replacement. A continued focus in this plan is to replace those systems and expand from back office to front office automation while increasing public access to justice-related information.

Arizona courts will continue to improve their business practices, especially ones to better serve the participants in the judicial process, including law enforcement, the legal community, jury members, victims, self-represented litigants, the media, and the public at large. To that end, the Arizona Judicial Branch Information Technology Strategic Plan: 2009-2011 aligns with the judiciary’s business goals found in the Arizona Judicial publication From Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona’s Courts 2005-2010, which defines its vision for connecting with and protecting the community.

**SERVING THE PUBLIC**

Public safety remains a key governing principle that directs automation. Where more complete and timely information is available on criminals, the public is better served. Integration of justice information, especially among criminal justice agencies, supports this goal. The courts continue working for better, closer and more automated interaction with law enforcement, the Department of Corrections, prosecution and defense agencies, as well as social services agencies, integrating with those systems to the extent possible. Criminal justice agencies are able to respond in the best interests of the public when they have ready access to juvenile and adult probation information, orders of protection, arrest information and pending DUI cases. The courts have been building their processes and infrastructure to record this information electronically and are now focusing, in cooperation with other criminal justice agencies, on sharing information in real-time.
Being responsive to the public is a key initiative. With enhanced public safety and public service as goals, initiatives include providing for public information access; enhanced “self-service” support for the self-represented, including interactive forms accepted statewide; improved interaction with potential jurors; technological improvements in courtrooms; and an improved ability to interact with the courts remotely. This complements the State of Arizona’s initiative for e-government. The Judicial Branch will continue to use technology to improve its ability to offer service in the e-government arena.

**IMPROVING EFFICIENCY WITH NEW TECHNOLOGIES**

Improving the efficiency of the Judicial Branch processes is an important goal. Several technologies are being implemented to support it. Electronic document management and electronic filing can help the courts manage records more efficiently. The use of audio and video to record court proceedings is another technology solution that is proving both cost-efficient and effective. Use of video conferencing for remote hearings and appearances saves time and transportation costs, and contributes to public safety. Several rural superior courts are expanding its use to address a chronic court reporter shortage.

Efforts to address the records management challenges of the court system are maturing. The acquisition of electronic document management systems (EDMS) that include abilities for imaging, electronic filing, document storage and document archiving for long-term preservation is essentially complete at the superior court and appellate court levels. The focus is now on providing guidance, standards, and “best practices” procedures and processes at the limited jurisdiction level as larger local courts select and implement electronic document management systems. EDMS forms the vital foundation for accepting electronic documents from the public and legal community (e-filing). Automated systems and processes are maturing to the point where a paper “safety net” may not be as vital as it once appeared to be. A team is examining minimum technical requirements for courts desiring to substitute an electronic record for paper “originals.”

With e-government, integration, electronic documents, and other remote electronic access services comes the need for security and authentication. The Judicial Branch will be stepping up its emphasis on the availability of electronic records as paper becomes less prevalent. The business continuity critical to preserving the electronic supply chain of justice is being put in place. A statewide approach for electronic authorizations and electronic signatures using a systemic, “simplify and unify” approach is still needed. The interactions with state and local agencies, their needs, and technological capabilities will be reviewed along with internal branch needs to ensure the appropriate controls are in place for different types of filings.
Maintaining a systemic view continues to be a philosophical foundation that requires projects to adopt a broader perspective, looking at ways not just to meet an immediate need but also examining and revising business processes for global improvements and solutions. The approach encourages questioning structures, terminology, processes, and procedures, as they exist. It promotes solutions that simplify and bring standardization and uniformity to court interactions statewide. It also complements a heightened awareness of our interdependence – among courts and with other government agencies or justice partners.

**Enterprise Architecture and Standards**

For the past decade, the direction of technology in the courts has been towards shared resources, standards, and elimination of duplicate efforts and systems. The 2009-2011 Information Technology Strategic Plan continues projects that foster cooperation and leveraging. Leveraging has become institutionalized as a process, yielding a standards-based technology environment. At the recommendation of the Commission on Technology (COT), a statewide committee providing technology oversight, and its subcommittee, the Technical Advisory Council (TAC), the Arizona Judiciary has adopted technical standards for automation statewide so that development can be shared, training leveraged, and cooperative projects undertaken. The enterprise architecture includes technical industry standards, protocols, and methodologies, and, where business value can be identified, even products and detailed specifications. Arizona Code of Judicial Administration § 1-505 adopted the architecture. See [http://www.supreme.state.az.us/cot/EAS/EAS.htm](http://www.supreme.state.az.us/cot/EAS/EAS.htm) for the details. These detailed standards and specifications provide needed direction to projects conducted at all levels of courts and between courts and justice partners.

**Standardizing Codes and Processes**

Automation table code standardization supports statewide similarity of information recorded in case management systems (CMSs). It is difficult to transfer data to other local and state entities, write standardized reports, and aggregate statewide statistics when every court uses different words, abbreviations, or codes for the same thing. This currently presents a problem in AZTEC courts. Mapping has proven to be very labor intensive with unsatisfactory results. Differences from court to court and bench to bench are being resolved in preparation for rollout of new statewide case management systems. Superior Court Clerks and limited jurisdiction court representatives are well into this standardization effort and have delivered both standard codes and associated terms for use with new case management systems statewide. The COT maintains and governs these standardized codes and terms for all levels of courts through a code standardization subcommittee.
Creation of standardized processing workflows that reflect the size and level of a court is also a COT recommendation. The approach enables more standardized training and less complex automation since fewer unique practices have to be addressed. “Best practices” for courts' workflow processes will be contained within the new case management systems under development, a direction approved by the Arizona Judicial Council (AJC) several years ago.

**NEW SYSTEMS BECOMING REALITY**

The drivers for projects to develop and implement second-generation automated systems include:

- Outdated technologies
- Business process inefficiencies
- High maintenance costs and complexities

In the fast-paced world of technology, it is an extraordinary accomplishment to sustain and support an automation system for 10 to 15 years. Many of the courts' systems are this old and reaching the end of their life cycles. They must be replaced. A project to replace the 20-year-old JOLTS system using state-of-the-art technology is well underway. The Judiciary’s project plan for JOLTSaz was approved by the Information Technology Authorization Committee (ITAC) in May 2004 and amended in September 2007.

AZTEC, a statewide case management system (CMS) developed in the late 1980’s and implemented in Arizona courts beginning in the early 1990’s, is also being replaced over the next few years. Requests for enhancements to AZTEC are being carefully weighed against the likely return on investment over the short remaining life of the program while development work continues on a candidate replacement system for limited jurisdiction courts and implementation gets underway on a vendor system for rural general jurisdiction courts.

COT keeps close tabs on the various CMS development and implementation efforts as they traverse through critical milestones, and will ensure that the finished systems meet the processing needs of a majority of courts statewide. While taking a “proof of concept” approach in past years allowed the most flexibility in development, it also subjected courts statewide to the development schedule of a single court. As the time for internally developed systems to be adopted for use continually lengthens, postponing work on adapting them for statewide rollout, commercial off-the-shelf systems hold increasing appeal. The AiCMS system from AmCad, Inc has been selected by competitive bid for use in general jurisdiction courts. Following a detailed assessment of functional gaps and a brief period for making related enhancements, the system is being installed in two pilot courts less than 11 months after contract award. The entire project to install it in the remaining 11 courts is targeted to complete by December 2009, just 28 months from contract award. The same commercial system is under consideration for use in limited jurisdiction courts.
Several of the larger municipal courts and consolidated justice courts in the state not using AZTEC also find themselves with end-of-life CMSs and the need to undertake complex development projects to replace them. Adoption of a statewide limited jurisdiction case management system provides the most economical solution to their technology dilemma. Addressing financial management also remains a top priority but is being addressed as part of the CMS replacement approach.

Simplifying and making more uniform the financial rules and fund allocation procedures remain an important priority. The complexity of the distribution of funds collected by courts increases the challenge of implementing an off-the-shelf vendor court package and makes the maintenance of existing financial systems costly and resource consuming. The judiciary continues to examine financial procedures and statutory requirements to identify ways in which the financial business of courts could be handled more easily. Realistically, courts will not be able to effect change of all the complexity at once. This will be a long-term effort to reduce complexity while resisting efforts or legislation that might introduce additional complexity into the system.

**Penalty Enforcement Program**

The automation portion of the Penalty Enforcement Program is the Fines, Fees and Restitution Enforcement Project (FARE). One hundred sixteen courts in thirteen counties have now implemented the unified FARE process whereby all citations and payments entered into their AZTEC case management system are automatically passed to a collections agency that will:

- Send a reminder notice before the court date
- Set up a Web and interactive phone payment service
- Send out delinquency notices
- Perform skip tracing
- Interact with MVD to suspend drivers licenses and vehicle registration renewals (TTEAP)
- Automate the TIP interface
- Set up, bill and track payment contracts
- Provide outbound calling for further collections effort after noticing has completed.

FARE has collected over $102 million to date, $33 million via electronic media, the Web, and telephone IVR. Over 360,000 TTEAP holds have been placed with just over 139,600 releases, thus far, a release rate of 38.8 percent.
FUNDING CHALLENGES

The judiciary faces many challenges in pursuit of these strategic initiatives. Perennially among the greatest challenges, funding looms even larger in the wake of purchasing a vendor case management system for general jurisdiction courts. In addition, a more capable data center has been constructed to support new centralized applications and provide necessary business continuity. Achieving justice integration and statewide electronic access to critical court information requires coordination of efforts, detailed standards, and funding. This is difficult with funding so limited and dispersed among so many different entities statewide. The problem was compounded over several years when the planned funding for many initiatives was interrupted by multiple reallocations of JCEF (a state-level automation funding source) by the legislature. Courts are working to enhance both local and centralized pools of automation funding to leverage the success of what has already been built and carry the judiciary forward in a consistent way to support its goals of improving public safety and public service. Without a change in support model or a drastic improvement in funding stream, the JCEF balance will be insufficient to support the complete implementation of new CMSs statewide once they are purchased or fully developed.

TECHNOLOGY PRIORITIES

The Arizona Judicial Branch’s information technology initiatives to support its strategic agenda outlined in *From Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona's Courts 2005-2010* are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Systemic Thinking Approach to Development and New Projects</td>
<td>H-S Code Standardization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Core Software Support/Maintenance AZTEC JOLTS APETS JUSTIS DW Appellamation</td>
<td>H-S Penalty Enforcement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Automation Training and Support</td>
<td>H-S Electronic Filing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Infrastructure Maintenance</td>
<td>H-S Integration -- ADRS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H-S Integration – e-Citation

H-S New Case/Financial Management System for Trial Courts

H-S Process Standardization

H-S JOLTSaz

H-M Business Continuity

M-S Electronic Document Management

M-S Internet Public Interactive Service – Minute Entry

M-M Internet Public Interactive Service – Standard Form Data/Fill/File

M-M Electronic Signatures

M-L Technical Training

M-L Enterprise Architecture (ongoing)
The Arizona Judicial Branch’s Information Technology Strategic Plan: 2009-2011 reflects technology planning for all Arizona courts. The State Appellate Courts and the Superior Court in each county, on behalf of their general and limited jurisdiction courts, prepared information technology strategic plans. Their accomplishments and directions are incorporated into the statewide technology activities coordinated by the Administrative Office of the Courts. The individual plans are included in Appendix D.
I. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

The Arizona Judicial Branch consists of the Supreme Court, the Court of Appeals, the Superior Court, Justice of the Peace Courts, and Municipal Courts. The Supreme Court has administrative supervision over all courts in the state and the authority to make rules governing all procedural matters in any court.

The Arizona Judicial Council, established in 1990, assists the Supreme Court in developing and implementing policies that will provide central direction for court management, consistency in court operations, and coordination of services within the courts. Under the direction of the Chief Justice, the Administrative Office of the Courts provides the necessary support for the supervision and administration of all courts.

The Commission on Technology, under whose auspices the Judicial Branch Information Technology Strategic Plan is developed, is a committee of the Arizona Judicial Council. The Commission plays both an advisory and a review role with respect to statewide technology policies, standards, and applications. The Information Technology Division of the Administrative Office of the Courts staffs the Commission and its subcommittees, and typically provides the technical resources for statewide technology projects.

The Arizona Judicial Branch has turned to technology as one means to meet its goal to provide an independent, accessible, and integrated judicial system in accordance with constitutional mandates. There are many compelling reasons that the court is looking to automation to meet today’s demands for information and efficient processing. The following strategic plan maps out the future direction of Arizona’s Judiciary in information technology architecture and projects for the three-year period including Fiscal Years 2009 through 2011.

The Arizona Judicial Branch is proud of its accomplishments in information technology over the eighteen years since statewide efforts towards technology planning and statewide systems and standards began in earnest.

- Most juvenile probation functions are automated on JOLTS (now being updated as JOLTSaz).
- Most courts are automated using the same, centrally supported and managed system, AZTEC. Apart from the high volume courts in Maricopa and Pima counties, only a handful of courts continue to use legacy case management systems. With development and purchase of AZTEC replacements nearing completion, migration to new, second-generation systems is now well underway.
• Adult probation offices in all 15 counties continue to use the same statewide reporting and statistical data collection system and a second-generation adult probation tracking system. APETS, initially developed and implemented in Maricopa County, has rolled out statewide, placing all adult probation information within a single database.

• A training program to support common court “best practices” processes and procedures has been developed and implemented. It addresses the automation training needs of the courts, providing both partial funding for staffing a training function in each county court system and also statewide training programs.

• A centralized repository of all court protective orders is available for query by law enforcement.

• Public access to case information for 153 Arizona courts is available via the Internet for lookup of cases by name or case number. A subscription feature also exists for public case information.

• Fourteen clerks of the superior court are digitizing paper filings using electronic document management systems in preparation for electronic case filing.

The Fiscal Year 2008 Accomplishments section provides a detailed listing of last year's major information technology accomplishments.

The demands of the public to access court records, information sharing among the courts and other criminal justice agencies, plus the sheer volume and complexity of justice transactions are focusing the Judiciary on modernizing the courts' use of technology. The court continues its review of technology-hostile court rules, especially in the electronic case-filing arena. The court hopes to encourage use of technology to enable the improved effectiveness of court business processes and those of the entire criminal justice system.

The Arizona Judicial Branch recognizes its role in the enhancement of the criminal justice system as a whole in the state. While much progress has been made within each criminal justice function to improve operational effectiveness, it is now widely acknowledged that criminal justice agencies must collaborate to bring about much needed systemic improvements. The first project to address the justice integration initiative is the electronic reporting of criminal dispositions to the Department of Public Safety. Related projects are planned to improve the exchange of accurate data among the various criminal justice functions before submittal to the common criminal justice history files. Being central to the criminal justice system, the courts play a critical part in the successful accomplishment of local integration initiatives.

Electronic Document Management (EDM), which includes electronic filing, document imaging, and the integration of documents with other applications, has become an important initiative of the chief justice. An EDM project addresses both back- and front office functions. Without a basic infrastructure made up of document repositories, software to manage them, and sufficient network bandwidth to support document transmissions, courts cannot begin to accept electronic documents from other agencies.
Now that the basic infrastructure is in place, along with a systemic analysis to alter existing document handling and filing processes, courts are able to respond to requests to accept electronic filings from the law enforcement, prosecution, and legal communities.

New case management system development projects address replacement of two core systems, AZTEC and JOLTS, as they are approaching the end of the automation life cycle. Next-generation systems will significantly reduce the level of clerical effort needed for data entry and update functions by enabling automated exchange of data among criminal justice agencies. Rather than placing all functionality within a single enterprise system controlled by the court, the integration model being pursued calls for loosely coupling disparate systems using defined standards for data exchange like GJXML and the NIEM as well as an enterprise service bus (ESB) for transaction-based services.

A statewide PC Refresh project has changed out client computing technology supplied to courts as part of the ACAP model. Aging machines owned by the state have been replaced with up-to-date models and an operating system capable of remaining in support for the duration of the machines’ four-year lifecycle. Related packaged software supplied to courts is being updated as well. New machines with a consistent software image enable a more standard environment and improved desktop management.

The 2009-2011 IT Plan continues to support the core functionality of the existing statewide applications. In particular, the AZTEC case management system will be strengthened and modified, as required, to provide its remaining user courts with benefits that will exceed the level of effort necessary to maintain it as it approaches the end of its life.

The Arizona Judicial Branch’s Information Technology Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2009-2011 offers a strategic direction for the information technology resources and activities in the Judiciary. It is based upon a rigorous planning process, which resulted in consolidated IT plans at the county level. These supporting plans are included in Appendix D.

This plan first presents the Judiciary’s business strategic initiatives. Those initiatives are defined in Sections III and IV. Then, the IT initiatives supporting these business needs are outlined.
The IT strategic initiatives are:

- Promote a Systemic Thinking Approach to Technological Solutions
- Provide Infrastructure that Facilitates Effective Communication and Integration
- Enhance Security and Disaster Recovery to Protect Court Technology-Related Assets
- Standardize Processes and Solutions to Improve Efficiency and Effectiveness
- Complete and Enhance Second-Generation Statewide Automation Projects
- Improve Data Exchange, Communications, and Public Access
- Digitize the Court Environment
- Provide Administrative Support Functions

Finally, major IT strategic projects are outlined.

The Commission on Technology and its subcommittees provide a strong, active force for directing technology efforts and funding. Its members deserve special thanks for the fine job they are doing in providing leadership in technology to the Arizona Judicial Branch. Members of Commission on Technology and its subcommittees, Court Automation Coordinating Committee, the Technical Advisory Council, the Probation Automation Coordinating Committee and, the e-Court subcommittee are provided below.
| **COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY- (COT)** |
| **2007-2008 MEMBERSHIP LIST** |

| **CHAIR** |  |
| **HON. REBECCA BERCH** |  |
| Vice Chief Justice |  |
| Arizona Supreme Court |  |

| **CHAIR** |  |
| **HON. REBECCA BERCH** |  |
| Vice Chief Justice |  |
| Arizona Supreme Court |  |

| **GARY KRCMARIK** |  |
| Court Administrator |  |
| Superior Court in Coconino County |  |

| **KENT BATTY** |  |
| Court Administrator |  |
| Superior Court in Pima County |  |

| **MARTIN KRIZAY** |  |
| Chief Probation Officer |  |
| Yuma County Adult Probation Department |  |

| **MICHAEL BAUMSTARK** |  |
| Deputy Administrative Director |  |
| Arizona Supreme Court |  |

| **BETH ANNE LEWALLEN** |  |
| Legislative Liaison |  |
| County Supervisors Association of Arizona |  |

| **ROBERT M. BRUTINEL** |  |
| Presiding Judge/Presiding Juvenile Judge |  |
| Superior Court in Yavapai County Div.II |  |

| **SHERI NEWMAN** |  |
| Clerk of the Court |  |
| La Paz Superior Court |  |

| **CHRISTOPHER CUMMISKEY** |  |
| Director, State CIO |  |
| GITA |  |

| **CATHERINE O’GRADY** |  |
| Prof. of Law & Executive Director Clinical Programs |  |
| ASU Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law |  |

| **PETER ECKERSTROM** |  |
| Judge |  |
| Court of Appeals Division II |  |

| **MARCUS REINKENSMeyer** |  |
| Court Administrator |  |
| Superior Court in Maricopa County |  |

| **JOHN GEMMILL** |  |
| Chief Judge |  |
| Court of Appeals Division I |  |

| **JOHN ROBERT REZZO** |  |
| Information Technology Director |  |
| Snell & Wilmer L.L.P. |  |

| **MICHAEL JEANES** |  |
| Clerk of the Court |  |
| Superior Court in Maricopa County |  |

| **ROXANNE K. SONG ONG** |  |
| Chief Presiding Judge |  |
| City of Phoenix Municipal Court |  |

| **ROGER KLINGLER** |  |
| Assistant City Manager |  |
| City of Scottsdale |  |

| **STAFF** |  |
| **STEWART BRUNER** |  |
| Strategic Planning Manager |  |
| Arizona Supreme Court, AOC |  |
# TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL - (TAC) 2007-2008 MEMBERSHIP LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAIR</th>
<th>GREGG OBUCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KARL HECKART</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>Superior Court in Pima County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Supreme Court, AOC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOHYEDDIN ABDULAZIZ</th>
<th>ELOISE PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court of Appeals</td>
<td>Superior Court in Gila County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LILLITH AVALON</th>
<th>RICK RAGER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerk of the Court</td>
<td>IT Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court in Apache County</td>
<td>City of Tempe Municipal Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JASON EPEL</th>
<th>KYLE RIMEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Manager</td>
<td>Automation Systems Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima County Consolidated Justice Court</td>
<td>Superior Court in Mohave County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOAN HARPHANT</th>
<th>DAVE STEVENS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court Administrator</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tucson Municipal Court</td>
<td>Superior Court in Maricopa County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANDY KENNEDY</th>
<th>ALAN Y. TURNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court Automation Manager</td>
<td>Judicial Information Systems Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scottsdale Municipal Court</td>
<td>Superior Court of Pinal County Clerk's Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CARY MEISTER</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Manager</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court of Yuma County</td>
<td>Arizona Supreme Court, AOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAROL MERFELD</th>
<th>STEWART BRUNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Projects Manager</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court in Pima County</td>
<td>Arizona Supreme Court, AOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE- (CACC)
#### 2007-2008 MEMBERSHIP LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **MICHAEL POLLARD**  
Judge  
City of Tucson Municipal Court |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KIP ANDERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chief Deputy Clerk  
Superior Court of Mohave County |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GORDON MULLENEAUX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Associate Clerk of General Accounting  
Superior Court in Maricopa County |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATHY CLARICH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Deputy Court Administrator  
City of Scottsdale Municipal Court |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATRICIA NOLAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Clerk of Court  
Superior Court in Pima County |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGARET GUIDERO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Court Administrator  
Superior Court in Yuma County |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREGG OBUCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Director  
Superior Court in Pima County |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOAN HARPHANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Court Administrator  
City of Tucson Municipal Court |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RICK RAGER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| IT Manager  
City of Tempe Municipal Court |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONALD JACOBSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Court Administrator  
City of Flagstaff Municipal Court |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAMES SCORZA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Executive Court Administrator  
City of Phoenix Municipal Court |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHILLIP KNOX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| General Jurisdiction Court Administrator  
Superior Court in Maricopa County |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAVE STEVENS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chief Information Officer  
Superior Court in Maricopa County |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATRICK MCGRATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Automation Services Manager  
Arizona Supreme Court |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAUL THOMAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Court Administrator  
City of Mesa Municipal Court |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. STEVEN MCMURRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Justice of the Peace  
Encanto Justice Court |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| STEWART BRUNER  
Strategic Planning Manager  
Arizona Supreme Court, AOC |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| STEWART BRUNER  
Strategic Planning Manager  
Arizona Supreme Court, AOC |
# Probation Automation Coordinating Committee (PACC)  
## 2007-2008 Membership List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAIR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **RONA NEWTON**  
Director of IT and Research  
Pima County Juvenile Court Center |  |

| **BARBARA BRODERICK**  
Chief Juvenile Probation Officer  
Maricopa County Adult Probation | **RIK SCHMIDT**  
Director of Juvenile Court Services  
Superior Court of Pima County |

| **HELLEN CARTER**  
Administrator  
Arizona Department of Corrections | **DAVE STEVENS**  
Chief Information Officer  
Superior Court in Maricopa County |

| **MARTIN KRIZAY**  
Chief Probation Officer  
Yuma County Probation Department | **AMY STUART**  
Information & Research Manager  
Arizona Supreme Court |

| **FRANK OWENS**  
Chief Probation Officer  
Gila County Probation | **PAULA TAYLOR**  
APETS Business Manager  
Arizona Supreme Court |

| **DAVID SANDERS**  
Chief Probation Officer  
Superior Court of Pima County | **STAFF**  
**BOB MACON**  
Probation Automation Manager  
Arizona Supreme Court, AOC |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHAIR</td>
<td>ANDREW HURWITZ</td>
<td>Justice, Arizona Supreme Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT BRUTINEL</td>
<td>Presiding Judge</td>
<td>Superior Court in Yavapai County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL JEANES</td>
<td>Clerk of the Court</td>
<td>Superior Court in Maricopa County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIANE DRAIN</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>State Bar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS LUSK</td>
<td>Justice of the Peace</td>
<td>Apache Junction Justice Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARL HECKART</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Information Technology Division, Arizona Supreme Court, AOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHERI NEWMAN</td>
<td>Clerk of the Court</td>
<td>Superior Court in La Paz County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD JACOBSON</td>
<td>Court Administrator</td>
<td>Flagstaff Municipal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>STEWART BRUNER</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Manager, Arizona Supreme Court, AOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. PLANNING METHOD AND PARTICIPANTS

The Judiciary’s planning process is a major Judicial Branch activity involving many people and organizations. It includes:

- The Chief Justice
- The Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)
- Division Directors of the AOC
- The Arizona Judicial Council and its subcommittees, which includes the Commission on Technology
- Members of the public
- Presiding judges
- Clerks of the court
- Judges
- Court administrators
- Court staff throughout the state

The planning process emphasizes the alignment of business goals and the IT strategies and projects.

Building on the foundation of former Chief Justice Charles E. Jones, who provided leadership and direction to the Judiciary in targeting five goals of the Judicial Branch’s strategic agenda, *Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona’s Courts 2005-2010*, adopted in June 2005 with the swearing in of Chief Justice Ruth V. McGregor, identifies the following as the Judiciary’s goals for the period 2005 through 2010.

- Providing Access to Swift, Fair Justice
- Protecting Children, Families, and Communities
- Being Accountable
- Improving Communication and Cooperation with the Community
- Serving the Public by Improving the Legal Profession

The process by which the goals were updated included meetings with presiding judges, clerks of court, members of the Arizona Judicial Council and key court staff throughout the Judiciary as well as getting input from law enforcement and conducting public surveys. This agenda remains the blueprint for building increased public trust in court systems, and inspiring confidence that individual rights are being protected and all Arizona citizens are being treated fairly.

This is the twelfth year that the Judiciary has published a formal information technology plan; each year the strategic IT initiatives have been reassessed and re-prioritized to assure they meet the stated mission and strategic organizational initiatives of the Judiciary. Some new business goals resulted from the publication of *Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona’s Courts 2005-2010*; new IT initiatives were crafted to support them. The timeline for the development of this IT strategic plan was as follows:
Commission on Technology held planning sessions at its annual meeting to do information technology strategic planning. Local, county-level strategic plans were reviewed and approved or approved with conditions. Priorities for statewide projects and support were reviewed and confirmed. A decision was made to include a business continuity component in the FY09-FY11 planning process.

Revision of last year’s countywide and appellate plans was directed by COT, continuing the two distinct portions of the plan preparation process for updates: one for business and one for technology. Presiding judges and court administrators were provided the strategy and schedule approved by COT then asked to provide business and technical contacts to AOC. Due date for business continuity portion of plan was revised to “when practicable” by COT.

Specific instructions and last year’s completed plans were delivered to business contacts with a due date for return of the updated business input to AOC.

Calls were held with business contacts around the state to review the process and resolve issues raised. Specific instructions and planning materials were delivered to IT contacts following return of updated business information by business contacts.

Calls were held with technical contacts around the state to review the process and resolve issues raised.

County court and appeals court IT plans were submitted to AOC for review and summarization.

Commission on Technology re-identified key priorities from *Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona’s Courts 2005-2010* for the 2009 fiscal year and aligned strategic plans. COT also evaluated County Court Information Technology Strategic Plans submitted in March 2009. Letters were then sent to presiding judges informing them of COT’s decisions regarding their submitted plans.

Commission on Technology approved the Arizona Judicial Branch Information Technology Strategic Plan for 2009-2011 at its September meeting. After final edits, the plan was submitted to GITA and JLBC.

Figure 1 illustrates the typical processes and timing of the Arizona Judicial Branch Strategic Planning effort.
FIGURE 1. ARIZONA JUDICIAL BRANCH STRATEGIC PLANNING
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III. JUDICIAL BRANCH VISION

Over many years and through the dedication and efforts of many, Arizona has developed a very good court system, one of which we should all be proud. But together, we can make it even better. Through teamwork and continued commitment to make our system work for those who depend upon the courts, we can make our system truly great.

From... Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona's Courts 2005-2010

The Honorable Ruth V. McGregor assumed the leadership of the Judiciary in June 2005, becoming Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court. She has provided direction to the Arizona Courts with her statement of Judicial Branch strategic initiatives in Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona's Courts 2005-2010. There are five broad goals, each associated with several key strategic business needs. This agenda is a road map to increasing the public's trust in and access to the court system.

PROVIDING ACCESS TO SWIFT, FAIR JUSTICE

The role of courts is to swiftly and fairly resolve cases. To accomplish this goal, courts must become efficient and user-friendly. Challenges include addressing the needs of the growing ranks of unrepresented litigants, protecting the rights of victims, and speeding up the wheels of justice. Specific initiatives to achieve these objectives include creating self-help and information centers for those who cannot afford representation; putting case-related information on the web so that parties, witnesses, and victims can receive timely, accurate information; and re-engineering case processing systems so that cases are resolved more quickly. This is especially important in areas such as DUI processing. Arizona citizens have the right to an adequately funded system that employs modern technology to process cases and communicate information, protects the rights of victims, ensures that self-represented litigants have meaningful access to the courts, and is open and available to all members of the public. The initiatives supporting this goal will help ensure that Arizona’s diverse population can be confident that our system of justice will be swift, impartial, fair, and compassionate to the victims of crime.
PROTECTING CHILDREN, FAMILIES & COMMUNITIES
Arizona’s children and families are precious resources. Courts must be able to act swiftly and dispense justice in family law cases so that children are protected from neglect and abuse, and to make appropriate, permanent placements so that children do not languish in the custody of the state. All this must be accomplished while balancing the rights of parents. Domestic violence cases have skyrocketed and require emergency procedures to ensure the safety of domestic violence victims. In addition, Arizona’s rapidly expanding and aging population has increased the number of cases involving vulnerable persons, elder care, probate, and fiduciary responsibility. The courts must engineer new case management processes and educate court personnel to efficiently resolve these family-related cases.

Courts also oversee supervision of probation for those who have been convicted of criminal charges. Initiatives to enhance probation supervision call for increased automation to track probationers, enhanced efforts to collect restitution, additional training for probation officers and improved methods to assist substance-abusing probationers. Courts must improve processes to protect children, families, and communities through innovative and forward-looking programs.

BEING ACCOUNTABLE
Courts must ensure that judges and staff in all courts and at all levels are competent, professional, and customer service oriented. To accomplish this goal, courts must adopt a system of standards to measure operations and performance. What gets measured gets done. To enhance public trust and confidence, courts must keep the public informed about our initiatives and must quickly investigate and resolve all allegations of misconduct. Courts must ask the right questions, apply the right standards, and spend the time necessary to improve the performance of all parts of the judicial system.

IMPROVING COMMUNICATION AND COOPERATION WITH THE COMMUNITY
Many members of the public do not fully understand our courts and how they operate. To ensure an informed public, courts must take responsibility to communicate clearly. We must also find ways to help the public make informed decisions about judges standing for retention by improving the information about judges’ performance provided by the Commission on Judicial Performance. Courts must continue to improve jury management systems and selection procedures. Courts should increase not only our efforts to foster public understanding of the judicial branch, but also our efforts to improve communications across all branches and levels of government. The initiatives supporting these goals include expanding direct outreach efforts to the public, increasing intra-branch cooperation with other levels of government, and expanding programs that foster mutual understanding and respect among all branches of government.
SERVING THE PUBLIC BY IMPROVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION

Working with the Arizona State Bar, the Court should implement strategic initiatives to improve public confidence in the legal system and in the lawyers who serve within the system. Because the Supreme Court regulates the practice of law, the Court should continually develop methods by which the legal profession can improve its service to the public. Other initiatives include examining existing rules that govern the practice of law and attorney admission and discipline and revising those that cause unnecessary delay. The Court also will consider whether changes to rules of court procedure can reduce the cost of litigation, improve the timeliness of dispute resolution, or discourage unnecessary adversarial proceedings.
IV. JUDICIAL BRANCH STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

GOOD TO GREAT:
A STRATEGIC AGENDA FOR ARIZONA’S COURTS
2005-2010

GOAL 1
PROVIDING ACCESS TO SWIFT, FAIR JUSTICE

Our judicial system is predicated on the belief that all citizens coming before the courts are entitled to equal justice, regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, age, or economic circumstance. To develop a fully impartial system of justice, courts must resolve cases swiftly and fairly because justice delayed may be justice denied. Memories fade, evidence is lost, and the accused may spend months or years in custody without having been found guilty of any crime. Courts must ensure that litigants and victims fully understand their rights and that those rights are protected. Courts must provide meaningful access to all, ensuring that not litigant is denied justice due to the lack of counsel or the inability to understand legal proceedings. To the end, this strategic goal, “PROVIDING ACCESS TO SWIFT, FAIR JUSTICE,” focuses on the following areas: providing adequate funding for the Judicial Branch; implementing and maintaining modern technology to support the work of the Judicial Branch; addressing bias in the judicial system; ensuring enforcement of the rights of victims; providing meaningful assistance to self-represented litigants; creating user-friendly courts that effectively utilize technology and efficiently process and manage cases to resolve disputes in a fair and timely manner; and continuously examining processes and systems to find ways to improve how courts conduct their business.

1-A
FUNDING FOR THE JUDICIAL BRANCH

A Judicial Branch can carry out the constitutional and statutory duties of the Branch only if it is adequately funded.

The bad economic times following the “9-11” terrorist attack demonstrated the vulnerability of the Judicial Branch to budget cuts and consequently resulted in significant funding and resource reductions. Budget cuts resulted in case delay, postponement, or cancellation of essential investment in basic automation, high employee turnover, and higher probation caseloads. It will take years for the Judicial Branch to recover from these budget reductions.

The Judicial Branch depends on the support of the state Legislature, county boards of supervisors, and city councils for its funding. The Judicial Branch must be accountable for how it spends public funds, and the funding entities must understand the importance of appropriately funding the Judicial Branch.

INITIATIVES

Develop strategies for improving the level and stability of funding for the Judicial Branch.
- Create a committee on Funding of the Courts to develop and recommend funding strategies.
1-B

TECHNOLOGY AND THE COURTS

The Arizona Judicial Branch has aggressively planned and, as funding permitted, implemented new technology projects to improve the provision and administration of justice. Core business systems that are in place must continue to be evaluated and updated to ensure effectiveness. Additionally, integration links between courts and key partners of state and local government are being built.

The next level of technology planning and investment involves digitizing records and making them available electronically to judicial officers, court staff, lawyers, litigants, and the public. Courts must plan for managing electronic case records from the point of filing (e-filing), through the life of the pending case, and beyond as required by court records retention schedules.

INITIATIVES

Improve technology initiatives and programs.

• Promote the use of technology within courts to facilitate the processing of cases in an efficient manner.
• Develop a plan with local courts for the replacement of aging, legacy court automation systems with modern technology.
• Continue to develop standards and policies for e-filing, electronic access to court records, and electronic record storage, backup and recovery.

1-C

FAIRNESS IN THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM

The judiciary aspires to develop and maintain a fair and impartial justice system. The court community should reflect the diversity of the public it serves at all levels and maintain open dialogue with all groups in order to increase respect for courts and understanding between courts and the public they serve.

INITIATIVES

Continue to strive for a justice system in Arizona that is free from actual or perceived racial, ethnic, gender, or economic bias.

• Enhance communication between the courts and minority communities.
• Provide continuing education to the judiciary and judicial staff on issues of cultural and racial diversity.
• Increase the diversity of the judiciary at all levels to reflect the communities it serves while maintaining the highest level of judicial qualifications.
• Address the over-representation of minority youth in the justice system through the “Building Blocks” initiative.
1-D

**VICTIM’S RIGHTS**

For those directly impacted by crime, negotiating the criminal justice system can cause frustration. Courts must respond to the needs of victims while protecting the constitutional rights of both the accused and the victim. Courts must ensure that victims have the opportunity to exercise rights granted to them. Additionally, victims deserve to be treated with respect by all entities in the criminal justice system.

**INITIATIVES**

Ensure that the rights afforded victims of crime are enforced and that victims are informed and treated with dignity and respect.

- Create a subcommittee on victims and the courts as part the Arizona Judicial Council and a state-level position within the AOC to focus on issues involving victims and the courts.
- Provide continuing education of the judiciary and judicial staff about the rights and appropriate treatment of victims.
- Work in cooperation with law enforcement, prosecutorial agencies, defense counsel, and victims to ensure compliance with victims’ rights provisions.

1-E

**SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANTS**

For many people, the cost of legal representation has become prohibitive, as evidenced by the ever increasing number of self-represented litigants appearing before the courts. To ensure that citizens have meaningful access and an opportunity to be heard, Arizona courts must develop alternative and more effective methods to provide assistance to litigants so that they are not denied justice because they lack the benefit of counsel.

**INITIATIVES**

Develop and implement effective ways to assist self-represented litigants.

- Develop and adopt Supreme Court Guidelines defining legal assistance, as distinguished from legal advice, so that judicial staff can provide appropriate legal assistance.
- Expand the Judicial Branch’s self-service center web site to include forms, instructions, and other information helpful to those who appear unrepresented in the limited jurisdiction and superior courts.
- Develop simple, easy to use, web-based interactive forms needed for dissolution and other domestic relations related cases, small claims, forcible detainer, and probate cases.
- Encourage the establishment of self-service centers in courts and encourage the expansion of pro-bono legal representation by members of the State Bar.
1-F  
**USER-FRIENDLY COURTS**

To enhance public trust and confidence in the judiciary, courts must be truly accessible to those they serve and must address the public’s growing expectation of assistance in the area of self-representation. Moreover, as the age and diversity of Arizona’s population continue to increase, courts must provide more language interpreters and assistance for the speech or hearing impaired. Public expectations concerning the timely resolution of disputes, particularly in divorce and child custody proceedings, continue to challenge courts. The continuing development of efficient case processing and management systems is designed to ensure the resolution of disputes in a fair and timely manner, thereby strengthening public confidence in the courts.

**INITIATIVES**

Provide an opportunity for those who appear before the courts to improve their understanding of the proceedings and their ability to communicate with the court.

- Implement programs to ensure the availability of qualified language interpreters for non-English speaking litigants.
- Implement programs to assist speech or hearing impaired litigants.
- Provide customer service training for judges and judicial staff.

Re-engineer domestic relations case processing to eliminate, where possible, the adversarial nature of dissolution and to provide prompt, fair, and more cost-effective methods to resolve dissolution and child custody matters.

- Implement Rules of the Supreme Court on domestic relations cases.
- Identify best practices from family court pilot programs in Maricopa, Pinal, and Coconino Counties and determine suitability for implementing in other parts of the state.

Develop case management procedures that reflect best practices for resolving disputes in a prompt, fair, and cost-effective manner.

- Assist courts in the development and implementation of best practices for efficient case processing, including case management for judges.
- Develop innovative ways in which to use these methods to achieve more mutually satisfying results and to expedite case dispositions.
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

To better serve the public, courts must continuously develop innovative procedures to resolve civil disputes and dispose of civil and criminal cases in a fair, timely, and cost-effective manner. Litigants should not be forced to wait for resolution of issues such as the custody of children, their financial future, or their very freedom. While traditional adversarial methods of dispute resolution are appropriate for many cases, courts must continue to implement better and more cost-effective methods. For example, across the country and in Arizona, more specialty courts, some therapeutic by design, have been created. Drug, DUI, domestic violence, and mental health courts, to name a few, are gaining popularity as courts experiment with different ways to address problems unique to the offenders appearing in these courts.

Courts of limited jurisdiction, where more than 95 percent of all litigants find themselves, must not be left behind as the judiciary moves forward. Demands placed upon these courts have increased significantly over the years. To meet current demand and ensure public trust and confidence in the judiciary, Arizona courts will continue to expand case re-engineering efforts at all levels.

It is an unfortunate reality that violence occurs in courts around the country. Administrators and presiding judges in Arizona have been diligent, limited by available resources, in providing security in courthouses to deter violence, but no courthouse is immune from this possibility. Court leadership must continue to ensure that everyone who walks through the doors of a courthouse in Arizona is safe.

INITIATIVES

Develop and implement a plan to enhance the operations of limited and general jurisdiction courts.
- Encourage the upgrade of court facilities to better serve the public and provide adequate space for court staff and records.
- Continue to improve courthouse security to ensure the safety of those who use or work in the court system.
- Ensure all courts have put in place and practiced an emergency response plan and protocols.
- Implement the fines/fees and restitution enforcement (FARE) program.

Explore opportunities for re-engineering civil case processing to ensure that cases are resolved in a prompt, fair, cost-effective manner.
- Study case processing time standards and develop appropriate standards for all civil case types.
- Complete study on mandatory arbitration system and implement recommendations and rule changes approved by the Supreme Court.

Continue re-engineering criminal case processing to ensure fair and timely resolution of cases and to ensure that criminal justice agencies and the courts have accurate case and defendant information when and where it is needed.
- Dispose of 90 percent of felony cases within 100 days and 99 percent of cases within 180 days and, as necessary, achieve funding to meet these goals (Fill the Gap).
- Continue criminal case management re-engineering with emphasis on criminal case delay in non-urban counties.
- Develop strategy for re-engineering DUI case processing to expedite case dispositions.
- Develop and implement a strategy for the long-term support and expansion of integrated justice information systems.
- Study case processing time standards and develop appropriate standards for all criminal case types.
Review the process of keeping the court record to determine the most appropriate and cost-effective method to preserve the integrity of judicial proceedings and effectively utilize valuable court reporting resources.

- Implement the recommendations of the Keeping the Record Committee approved by the Arizona Judicial Council and the Supreme Court.

Review experience with specialty courts around the country and in Arizona to determine which procedures should be replicated in Arizona.

- Create a Committee on Specialty Courts to evaluate effectiveness and viability of using the specialty court model in Arizona.

Review and make recommendations on ways to improve the Supreme Court’s procedures for considering proposed rules revisions.
GOAL 2
PROTECTING CHILDREN, FAMILIES & COMMUNITIES

Courts provide a fair and impartial forum for resolving disputes, ensure that those who violate laws are held accountable, serve to limit the arbitrary use of government power to deprive citizens of their rights, and ensure that those in need of protection due to age or infirmity are protected from physical or financial harm. Arizona courts are an essential component of a justice system that exists, in substantial part, to protect children, families, and the communities in which we live. To that end, this strategic goal, “PROTECTING CHILDREN, FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES,” includes four major areas of focus: abused and neglected children; victims of domestic violence; vulnerable persons; and juvenile and adult probation supervision and probation department employee safety.

2-A
ABUSED AND NEGLECTED CHILDREN

There may be no greater exercise of governmental power, with the exception of the imposition of the death penalty, than the state’s removal of children from their parents once allegations of abuse or neglect have been made. Courts are required to balance the protection of the child with the rights of the parent. Once intervention is deemed necessary, it is imperative that courts act swiftly and fairly to dispense justice, ensuring that all parents are given every reasonable opportunity to become responsible for the care of their children. If parents are unable to assume custody, courts and ancillary services must make every effort to find appropriate, permanent homes so that no child languishes needlessly in the custody of the state.

Governor Napolitano and the Legislature have made reform of Arizona’s child protection services a high priority. In particular, the reform involved providing more resources to investigate child abuse and a policy directive that protection of the child is the first priority when making child care placement decisions. This reform has resulted in an explosion in the number of children placed in out-of-home care. Courts must address the impact of these reforms not only on juvenile courts but also on family law and case processing in the courts.

INITIATIVES

Process child abuse and neglect cases in a fair and timely manner to ensure children have safe, nurturing, and permanent homes while protecting the rights of all parties.

- Obtain from the Legislature and boards of supervisors the resources necessary for courts to keep up with the growth in dependency cases.
- Pilot test dependency case management procedures and, if successful, implement statewide.
- Encourage public and private agencies to increase efforts to recruit foster homes for children in need.
- Review and prepare an evaluation on the use of jury trials in termination of parental rights cases.
- Encourage public and private agencies to increase efforts to recruit adoptive families and expedite the certification process for children available for adoption.
- Provide continuing education to the judiciary on the impact of child abuse and neglect on children and families and the responsibility of courts to comply with the federal requirements of the Title IV-E provisions.
- Reprogram and deploy the dependency case management modules as part of the JOLTSaz project.
Domestic violence affects thousands of Arizona citizens each year. Courts and probation departments observe the real impact such violence has, not only on the victims of the abuse, but also on the children who live with and witness violence in their own homes. It is important for judges and judicial staff to be knowledgeable and possess the skills necessary to process domestic violence cases swiftly and appropriately.

**INITIATIVES**

Develop and implement best practices and procedures to address domestic violence effectively and to reduce its impact on children and families.

- Expand probation services to the limited jurisdiction courts for domestic violence cases and create specialized caseloads, where appropriate, to ensure offender compliance with court orders.
- Provide continuing education to the judiciary concerning the seriousness of domestic violence, the cycle of abuse, and its impact on families, particularly children, and the most effective methods for handling domestic violence cases.
- Implement changes to the domestic violence protection order petition and protection order repository to produce uniformity among courts and between states.
- Provide web-based online forms for petitions for orders of protection.
- Evaluate "domestic violence courts" used in Arizona and elsewhere to determine effectiveness and promote successful court models.

As the population of our state continues to increase and age, courts often are called upon to appoint fiduciaries, licensed by the court, to aid those who need assistance in managing their personal and financial affairs due to age or other infirmity. Courts must ensure, through effective oversight, policies, and training that fiduciaries act in the best interests of those they serve and are held accountable for performing their duties properly.

**INITIATIVES**

Implement the re-engineering of probate case management statewide to ensure protection of elderly, mentally incapacitated, and other vulnerable persons.

- Secure additional resources necessary to decrease the amount of time required investigating and resolve complaints filed against private and public fiduciaries.
- Conduct audits of fiduciaries to ensure laws, rules, and code provisions applicable to fiduciaries are followed.
- Utilize automated case processing and uniform case management systems for probate cases.
- Provide continuing education to the judiciary on the effective oversight of probate and mental health cases.
- Re-engineer probate case management statewide to strengthen protection of elderly, mentally incapacitated, and other vulnerable persons.
Persons who violate the laws of this state must be held accountable. Courts are required to determine the appropriate punishment for these individuals, within the context of existing laws, in order to deter crime and protect the public. If a court determines probation to be the most appropriate action, it must ensure that the offender not only is held accountable, but also is offered rehabilitative services designed to reduce or eliminate future criminal activity. Those offenders with histories of substance abuse or mental illness present a unique challenge, and innovative approaches, such as therapeutic courts, must be considered to reduce offender recidivism and promote public safety. Successful management of juvenile and adult probation populations requires following proven principles of effective community supervision and using treatment and rehabilitation programs supported by research and experience. It also requires using modern technology tools that are capable of providing accurate, relevant, and timely information.

It is equally important to provide a safe work environment to probation officers and other department staff who come into contact with offenders. Whether the contact is in the field or in a probation department office, the safety of the officer and staff must be a priority when allocating resources.

**Initiatives**

Provide a balanced approach to probation that focuses on holding probationers accountable, keeping communities safe, and providing treatment and rehabilitation services to offenders.

- Continue to enhance efforts through improved automation, skip tracing, and billing to collect restitution and fees from probationers.
- Require that probationers complete all conditions of probation, including required community service hours.
- Provide probation services to the limited jurisdiction courts for those convicted of sex offenses, domestic violence related offenses, and DUI offenses.
- Ensure the provision of appropriate treatment services for mentally ill offenders.

Develop innovative, effective methods to assist substance-abusing offenders, including the continued expansion of drug courts, to prevent additional contact with the justice system and ensure community safety.

- Expand statewide the use of drug courts and treatment in reducing substance abuse and recidivism in the justice system.
- Provide judicial education about the management and supervision of substance abusing offenders.
- Ensure offenders are appropriately screened for needs and risk to the community and that appropriate treatment and other services are provided.

Continue implementing and improving a comprehensive officer safety program to ensure the safety of officers and probation department staff.

- Monitor compliance with statewide policies on officer safety.
- Ensure that probation personnel receive on-going safety training.
- Advocate for the resources necessary to provide training and safety equipment to probation personnel.

Develop and implement statewide automated systems to assist probation departments in managing probation caseloads.

- Implement the Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System (APETS) in all probation departments statewide.
- Develop and implement statewide (except Maricopa County) a new Juvenile On-Line Tracking System (JOLTS) and integrate it with the system used in Maricopa County.
Conduct research on offender management, treatment and rehabilitation programs used in Arizona to ensure best practices are utilized.

- Evaluate drug treatment outcomes for offenders referred to drug courts and those receiving treatment services through the Drug Treatment and Education Fund.
- Evaluate offender assessment practices used to determine appropriate supervision level and compare practices to “what works” principles of community supervision.
GOAL 3
BEING ACCOUNTABLE

The judiciary, like the Executive and Legislative Branches of government, must be accountable to the public. This strategic initiative, "BEING ACCOUNTABLE," focuses on the obligation of the judiciary to ensure that staff at all levels are competent, professional, and customer service oriented; to establish standards by which court operations and performance can be measured; to keep all branches of government and the public informed of court operations, programs, and initiatives; and to develop a clear strategic agenda that fosters public trust and confidence. Confidence in our judges is at the heart of maintaining the public's trust. Allegations of misconduct must be investigated and resolved timely and fairly.

INITIATIVES

Recruit and retain a professional, well-trained, customer service oriented workforce to better serve the needs of the public.

- Advocate for competitive salaries and benefits for all court employees, including probation officers, judicial staff, and judicial officers.
- Enhance training and career opportunities to increase the knowledge and professionalism of staff.
- Update and enhance judicial education programs to require comprehensive, meaningful training of judges, judicial staff, and probation officers.

Assist the Chief Justice in the development, review, and implementation of the Strategic Agenda of the judiciary.

- Continue to encourage local courts to engage in setting strategic goals consistent with those established by the Judicial Branch Strategic Agenda.
- Continue strategic planning by committees and commissions of the Arizona Judicial Council.

Establish performance and operational standards and measures for courts.

- Review the ten core Trial Court Performance Measures developed by the National Center for State Courts and implement those measures determined to be beneficial to Arizona courts.
- Develop operational standards for courts.

Ensure the Commission on Judicial Conduct has sufficient resources to perform its constitutional duties fairly and timely.
GOAL 4
IMPROVING COMMUNICATION AND COOPERATION WITH THE COMMUNITY, OTHER BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT, AND WITHIN THE JUDICIAL BRANCH

While the judiciary is a branch of government independent from the other two, it does not exist in isolation. Courts exist to serve the public and cannot serve effectively if meaningful communication among the branches, within the branch, and with the public does not take place. This strategic initiative, “IMPROVING COMMUNICATION AND COOPERATION WITH THE COMMUNITY, OTHER BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT, AND WITHIN THE JUDICIAL BRANCH,” focuses on enhancing judicial communication with the Executive and Legislative Branches of state government, with all other levels of government, with the public, and with other courts.

The judiciary also should foster public understanding of the role of the judiciary and how it functions through community outreach and educational programs. The judiciary must make every effort to ensure voters, who decide on judicial election and retention, have sufficient information provided to them to make an informed choice at the voting booth.

INITIATIVES

Communicate effectively with other parts of the Judicial Branch, as well as with the Executive and the Legislative Branches, to improve communications and business relations.

• Foster a continuing relationship with the Legislature through programs such as the “View from the Bench,” which pairs legislators with judges for purposes of enhancing mutual respect for their respective roles.
• Foster a continuing relationship with the Executive Branch through regular communication on issues of mutual interest.

Communicate effectively with the communities we serve to ensure continuous improvement of the court in its service to the community.

• Conduct citizen summits in various locations to gather input from the general public, court users, and minority communities.
• Keep the public informed of court activities and initiatives through the use of the Judicial Branch web site and other means of outreach.
• Foster a continuing relationship with city councils and county boards of supervisors through regular communication on issues of mutual interest.

Communicate effectively with all parts of the Judicial Branch to promote better-informed policy making, improved collegiality, and intra-branch cooperation and participation in the administration of justice.

• Identify opportunities for the Chief Justice, Vice Chief Justice, and other members of the Supreme Court and executive management of the AOC to meet with Judicial Branch leadership and judicial system staff.
• Expand use of the Judicial Branch web site and email to provide information to judges and other judicial system staff and opportunities to provide input through electronic surveys.
• Convene meetings or conferences to provide opportunities for court leadership at all levels to discuss management issues and ways to expand local court participation in strategic planning and policy development.
• Prepare a plan, which includes an education component, on developing court leadership, management, and succession planning for all court levels.
Keep the Executive and the Legislative Branches of government, as well as the public, informed of court operations, programs, and initiatives.

- Deliver an annual State of the Judiciary Address.
- Publish an annual report.
- Publish the Judicial Branch’s strategic agenda.

Improve voter information provided by the Commission on Judicial Performance Review for merit selected judges who are standing for retention.

Develop educational programs and initiatives to improve the public’s understanding of the role and functioning of the court.

- Explore feasibility of forming a partnership with the Legislative and Executive Branches to broadcast oral arguments.
- Partner with the State Bar of Arizona to expand educational programs within schools, such as “We the People,” to foster a greater understanding of the role of the courts in a constitutional system of government.
- Develop and implement opportunities for young people to observe courts in action and continue partnering with the State Bar to maintain and expand the “Law for Kids” website.
- Assist the public in developing a greater understanding of the functions and role of the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals by conducting oral arguments and town halls in communities around the state.
- Develop programs to inform the public about judicial selection in Arizona.
- Create a Committee on the “Centennial Celebration of the Arizona Judiciary” to plan for and participate in the 2012 centennial celebration.

Develop jury selection procedures and management systems that provide a convenient, respectful, and meaningful experience for jurors.

- Educate the public about the importance of jury duty.
- Develop jury management procedures, including automated systems to assist jurors in scheduling jury service.
- Implement and publicize systems to promote compliance with the requirement to appear for jury duty.
- Increase juror compensation.
- Develop juror appreciation programs.
- Create juror exit surveys to obtain juror input.
- Compare Arizona’s existing juror standards with new American Bar Association standards and update, as appropriate.
GOAL 5
SERVING THE PUBLIC BY IMPROVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION

The judiciary has long recognized the indispensable role of the legal profession in protecting individual rights and liberties in a free society. We continue in that tradition. Because the Supreme Court regulates the practice of law, however, the judiciary must determine how the legal profession can best serve the public. While the traditional adversarial system for resolving disputes succeeds in many cases, that system may not be desirable in all cases. This strategic goal, “SERVING THE PUBLIC BY IMPROVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION,” requires examination of existing rules governing the practice of law, the attorney admission and disciplinary systems, and legal practices and procedures that encourage unnecessarily adversarial proceedings in and out of the courtroom.

INITIATIVES

Identify ways in which rules of procedure and the practice of law can be changed to promote a more economical, timely, and, where appropriate, less adversarial justice system to resolve civil cases.

- Identify case types that are most suitable for using less adversarial resolution proceedings.
- Identify existing rules governing the practice of law that, if changed, can reduce the cost of litigation, improve timeliness of case resolution, and provide less adversarial alternatives to dispute resolution.

Work with the Committee on Character and Fitness, the State Bar and other entities to identify ways to improve the attorney admission process. Work with the State Bar to improve the attorney discipline system to ensure the efficient, timely, and fair resolution of complaints.
V. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

BACKGROUND

The Commission on Technology has identified information technology goals, strategic initiatives, and strategic projects that support the vision and strategic initiatives of *Good to Great*. Together, they set technology direction for the Judiciary and the Information Technology Division of the Administrative Office of the Courts, which staffs and supports statewide projects.

The Commission on Technology’s authority and responsibility for the identification of the information technology priorities for the Judiciary are outlined below.

COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY: BACKGROUND

The Commission on Technology, a committee of the Arizona Judicial Council (AJC), has identified the strategies for automation statewide to support goals aligned with the overall vision and goals of the Judiciary. The Commission on Technology, one of five standing committees of the Arizona Judicial Council, was established in 1990. The Commission was charged with "providing strategic leadership for the successful application of information technology to improve access, efficiency and the quality of justice of the Arizona Court System.” The Commission’s charge to oversee the application of technology in the courts is consistent with the strategic initiatives and priorities of the Judiciary.

The Commission meets five times per year; subcommittees meet more often. Members include judges, clerks of court, court administrators, a State Bar representative, a Legislative Branch representative, a Governor’s Office representative, a League of Cities and Towns representative, a County Supervisors’ Association representative, and the public. Commission subcommittees provide technical advice and counsel to Commission members. A list of the 2008 Fiscal Year Commission on Technology membership and that of its subcommittees is included in the Introduction.

COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY: AUTHORITY

The Commission on Technology is similar in function to the Arizona Executive Branch’s Information Technology Authorization Committee (ITAC). For instance, it reviews and approves Judicial Collections Enhancement Fund (JCEF) grant requests for automation projects. The Commission approves funding requests and provides support for projects that further the goals contained in this document. The Commission’s authority and responsibility are to:

- Establish the goals, policies, and priorities for the statewide Judicial Information Technology Plan.
• Determine the allocation of available Judicial Collection Enhancement Funds and Traffic Case Processing Funds (TCPF) for automation grant requests and projects consistent with the direction, standards, and priorities of the Judicial Strategic Business and Information Technology Plans. The Arizona Judicial Council determines the amount of these funds available for this purpose.

• Oversee the statewide judicial branch data communications network, including establishing security standards and procedures.

• Develop and submit for approval statewide technical standards, which shall be used in all court automation projects, including security, disaster recovery, and communication standards.

• Oversee the selection, development, and support of automation systems used by multiple courts and supported by the Administrative Office of the Courts.

• Encourage projects which utilize technology to increase accessibility to the courts, improve court efficiency, and improve court management.

• Review and approve countywide court information technology plans for consistency with the Judiciary’s Strategic Business and Information Technology Plans.

• Review and approve or disapprove court technology projects that exceed a cost of $250,000. The Commission also establishes the policies and procedures for the submission of project plans.

• Monitor the progress of all court automation projects pursuant to county-wide court information technology plan.

COMMISSION SUBCOMMITTEE: TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

The Technical Advisory Council (TAC) is a subcommittee of the Commission on Technology whose members provide a technical perspective and expertise to the Commission. They are charged to respond to Commission requests to recommend specific standards and technologies to carry out statewide policies and priorities. They may also be requested to review technical aspects of automation plans and grant requests and make recommendations regarding technical standards and approaches. Technical standards, technology architectures, and recommendations for specific technology solutions come from this group.

COMMISSION SUBCOMMITTEE: COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

The Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) is charged with coordinating the integrated implementation of statewide applications other than probation automation. It oversees development of statewide automation systems to ensure they can be implemented in other Arizona courts. It also oversees various high profile, single-court projects, as directed by COT, to ensure goals are being met.
COMMISSION SUBCOMMITTEE: PROBATION AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

The Probation Automation Coordinating Committee (PACC) oversees the enhancement and deployment of the statewide records management systems for adults (APETS) and juveniles (JOLTS) related to probation.

COMMISSION: SUPPORT STAFF

Staff in the Information Technology Division (ITD), a division of the Administrative Office of the Courts, serves as support to the Commission on Technology, much as the Government Information Technology Agency (GITA) performs the staffing function for ITAC. Beyond staffing, ITD provides development and support resources for many of the statewide initiatives currently in process. ITD personnel, under the direction of Mr. Karl Heckart, CIO, plan to continue to staff the implementation, support, and enhancement of such statewide activities as replacement of case and financial management systems, the Arizona Judicial Information Network (AJIN), the Judicial Intranet, the customer service center, and other centralized services. ITD staff members also provide support to ad hoc subcommittees, such as Funding or e-Court, created by a motion of the COT.
COMMISSION IDENTIFIED STRATEGIC BUSINESS NEEDS

In the fall of 1993 during a strategic planning retreat, the Commission on Technology identified the following strategic business needs related to automation. These needs support the overall mission and goals statement of the Judiciary. (For the purposes of this plan “effectiveness” is defined as including both quantity and quality.) In order of the Commission’s assigned priority, they are:

- Improved effectiveness in the maintenance of court records.
- Improved effectiveness in case management.
- Improved effectiveness in courts’ communications among themselves and with other justice and law-enforcement agencies.
- Improved effectiveness in the courtroom by employing technology in courtroom activities.
- Improved effectiveness in the business functions of court operations.
- Improved effectiveness in the enforcement of court orders, including collections.
- Improved effectiveness of probation tracking.
- Provide education to court staff and the public regarding the justice system and technology as used in the courts.
- Improved effectiveness in the maintenance of official appellate court records.
- Improved effectiveness in jury management.
- Improved effectiveness in juvenile court and juvenile detention records and case management.
- Improved effectiveness of facilities management.

In September of both 1996 and 1998 at its second and third strategic planning retreats, the Commission identified and reaffirmed information technology automation goals for the Judiciary and the strategic IT initiatives to support them. In its April and May 1998 meetings, the Commission on Technology reviewed the strategic initiatives in published IT Strategic Plans and reaffirmed them, adding Year 2000 readiness.

The Commission has recently reaffirmed these goals and strategic initiatives yet again. The initiatives have been aligned with and in support of Good to Great goals, and with the previously identified business needs of the court.
The information technology automation goals are:

### STATEWIDE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AUTOMATION GOALS

**Fiscal Years 2009 – 2011**

1. Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.
2. Improve information access and communication from and to judicial entities as well as the other criminal justice system functions.
3. Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial effectiveness in handling growing caseloads.

To achieve these goals, the Commission on Technology has identified the following broad strategic initiatives. This strategic agenda is both consistent with previous years' IT Plans and with the updated focus provided by Chief Justice McGregor in *Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona's Courts 2005-2010*.

The information technology strategic initiatives are:

### INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

**Fiscal Years 2009 – 2011**

1. Promote a *systemic thinking* approach to technological solutions.
2. Provide infrastructure (including the network, centralized help desk, field support, training, and distributed systems management capabilities), processes, and procedures to support statewide court communication, automation, and integration.
3. Enhance information security and disaster recovery policies, procedures, and technology to protect statewide court technology-related assets.
5. Complete, maintain, and enhance second-generation statewide automation projects.
6. Improve data exchange and communications with the public, the other criminal justice functions, and outside agencies.
7. Digitize the court environment.
8. Provide divisions of the Administrative Office of the Courts with automated solutions to meet internal goals and objectives.
STRATEGIC TECHNOLOGY PROJECT ALIGNMENT WITH BUSINESS INITIATIVES

Given the information technology business needs, goals, and strategic initiatives, the Commission has elected to support several strategic technology projects. The strategic technology projects, aligned with the strategic business initiatives, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Strategic Projects</th>
<th>ALIGNMENT with Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona’s Courts 2005-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Code Standardization</strong></td>
<td>• Assist the courts in the development and implementation of best practices for efficient case processing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Penalty Enforcement Program/FARE** | • Implement the fines/fees and restitution enforcement (FARE) program.  
• Continue to enhance efforts through improved automation, skip tracing, and billing to collect restitution and fees from probationers. |
| **Electronic Filing and Electronic Signature** | • Promote the use of technology within courts to facilitate the processing of cases in an efficient manner.  
• Develop simple, easy-to-use, web-based interactive forms needed for high volume case types.  
• Continue to develop standards and policies for e-filing; electronic case access; and electronic record storage, backup, and recovery. |
| **Justice Integration, e-Citation, and ADRS** | • Promote the use of technology within courts to facilitate the processing of cases in an efficient manner.  
• Implement changes to the domestic violence protection order petition and protection order repository to produce uniformity among courts and between states.  
• Ensure that criminal justice agencies and the courts have accurate case and defendant information when and where it is needed.  
• Develop and implement a strategy for the long-term support and expansion of integrated justice information systems.  
• Work in cooperation with law enforcement, prosecutorial agencies, defense counsel, and victims to ensure compliance with victims’ rights provisions. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Strategic Projects</th>
<th>ALIGNMENT with Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona’s Courts 2005-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New Case/Financial Management Systems for Trial Courts | • Explore opportunities for the re-engineering of civil case processing to ensure cases are resolved in a prompt, fair, cost-effective manner.  
• Continue re-engineering criminal case processing to ensure fair and timely resolution of cases.  
• Promote the use of technology within courts to facilitate the processing of cases in an efficient manner.  
• Utilize automated case processing and uniform case management systems for probate cases.  
• Develop a plan with local courts for the replacement of aging, legacy court automation systems with modern technology.  
• Continue development of efficient case processing and management systems to ensure the resolution of disputes in a fair and timely manner. |
| Process Standardization | • Promote the use of technology within courts to facilitate the processing of cases in an efficient manner.  
• Implement changes to the domestic violence petition and protection order repository to produce uniformity among courts and between states.  
• Explore opportunities for the re-engineering of civil case processing to ensure cases are resolved in a prompt, fair, cost-effective manner.  
• Continue re-engineering criminal case processing to ensure fair and timely resolution of cases.  
• Develop simple, easy-to-use, web-based interactive forms needed for high volume case types.  
• Utilize automated case processing and uniform case management systems for probate cases. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Strategic Projects</th>
<th>ALIGNMENT with Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona’s Courts 2005-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| JOLTSaz (Next Generation Juvenile Probation System) | - Develop and implement statewide (except Maricopa County) a new Juvenile On-Line Tracking System (JOLTS) and integrate it with the system used in Maricopa County.  
- Develop and implement statewide-automated systems to assist probation departments in managing probation caseloads.  
- Reprogram and deploy the dependency case management modules as part of JOLTSaz.  
- Continue development of efficient case processing and management systems to ensure the resolution of disputes in a fair and timely manner.  
- Develop a plan with local courts for the replacement of aging, legacy court automation systems with modern technology. |
| Business Continuity                   | - Promote the use of technology within courts to facilitate the processing of cases in an efficient manner.  
- Develop and implement a strategy for the long-term support and expansion of integrated justice information systems. |
| Electronic Document Management        | - Promote the use of technology within courts to facilitate the processing of cases in an efficient manner.  
- Continue to develop standards and policies for e-filing; electronic case access; and electronic record storage, backup, and recovery. |
| Internet Public Interactive Service, Standard Forms, and Minute Entry | - Expand the Judicial Branch’s self-service center web site to include forms, instructions, and other information helpful to those who appear unrepresented in the limited jurisdiction and superior courts.  
- Develop simple, easy-to-use, web-based interactive forms needed for high volume case types.  
- Provide web-based online forms for petitions for orders of protection.  
- Continue to develop standards and policies for e-filing; electronic case access; and electronic record storage, backup, and recovery. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Strategic Projects</th>
<th>ALIGNMENT with Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona’s Courts 2005-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Automation/Technical Training | • Recruit and retain a professional, well-trained, customer service oriented workforce to better serve the needs of the public.  
• Enhance training and career opportunities to increase the knowledge and professionalism of staff. |
| Enterprise Architecture       | • Continue to develop standards and policies for e-filing; electronic case access; and electronic record storage, backup, and recovery.  
• Develop a plan with local courts for the replacement of aging, legacy court automation systems with modern technology. |
| Core Software Support and Maintenance | • Develop a plan with local courts for the replacement of aging, legacy court automation systems with modern technology.  
• Develop and implement statewide automation systems to assist in managing caseloads.  
• Implement the Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System (APETS) in all adult probation departments statewide. |

- AZTEC
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VI. FISCAL YEAR 2008 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Below is a summary of the accomplishments of the Arizona Judicial Branch with respect to its information technology efforts during the 2008 fiscal year. Considerable progress was made during the year on the statewide strategic projects.

It is important to recognize that while AOC/ITD provided management and technical support required for many of the statewide strategic projects, local court entities also supplied substantial resources in the areas of design, testing, and implementation. Their participation in and contributions to statewide projects is detailed in their separate countywide court IT plans.

There was also important progress made by individual courts on their own internal projects. Capabilities in the IT arena continue to increase at the local level. Many local court projects are shown in the second table below as they represent another level of effort required to accomplish the Arizona Judicial Branch strategic initiatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>FY 2008 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC Support</td>
<td>The modification project is enhancing AZTEC, the statewide ACAP software, to</td>
<td>Releases provided:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Maintenance</td>
<td>provide for enhanced functionality and usability, balanced with end-of-life</td>
<td>• AZTEC 1.4, which includes the new AZTEC Protective Order Module in support of Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>considerations.</td>
<td>Passport and allows for AZTEC to interact with Microsoft Word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• AZTEC 1.4 Patch 01, which includes updates necessary to accommodate 14 digit citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>number for handheld e-Citations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Converted internal forms in support of new word processing software on refreshed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PCs in courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Began planning for AZTEC 1.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continued maintenance activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC Court</td>
<td>Provide reporting and support to AZTEC courts.</td>
<td>Average of 796 support calls for AZTEC courts received each month with 91% being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>resolved within 5 days.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## New Court Financial System

Build a financial module to interface with and perform financial processing for all courts’ case management systems.

Court financials will be provided in case management systems – see general jurisdiction (GJ) and limited jurisdiction (LJ) case management system (CMS) accomplishments.

## E-Citation

Opening court cases automatically using ticket data from law enforcement.

Converted legacy Avondale photo enforcement process to current state standard. Created AZTEC eCitation Administrative Guide and Implementation Process Workflow as part of standardization effort.

Implemented Hand Held eCitation in Avondale and Oro Valley.


Implemented local or county photo enforcement in Apache Junction Justice, as well as Glendale, Star Valley, Prescott Valley, and Peoria Muni Courts.

Continued planning and preparation for future implementations.

## Process and Code Standardization

Support CMS transition by standardizing court processes and case-related codes then mapping the standard set of event, activity, and other codes.

Prepared for implementation of new CMS in GJ courts. Mapped code set in AZTEC tables to standardized codes, as well as individual databases for Yuma, La Paz, Mohave, Yavapai and Pinal for entry in AJACS.

LJ court standardization scheduled to reconvene by end of CY08 to support implementation of new CMS in LJ courts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PENALTY ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM (PEP)</th>
<th>The Fines, Fees and Restitution Enforcement (FARE) program and the Debt Set-Off program are the current automation portions of PEP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continued implementation of the backlog phase for 115 AZTEC and non-AZTEC courts in 13 counties. Full FARE implementation in process at Chandler and Gilbert Municipal Courts. Collected approximately $99.3 million in past due receivables. Traffic Ticket Enforcement Assistance Program (TTEAP) holds are now over 348,500 and releases are just over 136,000 (39%). The Debt-Set-Off program has collected over $7.1 million and is $1 million over calendar year 2007. Through May 2008, over $6 million has been intercepted. The federal tax intercept program is anticipated to pass out of Congress in the coming year and be available for the 2008 tax year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAX INTERCEPT PROGRAM (TIP)</th>
<th>TIP sends courts’ and other participants’ accounts receivable data electronically to the Department of Revenue and the State Lottery via a centralized clearinghouse at the Supreme Court. Any lottery or tax refund money for those who owe court fines is intercepted and paid to the courts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced Tax Intercept application to address format changes made to taxpayer information fields. Dept. of Revenue began rewrite of their SSO/TIP application in anticipation of January 2009 implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIDEO-CONFERENCING</th>
<th>Use video over wide area network to initial appearances, hearings, training, and the remote court reporter project.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Created a network connection to Maricopa Superior Court to support Remote Court Reporting project for the rural counties. Supreme Court streaming video expansion project placed on hold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment Maintenance &amp; Upgrades</strong></td>
<td>This includes the maintenance and upkeep of the equipment in 147 ACAP courts and 65 JOLTS sites across the state as well as a centralized data center with AS/400, RS/6000 and Windows servers supporting statewide AJIN, ACAP, APETS, JOLTS, TIP, and the Supreme Court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Data Center</strong></td>
<td>Expand area holding computers and communications equipment for statewide applications, obtain dedicated environmentals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security and Disaster Recovery</strong></td>
<td>This twofold project will: Provide for statewide automation and network security, Develop disaster recovery strategies and acquire resources to implement them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>This support activity encompasses the many projects required to support the shared judicial branch infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AUTOMATION TRAINING

This program includes all activity to provide training in statewide automation software and related business processes. It includes face-to-face training, developing Computer-Based Training (CBT) and conducting interactive distance learning sessions.

The program for funding a field trainer in each county court system received continued funding. Most counties have a field trainer and improved the volume and frequency of local training on AZTEC. Apache County joined the program in 2008.

After COT approved reallocating existing funds to help counties that perennially are unable to hire a field trainer, Graham and Greenlee began crafting an agreement with Cochise to utilize Cochise field trainer services.

JUVENILE ONLINE TRACKING SYSTEM (JOLTS)

The Juvenile Online Tracking System (JOLTS) is used by all juvenile probation, detention and court staff. Centralized support is provided to 13 counties; Pima and Maricopa participate in enhancement projects and provide electronic data to the youth index and statistical database.

Continued problem-resolution and legislative-change support for legacy JOLTS, though code was frozen on December 31, 2006.

Continued support for Crystal Reports new report requests or modifications to existing reports from the rural counties.

JOLTSaz

This single, statewide juvenile data repository for Pima and the 13 rural counties will be a Windows-based system that allows robust user interface and better performance due to distributed computing. JOLTS is being rewritten with newer technology and a 3-tier open architecture design that best suits the organization’s future needs.

Development continues on Phase 1 of JOLTSaz to provide, at a minimum, current functionality of Legacy JOLTS and additional functionality deemed “absolutely necessary.”

Phase 1 is composed of 5 Tracs. Trac 1 was completed in October 2007. Trac 2 was completed in March 2008.

Other significant accomplishments include:

- Voice of the Customer – User Input Sessions held at AOC and Pima County in May 2008
- Test environment created for QA testing, user input sessions and the user acceptance test in May 2008
- Ongoing joint development effort and successful partnership between AOC and Pima County, with each building specific functional modules of the new system.
**Juvenile Probation Statewide Identifier**

A common, unique statewide identifier will consistently and electronically tie juvenile cases together in a timely and reliable fashion at the state level. Without it, vital statistics including agency performance metrics and juvenile risk assessment predictors may be distorted, inaccurate, and not portray the big picture.

**Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System (APETS)**

Probation departments across the state cooperated to develop APETS to track adult probation cases. APETS has a single database structure so departments can send probationers electronically for inter-county supervision. The project started as a consortium between Maricopa County, Pima County, and the AOC.

Business requirements, development specifications, and report prototypes were completed for a manual process involving Legacy JOLTS. Additional analysis is underway to propose a process to match and assign Statewide ID numbers. This process will eventually be replaced by the automated, permanent solution residing in JOLTSaz.

Continued the support and enhancement of the Arizona Probation Enterprise Tracking System (APETS).

Completed a Summer 2007 Build that included a drug court module, revised case plan, judge history, case/count petitions/terminations, and several county specific enhancements.

Rolled out a new Report Application that allows counties to pull the most recent data and not impact production (placed report data on different server). This release included additional management, tracking and QA reports.

Implemented a build to address legislation which sanctions employers for hiring undocumented (illegal) workers.

Continued to expand automated UA data feeds: Mohave, Gila, Cochise and Graham counties have auto feed of urinalysis results.

Began work on a Summer/Fall 2008 Build to include expanded address/phone/location fields, improved capability to document and track foreign-born clients, new management reports, added security features and several key Pre-Trial Services (PTS) enhancements.
**Probation/CMS Integration**

Streamline productivity through real-time data sharing via a common interface platform between applications. The goal is to reduce redundant data entry, thus improving data integrity and consistency across applications.

Initiated development of a common interface platform (ESB) between applications, in this case enabling real time inquiry to CMS financial data and calendaring information.

APETS was selected as the pilot for constructing the initial interface with the AJACS CMS. Completed a detailed scope statement, high level design, and MQ training for the programming staff. Began detail design work.

**Enterprise Architecture**

This project focuses on developing enterprise wide software, methods, standards, guidelines and expertise for the development, support and maintenance of technology solutions.

Continued training and mentoring in technology areas. Performed periodic enterprise application development and code reviews to confirm adherence to standards.


Reviewed and revised entire EA standards table, in conjunction with TAC.

**Justice Integration: Criminal Case Disposition Reporting**

As part of the statewide, cooperative and long-term project to support and participate in automated integration projects; this project addresses the automated transfer of criminal case dispositions to the Arizona Department of Public Safety’s criminal history repository.

Maintained the e-Dispo module for the 62 using courts.

Continued development and testing with DPS and court community to enable ADRS processing, an ultimate solution to rejections/error rates using a “data bus” approach to integration for criminal data throughout the state. Created eight IEPDs to define the interfaces with the case management system.
The Domestic Violence project provides law enforcement access to served orders of protection and injunctions against harassment through the DPS network connection. It gives law enforcement a statewide view of protection orders, thus granting increased protection to victims of domestic violence. This also eliminates double data entry of protective orders by sheriffs into their local record management systems and NCIC.

Data entered in the protective order module in AZTEC continues to be pulled into Court Protective Order Repository (CPOR). All courts in 4 counties currently have data automatically pulled from CPOR to Law Enforcement Protective Order Repository (LPOR) for verification by law enforcement prior to sending the record on to the FBI. Planning now underway to expand automatic transfer of data from CPOR to LPOR for additional counties in FY2009.

Completed development and testing of forms within AZTEC CMS. Deployed new Protective Order Module to ACAP courts via AZTEC 1.4 in November/December 2007. All AZTEC courts now have the ability to print the following forms from within AZTEC: Defendant Guide Sheet, Order of Protection, Injunction Against Harassment, Injunction Against Workplace Harassment, Hearing Request, Notice of Hearing, Hearing Order, and Notice of Brady Disqualification. Four non-AZTEC courts (Chandler, Gilbert, Phoenix and Prescott) now on PASSPORT and Paradise Valley is testing it.

Planned additional changes to AZTEC DV module, including automatic docket events, for upcoming AZTEC 1.5 release.
Automation, Training and Desktop Support

This includes the many activities required to support existing applications and desktops statewide. It includes training, help desk, and field support staff activities and projects.

Remote computer access via Altiris continued to be performed on an as-needed basis during problem troubleshooting. Remote computer access via Altiris remains the standard process for performing on-going, routine training of customers as reported issues are being resolved. Support Center continues its significant improvement in overall resolution timeframes due to continued use of Altiris Remote Control functionality.

Software deployment for updated versions of supported applications also continued on a routine and project-coordinated basis.

Continued to train all Support Services staff in new application versions and computer installations. Began Statewide refresh of ACAP computers utilizing Vista operating system and latest Microsoft suite of products.

With the deployment of Vista throughout the state, the Support Services Team is also able to use the “Remote Assistance” tool that comes with the operating system.
The Public Access to Court Case Information is an Internet site for the public to look up case information from 153 Arizona courts. It includes most criminal, civil, and traffic cases.

Supreme Court Website received almost 63 million hits during the fiscal year. In FY08, public access continued to grow. Statistics are:

- Total Hits: 51,200,232
- Unique Visitors: 672,614+

For the first 11 months, the AJB Web site apart from public access has also shown an increase in visitors. Statistics for the AJB Web site are:

- Total Hits: 13,229,836
- Unique Visitors: 713,871
- Megabytes Downloaded: 587,308
- Average Visitors per Hour: 89

The most popular download (apart from Public Access) continues to be the Child Support Calculator.

Several portions of the Arizona Judicial Branch's Internet Web Site were revised this year.
Provide training statewide for automation projects supported by the Supreme Court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class No.</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DUI Case Processing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Claims Processing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible Detainer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-of-Period Reporting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Order Proc.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispo Reporting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC Bond Processing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/A &amp; Long Form Complaints</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVD Reporting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Restitution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Processing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentencing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC Tables</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Reviews</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casper/Stats/Data Cleanup</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conference Trainings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7</th>
<th>59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Warrant Processing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Word 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9</th>
<th>59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Forms in Aztec

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Word Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>63</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Totals

|                | 76  | 686 |

### Appellate Court Automation

Appellamation is the state standard appellate case, calendaring, and financial management system, designed to replace three separate and incompatible systems previously used. The Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals Division One use Appellamation.

Deployed Appellamation 5.3, which includes a clerk review module for e-filing submissions. One of the clerk review features provides for uniquely identifying e-filing litigants as they file into the Court.

Deployed Appellamation financial management functions in Arizona Supreme Court.

Deployed production document scanners to the Arizona Supreme Court Clerk’s Office.

Integrated OnBase with Appellamation in the Court of Appeals, Division One.

Continued litigant to court e-filing project for Supreme Court.

### Certification & Licensing

CLD Online is an Internet application created for the AOC’s Certification & Licensing Division. It works in conjunction with CLD business applications to process certification renewals and fee payments via the Internet.

Performed annual maintenance to online renewal applications for Certified Reporters, Defensive Driving Schools, Instructors, and Fiduciaries.

Processed 826 online renewals and collected $129,940 in renewal fees, excluding Licensed Document Preparers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CERTIFICATION &amp; LICENSING</strong></th>
<th>Business process mapping for the entire Certification &amp; Licensing Division in support of a larger re-engineering project for internal applications.</th>
<th>Project placed on hold.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECURE PROGRAM BOARD WEBSITES</strong></td>
<td>Create secure internet websites for each of the CLD Program Boards.</td>
<td>Created and developed a secure website for each program board, enabling access by 11 non-court-employee members who use the internet website to obtain all posted documentation relevant to the upcoming Board meeting. Posted documents are accessible only via a password. CLD users able to add and remove documentation to the secure websites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DCATS FCRB</strong></td>
<td>Modify DCATS FCRB to enhance tracking of children placed in Foster Care and identify whether problems are service gaps systemic.</td>
<td>Completed design and coding on database changes to enable FCRB to create statistical reporting for Service Gap or System problems at the child/element level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPREME COURT OFFICE AUTOMATION</strong></td>
<td>This project includes ongoing support of the Supreme Court’s and Administrative Office of the Courts’ desktop.</td>
<td>Over 654 internal participants attended 113 training sessions for Vista, Word, Outlook, Excel, Adobe, and new employee orientation. Over 550 internal participants attended 89 sessions of special training related to AOC’s PC refresh between January and April 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VARIOUS AOC INTERNAL ACCOUNTING, FINANCE AND PAYROLL APPLICATIONS</strong></td>
<td>The Administrative Office of the Courts maintains budget, accounting, and personnel records for the AOC and the Supreme Court.</td>
<td>Continued conversion and implementation efforts on new, internal financial management system on Microsoft platform to meet new architecture standards, which enable distributed functionality. Created separate technology inventory tracking database as single point of reference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Project Management Office (PMO) provides best practices and oversees project-related processes with a goal of delivering automation improvements within scope, on time, and on budget.

Implemented project management risk planning and process guidelines; communication plan process and guidelines; project change request guidelines and template; and portfolio project management and processes. Modified various signoffs and checklists to ensure acceptance in key strategic technology areas. Implemented new guidelines and/or templates for
- project document storage;
- escalation process;
- standard project request template; as well as
- project test planning template, checklist and guideline.

Implemented checklist for active and closed project documentation. Created new project schedule templates for resource availability, court moves, and portfolio projects. Reorganized intranet website. Implemented semimonthly project ‘circle’ forums for AOC project managers. Continued participation in the Executive Branch Project Manager training and State certification program.

Implemented process for more frequent project reviews and reporting status on projects, as well as for tracking performance measures.
Use voice over IP (VOIP) videoconferencing to bring certified court reporters into superior court courtrooms, when needed. AJIN has adequate bandwidth to support a video feed between superior court locations.

A dedicated T1 line has been established between Maricopa Superior Court and the AJIN court network, ensuring an uninterrupted connection circumventing firewall issues encountered with Maricopa County. The AOC supplied the hardware for this purpose.

Once any county conducts a successful test with Maricopa the AOC no longer needs to be involved. The court simply adds the Maricopa Reporter address in their address book on the conference unit and dials. Maricopa’s Managing Court Reporter will coordinate the services with the contracting court.

Maricopa and Mohave Counties conducted successful testing in June 2008. An Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) was developed to delineate Remote Court Reporter Services provided by Maricopa Superior Court and their associated costs. Mohave was provided the IGA and is currently preparing to schedule services to address their personnel resource shortfalls.

Prepare for implementation of new case management systems (CMSs) that replace AZTEC for general jurisdiction (GJ) and limited jurisdiction (LJ) courts.

The project to implement a vendor CMS, AJACS, in 13 superior courts is well underway with two pilot courts preparing to implement. Obtained approval for vendor approach along with various funding approvals from governance bodies. Negotiated firm, fixed price contract with AmCad, Inc., LLC, to develop an AZTEC-replacement case management system suitable for general jurisdiction courts, excluding Maricopa and Pima counties. Selected two pilot courts: Yuma Superior and La Paz Superior. Conducted gap and JAD sessions and received initial test application. Testing and training are currently underway utilizing two training suites of 22 computers each in a portable, contained, and controlled environment for staff from court administration and the clerk’s office attending 4 weeks of intense course instruction prior to implementation. Deployments are being scheduled in the remaining 11 courts following the pilots. Contract completion is December 2009.

Continued partnership with Tempe
Municipal Court for case management system automation development and implementation, a candidate for adoption statewide in limited jurisdiction courts.

Began development of protective order module for the Tempe CMS application: completed systems analysis and design, business process workflow, screen design and layout, defined database structures and created table definitions.

Completed first phase gap analysis of two candidate applications based on percentage match to initial requirements matrix. Second analysis and detailed level of effort and associated costs also produced. Preparations for a user hands on assessment are underway.

Two of the remaining superior courts (Coconino, Apache) have obtained funding to install EDMS in support of e-filing. Graham Superior is currently transitioning from LaserFiche to OnBase.

Statewide contract modified to enable vendors to provide a low cost EDMS option called ODSI for small LJ courts.

Planned replacement of DocuShare with OnBase in final three departments at the Administrative Office of the Courts.

**EDMS**

Electronic Document Management includes the processes and environment where documents are created, stored, managed, located, retrieved, and viewed electronically. Electronic documents and records replace traditional media (paper). Electronic documents are and will be used in the day-to-day business of the court, by court staff, other justice-related agencies and the public.
**PC Refresh/Vista Rollout**

Replace end-of-life hardware and upgrade operating system for the AOC, AOC-supported courts, and AOC-supported Juvenile Probation offices.

Completed statewide testing and validation effort, internal and external images, development of Vista training curriculum and delivery plan, detailed deployment plan, as well as internal and external pilots. All desktop hardware at AOC was refreshed.

Deployment began in December 2007 and will complete in October 2008. Eight counties have been deployed with roughly 1850 desktop PCs with Vista. The remaining seven counties with approximately 1000 systems will be deployed by end of September.

A minimum number of older systems were left in courts, primarily to support FTR Gold and OnBase scanners that could not be upgraded to work with Vista yet.

Developed and tested conversion process for CMS-related forms. Provided in-house and field training in support of new forms. All WordPerfect forms used with the AZTEC system were converted to Word.

**Interactive Juror / Web Solutions**

Provides electronic access for jurors to complete their questionnaire online and interactively defer or reschedule service.

The 13 rural counties and a municipal court had their juror databases moved to the AOC and their juror questionnaires configured for online response. All courts were trained on the use of the online questionnaire process and resulting workflows. Four counties went live, with the remaining counties expected to go live by end of summer 2008.

**E-Appeal**

Enables courts to extract electronic documents from local OnBase EDMS, create an index of record, and transfer the complete electronic record on appeal package using the e-ROA XML standard. Transmission utilizes MQ Series on the court network, AJIN.

Numerous enhancements made to electronic record on appeal transfer system, including Vista support for the C2C Assembler (v2.3).

Wrapped up Yavapai pilot implementation. Installed in Cochise Superior. Began planning for Maricopa Superior incremental implementations.
LOCAL COURT ACCOMPLISHMENTS - CY2007

This is a summary of the accomplishments discussed in each of the county-level IT plans. Please refer to the individual plans in Appendix D for more detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURT</th>
<th>MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| APACHE COURTS    | • Began preparing for local components of case management system transition.  
• Completed technical systems inventory and strategies in support of business continuity.  
• Migrated jury database to Phoenix; prepared for implementation of jury questionnaire and website.  
• Received approval of funding needed to hire a local field trainer.  
• Enhanced Apache Minute Entry local program to perform electronic distribution four times per day.  
• Received permission from water case attorneys to issue electronic minute entries.  
• Upgraded all courtroom recording stations and clerk’s players to latest version of Liberty.  
• Continued back scanning including criminal cases opened in 2000, working with vendor.  
• Created home pages for justice courts on Apache County website. |
| COCHISE COURTS   | • Implemented AZTEC 1.4 including order of protection and Passport forms.  
• Attended CourTools training and began customer service surveys in superior court.  
• Automated cash book using an Excel spreadsheet.  
• Began electronic transfer of records on appeal to Division Two.  
• Enhanced clerk of the superior court website.  
• Re-opened Tombstone Municipal Court.  
• Provided access to electronic images for probation officers and justice partners, including Attorney General’s Office.  
• Implemented online video and questionnaire for jurors. |
| COCONINO COURTS | • Continued focus on digitizing all business functions.  
| | • Implemented FARE in all courts except Page Justice.  
| | • Maintained and enhanced a local court Web site.  
| | • Installed videoconference system for remote court reporting.  
| | • Obtained changes to AZTEC to promote electronic data transfers of criminal justice information among justice partners.  
| | • Replaced ageing in-courtroom CRT TVs with HD LCD TVs.  
| | • Participated in countywide EDMS implementation activity.  
| GILA COURTS | • Initiated network disaster recovery plan; purchased some related stand-by equipment.  
| | • Began eCitation using photo radar in Star Valley.  
| | • Connected court staff to county’s network.  
| | • Obtained court security officer in superior court and provided access to ACJIS.  
| | • Obtained funding and installed videoconference equipment.  
| | • Obtained and tested Vista operating system computers in preparation for PC refresh.  
| | • Began work on AZTEC forms conversion in preparation for PC refresh activities.  
| GRAHAM COURTS | • Installed metal detector and surveillance equipment in superior court.  
| | • Began building expansions at Pima Justice Court and Pima Municipal Court.  
| | • Agreed to replace LaserFiche with OnBase EDMS countywide.  
| | • Hired a web administrator and purchased content management software; improved superior court calendar on website.  
| | • Obtained agreement in principle to pursue shared field trainer with Greenlee County courts.  
| GREENLEE COURTS | • Obtained mobile computer and access for court administrator.  
| | • Added Internet connection to courtroom PC to enable electronic distribution of minute entries.  
| | • Continuing to improve court building physical security; obtained agreement from Sheriff to monitor panic buttons.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LA PAZ COURTS</th>
<th>MARICOPA COURTS</th>
<th>MOHAVE COURTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Named as pilot court for new general jurisdiction case management system.</td>
<td>• Implemented Juvenile iCIS and web access.</td>
<td>• Replaced critical, ageing servers with new, higher capacity ones; stabilized computer room environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implemented videoconference system for initial appearances, hearings, training, and administrative use.</td>
<td>• Completed Juvenile Web Minute Entry application and integrated with iCIS.</td>
<td>• Upgraded local domain server, Crystal Reports package, and EDMS with new version and servers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Created clerk of superior court web page.</td>
<td>• Enhanced and expanded clerk’s e-filing system to incorporate family court, WizNet vendor use, and SmartWarrants application.</td>
<td>• Enhanced security by installing new cameras and recording equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expanded FARE and TIP to all courts in county.</td>
<td>• Upgraded electronic document management system; expanded number of data integration projects and exchanges using ICJIS.</td>
<td>• Moved all limited jurisdiction courts to AZTEC 1.31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Connected county justice partners using videoconference solution, also enabling court-to-court hearings.</td>
<td>• Implemented electronic initiation of forcible detainer e-filing.</td>
<td>• Expanded and upgraded video systems throughout the county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Began storing electronic court reporter notes.</td>
<td>• Added measures in iCIS CourTools.</td>
<td>• Extracted legacy data from LOCIS and placed into a web-enabled application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implemented interactive juror features using the Internet.</td>
<td>• Reconfigured systems to fail over to disaster recovery hotsite.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|**NAVAJO COURTS** | • Created ad hoc reports for justice courts participating in DUI pilot project.  
• Installed Polycom videoconferencing equipment in each of six justice courts, reducing security risk and transportation costs.  
• Designed superior court website and provided to County IT to integrate into Navajo County website.  
• Installed digital audio recording equipment in remaining courtrooms at superior court. |
|---|---|
|**PIMA COURTS** | • Continued development of Pima AGAVE case management system and portions of JOLTSaz.  
• Implemented new module of PIMA system related to pretrial services as well as an application to manage adult treatment providers for Adult Probation.  
• Implemented a time and attendance system in superior court.  
• Updated computers and infrastructure in superior court and clerk’s office.  
• Implemented Project PASSPORT and related forms; capturing data for state repository.  
• Improved local court physical security.  
• Improved digitization of various court documents in largest courts.  
• Performed numerous enhancements to court Internet and intranet websites. |
|**PINAL COURTS** | • Implemented full-time GPS monitoring in probation area.  
• Developed local applications for calendar display, video inbox and automated exhibit lists.  
• Continued aligning superior court processes in preparation for new case management system transition.  
• Enhanced internet and intranet websites; added numerous self-service forms.  
• Installed FTR audio systems in additional courtrooms. |
|**SANTA CRUZ COURTS** | • Continued planning for facilities additions and renovation work in Nogales.  
• Implemented FARE in Justice Court Precinct #1 and Superior Court.  
• Purchased and installed OnBase EDMS and related hardware in Clerk’s Office; crafting procedures for day-to-day use.  
• Upgraded jury management software to Next Generation; planning next step to web interactive solution. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YAVAPAI COURTS</th>
<th>YUMA COURTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Complied with Project Passport; protective order forms links added to various municipal websites.  
• Continued justice partner and public online access to court documents, including self-service forms and local administrative orders.  
• Continued back-scanning all clerk files; done through 2004.  
• Expanded adult probation remote work program to additional officers; serving as regional monitoring center for State-mandated GPS Program  
• Continued regular planning meetings for justice integration/data sharing.  
• Prescott Consolidated City / Justice Courts progressing with auto posting of defensive driving school files and creating electronic minute entries. |
| • Installed four disaster recovery servers for general and limited jurisdiction courts as well as the clerk's office.  
• Completed CourTools initiative, published initial dashboard, and won Judicial Branch Achievement Award for Accountability.  
• Created digital court record using JAVS software and courtroom recording (superior court).  
• Constructed more local court Web sites; expanding online payments in limited jurisdiction courts using Official Payments and Teleworks offerings.  
• Completed state-of-the-art IT training room accommodating 16 students.  
• Completed emergency notification system in Yuma Justice Center.  
• Shut down AS/400 and legacy INSLAW case management system.  
• Expanded number of self-service computers in Law Library.  
• Began issuing forms in the courtroom (San Luis Muni). |
Pursued efforts based on roadmap for technology in State Appellate Courts.

Continued operation of "paperless e-court" initiatives in Division Two, including electronic filing, records transfer, order communication, and public access.

Continued court-to-court data transfer using approved specification and standard protocols in several superior courts and both appeals courts.

Completed Yavapai and Cochise record on appeal pilots; modified e-Blueback program.

Implemented EDMS in Division One; continued integration of OnBase EDMS into Appellamation case management system.

Implemented listserv to improve access to Supreme Court opinions and minutes.

Maintained and enhanced local court Web sites.

Implemented solution for posting Division One’s memorandum decisions on the Web.

Upgraded EDMS and webserver technologies in Division Two.
VII. CURRENT ENVIRONMENT ANALYSIS

HARDWARE ENVIRONMENT

The Arizona Judicial Branch has a diverse mix of hardware reflecting the various projects and programs that have evolved and applications that have been acquired and/or developed over the last several years. The mix of hardware includes the newest architectures designed to support the complexity of these applications and the large geographical area served by the Judicial Branch.

The server environment, hosted at the Administrative Office of the Courts Data Center, includes IBM AS/400s for JOLTS and general administrative operations of the Administrative Office of the Courts. The ACAP courts, Adult Probation, and the appellate courts are operating on IBM AIX systems. Windows servers provide for JOLTSaz, Internet, Intranet, e-mail, Statewide Crystal Enterprise ad-hoc reporting, and statewide remote on-line training, as well as file and print sharing.

The desktop environment includes a variety of PCs. AOC/ITD, under COT’s direction, has undertaken a four-year equipment leasing cycle which is designed to refresh desktop hardware regularly to ensure that it incorporates the technology needed to support the evolution of statewide applications and projects.

The following are standard PC models being placed into service:

**Desktop:**
EW290AV hp Compaq Business Desktop dc5700 SFF, Intel Core 2 Duo 2.13GHz, 160 GB, 2 GB RAM, NIC

**Laptop:**
RM266UA hp Compaq 8510p, Intel Core 2 Duo 2.2 GHz, 120 GB, 2 GB RAM, NIC

**Printer:**
Q5401A HP LaserJet 4250N

Note that hardware items listed in Appendix A are generally housed and supported centrally as a part of statewide or state-level projects. Individual courts often have additional hardware and/or software beyond these items. Equipment acquired and supported locally, as well as both ACAP- and JOLTS- supported desktop devices, are listed in the individual courts’ IT Strategic Plans which are attached. Please refer to individual county court plans for additional specifics at the local level.
SOFTWARE ENVIRONMENT

There remains a persistent diversity of software throughout the courts. As the Judiciary moves to centralized support and standardization with a centralized Customer Support Center, the set of products used becomes increasingly standardized. However, industry trends being as fast paced as they are, and unlikely to slow down, there will always be a three-tiered software offering.

- On the first tier are the old or legacy applications.
- On the second tier are the standard applications which are stable and for which training and Support Center assistance is available. Word and XP are both examples of that type of application; WordPerfect has been placed into tier 1, however, as MS Word gets implemented statewide on refreshed PCs, WordPerfect will be phased out of support.
- In the third tier are the pilot users of what will likely be the next version, release or product. The new CMS system in Tempe is an example of a third-tier application.

The list of software products shown in Appendix B is divided into two categories.

The first category includes the products in use statewide in courts for which the Support Center provides assistance. There are many other products in use in the Superior, Justice and Municipal courts statewide, most often supported by the IT staff of the local court, city, or county government. At the state level, however, these are not supported and not included in the list.

The second category includes those products in use at the Supreme Court and the Administrative Office of the Courts.
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INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

FOR FISCAL YEARS 2009-2011
The Information Technology Strategic Initiatives are aligned with initiatives in *Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona's Courts 2005-2010*. This section provides information on each Information Technology Strategic Initiative and its alignment with business needs of the Judiciary.

The current IT strategic initiatives are:

1. Promote a Systemic Thinking Approach to Problem Solving with Technology
2. Provide Infrastructure Processes, and Procedures to Support Statewide Court Communication, Automation, and Integration
3. Enhance Information Security and Disaster Recovery Policies, Procedures, and Technology to Protect Statewide Court Technology-Related Assets
4. Standardize Processes and Solutions to Improve Efficiency and Effectiveness of Court Operations
5. Complete and Enhance Second-Generation Statewide Automation Projects
6. Improve Data Exchange and Communications with the Public, Other Criminal Justice Functions, and Outside Agencies
7. Digitize the Court Environment
8. Provide Divisions of the Administrative Office of the Courts with Automated Solutions to Meet Internal Goals and Objectives

Through first generation automation efforts, the Arizona Judicial Branch has become dependent upon technology to facilitate its record keeping and communications activities. Information technology initiatives enable the Judiciary to better use dependable technologies and related processes to enhance and support their business needs.

An initiative to "Promote a Systemic Thinking Approach to Technological Solutions" was first introduced in the FY 2002-2004 plan. With the introduction of *Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona’s Courts 2005-2010*, this approach became even more important. Many initiatives focus on long-term changes of business practices to improve public safety and service. The approach has always been supported, but as more and more inter-independent projects are undertaken, it seems prudent to highlight this very important perspective. Its intent is to encourage both the business leaders and technologists to more thoroughly examine the impacts of their automation undertakings and to consider business process reengineering a key element in the process. When undertaking a project, technologists and their business leaders need to balance the
immediate need with the long-term impacts, recognizing the increasing interconnectness of courts and justice partners.

The Judiciary depends on electronic communications via email, the Internet, and the Intranet (which resides on the Arizona Judicial Information Network) to communicate with each other, the public, and with other justice agencies. Therefore, enhancing and securing the infrastructure is critical to implementation of judicial strategic business projects. Information technology strategic goals encompass an approach; building a foundation through infrastructure, security, and statewide applications; integrating with justice partners, and constructing an information supply chain that ends with appropriate public access.

Establishing basic case and cash management systems, having common data definitions, standard codes, and consistent data recording practices in courts across the state supports the need of the Judiciary to gather, track, and analyze information. The information technology project to create a central data repository to provide for data analysis, for instance, is predicated on all courts’ case and cash management data being in electronic form.

A more accessible court system is a focus of the Judiciary’s strategic initiatives. Technology initiatives and their related projects support that with the introduction of electronic filing and electronic forms via the Internet. A focus on security, business continuity, and disaster recovery accompanies the courts’ transition to an e-records environment, as well.

An integrated justice system is also a priority. Given that there is a single court organization in the state versus multiple other agencies involved in law enforcement, the Branch is in a unique position to bring together the other functions to improve the manner in which justice is administered in the State of Arizona. Technology projects to participate in data exchanges and sharing of information with local and state agencies will support this. And, of course, having a reliable and secure network is critical to such electronic sharing.

For ease of reference, the IT strategic initiatives aligned to meet the Judiciary’s business needs have been numbered as follows:

- 1 – systemic thinking/approach
- 2 – provide a robust infrastructure
- 3 – enhance security and disaster recovery
- 4 – standardize processes and solutions
- 5 – complete 2nd generation automation
- 6 – improve data exchange and communications
- 7 – digitize the court environment
- 8 – provide administrative support
Information Technology Strategic Initiatives Summary

The following sections detail each of the eight information technology strategic initiatives. The **Background** section includes a description of the initiative, its background, and the elements of the technology environment included in the initiative. The Strategic Alignment section aligns the initiatives with the Commission on Technology’s strategic automation goals.

In the **Business Value** section, the benefits that will accrue to the Judiciary and to the general public are identified. They include such things as improved quality of case and cash management, enhancing access to the courts, and reducing or avoiding costs.

In the **Dependencies** section, other activities, projects and groups upon which achieving this initiative depend are listed. This section will highlight the relationship of the strategic projects to one another.

Finally, in the **Impacts** section, each strategic project associated with the initiative is identified.
BACKGROUND

The Judicial Branch is directing its efforts to “front-office” solutions, offering improved public access, internal and external integration, and better customer service. As we address such systems as jury, online courtrooms, e-filing, and justice integration, we must take a systemic approach. We are in danger of either not meeting the demand or building unique solutions for every problem or commitment, increasing both cost and complexity. We can respond with a piecemeal, reactive approach or we can:

- Understand and Automate the Supply Chain
- Understand and Automate Judicial Business Process

The supply chain is made up of all our business partners, including law enforcement and prosecuting attorneys. If the judiciary doesn’t respond in an organized fashion, it could use ineffective or incompatible tools and approaches to address interdependence, integration and other process challenges. For instance, supporting multiple processes, protocols, and systems in our integration with other agencies, especially criminal justice agencies, will increase both complexity and cost.

The solution is to:

- Acknowledge interdependence as the guiding principle for judicial planning.
- Study, document, and then automate the judicial system supply chain in a uniform manner.
- Build an infrastructure for integration of information among courts and between courts and other agencies.
- Identify a “best practices” approach to judicial business processes, then document and automate them.
**Business Value**

- Improved responsiveness and productivity of court staff.
- Reduced risks in and complexity of systems development by reducing the number of process, systems, and protocols/standards requiring support.
- Improved overall quality of processes by using a “best practices” approach.
- Improved rural court productivity by providing them with the same level of processes supported by technology afforded to large, metropolitan courts.
- Reduced costs of resources by centralizing and eliminating, where feasible, duplicate procedures, forms, processes, and structures.
- Reduced training and support resources by standardizing the processes and procedures as well as the applications software, systems software, and hardware deployed to support them.

**Dependencies**

All strategic projects are dependent on this initiative. The systemic thinking approach should and will be applied to projects. An analysis and documentation of the supply chain, as well as the underlying business process, will assure that a technology implementation is supporting a “best practices” solution.
**IMPACTS**

The impact is widespread. Each IT project should implement a solution that is not just “paving a cow path.” As interdependency increases, projects must also consider impacts on other systems and on business processes. This includes secondary impacts outside the immediate sphere of the project, potentially including other agencies. The judiciary must now examine the entire context, since technology has changed the environment. Solutions must be designed with the understanding that there may be new and better ways of doing business using the new tools.

This initiative has an impact on all IT projects.
BACKGROUND

The Judiciary has been deploying and supporting automation statewide since 1990. A sophisticated and extensive infrastructure is required to support this effort. Most important to communication and coordination is a network connecting courts to one another and to the Supreme Court. There are two divisions of the Court of Appeals, 15 Superior Court locations, 78 Justice of the Peace Courts, and 83 Municipal Courts. There are over 428 judges and more than 9,800 employees of the Judiciary statewide.

The Arizona Judicial Information Network (AJIN) is a state-of-the-art Frame Relay/MPLS network extending to all courts as well as standalone probation and detention sites statewide. A few courts reach the AOC using virtual private network (VPN) connections through the Internet. As the demand increases for functionality such as electronic document management systems, interactive Web-based training, videoconferencing, disaster recovery hot sites, and information sharing among courts and agencies, the network must correspondingly increase throughput and flexibility. The Judiciary has responsibility for the expansion, enhancement, and maintenance of the network to meet bandwidth requirements, and for working with communications providers to assure uninterrupted system availability.

Created during Fiscal Year 1998, a centralized customer service center staffed by specialists in desktop software, court applications software, and desktop hardware fields all help calls from sites. It uses problem and change tracking software as well as call tracking software. The scope of operations has been expanded from support of the AZTEC application only to include all automation statewide. This effort is critical to maintaining on-going operations in each Arizona court and probation department site.
First-level support assists court personnel statewide in resolving problems. Second-level technical support personnel install and upgrade systems and respond to critical systems problems. They also proactively maintain equipment for over 1500 users statewide. While it is most desirable to have onsite or regional technical personnel to provide the most immediate and timely support, deployment of dedicated AOC field support personnel remains cost prohibitive. Deployment of a distributed systems management system was undertaken in FY 2004 to reduce field support travel requirements. The Altiris software enables a technician located in Phoenix to remotely manage court PCs throughout the state.

In Fiscal Year 2001, the centralized support center and second-level support functions were combined to form ITD Central Support Services. Second-level support personnel were cross-trained in the statewide applications in order to address more than one application during a site visit. This move was intended to improve assistance response time, reduce field support costs, and bring about a more systemic perspective among support personnel.

To support training needs statewide, a local automation trainer/business analyst continues to be funded. State funding matches local contributions to create this position, which provides centralized training on automation systems and “best practice” court processes. The position addresses training of new employees, introduction of new processes, new court software release training support, and generally works with centralized state trainers to support uniformity and quality in court processing statewide. This program has been very successful in past years and will receive continued funding through Fiscal Year 2009 as the new general jurisdiction case management system rolls out.

Unfortunately, not all rural counties have been able to take advantage of the trainer positions, due to local funding constraints. AOC Court Services Division has obtained permission from COT to reallocate some funding to address the needs of counties that have never been able to afford the field trainer for which state-matching funds had been reserved.
STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

**STRATEGIC INITIATIVE 2: INFRASTRUCTURE**

**ALIGNMENT WITH COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY STATEWIDE AUTOMATION GOALS**

- Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.
- Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions.
- Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial efficiency and effectiveness in handling growing caseloads.

BUSINESS VALUE

This strategic initiative will create, extend, and support an infrastructure that provides business value to statewide activities, involving the network, centralized help desk support, field support, equipment, and distributed system management. The benefits or business values for each area will allow:

**NETWORK**

- Improved rural court productivity by providing the same level of technology afforded the large metropolitan courts. Improved customer service by providing higher quality of data and case management and greater public access to information.
- Improved, more secure access to the Internet for rural courts with improved throughput.
- Improved centralized access to information, such as criminal history, orders of protection, domestic violence, etc., for law enforcement.
- Improved electronic integration with the legal community and other justice-related departments and agencies.
- Improved responsiveness and productivity of court staff.
- Reduced risks in and complexity of systems development by reducing the number of systems and protocols/standards needing support.
- Reduced reliance on local vendors.
- Improved openness and interoperability of judicial systems with outside agencies.
CENTRALIZED HELP DESK

- Improved overall quality of systems by devoting limited resources to fewer of them.
- Improved rural court productivity by providing them with the same level of technology afforded the large metropolitan courts.
- Reduced costs of resources by centralizing and eliminating, where feasible, duplicate support structures.
- Reduced training and support resources required by standardizing the applications software, systems software, and hardware deployed.

FIELD SUPPORT

- Improved responsiveness and productivity of court staff.
- Improved rural court productivity by providing the same level of technology as in the large metropolitan courts.
- Reduced training and support resources required by standardizing the applications software, systems software, and hardware deployed.
- Increased efficiency, accuracy, and effectiveness of support by developing and documenting processes and procedures.
- Reduced costs of resources by centralizing and eliminating duplicate support structures.
- Improved breadth of knowledge and quality of support staff.

IT EQUIPMENT UPGRADES

- Improved rural court productivity by providing the same level of technology afforded to large metropolitan courts.
- Reduced risks in and complexity of systems development by reducing the number of systems and protocols/standards requiring support.
- Reduced cost of maintenance by routine enhancements, upgrades, and replacements as well as preventative maintenance.

DISTRIBUTED SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

- Increased effectiveness of support by automating tracking, distribution, and other routine tasks.
- Increased system availability.
- Improved responsiveness and quality of support staff customer service.
- Reduced travel-related costs for support.
**DEPENDENCIES**

- Continued availability and enhancement of high-speed communications statewide (as courts continue to consume more bandwidth).
- Continued funding availability for field training positions.
- Effective use of remote PC management software in the new Windows Vista environment.
- Continued refresh of PC hardware, operating systems, and software in the field on a regular cycle.

**IMPACTS**

The infrastructure, along with the applications deployed on state-supported hardware and software throughout Arizona, provides the processing and communications foundation on which the remaining initiatives are built. Such initiatives and projects as justice agency integration, public access, electronic filing, and improved statistical reporting for accountability rely on a robust and well-supported infrastructure.

Nearly all the IT projects are impacted by and aligned with this initiative.
BACKGROUND

The digital world is becoming ever more perilous as computer systems become increasingly interconnected. With the creation of AJIN, the deployment of the centralized JOLTS juvenile tracking system, and the development of the AZTEC case management system using client server architecture, the Judicial Branch accepted the major responsibility of safeguarding the data and infrastructure on which courts statewide rely. An information security specialist developed the specific strategies, standards, and policies to achieve this goal.

Taking a purely central approach to addressing data security has become insufficient over time as an increasingly decentralized environment is constructed. For example, Electronic Document Management and Criminal Justice Data Integration projects present increased requirements for data security at the local level as statewide processes grow dependent on feeds from courts. Unfortunately, local courts typically have neither the money nor the equipment to ensure continuation of their business in a disaster. What used to be their isolated risk has graduated to a system-wide risk, as courts become increasingly process dependent on electronic documents and more data gets captured at the source. The Administrative Office of the Courts is working with the Department of Public Safety to address data security issues related to criminal justice data. Several committees, especially the recent Keeping the Record Committee, have been addressing a variety of electronic recordkeeping issues. The Clerks of Court, as the constitutionally designated keepers of the record, are also involved in various workgroups to develop appropriate standards and processes to provide for secure and reliable electronic data and documents.

COT continues to recognize an increasingly long list of vulnerabilities for courts. Two standing subcommittees of the Commission, CACC and TAC, have been charged with crafting best practices, related procedures, and training sessions to improve the survivability of data at the local courthouse. A business continuity matrix was approved for distribution with the FY08 IT planning materials. Results of the data gathering effort
represented by the matrix will promote quantification of the business risks courts face and provide perspective on the costs to address those risks. An assessment and planning guide of some sort is also envisioned. In addition, CACC and TAC were directed to examine a variety of options and related costs for protecting data in a distributed environment, and then return to COT with their joint recommendations for financially feasible solutions.

Due to the ever-changing nature of security threats, various high priority projects and tasks must be accomplished over the upcoming years to assure meeting the identified goals.

Section K of A.R.S. § 44-7501, “Notification of Breach of Security System,” mandates that courts create and maintain an information security policy that includes notification procedures for a breach of the security system of the court. “Breach” means an unauthorized acquisition of and access to unencrypted or unredacted computerized data that materially compromises the security or confidentiality of personal information likely to cause substantial economic loss to an individual. The scope of personal identification covers two main areas:

1. An individual's first name or first initial and last name in combination with a
   - social security number,
   - driver license number, or
   - non-operating identification license number.

2. An individual's financial account number, credit card number, or debit card number in combination with any required security code, access code or password that would permit access to the individual's financial account.

AOC staff has crafted and COT recommended to the chief justice content for an administrative order to instruct local courts on the minimum content of a policy that complies with the legislation.
**STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT**

**STRATEGIC INITIATIVE 3: ENHANCE SECURITY AND DISASTER RECOVERY ALIGNMENT WITH COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY STATEWIDE AUTOMATION GOALS**

- Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.
- Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions.
- Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial efficiency and effectiveness in handling growing caseloads.

**BUSINESS VALUE**

Better protect courts’ technology-related assets to reduce the risk of losing court assets or breaching data privacy requirements. Minimize disruption of business or loss of electronic records in the event of a local court disaster.

**DEPENDENCIES**

**SECURITY**

- Continued security/disaster recovery of centralized systems and data.
- Cooperative solutions with local governments when developing standards for local data and business continuity actions.
- Layers of security on image and e-record management systems to appropriately protect information.

**PRIVACY**

- Rule 123 and legislation-compliant solutions for use with EDMS, CMS, and public access projects.
- Trustworthy redaction techniques for electronic information.
IMPACTS

If not successful, disruption of court business operations might occur, as well as loss of valuable court data and documents. Personal and confidential data, protected by Rule 123, might be available for public view as a result of missing or insufficient controls.

A data breach would prompt initiation of a costly investigation and trust-eroding public notification process.

Projects afflicted include:

- Business Continuity
- Disposition Reporting (ADRS)
- Electronic Document Management
- Electronic Filing
BACKGROUND

As courts enter the realm of e-government and e-records, the importance of having enterprise architecture (EA) and related technology standards cannot be emphasized enough. Around 80 percent of new technology companies go out of business within 5 years of their formation. IT trade publications continue to hype expensive new approaches to age-old business problems every day. The pace of change increases at an exponential rate. New technologies are always accompanied by risks. Courts that make the wrong decisions about technology often find themselves relying on unsupported applications for their day-to-day work, sometimes for many years, an uncomfortable and expensive place to be.

A need exists for a set of cohesive standards to build to that promotes both reuse and sharing of automation systems across many jurisdictions. EA functions as a type of building code across the entire organization, describing a direction for current and future technology activities, supported by underlying product and integration standards that mitigate risk for courts. It acknowledges the interdependence of courts within the supply chain of data as well as the distributed nature of the court system and helps them maximize local investments by selecting products that interoperate, promoting data sharing and citizen access through e-government. EA focuses on the holistic impact to the organization.

EA effectively supports and enhances the business of government and improves the ability to deliver responsive, cost-effective government functions and services. Effective utilization of technology to achieve business functions and services, increasing citizen access to those services, sharing information and resources at all levels of government, and maximizing investment in IT resources are major motivating factors for the development and implementation of EA. Using technologies and products adhering to the “building code” enhances government services as a whole, promotes e-government solutions, improves productivity and performance, and optimizes economies of scale through interoperability, portability, scalability, and the sharing of resources. Standard
solutions also eliminate the need to make redundant contracts and purchases. They reduce implementation and support costs by limiting the range of solutions to a manageable few.

All technologies traverse a practical and functional life cycle from emerging to mainstream then, over time, to unsupported and eventually to obsolete. To provide direction regarding the life cycle categories for common court technologies, the Technical Advisory Council maintains a detailed table of EA standards for the branch. The Judicial Project Investment Justification (JPIJ) requires an explanation of the adherence of any new project to the standards. The annual IT plan project detail input sheet requires the same. The table was updated and enhanced in late FY 2006 to include a designation of the lifecycle category associated with listed products and technologies: Watchlist, Mainstream, Containment, or Retirement.

COT has designated that all items labeled “retirement” have a replacement strategy identified in the annual IT plan for the courts where they are installed. WordPerfect is an example. For reference, the approved table resides at http://www.supreme.state.az.us/cot/documents/EAS/EAS.htm. Any court can request that TAC consider a new standard for addition to the table at any time. There is also an exception process a court may use to request a business-related, one-time waiver to a particular standard.

In addition to general standards contained in the EA standards table, like GJXDM, more specific, pragmatic direction is needed in relation to various projects. A subset of a standard is sometimes necessary to provide direction to court developers. An example is specific XML tags used to communicate specific types of information or transactions. In those instances, COT has directed TAC to establish and maintain detailed specifications for various functions or levels of court within the framework of the approved standards. Issues related to specifications may be brought to COT for resolution, if necessary.

Specifications developed so far relate to e-filing civil cases and court-to-court record on appeal. Based on the Maricopa multi-vendor model, the civil case e-filing specification defines a common tagging scheme that complies with ECF 3.0, an industry standard for e-filing. The record on appeal specification defines tags necessary to electronically transfer a record on appeal, including the index of record, from a trial court to an appellate court, and from one appellate court to the next appellate court. Criminal standards will be set in conjunction with ACJC and criminal justice partners. A specification for reporting defensive driving school registrations and completions is in development.
STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

STRATEGIC INITIATIVE 4:
STANDARDIZE PROCESS AND SOLUTIONS
ALIGNMENT WITH COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY STATEWIDE AUTOMATION GOALS

- Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.
- Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions.
- Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial efficiency and effectiveness in handling growing caseloads.

BUSINESS VALUE

ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE
- Reduced risks in and complexity of systems development by reducing the number of systems and protocols/standards requiring support.
- Reduced training and support resources required by standardizing the applications software, systems software, and hardware deployed.
- Improved rural court productivity by providing them with the same level of technology afforded the large metropolitan courts.
- Improved responsiveness and productivity of court staff.

STANDARDS
- Mitigated project risks, increased project success, and increased interoperability and sharing of information and resources.
- Improved responsiveness and productivity of court staff.
- Improved rural court productivity by providing them with the same level of technology afforded the large metropolitan courts.
- Improved quality of support staff customer service.
**Detailed Specifications**

- Improved specific direction on application of standards to developers.
- Enablement of interoperability of component-based systems whether developed in courts or by vendors.

**Dependencies**

- Continued definition, maintenance, and communication of EA Standards.
- Most priority projects are either dependent upon or will significantly benefit from the application of standards and related, detailed specifications.
- Every exception approved puts a chink in the armor of a cohesive, statewide, integrated system.

**Impacts**

Every project needs to be closely aligned to this strategic initiative. Courts having items listed in the “Retirement” column of the EA Standards Table must identify a replacement strategy in the next IT plan submittal.
BACKGROUND

The courts embarked on the first wave of statewide automation around 1990 with a goal of implementing a standard case and financial management system statewide to replace manual processes. A juvenile probation system was expanded from Maricopa County to statewide use by the mid-1990s. The AZTEC case management system was deployed to 147 courts by the end of the decade. The hallmark of first-wave automation systems was their standalone approach, targeting specific high volume areas and incidentally replicating functions of other automation products, e.g., JOLTS and AZTEC both did calendaring, case management, and financials, only for two different populations. They were constructed for a specific level of court absent any overarching direction from branch technology or integration standards and so took on a closed, proprietary flavor, necessitating a back-end data warehouse to accomplish any integration. Sadly, these systems typically only increased the workload of the court, in the end, as personnel entered data into multiple systems in addition to wielding the paper. The systems did not align well with court business practices, being encyclopedic rather than workflow process based.

The second wave of automation is component based and focused on re-use of building blocks that can be modified and flexed across various systems. Doing so requires clear standards in both technology and business processes. The systems are designed from the standpoint of innovation more than generation; most data courts work with comes from somewhere else. The court acts as a hub of information more than an originator. Second-generation systems pick up information from law enforcement and attorneys’ systems, reducing workload by moving the responsibility for input to the source to get the clerk out of the data entry business. New systems contain workflow right out of the box, providing an inherent standard business process, removing the need for understanding the entire process before being able to perform any part of it. They also are exception based, triggering alerts whenever items fall outside specified parameters. The Judiciary has several second-generation statewide automation projects underway and completing them remains a top priority. They provide for probation, case, and cash...
management for the various levels and/or departments within the Judiciary, using shared core services that leverage development efforts following standards.

Meanwhile, support and enhancement of existing statewide applications remain a priority, though balanced against the remaining life of the application being enhanced. The Arizona Court Automation Project (ACAP) continues to provide automation to Superior, Justice, and Municipal courts. During FY 2000, the Windows version of the AZTEC case management software was implemented in most rural and suburban courts. During FY 2002, a rollout replacement of equipment and a software upgrade was begun for systems deployed in 2000. The next phase significantly enhanced the application in the financial arena and enabled its use in the large metropolitan courts by increasing its case processing capacity. In FY 2006, AZTEC began to be opened to allow e-citation and red light case initiation using an XML data stream, paving the way for electronic case filing while awaiting implementation of next-generation case management systems. Late in FY 2007, COT decided, and AJC concurred, to pursue implementation of a vendor CMS for general jurisdiction courts. Development work continues on a candidate CMS for limited jurisdiction courts around the state. Both systems will significantly improve the efficiency of courts.

The Criminal Justice Data Integration Project will also significantly reduce levels of court effort by eventually eliminating the redundant data entry now being performed. By 2004, the Judiciary had 64 Arizona general and limited jurisdiction courts operating on the ACAP software solution to pass criminal history data to DPS. Data integration will be further strengthened with the rollout of new limited and general case management systems statewide as well as the construction of the Arizona Disposition Reporting System in conjunction with ACJC and DPS. This project proves the concept of using an enterprise service bus approach for statewide integration by connecting disparate information systems among justice partners.

Appellamation is an appellate court case management system developed for the Supreme Court and both divisions of the Court of Appeals. This system, which uses unique appellate information architecture dissimilar to the AZTEC database, is being integrated with both AZTEC and the new CMSs to accept transfers of case information on appeal using the e-ROA program. The Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals, Division 1, have implemented Appellamation.

The Juvenile Online Tracking System (JOLTS) provides for the automation needs of the juvenile justice community. The first statewide system implemented, the JOLTS statewide juvenile probation caseload management system developed in Maricopa County Superior Court in 1979 is being replaced by a second-generation system in both Maricopa and the other counties. In May 2004, the Administrative Office of the Courts received permission from the Information Technology Authorization Committee (ITAC) to proceed with development using the new statewide judicial architecture. JOLTS users number approximately 2,600 statewide and include the following agencies: Juvenile Court Centers, Victim Rights Advocates, County Attorneys, Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA), Public Defenders, Foster Care Review Board (FCRB),
Attorney General’s Office, Department of Economic Security, and Clerk of the Court, ComCare, Court Administration, Department of Juvenile Corrections and Adult Probation Departments.

The effort to automate and enhance adult probation tracking functions statewide passed a key milestone in 2006, with implementation of the Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System (APETS) in the final four counties. All data statewide now resides on a single database – over 191,500 client records and 6.35 million contact records. Periodic enhancements to the software, support, and user training continue.

Fourteen of the fifteen superior courts use a common jury processing software package. Maricopa Superior Court, formerly operating on an internally developed system, migrated to an off-the-shelf system several years ago, based on their large volume needs as well as extended functionality requirements (like Web and IVR interfaces for the public). The judiciary undertook a study to determine the direction for jury processing software and functionality. That work group reviewed the migration path of the existing software in fourteen courts and determined to remain with that software rather than convert to the package selected by Maricopa. Recent upgrades to that system have enabled a more responsive and interactive interface to the public for jury processing via the Internet as directed by the Commission on Technology.

Related centralized data repositories, processing and/or standards for second-generation systems include electronic document management systems, electronic filing, collections, legal research/legal portal, data sharing and integration processing, self-service center court forms, authentication and security, and global directories. The COT’s ad hoc committee on Centralized Processing reviewed these issues during FY 2003 and provided recommended criteria to electing the degree and type of centralization for many common court automation functions.
**STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT**

**STRATEGIC INITIATIVE 5: SECOND-GENERATION STATEWIDE AUTOMATION ALIGNMENT WITH COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY STATEWIDE AUTOMATION GOALS**

- Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.
- Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions.
- Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial efficiency and effectiveness in handling growing caseloads.

**BUSINESS VALUE**

- Improved effectiveness of the Criminal Justice System through the electronic exchange of court data and documents and the provision of decision-making information to criminal justice administrators.
- Improved rural court productivity by providing the same level of technology afforded the large metropolitan courts.
- Improved consistency in record keeping and case management practices statewide.
- Improved customer service by providing higher quality of data and case management and greater public access to information.
- Improved responsiveness and productivity of court staff.
- Increased productivity of court and support staffs.
- Reduced development costs by reducing the number of systems implemented and supported statewide.
- Reduced maintenance and enhancement costs by reducing the number of systems implemented and supported statewide.
- Reduced cost impact of legislative and judicial administrative changes to processes and procedures requiring changes to application software.
- Reduced training and support resources required by standardizing the applications software, systems software, and hardware deployed.
- Reduced cost of maintenance by routine enhancements, upgrades, and replacements as well as preventative maintenance.
**DEPENDENCIES**

- The maintenance and continued upgrading of the infrastructure, including a new data center to support second-generation systems.
- Sufficient resources to complete current development and software procurement efforts for general jurisdiction courts.
- AOC modifications to create a limited jurisdiction statewide system from the candidate single-court system on time and on budget.
- Staff resources to perform statewide system replacements and upgrades while still providing legacy support.
- The establishment of a cross-branch policy and governance structure for the development of the Criminal Justice Data Integration Project.
- Sufficient resources to support rollout of the new case and probation management systems statewide.

**IMPACTS**

With several statewide systems all being replaced at nearly the same time, the financial impact is large. The problem was compounded over several years when the planned funding for many initiatives was interrupted by multiple reallocations of JCEF (a state-level automation funding source) by the legislature.

Court business processes will be affected by the workflow and document processing capabilities built into the new systems, but this impact will be offset by greater efficiencies in data entry and reporting. Integration points built into new automation systems will accept digital input from other systems and electronic filings, thereby precluding clerks from having to re-enter data from other sources.

Projects include:

- New General Jurisdiction Case Management System & Transition
- New Limited Jurisdiction Case Management System & Transition
- JOLTSaz
- Electronic Case Filing
- Code Standardization
BACKGROUND

The Judiciary provides electronic access to court information via the Internet and using messaging middleware in order to serve the public better, contribute to the improved effectiveness of the criminal justice system, and make courts more accessible. Information includes general information, case information, and court calendars. Additionally, we continue to foster development of electronic data interchanges between criminal justice agencies and work toward electronic filing for the legal community.

During Fiscal Year 2002, the Judiciary launched its Public Access Case Look-Up Web site. Using the service, the public can access case information with a 24-hour currency by case number or party name. This offering was an immediate and enormous success; in only the first five months of operation (February through June 2002), the site had over 12 million queries. Last year, it had more than 51 million queries.

The Judicial Branch recognizes and supports the need for improved operational effectiveness of the criminal justice system as a whole. Each criminal justice function must improve not only within itself but also in concert with the other criminal justice agencies. Given that there is a single court organization in the state versus multiple other agencies involved in law enforcement, the Branch is in a unique position to bring together the other functions to improve the manner in which justice is administered in the State of Arizona. The courts, being central to the system, are eager to collaborate in the statewide effort that began in Coconino County in Fiscal Year 2000 to automate the exchange of data used by more than one criminal justice agency. The pilot project linking the AZTEC application for the Superior Court in Coconino County and the Coconino County Attorney Case Management System continues to be expanded. Having created the Integration System Model, which was made available to the remaining Arizona counties, AZTEC’s ability to collect integration-related data has been expanded to accept an XML data stream. Integration functions will also be performed using XML interfaces within the new, second-generation CMSs.
A recent project provided law enforcement and the public with access to a repository of domestic violence information. That information is currently being standardized nationwide as part of Project Passport, headed by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), allowing protective orders to travel from state to state with easy recognition for law enforcement. More general availability will be subject to the policies contained in the updated Rule 123 that responds to privacy concerns expressed by victims groups.

Another data sharing project is electronic disposition reporting. This project provides for electronically sending criminal case dispositions to the Department of Public Safety via a messaging system. In pilot during Fiscal Year 2002, the system development was completed in 2003. Since 2004, 67 courts have been able to electronically report dispositions to the state’s criminal history repository. In concert with ACJC and DPS, AOC is taking the next incremental step in creating an electronic workflow among justice partners using enterprise service bus (ESB) architecture for exchanging criminal information prior to its inclusion in the DPS criminal data repository. The enterprise service bus acts as a clearinghouse for information independent from the systems that provide or consume its data. This approach will increase the ultimate acceptance rate for data at DPS to above 90 percent and ensure that justice partners are processing the right changes for the right suspect.

The disposition-reporting project has been designed to prove the enterprise service bus concept, defined as the transaction services layer of the courts’ enterprise-wide technical architecture. Other integration projects will ultimately make use of the same ESB architecture, since it precludes creation of a single, all-encompassing automation system (and the associated massive price tag) or the coordination of myriad reprogramming projects to align legacy systems’ processing. The ESB focuses only on the output and input rather than the inner workings of the systems themselves, an approach which approximates a basic service-oriented architecture to revolutionize criminal justice integration. The approach can accomplish in a short time what would take a generation of traditional programming. AOC is currently traversing an ESB strategic roadmap that winds through standards, policies, processes, and procedures to foster data exchange among justice partners and to direct future access to Arizona justice data.

The work of the Keeping the Record Committee disclosed chronic shortages of stenographic court reporters in several rural areas of Arizona. Most counties use digital recording equipment to fill the gap in reporting resources, but existing policies and best practices dictate using live court reporters for certain types of hearings. Voice over IP (VOIP) videoconferencing is now being used to bring certified court reporters into superior court courtrooms when needed, as an alternative to paying mileage and lodging-related expenses of traveling per diem reporters. The Superior Court in Maricopa County is making some of its official reporters available to provide this service to courts in other locations. Many court-reporting firms offer videoconferencing options for depositions and already have the equipment needed to participate in the program. One courtroom in each superior court is being equipped with videoconferencing...
equipment. Testing has been completed with several locations to assess reliability, cost, and demand. Videoconference equipment can also reduce travel for administrative and training purposes.

Since June 27, 2006, the Supreme Court has been broadcasting oral arguments from the courtroom around the world in real time. No special software is required to view the live audio/video footage from the Court’s website.

The Judicial Branch also recognizes that the public will be better served by improving the operational effectiveness with outside non-judicial entities. Technology can enable this objective. For example, with the implementation of expedited family court processes, the expanded use of electronic data exchange will support a speedier and more accurate processing of these cases by facilitating communication among the various state, local, and judicial entities involved.

**STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT**

**STRATEGIC INITIATIVE 6: IMPROVE PUBLIC AND AGENCY ACCESS**

**ALIGNMENT WITH COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY STATEWIDE AUTOMATION GOALS**

- Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.
- Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions.
- Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial efficiency and effectiveness in handling growing caseloads.

**BUSINESS VALUE**

- Improved effectiveness of the criminal justice system through the electronic exchange of court data and documents and the provision of decision-making information to criminal justice administrators.
- Improved consistency in record keeping and case management practices statewide.
- Improved customer service by providing higher quality of data and case management and greater public access to information.
- Improved protection for domestic violence victims even in other states though automation of protective orders with Project Passport.
• Improved public safety through improved centralized access to information, such as criminal history, orders of protection, domestic violence records, etc., for law enforcement.

• Improved quality and quantity of data available to the AOC for analysis and research.

• Improved electronic integration with the legal community and other justice-related departments and agencies.

• Improved quality of service to the public by providing other government agencies, such as DES and DOR, with more accessible electronic information to improve and support their processes.

• Increased overall accuracy and timeliness, reduction of processing backlogs and database completeness.

• Increased public access to the Supreme Court’s rulemaking process and oral arguments.

DEPENDECIES

• Proof of the Enterprise Service Bus architectural concept using the Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS).

• Continued development and support of a statewide data integration technical architecture.

• Acquisition of resources to continue developing pilot data sharing projects designed to make use of the integration infrastructure architecture.

• Further development of the judicial data warehouse, JUSTIS.

• Cooperation of state and local agencies, especially law enforcement.

• With state and local agencies, development of mutually agreed-upon security policies and procedures.

• Coordinated change management to assure that interdependent infrastructures continue to function together.

• Replacement of “ink and roll” fingerprinting with LiveScan throughout the state.

• Installation of videoconference equipment in one courtroom of each rural superior court.

• Sufficient network bandwidth to carry increased video and data integration traffic.

• Continued capabilities of the video streaming outsource partner and network to carry live video.

IMPACTS
With the Judiciary focusing on “front office” functionality, public and agency access becomes a primary concern for every project. Development projects will need to incorporate information and functionality to address this initiative. For instance, in the domestic violence repository, it required that AZTEC add certain information not collected at the time in order to fulfill the electronic reporting requirements as well as provide sufficient information to law enforcement. Videoconferencing initiatives will need to focus on improving access to courts, in most cases by providing for hearings and arraignments and other court processes without the need to be physically present in the courtroom. Even infrastructure maintenance, which is generally perceived to be internal, will need to build capacity to serve the information distribution needs of this initiative as more data/video traverses the network over time.
BACKGROUND

Courts are following industry’s lead to “digitize everything,” placing a focus on Information Systems to make it easier for people to get their jobs done and done well. As caseloads grow, so does related data entry, and, unfortunately, the harsh reality is that clerical positions are not added at a rate anywhere near the caseload growth rate. The solution is to increase the productivity of existing workers through technology, taking a holistic approach to arrive at a standards-based, integrated system comprised of various disparate parts. This path can invite creative destruction, however, wherein the old way of doing something declines then disappears, resources are re-deployed, institutions and people adapt, the new way grows, and overall benefits are recognized. The problem with creative destruction is its pain for anyone involved in the old technologies and old ways of doing things. Though courts will take an evolutionary rather than revolutionary approach, in the midst of digitization lie some changes in the way courts conduct business.

Fundamental to increasing productivity is a mindset that views the court system as an information supply chain -- a network of courts at all levels collectively responsible for dispensing justice within the state. Its goal is to deliver the right information to the right place at the right time. Because data created at or for lower courts may eventually end up at the Supreme Court on appeal, a chain relationship exists between law enforcement, municipal or justice courts, the superior courts, the courts of appeal, and the Supreme Court. This supply chain considers all the individual links leading up to the final one as essential functions within the overall value equation.

As mentioned in “Second-Generation Automation Systems,” current case management systems necessitate keying and re-keying case information. Second-generation systems will pick up information directly from law enforcement and attorneys’ systems, reducing workload by moving the responsibility for input to the source, removing the clerk from the tedious data entry and validation business. The new CMS forms the foundation of the “Digitize Everything” approach, on which are layered imaging, EDMS,
backup/data recovery, court-to-court case transfer, electronic access to records, electronic case filing, electronic notifications, and electronic archiving activities. In the interim, AZTEC has been enhanced somewhat to enable images to be associated with cases and to accept certain electronic case input from outside sources.

Paper records management and case file storage challenges face all courts today. The Judiciary continues to implement technologies such as imaging and electronic filing to address document management requirements. Electronic filing also supports the court’s migration to more streamlined processes and workflow management, which imaging was originally begun to support. This initiative has been a high priority each year since the first IT strategic planning session in 1990, as courts have scanned paper filings they receive as a prerequisite to getting rid of paper altogether. But pure imaging provides no metadata, making storage easy but retrieval very difficult. Electronic document management system projects continue to be among the strategic projects in the Commission on Technology’s priorities. These projects take the vital next step beyond imaging by enabling keywording and metadata for efficiently storing and retrieving true electronic documents. Only two superior courts still remain to implement a full-featured EDMS (during FY 2009) and emphasis is now changing to the largest limited jurisdiction courts. To lower the barrier to entry, a “lighter” version of OnBase, the state standard EDMS, aimed at smaller volume courts has been included in the latest contract amendment.

Although centralization of EDMS was considered as the result of a June 2000 EDMS study that recommended centralized document repositories when local jurisdictions did not have technical resources, this did not occur. Today, many local courts lack the technical resources required to operate a robust EDMS over the long term, safeguarding all original electronic records for significant retention periods, and providing timely disaster recovery. EDMS centralization has been directed at selecting a standard application to reduce the number of system interfaces that must be built and maintained. A current review of business continuity requirements as courts depend increasingly on paperless e-documents may extend this approach. TAC and CACC have been assigned to provide direction via best practices and training.

As electronic records exist within lower courts they can be re-used for appeals in higher courts. Specifications for data transfer will be defined to seamlessly move case information and related documents from limited jurisdiction to general jurisdiction courts and then on to appellate courts within the state – the supply chain of justice.

Public information from the set of digital case information will be collected in a central repository as the intended source for public inquiry. Public users will be able to “subscribe” to selected cases and receive updates based on changes to specific case information. Pro per se filers will increasingly use “fillable” forms or interactive forms that can also output a stream of digital data. A web-based virtual service center will provide common court forms online and lead users through the process of filling out forms and printing them. PCs deployed in many court sites across Arizona make public access to electronic resources increasingly available to court users.
The vast majority of case-related documents begin life on a computer, either in law firms, at parties’ homes, or on court websites. Once EDMS file rooms exist and second-generation CMSs are online, electronic case filing will enable courts to use this digital source data directly. The courts’ developing enterprise service bus provides a logical location for storing and forwarding electronic filings through a single “front door” to the court system. Law enforcement will continue to expand use of handheld citation devices, photo radar and red light cameras which output validated digital data. Mass filings, like metropolitan forcible detainers originating within the same law office, will also be candidates for e-filing. Once these projects are implemented, the tipping point will be reached – digital data will be the norm and paper becomes the exception.

Solving the electronic identity riddle as part of e-filing will allow courts to provide trustworthy case-related notifications of warrants, orders, or judgments, further reducing the production of paper within the court but also increasing reliance on electronic systems and processes. Procedural solutions within the Judiciary, like “/s/ typed name,” may relegate need for a complex technical signature solution to only those items originating or transmitted outside the courts. One low-cost possibility for “signing” documents originating in courts for use by others is to watermark a globally unique identifier (GUID) or system-generated sequence of hexadecimal digits on each image that could be checked for validity against a log maintained by the issuing court.

Finally, an electronic archiving strategy will be addressed for records that were only ever digital (“born digital”). State Library Archives and Public Records (SLAPR) is the eventual owner of the records under the retention schedules and must be a partner in crafting the statewide solution that takes into account the end-state of electronic court records. Currently, SLAPR requires records to be transmitted on paper or microfilm, regardless of their storage medium at the court.
**Strategic Alignment**

**Strategic Initiative 7: Digitize the Environment**

Alignment with Commission on Technology Statewide Automation Goals

- Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.
- Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions.
- Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial efficiency and effectiveness in handling growing caseloads.

**Business Value**

**Imaging/EDMS**
- Reduce cost of records storage.
- Provide simultaneous access to the same document.
- Lay foundation for electronic case filing.

**Backup/Data Recovery**
- Reduce the risk of losing court assets.
- Reduce time to restore business information following a disaster.

**Court-to-Court Case Transfer**
- Eliminate re-keying of case information.
- Improve electronic integration with the legal community and other justice-related departments and agencies.

**Electronic Access to Records**
- Improve access by the public to court records.
- Improve access by justice partners to court records.
**Electronic Case Filing**
- Extend filing hours and increase access to justice.
- Reduce paper costs.

**Electronic Notifications**
- Simplify court communications processes.
- Reduce paper costs.

**Electronic Archiving**
- Improve the accessibility of archived court information following approved retention schedules.

**Dependencies**
- Transferring imaged and electronic documents may require upgraded network capability.
- Desktop PC often must be high-end to handle images – sometimes requires separate specification for scan stations.
- Legislation and court rule changes may be required to achieve paperless original documents.
- Funding.
- Software development will be required to provide access to electronic documents through and integration with developing case management systems.
- Authorization, verification, and signature technologies and policies must be established.
- Systemic thinking needs to be applied to this entire process, as business process reengineering and standardization are absolute requirements when creative destruction is involved.
- Public, commercial, and government agency needs for court documents online must be balanced against privacy interests.
- Archiving requires periodic media and format updates to ensure continued accessibility of permanent retention files.
- Detailed technical requirements, must be clearly defined before paper is removed from the court environment.
**IMPACTS**

Simply put, digitizing the courts provides the foundation for e-government. It enables "born digital" content from litigants' systems to be filed into court (getting clerks out of the labor intensive scanning business) and judgments/minute entries to be rapidly communicated from court to affected parties (getting clerks out of the labor intensive minute distribution business).

It also makes a tremendous dent in the courts' paper records storage challenges since disk space is far cheaper than shelf space with a far smaller footprint. It enables increased justice partner and public access to information (within the bounds of privacy) since multiple individuals can view the same electronic case file at the same time. And, through metadata, it provides for almost instant location of the needed portion of a particular record without reading page after page of a paper file.

Behind the counter, digitization streamlines caseflow by enabling an electronic workflow in which records are intelligently routed to the next functional area and workers see a queue of records that await their action. This keeps the focus on value-added work allowing more cases to be processed with the same resource level.

But all this doesn't come without the stress of a paradigm change -- the current workforce is paper-centric and current work processes were all developed in a paper world. Processes have to be reconstructed around working "digitally" over time. As industry has proven over the past decade, the rewards of digitization far outweigh the risks.

Specific projects include:

- Electronic Document Management
- Electronic Minute Entry/Distribution
- Business Continuity
- Electronic Filing
- Electronic Signature
BACKGROUND

In addition to supporting statewide technology projects, the Information Technology Division of the Administrative Office of the Courts is responsible for providing support and development of a variety of automated systems for AOC divisions. These divisions are supporting courts in the pursuit of the goals outlined in *Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona’s Courts 2005-2010*.

The Administrative Office of the Courts’ mission is to assist the Chief Justice in carrying out the constitutionally prescribed responsibility for providing administrative supervision over the integrated Arizona court system and support the Chief Justice and the Supreme Court in providing quality administrative leadership and assistance to Arizona’s courts.

Further, legislation has often charged the Supreme Court with administering certain programs in support of justice-related activities, for instance, Foster Care Review Board (FCRB) functions, certification of private fiduciaries and process servers, the confidential intermediary program, defensive driving school certification, legal document preparer certification, certified reporter certification, and grant tracking. These activities often require automation in order to perform the data collection and tracking needed. Several programs of this nature are supported and/or in development.
**STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT**

**STRATEGIC INITIATIVE 8: AOC AUTOMATION**

Alignment with Commission on Technology statewide automation goals

- Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.
- Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions.
- Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial efficiency and effectiveness in handling growing caseloads.

**BUSINESS VALUE**

**DEFENSIVE DRIVING**

- Began development and programming efforts to add new functionality to centralize the reporting of Defensive Driving registrations and completions from all defensive driving schools in the state to all courts in the state in support of House Bills 2001 and 2488. Details are reported in a separate project.

**TAX INTERCEPT PROGRAM (TIP)**

- Made changes to the TIP application to facilitate implementation of file formatting changes made by the Department of Revenue.

**CERTIFICATION AND LICENSING DEPARTMENT (CLD) ONLINE PROJECT**

- Modified the online renewal certification applications in compliance with legislative and ACJA changes.
**Foster Care Review Board (FCRB) Case Management System**

- Implemented programming changes in the FCRB application that enhance reporting on Findings and Elements on children placed in foster care. The new functionality makes it possible to provide analytics and statistical reporting on problems due to service gap problems or systemic problems.

**Finance Projects**

(The Administrative Office of the Courts maintains budget, accounting, and personnel records for the AOC and the Supreme Court.)

- Continued efforts to convert and work toward implementation of a new internal financial management system on a Microsoft platform to meet new architecture standards which will enable distributed functionality of various components, such as purchase order creation and approval routing.

**Project Management Office**

- Created and implemented process guidelines and templates for issue escalation, Windows SharePoint Services guideline for sharing and storage of project-related documents, active and closed project documentation checklists, and new project request form.
- Reorganized content on PMO website to make information more readily available and templates easier to find.
- Created an IT Resource Availability project for resource managers, cluster managers, and project managers. Project participants can view any AOC ITD employee and see what projects he/she is working on and when.
- Created linked Cluster Master Projects so that upper management can review project status of an entire cluster quickly and easily.
- Tested Project Server, Project Professional, and Project Web Access on the new Vista operating system.
- Revised current project methodology to include Agile development processes.
- Assisted project managers obtaining state project management certification.
- Held semi-monthly project management forums for project management-related training sessions or accredited COJET training sessions.
- Assisted project managers on various individual projects.
- Provided regular oversight and project status reporting for executive management. Gave direction to project managers, coached and provide project assistance, as needed.
IX. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PROJECTS

This section contains a description of the statewide or state-level strategic projects undertaken by the Judicial Branch for Fiscal Years 2009 through 2011. These projects arise from the strategic initiatives above and support Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona’s Courts 2005-2010’s business goals as well as the Commission on Technology’s automation goals. Most are on-going projects focused on attaining the goals of a more responsive and accessible Judiciary.

At its June 2008 strategic planning session, the Commission on Technology reaffirmed the importance of existing strategic projects and re-evaluated their groupings into affinity areas by impact and time to implement. Commission members continued to evaluate the several long-range projects added in past years, removing interactive jury, PC refresh, Project Passport, and the new data center; elevating the urgency of electronic filing; and reducing the desired time to implementation for new case management systems, JOLTSaz, integration projects, and process standardization. The business continuity project added last year had its expected timeline lengthened to reflect the amount of effort it requires from courts. The “short” timeframe definition was re-iterated as being within the next fiscal year.

The Arizona Judiciary’s strategic information technology projects for 2009-2011, in order of priority and time to implement are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC PROJECTS</th>
<th>PRIORITY*</th>
<th>TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CODE STANDARDIZATION</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENALTY ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRONIC FILING</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATION – ADRS</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATION – e-Citation</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW CASE/FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS FOR TRIAL COURTS</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCESS STANDARDIZATION</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSaz</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS CONTINUITY</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNET PUBLIC INTERACTIVE SERVICE – MINUTE ENTRY</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNET PUBLIC INTERACTIVE SERVICE – STANDARD FORMS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNICAL TRAINING</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE (ONGOING)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on relative importance/impact being High/Medium/Low and predicted time to implementation being Short/Medium/Long term
These technology projects address five objectives. Below the projects are listed by these objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using Systemic Thinking</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Serving the Public and Public Safety | Penalty Enforcement Program  
Internet Public Interactive Service  
Integration – ADRS and e-Citation  
Business Continuity |
| Improving Core Applications        | New Case/Financial Systems for Trial Courts  
JOLTSaz (Next Generation JOLTS) |
| Standardizing for Leveraging       | Code Standardization  
Process Standardization  
Enterprise Architecture  
Technical Training  
Electronic Signatures            |
| Improving Efficiency with New Technologies | Electronic Document Management  
Electronic Filing |

In addition, there are many technology-related activities and projects within the judiciary that support day-to-day operations. Staff must, for instance, provide continued support for the existing core applications and infrastructure. Existing projects need to be completed or supported with required or mandated enhancements.
While the mix of projects is typically balanced, the Judiciary is now actively funding implementation of several second-generation automation systems using new technologies. We are not, however, just addressing technology in a vacuum. Several of these projects involve standardizing, reengineering and collaborating to find, document and train on best practices, thus leveraging judicial resources statewide.

Further, the majority of the court technology activity is dedicated to supporting the existing infrastructure, applications, and staff. Innovative initiatives (e-filing, minute entry, integrated justice applications) represent only approximately 10% of the overall spending this year. Basic operational activity continues to support the judicial goals of service to the public and protecting public safety.
* Chart does not include local court costs even if related to a statewide goal.

For each project’s alignment with business strategic initiatives and automation goals, refer to the **Strategic Plan Analysis** section where this is detailed in several charts.

- Alignment with *Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona’s Courts 2005-2010*
- Alignment of Strategic Projects with Automation Goals
- Portfolio Analysis: Projects by Class

For each project listed in the detailed strategic projects section, the following information is included:

- The project’s goals are provided. They are stated in terms of milestones planned to be completed by the dates, which may be noted.
• The **Snapshot** provides a very brief characterization of the project. Included are the project’s class and status. Also, an assessment of the degree of risk associated with successful completion of the project is included.

• A **Description** section describes the project and can include general information, a report of the existing situation, an outline of proposed changes and objectives, and description of technology used or technical environment.

**STRATEGIC PROJECT ANALYSIS**

The Commission on Technology has different perspectives from which to view projects to assist it in analyzing proposed strategic information technology projects.

**ALIGNMENT OF BUSINESS GOALS AND IT PROJECTS**

The first view aligns technology projects with the strategic business initiatives of the Arizona Judicial Branch. Projects are undertaken only when they support the business goals and initiatives of the judiciary. Below is a table depicting the various business initiatives that each technology project supports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PROJECTS</th>
<th>FISCAL YEARS 2009-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>ALIGNMENT WITH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOOD TO GREAT: A STRATEGIC AGENDA FOR ARIZONA’S COURTS 2005-2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Standardization</td>
<td>Assist the courts in the development and implementation of best practices for efficient case processing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Enforcement Program/FARE</td>
<td>Implement the fines/fees and restitution enforcement (FARE) program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to enhance efforts through improved automation, skip tracing, and billing to collect restitution and fees from probationers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Filing and Electronic Signatures</td>
<td>Develop simple, easy-to-use, web-based interactive forms needed for high volume case types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote the use of technology within courts to facilitate the processing of cases in an efficient manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to develop standards and policies for e-filing; electronic case access; and electronic record storage, backup, and recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PROJECTS</td>
<td>ALIGNMENT WITH GOOD TO GREAT: A STRATEGIC AGENDA FOR ARIZONA’S COURTS 2005-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Justice Integration, e-Citation, and ADRS | Promote the use of technology within courts to facilitate processing of cases in an efficient manner.  
Implement changes to the domestic violence petition and protection order repository to produce uniformity among courts and between states.  
Ensure that criminal justice agencies and the courts have accurate case and defendant information when and where it is needed.  
Develop and implement a strategy for the long-term support and expansion of integrated justice information systems.  
Work in cooperation with law enforcement, prosecutorial agencies, defense counsel, and victims to ensure compliance with victims’ rights provisions. |
| New Case/Financial Management Systems for Trial Courts | • Promote the use of technology within courts to facilitate the processing of cases in an efficient manner.  
• Continue re-engineering criminal case processing to ensure fair and timely resolution of cases.  
• Utilize automated case processing and uniform case management systems for probate cases.  
• Develop a plan with local courts for replacement of aging, legacy court automation systems with modern technology. |
# INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PROJECTS
## FISCAL YEARS 2009-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Strategic Projects</th>
<th>Alignment with Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona’s Courts 2005-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Process Standardization**   | Promote the use of technology within the courts to facilitate the processing of cases in an efficient manner.  
Implement changes to the domestic violence protection order repository to produce uniformity among courts and between states.  
Explore opportunities for the re-engineering of civil case processing to ensure cases are resolved in a prompt, fair, cost-effective method.  
Continue the re-engineering of criminal case processing to ensure fair and timely resolution of cases.  
Develop simple, easy-to-use, web-based interactive forms needed for high volume case types. |
| **JOLTSaz** (Next Generation of the Juvenile Probation System) | Reprogram and deploy the dependency case management modules as part of JOLTSaz.  
Develop and implement statewide-automated systems to assist probation departments in managing probation caseloads.  
Continue development of efficient case processing and management systems to ensure the resolution of disputes in a fair and timely manner.  
Assist the courts in the development and implementation of best practices for efficient case processing.  
Develop a plan with local court for replacement of aging, legacy court automation systems with modern technology. |
| **Business Continuity**        | Ensure courts have put in place and practiced an emergency response plan and protocols.  
Promote the use of technology within courts to facilitate the processing of cases in an efficient manner.  
Develop and implement a strategy for the long-term support and expansion of integrated justice information systems. |
| **Electronic Document Management** | Enhance the use of technology within courts to process cases in an efficient manner, including the development of an electronic document management system. |
| **Internet Public Interactive Service -- Standard Forms and Minute Entry** | Expand the Judicial Branch’s self-service center web site to include forms, instructions, and other information helpful to those who appear unrepresented in the limited jurisdiction and superior courts.  
Develop simple, easy-to-use, web-based interactive forms needed for high volume case types.  
Continue to develop standards and policies for e-filing; electronic case access; and electronic record storage, backup, and recovery. |
### INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PROJECTS  
**FISCAL YEARS 2009-2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PROJECTS</strong></th>
<th><strong>ALIGNMENT WITH GOOD TO GREAT: A STRATEGIC AGENDA FOR ARIZONA’S COURTS 2005-2010</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Automation/Technical Training     | Recruit and retain a professional, well-trained, customer service oriented workforce to better serve the needs of the public.  
                                  | Enhance training and career opportunities to increase the knowledge and professionalism of staff. |
| Enterprise Architecture           | Make recommendations on steps necessary to provide appropriate security to protect court facilities, personnel, and computer systems from intentionally inflicted harm or destruction.  
                                  | Encourage the elimination of duplicative local rules and encourage the consistent application of statewide rules of procedure. |

### ALIGNMENT OF AUTOMATION GOALS AND IT PROJECTS

A second view of technology projects organizes them by their support of one or more of the three Statewide Automation Goals. They are:

- Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.
- Improve information access and communication from and to judicial entities as well as the other criminal justice system functions.
- Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial effectiveness in handling growing caseloads.
The following chart also includes the priorities established by the Commission on Technology at its March 2001 and June 2002 planning workshops, as updated at the June 2008 annual planning meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC PROJECTS</th>
<th>PRIORITY RANK</th>
<th>BUSINESS &amp; AUTOMATION INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
<th>ACCESS &amp; COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>JUDICIAL EFFECTIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code Standardization</td>
<td>H-S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Enforcement Program</td>
<td>H-S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Filing</td>
<td>H-S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration -- ADRS</td>
<td>H-S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration – e-Citation</td>
<td>H-S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Case/Financial Management Systems for Trial Courts</td>
<td>H-S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Standardization</td>
<td>H-S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSaz</td>
<td>H-S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Continuity</td>
<td>H-M</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Document Management</td>
<td>M-S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Public Interactive – Minute Entry</td>
<td>M-S</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Public Interactive – Std Forms</td>
<td>M-M</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Signatures</td>
<td>M-M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Training</td>
<td>M-L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Architecture (ongoing)</td>
<td>M-L</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS OF IT PROJECTS**

A third view organizes projects by operational type (basic, enhancing) with respect to their support of business goals. Other factors considered are a project’s urgency based upon interdependencies with other projects, operational demands and/or legislative mandates. These views and factors enable the Commission to identify and prioritize the strategic projects.

This reflects an assessment of the level of impact the proposed strategic project will have on the Commission on Technology’s identified strategic business needs. For this analysis, the Commission has adopted an approach developed by Mr. William Rossner, a Gartner Group analyst, as a way of approaching strategic planning for information technology. Application portfolio analysis provides for applications to be categorized into three classes:
• The **utility class** of applications - which includes the basic applications required to be in business.

• The **enhancement class** of applications - which includes those that extend the organization’s performance, offering, for instance, faster delivery of information, better service, and higher quality.

• The **frontier class** of applications - which includes those that represent a potential breakthrough that could make a dramatic improvement in an organization’s efficiency, effectiveness, or competitiveness.

Mr. Rossner noted that balancing each of these areas is the key to planning.

**Utility Class Applications**

The AOC/ITD planning group believes they have balanced maintenance, replacement, and upgrades to basic necessary functions with enhancement and “leading edge” projects. Several projects are those maintaining past efforts that created basic infrastructure and business applications, like APETS and the data warehouse.

Not all basic IT projects are listed below, of course, but the priority projects with state-level visibility and significant resource needs are. Several IT applications are simply in maintenance mode and are not identified as priority projects. It is expected that these applications will continue to be supported and maintained. These include, for instance, the Dependant Children’s Automated Tracking System (DCATS), the Tax Intercept Program (TIP), and various internal accounting and utility programs supporting the Supreme Court and the Administrative Office of the Courts.

**Enhancement Class Applications**

The enhancement types of projects are directed towards extending the capabilities of many applications - adding, for instance, improved data integration functions to the case management system to support the justice integration strategic initiatives (balanced with the remaining life of the application). Enhancement projects also include those new projects that will allow courts to provide a higher quality of service to the public, another goal of Good to Great.

Past development of a method of accepting XML data from law enforcement to initiate cases, sometimes referred to as e-citation or red light support, as well as changes to support adoption of Project Passport forms related to domestic violence comprise enhancements. Increasing the functionality of the defensive driving application by constructing a statewide clearinghouse to store and forward records of completion that comply with recent legislation also falls in the category of an enhancement.
Since return on investment decreases as a function of remaining useful life, AZTEC development efforts are being greatly scaled back as replacement CMSs get implemented. AZTEC must continue to be updated for legislative changes as long as it remains in production use, but any requested enhancements to AZTEC’s functionality are being carefully balanced against end-of-life considerations.

**FRONTIER CLASS APPLICATIONS**

In addition, the Judiciary is engaged in projects that are on the “frontier” of technology. When complete, these will substantially increase the Judiciary’s technology capability, and significantly modernize it using technology. There are a limited number of these, and they are interrelated. It is expected that the Arizona Disposition Reporting System development and related enterprise service bus (ESB) approach, for instance, will greatly increase data integration with other justice agencies and also enable increased integrity of criminal history data in the state.

With respect to electronic filing, the Judiciary is in sync with the state executive and legislative branches in speeding to accept electronic documents. At its June 2005 annual planning meeting, the Commission on Technology (COT) created an e-court subcommittee to drive and coordinate the statewide evolution of electronic filing in Arizona. Predicated on the understanding that e-filing is far more business process dependent than technology dependent, this ad hoc group chaired by Justice Andrew Hurwitz is overseeing the business decisions, change process, and specific plans necessary to:

- Expand court-to-court electronic filings including records on appeal and lower court bindovers;
- Create and leverage a central, electronic clearinghouse for criminal data among justice partners; and
- Create a unified, attorney/public e-filing system leveraging standardized, interactive, statewide forms as its foundation.

Related to e-filing, the Judiciary continues evaluating rules for authenticating and accepting electronic documents filed by the legal community and by the public. Current policies related to paper filing are not influencing the crafting of electronic solutions, in order to keep new ideas flowing and progress being made.

It is important to note that each strategic project in the list encompasses more than one major activity. They are related but separate, often with entirely different project teams and user base. For example, the strategic project of Automation Training and Support includes a centralized support center, field support technicians, and several independent projects developing computer based training (CBT) and Web-based interactive training on automation applications. Further, it also includes the combined funding and training of the on-site county-level automation trainer. Individual technology projects may, therefore, be enhancing, but if the major impact of the strategic project is to maintain basic utility, then the strategic project would likely be classified as utility.
Taking that approach to the Arizona Judicial Branch’s strategic projects, both existing and planned, yields the following overview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC PROJECTS</th>
<th>UTILITY</th>
<th>ENHANCEMENT</th>
<th>FRONTIER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code Standardization</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Enforcement Program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Filing</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration – ADRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration – e-Citation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Case/Financial System for Trial Courts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Standardization</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSaz</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Continuity</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Document Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Public Interactive Service – Minute Entry/Distribution</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Public Interactive Service – Standardized Forms</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Signatures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Architecture (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Judiciary considers the distribution of strategic projects to be reasonably balanced. The frontier projects are large in scope and resource demands. Limiting those to significant and “doable” projects is deliberate.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Continue the placement and support of PCs for ACAP, JOLTS, APETS, and AOC users, including the replacement of desktops as leases terminate.
- Continue phone support for statewide and AOC applications.
- Facilitate the rollout for new releases of core application software.
- Add and train resources to support new APETS users statewide.
- Develop an automation-training curriculum.
- Develop computer-based training and online interactive training programs for case management systems and other core application software.
- Develop training programs for automation field trainers.
PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

TRAINING PROVIDED:

- AZTEC 1.4 training, including new protective order module, MS Word 2007 forms, AZTEC forms, merge using Word 2007; VISTA assistance during PC rollout; and Quick Tip Program, CSD Automation Services' monthly AZTEC processing or navigational tip, with documentation.
- 76 classes to 686 attendees during the fiscal year.

SUPPORT SERVICES PROVIDED:

- An average of 821 support calls for AZTEC courts received each month with an 95 percent resolution rate within 5 business days.
- An average of 206 problem tickets handled for JOLTS on a monthly basis.
- An average of 543 problem tickets handled for AOC/Supreme Court on a monthly basis.
- Averages of 680 information calls handled for Public Access / FARE on a monthly basis.
- New software releases/updates of AZTEC, DCATS, TIP, and other AOC sponsored applications continued to be deployed through automatic update server (Altiris).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This strategic project provides support statewide for automation. It includes:

- a help desk function,
- statewide technical support, and
- automation training.

The requirements for effective application and field support and training have increased with the number of statewide applications deployed.

**Phone and Technical Support**

User phone support and field support functions are consolidated into a single Support Services group. The goals established for Support Services reflect the desire to provide centrally located as well as remotely stationed field support function.

AOC Support Services (Customer Support Center and Technical Support) currently supports a total of:

- 2,780 PCs for state-wide ACAP, JOLTS and APETS users
- 744 PCs for AOC/Supreme Court users

For the centrally supplied support, technicians have used the newly acquired software tools for the remote control and diagnostics of user’s hardware and software. Since it was implemented, travel has been reduced by a significant amount and staff has provided more timely response to problems being experienced by the users.

Ideally, deploying field technicians in both northern and southern Arizona would provide more immediate on-site technical support. These technicians would perform troubleshooting of both hardware and software problems not resolved by the centrally located support. Funding has not been allocated for this at this time and so deployment of distributed field support is delayed.

Distributed system management is part of the funded ACAP Support effort. The software, Altiris, is part of the “image” delivered to courts in the new release of AZTEC.

This software has established the capability to remotely manage the systems distributed in a variety of locations in Arizona. It addresses two areas of remote management. First, it establishes processes, procedures, and automated solutions to poll, analyze, and report on systems’ status, providing alerts to both existing and pending problems as well as an inventory of software on the system. Second, it provides for the automated distribution of both application and system software. This software distribution and remote management package significantly reduces travel expenses and allows the Field Support team to be more responsive to user requests for PC service, software, and assistance.
Statewide support for APETS was added for Fiscal Year 2005 and Support Center staff received training in the APETS application. The Support Center now handles calls from APETS/Adult Probation users in the counties.

**TRAINING**

Some of the automation-training role for the various statewide applications resides in the user community. They are the experts in the business functions required to do the job and the best way to use the automation tools to achieve their goals.

Therefore, in coordination with Technical Support, development activities, rollout tasks, and help desk access; Automation Process Analysts are available to provide strategies and programs for automation training. In addition, 11 of the 15 counties use JCEF grant funding to pay a portion of the salary of a local field trainer to provide local support and training, particularly to new staff. The users, especially AZTEC users, have identified this as a very high priority as often court training resources are limited and the effective training of new court staff is critical to on-going court operations.

As new applications are implemented, Training Support will collaborate with the responsible software development teams to construct the required training courses. They will also develop training tools on targeted topics that may involve the preparation of recorded training classes and conducting regional training conferences. Further, they will provide the Support Services staff with training to provide needed phone and on-site technical support, as appropriate.
Training offered in FY 2008 by AOC staff to court staff statewide included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DUI CASE PROCESSING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL CLAIMS PROCESSING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCIBLE DETAINER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END-OF-PERIOD REPORTING</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTECTIVE ORDER PROC.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISPO REPORTING</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC BOND PROCESSING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/A &amp; LONG FORM COMPLAINTS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVD REPORTING</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM RESTITUTION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL PROCESSING</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPEALS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENTENCING</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC TABLES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONAL REVIEWS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASPER/STATS/DATA CLEANUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFERENCE TRAININGS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARRANT PROCESSING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORD 2007</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORMS IN AZTEC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORD FORMS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>686</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To satisfy the need for on-site automation training and assistance, State funds will partially fund an automation trainer in each county. The position’s duties will include supporting all the courts (county and municipal, general and limited jurisdictions). These trainers assist users locally in their attempts to better utilize the automated systems. Standardizing business processes and workflow as well as assistance in creating specialized management reports are examples of such improved utilization.

Training is the most critical component in the success of an automation system. This training needs to be readily available to new staff and frequent refreshers must be made available to veteran staff. The AOC, with funding from the Commission on Technology, will be offering a multi-faceted approach to solving this problem:
• Comprehensive Curriculum - A training team develops the comprehensive ACAP training curriculum. It provides classes in all aspects of case processing and the use of the case management system.

• Class Room Training - The AOC has created a portable, self-contained training lab that allows ACAP training to be hosted on site or at offsite locations throughout the state without requiring dedicated computer training rooms. A regular set of classes is being made available at Regional and Judicial Staff Conferences.

• Computer Based Training (CBT) - The AOC has the capability to produce and distribute interactive and self-directed computer-based training. Some of the very basic classes will be distributed in the form of CDs to the courts. Most of the training will be made available, in interactive format, across the Court's network (AJIN). These classes will be on most needed topics and will be conducted by a live instructor. These courses can also be recorded for later review or access by persons unable to participate.
Because courts increasingly rely on automated systems and electronic documents, the Commission on Technology has increased its emphasis on business continuity planning during the plan period. A set of systemic best practices is being developed and communicated to local courts regarding the identification of and mitigation of vulnerabilities. Work has begun on compiling a statewide inventory to reveal disconnects between local expectations for business restoration and the likely realities courts face during disaster scenarios.

COT has identified a minimum set of information courts are responsible to document in planning a response to specific business risks, from both inside and outside the court building. Formulating responses to disasters and documenting a business restoration strategy requires hard work and intense communication among court departments and with justice partners. COT plans to compile from courts’ input a set of scenarios and related options that would mitigate the largest, most common risks for the most courts. Discussion can then focus on the appropriate business continuity initiatives to fund.

Media focus remains strong on recent releases of personal information by government entities. A recent GAO study of over 570 data breaches reported in the news media from January 2005 through December 2006 showed these incidents varied significantly in size and occurred across a wide range of entities. Since court business relates to individuals, no court storing electronic information is immune. Arizona recently passed a law mandating notification of individuals whose personal information is inadvertently released. An administrative order has been developed to address provisions of that law that relate to courts.
**PROJECT GOALS**

- Provide specific training to court administrators related to court business continuity of automated systems.
- Develop an assessment and planning guide for court business continuity, focusing on the information technology elements that enable court business.
- Evaluate loss scenarios and mitigation costs to determine appropriate initiatives to fund.
- Educate local courts on the risks associated with creation and maintenance of distributed electronic records.
- Obtain the address of each court’s designated business restoration location to ensure communications connectivity exists prior to a disaster.

**PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008**

- TAC staff counseled various court representatives completing the risk assessment tool developed in FY 2007.
- Remained abreast of Pandemic Continuity of Operations document being developed by AOC, especially mission critical court functions. Staff met with AOC’s Director of Administrative Services to ensure duplicate information was not being collected by the COT effort.
- COT received a preliminary report on several risk assessments returned; more are needed to obtain statistically significant data.
- COT recommended content for a data protection and breach notification policy in response to A.R.S. 44-7501.

---

**SNAPSHOT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In our increasingly interconnected world, business, including the business of government, comes to a standstill without the flow of electronic information. When court data systems or the network that connects them are damaged and processes disrupted, the problem is serious and the impact far reaching. Mistakes lead to public distrust and the erosion of public confidence in the institutions of government. The consequences can be much more than an inconvenience, even affecting life, health, and public safety. Vital digital records must not only be preserved but have at least the same assurance of availability as paper records were perceived to have.

Disaster recovery has always been an issue for courts but it is becoming pervasive as courts increase their reliance on automated systems and electronic documents. Integration also makes an outage in a single court potentially disruptive to their partners throughout the justice system. Fixing a single site, like the data center at the State Courts Building, only addresses a piece of the overall problem, since more of the environment is being distributed among the local courts. Local courts must develop and communicate their own detailed plans.

A prime example of the risk related to decentralization is in the arena of electronic document management. With the implementation of EDMS in superior court clerks' offices, courts are poised to stop collecting paper in the near term with the advent of electronic case filing. Even in the current environment where clerks digitize the paper they receive, court processes are becoming dependent on the electronic records. The majority of rural courts had to stretch financially to afford a single EDMS server; purchasing a secondary or redundant system is well out of their reach. Courts are not prepared to quickly rebuild servers and get data restored even where reliable backups exist.

The AOC cannot afford to replicate everything rural courts do with automated systems. The amount of bandwidth needed to move images around the state is phenomenal and would drastically slow communications over AJIN. The solution must therefore be largely local in nature. A set of systemic best practices needs to be developed and communicated to local courts regarding the identification and mitigation of vulnerabilities.
Interestingly, a recent study revealed that natural or man-made disasters were actually the least likely cause of downtime. The wealth of other more mundane contributors to outages includes: user errors, application errors, hardware failure, utility outages, and fiber cuts. There is quantifiable risk associated with each of these conditions, defined as the probability of occurrence multiplied by the magnitude of impact. TAC created a survey tool that helps local courts confront their risks from the likely perspectives of

- Failure of a single system or component (disk, switch, power supply),
- Unavailability of staff (pandemic flu)
- Failure of the enabling environment (power grid down, fiber cut)
- Failure of multiple systems or components (water damage, power surge, server room fire)
- Loss of an entire facility (flood, hazardous waste, bombing).

The tool, a business continuity/disaster-planning matrix, used to capture COT’s minimum required artifacts, is divided into two parts. Part 1 asks court business leaders to identify top services and business functions the court can’t live without -- those required by law, rule, or administrative order. Common processes were pre-populated to help the brainstorming process. Leaders are then prompted to enter the maximum allowable time the court can go without providing that function. Leaders may also define an order of precedence for restoring the function based on the criticality of each individual business process.

Part 2 aligns the required business processes with the automation systems that support them. Risk is then identified using a five-point scale for likelihood and a five-point scale for impact. This scoring effort reveals those processes that most need protection or workarounds in place. The amount of unplanned downtime that can be tolerated is also an instructive number.

The completed matrices will be returned to AOC staff to provide to COT for consideration of vulnerabilities, solutions, and costs. Staff will also characterize the “ripple effect” of one court’s outage on the other courts and justice partners relying on data from that court. The goal is to characterize those initiatives that best advance the courts in the direction of the desired state.
Completed risk assessments returned to date have identified the following items under the control of AOC as having the highest priority for restoration:

- AJIN connectivity and trust relationships,
- Videoconference network (for remote appearances or hearings),
- Case management system and court database,
- JOLTS application,
- APETS application,
- E-mail application,
- Jury+ application,
- ATLAS application (Executive Branch).

Completed risk assessments returned to date have identified the following items under local control as having the highest priority for restoration:

- The local area network,
- Court reporting/recording software,
- Local add-on applications to the case management system,
- Any electronic document management system,
- Financial applications outside the case management system (often county or city systems).

Much more data is still required to compose a statistically accurate sample.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Establish a dictionary of standard codes, descriptions, and definitions for the variety of limited jurisdiction court-related events and functions.
- Complete the dictionary of standard codes, descriptions, and definitions for the variety of superior-court-related events and functions.
- Maintain a centralized repository of standard codes, descriptions, and definitions for use by Arizona courts and case management system developers.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

- The standard set of codes for events, activities and case components was activated and is in use in Pima’s AGAVE CMS.
- The AZTEC master tables were mapped and applied in the new General Jurisdiction CMS (AJACS). Individual mapping efforts began for superior courts in Yuma and La Paz counties. Their existing codes were mapped and otherwise reconciled with the standard set and will be implemented upon go-live in each county in early FY 2009.
- Work continues on financial and calendar activities, and the development of civil and criminal statistical reports for Superior Courts.
- The Limited Jurisdiction Standardization Workgroup meets monthly and is currently finalizing codes so mapping can begin immediately upon selection of a new CMS for LJ courts.
The Data Standards Committee approved by COT met twice in FY 2008 for status updates. No issues were brought to this committee.

Table code standardization supports statewide consistency of information recorded in case management systems. It is difficult to transfer data to other local and state entities, write standardized reports, and aggregate statewide statistics when every court uses different words, abbreviations, or codes for the same event or activity. This is currently an issue in AZTEC courts and mapping has proven to be a labor intensive task with unsatisfactory results.

Integration, statistical analysis reporting, and shared information projects have highlighted the need for courts to record, count, and report events in a consistent manner. Even within the AZTEC courts, which are using the same application software, differences in various code table values have made reporting difficult and made integration projects more complex due to data transformation and mapping requirements.

Superior, Justice of the Peace, and Municipal Courts are addressing the need for consistency through the establishment of standardized code sets to be used statewide. The sets include standard codes for:

- Case Type,
- Party Type,
- Case Status,
- Party Status,
- Calendar Events, and
- Courtroom Events.

These projects are planned to dovetail with state-level integration projects with other agencies to identify XML tags and valid values/codes for a variety of criminal-justice-related events.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

**PROJECT GOALS**

- Continue development of Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System (APETS) functionality as requested and prioritized by the APETS user group and APETS Steering Committee.
- Investigate other integration partners for probation data.
- Establish urinalysis data feeds into APETS from both TASC and Norchem for the remaining few counties. Identify whether additional vendors are capable of submitting data feeds. Make necessary design changes to expand data feed capability at the pre-trial service (PTS) stage.
- Design and pilot several integration points with the General Jurisdiction Case Management System (AJACS), to include transferring of data at case initiation; petition; and termination stages.
- Provide additional management reports to the Replication Server’s Report Application for county management to access.
- Design and implement data fields/screens to support the restructure of DTEF (Drug Treatment and Education Fund) elements, which also support evidence-based practices changes to treatment monitoring.
- Begin adapting existing functionality to meet upcoming changes to Arizona Code of Judicial Administration sections designed to align adult probation with evidence-based practices. This evolving process will have considerable impact throughout the APETS application and will be phased-in over a couple of years.
PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

- Released APETS 2007 Spring/Summer Build (July 2, 2007) and an Incremental Build (July 23, 2007), which contained a drug court module, revised case plan, new case/count petition/termination functionality, as well as several county-specific enhancements.

- Implemented a new report application on the replication server, which allows counties to access most recent data and not impact production.

- Completed and released a Winter Mini Build to further enhance case reinstatements and terminations.

- Completed and released the UC 2008 Build which changed the uniform conditions, due to legislation that went into effect January 1, 2008.

- Established urinalysis data feeds into APETS from both TASC and Norchem for Cochise, Gila, Graham, Greenlee, and Mohave counties.

SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Utility   | New          | High | X
| Enhancement | On-going    | Medium | X
| Frontier | Replace/Upgrade | Low | X

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Adult Probation Core Software Support Project involves the continued enhancement and support of the Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System (APETS), the statewide, automated tracking system for Arizona’s adult probation services.

APETS is designed to provide consistency in service delivery, a meaningful reporting structure, and equality in information sharing. APETS assists the probation officers in the field, the support staff who manage probation case file information, and the management teams in the counties and at the AOC. The application is written in PowerBuilder using a code generator called HOW and utilizes an Informix database. APETS was first deployed in production in Maricopa County in March 1999. By December 2006, all adult probation departments in the state were using APETS as their primary business tool. At that time, project objectives switched to implementing a replication server and developing/implementing software enhancements.
During the presentence stage of the court process, APETS contains various demographic, case-specific, collateral and victim information, initial assessment data, as well as an officer’s recommendation to the court on sentencing. For persons subsequently sentenced to a term of probation, APETS contains the specific conditions imposed by the court, case notes and information for monitoring progress toward the case plan, treatment and employment performance, and milestones throughout the person’s grant of probation. APETS also identifies when persons transfer among counties, transfer out of state, or are deported. Additionally, several counties use the application’s pre-trial services (PTS) module, which provides defendant and case tracking during the earliest stages of the arrest/release process.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Digitize the Appellate courts.
- Enable electronic dissemination of court documents.
- Complete implementation of OnBase electronic document management system(s) with CMS integration.
- Continue to enable electronic filing of specific types with direct integration to the database, including data and document transfer from lower courts.
- Standardize court operations and procedures across appellate courts where possible through the use of automated tools and assistance.
- Integrate to emerging court community document management and production systems and standards.
- Populate Public Access and the statistical central repository with Appellamation data.
- Provide other forms of public access to appellate case information, decisions, calendars, dockets, and documents.
- Continue enhancement and improvement of Appellamation, including workflow management, issue management, and work product management.
**PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008**

- Implemented the Hyland OnBase document management system within the Court of Appeals Division One. This included the acquisition and installation of computing hardware (i.e., computer systems, mass storage systems, etc.) as well as imaging scanning stations, and the installation and configuration of the OnBase software.

- Implemented the Appellamation financial management system.

- Deployed Appellamation Release 5.3, which, among other things, delivered a clerk review function for the receipt, review, and acceptance of criminal case files submitted to the Supreme Court.

- Developed an e-filing system pilot project for use by attorneys and pro per se litigants. When deployed, this system will permit persons to file electronic documents with the Appellate courts over the Internet.

---

**SNAPSHOT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The Appellamation Project began in 1997 as a joint effort between ITD/AOC, the three appellate courts, and Progressive Systems, Inc. (PSI). The goal of the project was to build a comprehensive automated system that met the unique case tracking and reporting requirements of the state’s appellate courts. The system utilizes modern client/server technology and is capable of integration with lower court applications (also provided by PSI).

In 1999, ITD/AOC assumed full responsibility for the completion of the system and its deployment. At the present time, the application has been implemented successfully in the Supreme Court and in the Court of Appeals Division One.

The Supreme Court, the Court of Appeals and the Appellamation development team plan continued development of enhancements and functional modules. A number of automated interfaces and integration activities continue to further the appellate court’s e-Court initiatives. These include providing various forms of electronic filing and management of electronic documents. Other future enhancements are planned to improve workflow in the courts and expand public access to court and case information over the Internet.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

• Provide AZTEC maintenance releases as needed to implement required legislation changes and efficiency enhancements.

• Provide support and maintenance for automation until new CMS application implements in all ACAP courts.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

• Developed and deployed AZTEC Version 1.4, which includes the ability to print Project Passport Protective Order forms and enhancements to the AZTEC Protective Order Module and the Word macros to utilize AZTEC forms/templates using Word as the application’s word processor.

• Developed and deployed template/forms and document conversion for standard forms stored in AZTEC in support of WordPerfect-to-Word conversion effort.

• Continued reviewing and closing outstanding and obsolete Remedy tickets related to AZTEC issues.
AZTEC is the legacy case and cash management system deployed throughout 143 of Arizona’s general and limited jurisdiction courts. These 143 courts make up the current Arizona Court Automation Project (ACAP). AZTEC software maintenance is an internally supported project. Though development staff and software support were originally provided by a vendor, the Arizona Judicial Branch obtained rights to the software for use in Arizona courts and began directing and performing the development of enhancements and modifications. The remaining AZTEC development team continues to address deficiencies in the system and provide enhancements, balanced by end-of-life considerations, until next-generation case management systems currently in development are deployed.

The Commission on Technology re-affirmed its approach to AZTEC developed during the strategic planning for Fiscal Years 2004 – 2006. The application is reaching the end of its lifecycle and is being replaced by a vendor system at the general jurisdiction level and by either a locally developed candidate system or a vendor system at the limited jurisdiction level.

The continued operation and maintenance of AZTEC will be to support the required needs and functions of the courts during a several-year migration to new systems. In the meantime, the on-going support and maintenance of the basic case and cash management system for Arizona courts will remain a priority. Considerable investment has been made to-date in first-generation systems and now that they are implemented throughout the Judicial Branch and improved for users over time, they must continue functioning fully to support their users during transition to second-generation systems.

The major focus of the AZTEC team during 2008 was bug fixes, enhancements to accommodate use of Microsoft Word in place of WordPerfect, Project Passport readiness, and handheld e-Citation readiness.

A group of courts in the West Valley continues implementing some data entry and inquiry screens developed by Scottsdale Municipal Court to improve efficiency. Details of this project are contained within the Maricopa County Courts Plan attached as Appendix D.
TESTING & DEPLOYMENT PROCESS

A key to making a statewide case management system succeed is to ensure the quality and reliability of the data. This has turned out to be more of a challenge than at first realized, as each court uses the system differently. AZTEC development staff continues to use automated test tools to perform unit testing of AZTEC. System testing is performed by CSD. After all the internal tests are performed and recorded successfully, pilot courts are invited to perform testing on their own test databases.

The deployment of software in a timely manner continues to be a challenge. After the software has been tested and accepted by the pilot courts, the software is ready to be rolled out to the courts. If a site visit or substantial training is required, the rollout of a major new release of the software to 143 courts and over 1300 customers takes 20-35 weeks, depending on the degree of change. Further, some courts with technical staffs are building “bolt-on” modules. Integration with these bolt-ons and other locally acquired software is also challenging, especially the coordination in the testing and implementation phases. A major challenge is development where overlapping or conflicting versions of Microsoft runtime software versions are a factor.

ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS

The goal is to continue supporting the end-of-life case management system in a way that improves its usefulness to the courts without incurring high development costs. Commission on Technology has established a committee (CACC) to coordinate the requests coming from various user groups and to establish development priorities. This committee reviews all of the enhancement requests and makes determinations as to viability and priority.

PROJECT DEPENDENCIES

Many of the above enhancements relate to or are dependent upon other strategic projects as follows:

JUSTICE INTEGRATION: Creating and maintaining the infrastructure and expertise will be necessary to provide for the following enhancements:

- Penalty Enforcement Program
- Defensive Driving School information
- MVD electronic reporting and queries
- Criminal History Reporting to DPS

PUBLIC ACCESS AND WEB PRESENCE: In addition to the enhancements to the software to provide for the information, many enhancements will require an infrastructure to provide public access:

- Public Access to calendar information
- Domestic Violence/Orders of Protection
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

**PROJECT GOALS**

- Provide application support and maintenance via Remedy tickets.
- Complete system enhancements only when required by court rule or legislation.
- Create new, and modify existing, Crystal reports as requested by counties.
- Facilitate efforts of data review in preparation for conversion to JOLTSaz, including data quality review/cleanup and review/consolidation of codes tables statewide.
- Provide data for annual reporting requirements, including AOC Annual Report, Arizona Courts Data Book, Juvenile Performance Measures, and Juveniles Processed in the Arizona Court System, ad hoc reporting, and research.
- Continue to increase the automated sharing of juvenile justice information with other state and county agencies through the use of the JOLTS Warehouse and other means.
- Roll out initial process for matching and uniquely identifying juveniles currently in separate JOLTS databases in Pima and the rural counties.
- Participate in project to create research data repository to meet on-going need for current statewide data for reporting and research purposes.
PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

- Provided continued support for JOLTS system and users including facilitation of statewide user’s groups and workgroups, conducting training, on-site support and completing urgent system fixes.
- Facilitated review, consolidation and definition of 11 statewide code tables, including completing required code table modifications.
- Recreated Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP) database and research analysis.
- Completed Statewide ID business requirements, development specs and report prototypes for manual (interim solution) in JOLTS.

SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Juvenile probation, detention and court staffs in the 13 rural counties and Pima use the Juvenile Online Tracking System (JOLTS), an AS/400 application. Centralized support is provided to the 13 rural counties. All counties provide electronic data to the JOLTS Youth Index, statistical database and Juvenile Data Warehouse System.

The JOLTSaz project is currently underway to consolidate the two versions of JOLTS used by Pima and the 13 rural counties. A third system, iCIS, is used by Maricopa County. JOLTS application support and maintenance must continue during the development, testing, and implementation of JOLTSaz. Enhancements to the existing JOLTS system will be completed only if required by court rule or legislation.

Addressing data quality issues in preparation for conversion and migration to JOLTSaz remains a major focus.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Enhance and support statewide data collection of court data (AZTEC and non-AZTEC) and other court entities data into the data warehouse.
- Enhance and support the interface to Public Access information for the public and other interested agencies.
- Create, enhance, and support Judicial Dashboards and reports that provide case flow analysis, status updates, and identification of problem cases and incorporate CourTools metrics.
- Convert and enhance current Data Warehouse applications to .NET architecture.
- Analyze and evaluate Business Intelligence (BI) solutions.
- Continue support for ad hoc reporting requests from the data warehouse.
- Continue to support and enhance the central repository as an on-going project in FY 2009.
- Upgrade to a new Data Warehouse Server to help support the growing central repository.
- Implement “Full FARE” interfaces with Chandler Municipal Court.
- Continue support of the Intranet DNA Web site for Adult Probation.
PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

- Continued support of the Public Access Victim Notification application using Maricopa Superior Court extracts / active criminal cases.
- Supported Interim FARE interfaces with Chandler Municipal and AZTEC courts for the Fines, Fees, and Restitution Enforcement program.
- Continued Full FARE interfaces with Phoenix Municipal Court.
- Continued support of the TTEAP process for FARE.
- Continued implementation of AZTEC courts into the Interim FARE process.
- Continued coordination with Maricopa Justice Courts for implementing Interim FARE.
- Implemented enhancements to CPOR that includes new information from the Project Passport Protection Order Forms.
- Continued coordination with AZTEC and non-AZTEC courts for Project Passport data transfers.

SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Judicial Branch’s Judicial Statewide Information Service (JUSTIS) has been in production and evolving for over 7 years. The JUSTIS foundation includes a central data warehouse, data mart server, and MQ servers. The objective of JUSTIS is to act as the statewide central data repository for court information and to coordinate the movement of data from one point to another. The data warehouse has been constructed, implemented, and is continuously populated with data from ACAP and non-ACAP courts. Now that the technical challenge has been achieved, the focus is to include data from all the entities in the Judicial Branch.
The data warehouse provides the following court case information:

- A centralized case and person search capability for court personnel.
- The data collection mechanism for the publicly accessible court and calendar information via the Internet.
- The data collection mechanism for the statistical database needed to respond to both executive and legislative requests for statistical information about court activity.

The benefits of maintaining the data warehouse are:

- Improved quality of service to the public by providing other government agencies, such as DPS, DES, and DOR with more accessible electronic information to improve and support their processes.
- Improved centralized access to information, such as criminal history, orders of protection, domestic violence, etc., for law enforcement.
- Improved electronic integration with the legal community and other justice-related departments and agencies.
- Improved quality and quantity of data available to the AOC for analysis and research.
- Improved customer service by providing higher quality of data and case management and greater public access to information.

One of the main benefits mentioned of the data warehouse is to provide data for statewide analysis and statistical reporting. The report generation is in accordance with the policies established by the Arizona Judicial Council and targeted judicial dashboards will be developed for ease of report creation.

JUSTIS is also foundational to the development and support of FARE, part of the Penalty Enforcement Program. JUSTIS provides the main interface between the courts (AZTEC and non-AZTEC), external agencies (MVD), and the service provider.

The Intranet DNA web site for Adult Probation was implemented in 2004. The website enables DNA search capabilities by names INITIALS, officers, or agency. All data is imported from DPS, and DPS receives all their data from the agencies listed within the drop down box on the web page, including all county superior court probation departments.

The Arizona Court Automation Project (ACAP) remains the core application providing information to the central repository. Therefore, with 143 Arizona courts using the same software, the collection and "warehousing" of case and party data is primarily from a single integrated system. The database of each court is secured and protected from unauthorized access and the data-warehousing concept provides a centralized copy of selected case information - a sort of index to the actual data residing on the several
physical systems centrally located in Phoenix. The index contains the commonly required information regarding a case and is not an entire copy of the courts' data.

Preliminary user requirement sessions have been held to determine the information that judges and other court personnel would like to have available. On-going customer interviews are planned for determining the required data needed for the central repository for improving the timeliness and availability of judicial information. Statistical reporting data as well as other aggregates have been built into the data warehouse infrastructure to support other required analysis and planning. AOC can enhance the integrated central repository, with additional research to determine additional needs of the public, the requirements of new federal legislation for such things as a domestic violence index, and the local and state law enforcement needs.

The central repository, with its sTrac, eTrac, iTrac, statistical, and public access modules, is in production in all superior courts and selected limited jurisdiction courts. It provides court personnel the ability to view high-level summary information about their caseloads and also allows them to drill down to detail supporting the summary information. It provides management tools to help courts better manage their cases. Usage and reliance upon Data Warehouse data continues to grow at a significant rate as the following illustrates:

- 2006 usage increase over 2005 – 397%
- 2007 usage increase over 2006 – 180%
- 2008 usage increase over 2007 (projected) – 243%

The addition of juvenile probation information to the central repository in FY2002 and the FY 2004 addition of adult probation information bring the Arizona Judiciary another step closer to having all AZ court information consolidated and available centrally for analysis and review.

A centrally maintained and supported UNIX system provides the platform for housing the central data repository. A mechanism for automating incremental data loads from the individual court databases has being designed and coded.

Research into other court systems is being done to identify the cost and timeline for browser-enabled access to the central repository.

Standardization and coordination of Web- and telephone-based payment systems, interfaces with the Motor Vehicle Division and Department of Revenue, and collections of court obligations is necessary to provide consistent services to both in-and out-of-state citizens owing a court obligation, and to realize efficiencies for taxpayers by avoiding the cost of building and maintaining multiple systems. This approach is also consistent with practices in other branches of government. For example, in April 2003, the Governor issued a directive requiring coordination of all Web development initiatives and Web-related services through the executive branch’s Government Information Technology Agency.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Centralize defensive driving registration and completion reporting to courts in the state through the AOC.
- Perform data validation on courts that participate in the Data Warehouse.
- Provide secure, standardized, XML transactions from the schools through the AOC to the courts via MQ messaging.
- Integrate the Defensive Driving School (DDS) registration and completion data into the AZTEC case management system.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

- Completed in-depth analysis and began development and programming efforts to add the new functionality to the Defensive Driving Tracking System (DDTS) and AZTEC Case Management System.
- Began development efforts on a new middleware application that will transfer data to and from the Defensive Driving Tracking System and AZTEC, perform Data Warehouse validation and transfer Defensive Driving data to and from non-AZTEC courts’ MQ queues.
- Hired a Senior Systems Analyst to assist with project oversight, documentation, developing test plans and test scripts, as well as coordinating all user acceptance testing.
This project responds to new requirements brought about by House Bills 2001 and 2488, which amend Section 28-3393 of the Arizona Revised Statutes relating to defensive driving schools. Effective January 1, 2009, an eligible individual who elects to attend a DDS may attend any Supreme Court-certified school that complies with the court automation and reporting requirements. The amendments preclude courts from using only “preferred provider” DDSs, upon the expiration of their current contracts with the schools.

In an effort to streamline the process of reporting DDS completions from all certified schools to all courts, the AOC is centralizing this functionality. Centralization benefits the schools as they are required to report to both the AOC and to each individual court. After project implementation, schools will report only to the AOC who will then report out to the court of jurisdiction. The benefit to the courts will be the ability receive one data feed for DDS completions from all schools. The addition of centralized DDS registration reporting will benefit the courts that are presently using or plan to use photo enforcement, as the DDS registration notification eliminates the need for service of photo enforcement citations.

Phase 1 of the project will continue to utilize the DDTS application and the established AOC reporting processes at the DDS with new functionality added to capture DDS registrations. A new middleware application will be implemented to pick up the registration and completion data from the DDTS application. This application will then send applicable records through a Data Warehouse validation process and create XML messages for valid records which will be sent to the appropriate courts’ MQ queues. Invalid records will be sent back to the DDTS system; the schools will be notified to correct bad records and retransmit them to the AOC. The application will then transfer the data from AZTEC courts’ MQ queues to the appropriate AZTEC database tables. After the records are transferred to AZTEC, an internal process will perform necessary updates to all impacted cases. Phase 1 is on schedule to start user acceptance testing by late summer 2008, with production implementation scheduled before the end of the calendar year.
Plans for Phase 2 of the project include the replacement of the entire DDTS application used by the DDSs. A consultant will be hired to develop a new web-based user interface for the DDSs. This will allow for the capture of all data necessary to report on court fees that are collected by the schools and transferred to the court of jurisdiction. Additional functionality will be added to the AZTEC case management system to process mass receipting of DDS-collected diversion fees at the case level.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Implement a standard process and mechanism for electronic transfer of data from law enforcement agencies to the courts.
- Implement a standard process and mechanism for electronic transfer of data from the Prosecutor to the courts.
- Implement the functionality to import and post-electronic data from vendors, law enforcement, and prosecutors into the court case management system (CMS).
- Obtain secure communication paths from citation originators to court case management systems.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

- Completed the specification for electronic case initiation with Coconino, including citations, initial arraignments, and long form filings.
  - Perfected the interfaces need to move the data from one organization to another.
  - Completed a “poster” program that allows court clerks to review incoming data and supplement the information. Once the clerk accepts the data, the incoming records are posted into the AZTEC CMS.
- Worked with handheld vendor to implement handheld devices in 5 law enforcement communities with several more in test phase.
• Worked with DPS and their vendor, Redflex, to implement a photo radar van system and the electronic transfer of citations in 8 jurisdictions. Many more jurisdictions will come online in response to legislation enabling DPS to perform photo enforcement statewide beginning in FY 2009.

• Worked with two vendors to implement photo radar, red light running, and other fixed photo enforcement systems throughout Arizona.

• Published an e-citation “cookbook” to describe standard import process and requirements to vendors and project managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNAPSHOT</th>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>x High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

In FY 2006, AZTEC began to be opened to allow an XML data stream from e-citation devices, photo radar, and red light systems to automatically initiate cases. This paved the way for full electronic case filing while awaiting implementation of next-generation case management systems. This project benefits the court community by building the foundation for automated case initiation for bookings, citations, and filings into the AZTEC database, thereby decreasing the amount of data entry the court clerk would need to do for case initiation and simultaneously improving the accuracy of case data.

The initial integration project involved the courts (via AZTEC) and Flagstaff/Coconino City/County Law Enforcement as well as Prosecutors (via their records management systems). The project includes creation of data transfer interfaces and standardization of transaction structures. The transactions include data for three different types of case initiation: Citation, Booking, and Long Form Complaint data. A web interface allows the court clerk to review the data and supplement it (if needed) then to post the data into the AZTEC CMS.

Another facet of the project includes obtaining electronic ATTC input to AZTEC from law enforcement officers’ handheld devices. Several courts, beginning with Tucson and Oro Valley have partnered with their local law enforcement agencies to provide officers with handheld devices containing the ATTC form. The data is manually transferred to the court network for upload to AZTEC. Late in the year, DPS agreed to use the law enforcement network to transport data from the officers’ handhelds to the court.
To transition the e-citation project from the initial, labor-intensive implementations to a streamlined production process, the developers have crafted a “cookbook” describing the input process in detail. The cookbook is being revised to increase its usability. The process has now been publicized to judges and law enforcement officers around the state.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Assist courts, on request, to implement the electronic document management (EDM), imaging, and electronic filing systems that are compatible with adopted standards.
- Provide guidance to courts regarding electronic records.
- Identify short-and long-term funding resources to support electronic document management, storage, and archiving.
- Support statewide e-filing by creating a central repository for court filings received through an online interface, then replicated following acceptance by clerks.
- Implement the OnBase imaging solution throughout the Administrative Office of the Courts.
- Implement the OnBase imaging solution in the Supreme Court.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

- Supported the implementation of OnBase in Coconino Superior Court.
- Continued supporting OnBase in Superior Courts where already implemented.
- Prepared to support Graham LaserFiche-to-OnBase conversion and Apache-homegrown-system-to-OnBase conversion.
• Expanded internal use of OnBase at the Administrative Office of the Courts to additional departments and business functions.

• Continued to participate in e-Records Subcommittee of Limited Jurisdiction Courts committee to provide direction regarding destruction of paper records where equivalent electronic records exist.

• Inaugurated TAC e-Records Subteam to recommend technical requirements for courts seeking to destroy paper records for which equivalent electronic records exist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electronic Document Management (EDM) includes the processes and the environment where documents are created, stored, managed, located, retrieved, and viewed electronically. Electronic documents and e-records replace traditional media (paper). Electronic documents are and will be used in the day-to-day business of the court, by court staff, other justice-related agencies, and the public.

An electronic document management system (EDMS) is generally made up of several different technologies that must be integrated, including imaging, electronic filing, faxing, workflow management, case management system applications, COLD, and database management.

The Judicial Branch realizes that the needs and benefits of Electronic Document Management extend throughout the criminal justice system and will collaborate with other agencies to develop a model that satisfies system-wide requirements as well as those of the courts.

The current court strategy is to:

• Assist courts in developing alternatives to their records storage and paper case file routing/tracking challenges.

• Develop documentation and State-level expertise to assist courts in selecting the best model for their environment while remaining non-proprietary and capable of
storing and sharing documents between and among courts, other government agencies, the legal community, and litigants.

- Provide guidance to courts having EDMS regarding destruction of paper court records for which images exist as well as retention of electronic records.

There is a strong interdependence between this and other strategic projects. The electronic filing project requires that an EDMS base be present. Electronic authorizations and signatures will also play a role. Certification that the electronic original document is actually the signed and unaltered original document will be important. Technologies and processes to provide this assurance must be in place.

An ever-increasing number of Arizona courts at all levels are using imaging and electronic document management systems. Nearly all Superior Court Clerks and several clerks of larger limited jurisdiction courts have now implemented full-featured EDM. The lone clerk granted an exception by COT to implement a non-standard EDMS developed by another court was recently awarded funding to replace that system with the standard system in preparation for CMS implementation. Focus is switching to larger limited jurisdiction courts in cities that are adopting EDMS. Tucson City Court was the first municipal court to undertake a full OnBase implementation and to integrate AZTEC in scanning operations without using bar codes. Oro Valley and Flagstaff Municipal are following in Tucson’s footsteps.

There is clear need for the EDMS initiative as well as a receptive environment. Because storage and paper handling has reached a critical level, there is a realization of an urgent need in many courts. Both the public (especially the media) and Arizona Bar have expressed interest. A renewed vendor interest in the Arizona market has caused some additional visibility. With the introduction of digital signature legislation in Arizona, the policy environment is in place to support electronic documents.

There are, however, concerns about privacy. Once all court documents are electronic and easily disseminated over the Internet, thus making court documents generally accessible, it potentially removes the current “practical obscurity” of public court records. The Arizona Judicial Council has inaugurated a team to review the court’s public records policy to determine if additional rules or guidelines are required to protect citizen privacy in digital courts.

At this time, statewide models for electronic document management and electronic filing have not been formally selected, though Commission on Technology has accepted eight principles related to e-filing in the state. Various pilot implementations are in place, though these are limited in scope. Following the chief justice’s visit to COT in June 2008, the e-Court subcommittee will oversee rapid adoption of a statewide e-filing process in the Arizona. Arizona Code of Judicial Administration (ACJA) Sections 1-504 and 1-506 direct a uniform approach to document management and e-filing. E-Court is overseeing the business process needed to implement that uniform approach. With so many courts creating e-records and having the ability to share those with other courts and justice partners, emphasis is now shifting to protecting the integrity and availability.
of those records. Many courts employing imaging do not yet meet the requirements of ACJA 1-506 for electronic filing, having neither the funding nor technical know-how required. AOC will undertake, as a corollary project to e-filing, creation of a central repository for storing a second electronic copy of clerks’ accepted records.

As imaging processes mature, Clerks are becoming disillusioned because the promise of a reduced paper workload is not being realized. Clear direction is needed regarding removal of paper records where electronic reproductions of them exist, especially in limited jurisdiction courts, since they are not courts of record. A subteam of TAC is creating minimum technical requirements for enabling destruction of paper prior to the end of a record’s retention period.

Activities already completed for this multi-year project include:

- Establishing pilot projects to test the adopted standards and guidelines for electronic filing and electronic document management.
- Establishing electronic document management models for different types of courts.
- Leveraging State support and procurement by identifying a limited product set to be used statewide.
- Identifying potential short-and long-term funding resources to support the project.
- Enhancing the ACAP case management system (AZTEC) to recognize and manage electronic documents.

Activities that must still be undertaken include:

- Organizing resources - human, financial, expertise, etc., to support the completion of the initiative.
- Enabling full e-filing functionality in new CMSs under development.
- Detailing an electronic filing model that can be deployed throughout the Judicial Branch for all courts and all case types.
- Identifying and securing the funding necessary for construction, deployment, and ongoing maintenance.

In addition to executing the technical tasks, the Judicial Branch also needs to prepare the courts and the public for this paradigm shift from paper to electronic documents. Education of court staff, the legal community, and the public will be necessary. A more structured document identification standard will have to be created.
In Fiscal Year 2002, the Administrative Office of the Courts implemented imaging in selected pilot projects. The EDM system stored administrative records with relatively short (5-10 years) retention requirements. Such systems will not have to undergo the more rigorous strictures of the EDMS guidelines since long-term preservation is not required. This pilot was so successful that the AOC undertook the implementation of a statewide EDMS package. The AOC began implementing its own full-featured EDMS during 2004, as well. The Arizona Supreme Court is implementing the state-standard EDMS with help from the AOC.

Refer to the individual county court technology plans in Appendix D for more information on courts' plans for EDMS implementations and enhancements. The investment is considerable and the judiciary is proceeding with caution, but EDMS has become a “must have” rather than “nice to have” tool.
Electronic Filing or “e-filing” is a composite project that makes use of portions of other individual projects necessary to enable filing of documents and data into courts. e-Filing in courts stems from adoption of the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act (UETA) by Arizona (A.R.S. 44-7001) to facilitate and promote commerce and governmental transactions by validating and authorizing the use of electronic contracts, records, and signatures.

**PROJECT GOALS**

**ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT**
- Create a central repository for electronically submitted court filings, documents, and images accepted by clerks statewide.

**LITIGANT FILING**
- Create a Web-based service through which litigants (attorneys and pro per se) submit Arizona court case files online, thereby eliminating the need for physical paper handling.
- Demonstrate feasibility of a standard, court-provided interface by which litigants can submit filings using a common e-Filing Service Provider (EFSP) vendor.
- Speed adoption of a statewide e-filing system by implementing a vendor-developed:
Electronic filing manager (EFM) capable of supporting multiple jurisdictions and licensed/owned by the court and
Internet-based portal that supports both free-form pleading and form-based filings.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT FILING**

- Expand electronic filing beyond pilot projects in select courts to include records management systems and citation generating systems such as handheld devices, red light running traffic monitors, and photo radar systems.

**CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS**

- Balance cost/benefit of continuing to enhance AZTEC’s online interfaces for e-filing as next-generation case management systems near completion.
- Ensure next-generation case management systems support e-filing out of the box.

**PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008**

**ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT**

- Continued work to open the ACAP case management system (AZTEC) to interface to an electronic document management system in preparation for e-filing initiatives.
- Completed project to integrate Division One case management system with an electronic document management system. Re-initiated planning preparations with new Supreme Court Clerk and staff.

**LITIGANT FILING**

- Developed Arizona Court eFiling (ACE) pilot project application for deployment within the Supreme Court Clerk’s Office. The product was initially set up to submit non-case-initiating criminal case filings. Set target date for production release in September 2008.
- Created plan to expand ACE’s use to include the Court of Appeals, Division One, by early Spring 2009.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT FILING**

- Documented the ITD/CSD, vendor, law enforcement agency, and court workflow of the e-Citation implementation process. Documentation was made available online via the Court’s Internet website.
• Successfully integrated several Arizona Department of Public Safety and local law enforcement e-citation handheld, and mobile and fixed photo enforcement systems with the AZTEC case management system (limited jurisdiction courts). By fiscal year end, AZTEC had received tens of thousands of e-citations.

• Continued to improve standard message interface to be used by vendor-provided handheld device, red light running traffic monitor, and photo radar systems. This work will streamline the process for future technology implementations throughout the state.

CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

• Signed contract and embarked on enhancements for a new, vendor-developed, general jurisdiction case management system that includes e-filing interfaces to simplify the process of delivering litigant e-filing services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Electronic filing focuses on exchanging case file data, documents, and images, including appropriate and validated indexing information, with case management and other court-critical information systems. The Electronic Document Management (EDM) initiative seeks to supplement these court-critical applications, with document and image storage support. EDM focuses on the processes and the environment for electronic document creation, storage, management, retrieval, and archiving. Courts currently use imaging systems to digitize documents received on paper. The digitizing process today typically requires staff to manually feed documents into imaging systems (scanners). The most effective and efficient method over the long term is to implement electronic filing and thus remove the need to manually digitize information. Rules and guidelines for electronic filing are being examined by the Commission on Technology’s e-Court Subcommittee. The COT is specifically charged with approving pilot implementations of Rule 124, which permits electronic filing, but the e-Court Subcommittee wants to amend Rule 124 to describe allowed production implementations of e-filing in the near future.
The historical strategy has been to:

- Assist courts in developing alternatives to their records storage and paper case file routing/tracking challenges.
- Examine and apply the lessons learned from electronic filing pilots and projects to a unified, statewide approach.
- Keep current with electronic filing research and evaluate what is successful nationally.
- Continue to work with the national effort to develop common e-filing message schemas based on Global Justice XML Data Dictionary (GJXDD), Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards (OASIS) LegalXML, and National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) specifications.
- Continue to work with the OXCI national group to develop XML processing interfaces to case management systems.

The Arizona Supreme Court, Administrative Office of the Courts, is a member of the OASIS group and has been supporting their efforts towards standardization in the use of XML for court filings nationwide. ACJA § 1-506 directs the courts to embrace Extensible Markup Language (XML) as well as portable document format (.pdf) for electronic filing submissions.

The goals of electronic filing are to:

- Increase the effectiveness of the Court and criminal justice system;
- Reduce costs;
- Improve service to the public;
- Study, coordinate, and plan the transfer of case records electronically to, from, and between courts;
- Craft a unified statewide model for electronic filing; and
- Promote the transition to full production of pilots in different courts to the eventual statewide model.

Historically, there are some long-running pilot and experimental projects in Arizona courts for electronic filing. They include:

- Pima County Consolidated Justice Courts: Small Claims electronic filing.
- Arizona Court of Appeals - Division Two - Electronic Document Management project, electronic transfer of court records on appeals from various superior courts, and litigant e-filing (“e-filer”).
- Maricopa County Superior Court’s effort to allow multiple filers to write data into their EDMS and CMS via a standard XML interface.
Central Phoenix Justice Court’s case management system interface for mass filing of forcible detainer cases.

The introduction of digital signature legislation in Arizona paved the way for an environment to support electronic filing of documents. The courts adopted Rule 124 in the Year 2000 to provide for electronic filing. COT also approved the standards-based electronic transfer of records on appeal from superior courts to appellate courts.

The e-Court Subcommittee has submitted and COT has ratified a set of general principles to govern eventual solutions.

1. Approach: Courts should create a competitive, multi-provider environment under which any provider who meets the certification criteria will be able to file.
2. Court users should be presented with a common look and feel no matter the jurisdiction. No litigant will have to operate multiple systems to file in various courts in the state.
3. Courts are too resource constrained to provide extensive technical support themselves for filing attorneys and the public.
4. For automated filing, only one interface will exist per case management system. Data must be exchanged bi-directionally between case management and e-filing systems.
5. The path to success involves general consistency with national standards and cooperation between courts and private sector ventures.
6. Privacy and access issues must be adequately addressed.
7. While the conceptual model for e-filing includes criminal cases, the courts, not vendors, are responsible for criminal justice integration activities.

Several of these principles are being tested in the ACE e-Filing Pilot Project being undertaken for criminal case files destined for the Supreme Court.

In June 2008, Chief Justice Ruth McGregor challenged COT to craft a statewide model for electronic filing on an accelerated timetable that would respond to four overarching directives (elaborated below). The time is right for implementing e-filing because the activities associated with the electronic filing value chain are coming to fruition after years of effort:

- Completing implementation of EDMS in appellate and superior courts.
- Completing implementation of a development, test, and production message broker, i.e., Enterprise Service Bus.
- Completing the creation of a common XML message for electronic filing for all court levels and transaction types.
Completing the development of production-grade, message broker-supported applications that facilitate the placing and retrieving of case file and citation data, documents, and images into and out of the Enterprise Service Bus environment.

Identifying potential short- and long-term funding resources to support the project.

Developing an electronic filing business model that can be deployed throughout the Judicial Branch.

Converting hardcopy court forms into their online equivalents, preceded by court form conversions from Corel WordPerfect format to Microsoft Word format.

Researching and beginning the required changes to filing-related rules in Arizona courts.

Preparing the courts and the public for a paradigm shift from physical paper to electronic document filings.

Creating “cookbooks” that communicate to business partners what is needed to effectively engage in electronic filing with the courts.

In addition to various technical tasks, court staff, the legal community and the public are becoming more comfortable with living in an electronic world. Standards for things like structured document identification for use by the legal community are beginning to emerge.

As electronic document management systems and electronic filing become more common across the state, the judiciary will create a central filing index and access site for all electronic court documents using the Enterprise Service Bus currently under construction. Creation of a public filing “front door,” a single electronic filing repository, in lieu of individual court sites, supports a unified, statewide approach to e-filing; creates ease of access for the public to court case file documents; and improves costs, efficiency, and data security.

**ACE e-Filing Pilot Project Details**

To foster a unified approach to statewide e-filing in the courts and to promote objectives embodied in e-Court’s Principle Two (common look-and-feel), the appellate courts have worked cooperatively with Maricopa Superior Court in adapting the methods contained in the Maricopa e-filing system to the ACE e-Filing application. The focus of the pilot project is subsequent criminal case filings from the Attorney General’s Office. As such, the Supreme Court is leading this initiative. The ACE e-Filing application, which consists principally of an Electronic Filing Manager (EFM), is being constructed to support multiple vendors, known as Electronic Filing Service Providers (EFSPs). Multiple EFSPs have been envisioned to be the provider of the majority, if not all, of the customer-facing e-filing services (e-Court’s Principle One – multi-provider environment).
The ACE pilot project environment is principally composed of four major subsystems: 1) the user interface; 2) the ACE e-Filing application, which includes the EFM; 3) the Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) coupled with ESB software integration modules and complementary AOC ITD Infrastructure; and 4) the Appellamation Case Management System (CMS). For perspective, the following diagram illustrates the relationships among these subsystems:

Four user interface types are depicted in the diagram: 1) Web “Thin” Client; 2) Message Broker “Thick” Client; 3) System-to-System; and 4) Data Acquisition Systems. The ACE pilot project exploits the Web “Thin” Client interface, wherein the Web client is delivered from a Web server and runs within the user’s Web browser software. The Web client facilitates the exchange of case file information from the user to the target court. The other configurations are variations of “thick” client interfaces, i.e., remote systems that operate their own software to exchange case file information with target courts.

The inclusion of an EFSP(s) will be considered in subsequent ACE development phases. This product, however, may be absorbed by the new, statewide e-filing initiative championed by the chief justice.
STATEWIDE E-FILING PROJECT DETAILS

In the spring of 2008, the Arizona Judicial Council and Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court, recognizing the opportunities and need for the next evolutionary step in court automation, directed the Administrative Office of the Courts to initiate a project to develop a statewide electronic case filing system and implement a pilot court by the second quarter of 2009. Supreme Court Chief Justice, Ruth McGregor, elaborated four key directives to guide this important initiative:

1. The Branch must not create a fragmented system that leaves some courts behind due to their location or volume.
2. e-Filing must apply to all types of cases in the state, including those for which no filing fees exist.
3. Arizona must use a court-powered and court-managed system. No vendor must own or control court documents.
4. The solution chosen must be a first-class system, capable of supplying all the services that court users need, including case initiation and service of process.

In response, the Arizona Judiciary intends to construct an Arizona Court Filing Service which will provide citizens of Arizona and clients of the courts a single portal with which to conduct business, no matter the court or type of case. This portal will allow attorneys and parties to cases in the courts to rapidly access and file information pertinent to those cases in any court in a seamless, easy to understand way.

The Judiciary has made significant investments in the automation of the courts. These investments lay a significant foundation for the envisioned electronic filing service. However, several key components are necessary to complete and integrate the technologies into a cohesive and reliable system. The court is, therefore, seeking to develop a partnership with a company having proven electronic filing experience to construct, deploy, and operate a public facing Internet electronic filing portal that integrates with court automation systems and comports with the directives of the Arizona Chief Justice.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

**PROJECT GOALS**

- Comply with Chapter 192, Laws 2007, amending A.R.S. § 12-283 to require counties to provide criminal case minute entries online by January 1, 2010.
- Create the capability to electronically docket, distribute, and post minute entries online using a standard system or process throughout the State.
- Address support issues with current MEEDS system used by several superior court clerks.

**PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008**

- Worked with vendor of new general jurisdiction case management system to ensure electronic minute entry/distribution requirements in functional matrix were addressed.
- A standard minute entry and distribution system using the OnBase EDMS platform proposed by eleven clerks was placed on hold following confirmation that the selected GJ CMS contained required functionality.
Population and case filing growth without concomitant staff growth causes clerks of superior court to continually pursue ways to work more efficiently. Costs associated with postage, paper, toner, and human resources continue to increase while budgets do not. Courtroom clerks are in court handling the burgeoning number of hearings and can’t get enough time at their desks to compose the minute entries that reflect actions in the courtroom. The public expects more court information to be made available in a more timely fashion.

Stakeholders in the court system desire to receive their information sooner. Parties, witnesses, and victims deserve timely, accurate information. Enabling victims of crimes to receive email notification of their criminal case information helps to address their needs and rights. More modern and efficient processing and distribution of minute entries, addressed in a consolidated and standardized way, would save taxpayer dollars and provide more open government in the criminal area of the court system.

Technology could easily reduce or even eliminate the highly manual business processes of minute entry and distribution in clerks’ offices by providing the capability to electronically docket, distribute, and post online minute entries. Automation provides cost savings associated with paper, postage, and expensive toner cartridges, too. Telephone calls are reduced as related agencies and the public obtains the needed information online. Eliminating the time needed to print, digitally scan, docket, copy, and mail minute entries by “snail mail” shortens the turnaround time for getting notice of court actions to the intended recipients. Courts would benefit greatly from receiving documents by e-filing, yet rural clerks have not yet streamlined back-office processes sufficiently for doing business electronically.

With all this in mind, clerks of the superior court in Gila, Pinal, Mohave, and Yuma counties made a foray into automation of minute distribution using a product called MEEDs, installed and maintained by a small business. Other rural superior court clerks previously considered the solution but questioned the long-term viability of the company. Also, the MEEDs solution did not have the capability to post minute entries to the Web. Clerks resigned themselves to wait for the new general jurisdiction CMS to automate the function. In the meantime, the state-standard OnBase EDMS was
adopted by 11 of the 13 rural clerks to produce and manage their digital images. With some enhancements, the OnBase system could be made to perform minute entry using an electronic form populated by a keystroke once a unique value is entered. Because it is integrated with AZTEC, OnBase could also consult the CMS to locate additional values and populate key fields. The estimated cost of a joint venture to develop OnBase minute entry as proposed by the clerks was $333,000.00, roughly $30K per clerk’s office.

Following selection of a vendor case management system at the very end of Fiscal Year 2007 and completion of due diligence to compare the OnBase solution to the technical capabilities of the vendor CMS solution, the funding of the OnBase solution was placed on hold to prevent development of redundant solutions. The decision will be re-evaluated following implementation of the GJ CMS in the two pilot courts early in FY 2008.

Due diligence efforts determined that the vendor CMS would fully interface with clerks’ OnBase systems, enabling minute entries to be fully automated without need for scanning or generation of paper. Minute entry forms would be viewable or updatable based on security settings contained in the CMS. This functionality will be proven in the two pilot court implementations.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Identify the appropriate technologies to provide and assure secure access to the Arizona Judicial Information Network (AJIN).
- Identify the appropriate technologies to provide authentication and verification for electronic documents and transactions.
- Undertake a study of the existing statutes and court rules related to signatures and make recommendations for changes to support appropriate use of new technologies.
- Form a statewide committee of business and technology court personnel to develop recommendations for electronic signatures for internal court documents.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

- The Clerk of the Superior Court in Maricopa County has implemented and enhanced a SmartWarrant application that supplies electronic images of warrants and quashes, integrated with the clerk's internal e-filing application, in an electronic form using ICJIS as the engine for distribution to justice partner agencies.
- Decisions regarding adoption of a comprehensive e-signature strategy continued to be deferred to the e-Court Subcommittee due to the high cost of a statewide solution and sense of relatively limited scope for such a solution. It is anticipated that the statewide e-filing solution will eventually address the signature issue in a practical way.
As courts extend their networks, interacting with law enforcement and other agencies, it becomes necessary to assure that information sources can be validated. Further, courts must include some mechanism on electronic documents to provide for the function performed by signatures in the paper world. Key concepts are the same in both paradigms: document integrity, authenticity, and non-repudiation.

Passwords, tokens, and encryption are designed to secure access to networks, systems, and information. Electronic signatures on an electronic document, on the other hand, are designed to indicate that a document has been signed by the person who purported to have signed it. Digital signatures, which are a type of electronic signature, may also have a feature that can detect whether the original content of a message or document has been altered. Digital signatures based on PKI can serve both functions. The State of Arizona is embracing PKI (public key infrastructure) technology for digitally signing documents submitted to or by the state, using VeriSign, Inc. as its approved certificate authority. This technology can be used by access control systems to verify identity and affix an electronic signature to an electronic document. It also provides for encryption of that document. The price per certificate remains high, however, even for non-proprietary solutions other than VeriSign.

The traditional ID and password can now be supplemented by biometric authentication methods like fingerprints, voiceprints, and retinal scans. For access, experts often note that authentication should consist of both something you have (a fingerprint, a secure ID token) and something you know (a password). Biometrics takes that approach one step farther by requiring something you are.
Courts are working closely with state and local law enforcement, local counties, and other state government agencies on selecting the appropriate technologies for both access and signatures. A proliferation of different accesses, passwords, and technologies creates confusion and becomes unmanageable for the ordinary user who requires access to multiple systems. Courts also desire to keep the cost of electronic filing as low as possible to prevent barriers to its use, especially for pro se litigants, while maintaining integrity, authenticity, and non-repudiation.

To that end, TAC re-reviewed digital signature technology using PKI in 2006. Their previous conclusions were reaffirmed -- that the business need and volume are still not significant enough to warrant the expense of implementing a complete digital signature infrastructure like PKI. For internally generated and signed documents of a routine nature, system access and security along with either a typed or imaged signature remain sufficient for the majority of courts nationally who are doing electronic signatures. The Superior Court in Maricopa County has issued administrative orders in support of e-filing pilot projects allowing the “/s/” designation and a typed signature with valid system ID and password. The court is also able to use server-side certificates to “sign” documents being issued for use outside the court. It is also anticipated that the e-Court Subcommittee will address the signature issue as a barrier to statewide e-filing. TAC recommended that this be revisited as the use of such signatures increases; they will periodically evaluate alternative approaches and research practices used in other state and federal courts.

An integration project where law enforcement issues electronic citations is well underway in many jurisdictions around the state. Going forward, the judiciary needs to address both the defendant’s and the officer’s signature. A citizen cannot be expected to have a digital certificate available during a traffic stop; so alternative signatures such as biometric or “facsimile” signatures are more likely to be used. The officer’s ID and password verification is considered sufficient electronic signature for transmitting electronic citations to the court. Officers print a record of the stop and provide that to the citizen for reference. The court is also required to print the electronic citation on demand. SmartPrint, a statewide solution for doing so has been implemented at the AOC.

On another front, several superior courts wish to implement electronic signatures for minute entries being distributed electronically. Minute entries can contain orders of the court and as such are documents that must be signed by the judge and maintained as a record in the case. With the implementation of electronic document management systems (EDMS), courts wish to file electronically prepared documents directly into the EDMS without first printing, signing, and then imaging that document.
The Arizona Supreme Court has previously ruled (in 1943) that “The signature may be written by hand, or printed, or stamped, or typewritten, or engraved, or photographed, or cut from one instrument and attached to another” in a case involving whether facsimile signatures of the treasurer on bonds were valid. It reaffirmed in CV-06-0280-SA that intention of authentication carries more legal weight than the presence of a name impressed upon paper. The recent opinion also reaffirmed the authority of Rule 124, which states, “[a]n electronically filed document constitutes the filing of the original written and signed paper under the rules governing practice and procedure in the courts of this state [emphasis added].”

Inside the court system, the issue is much more one of procedure than of technology. That may be reversed when contemplating materials passing from outside the court system to inside or vice versa. Effort is focusing on the easier task of getting electronic filings accepted within the judiciary before switching to the harder task of getting them accepted outside the judiciary.
PROJECT GOALS

Research, justify, and adopt additional enterprise standards as required to support leveraged development and development environments.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

• Continued refinement of development guidelines for ancillary and “bolt-on” core modules.

• Continued development and implementation of the enterprise architecture standards for two Enterprise Application Development Projects (JOLTSaz and Tempe CMS). Several other projects not classified as “enterprise” were also created using the enterprise architecture standards.

• Worked closely with selected vendor, AmCad Inc., in developing GJ CMS architecture.

• Implemented Agile project management technique “SCRUM” within AOC ITD. Continued evolution in design and implementation of the technique.

• Completed initial design of the architecture for the enterprise service bus (ESB) and began implementation activities.
Cooperative development and resource leveraging have become key strategies in automation development for courts. To facilitate those joint efforts, some standards have been adopted statewide.

The Arizona courts have identified a core set of applications that are maintained and supported at the State level. These include AZTEC, JOLTS, APETS, Appellamation, and other products supported by third-party vendors, such as Jury+ and OnBase (refer to ACJA § 1-501). These software applications are supported centrally and changes are coordinated.

Some courts have technical staff to develop modules that address the special needs of a court. These modules are generally interfaced to the core applications. Often when other courts see these applications, they wish to implement the functionality, too. However, when new releases of the core applications are provided, many times there has been difficulty with compatibility of the locally developed modules and the new release.

To avoid or mitigate the difficulty, the courts have adopted a set of guidelines. Basically, if a local module is developed within the enterprise architecture and is coordinated with the application support staff at the State, vendor, or shared support level, core release developers will make efforts to protect those interfaces. They will, at a minimum, coordinate with technical staff for the change requirements, development and testing that is necessary for the local module to function in the new release's environment.

Adopting an IT enterprise architecture, although intuitively a positive organizational direction, is often difficult. Standards are many times perceived as coming at the expense of freedom. However, with today’s fast-paced technology demands, architecture is a strategic necessity. A mature IT enterprise must have the discipline to adopt and follow a consistent set of strategies, reference models and exchange capabilities.
Per Gartner, the strategic goal of enterprise architecture is to position the entity to leverage technology in support of the business strategy and make technology the proactive enabler of an agile, responsive enterprise that can react in real time to changes. Enterprise architecture will provide standardization and elimination of redundancy and complexity across the Arizona Judicial Branch.

The cross-jurisdictional nature of criminal justice activities supports adopting common architectures to facilitate integration.

The Judicial Branch must avoid being what Gartner Group describes as a “typical unarchitected e-government” where “multiple sets of customer channels, interfaces and systems are independently developed … and require duplicative infrastructure and forced disparate access experiences for constituents.”

There is a lower cost to buy and support a limited set of products and standards; the judiciary can leverage both volume discount buying and maintain a less complex environment.

The standards, protocols, and products listed are prescribed for core, leveraged activities and applications among the courts statewide. Where there are unique local undertakings that cannot be leveraged, a court is free to go beyond the standards set. If sharable modules related to core applications are developed, then the standards should be followed. Non-standard products and applications are a challenge to support and can be a security concern. The “Distributed Component (Bolt-on) Module” documents the approaches to development of local, leveraged and standardized modules. To be sharable, supported in the statewide framework, or part of core-standardized applications, modules will be developed to the Enterprise Architecture Standards of the Arizona Judicial Branch.

Since the table of Enterprise Architecture Standards was approved by COT there have been few exception requests. Exception requests continue to focus on adoption of EDMS products that are already owned or part of a local entity’s system. The table of EA standards, “Enterprise Architecture for the Judicial Branch,” adopted through Arizona Code of Judicial Administration §1-505, was thoroughly reviewed, updated, and slightly expanded by TAC during FY08 then approved by COT. There were no changes to the “Distributed Component Development Matrix,” which is the guideline for the development of “bolt-on,” ancillary software modules. The standards can be found on the Commission’s web site at [http://www.supreme.state.az.us/cot/Documents/EAS/EAS.htm](http://www.supreme.state.az.us/cot/Documents/EAS/EAS.htm).
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

• Take an enterprise approach to directory service and managing user information, enabling integration across applications and single signon.

• Upgrade the courts’ mail system to Exchange 2007.

• Continue to expand the Arizona Judicial Information Network (AJIN) Intranet service offering to support better communications and efficiency and to reduce paper.

• Continue to use virtual server software to improve physical server utilization in the production environment.

• Educate court staff about the AJIN and the Intranet at existing court educational forums.

• Develop marketing and educational materials for court staff who will be accessing the Judicial Intranet.

• Continue to increase the capacity of AJIN in all counties and courts to meet present and future communication requirements.

• Collaborate with the State-level effort to develop a unified Arizona data communications network capable of meeting the needs of all Arizona state agencies.

• Include Adult Probation sites throughout the State in AJIN.
• Develop policies, standards, and guidelines for a variety of infrastructure products and processes related to coordinating operations activity and ensuring security.

**PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008**

• Conducted “IT’s Your Business” classes for the AOC. Topics included storage, viruses, Trojans, and spyware.

• Constructed an Exchange 2007 environment in the new Computer Center.

• Implemented Instant Messaging (IM) using Microsoft Office Communicator 2007. Customers can now IM across the state and with outside groups using a special secure connection to MSN, Yahoo, or AOL IM services.

• Established a virtual server environment; currently 34 virtual servers are used for production, testing, and development.

• Implemented Tivoli Monitoring for all servers and specific applications, replacing multiple systems and creating one central location to monitor all servers and applications. Reduced training and monitoring time.


• Implemented R-Directory and MyPassword software packages. Users can access R-directory to locate personnel and update their own profile. With MyPassword, authenticated users can change and reset their own password without contacting the Support Center.

---

**SNAPSHOT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

INFRASTRUCTURE MAINTENANCE

Infrastructure Maintenance is part of the overall shared infrastructure and shared services required to support the basic court operations and related programs on a day-to-day basis. Along with “Automation Training and Support” (PC deployment, field support, help desk), it represents the foundation of the Judicial Branch’s automation efforts. The key components include shared communications network and associated services (e-mail, business process workflow, information access), data center, database administration, security, and disaster recovery. Infrastructure Maintenance primarily involves on-going maintenance and support, though various projects to upgrade servers and network bandwidth will continue. Creation of a new central data center is a separate project.

The Arizona Judicial Information Network (AJIN) has been established as the means by which court data can be exchanged within and between counties and State-level agencies. As statewide strategic applications have been deployed, the capacity needs placed upon AJIN have risen considerably. Thus, additional investment must continue to be made in AJIN as long as it is to be the Judicial Branch’s network. Refer to the appendices for an identification of the servers and software (both desktop and server-based applications and server operating systems) that make up AJIN.

Major goals over the next several years include continuing to increase network security, adding capacity in those areas now experiencing less than needed service, and adding Adult Probation sites throughout the state.

AJIN is 100 percent TCP/IP. Only a few courts in the state are not AJIN connected. During the 2008 fiscal year, the uptime of operations units during normal operating hours was above 99 percent. This included network access as well as access to information on the many servers supported by the Operations group.
JUDICIAL INTRANET

As a sub-project of AJIN, the Judicial Intranet has established an information exchange and dissemination capability throughout the courts in Arizona. The Judiciary leverages Internet technology to distribute information and documents to courts and provide expanded communication capabilities. The Administrative Office of the Court staffs the Webmaster position to manage a Web server. The various projects, programs and divisions, as needed, maintain information contained on the various Judicial Intranet pages. Continued training of staff in Web use and Web page publishing remains a goal.

The business goals to be met by implementing the Judicial Intranet for the courts are:

- Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions.
- Improve efficiency and effectiveness in communications among courts and between courts and other justice and law-enforcement agencies.

The benefits that accrue to the courts through implementation are the following:

- Reduced cost by reducing the paper and postage costs of intra-court communications.
- Improved responsiveness and productivity of court staff.
- Improved rural court productivity by providing the same level of technology afforded the large metropolitan courts.
- Improved quality of support staff customer service.

ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS

The Judiciary provides e-mail and Internet connectivity to all courts on the Arizona Judicial Information Network and to the justice community at large through the Internet. The implementation of e-mail has been phased.

The business goals met by implementing an e-mail solution in the courts are:

- Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions.
- Encourage projects that utilize technology to increase accessibility to the courts, improve court efficiency, and improve court management.
- Improve efficiency and effectiveness in courts’ communications among themselves and with other justice and law-enforcement agencies.
- Establish technical standards that shall be used in all court automation projects, including communication standards.
The benefits that accrued to the courts upon implementation were the following:

- Reduced cost by reducing the paper and postage costs of intra-court communications.
- Improved rural court productivity by providing the same level of technology afforded the large metropolitan courts.
- Improved customer service by providing higher quality of data and case management and greater public access to information.
- Improved responsiveness and productivity of court staff.
- Increased effectiveness of support by automating tracking, distribution, and other routine tasks.
- Reduced risks in and complexity of systems development by reducing the number of systems and protocols needing support.
- Reduced training and support resources required by standardizing the applications software deployed.

**SECURITY AND DISASTER RECOVERY**

Reliability and security of the Arizona Judicial Information Network (AJIN) is of primary importance. As a result, several statewide efforts are underway to address the maintenance and security of AJIN.

Firewalls and security monitoring equipment are the key technologies to protect the network. Every extended connection to AJIN is protected by a firewall and monitoring probes. These devices prevent attacks from the Internet and outside agencies, and also protect our internal IP addresses from the outside sites visited by AJIN users.

Guidelines to govern security system management have been formulated. Policies, standards and/or guidelines are developed for all to follow. The key to a successful implementation is communication among the various technical groups throughout the state.

The AOC standard for remote access is Virtual Private Networking (VPN). This technology enables telecommuters secure access e-mail and applications via the Internet. Many AOC staff and court personnel also now use a highly secure extranet client to access AJIN.

AJIN is a very reliable network today. The necessary firewalls, redundancy, and systems management documentation have resulted in high network availability for the users throughout the State.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

This project implements a web solution (Jury+ Web Solution) provided by Jury Systems Incorporated (JSI) to offer online jury questionnaire responses, updates, postponements, and excuse from service for each participating court. A centralized server environment at the AOC will support the Jury+ Web Solution software. Each participating court will access the Jury+ Web Solution software using a standard web browser. This will allow the courts to accept connections from potential users, making it easier for jurors to interact with courts.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

- The project to implement a web solution (Jury+ Web Solution) using a centralized server environment was completed. The software was installed by JSI and their partner, Hershey Systems, on the internal server at the AOC. An online questionnaire was developed for each court and each court’s system was configured to accept the online responses, updates, postponements, and excuses.
- The Administrative Office of the Courts contracted with JSI for an additional year’s support of the new Web Solutions component of the Jury+ jury management software.
In 1995, the AOC purchased JSI’s Jury+ software for the jury commissioners in all counties except Maricopa County. Maricopa County chose to purchase their own jury software from another vendor. The Jury+ software is still in use by these original counties. As a result, Jury+ "Next Generation" was certified as the migration path for those superior courts using Jury+ software. As all current Jury+ users are committed to that migration path, they were able to leverage their combined buying power to obtain a discount in software license fees from the vendor over the years. All of these superior courts have upgraded their Jury+ software to the “Next Generation” Windows version.

The Commission on Technology has determined that courts should continue to focus on "front-office" applications, that is, applications that directly interact with the customer the public and other justice agencies. This is particularly true for jury processing, where the courts must make it easier and more convenient for potential jurors to interact with them. Jury commissioners have migrated to application software that is capable of such interactions.

In FY 2007 The Administrative Office of the Courts purchased the new Web Solutions component of the Jury+ jury management software for the 13 superior courts that did not already have this feature. The Web Solutions component allows jurors in these counties to complete their juror questionnaire online. Jurors are also able to update their personal information, answer qualifying questions, and seek a postponement over the Internet.

Throughout FY 2008, JSI and their subcontractor, Hershey Systems, carried out implementation of the Web Solutions component, in cooperation with the AOC. The project is now completed.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Continue to maintain existing virtual self-service center forms available to the public and develop new ones required by court rule or statute, especially high usage items and those that are interactive.
- Sustain the support, training, and marketing efforts for court forms. Involve limited jurisdiction courts in the compilation/development effort.
- Standardize forms data to reduce duplicate efforts in providing court forms to the public and prepare for statewide e-filing.
- Create a single governance structure over content of forms for court users.
- Expand implementation of online payment in preparation for initiating cases via submittal of forms.
- Investigate vendor service offerings to develop electronically filed forms in conjunction with statewide e-filing effort.
**PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008**

- Continued web payment for traffic citation fines in selected courts through the FARE project.
- Began analysis of forms from variety of LJ courts submitted by presiding justices of the peace to compare in attempt to reduce to set of standard data by subject area.
- Discussed appropriate governance over forms standardization effort as a whole.
- Posted Spanish versions of Legal Advice-Legal Information Question and Response Handbook and Signage to Internet/intranet.
- Issued administrative order adopting Garnishment Forms and posted forms to the intranet.
- Presented information on new garnishment forms at judicial training for justices of the peace.
- Updated the Transfer of Real Property (No Right of Survivorship) forms to comply with changes to ARS 14-3971.
- Updated Adult Name Change forms and posted to intranet for courts' use statewide.
- Updated Personal Information Redaction Affidavits (consistent with legislative changes to ARS 11-483, 11-484, 16-153 and 28-454).
- Updated Order of Protection and Emergency Order of Protection as directed by Administrative Directive #2007-03.
- ITD and CSD staff met with representatives from AZ Foundation for Legal Services and Education and representatives from Community Legal Services, Inc. to discuss National Public Automated Documents Online (NPADO) and document assembly to examine mutually consistent goals, areas to eliminate duplication of efforts, and a means to increase services to pro se litigants.
- ITD staff met with a vendor to examine business model as a means to increase services to pro se litigants.
- Added links to sites providing forms for Coconino, Maricopa, Pima and Yavapai counties to the Self-Service Forms site. These links direct the user to superior, justice court, and municipal court online forms.
- Corrected Garnishment of Earnings Form 2.
Goal 1-E of “Good to Great” addresses self-represented litigants. For many people, the cost of legal representation has become prohibitive, as evidenced by the ever-increasing number of self-represented litigants appearing before the courts. Arizona courts are taking steps to provide meaningful assistance to the self-represented so that they are not denied justice because they lack the benefit of legal counsel. Among those steps are:

- Develop and adopt Supreme Court Guidelines defining legal assistance, as distinguished from legal advice, so that judicial staff can provide appropriate legal assistance.
- Expand the Judicial Branch’s self-service center web site to include forms, instructions, and other information helpful to those who appear unrepresented in the limited jurisdiction and superior courts.
- Develop simple, easy to use, web-based, interactive forms needed for dissolution and other domestic-relations-related cases, small claims, forcible detainer, and probate cases.
- Encourage the establishment of self-service centers in courts and encourage the expansion of pro-bono legal representation by members of the State Bar.
- Development of the Web Portal needed to provide a convenient and unified access point to court information statewide.
- Continued development of the Central Repository as the intended source for public inquiry on other topics.
FORM DATA STANDARDIZATION PROJECT

COT’s e-Court subcommittee identified standardized forms for court users, mostly self-represented litigants, as a top project at the limited jurisdiction level. Next to citations written by law enforcement officers, litigant forms are the most common filing at a level of court which processes 93 percent of cases in the state. Standardizing those forms across jurisdictions would allow a single electronic location to serve the public and enable a more interactive experience that promotes the chief justice’s goal of better serving self-represented litigants. With over 82 justice courts and 83 municipal courts each publishing local forms today, the task is daunting in scope, but manageable when broken into some discrete subprojects, as described below. The first step involves identifying that particular data necessary for each type of form that could be filed in any limited jurisdiction court action.

Internet technology has enabled “one-stop shopping” for pro se litigants. Court websites are able to point to an AOC website for a user form that downloads on the litigant’s local machine. That form is filled out locally, then printed and delivered, or eventually e-filed, to the appropriate court. The current proliferation of forms covering the same basic subject areas in individual courts greatly complicates achievement of the goal.

In that context, the limited jurisdiction subteam of COT’s e-Court subcommittee has taken the job of identifying standard data that must appear in any particular form by subject area in order to constitute a valid filing. Those subject areas include:

- **Generic** -- change of address, request for audio copy, motion to 
- **Generic Civil/Small Claims** -- application for deferral or waiver, petition in support of debtor’s examination, notice of dismissal/satisfaction of judgment, counterclaim, reply to counterclaim, affidavit and entry of default, petition and order for change of venue, subpoena, writ of restitution, writ of execution, civil motion to set aside judgment, motion to _, civil notice of appeal
- **Civil** -- civil notice of trial, civil summons, civil complaint, civil answer, civil request for hearing, civil subpoena, disclosure statement, motion to _, notice of appeal, counterclaim
- **Small Claims** -- small claims instructions, small claims summons, small claims complaint, small claims answer, transfer from small claims to civil, motion to _
- **Forcible Entry and Detainer** -- forcible detainer instructions, forcible detainer complaint, forcible detainer summons, forcible detainer answer, motion to _, notice of appeal
- **Garnishment** – 22 individual forms already approved by AJC and placed on self-service forms website
- **Feed Liens** -- including live stock complaint, live stock summons, live stock judgment, motion to _, notice of appeal
- **Impoundment**
- Municipal Court Civil Forms – motion to continue, motion to accelerate, motion to modify release conditions, motion to reduce/exonerate bond, motion to quash warrant, motion to set aside default judgment(s), motion for discovery, motion to continue OP/HI hearing (plaintiff), motion to continue OP/HI hearing (defendant).

The next step involves comparing the specific fields contained in representative forms from around the state to arrive at a core set of data. Two vendors (one for-profit and one not-for-profit) were approached about construction of the forms around that standard data, through no plans were made prior to the inclusion of standard forms within the scope of the statewide e-filing request for proposals.

**VIRTUAL SELF-SERVICE CENTER PROJECT**

The Court Services Division of the Administrative Office of the Courts has undertaken to provide a Web-enabled virtual self-service center for court forms. This began in support of the initiatives within *Justice for a Better Arizona: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona’s Courts 2002-2005* to make courts more accessible to the public. A major initiative for 2008-2010 is to expand these standard offerings and make the forms more interactive and user-friendly, hosted by the AOC.

The Web-based virtual service center provides a set of common court forms online and leads users through the process of filling out forms and printing them. This application is on the Judicial Branch’s Internet Webpage. Standard Web-based technologies are used for this project. The Adobe Acrobat product was selected as the development tool for the Child Support Calculator. Continued development will use Adobe Acrobat’s portable document format together with HTML forms to continue development of the virtual self-service center.

At such time as electronic filing is implemented in courts, the ability to submit these forms electronically to the court will be an enhancement. Form data will be converted to a stream similar to citation data for use by the case management system.

The central repository and related production data repository is key to a number of projects, public access among them. It is considered a shared infrastructure resource.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOAL

- Finalize the business requirements for a next generation of the Juvenile On-Line Tracking System in the State of Arizona (JOLTSaz).
- Complete detail design specifications and development for JOLTSaz.
- Conduct User Input Sessions and User Acceptance Testing for the new system.
- Integrate with AJACS (Rural) and AGAVE (Pima) case management systems.
- Complete detail design and development work of Statewide Identifier for both interim (JOLTS) and permanent (JOLTSaz) solutions.
- Begin conversion and implementation of JOLTSaz application rollout in rural counties in March 2009.
**PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FY 2008**

- TRAC (Timely Recorded Action Components) Overview:
  - Completed TRAC 1C (Infrastructure, Probation Supervision I).
  - Completed TRAC 2 (Juvenile Demographics, Diversion, Dependency and Detention Visitation).
  - TRAC 3 work in progress and on schedule for August 2008 delivery (Race and Ethnicity, Probation Supervision II, Juvenile Court Case Data, Victims, Financials, Court Calendar Admin, Detention, and analysis for Reports, Forms/Letters, and Security).
  - TRAC 4 work scheduled to begin in September 2008 with a January 2009 delivery date (Dependency Reports, Needs Assessment, Security, Reports, and Forms/Letters).

- Probation Automation/CMS Integration project plan completed and project work is underway.

- Detailed scope statement and high level design specifications were completed for the automated Statewide ID process (permanent solution to be delivered in JOLTSaz).

- Development complete for conversion of juvenile demographics functionality and testing in process.

- User input sessions were held in May 2008. This involved users from all rural counties and Pima. They were given the opportunity to take a first look at JOLTSaz and provide feedback. The feedback was very positive overall.

- Received JABG grant in the amount of $150,000.00 to complete the Statewide ID development, provide up-to-date training units, and pay for contractor salary.

- Continued to support JOLTSaz Detention Visitation module in production.

---

**SNAPSHOT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JOLTS is considered one of the most comprehensive juvenile court systems in the country. That said, there are limitations with this legacy system that need to be addressed. The JOLTS system is written in COBOL and includes multiple DB2 databases (one per county) that reside on an AS/400 platform. The original application was implemented over 25 years ago and has been modified numerous times to accommodate changes in the juvenile courts and changes in statute. The cost to maintain JOLTS, with its current technology and support limitations, continues to increase each year.

The new JOLTSaz system is being written with newer technology using VB.net and a SQL Server platform. JOLTSaz will have a single database instead of 14 separate databases to maintain. This will allow information to be shared among the State’s juvenile courts and, eventually, with other agencies.

Phase 1 of JOLTSaz will lay the foundation for building interfaces and the exchange of data required in the juvenile services and justice arenas. This includes an iterative approach to developing the full application focused on providing current functionality in JOLTS. This will be followed by a conversion of data from JOLTS in conjunction with a methodical, county-by-county rollout across the state.

Phase 1 is a step towards the recommendation for an increase in the efficiency of obtaining statewide data and places the new system in a key position to play a major role in sharing information. This goal will also be accomplished by the development and implementation of a statewide juvenile identification number that will be utilized by all counties (one common statewide number for each juvenile), and an interface with the Clerk of Courts’ case management systems, namely AJACS for the rural counties and AGAVE for Pima County.

Phase II will include enhancements to JOLTSaz and new functionality that was not in JOLTS and was not developed in Phase I. Phase II will be worked on in parallel with the statewide rollout, beginning in January 2009, and could continue beyond full statewide implementation in 2010.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS) provides interface capability between law enforcement, prosecution and the courts and includes the following additional features that build upon the initial version of ADRS:

1. Improved features for the web entry front-end to facilitate ease of entry and the accuracy and completeness of the data collected.
2. Increased charge disposition tracking capability, including the ability to capture and store reported dispositions that do not match with criminal history into an issue resolution queue.
3. Query/Response GJXDM XML integration between the courts’ and ADRS.
4. Workflow notification processing to support agency accountability in reporting, and timely processing of disposition information.
5. Local justice and law enforcement system integration which supports reduced data entry and consistency of information stored between systems.
6. Agency profile information that allows for notification delivery choices between email, fax and GJXDM XML system-to-system transactions.
7. Agency Report Card functionality, which will allow the State to make public statistical information about the completeness of agency disposition reporting, thereby empowering agency accountability.
PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

• Reviewed and approved all XML transactions.
• Completed the ADRS Design Specification for electronic transactions.
• Completed ADRS database changes and Web screen development.
• Designed and approved Interface requirements.
• Designed MQ queues and communication infrastructure.

SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS) is part of the strategic Integrated Justice plan for the State of Arizona. The goal of the system is to improve the reporting of disposition and sentencing information from the law enforcement and justice agencies throughout the State.

DPS recently implemented the initial version of ADRS (Phase II). Phase II of ADRS provides a web interface to Maricopa County justice agencies for entering disposition and sentence data, thereby eliminating their submittal of the yellow disposition forms to DPS for data entry. The initial agencies are the Maricopa County Attorney’s Office and the Maricopa County Clerk of the Superior Court.

The system interfaces with AZAFIS and the Arizona Computerized Criminal History System (ACCH). AZAFIS populates all of the fingerprint-based arrests in the State into ADRS. ADRS has a 2-way interface with ACCH. Dispositions added, updated, or deleted through ADRS will be updated in ACCH on a real-time basis. If updates occur directly in ACCH related to Arrest / Charge information, transactions will update ADRS to keep them synchronized.

Based on the Arizona Integrated Justice Strategic Plan developed by IBM, ACJC, and participating agencies, it is clearly defined that integration of Justice and Law Enforcement systems with ADRS is an essential component for improving the accuracy and completeness of Arizona’s criminal history information. The following benefits will be achieved through this integration effort:
• Increased accuracy and completeness of disposition reporting.
• Improved decision making by the justice and law enforcement practitioners through improved criminal history information.
• Increased accuracy and consistency of information being delivered throughout the criminal justice process, thereby improving the efficiency and effectiveness of all agencies.
• Increased accountability within the agencies for complete, accurate and timely reporting of disposition information.

To support the realization of these objectives, technical and business leaders for the Arizona Administrative Office of the Courts, Arizona DPS, ACJC, and other justice and law enforcement agencies identified priority features to be incorporated into the ADRS system. These features are described within the statement of work document under which the ADRS Phase II project is proceeding.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Increase data center floor space to support second wave of court automation.
- Improve backup power, environmental controls, and fire protection in new data center.
- Move all equipment in the current data center to the new data center with minimal downtime.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

- Completed the RFP, evaluated proposals, negotiated, and awarded a contract to construct a Computer Center within the State Courts Building in the second floor space formerly occupied by AOC Human Resources.
- Constructed a Computer Center over twice the size of the original computer room having redundant air conditioning isolated from the Courts building, redundant power, updated fire suppression system, 20-inch raised flooring, and an overhead cable system.
- Installed all network cabling and approximately 30 percent of the servers by June 2008.
### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This is a facilities project which will allow for the existing data center to move to new location within the AOC having sufficient floor space to support 40 new racks for the second wave of court automation. The new data center will have a self-contained HVAC and power system connected to a diesel-fueled emergency generator. This will eliminate equipment outages due to building power and building HVAC outages. The new data center equipment rack allowance will meet the current and near future needs of statewide operations. Without the new data center, the full implementation of the statewide general and limited jurisdiction case management systems as well as the new JOLTSaz system is not possible. Additional floor space, HVAC, and power related to long-term growth and redundancy had to be eliminated to keep costs at a reasonable level; funds must be allocated at a later date.

Demolition work began in early December 2007 and construction was completed in June 2008. Work is now underway to migrate existing equipment with as little disruption to users as possible. Full utilization is scheduled for November 2008, completing the project.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

**PROJECT GOALS**

- Identify the optimum replacement case management system (CMS) for the legacy application, AZTEC, at the general jurisdiction level.
- Perform a gap analysis of the functions in the vendor CMS and complete any enhancements required for statewide distribution.
- Prepare for implementation of the selected vendor CMS for rural general jurisdiction (GJ) courts.
- Complete the Pima AGAVE system in Pima Superior Court/Clerk of the Superior Court.
- Obtain a case financial system that will:
  - Handle the complex financial allocation algorithms that currently exist.
  - Provide program interfaces that permit integration with other systems.
  - Create an object-oriented structure so that the system and its components are usable for juvenile and adult probation financial activity.
PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

- Implemented AGAVE Financials (V1.5) and made considerable progress on CACTIS Replacement system (V2.0).
- Procured vendor CMS solution selected by COT and approved by AJC and ITAC.
- Completed contract negotiations between AmCad, Inc., and AOC; signed a detailed contract, including detailed project schedule, on August 8, 2007.
- Developed detailed budget followed closely through first full year of the project.
- Negotiated and made adjustments to the detailed project schedule, where necessary.
- Assembled GJ CMS Project Team from combined CSD and ITD staff as well as personnel outside the AOC.
- Renovated level one of the State Courts Building to become project offices.
- Completed GAP analysis and JAD sessions to define system development in November 2007.
- Received initial software and conversion plan delivery on February 29, 2008.
- Undertook initial system training and testing between March 3 and April 24, 2008.
- Received final test version of software on April 25, 2008.
- Began onsite training and configuration at Yuma Superior Court, the first pilot, June 16, 2008.

<p>| SNAPSHOT |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The existing case management system for general jurisdiction courts is AZTEC, which is implemented in 13 of the 15 superior courts. It is a generalized and parameterized system that provides functionality for both limited and general jurisdiction courts. In a strategic planning session for 2004-2006, the court considered the AZTEC system to be reaching the end of its life cycle because of aging technology. The product has become difficult to support, especially finding staff knowledgeable in the AZTEC development tools.
The differences in processing workflows and volumes are prompting the move to acquire separate systems for general jurisdiction courts and limited jurisdiction courts. This is especially desirable for the larger metropolitan courts. Rural courts, however, indicated a preference for continuing to use only one system for all levels of court in their counties.

The Commission on Technology considered and discussed several options available to the court to address replacing AZTEC. One option was to identify, via issuing a Request for Proposal, a commercially available court package. Funding was considered a major challenge, though. Another option involved harnessing the development work being done by individual courts for application statewide. Pima Superior Court had decided to build a case calendaring system using the .NET architecture. COT, Pima Superior Court, and the Pima Clerk’s Office jointly decided to expand development to create a case management system which would be a potential solution for general jurisdiction courts statewide. A separate project addresses the need to replace AZTEC in limited jurisdiction courts.

During FY 2007, the judiciary continued evaluating AGAVE, the Pima Superior CMS, for its suitability for replacing AZTEC in the general jurisdiction courts. COT members requested a study of the viability of vendor systems installed subsequent to the “build” decision being made in 2004. Having seen the results of that study, members re-evaluated the build, borrow, and buy options in early 2007. A functional matrix developed as part of the CMS transition effort was validated in Yavapai Superior Court then used as the basis for comparison for AGAVE, Maricopa’s iCIS CMS, and various vendor systems AOC staff had examined on a nationwide tour. Vendor systems consistently covered more of the functional matrix than homegrown systems with the added advantage of using outside labor to perform development and initial court implementations, helping address AOC’s manpower shortage. COT determined that vendor solutions were worth a closer look.

A Request for Proposal was generated within an extremely tight time frame and issued to the public on March 16, 2007. Responses were received and the RFP review process completed on May 30, 2007.

The RFP Review Committee made its recommendation to COT on June 7, 2007, and through executive session provided full disclosure of the various vendor options. In public session, COT members voted to recommend a buy option using the top-scoring vendor, AmCad, to the Arizona Judicial Council. At its meeting 11 days later, AJC subsequently ratified that approach and authorized AOC to enter into contract negotiations with the vendor. AJC also approved the budget to purchase and implement the vendor CMS in 13 superior courts. AGAVE development continues for implementation in Pima Superior Court and the Clerk’s Office.
In July 2007, AJC and ITAC approved funding and a budget for the life of the project based on the high level project schedule (August 2008 to December 2009).

Contract negotiations and the development of a comprehensive project schedule were completed by August 8, 2008, when AmCad’s CEO and the AOC Director signed the developed contract. Immediately following the signing ceremony, teams from the AOC and AmCad began to confer on system requirements and strategy for meeting the aggressive project timeline. Phase 1 of the contract involves successful completion of the two pilot courts, Yuma and La Paz Superior. Phase 2 covers the deployment of the remaining 11 rural superior courts using a support services arrangement to be renegotiated upon completion of Phase 1.

The project management team responsible for the research and business case activity in FY 2007 remained in place to begin system scope and development. The team assembled specialists from the AOC’s Court Services and Information Technology Divisions, and acquired from outside sources the remaining team members to begin the project, a total of 24 staff. The ground floor of the State Courts Building was renovated to create project offices.

Through a series of solicitations to the court community, AOC staff, and the project team, netting over 40 suggested titles for the new CMS, the General Jurisdiction Case Management System was officially given the name Arizona Judicial Automated Case System or AJACS. A logo and related name recognition process were put in place along with an update of the project website.

Throughout FY 2008, the CMS vendor, AmCad, Inc., worked closely with the AOC team to determine the ability to incorporate in the product all functional requirements contained in the validated matrix. Though some adjustments were made to the delivery dates of those functional requirements in the software application because of the complexity involved, by August 2008 all requirements will be incorporated into the application and those requirements not initially implemented in the pilot courts will be upgraded to complete their functionality. The application version from the August 2008 release will be then delivered to the first court to follow pilot implementation, Mohave Superior. The source code will be completed and, upon final payment, become the property of the AOC for future development.
The following table briefly outlines project activities and the timeline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITY</th>
<th>DATE(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GAP analysis and JAD sessions for system design</td>
<td>Mid-September through November 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration development</td>
<td>November 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of design documentation</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of internal/external design documents</td>
<td>January 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of initial data conversion documentation</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of data conversion documentation (after considerable rework by developers)</td>
<td>February 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of initial five external system interfaces</td>
<td>April 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and testing of interfaces</td>
<td>April 2008 to pilot implementations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of AOC technical staff and pilot courts representatives</td>
<td>March 3, 2008 to April 24, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application testing</td>
<td>March 10, 2008 through pilot court implementations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two project schedule adjustments affected the beginning date of the pilot court implementations. The first moved the final delivery of the test application from January 18, 2008, to April 21, 2008, and the pilot court implementation was adjusted accordingly from March to May 2008. When it was determined that the software required additional testing before deployment to the pilot courts, a second adjustment moved the beginning of Yuma Superior Court’s implementation from May to June 2008. The Yuma implementation schedule began with training onsite on June 16, 2008, and is progressing toward a conversion and go-live weekend of July 11 to July 14, 2008.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

• Prepare for implementation of a new case management system (CMS) for limited jurisdiction (LJ) courts.

• Complete the porting and migration of Tempe Municipal Court's current CMS functionality to a .NET environment. Evaluate it for distribution as the statewide limited jurisdiction court CMS.

• Perform a gap analysis of the functions in the Tempe system to determine additional enhancements required for statewide distribution.

• Include a case financial system that will handle the complex financial allocation algorithms that currently exist.

• Include a civil case-processing module that will handle all filings and forms utilized by a justice and/or municipal court.

• Provide program interfaces that permit integration with other systems.

• Create an object-oriented structure so that the system and its components are usable for juvenile and adult probation financial activity.
### Project Goals Accomplished in Fiscal Year 2008

- Continued assisting Tempe Municipal Court with development work using the adopted architecture and development environment. See Arizona Code of Judicial Administration Section 1-505.
- Continued the strategy of relying on an “opportunistic” development effort having the potential for broader use.
- Continued to construct improvements in the framework for statewide application building, including security, navigation (tree-view panels), and screen layout standards in support of significant development efforts that will have statewide impacts.
- Made use of a consistent business analysis structure and templates.
- Began development of a Protective Order Module for the Tempe CMS application. Database structures and all systems analysis and design were completed. Programming efforts began. Anticipated completion and delivery to Tempe Municipal Court is September 2008.
- Completed a second phase gap analysis of both LJ CMS candidate applications (Tempe CMS and AmCad) and prepared an initial product comparison and budget forecast.
- Completed planning and coordination of a user hands-on assessment of both LJ CMS candidate applications at the AOC in late summer 2008. Results will be included in a final report of candidate applications being presented to COT in the fall of 2008.

#### Snapshot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project Description

The existing case management system for limited jurisdiction courts is AZTEC, which is implemented in 143 justice and municipal courts. It is a generalized and parameterized system that provides functionality for both limited and general jurisdiction courts. In a strategic planning session for 2004-2006, the court determined the AZTEC system to be reaching the end of its lifecycle because of aging technology. The product has become increasingly more difficult to support since then, especially finding staff knowledgeable in the AZTEC development tools.
The differences in processing workflows and volumes prompted the move to acquire separate systems for general jurisdiction courts and limited jurisdiction courts. This approach is especially desirable for the larger metropolitan courts. Rural counties, however, indicated a preference for continuing to use only one system for all levels of court.

Several options have been considered and discussed to address replacing AZTEC. One option was to identify, via issuing a Request for Proposal, a commercially available court package. Funding was considered a major challenge, though. Another option involved harnessing the development work being done by an individual court for application statewide. Tempe Municipal Court had already received approval for the porting and migration of the legacy CMS functionality to a .NET environment.

The judiciary continues to evaluate Tempe’s approach for replacing AZTEC in the limited jurisdiction courts. It will coordinate closely with the project to replace AZTEC on the general jurisdiction level. In the event a single product is identified to perform both roles, the two projects will combine resources for procurement, development/modification, implementation planning, training, delivery, and on-going desktop and phone support.

Having received a vote of confidence at the Commission on Technology meeting in June 2007, AOC’s development and transition activities began to escalate in FY 2008. Related budget has been set aside to accomplish the gap closure at municipal courts, expand the functionality to justice courts, and obtain related manpower to begin implementation in pilot courts once the code is available from Tempe.

Further evaluation is underway to determine if the Tempe application can be utilized for distribution as the statewide limited jurisdiction court CMS. A gap analysis will be performed of the functions in the Tempe system to determine additional enhancements required for statewide distribution.
PROJECT GOALS

- Establish a centralized collections function to enforce court financial orders.
- Modify automation systems to share new/modified case information and payment information with a collections vendor.
- Modify automation systems to accept and process electronic payment transactions.
- Implement the enforcement provisions provided for under the Department of Motor Vehicles' Traffic Ticket Enforcement Assistance Program (TTEAP) (A.R.S. 28-1631).
- Broaden the court’s implementation of the Arizona Department of Revenue’s (ADOR) Tax Intercept program.
- Modify automation systems to provide near-real-time transaction processing to the Motor Vehicle Division (MVD) to allow for TTEAP.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

- Total of 116 courts in 13 counties with 1.89 million cases submitted with a value of $942 million.
- Backlog receivables project has realized over $102.2 million in collections to date.
- Approximately $33,000,000 collected via electronic media, Web, and IVR.
A large number of the online payments have been received from out-of-state and even out-of-country defendants.

Skip tracing and out-bound calling have proven beneficial in the enhancement of collections.

TTEAP implementation has been proven successful as the number of holds exceeds 360,000, with over 139,600 releases for a release rate of 38.8 percent.

TTEAP continues to be the key factor in collections with all FARE courts participating – threshold for placing a hold was reduced to $0 (excluding parking violations) and boating violations have been included.

FARE for backlog in AZTEC superior courts has now been successfully implemented in Navajo, La Paz, Graham, Mohave, Santa Cruz, Coconino and Pinal County Superior Courts.

Preparations of court AZTEC data for FARE implementation is becoming the method by which the databases throughout the state will be reviewed and corrected for use in future CMS conversions.

---

### SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Penalty Enforcement Program (PEP) is an effort by the Arizona judiciary to enforce court-ordered penalties. The Fines, Fees and Restitution Enforcement (FARE) Project is the automation project directed at centralizing and automating that enforcement. It provides civil and criminal case data to a vendor for account collection activities. It began with implementation in several “pioneer” limited jurisdictions courts. The data shared with the vendor includes pre-disposition and post-disposition, tax intercept, time payment, and special collections.

This program has provided more consistent court order enforcement on a statewide basis and also increased revenue due to improved fines and penalties collections and additional collection methods used. It has provided the public with alternative ways to satisfy court-ordered sanctions.
Administrative Order (AO) 2003-79 established the Penalty Enforcement Program and enabled the FARE Project to proceed. AO 2003-79 summarizes the mission, goals, and scope of this project.

Phase I of PEP is implemented and revenues collected to date have exceeded expectations. Initial projections were that Phase I would result in increased revenues of $2 million; as of this date, a total of $42 million, has been achieved. Phase II calls for expansion of TIP to include a federal tax refund intercept program and work continues to encourage Congress to make the necessary changes to federal law.

Phase III of PEP is the Traffic Ticket Enforcement Assistance Program (TTEAP). Established by A.R.S. §28-1631, this collaborative project with the Department of Transportation, Motor Vehicle Division, has assisted in collecting delinquent fines and penalties by requiring these financial sanctions to be paid before vehicle registrations can be renewed. The Legislature appropriated funds to the Department of Transportation for implementation of TTEAP, and since its production implementation, it has proven to be the key element of FARE success.

In accordance with Phase IV of PEP, the AOC hired a consultant to examine the current collection practices of the Arizona courts and various options for enhancing these collections. In December 2002, the consultant reported to the Arizona Judicial Council that outsourcing part, but not all, of the collections process was indeed feasible and would result in increased collections. Further, the consultant emphasized that public trust and confidence in the judicial system, as well as in the executive and legislative branches of government is improved when compliance with court orders is more uniformly enforced. The Arizona Judicial Council concurred with the findings of the consultant and, in February 2003, a request for proposals was issued by the AOC inviting private vendors to submit proposals to privatize collection activities. A private vendor, ACS Local and State Solutions (ACS), with headquarters in Washington, D.C., was selected following a competitive process. ACS is a substantial, publicly traded entity experienced in various similar partnerships with state and local governmental units whose purpose is to secure compliance with court orders.

During this same time period, several experiments using some of the techniques envisioned were conducted in test courts with considerable success. Based on the work of the consultant, the success of other e-Government projects such as Arizona@YourService, and the test projects, it became evident that a private/public partnership between ACS and the Arizona courts to outsource certain collection-related activities would be cost effective, should result in enhanced customer service, and would improve compliance with court orders.

A contract extension of collection services has been signed with ACS to provide collection and payment-related services for the courts of Arizona. A “Fines/Fees and Restitution Enforcement” Program, “FARE”, is created through this partnership between the judicial branch and ACS. FARE incorporates Phases III and IV of PEP and provides local courts with a suite of services including, but not limited to, the following:
• Courtesy notices
• Delinquency notices
• Credit bureau reporting
• Web and telephone-based credit card payments
• Referral to the Tax Intercept Program (TIP)
• Referral to the Traffic Ticket Enforcement Assistance Program (TTEAP)
• Electronic skip tracing
• Case record data enhancement
• Installment payment plan services
• Advanced collection and offender location services

Laws 2003, Chapter 263, Section 8, as signed by Governor Napolitano, provides that a portion of the expected increased revenues will be directed to the state general fund, with the remainder directed to county and city funds. The FARE Program is an essential component in increasing compliance with court orders and thus, increasing collections. The FARE Program involves implementation and operational costs that should be borne by the persons who incur court obligations. Costs of program operations, Web- and telephone-based credit and debit card payments, electronic payments processing, courtesy and additional notices, address checking and updating may be incurred for every court obligation and shall be paid by a FARE general services fee. Costs for additional notices, credit bureau reporting, skip tracing, referral to TTEAP and TIP and personal contact and litigation may be incurred in efforts to collect a delinquent court obligation and specific collection fees must be imposed to recover costs.

Standardization and coordination of Web- and telephone-based payment systems, interfaces with the Motor Vehicle Division and Department of Revenue, and collections of court obligations is necessary to provide consistent services to both in and out-of-state citizens owing a court obligation, and to realize efficiencies for taxpayers by avoiding the cost of building and maintaining multiple systems. This approach is also consistent with practices in other branches of government. For example, in April 2003, the Governor issued a directive requiring coordination of all Web development initiatives and Web-related services through the executive branch’s Government Information Technology Agency.

The FARE Advisory Committee has been established to evaluate the effectiveness of existing collection programs, the operational and overall effectiveness of collection programs at approaching the goal, and to establish measures to evaluate existing and future programs. The Committee has approved and distributed a set of measures for evaluating program effectiveness at the local level.
The Arizona Judicial Council has approved a methodology for distributing to participating courts any funds remaining after all expenses of the vendor, other governmental entities, and the AOC have been met. Checks for Fiscal Years 2006 and 2007 have been distributed. Fiscal Year 2008 expenses are being finalized and any excess funds will be distributed in early Fiscal 2009.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Establish and prioritize workflows and procedures to be standardized.
- Establish and document ‘best practices’ for limited and general jurisdiction courts for selected workflow processes.
- Develop training programs and deliver training to court staff to support implementation of “best practices.”

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

- In a major effort, 83 business processes were analyzed and documented by the GJCMS team and court users. These process flow diagrams were used initially to develop tickler tables in AJACS, and will be invaluable in the set up of other tables as needed.
Considerable difference exists from court to court in the way administrative functions are performed. Few workflows, “best practices,” and procedures have been, to date, developed and standardized. The result of these many differences is that automated case management systems require great complexity, with many parameters and options, in order to accommodate the sizeable number of unique local practices.

To minimize complexity, standardize documentation and training, and thus create a more efficient and effective Judiciary, the Commission on Technology recommended that the Judicial Branch undertake a series of projects to identify standard procedures and workflows for similarly sized and staffed general and limited jurisdiction court environments.

In 2005, the Commission on Technology created an ad hoc committee to prioritize and select processes, research “best practices,” and make recommendations on code standardization (see separate project description). This project is closely related to the functional specifications for new case management systems for general and limited jurisdiction courts. The development of those specifications for use by the originating court is helping identify key processes that would benefit from being simplified and standardized statewide through the rollout of the new case management systems.

Code standardization and data conversion are not enough. Those business processes and associated workflows that underlie the new case management systems must be adopted by courts as the statewide rollout occurs. Without common processes and uniform processing of case-related data, the efficiencies promised by a statewide case management system will be forfeited. Support of the new systems will be much more complex and costly, as well.

Court business processes must be standardized to match the business process underlying the automation system. This will involve extensive local process documentation, mapping to the applicable case management system, somewhat customized training materials, and extra training time for local users. All these translate into initial productivity losses, which are being factored into the business case for the CMS transition activities, the rollout timeline, and resource leveling.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Implement Project Passport forms throughout the Arizona Court System.
- Enable the AZTEC CMS application to create, store, and print Project Passport forms.
- Ensure that the Protective Order module within the AZTEC application is more user-friendly and easier to use.
- Implement a Web interface for petitioners to enter their own Protective Order data.
- Provide enhanced Protective Order data to the courts’ protective order database (CPOR) and the National Criminal Information Center (NCIC).

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

- Developed an automated protective order module using new technology (outside AZTEC). Performed unit and quality assurance testing.
- Designed mechanism to produce Passport Forms within the AZTEC CMS/Crystal Reports and enhanced AZTEC to fix all outstanding bugs and requests related to the module.
- Produced user requirements, functional specifications, and the software design document (SWDD) for the AZTEC New Protective Order Module.
- Developed prototype screens and forms.
- Developed and distributed updated CPOR specifications to non-AZTEC courts.
- Tested and implemented Project Passport data transfer with Mesa Municipal and Prescott Municipal/Justice Courts.
- Made database and programming level changes in the Data Warehouse to store and process the new fields from the Project Passport form.

### SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Passport is a national project aimed at enhancing the safety of victims and law enforcement officers by improving the recognition and enforcement of orders of protection within and among states and tribes. In March 2005, the Arizona Supreme Court hosted a Project Passport Regional Conference sponsored by the National Center for State Courts. Conference attendees included teams from nine central/southwestern states. Since the conference, Arizona’s Project Passport Team has collaborated with many other states to 1) identify needs of different entities; 2) develop a common recognizable first page for orders of protection, and 3) foster ongoing collaboration and information-gathering regarding domestic violence and protective orders.

All Arizona protective order forms have been reviewed and significantly modified to meet the standards of Project Passport. The new forms are available at [http://supreme.state.az.us/nav2/selfserv.htm](http://supreme.state.az.us/nav2/selfserv.htm).

The Arizona Judicial Council (AJC) approved the new protective order forms in June 2006. Each court was allowed to use the previously approved forms until their employees received the requisite training, and the new forms have been integrated into each court’s automated system. However, all courts were required to use the new forms no later than December 31, 2007, to be compliant with Administrative Directive No. 2006-01. Successful integration of the Passport Forms into the AZTEC CMS application brought this project to a close.

Arizona’s Project Passport Team, chaired by the Honorable William O’Neil, earned favorable recognition from the National Center for State Courts for its effort in developing and implementing Arizona’s new protective order forms.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

• Provide IT staff supporting the Judicial Branch processing with training opportunities on statewide software and technologies, especially those adopted in the Enterprise Architecture.

• Work with the Technical Advisory Council to identify needs for technical training.

• Provide .NET training to staff within projects implementing this architecture.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

• Continued XML training provided to Court and AOC technical staff.

• Upgraded and continued using server-based KSource training for technical programming and database staff at AOC.

• Sent key AOC technical staff to Microsoft Vista and Office 07 training.

• Established IBM Websphere MQ “Boot Camp” for all programmers using the new ESB for communications.
The Technical Advisory Council, a subcommittee of the Commission on Technology, recommended that Information Technology staff throughout Arizona be provided training on the basic software and hardware products in use by the Judicial Branch. The Judiciary can leverage limited funding for training by offering centralized vendor classes.

The training sessions may be identified and arranged through TAC as the need arises. Among the technical topics for which statewide training is possible are:

- .NET
- Windows Server administration (the operating system of our Internet/Intranet servers)
- AIX/UNIX server administration
- Web authoring tools
- HTML/XML
- Java Script
- Active Server Pages
- Informix (the database of the AZTEC and APETS software application)
- DB2 and SQL Server
- Imaging technologies
- Electronic document management technologies, including Hyland’s OnBase and Kofax’s Ascent Capture
- Data warehousing concepts and software applications
- Data integration architectures and products, including Websphere MQ and MQSI
- Various other products that are used statewide such as Altiris (desktop management system software)
- Crystal Reports Enterprise, version 11
• Microsoft SQL Server Reporting Services (SSRS)

No plans for formal, statewide technical training commitments were made for FY 2003 through FY 2008 due to budget constraints. However, adopting the Enterprise Architecture Standards that include .NET resulted in a need for training technical staff statewide. This technical training remains primarily a local and/or project responsibility during the next fiscal year as funding is currently unavailable for statewide efforts. Project staff implementing the .NET architecture will receive training with project funding. State-level coordination will facilitate leveraging and acquisition of volume discounts that may be available.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

Increase use of voice over IP (VOIP) videoconferencing throughout the state to improve access to scarce resources, reduce travel, and increase public safety.

- Bring certified court reporters into superior court courtrooms when needed, as an alternative to paying mileage and lodging-related expenses of traveling per diem reporters.
- Expand number of locations using videoconferencing for remote hearings and initial appearances.
- Encourage the use of videoconferencing for court training and administrative purposes to increase communication and collaboration.
- Continue to work with the rules process to enable a greater variety of court functions to be handled remotely.
PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008

Implemented videoconferencing in majority of superior court locations around the state using Fill the Gap grants to connect rural courts to resources in Phoenix. Prior to the decision, Flagstaff was the only rural court location to have videoconferencing on AJIN. Many rural court locations had previously established local videoconferencing to local jails for remote initial appearances.

The AOC established a dedicated T1 line between Maricopa Superior and the court network (AJIN) to ensure an uninterrupted connection that circumvented the firewall issues encountered with Maricopa County as part of the Remote Court Reporters’ Project. The AOC supplied the hardware for this purpose. Now, once a county conducts a successful test with Maricopa, the AOC no longer needs to be involved. Rather, the court simply adds the Maricopa Reporter address in their address book on the conference unit and dials. Maricopa’s Managing Court Reporter will coordinate the services with the contracting court.

In June 2008, successful testing was conducted between Maricopa and Mohave County. Additionally, a Service Agreement (SA) was developed to delineate Remote Court Reporter Services to be provided by Maricopa Superior Court and their associated costs. Mohave was provided the SA and is currently preparing to schedule services to address their personnel resource shortfalls.

SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

With the rapidly increasing cost of travel, videoconferencing is becoming a very cost-effective method for courts to accomplish a variety of functions. The AOC provides videoconferencing capabilities to courts through the AJIN network using equipment installed by one of two preferred vendors. The initial three sites were Phoenix, Tucson, and Flagstaff. AOC development staff has made extensive use of videoconferencing in the development of JOLTSaz in conjunction with resources at Pima Juvenile Court.
The program goal is to equip one courtroom in each superior court with videoconferencing equipment. Once the equipment is in place, it could be used for other purposes, such as video-arraignments with jail facilities or administrative meetings, or training. Counties with multiple superior court locations, such as Gila, Yavapai, and Mohave, could purchase additional systems to videoconference between locations for various purposes, including court reporting.

Court reporters are used in every superior court in Arizona as the traditional means of making verbatim records of court proceedings. The work of the Keeping the Record Committee disclosed chronic shortages of stenographic court reporters in several rural areas of Arizona. Some counties use per diem reporters multiple times a week at a typical cost of $250 to $400 a day. Most counties use digital recording equipment to fill the gap in reporting resources, but existing policies and best practices dictate that they use live court reporters for some types of hearings.

There are more than 500 certified reporters in Arizona. Approximately three out of four reporters live in Maricopa County. Most work in the private sector. The Superior Court in Maricopa County has 80 staff reporters, half of whom work out of a pool arrangement. Some of these reporters would be available and interested in working for other counties via videoconferencing during the workday. Maricopa also has a staff coordinator who could assist in scheduling these reporters for other counties. At least one outside vendor in Phoenix has indicated a strong interest in providing this service, as well. Many court-reporting firms offer videoconferencing options for depositions and already have the equipment needed to participate in the program.
PROJECT GOALS

- Deploy 3500 replacement PCs to users statewide.
- Deploy MS Word 2007 replacing WordPerfect.
- Validate Microsoft Vista for suitability as the replacement operating system for Windows 2000 and Windows XP.
- Create an internal and external Vista image.
- Develop and execute training plan in support of new PCs.
- Convert AZTEC forms for all supported courts from WordPerfect 8 to MS Word 2007.
- Assist courts in workarounds for local applications that are not yet Vista compliant.
- Continue maintenance and support throughout complete test and deployment cycle.
**PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2008**

- Hired project staff according to implementation plan.
- Completed Vista validation process (overall statewide test cycle).
- Finalized Vista production images and placed orders with manufacturer.
- Established storage facilities in identified sites around the state then ordered and received all products.
- Deployed 2000 Vista PCs/laptops around the state and 500 internal to AOC, maintaining high customer satisfaction with the project team and new products.
- Continued issue tracking process and resolved issues raised during Vista implementation activities.
- Obtained exception to State surplus process to access remaining value in de-installed PCs.
- Converted over 2000 AZTEC forms from WordPerfect to Word.
- Completed AOC training in accordance to project training plan.

**SNAPSHOT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The purpose of this periodic project is to replace all the State-owned external (ACAP and JOLTS) and AOC internal PCs (about 3500). Because of the long life required of the new PCs and the ever-shortening support cycle by software manufacturers, the project also includes a change in the operating system and basic applications utilized by PCs deployed in the courts’ environment. After weighing the costs/benefits and support cycle of Windows XP with Microsoft Office 2003 against Windows Vista and upgrading Microsoft Office to version 2007, the decision was made to use the newest operating system and applications. Standard applications and bolt-ons have been tested to ensure continued operation in the new environment.
Since the courts own the PCs being taken out of service, some PCs have been left behind or re-deployed as a fallback plan to host applications until drivers exist and manufacturers update their code to work in the Vista environment.

This two-year, statewide project (including testing, training, deployment, hardware recovery, and support) is scheduled to complete in October 2008.
The Arizona Judicial Branch has a very diverse mix of hardware reflecting the various projects and programs that have evolved and applications that have been acquired and/or developed over the last several years. Note that the items listed here are generally supported centrally as a statewide project; where individual courts have additional hardware and/or software beyond these items, that equipment is listed on the individual court’s inventory of judicial equipment and not in this document.

**DESKTOP ENVIRONMENT**

The desktop environment includes a variety of PCs. AOC/ITD, under direction from the Commission on Technology, has undertaken a four-year equipment leasing cycle which is designed to refresh desktop hardware regularly to ensure that it incorporates the technology needed to support the evolution of statewide applications while providing additional savings needed to support other technology projects.

The following are standard PC models being placed into service:

**DESKTOP:**
EW290AV hp Compaq Business Desktop dc5700 SFF, Intel Core 2 Duo 2.13GHz, 160 GB, 2 GB RAM, NIC

**LAPTOP:**
RM266UA hp Compaq 8510p, Intel Core 2 Duo 2.2 GHz, 120 GB, 2 GB RAM, NIC

**PRINTER:**
Q5401A HP LaserJet 4250N

**SERVER ENVIRONMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Server Type</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Operating System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IBM i-series</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>OS/400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM p-series</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP Proliant</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Windows 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP Proliant</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Windows 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP Proliant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Windows 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP Proliant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>VMWare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX - B
APPENDIX – B. SOFTWARE ENVIRONMENT

The list of software products below is divided into two categories.

First is a list of the products in use statewide in courts to which the Customer Support Center provides assistance. There are many other products in use in the Superior, Justice and City courts statewide, most often supported by the IT staff of the local court, city or county government. At the state level, however, these are not supported and not included in the list below. Refer to individual court plans for their list of local software.

The second list includes those products in use at the Supreme Court and the Administrative Office of the Courts.

COURTS

Software in courts that is supported statewide in conjunction with existing programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOFTWARE APPLICATION</th>
<th>VENDOR</th>
<th>NO. USERS</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APETS (Adult Probation Tracking System)</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>19 sites, approximately 1700 APD users</td>
<td>Currently installed at all county adult probation departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC</td>
<td>Progressive Solutions, Inc.</td>
<td>149 courts; 1404 court users</td>
<td>Court Case and Cash Management Software for the Arizona Court Automation Project (ACAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC MVD</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>88 courts; 1,216 court users</td>
<td>Used by ACAP and LVCC courts to report motor vehicle convictions and warrants to Motor Vehicle Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case File Tracking</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>120 ACAP computers</td>
<td>Bar code scanning/case file tracking application used by some ACAP courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASPER</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>408 ACAP computers</td>
<td>Combined statistical reporting application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFTWARE APPLICATION</td>
<td>VENDOR</td>
<td>NO. USERS</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Reports</td>
<td>Business Objects</td>
<td>145 statewide users</td>
<td>Web-based ad-hoc report writer for case and cash management system used by ACAP, JOLTS and APETS users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Explorer</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>3489</td>
<td>ACAP and JOLTS users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTS (Juvenile Online Tracking System)</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>65 juvenile probation and detention office sites 2,189 JWALK</td>
<td>Software to track juvenile case information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JURY+</td>
<td>Jury Systems, Inc.</td>
<td>13 Superior Courts 49 systems</td>
<td>Jury management software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Treatment Tracking</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Records and tracks treatment information for juveniles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlook 2000</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>2992</td>
<td>ACAP and JOLTS users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Intercept Program (TIP)</td>
<td>Internal development in PowerBuilder</td>
<td>Approximately 90 courts; 847 users</td>
<td>Software used to collect and transmit unpaid fines information to lottery and DOR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WordPerfect</td>
<td>Corel</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>Phase out with next computer rollout beginning Sept. 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word, Excel, PowerPoint Viewers</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>Word – 741 Excel – 724 PowerPoint – 720 Access - 47</td>
<td>Internet application that calculates child support payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Support Calculator</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>288,484 per month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFTWARE APPLICATION</td>
<td>VENDOR</td>
<td>NO. USERS</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASA Volunteer Webpage</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>380 per month</td>
<td>Secure Internet application that uploads documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Arizona Supreme Court and the Administrative Office of the Courts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Software Application</th>
<th>Vendor/Internal Development</th>
<th>No. Users</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Used for a variety of localized databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adobe Acrobat Professional</td>
<td>Adobe</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>Used for publication of documents to Internet/Intranet as well as interactive forms development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appellamation</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>80 Supreme Court users</td>
<td>Appellate court software in production in the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals Division One.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Information Tracking System (BITS)</td>
<td>Internal development on RS/6000</td>
<td>Web Based</td>
<td>Used by remote Dependent Children's Services offices to create and track budgets and expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centra Symposium and Knowledge Composer</td>
<td>Centra</td>
<td>Statewide (2,816)</td>
<td>This software allows centrally located trainers to provide remote virtual classroom training in all AJIN courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Access</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>801 statewide</td>
<td>Used for terminal emulation access to the AS/400.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidential Intermediary Program (CIP)</td>
<td>Internal development on AS/400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Application to track activity related to the Confidential Intermediary Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD Online</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Internet application to process online renewals and fee payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive Driving</td>
<td>Internal development on AS/400</td>
<td>18 driving schools</td>
<td>Statewide-centralized database of defensive driving class participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Application</td>
<td>Vendor/Internal Development</td>
<td>No. Users</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependant Children’s Activity Tracking System (DCATS)</td>
<td>Internal on-going support on RS/6000 in PowerBuilder for this system built with a vendor on contract.</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Application used to record and track activity related to Foster Care Review Board and Court Appointed Special Advocate programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excel</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>724 internal computers</td>
<td>Spreadsheet application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlook</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>2,289 internal computers</td>
<td>Messaging and group-collaboration software used in conjunction with Exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Resource Library (ERL)</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>AJIN users statewide</td>
<td>Tracking and checkout for educational materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Expressions</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Used to maintain the Intranet and Supreme Court web site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Tracking System</td>
<td>Internal development on AS/400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Application to record and track grants to courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Fiduciary Tracking</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tracks certification of private fiduciaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Explorer</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>685 internal computers</td>
<td>Used for Internet/Intranet access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Contract Tracking</td>
<td>Internal development on AS/400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Used to track juvenile service provider contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Online Tracking System Youth Index</td>
<td>Internal development on the AS/400</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Used for statistical analysis and for sharing high-level JOLTS data among users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logos</td>
<td>New World Systems Troy, MI</td>
<td>AOC: 30</td>
<td>Fund Accounting, Fixed Asset, Contract Tracking, and Budgeting package.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee Virus Scan</td>
<td>McAfee</td>
<td>v8.6 – 2356 V8.0 - 3341</td>
<td>Virus scanning on all desktops in the AOC, Supreme Court and all AJIN computers (ACAP, JOLTS and APETS sites) statewide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft Project</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Project planning tool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>License</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MQ Series</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Server-based message broker software for integration projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MQ Series Integrator</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Server-based message broker software for content-based routing and application development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netview</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Used to manage LAN and WAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Assistance Hotline</td>
<td>Internal development Remedy AR System</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Call tracking and referral information database. AS400 version replaced by Remedy AR System application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PowerBuilder</td>
<td>Sybase</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Development tool for new applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PowerGen</td>
<td>E Crane, Inc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Developer tool for PowerBuilder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW</td>
<td>Riverton</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Case development tool, UML modeling tool; PowerBuilder and BV code generator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PowerPoint</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>720 internal computers</td>
<td>Primary presentations application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick Test Pro</td>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Test script execution product that supports regression testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Center</td>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Used as part of a structured testing methodology to script and track testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Records all user actions on a test application for developers to review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedy</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>1000+</td>
<td>Call/service request tracking application. Used by IT Support Center. User access via Web browser provided for lookup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Application</td>
<td>Vendor/Internal Development</td>
<td>No. Users</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>Informix Statewide Dashboards</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>Visionary is an Internet-enabled, graphical development and deployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tool for creating visually rich, intuitive, analytic applications for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>corporate decision-makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visio</td>
<td>Microsoft Viewer: 270 Client:</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>Diagram/flow charting software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Exception Time Reporting (WETR)</td>
<td>Internal development on AS/400</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>Records leave and weekly time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Microsoft 741 internal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Word processing software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WETR Online</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>AOC Intranet application used for timekeeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Leave Requirements</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>AOC Intranet application used for leave requests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX – C. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACAP</td>
<td>Arizona Court Automation Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCH</td>
<td>Arizona Computerized Criminal History System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>Arizona Court eFiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACJA</td>
<td>Arizona Code of Judicial Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACJC</td>
<td>Arizona Criminal Justice Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACJIS</td>
<td>Arizona Criminal Justice Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADRS</td>
<td>Arizona Disposition Reporting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAVE</td>
<td>The name given to the CMS being developed by Pima Superior Court and the Pima Clerk’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJACS</td>
<td>Arizona Judicial Automated Case System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJB</td>
<td>Arizona Judicial Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJC</td>
<td>Arizona Judicial Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJIN</td>
<td>Arizona Judicial Information Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>Administrative Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC</td>
<td>Administrative Office of the Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APD</td>
<td>Adult Probation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APETS</td>
<td>Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARS</td>
<td>Arizona Revised Statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS/400</td>
<td>IBM’s midrange business computing platform and operating system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTC</td>
<td>Arizona Traffic Ticket Complaint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZAFIS</td>
<td>Arizona Fingerprint Identification System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC</td>
<td>Arizona Courts’ standard case and cash management system software, operating in most courts in all Arizona counties except Maricopa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>Business Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACC</td>
<td>Court Automation Coordinating Committee (formerly LVCC), as subcommittee of COT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASA</td>
<td>Court Appointed Special Advocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT</td>
<td>Computer-Based Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>Certification and Licensing Division of the AOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Case Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COJET</td>
<td>Committee on Judicial Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLD</td>
<td>Computer Output to Laser Device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSR</td>
<td>Convicted Persons on Supervised Release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Commission on Technology, a committee of AJC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPOR</td>
<td>Court Protective Order Repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSD</td>
<td>Court Services Division, a division of the AOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>Calendar Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCATS</td>
<td>Dependant Children’s Automated Tracking System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDS</td>
<td>Defensive Driving School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDTS</td>
<td>Defensive Driving Tracking System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>Department of Economic Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMZ</td>
<td>Demilitarized Zone (related to network firewalls and the Internet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>Department of Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS</td>
<td>Department of Public Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTEF</td>
<td>Drug Treatment and Education Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>Driving Under the Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-CITATION</td>
<td>An electronic means of opening a case within a CMS, typically by law enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-COURT</td>
<td>An ad hoc subcommittee of the Commission on Technology charged with accelerating the adoption of e-filing in Arizona courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-FILING</td>
<td>Electronic filing of case-related information formerly done using paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-SIGNATURE</td>
<td>Electronic means of providing the function of a wet signature on a document such as “/s/”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Enterprise Architecture, codified in ACJA §1-505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECF</td>
<td>Electronic Court Filing Specification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDM</td>
<td>Electronic Document Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMS</td>
<td>Electronic Document Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFM</td>
<td>Electronic Filing Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFSP</td>
<td>Electronic Filing Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESB</td>
<td>Enterprise Service Bus (formerly called “data bus”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARE</td>
<td>Fines, Fees and Restitution Enforcement Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCRB</td>
<td>Foster Care Review Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAO</td>
<td>U.S. Government Accountability Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GITA</td>
<td>Government Information Technology Agency, an executive branch agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJ</td>
<td>General Jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJXDD</td>
<td>Global Justice XML Data Dictionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJXDM</td>
<td>Global Justice XML Data Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJXML</td>
<td>Global Justice Extensible Markup Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUID</td>
<td>Globally Unique Identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUI</td>
<td>Graphical User Interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICIS</td>
<td>Maricopa Superior Court’s and Justice Courts’ case management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEPD</td>
<td>Information Exchange Package Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Instant Messaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Internet Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITAC</td>
<td>Information Technology Authorization Committee, an executive branch committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITD</td>
<td>Information Technology Division, a division of the AOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVR</td>
<td>Interactive Voice Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JABG</td>
<td>Juvenile Accountability Block Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAD</td>
<td>Joint Application Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCEF</td>
<td>Judicial Collections Enhancement Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JLBC</td>
<td>Joint Legislative Budget Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTS</td>
<td>Juvenile Online Tracking System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPIJ</td>
<td>Judicial Project Investment Justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUSTIS</td>
<td>Judicial Statewide Information Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWI</td>
<td>Justice Web Interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ</td>
<td>Limited Jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPOR</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Protective Order Repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEEDS</td>
<td>Minute Entry Electronic Distribution System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPLS</td>
<td>Multi-Protocol Label Switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVD</td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Division (of the Arizona Dept. of Transportation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSC</td>
<td>National Center for State Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCIC</td>
<td>National Criminal Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td>Network Interface Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIEM</td>
<td>National Information Exchange Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPADO</td>
<td>National Public Automated Documents Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASIS</td>
<td>Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXCI</td>
<td>Open XML Court Interface (to a CMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACC</td>
<td>Probation Automation Coordinating Committee, a subcommittee of COT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Personal Computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>Portable Document Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEP</td>
<td>Penalty Enforcement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKI</td>
<td>Public Key Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMS</td>
<td>Probation Information Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMO</td>
<td>Project Management Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS</td>
<td>Pre-Trial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAM</td>
<td>Random Access Memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Request for Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Service Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLAPR</td>
<td>Arizona State Library, Archives, and Public Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEP</td>
<td>Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWDD</td>
<td>Software Design Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Council, a subcommittee of COT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCPF</td>
<td>Traffic Case Processing Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Tax Intercept Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAC</td>
<td>Timely Recorded Action Components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTEAP</td>
<td>Traffic Ticket Enforcement Assistance Program including penalties for all delinquent court obligations and holds on vehicle registration renewals, as provided by law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Urinalysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UETA</td>
<td>Uniform Electronic Transactions Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOIP</td>
<td>Voice Over Internet Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPN</td>
<td>Virtual Private Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XML</td>
<td>Extensible Markup Language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX - D