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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 in addition to general case information.

Chief Justice Ruth V. McGregor provided 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*. Upon her retirement June 30, 2009, Vice Chief Justice Rebecca White Berch became the new chief justice and began codifying her vision for the next five years. That direction will be reflected in the 2011-2013 Information Technology Strategic Plan.

Having built a robust infrastructure and key “back-office” functions, Arizona court automation continues making major improvements through implementation of “second generation” automated systems, continuing the journey to exploit process efficiencies and economies 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: 2010-2012* 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. Arizona Judicial Council (AJC) recently authorized 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 2010-2012 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 conjunction with the 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 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 in the process of being replaced. 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 meeting the requirements of limited jurisdiction courts and implementation continues in rural general jurisdiction courts.

COT and steering committees keep close tabs on the 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 lengthened, postponing work on adapting them for statewide rollout, commercial off-the-shelf systems held increasing appeal. The AiCMS system from AmCad, Inc., was 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 was installed in two pilot courts less than 11 months after contract award. The current project to install it in the remaining 11 courts is targeted to complete by May 2010, just 33 months from contract award. The same commercial system is now being enhanced to meet the unique requirements of the limited jurisdiction courts in the state.
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. They are being involved in the governance, development, and testing efforts.

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 thirty-six courts in fourteen 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 $134.7 million to date, $38.6 million via electronic media, the Web, and telephone IVR. Over 488,500 TTEAP holds have been placed with just over 208,300 releases, thus far, a release rate of 42.7 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 current economic trends. 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. Should further fund sweeps occur, the JCEF balance will be insufficient to support the complete implementation of new CMSs statewide, once they are fully developed and tested, without local funds being consumed at each court.

**Technology Priorities**

The Arizona Judicial Branch’s information technology initiatives support its strategic agenda outlined in *From Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona’s Courts 2005-2010*. At its June 2009 strategic planning session, the Commission on Technology reaffirmed the importance of existing strategic projects and revised their groupings from affinity areas by impact and timeline to a funding-based priority list, pared considerably from past years in response to reductions in budgets. Strategic projects were placed in priority categories numbered 1 though 5 with 1 being the highest priority and 5 being the lowest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Projects</th>
<th>Priority*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJACS (GJ CMS) Rollout</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Minute Entry Access</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Filing — Payment Portal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Filing — Central Case Index</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Filing — Central Document Repository</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ EDMS Central Repository</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge/Bench Automation (e-Filing)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ CMS — Development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APETS-CMS Integration</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSAZ — Statewide Needs Assessment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSAZ — Development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ CMS Pilot(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ Disconnected Scanning</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ Document Briefcase</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Arizona Judicial Branch’s Information Technology Strategic Plan: 2010-2012 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 2010 through 2012.

The Arizona Judicial Branch is proud of its accomplishments in information technology over the nineteen 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. Implementation of a next-generation, AZTEC replacement system is nearing completion in general jurisdiction courts and development/planning for enhancements to meet limited jurisdiction court requirements 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, is implemented 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.

• All clerks of the superior court are digitizing paper filings using electronic document management systems in preparation for electronic case filing. Several prominent limited jurisdiction courts have implemented electronic document management, as well.

The *Fiscal Year 2009 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 addressing technology-hostile court rules, especially in the electronic case-filing arena. In this era of insufficient finances, Court leadership is committed to use 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 or the public. 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 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 has been updated as well. New machines with a consistent software image enable a more standard environment and improved desktop management.

The 2010-2012 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 2010-2012 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CHAIR</strong></th>
<th><strong>LOURAINARKFELD</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HON. REBECCA BERCH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Presiding Judge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vice Chief Justice</strong></td>
<td><strong>City of Tempe Municipal Court</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CATHERINE O’GRADY</strong></th>
<th><strong>Prof. of Law &amp; Executive Director Clinical Programs</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASU Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>KENT BATTY</strong></th>
<th><strong>CATHY O’GRADY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Court Administrator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Prof. of Law &amp; Executive Director Clinical Programs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superior Court in Pima County</strong></td>
<td><strong>ASU Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MARCUS REINKENSMYER</strong></th>
<th><strong>Court Administrator</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superior Court in Maricopa County</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MICHAEL BAUMSTARK</strong></th>
<th><strong>JOHN ROBERT REZZO</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deputy Administrative Director</strong></td>
<td><strong>Information Technology Director</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arizona Supreme Court</strong></td>
<td><strong>Snell &amp; Wilmer L.L.P.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DELCY SCULL</strong></th>
<th><strong>ROXANNE K. SONG ONG</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chief Presiding Judge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cochise County Juvenile Court Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>City of Phoenix Municipal Court</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ELIZABETH HEGEDUS-BERTHOLD</strong></th>
<th><strong>ROXANNE K. SONG ONG</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Analyst</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chief Presiding Judge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Supervisors Association of Arizona</strong></td>
<td><strong>City of Phoenix Municipal Court</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MICHAEL JEANES</strong></th>
<th><strong>ANN TIMMER</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clerk of the Court</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vice Chief Judge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superior Court in Maricopa County</strong></td>
<td><strong>Court of Appeals, Division I</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ROGER KLINGLER</strong></th>
<th><strong>GARYE VASQUEZ</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant City Manager</strong></td>
<td><strong>Judge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Scottsdale</strong></td>
<td><strong>Court of Appeals, Division II</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GARY KRCMARIK</strong></th>
<th><strong>STAFF</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Court Administrator</strong></td>
<td><strong>STEWARD BRUNER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superior Court in Coconino County</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strategic Planning Manager</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHERI NEWMAN</strong></th>
<th><strong>STAFF</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clerk of the Court</strong></td>
<td><strong>STEWARD BRUNER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>La Paz Superior Court</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strategic Planning Manager</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arizona Supreme Court, AOC</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ray MetroFramework</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL- (TAC)
#### 2008-2009 MEMBERSHIP LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAIR</th>
<th>CAROL MERFELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KARL HECKART</td>
<td>MOHYEDDIN ABDULAZIZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>Court of Appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Supreme Court, AOC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHYEDDIN ABDULAZIZ</td>
<td>CAROL MERFELD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>Superior Court in Pima County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court of Appeals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LILLITH AVALON</td>
<td>GERALD L. PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk of the Court</td>
<td>RON BITTERLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court in Apache County</td>
<td>Director Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON BITTERLI</td>
<td>LILLITH AVALON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Information Technology</td>
<td>Clerk of the Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa Superior Clerk of the Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENNIFER GILBERTSON</td>
<td>RICK RAGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS Officer</td>
<td>JOAN HARPHANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Phoenix Municipal Court</td>
<td>Court Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANDY KENNEDY</td>
<td>KYLE RIMEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Automation Manager</td>
<td>Automation Systems Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scottsdale Municipal Court</td>
<td>Superior Court in Mohave County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANDY KENNEDY</td>
<td>DAVID STEVENS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Automation Manager</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scottsdale Municipal Court</td>
<td>Superior Court in Maricopa County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARY MEISTER</td>
<td>ALAN Y. TURNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Manager</td>
<td>Judicial Information Systems Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court of Yuma County</td>
<td>Superior Court of Pinal County Clerk's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>STEWART BRUNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEWART BRUNER</td>
<td>Stewart Bruner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning Manager</td>
<td>Information Technology Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Supreme Court, AOC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE - (CACC)
## 2008-2009 MEMBERSHIP LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAIR</th>
<th>PATRICK MCGRATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL POLLARD</td>
<td>Automation Services Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>Arizona Supreme Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tucson Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KIP ANDERSON</th>
<th>C. STEVEN MCMURRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Deputy Clerk</td>
<td>Justice of the Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court of Mohave County</td>
<td>Encanto Justice Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATHY CLARICH</th>
<th>GORDON MULLENEAUX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Court Administrator</td>
<td>Associate Clerk of General Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Glendale Municipal Court</td>
<td>Superior Court in Maricopa County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JANET G. CORNELL</th>
<th>PATRICIA NOLAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court Administrator</td>
<td>Clerk of Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scottsdale Municipal Court</td>
<td>Superior Court in Pima County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGARET GUIDERO</th>
<th>DOUG PILCHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court Administrator</td>
<td>Executive Court Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court in Yuma County</td>
<td>Phoenix Municipal Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOAN HARPHANT</th>
<th>RICK RAGER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court Administrator</td>
<td>IT Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tucson Municipal Court</td>
<td>City of Tempe Municipal Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KARL HECKART</th>
<th>DAVID STEVENS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Supreme Court</td>
<td>Superior Court in Maricopa County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONALD JACOBSON</th>
<th>PAUL THOMAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court Administrator</td>
<td>Court Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Flagstaff Municipal Court</td>
<td>City of Mesa Municipal Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHILLIP KNOX</th>
<th>STEWART BRUNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Jurisdiction Court Administrator</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court in Maricopa County</td>
<td>Arizona Supreme Court, AOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| STAFF | |
|-------||
| STEWART BRUNER | |
| Strategic Planning Manager | |
| Arizona Supreme Court, AOC | |
## PROBATION AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE- (PACC)
### 2008-2009 Membership List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAIR</th>
<th>BARBARA BRODERICK</th>
<th>DELCY G. SCULL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RONA NEWTON</td>
<td>Chief Juvenile Probation Officer</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of IT and Research</td>
<td>Maricopa County Adult Probation</td>
<td>Cochise County Juvenile Court Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima County Juvenile Court Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCOTT KIRSHNER</th>
<th>DAVID STEVENS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Parole Administrator</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa County Adult Probation</td>
<td>Superior Court in Maricopa County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRANK OWENS</th>
<th>AMY STUART</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Probation Officer</td>
<td>Information &amp; Research Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila County Probation</td>
<td>Arizona Supreme Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAVID SANDERS</th>
<th>NICOLE STUDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Probation Officer</td>
<td>Manager of Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court of Pima County</td>
<td>Arizona Department of Corrections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIK SCHMIDT</th>
<th>PAULA TAYLOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director of Juvenile Court Services</td>
<td>APETS Business Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court of Pima County</td>
<td>Arizona Supreme Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>BOB MACON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation Automation Manager</td>
<td>Probation Automation Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Supreme Court, AOC</td>
<td>Arizona Supreme Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-COURT SUBCOMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2008-2009 MEMBERSHIP LIST</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAIR</strong></td>
<td><strong>ANDREW HURWITZ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justice</strong></td>
<td>Arizona Supreme Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROBERT BRUTINEL</strong></td>
<td><strong>MICHAEL JEANES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presiding Judge</strong></td>
<td><strong>Clerk of the Court</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court in Yavapai County</td>
<td>Superior Court in Maricopa County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIANE DRAIN</strong></td>
<td><strong>DENNIS LUSK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attorney</strong></td>
<td><strong>Justice of the Peace</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Bar Representative</td>
<td>Apache Junction Justice Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KARL HECKART</strong></td>
<td><strong>SHERI NEWMAN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director, Information Technology</strong></td>
<td><strong>Clerk of the Court</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Superior Court in La Paz County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DONALD JACOBSON</strong></td>
<td><strong>STAFF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Court Administrator</strong></td>
<td><strong>STEWART BRUNER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagstaff Municipal Court</td>
<td><strong>Strategic Planning Manager</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 thirteenth 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>JUNE 2008</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Technology held information technology strategic planning sessions at its annual meeting. Local, county-level strategic plans were reviewed and approved or approved with conditions. Priorities for statewide projects and support were reviewed and voted on.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SEPTEMBER 2008</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Update 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 names of business and technical contacts to AOC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OCTOBER 2008</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 2008</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Business drivers were summarized for COT members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FEBRUARY 2009</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calls were held with technical contacts around the state to review the process and resolve issues raised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MARCH 2009</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County court and appeals court IT plans were submitted to AOC for review and summarization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>JUNE 2009</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In light of the difficult financial environment faced by the Branch, Commission on Technology members re-identified key priorities from Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona’s Courts 2005-2010 for the 2010 fiscal year and aligned strategic projects. AJC subsequently approved funding for the strategic projects. 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SEPTEMBER 2009</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Technology approved the Arizona Judicial Branch Information Technology Strategic Plan for 2010-2012 at its September meeting. Following final edits, the plan was submitted to GITA and JLBC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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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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

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.
**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.
2-B  
**VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE**

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.

2-C  
**VULNERABLE PERSONS**

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 typically 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 2009 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 plans.

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/JOLTSaz) related to probation.

COMMISSION: SUPPORT STAFF

Staff in the Information Technology Division (ITD) 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.
COURT STRATEGIC INITIATIVES (GOALS AND INITIATIVES NAMES)

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 2010 – 2012**

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 2010 – 2012**

1. Promote a *systemic thinking* approach to technological solutions.
2. Provide infrastructure (including the network, data center, 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 while appropriately safeguarding confidential information.
7. Digitize the entire court environment.
8. Provide divisions of the Administrative Office of the Courts with automated solutions to meet internal goals and objectives.
Given the information technology business needs, goals, and strategic initiatives, the Commission has elected to give high priority to several strategic technology projects. The strategic technology projects, aligned with the strategic business initiatives, are as follows:

**Strategic Technology Project Alignment with Business Initiatives**

The strategic technology projects, aligned with the strategic business initiatives, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Information Technology Strategic Projects</strong></th>
<th><strong>Fiscal Years 2010-2012</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronic Filing Related Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alignment with</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona’s Courts 2005-2010</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop simple, easy-to-use, web-based interactive forms needed for high volume case types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</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><strong>Integration-Related Projects</strong></td>
<td>Promote the use of technology within courts to facilitate processing of cases in an efficient manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement changes to the domestic violence petition and protection order repository to produce uniformity among courts and between states.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure that criminal justice agencies and the courts have accurate case and defendant information when and where it is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop and implement a strategy for the long-term support and expansion of integrated justice information systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work in cooperation with law enforcement, prosecutorial agencies, defense counsel, and victims to ensure compliance with victims’ rights provisions.</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>
| **New Case Management Systems Development / Enhancements** | 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. |
| **Probation Automation Development / Enhancements** | 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. |
| **LJ Electronic Document Management Projects** | Enhance the use of technology within courts to process cases in an efficient manner, including the development of an electronic document management system.  
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. |
## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PROJECTS
### FISCAL YEARS 2010-2012

<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>Electronic Document Access / Public Minute Entry Access</td>
<td>Continue to develop standards and policies for e-filing, electronic access to court records, and electronic record storage, backup, and recovery. Keep the public informed of court activities and initiatives through the use of the Judicial Branch Website and other means of outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge/Bench Automation</td>
<td>Promote the use of technology within courts to facilitate the processing of cases in an efficient manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. FISCAL YEAR 2009 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Below is a summary of the accomplishments of the Arizona Judicial Branch with respect to its information technology efforts during the 2009 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 2009 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC Support and Maintenance</td>
<td>The modification project is enhancing AZTEC, the statewide ACAP software, to provide for enhanced functionality and usability, balanced with end-of-life considerations.</td>
<td>Releases provided:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• AZTEC 1.5, which includes a new module in support of Defensive Driving Centralized Reporting and allows for schools to report electronically, and courts to document registrations and completions automatically. AZTEC 1.5 also includes significant enhancements to the Protective Order module.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• AZTEC 1.5 Patch 01, which includes updates necessary to improve the processing efficiency of the DDP module and the photo enforcement electronic batch process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Began planning for AZTEC 1.6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continued maintenance activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC Court Support</td>
<td>Provide reporting and support to AZTEC courts.</td>
<td>Average of 878 support calls for AZTEC courts received each month with 93% being resolved within 5 days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW COURT FINANCIAL SYSTEM</strong></td>
<td><strong>Build a financial module to interface with and perform financial processing for all courts’ case management systems.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Court financials will be provided in case management systems – see general jurisdiction (GJ) and limited jurisdiction (LJ) case management system (CMS) accomplishments.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **E-CITATION**                | **Opening court cases automatically using ticket data from law enforcement.** | **Completed implementation of DPS photo enforcement in all Justice Courts statewide in February 2009 (58 AZTEC and 25 iCIS).**
**Implemented local or county photo enforcement in Green Valley JP, Show Low Muni and Pima Consolidated Justice Court (non-AZTEC).**
**Implemented Handhelds in Quartzsite JP, Quartzsite Muni, and Peoria Muni.**
**Continued planning and preparation for future implementations (Handheld – Surprise, Glendale, Jerome, and Sedona Muni, Bowie JP. Photo -- El Mirage, Eloy, Bullhead, Superior Muni).** |
| **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.** | **Supported implementation of AJACS CMS in GJ courts including mapping code set in AZTEC tables to standardized codes, as well as individual databases for Yuma, La Paz, Mohave, Cochise, and Pinal for entry in AJACS. Established CMS workgroups to assist courts with new codes as they move into AJACS production.**
**LJ court standardization scheduled to reconvene by summer of CY09 to support implementation of new CMS in LJ courts.** |
| **Penalty Enforcement Program (PEP)** | The Fines, Fees and Restitution Enforcement (FARE) program and the Debt Set-Off program are the current automation portions of PEP. | Continued implementation of the backlog phase for 135 AZTEC and non-AZTEC courts in 14 counties. Scheduled another 19 courts. Full FARE implementation in process concurrent with new CMS rollout. Maricopa and Pima Justice Courts as well as Tempe Municipal are scheduled for full FARE implementation. Collected approximately $132.4 million in past due receivables. Traffic Ticket Enforcement Assistance Program (TTEAP) holds now number over 481,000 and releases number just over 203,100 (42%). The Debt-Set-Off program collected over $7.5 million in calendar year 2009 and is $600K over calendar year 2008. The federal tax intercept program is anticipated to pass out of Congress in the coming year and be available for the 2010/2011 tax year. |
| **Tax Intercept Program (TIP)** | 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. | Dept. of Revenue began rewrite of their DSO/TIP application but subsequently placed the project on hold. |
| **Video-Conferencing** | Use video over wide area network to initial appearances, hearings, training, and the remote court reporter project. | 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. |
| Equipment Maintenance & Upgrades | 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. | Installed new storage attached network (SAN) director product to support the growing number of systems on the SAN. Upgraded all primary and secondary servers to new IBM AIX platforms. Upgraded Informix Database to IDS 11.xx. |
| AJIN Enhancements | Implement router-based software to maintain a database of previously scene traffic, provide compression, and aggregate multiple video streams into a single link at remote sites, thereby greatly accelerating network transport speed. | Installed Cisco Wide Area Application Services (WAAS) CORE to the following Superior Courts: Pinal, Yuma, La Paz, Cochise, Navajo, and roughly one-third of justice courts. Created schedule to upgrade all courts on AJIN over time. On the average WAAS acceleration provides double the previous bandwidth. It enables pre-deployment of training CBTs on the local router. Configured quality of service (QoS) statewide to support increased videoconferencing usage on AJIN. |
| New Data Center | Expand area holding computers and communications equipment for statewide applications, obtain dedicated environmental. | Completed movement of equipment from old computer room in November 2008. |
| Security and Disaster Recovery | This twofold project will: Provide for statewide automation and network security, Develop disaster recovery strategies and acquire resources to implement them. | Upgraded adult probation login to dual security servers to support single sign-on. A full cluster proxy was installed to support Internet access and related security. |
| Infrastructure Maintenance | This support activity encompasses the many projects required to support the shared judicial branch infrastructure. | Deployed SQL server replication for all AJACS courts. Deployed EMC backup solution to replace Tivoli at cost savings. Installed new, clustered Exchange 2007. |
| 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 now have a field trainer, which improves the volume and frequency of local training on AZTEC. Graham and Greenlee Counties joined the program in FY09.** |
| 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. JOLTS will be decommissioned once the rollout and implementation of JOLTSaz is complete, due to reliance on COBOL and AS/400 platform.** | **Support staff at AOC continues to resolve problems and respond to questions and inquiries via remedy tickets. Staff also creates new, and modifies existing, Crystal Reports as requested by the rural counties.** |
| JOLTSaz | **JOLTSaz will be a full juvenile tracking system, including both delinquency and dependency, for Pima and the 13 rural counties. It is being written with newer technology using VB.net, a single, centralized SQL database statewide and hosting a 3-tier open architecture design that best suits the organization’s future needs.** | **Completed analysis and development of all functional components, independent of integration with CMS, on schedule in January 2009. Remaining work in process includes new requirements for Forms and Letters using OnBase, new requirements (interim solution) for Needs/Strengths Assessment, conversion of Crystal Reports to Microsoft SQL Server Reporting Services, CMS integration with AJACS including JOLTSaz modification development and development to convert data from Rural JOLTS to JOLTSaz, Pima JOLTS to JOLTSaz, and JOLTSaz to AJACS.** |
| JUVENILE PROBATION STATEWIDE | **No common, standard method exists to uniquely identify unique/exact matched juveniles,** | **Defined the interim business process that identifies unique/exact matched juveniles, environment and migrated approximately 3000 total users.** |
**IDENTIFIER (SWID)**

Identifies partially matched juveniles, and facilitates the manual cleanup of partially matched juvenile records within and across counties.

- Internal cleanup and matching is complete for rural and Pima counties.
- Across-county matching is complete for rural counties.

Designed a technical solution that supports the interim process. Completed multiple reports that support the cleanup and matching process for all counties. Developed a facility that allows JJS staff to record decisions made on partially matched juveniles. Developed a web-service that will automatically assign IDs based on matching information.

**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.

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

Completed auto feed of urinalysis results to all counties having TASC and NORCHEM vendor relationships: Mohave, Gila, Cochise and Graham counties have auto feed of urinalysis results.

Completed and implemented Summer/Fall 2008 Build that included 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.

Enhanced reporting application to include a Statewide hand-count report to support bi-annual “stand down audits” of PO caseload paper client files against APETS data.

Implemented Spring Build 2009 to support Senate Bill 1476, including early termination credits tracking based on client cooperative behavior and PO discretionary award.

Began Summer 2009 Build with major enhancements to support Evidence Based...
### 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.

Continued planning. CMS Integration with AJACS is aligned with JOLTSaz and will be rolled out for Juvenile Probation Departments at the same time as other JOLTSaz functionality, beginning in 3rd quarter 2010. CMS Integration for Adult Probation Services is a separate timeline and can start once testing of the interface between AJACS and APETS is complete in 2010.

Completed a staging sub application to support integrated data review and appraisal before merging or inserting into core APETS tables. Test scripts for integration are in process. Documentation for changes to the Case Management System is in progress.

### 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.

Enhanced Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) and added features, including Common Code Mapping (CCM) and Common Case Index (CCI).

Architecture/Design/Implementation.

Reviewed EA standards table, in conjunction with TAC. Provided architectural guidance and oversight for statewide e-filing initiative.

### 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

Maintained the e-Dispo module for the 62 using courts. Further rollout on hold pending release of Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS).

Completed development and testing of the current ADRS XML IEPD formats. Began efforts to fully automate ADRS transactions between DPS and AJACS GJ-CMS to
Arizona Department of Public Safety’s criminal history repository.

provide electronic transactions between systems.

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 to additional counties in 2010.

Deployed improved Protective Order Module to ACAP courts via AZTEC 1.5 in December 2008.

Changed AZTEC DV module, including automatic docket events.

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 and use of Microsoft Remote Assistance Software. 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. Completed Statewide refresh of ACAP computers utilizing Vista operating system and latest Microsoft suite of products.
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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.
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.

The Supreme Court Website received over 57 million hits during the fiscal year. While total hits decreased, the number of unique visitors increased by more than 300,000.

In FY09, public access statistics are:

| Total Hits | 40,966,675 |
| Unique Visitors | 747,434+ |

For the past 12 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 | 16,190,869 |
| Unique Visitors | 912,301 |
| Megabytes Downloaded | 718,001 |
| Average Visitors per Hour | 104 |

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. The Public Access to Court Case Information module was also enhanced using up-to-date, industry standards (.Net) that improved performance and enhanced usefulness of the site to users.
Statewide Automation Training

Provide training statewide for automation projects supported by the Supreme Court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DUI Case Processing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Claims Processing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible Detainer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-of-Period Reporting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Order Proc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispo Reporting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC Bond Processing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/A &amp; Long Form Complaints</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVD Reporting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Restitution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Processing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentencing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC Tables, Utilities, + Parameters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casper/Stats/Data Cleanup</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant Processing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

Began deployment of Appellamation 5.4, which includes an enhancement to the e-Distribution feature. Multiple sending options were added to provide maximum flexibility for the clerks when communicating to various stakeholders via Appellamation.

Continued litigant to court e-filing project for Supreme Court and deployed e-filing in Division One, including clerk review function. The litigant to court application is now the first multi-court e-filing solution in the state.

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 Licensed Document Preparers, Certified Reporters, Defensive Driving Schools, and Instructors.

Processed 908 online renewals and collected $291,400 in renewal fees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification &amp; Licensing</th>
<th>Defensive Driving Tracking System</th>
<th>Implemented changes to the Defensive Driving Tracking System as part of the Defensive Driving Centralized Reporting Project. Enabled the January 2009 implementation of major legislation changes to the Diversion program by centralizing the reporting process to the courts for Defensive Driving attendance. As of May 31, 2009 over 160,000 DD records from 22 schools have been reported to the courts for processing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certification &amp; Licensing</td>
<td>Attorney Admissions Application</td>
<td>Due to “admittance on motion” legislation taking effect January 1, 2010, CLD and ITD performed system reviews on potential replacement applications from vendors, including the NIC/CAVU common licensing application in use at executive branch agencies. A statement of work was signed and implementation of the new software scheduled for January 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCATS FCRB</td>
<td>Modify DCATS FCRB to enhance tracking of children placed in Foster Care and identify whether problems are service gaps systemic.</td>
<td>Implemented statistical reporting for service gap or system problems at the child/element level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court Office Automation</td>
<td>This project includes ongoing support of the Supreme Court's and Administrative Office of the Courts’ desktop.</td>
<td>Automation trainer position was frozen and remained unfilled for entire year. Human Resources handled limited number of new employee orientations. Several other training sessions were held using outside vendors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various AOC Internal Accounting, Finance and Payroll Applications</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 World's logos.net financial management system on Microsoft platform to meet new architecture standards, which enable distributed functionality.</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 Agile project management techniques and checklists within the project process for use by scrum/project managers and team resources.

Provided an approval forum for an adaptive Agile project methodology by project which overlays the formal project management process. Project planners were assigned to specific project managers in order to build a more cohesive relationship.

Continued project ‘circle’ forums for ongoing project management and team resource training. Provided additional oversight and processes for high profile, enterprise projects.

Formalized weekly implementation planning meeting and inaugurated shared implementation calendar in Outlook.
Develop and implement new case management systems (CMSs) that replace AZTEC for general jurisdiction (GJ) and limited jurisdiction (LJ) courts.

A vendor CMS, AJACS, had been implemented in 6 of 13 superior courts: Yuma, La Paz, Cochise, Mohave, Pinal and Santa Cruz. Deployments are scheduled in the remaining 7 courts to be completed in May 2010.

Courts have received intense course instruction prior to implementation utilizing two suites of 22 computers each in a portable, contained, and controlled environment for staff from court administration and the clerk’s office. Courts are also given a minimum of two weeks of onsite post go-live support to ensure the implementation is a success.

Though data conversion remains a challenge in each court, it has been vastly improved as lessons learned are accumulated from each subsequent court implementation.

Continued to partner with Tempe Municipal Court to develop and implement new case management system and completed development of Protective Order Module, though Tempe will not be the AZTEC-replacement system statewide (see below).

Conducted user assessments of two candidate LJ CMS applications (Tempe CMS and AmCad AiCMS). Prepared recommendation report and presentations on LJ CMS solution for COT and AJC, who selected a “hybrid” approach utilizing AiCMS software as the baseline product enhanced by incorporating functionality favored in the Tempe CMS product with AZTEC system improvements developed by Scottsdale Municipal Court called AZTEC Wizard.

Conducted site visits with AmCad of 6 LJ Courts to observe business processes and review current system configurations and requirements. Conducted gap analysis sessions to identify and document additional LJ functional requirements resulting in the generation of an Internal/External Design Document.

Completed contract amendments with AmCad for development of LJ-specific functionality and enhancements in AiCMS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICARTA JUDICIAL BRANCH</th>
<th>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLAN: 2010-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDMS</strong></td>
<td>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. All remaining superior courts installed EDMS in support of e-filing. Graham Superior converted from LaserFiche to OnBase. Statewide contract modified to enable new solutions for document synchronization between separate OnBase systems and disconnected scanning for small LJ courts. Planned replacement of DocuShare with OnBase in final three departments at the Administrative Office of the Courts placed on hold pending resolution of issues with Verity full-text indexing functionality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PC REFRESH/VISTA ROLLOUT</strong></td>
<td>Replace end-of-life hardware and upgrade operating system for the AOC, AOC-supported courts, and AOC-supported Juvenile Probation offices. Deployment completed in November 2008. Roughly 3150 desktop PCs with Vista were deployed during this effort. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERACTIVE JUROR / WEB SOLUTIONS</strong></td>
<td>Provides electronic access for jurors to complete their questionnaire online and interactively defer or reschedule service. All counties went live by end of 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-APPEAL</strong></td>
<td>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. Installed and tested C2C in Maricopa Superior Court. Set August 10th as the formal implementation date. Implemented C2C in Certification and Licensing Division of AOC to enable exchange of case file data with Court of Appeals Division One.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERPRETER REGISTRY</strong></td>
<td>New web-based application written in .Net which allows potential interpreter resources to register on the site and allows courts to search those registrants for interpreters that meet their needs in terms of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPCC RREEFFRREESSH//VVIISSTTAA RROOLLL</strong></td>
<td>Replace end-of-life hardware and upgrade operating system for the AOC, AOC-supported courts, and AOC-supported Juvenile Probation offices. Deployment completed in November 2008. Roughly 3150 desktop PCs with Vista were deployed during this effort. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERACTIVE JUROR / WEB SOLUTIONS</strong></td>
<td>Provides electronic access for jurors to complete their questionnaire online and interactively defer or reschedule service. All counties went live by end of 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-APPEAL</strong></td>
<td>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. Installed and tested C2C in Maricopa Superior Court. Set August 10th as the formal implementation date. Implemented C2C in Certification and Licensing Division of AOC to enable exchange of case file data with Court of Appeals Division One.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERPRETER REGISTRY</strong></td>
<td>New web-based application written in .Net which allows potential interpreter resources to register on the site and allows courts to search those registrants for interpreters that meet their needs in terms of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhanced Revenue Reporting</strong></td>
<td>Streamlines quarterly revenue reporting for courts, making it easier to “save as you go,” and includes calculations for 5% fill the gap set aside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justice Web Interface (JWI)</strong></td>
<td>A web portal solution that facilitates the querying of data across multiple source systems to provide users with a single view of information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language, skill level, and willingness to travel.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOCAL COURT ACCOMPLISHMENTS - CY2009

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>APACHE COURTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Continued preparing for extensive local components of case management system transition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developed business continuity plan following COOP guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implemented web version of prospective juror questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hired a local field trainer; focused on Justice Court financial reconciliations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implemented OnBase EDMS in Clerk’s Office and converted related local programs to use it; continued back scanning criminal case files.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Added order and notice templates to electronic minute entry/distribution program. Expanded electronic distribution program to Superior-Court-generated documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Upgraded ACAP PCs to Vista along with local server infrastructure; planned projects to address architectural deficiencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Created high profile case website for Apache County with automated noticing function.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COCHISE COURTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Implemented AJACS in Superior Court and AZTEC 1.5 including order of protection forms and defensive driving changes in other courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conducted CourTools customer service surveys in all courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expanding access of justice partners to clerk’s case-related document images.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Upgraded court recording software and hardware to work in Vista environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Added high profile case link to clerk of the superior court website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Installed new computer hardware and software used in education of probationers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Standardized warrant forms used by all JP courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implemented questionnaire-mail link to register deferments for jurors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COCONINO COURTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Continued focus on digitizing all business functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implemented EDMS in Coconino Superior Court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maintained and enhanced a local court Web site; implemented online juror questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Replaced all ACAP PCs in county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Obtained changes to AZTEC to improve data transfers of criminal justice information among justice partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Upgraded FTR digital recording product.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GILA COURTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Upgraded firewall and wireless security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Began fill-in forms project to be placed online for Probation and Family Law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Deployed Vista PCs and upgraded local applications to work with Vista; provided training in the new tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Graham Courts       | - Upgraded local network speed to address increased traffic.  
                      - Provided court calendar information online for public and justice partners to decrease phone calls to court.  
                      - Implemented FARE in Globe limited jurisdiction courts.  
                      - Provided online jury summoning.  |
| Greenlee Courts     | - Continued building expansions at Pima Justice Court and Pima Municipal Court.  
                      - Replaced LaserFiche with OnBase EDMS countywide; Superior Court is primary user.  
                      - Purchased web-publishing software to enable work on local websites; developing department-specific content.  
                      - Migrated ACAP PCs in the county to a V-LAN to enable AOC greater access.  
                      - Hired shared field trainer with Greenlee County courts.  
                      - Implemented digital recording in Safford Municipal Court.  |
| La Paz Courts       | - Hired local court technology resource to reduce dependence on county.  
                      - Implemented AJACS general jurisdiction case management system as a pilot court on August 1, 2008.  
                      - Added web pages for limited jurisdiction courts.  
                      - Added PCs and network connections in Quartzsite.  
                      - Put up limited jurisdiction court websites.  |
### Maricopa Courts
- Completed numerous iCIS case management system enhancements including support for two new justice court precincts.
- Enhanced and expanded digital recording in courts.
- Numerous PCs refreshed at various courts throughout county.
- Superior Court and Clerk tightened project management processes, controls, and governance.
- Numerous limited jurisdiction courts participated in LJ CMS gap analysis effort.
- Various courts added measures in CourTools; Phoenix recognized as one of first Arizona courts to implement all 10 measures.
- Improved security of information systems and business continuity.
- Beginning to use virtualization to reduce cost of IT infrastructure.
- Submitted consolidated IT strategic plan.

### Mohave Courts
- Expanded video systems into remote jail substations and Victim Witness locations.
- Installed backup power generator and connected it to all servers and network switches.
- Upgraded all FTR recording systems to accommodate MS-Vista.
- Designed and implemented an online employee satisfaction survey.
- Implemented Juvenile Education Development system to track training histories.
- Completed 130 interactive.pdf forms and placed online.
### NAVAJO COURTS
- Installed enhanced phone capabilities in two justice courts, enabling automated assistance.
- Performing arraignments using videoconferencing in all six justice courts, reducing security risk and transportation costs.
- Installed videoconferencing equipment in three Superior Court courtrooms and began conducting remote initial appearances from the jail facility.
- Continued work with County IT to integrate superior court website into Navajo County website.
- Completed refresh of ACAP PCs countywide.

### PIMA COURTS
- Implemented Pima AGAVE Calendaring and Civil Bench modules.
- Continued development of Pima AGAVE case management system and portions of JOLTSaz; began integration activities between the two.
- Implemented KIOSK application for Adult Probation to enable self-reporting.
- Deployed a pilot version of Electronic Documents application in Clerk’s Office.
- Began movement from Crystal to SSRS reporting.
- Stabilized environment at PCCJC.
- Improved local court computing infrastructure.
- Focused on increasing collections through automation in smaller courts.
- Performed numerous enhancements to court Internet and intranet websites.

### PINAL COURTS
- Continued full-time GPS monitoring in probation area.
- Developed local applications to print juror checks and validate that images match docket entries; enhanced other in-house applications.
- Continued aligning superior court processes in preparation for new case management system transition.
- Enhanced internet and intranet websites; standardized justice court self service forms countywide.
- Enhanced probation staff’s ability to work away from offices.

### SANTA CRUZ COURTS
- Broke ground on facilities additions and renovation work in Nogales.
- Replaced all ACAP PCs in the county.
- Implemented web interactive jury management solution.
| YAVAPAI COURTS | Completed study of OnBase’s applicability to adult probation processes.  
|               | Continued justice partner and public online access to court documents, including self-service forms and local administrative orders.  
|               | Continued back-scanning all clerk files.  
|               | Expanded adult probation videoconferencing and telecommuting.  
|               | Continued regular planning meetings for justice integration/data sharing.  
|               | Jerome Muni Court implemented digital audio recording and began implement activities for e-citation; Verde Valley JP established a website. |
| YUMA COURTS   | Completed implementation of JAVS for all courtroom users in the new Justice Center.  
|               | Implemented credit card and online payment for various courts using county Official Payments Corp. payment portal.  
|               | Opened document management system to county justice partners and public for retrieval of images.  
|               | Updated listings for court personnel in county’s GroupWise e-mail system and for county personnel in courts’ Outlook e-mail system.  
|               | Installed A+ Learning System on educational servers to provide courses for AZTec High School and Detention Education. |
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, problem and change management, systems monitoring, Tax Intercept Program, desktop deployment, Statewide Crystal Enterprise ad-hoc reporting, SQL Server Reporting Services, 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 has been implemented statewide on refreshed PCs, WordPerfect is being 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 statewide LJ CMS system 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 2010-2012
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 necessarily accompanies the courts’ transition to an e-records environment, as well. Plans are underway to construct central repositories to store copies of court documents geographically distant from the courts themselves.

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.
**STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT**

**STRATEGIC INITIATIVE 1: SYSTEMIC THINKING/APPROACH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALIGNMENT WITH COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY STATEWIDE AUTOMATION GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial efficiency and effectiveness in handling growing caseloads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 384 judges and more than 9,600 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 3500 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 product 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 FY 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 2010 as the new general jurisdiction case management system rolls out. The position will also be key to rolling out the limited jurisdiction case management system in a timely fashion.

Historically, not all rural counties have been able to take advantage of the trainer positions, due to local funding constraints. AOC Court Services Division 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. This resulted in increased coverage by field trainers to underserved counties.
**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.
- Improved power consumption/energy efficiency and reduced carbon footprint.

**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 Windows Vista environment and new applications.
- 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 and subsequently became the tool
for recording efforts by the general jurisdiction case management system team to quantify local risks and dependencies on statewide systems as part of their pre-implementation efforts. 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 crafted and COT recommended to the chief justice content for an administrative order (AO 2008-68) to instruct courts on the minimum content of a local policy that complies with the legislation.
**STRAategic 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 of 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 and the court record.

**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
- AJACS (GJ CMS) Rollout
- LJ Electronic Document Management
- Electronic Filing Central Repositories
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 4.0, 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 has also been ratified in support of the recent central clearinghouse project.
**STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT**

### STRATEGIC INITIATIVE 4: STANDARDIZE PROCESS AND SOLUTIONS ALIGMENT 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Value</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced risks in and complexity of systems development by reducing the number of systems and protocols/standards requiring support.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced training and support resources required by standardizing the applications software, systems software, and hardware deployed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved rural court productivity by providing them with the same level of technology afforded the large metropolitan courts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved responsiveness and productivity of court staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STANDARDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mitigated project risks, increased project success, and increased interoperability and sharing of information and resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved responsiveness and productivity of court staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved rural court productivity by providing them with the same level of technology afforded the large metropolitan courts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved quality of support staff customer service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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 their 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 system. Late in FY 2007, COT decided, and AJC concurred, to pursue implementation of a vendor CMS for general jurisdiction courts. Development work is presently underway on enhancing that CMS for use by limited jurisdiction courts around the state. The finished system 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 system statewide as well as the completion 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 AJACS CMS 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 275,000 client records and 11.77 million contact records. Periodic enhancements to the software, support, and user training continue, including fundamental programming changes to support a business process change to evidence-based practices (EBP) within the plan period.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment with Commission on Technology Statewide Automation Goals</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial efficiency and effectiveness in handling growing caseloads.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 implementation efforts for general jurisdiction courts.
- AOC/vendor modifications to create a limited jurisdiction statewide system from the selected general jurisdiction system on time and on budget.
- Staff resources to perform statewide system development and implementations while still providing legacy support for case and probation management systems statewide.
- The establishment of a cross-branch policy and governance structure for the development of the Criminal Justice Data Integration Project.
- Sufficient resources to create and support new central repositories of electronic documents in support of statewide electronic case filing.

**IMPACTS**

With several statewide systems all being replaced at nearly the same time, the financial impact is unprecedented. The problem has now been compounded over several years as the planned funding for the initiatives got interrupted by multiple reallocations of JCEF (a state-level automation funding source) by the legislature. There is no longer any certainty that sufficient funds will exist to complete the statewide implementations of these vital, second-generation systems.

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 much 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 Rollout
- New Limited Jurisdiction Case Management System Development, Pilot, and Rollout
- JOLTSaz Statewide Needs Assessment, Pilot, and Rollout
- Electronic Case Filing
- Central Repositories for Electronic Documents
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 both the legal community and self-represented litigants.

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 almost 41 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 a single court organization exists 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 original project linking the AZTEC CMS 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 using XML interfaces will also be performed “out of the box” by 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 continues 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. A policy committee has been appointed by the chief justice to codify rules that enable more use for videoconferencing in the administration of justice.

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 and archived proceedings remain available long after the court date.

The Judicial Branch also recognizes that the public will be better served by improving 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 case-related 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 transparency and public access to the Supreme Court’s rulemaking process and oral arguments.

DEPENDENCIES

• Proof of the Enterprise Service Bus architectural concept using the Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS).
• Continued development and support of a technical architecture enabling statewide data integration.
• 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 courtrooms of rural superior courts.
• Sufficient network bandwidth to carry increased video and data integration traffic.
• Continued capabilities of the Supreme Court’s 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, both from the bench and in the back office.

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, central repositories of electronic documents, electronic notifications, electronic archiving, and judge/bench automation 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.

All courts face paper records management and case file storage challenges 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. All superior court clerks have now implemented a full-featured EDMS and the largest limited jurisdiction courts are following suit.

A June 2000 EDMS study recommended centralized document repositories for jurisdictions lacking technical resources, but legislation requiring the storage of superior court records in the county seat blocked the approach. EDMS centralization was instead directed at selecting a standard application for superior courts to reduce the number of system interfaces that must be built and maintained. Today, many courts still 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. A review of business continuity requirements as courts depend increasingly on paperless e-records led to revisiting the approach. Almost 20 smaller courts have plans to implement EDMS in the near term. To speed adoption, the AOC is pursuing a disconnected scanning option that enables LJ courts to connect to a central, shared EDMS rather than each purchasing and maintaining independent local systems.

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 and interactive, intelligent forms that output a stream of digital data. An e-filing portal, AZTurboCourt.gov, will provide standard court forms online and lead users through the process of filling out forms and printing them or eventually e-filing them. PCs deployed
at many court, county, and municipal 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 eviction actions originating within the same law office, are also slated 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. No plan exists to totally discontinue paper filing at the court counter, though the practice should become practically obscure over time as the convenience of electronic filing increases.

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, though ratification of the PDF/A format as an international standard may enable a change to electronic archiving over time.
**STRATEGIC ALIGMENT**

**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, especially at the superior court.

**Dependencies**

- Transferring increasing numbers of imaged and electronic documents may require upgraded network capability.
- ACAP desktop PCs need to be able to function as scan stations in limited jurisdiction courts for the central EDMS model to work.
- 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 and safe business practices 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 and has 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
- Disconnected Scanning
- Public Minute Entry Access
- Business Continuity
- Electronic Filing
- Judge/Bench Automation
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
- Following centralization of the reporting of Defensive Driving registrations and completions from all defensive driving schools in the state to all courts in the state, functionality is being added to supply related financial information to statewide CMSs. Details are reported in a separate project.

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 enhancements in the FCRB application for 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 maintained process guidelines and templates for various areas.
- Continued revising current project methodology and checklists to incorporate Agile development processes for use by scrum/project managers and team resources.
- Provided an approval forum for an adaptive Agile project methodology which overlays the formal project management process. Project planners were assigned to specific project managers in order to build a more cohesive relationship.
- Continued project ‘circle’ forums for on-going project management and team resource training. Provided additional oversight and processes for high profile, enterprise projects.
- Formalized weekly implementation planning meeting and inaugurated shared implementation calendar in Outlook.
- 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.
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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 2010 through 2012. 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 2009 strategic planning session, the Commission on Technology reaffirmed the importance of existing strategic projects and revised their groupings from affinity areas by impact and timeline to a funding based priority list, pared considerably from past years in response to reductions in budgets. Commission members continued to evaluate the several long-range projects added in past years that have been institutionalized, removing penalty enforcement program, ADRS, e-Citation, electronic signature, technical training, and enterprise architecture from the strategic list while elevating creation of specific facilities in support of e-filing, enhancements to the defensive driving central clearinghouse, and judge/bench automation. Several other items had their names and scope updated. Initiatives and related projects were placed in priority categories numbered 1 though 5 with 1 being the highest priority and 5 being the lowest.

The Arizona Judiciary’s strategic information technology projects for 2010-2012, in order of priority are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC PROJECTS</th>
<th>PRIORITY*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJACS (GJ CMS) ROLLOUT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC MINUTE ENTRY ACCESS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRONIC FILING — PAYMENT PORTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRONIC FILING — CENTRAL CASE INDEX</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRONIC FILING — CENTRAL DOCUMENT REPOSITORY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ EDMS CENTRAL REPOSITORY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE/BENCH AUTOMATION (E-FILING)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ CMS — DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APETS-CMS INTEGRATION</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSAZ — STATEWIDE NEEDS ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSAZ — DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ CMS PILOT(S)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ DISCONNECTED SCANNING</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ DOCUMENT BRIEFCASE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSAZ — PILOT</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIC PROJECTS</td>
<td>PRIORITY*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSIVE DRIVING PHASE 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT ACCESS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSAz — ROLLOUT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ CMS ROLLOUT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APETS ENHANCEMENTS (EBP)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJACS ENHANCEMENTS</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSAz PHASE 2 DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 | APETS Enhancements (EBP)  
JOLTSaz Statewide Needs Assessment  
Public Minute Entry Access  
e-Filing (all 3 projects)  
Electronic Document Access  
Defensive Driving Phase 2 |
| Improving Core Applications | AJACS Enhancements  
LJ CMS Development  
JOLTSaz Development  
JOLTSaz Phase 2 Development  
Defensive Driving Phase 2  
APETS Enhancements (EBP and CMS integration) |
| Standardizing for Leveraging | AJACS (GJ CMS) Rollout  
LJ CMS Pilot and Rollout  
JOLTSaz Pilot and Rollout  
LJ EDMS Central Repository  
e-Filing (all 4 projects) |
| Transforming Technologies | Judge/Bench Automation (e-Filing)  
LJ Disconnected Scanning  
e-Filing Central Case Index and Doc Repository  
Electronic Document Access  
Integration Projects (all)  
LJ Document Briefcase |

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 and electronic filing-related functionality 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, half of the court technology activity is dedicated to supporting the existing infrastructure, applications, and staff. Project work (CMSs, e-filing, public minute access, integrated justice applications) represents the other half of the overall spending this year, an unusually high amount but attributable to multi-year, next-generation development efforts. New, transformational, technology projects account for only 1% of spending.
* 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>TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PROJECTS</th>
<th>ALIGNMENT WITH GOOD TO GREAT: A STRATEGIC AGENDA FOR ARIZONA’S COURTS 2005-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Electronic Filing Related Projects** | Develop simple, easy-to-use, web-based interactive forms needed for high volume case types.  
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.  
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. |
| **Integration-Related Projects** | 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. |
<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 Management Systems Development / Enhancements | 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. |
| 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. |
| Probation Automation Development / Enhancements | 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. |
### INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PROJECTS
**FISCAL YEARS 2010-2012**

<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>LJ Electronic Document Management Projects</strong></td>
<td>Enhance the use of technology within courts to process cases in an efficient manner, including the development of an electronic document management system. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Automation/Technical Training</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enterprise Architecture</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronic Document Access / Public Minute Entry Access</strong></td>
<td>Continue to develop standards and policies for e-filing, electronic access to court records, and electronic record storage, backup, and recovery. Keep the public informed of court activities and initiatives through the use of the Judicial Branch Website and other means of outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judge/Bench Automation (e-Filing)</strong></td>
<td>Promote the use of technology within courts to facilitate the processing of cases in an efficient manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 2009 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>AJACS (GJ CMS) Rollout</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Minute Entry Access</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Filing — Payment Portal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Filing — Central Case Index</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Filing — Central Document Repository</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ EDMS Central Repository</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge/Bench Automation (e-Filing)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ CMS — Development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APETS–CMS Integration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSaz — Statewide Needs Assessment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSaz — Development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ CMS Pilot(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ Disconnected Scanning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ Document Briefcase</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSaz — Pilot</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive Driving Phase 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Document Access</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSaz — Rollout</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ CMS Rollout</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APETS Enhancements (EBP)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJACS Enhancements</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSaz Phase 2 Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></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 appropriately balanced maintenance, replacement, and upgrades to basic necessary functions with enhancement and “leading edge” projects. Several projects are building incrementally on past efforts that created basic infrastructure and business applications, like APETS, AJACS, and the defensive driving statewide clearinghouse.

Not all 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, AZTEC, the first-generation statewide case management system, Dependant Children’s Automated Tracking System (DCATS), the Tax Intercept Program (TIP), Appellamation, 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 probation automation and case management systems to support the justice integration strategic initiatives. 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.

Constructing public minute entry access on top of functionality provided in the AJACS case management system qualifies as an enhancement, as does re-engineering APETS to accommodate the change in business approach brought about by Evidence-Based Practices (EBP). Increasing the functionality of the central clearinghouse by constructing a web-based application for use by defensive driving schools to report more detailed information to enable financial integration with AZTEC and the new case management systems also falls in the category of an enhancement.

Since return on investment decreases as a function of remaining useful life, AZTEC development efforts have been 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 carefully balanced against end-of-life considerations.

FRONTIER CLASS APPLICATIONS

In addition, the Judiciary is engaged in a few 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 is a growing number of these, and most are interrelated. It is expected that the various e-filing related projects will greatly increase digitization in the courts, speed case processing, and vastly improve public access to filed documents. It will secondarily improve business continuity through the creation of central document repositories.

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 Vice Chief Justice Andrew Hurwitz continues 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.

The Judiciary continues evaluating its 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 project titled “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>AJACS (GJ CMS) Rollout</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Minute Entry Access</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Filing — Payment Portal</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Filing — Central Case Index</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Filing — Central Document Repository</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ EDMS Central Repository</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge/Bench Automation (e-Filing)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ CMS — Development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APETS-CMS Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSaz — Statewide Needs Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSaz — Development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ CMS Pilot(s)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ Disconnected Scanning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ Document Briefcase</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSaz — Pilot</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive Driving Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Document Access</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSaz — Rollout</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ CMS Rollout</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APETS Enhancements (EBP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJACS Enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSaz Phase 2 Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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 2009

TRAINING PROVIDED:

- AZTEC 1.5 training, financial processing and defensive driving, MS Word 2007 forms, merge using Word 2007; and Quick Tip Program, CSD Automation Services' monthly AZTEC processing or navigational tip, with documentation.
- 117 classes to 690 attendees during the fiscal year.

SUPPORT SERVICES PROVIDED:

- An average of 878 support calls for AZTEC courts received each month with an 93 percent resolution rate within 5 business days.
- An average of 206 problem tickets handled for JOLTS on a monthly basis.
- An average of 559 problem tickets handled for AOC/Supreme Court on a monthly basis.
- Averages of 680 information calls handled for Public Access and/or FARE on a monthly basis.
- New software releases/updates of AZTEC, DCATS, TIP, AJACS, 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 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:

- 2,801 PCs for state-wide ACAP, JOLTS and APETS users
- 662 PCs for AOC/Supreme Court users

For the centrally supplied support, technicians use software tools for the remote control and diagnostics of users’ hardware and software. Since remote tools were 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, 13 of the 15 counties use 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 like AJACS 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 2009 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>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL CLAIMS PROCESSING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCEBLE DETAINER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END-OF-PERIOD REPORTING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTECTIVE ORDER PROC.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISPO REPORTING</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC BOND PROCESSING</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/A &amp; LONG FORM COMPLAINTS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVD REPORTING</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM RESTITUTION</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL PROCESSING</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPEALS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENTENCING</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC TABLES, UTILITIES &amp; PARAMETERS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASPER/STATS/DATA CLEANUP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARRANT PROCESSING</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORD 2007 &amp; FORMS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC &amp; THE COURTS (1.5)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC CALENDAR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 LEG. UPDATE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CENTRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC &amp; PHOTO ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC DEFENSIVE DRIVING</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTSALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>690</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CONFERENCE TRAINING           | 12  | 185       |

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 continues its emphasis on business continuity. A set of systemic best practices is being developed and communicated to local courts regarding the identification of and mitigation of vulnerabilities. Work continues on compiling a statewide inventory designed 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. Administrative Order 2008-68, issued August 14, 2008, addresses provisions of that law related 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 2009**

- AOC agreed to incorporate the risk assessment tool developed in FY 2007 into the pre-implementation planning activities for AJACS CMS conversions. Business analysts now assist courts in completing the assessment and returning it to COT staff to compile.
- Remained abreast of Pandemic Continuity of Operations guidance being developed by AOC, especially mission critical court functions.
- COT received a general update on business continuity efforts in several courts as reported in countywide IT strategic plans.
- COT recommended content for a data protection and breach notification policy issued in Administrative Order 2008-68 on August 14, 2008.

<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 all superior court clerks’ offices throughout the state, courts are poised to stop collecting paper in the near term in favor 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 superior 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. As limited jurisdiction courts now undertake digitization efforts on even lower budgets with fewer support staff, the problems are magnified.

ACJA 1-507 contains provisions for courts desiring to destroy paper for which equivalent electronic records exist; unfortunately, few courts are able to meet the associated technical requirements, even for closed records. The AOC is designing a solution that replicates electronic records from the state-standard EDMS to a central location. For limited jurisdiction courts that cannot afford a local EDMS, AOC is pursuing a central EDMS for shared use. Both solutions increase the survivability of electronic court records by storing multiple copies in separate geographic locations. The AO authorizing statewide e-filing is anticipated to enable courts using the AOC central EDMS or replication solution to destroy paper, since the AOC systems meet the technical requirements of ACJA 1-507.

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 operate 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. The pace of returns diminished greatly in the wake of the statewide budget crisis and AJACS CMS conversion resources are being relied upon to assist courts with completion of the assessments.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

- Support business transition to Evidence Based Practices (EBP) code requirements, the new direction probation supervision is taking statewide. Many current features in APETS must be changed based on EBP principles.

- Incorporate Phase 1 of Evidence Based Practices and provide probation departments with more effective supervision techniques, measures and strategies for monitoring a person’s performance while on supervised probation. Modify risk assessment and case plan functionality, change aspects of compliance tracking, expand Earned Time Credit and Interstate Compact tracking, and improve the monitoring of treatment funds.

- Create an interface between APETS and Pima Probation’s Automated Reporting Kiosk (ARK) system to enable low-risk probationers to comply with reporting requirements and free up probation officers to focus on high risk clients. Probationers will log on to a kiosk terminal, using their fingerprint, at any one of four locations in Pima County.

- Redesign several Drug Court screens, change Intensive Probation Supervision enhance the PSI report and Modify the Presentence and Uniform Conditions.

- Work with Clerks of Court and Adult Probation Departments to review adult criminal case processes and adopt standard business practices statewide. The goal is to eliminate duplicate data entry, improve timeliness of data entry, reduce paper flow and make information available to everyone who needs it, when they need it. Interface APETS with the AJACS CMS.
**PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2009**

- Designed a new “Hand Count” report for counties to use when manually reconciling the probationers they currently have with what is reflected in APETS.

- 2008 Summer/Fall Build included changes to over 30 screens to improve the overall quality and consistency of data in APETS, revised how foreign-born clients are documented and tracked, provided several new management reports, added security features and key Pre-Trial Services (PTS) enhancements.

- The Earned Time Credit (ETC) build made changes to comply with new legislation that allows probationers to earn 20 days credit for every 30 days they are in compliance with certain probation requirements.

- Expanded the automated feed of urinalysis results to Greenlee, Apache, La Paz, and Navajo counties.

### 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

APETS is the automated tracking system for Adult Probation services. It was first deployed in Maricopa County and all probation departments in the state were using it by December 2006. APETS has approximately 2,500 users statewide that access the system on a 24/7 basis. The application is written in PowerBuilder using a code generator called HOW and utilizes an Informix database.

Beginning with Pretrial, dependents are tracked through initial arrest to supervised release and acquittal or conviction. Data is retained separately to ensure protection for non-convicted persons. Data includes case status, contact/case notes, and drug testing results.

Presentence support includes multiple assessment tools, full demographic data, abuse history, criminal history, and standard format face sheet for court review. Recommendations may be made by the Probation Department, altered by the judge and outcomes entered for use in supervised probation tracking.
Supervised probation tracking is a fully functional case management system. Functionality includes case initiation, post PSI assessments, case plan management, drug court management, contact/case notes, UA tracking, petition processing, conditions and addendums of probation management, program and treatment tracking, multi-county courtesy supervision, multiple client transfer capability, victim tracking and responsible officer history.

Administratively, APETS allows multiple search capabilities, management level browse and review engines, caseload management, administrative category management (deportation, prison, specific jail terms and unsupervised status requiring minimal personnel interactions) and Interstate Compact support.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Digitize the Appellate courts.
- Enable electronic dissemination of court documents.
- Comprehensive implementation of the 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. Populate emerging Central Case Index and Central Document Repository systems currently in development.
- 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 2009**

- Expanded and improved the integration with Hyland OnBase document management system within Appellamation. Initiated the usage of OnBase within the Court of Appeals Division One. Upgraded the OnBase system to version 6.4.
- Expanded the Appellamation financial management system to the Arizona Supreme Court.
- Enhanced reporting capabilities by adding new reports and enhancing existing reports.
- Released Appellamation 5.3 to production usage in concert with the Arizona Court Efiling system (ACE) pilot. The pilot phase was expanded beyond the Arizona Supreme Court to include the Court of Appeals Division One. Appellamation 5.3 includes clerk review functions for the review and acceptance of electronic filings.
- Devised and implemented an appellate CourTools measurement, reporting, and management program.
- Upgraded the CMS database from Informix 7 to Informix 11. Upgraded the database server hardware and AIX operating system.
- Deployed an e-filing system pilot project in the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals Division One for attorneys and pro per se litigants. The system permits the filing of electronic documents with the Appellate courts over the Internet leveraging industry standards, including LegalXML. Participants include the Attorney General, Office of Legal Advocates, Maricopa County Attorney, Maricopa Public Defender, Pima County Attorney, and Pima County Public Defender.

**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 2009

- Developed and deployed AZTEC Version 1.5, to provide the ability for LJ courts to automatically consume and process Defensive Driving School registration and completion records from all certified schools.
- Continued reviewing and closing outstanding and obsolete Remedy tickets related to AZTEC issues.
AZTEC is the legacy case and cash management system deployed throughout 137 of Arizona’s general and limited jurisdiction courts. 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 has reached the end of its lifecycle and is being replaced by a vendor system at both the general jurisdiction level and the limited jurisdiction level.

The continued operation and maintenance of AZTEC will only 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 FY2009 was to provide system enhancements to allow courts to accept and process defensive driving records from all certified schools (legislation changes to the DD program disallowed contracts with primary providers), and continuing to support the implementation of DPS and local photo enforcement programs along with handheld e-Citation devices.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS IN FISCAL YEAR 2010

- Provide legacy 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.
- 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 data warehouse and other means.
- Facilitate and support the business process of reviewing and cleaning up juvenile records in rural counties, Pima, and Maricopa in preparation for the Statewide Identifier project. Compare these records across county databases to identify unique matches. Assign statewide identifiers to all juveniles based on matching results.
- Design, develop, and implement a statewide identifier web-service, which will assign statewide IDs to all newly added juveniles in existing juvenile tracking systems. Also, design, develop and implement an interface from rural JOLTS to the statewide identifier web-service.
PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2009

- Provided continued support for the JOLTS system in the 13 rural counties, including facilitation of statewide user's groups/workgroups, training, and completion of urgent system fixes as well as producing new, or modifying existing, Crystal reports.

<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>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SNAPSHOT

Written 25 years ago, the Juvenile Online Tracking System (JOLTS) is still considered one of the most comprehensive juvenile court automation systems in the country. Juvenile Probation, Detention and Court Staffs in the 13 rural counties and Pima County use JOLTS today. Centralized support at AOC is provided to the 13 rural counties while Pima County has and maintains its own version. A third juvenile probation system, iCIS, is used by Maricopa County. All counties provide electronic data to the JOLTS Youth Index, statistical database and the Juvenile Data Warehouse system.

The JOLTSaz project is in progress as a partnership between AOC and Pima, each building specific functional modules of the new system. JOLTS will be decommissioned once the rollout and implementation of JOLTSaz is complete. Current functionality in JOLTS needs to be enhanced and entirely new functions need to be developed. The cost to maintain JOLTS with its current AS/400 platform is expensive and continues to increase each year. It is also increasingly difficult to find skilled Cobol/DB2 programmers to support this legacy application.

JOLTS application support and maintenance must continue during the development, testing and implementation/rollout of JOLTSaz. Enhancements to the existing JOLTS system for the 13 rural counties will be worked only if required by court rule or statute. Remedy tickets for JOLTS problem resolution are accepted based on the severity level established. Requests for new Crystal reports or modifications to existing Crystal reports are handled based on resource bandwidth at AOC.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Develop and implement a Data Warehouse Strategic Roadmap that will outline and guide in the design of a new data warehouse that accommodates new business processes, new architecture, and new data warehouse technology.

- Support statewide data collection of court data (AJACS, AZTEC and non-AZTEC) and add other court entities’ data into the data warehouse.

- Support the interface to Public Access information for the public and other interested agencies.

- Analyze and develop judicial dashboards and reports that provide case flow analysis, status updates, identification of problem cases, and incorporate CourTools metrics.

- Convert current data warehouse web applications to the AOC standard architecture.

- Analyze and evaluate Business Intelligence (BI) solutions.

- Continue support for ad hoc reporting requests from the data warehouse.

- Continue to support the central repository as an on-going project in FY 2010.

- Continue coordination with Maricopa Justice Courts to implement remaining courts into Interim FARE.

- Implement “Full FARE” interfaces with Chandler Municipal Court.
PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2009

- Continued support of the Public Access Victim Notification application using Maricopa Superior Court extracts / active criminal cases.
- Continued supported of Interim FARE interfaces with Chandler Municipal and AZTEC courts for the Fines, Fees, and Restitution Enforcement (FARE) program.
- Continued support of 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.
- Implemented two Maricopa Justice Courts into Interim FARE.
- Implemented enhancements to CPOR that include new information from the Project Passport Protective Order Forms.

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 data warehouse functions as the central data repository for the judicial branch and has become the primary statewide interface between the case management systems (CMS) and other agencies. Interfaces were created in response to a need to collect statewide data in a central location and provide for formatting that would enable the data to be used in a consistent way. Based upon the need of specific projects, specifications were created to describe how to transfer information to/from the data warehouse and programs written to allow the information to be processed and loaded into the data warehouse. A statewide view of court information is the result. Some of these interfaces included FARE, CPOR, and Public Access.

The data warehouse expanded its service offerings by incorporating MQ messaging into the core service base. MQ messaging sends data in a message format between the data warehouse and other agencies / vendors. The main partners participating in MQ messaging are DPS and ACS. Some pioneer judicial partners that have adopted this service to communicate with the data warehouse include Phoenix Municipal Court, Chandler Municipal Court, and Maricopa Superior Court.
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 business 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 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.

The data warehouse is the foundation for the development and support of FARE, part of the Penalty Enforcement Program. The data warehouse provides the main interface between the courts (AZTEC and non-AZTEC), external agencies (MVD), and the service provider.

The Arizona Court Automation Project (ACAP) remains the core application providing information to the central repository. With 143 Arizona courts using the same software, the collection 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 – 220%

A strategic road map is being created to lay out the direction and evolution of the data warehouse. The roadmap will be used to move the data warehouse into the future in an effective fashion aligned with business goals.
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 2009**

- Reviewed, approved, and performed pre-certification testing of all manually generated XML transactions.
- Generated documentation for all IEPD processes

<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 has implemented the initial version of ADRS (Phase I). 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

• 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 2009

• Completed development, testing, and implementation to add the new functionality to the Defensive Driving Tracking System (DDTS) and AZTEC Case Management System.

• Completed development, testing, and implementation of a new middleware application that transfers 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.
  o Began in-depth analysis to support development of 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.

<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>

**SNAPSHOT**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

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 centralized this functionality. Centralization benefits the schools as they were previously required to report to both the AOC and to each individual court but now report only to the AOC, who then reports out to the court of jurisdiction. The benefit to the courts is the ability receive a single data feed for DDS completions from all schools. The addition of centralized DDS registration reporting benefits courts presently using or planning to use photo enforcement, because the DDS registration notification eliminates the need for service of photo enforcement citations.

Phase 1 of the project continued to utilize the legacy DDTS application and the established AOC reporting processes at the DDS with new functionality added to capture DDS registrations. A new middleware application was implemented to pick up the registration and completion data from the DDTS application. This application then sends applicable records through a Data Warehouse validation process and creates XML messages for valid records which are sent to the appropriate courts’ MQ queues. Invalid records are sent back to the DDTS system; the schools are notified and correct the bad records then retransmit them to the AOC. The application then transfers the data from AZTEC courts’ MQ queues to the appropriate AZTEC database tables. After the records are transferred to AZTEC, an internal process performs necessary updates to all impacted cases. Phase 1 was implemented on December 31, 2008.
Phase 2 of the project includes the replacement of the entire DDTS application used by the defensive driving schools. The legacy AS/400 system will be retired and a new web-based user interface will be implemented for use at the schools. 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 perform 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 2009

- Worked with handheld vendor to implement handheld devices in three law enforcement communities with several more in test phase.
- Created reporting mechanisms for photo enforcement vendors and courts to manage and monitor case status, payments, and performance of service.
- Worked with two vendors to implement photo radar, red light running, and other fixed photo enforcement systems throughout Arizona.
- Published an e-citation Administration Guide to describe standard import process and requirements to vendors and project managers. Published other support documentation for eCitation.
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 providing electronic ATTC input to AZTEC from law enforcement officers’ handheld devices. There are now 13 courts that have partnered with their local law enforcement agencies to provide officers with handheld devices containing the electronic ATTC form. The data is transmitted to the court network via the DPS network for upload to AZTEC.

Implementations of both handheld and photo enforcement projects have grown much easier over time as the process undergoes continual refinement.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

• Assist courts 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. Provide reliable method of integrating one OnBase system with another.

• Create a centralized EDMS for use by smaller, limited jurisdiction courts.

• 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 2009

• Supported the Graham LaserFiche-to-OnBase conversion effort.

• Completed Apache-homegrown-system-to-OnBase conversion.

• Continued supporting OnBase in Superior Courts; all now have EDMS and 14 of 15 use the state-standard system.
- Completed initial proof of concept for disconnected scanning approach between AOC and El Mirage Municipal Court. Began efforts to integrate a central LJ EDMS with the AZTEC CMS.
- Expanded internal use of OnBase at the Administrative Office of the Courts to additional departments and business functions.
- Continued to participate in providing direction regarding the destruction of paper records where equivalent electronic records exist.
- At the request of the e-Records Subcommittee of Limited Jurisdiction Courts Committee, the TAC e-Records Subteam recommended technical requirements for courts seeking to destroy paper records for which equivalent electronic records exist. These requirements were codified in ACJA 1-507, approved December 10, 2008, under AO 2008-99.

### 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

Electronic Document Management (EDM) includes the processes and the environment associated with electronic document creation, storage, management, location, retrieval, and viewing. 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 (including both local court and Central Document Repository [CDR] systems), faxing, workflow management, case management system applications, COLD, and database management. In the context of the overall IT infrastructure, EDMS technology is considered a “back-office” support system, i.e., the technology cannot be directly accessed by the public.

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 through user and application programming interfaces between and among courts, other government agencies, the legal community, and litigants.
- Provide guidance to courts that have EDMSs regarding the destruction of paper court records for which images exist as well as the retention of electronic records.
- Provide a central solution that significantly reduces the barrier to entry for limited jurisdiction courts desiring to digitize paper records and accept electronic case filings.

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 put in place.

An ever-increasing number of Arizona courts at all levels are using imaging and electronic document management systems. All Superior Court Clerks and clerks of several larger limited jurisdiction courts (Tucson, Phoenix, Flagstaff, Mesa, Scottsdale, Oro Valley) have now implemented full-featured EDMSs. 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. Focus is now switching to smaller limited jurisdiction courts that have plans for adopting EDMS but insufficient resources.

There is clear need for the EDMS initiative as well as receptive organizations. 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 mainstream and judicial 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, legitimate concerns about privacy. Once all court documents are electronic and easily accessible over the Internet, it potentially removes the current “practical obscurity” of public court records. The Arizona Judicial Council team reviewed the court’s public records policy, Supreme Court Rule 123, and suggested additional rules to balance demands for increased access to public information with necessary protection of citizen privacy in digital court records.
Over the past year, statewide models for electronic document management and electronic filing have rapidly come into focus, following the chief justice’s visit to COT in June 2008 to spur rapid adoption of a statewide e-filing process in the Arizona. Commission on Technology had previously adopted eight principles related to e-filing in the state. Various pilot implementations were in place at various courts for various lengths of time, though limited in scope and not coordinated from the statewide perspective.

Following the chief justice’s visit to COT, the e-Court subcommittee focused on using a vendor solution to accomplish statewide e-filing in Arizona for all courts and all case types. 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 necessarily 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 is undertaking, as a corollary project to e-filing, creation of a central case index (CCI) and central document repository (CDR). For courts supported by the AOC, this environment will provide a second spinning copy of electronically filed court case documents and serve as the gateway/repository for Public Access to court documents per Rule 123 criteria. For courts performing their own support, the CCI will catalog the locations of the accepted records on clerks’ systems in order to pass requests directly to those systems for fulfillment.

But, since e-filing applies to all case types and all courts, the LJ level cannot be overlooked. EDMS is a pre-requisite to acceptance of electronic documents by LJ courts. The cost of procuring then implementing and maintaining even a minimal functioning local system in each LJ court is prohibitive (over $4 million initially). Waiting for cities or counties to implement digitization efforts for local courts to join will hold off e-filing for years. The solution is called disconnected scanning: a way to leverage a central system among over 100 local courts in a way that does not consume all available bandwidth. Storing images scanned during the workday to transmit during off hours and making them available to courts the following morning should relieve to a great extent the court’s wide area network bandwidth concerns. Work is underway on constructing the central system and integrating it with the case management and e-filing systems to reduce the burden on local courts. In addition, alternative techniques for distributing, clerk-stamping, and storing court documents in the CDR itself are being investigated to further relieve network bandwidth concerns.

As imaging processes mature, Clerks have become disillusioned because the initial promise of a reduced workload and storage space are not being realized. Through the e-Records Subcommittee of the Limited Jurisdiction Courts Committee they requested clear direction regarding the removal of paper records where electronic reproductions of them exist, especially in limited jurisdiction courts, since they are not courts of record. That direction has been provided in ACJA 1-507, approved December 10, 2008.
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.
- Implementing 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 is endeavoring to prepare courts and the public for this paradigm shift from paper to electronic documents. Education of court staff, the legal community, and the public is getting underway.

In Fiscal Year 2002, the Administrative Office of the Courts implemented imaging in selected pilot projects to store administrative records with relatively short (5-10 years) retention requirements. 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 continues 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 therefore proceeding with some caution, but EDMS technology 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.

AZTurboCourt is the Court’s all-encompassing system that supports electronic filing. AZTurboCourt’s main components include the Electronic Filing Service Provider (EFSP), Electronic Filing Manager (EFM), and an optional Clerk and Judge Review application for use with case management systems (CMS). The EFSP (described in detail in the Internet Public Interactive Service section of this document) enables users to interact with the e-filing system described in this section. The EFM stores and transmits case file information to and awaits, records, and communicates responses from the destination or “target” case management system. The Clerk and Judge Review application enables clerks of the court to accept or reject case file submissions. Back-end facilities keep track of registered users, filed documents, reviews within the court, and cases available to be viewed by the public.

Related projects described in prior plans include court-to-court records transfer (C2C) and justice partner filings on criminal cases into the Arizona Supreme Court and Court of Appeals Division One (ACE).
The AZTurboCourt technical design diagram (below) highlights the various components that are either dedicated to the e-filing system or play a role in the e-filing system's operation, but that also support non-e-filing applications -- these components can be part of the shared infrastructure. As mentioned above, the EFSP, EFM, and Clerk/Judge Review functions (and their corresponding databases) are dedicated to the e-filing system, in which the EFSP represents the AZTurboCourt “store front” or customer front-end and the EFM and Clerk/Judge Review components represent the AZTurboCourt back-end components used by courts. Individual users of the AZTurboCourt e-filing system (e.g., case parties, attorneys, document preparers, law enforcement agencies) only have direct access to the EFSP. The EFSP then facilitates the requisite communications to and from the EFM.

Also facilitating communications to the EFM are the target CMSs. The target CMSs receive information from and return information to the EFM via various “middleware” components, namely IBM MQ, Central Case Index (CCI), and Central Document Repository (CDR). IBM MQ transports/routes messages between the EFM and target CMSs. The CCI and CDR maintain either the location of successfully filed case documents or the actual case documents. The CCI-CDR environment serves two essential purposes. First, they together provide a central location through which users of AZTurboCourt can quickly locate and retrieve secondary copies of the official court record. The combined systems mitigate the need for direct access to the target CMSs. This design approach significantly reduces network traffic over AJIN and the associated performance overhead on each of the target CMSs.

The following diagram illustrates the technical design of the statewide e-filing environment.
PROJECT GOALS

DOCUMENT SCANNING / ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT

- Assess, design, and deliver document scanning solutions for small, medium, and large-sized courts that complement clerk-accepted electronically submitted case file information and until e-filing is mandated across the state.

- Automate, where possible, the capture of meta data, forms data, and document images as information is scanned. Investigate bar coding documents to significantly reduce, if not eliminate, manual entry of case file information.

- 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 self-represented) 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).
- Leverage the court-defined data standards in all jurisdictions within and between the e-filing system and target CMSs in support of the CourTools court performance reporting initiative.
- 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
  - Internet-based portal that supports both free-form pleadings 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.
- Expand electronic filing beyond the individual case file submission user interface to include a bulk-filing interface for Records Management Systems that comply with the ATurboCourt bulk-filing interface specification.

**Clerk/Judge Review / Case Management Systems Integration (AZTEC, AJACS, Appellamation)**

- Create an integrated Clerk and Judge Review application for both the AZTEC and AmCad CMSs that enables clerks to accept or reject case file submissions and transfer the appropriate data to the CMS.
- Enable court users and/or the CMS itself to initiate and/or provide automated responses to filers through the review module.
- Ensure next-generation case management systems support statewide e-filing out of the box.

**Registration System**

- ATurboCourt.gov’s Registration System is the central location through which filers for all ATurboCourt.gov services will, at a minimum, register to use the Statewide E-Filing and Public Access systems.
- Expand the support for third-party authentication and the security measures required for the Public Document Access System over time.
**MQ Integration**

- Situate IBM MQ as the message transport and exchange mechanism between the AZTurboCourt e-filing system, specifically the Electronic Filing Manager (EFM), Central Case Index (CCI), and target Case Management Systems (CMSs).
- Route e-filing-related messages to and from each of connected system using IBM MQ, e.g., CCI.

**Online Payment Portal**

- Create a mechanism through which e-filers apply payments toward the purchase of their AZTurboCourt services (e.g., Credit Cards, Automated Check Handling).
- Exchange transaction data with selected banking institution(s) and back-end target court CMSs to ensure that transactions can be completed and that appropriate audit trails are instituted.
- Provide organizational oversight and ongoing management of payments made through AZTurboCourt.

**Judge Information Management Module**

- Assess, design, and deliver judge information management capability that assists with the day-to-day activities of the judiciary, integrated with target CMS automation efforts.
- Obtain consulting from sitting judges to ensure that the design adopted streamlines their work on the bench compared to paper processing.

**Central Case Index (CCI)**

- Optimize data retrieval times for the e-filer while minimizing the use of available AJIN bandwidth and other system resource overhead.
- Provide “copy” repository of or pointers to all case file information and documents located in the CDR or elsewhere within AJIN.
- Maintain a unique identifier to associate filers with all cases with which s/he is associated.
- Create specifications by which courts interface their respective CMSs to the CCI-CDR environment.
**CENTRAL DOCUMENT REPOSITORY (CDR)**

- Maintain either pointers to or copies of specific document images associated with case file information contained or referenced within the CCI.
- Optimize document retrieval times for the e-filer (EFSP) while minimizing the use of available AJIN bandwidth and other system resource overhead.
- Store a “copy” of all/most case file documents and metadata supplied by back-end, target, court EDMSs and CMSs.
- Create specifications by which target courts may interface their respective CMSs to the CCI-CDR environment including interface specifications that external system developers will use to facilitate information exchanges via the AZTurboCourt EFM.

**PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2009**

**DOCUMENT SCANNING / ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT**

- Continued work to interface the ACAP case management system (AZTEC) 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**

- Deployed the Arizona Court eFiling (ACE) pilot project application within the Arizona Supreme Court Clerk’s Office.
- Deployed a second release of ACE to enable simultaneous support of the Arizona Supreme Court Clerk’s Office and the Court of Appeals Division One.
- ACE was set up to submit non-case-initiating criminal case filings. Continued enhancements of ACE will depend on available support staff and their needed contributions to the development of the AZTurboCourt statewide e-filing system.

**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.

CLERK/JUDGE REVIEW / CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (AZTEC, AJACS, APPELLAMATION)

• Continued enhancing new, vendor-developed, general jurisdiction case management system that includes e-filing interfaces to simplify the process of delivering litigant e-filing services.

REGISTRATION SYSTEM

• Designated the AZTurboCourt user registration system to accommodate the e-filing population. The system will be enhanced to also support the Public Access user population.

MQ INTEGRATION

• The MQ environment has been enhanced by external applications designed to place information onto the MQ message routing queues and to extract information from the MQ message queues. The AOC-dubbed MQ “PUT” and “Trigger Process” application routines were developed to accommodate any front-end or back-end application, such as e-filing and e-citation, that needs to interface with back-end court systems.

ONLINE PAYMENT PORTAL

• Began design of the Online Payment Portal. It will be first deployed with the AZTurboCourt Pay & Print service. The Portal will be setup to interface with the court’s financial institution.

JUDGE INFORMATION MANAGEMENT MODULE

• The baseline AJACS GJ CMS was deployed to various superior court locations. The Judge Information Management Module will become an enhancement of the court’s AJACS Jurisdiction CMS application.

CENTRAL CASE INDEX (CCI)

• The purpose and basic design overview of the Central Case Index (CCI) was completed. Formal system requirements, technical design, and development are planned for FY10.

CENTRAL DOCUMENT REPOSITORY (CDR)

• Completed the purpose and basic design overview of the Central Document Repository (CCR). Formal system requirements, technical design, and development are planned for FY10.
**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**

**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, pursuing 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.
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 continue to be 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 drive of the e-Court Subcommittee is to enable production implementation of e-filing statewide in the very 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 (now referred to as eviction actions).

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 several overarching directives. 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 worked cooperatively with Maricopa Superior Court in adapting the methods contained in the Maricopa e-filing system to the ACE e-Filing application. The initial focus of the pilot project was subsequent criminal case filings from the Attorney General’s Office. As such, the Supreme Court leads this initiative. The ACE e-Filing application, which consists principally of a common Electronic Filing Manager (EFM) that can support multiple courts, was constructed to support multiple vendors, known as Electronic Filing Service Providers (EFSPs). Multiple EFSPs were 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 “Thin” Web 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 using a court-defined data exchange specification.

The inclusion of EFSPs was to be considered in subsequent ACE development phases. This product, however, is destined to be absorbed by the new, statewide e-filing initiative championed by the chief justice called AZTurboCourt.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS


- Create the capability to electronically docket, distribute, and post minute entries online using a standard system or process throughout the State.

- Provide a viable replacement for current MEEDS system used by several superior court clerks.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2009

- Continued working with vendor of new general jurisdiction case management system to ensure electronic minute entry/distribution requirements established in functional matrix were fully addressed.

- Strategized options for a standard solution to assemble all applicable minute entries from the AJACS GJ CMS into a single repository that can be indexed and accessed via the Public Access website.
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. In addition, a change to legislation stipulated that minute entries be published electronically by January 1, 2010, for rural courts.

Technology could easily reduce or even eliminate the highly manual business processes of minute entry 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 obtain 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 the Minute Entry Electronic Distribution System (MEEDS), installed and maintained by a small business, SmartBridge Technology. Other rural superior court clerks previously considered the solution but questioned the long-term viability of the company. In fact, since 2006, Gila County Superior Court’s CIS Department has had to support the
application themselves. 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. The clerks proposed some enhancements by which 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 was integrated with AZTEC, OnBase could
also consult the CMS to locate additional values and populate key fields. The estimated
cost of the 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. 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.

Following implementation of the AJACS GJ CMS in the two pilot courts, the decision
was made to pursue a CMS- rather than EDMS-driven solution for minute entries. The
search for a solution to meet the revised requirements in A.R.S. 12-283 ensued. At the
June 2009 COT annual planning meeting, AOC committed to construct a facility that
meets the legislated requirements for rural courts, based on AJACS’ capabilities. Work
is underway on constructing a solution that assembles all applicable minute entries from
the AJACS GJ CMS into a single repository that can be indexed and accessed via the
Public Access website.
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 2009**

- The Clerk of the Superior Court in Maricopa County has implemented an electronic seal with a unique identification number that affixes to imaged documents, including warrants and quashes, for distribution to justice partner agencies using ICJIS.
- 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. E-Court published a decision concerning the sufficiency of “/s/” notation for electronic documents submitted through the statewide e-filing solution. Specifics appear at http://www.supreme.state.az.us/ecourts/Documents.htm.
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

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 is 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 AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

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

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2009

- Began review and design for development guidelines for ancillary and “bolt-on” core modules for the AJACS GJ CMS application.

- Continued development and implementation of the enterprise architecture standards for two enterprise application development projects (JOLTSaz and Tempe CMS). The Tempe CMS project is near completion (from the architectural support perspective) and JOLTSaz is continuing.

- Invested substantial time with vendor, AmCad Inc., in continued development and defect management for AJACS. Began the process of development for the LJ CMS with AmCad as well.

- Continued support for using Agile development/SCRUM processes within ITD. Transitioned the process to the Project Management Office and participated in monthly planning sessions for improvement.

- Completed initial implementation of the ESB to support the eCitation handheld devices. Began work on new features for the ESB to support the eFiling project as well as probation automation integration with the CMS.
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.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

**PROJECT GOALS**

- Take an enterprise approach to directory service and managing user information, enabling integration across applications and single sign-on.
- Implement the Federal Information Processing Standards across the network.
- 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.
- Migrate MQ environment from Windows to AIX platform.
- Educate court staff about the AJIN and the Intranet at existing court educational forums. Develop marketing and educational materials for court staff that will be accessing the Judicial Intranet.
- Deploy McAfee e-Policy to provide a single console management system for deploying group security policies, integration of security solutions, access to real-time information and for optimizing security compliance.
- 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.
• Implement BMC Remedy Action Request System for incident and change management functions.
• 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.
• Deploy a new backup and recovery system for Windows and AIX servers.

**PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2009**

• Installed a new SAN Director to support the need for high performance, high reliability and a flexible connectivity platform supporting mission critical applications and eliminating the disruption when upgrading hardware and software.
• Upgraded IBM AIX servers and Informix dynamic servers to the most current software.
• Ordered and began installations to all statewide courts of Cisco’s Wide Area Application Services (WAAS), a comprehensive WAN optimization solution that accelerates application performance.
• Configured statewide Quality of Service (QoS) to support video arraignment and remote conferencing support.
• Installed a full cluster proxy to support Internet access and security, composed of independent proxy servers and providing larger disk cache capacity and balancing.
• Began deployment of replication on SQL servers for the purpose of copying and distributing data and databases and synchronizing between databases to maintain consistency.
• Implemented single sign on for Adult Probation to allow seamless access to data servers including a dual security upgrade.
• Began deployment of a new backup system which significantly reduces licensing costs and is key to cost containment strategy.
• Migrated over 3000 users to clustered Exchange 2007 having new high availability features like the continuous and asynchronous updating of a second copy of a database with the changes that have been made to the active copy.
• Added to the virtual server environment; currently 68 virtual servers are used for production, testing, and development.
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, and 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. Newer applications and devices connected on the network demand more intelligence, requiring upgrades of the established networking infrastructure. Thus, additional investment and planning must continue to be made in AJIN as long as it is to be the Judicial Branch’s enterprise 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 complying with Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) 140; increasing security; increasing capacity to remote locations using Cisco’s Wide Area Application Services (WAAS); lowering anti-virus update time frames; and delivering live training videos to all sites, saving on travel time and costs. In addition, services will include server virtualization and virtual machine mobility and upgraded storage area networks (SANs) to improve integrated and automated business management performance.
Server virtualization provides the opportunity to reduce cost and energy requirements, increase agility, speed deployment, and leverage data center space because servers no longer need to be procured, installed, cabled up and connected to the rest of the infrastructure. This enables rapid deployment of a development or testing environment or creation of ‘sandboxes’ to assess specific functions such as load testing. Virtualization also takes into account the larger impacts due to failures of underlying hardware, tracking software licensing compliance, and the unnecessary consumption of server resources for those more lightly used VMs.

AJIN is 100 percent TCP/IP. Only a few courts in the state are not AJIN connected. During the 2009 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, instant messaging, 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 to 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.
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 capabilities on the Web to include forms, instructions, and other information helpful to those who appear unrepresented in the limited and general jurisdictions, and appellate courts.
- Develop simple, easy to use, web-based, interactive forms needed for dissolution and other domestic-relations-related cases, small claims, eviction actions, general civil, and probate cases.
- Expand the breadth of the self-service approach for court users through online resources.
- Develop a Web Portal that provides a convenient and unified access point for filing court cases as well as viewing case-related information statewide.
- Continued development of a central document repository as the source for public/party inquiry of court documents.
- Provide marketing support to educate the public about the functionality and convenience of the new electronic access capabilities.
**PROJECT GOALS**

**FILLABLE FORMS**
- Create a single governance structure over the development and content of forms for court users statewide.
- Standardize forms data to reduce duplicate efforts in providing court forms to the public and prepare for statewide e-filing.
- Automate the entire workflow associated with case initiation and subsequent filings for select case and form types in the Superior Court, Justice Courts, Municipal Courts, and Appellate Courts.
- Deliver self-service forms to the public via AZTurboCourt, based on court rule or statute.
- Sustain the support, training, and marketing efforts for the statewide AZTurboCourt electronic filing initiative. Involve representatives from all court levels in the development of the forms logic and format.
- Include child support calculator functionality within AZTurboCourt e-filing application developed by the vendor.

**PUBLIC ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS**
- Enable the general public to obtain copies of publically releasable court documents. Extend partial access to documents to Arizona citizens with ADOT-MVD issued drivers' licenses or non-operator identification cards. Extend commercial access only to registered entities having appropriate credentials.
- Extend full access to filers/parties within a case only.

**AZTURBOCOURT.GOV**
- Provide the main access point through which all Internet-accessible services are provided (e.g., e-Filing, FARE, document access, child support calculator, etc).
- Evolve portal over time as new online services are developed.

**MARKETING AND TRAINING**
- Spread the word statewide and nationally about AZTurboCourt.gov and electronic filing.
- Creatively direct communications to individual courts (notices, training), attorneys and legal aids, as well as self-represented litigants.
PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2009

FILLABLE FORMS

- Developed and tested initial intelligent forms, i.e., interview-based question and answer process for justice court small claims, limited civil, and superior court dissolution of marriage.

- Obtained guidance from COT’s e-Court subcommittee about specific issues uncovered in the production of intelligent forms.

- Included a team of subject matter experts from various courts around the state to directly contribute to the development of the AZTurboCourt e-filing system’s intelligent forms sets in accordance with Arizona Revised Statutes and Court rules.

PUBLIC ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS

- The Rule 123 subcommittee drafted a major recommendation relating to the balance between increasing availability of court documents and protecting personal information. The recommendation specified the types of court documents that can be made public and the terms that govern who may gain access to the court documents. The recommendation was distributed for formal review but is not yet approved.

AZTurboCourt.gov

- Designed, developed and deployed a single, Web-based portal, AZTurboCourt.gov, through which the public is directed to the various Court-provided online services, including AZTurboCourt e-filing, child support calculator, and public access to court documents.

MARKETING AND TRAINING

- Formed a team dedicated to produce materials to be posted within the courts’ buildings advertising the existence of and direction to AZTurboCourt.gov products and 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**

**fillable forms**

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, the Court Services Division of the Administrative Office of the Courts began developing a Web-enabled virtual self-service center for court forms. Building on a major initiative for 2008-2010 to expand these standard offerings and make the forms more interactive and user-friendly, the self-service effort is being consolidated into the statewide e-filing initiative and improved from fillable forms to intelligent forms filed using AZTurboCourt.

The current virtual service center on the Judicial Branch’s Internet Webpage provides a set of common court forms online and leads users through the process of filling out forms and printing them. The Adobe Acrobat product was selected as the development tool for the Child Support Calculator and was relied upon together with HTML for development of the virtual self-service center.

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. 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, eliminating the need for manual intervention. Attorneys are the likely candidates to make use of data fillable forms while pro se litigants will likely favor the intelligent forms option from TurboCourt.

**Public Access**

Rule 123, Rules of the Supreme Court of Arizona (“Rule 123”) authorizes courts to provide remote electronic access to case records. The types of access include requests for bulk or compiled data and remote electronic access to case records. Procedures for each method of access have been drafted and are under review and comment. A brief description of each access method follows.

Section 1-605: Requests for Bulk or Compiled Data. A custodian of bulk data may make such data or a portion thereof available through a subscription service and pursuant to the provisions of Rule 123, this section and all other applicable rules and law. The custodian of bulk data will require the requestor to enter into a dissemination agreement containing, at a minimum, the terms set forth in the proposed Court policy and pay a fee. Procedures define the “Dissemination Agreement,” e.g., the roles of the requestor and records custodian, the terms that govern how information is created/compiled, and what information can be distributed, etc,
Section 1-605 – Remote Electronic Access to Case Records. Rule 123, Rules of the Supreme Court of Arizona ("Rule 123") authorizes courts to provide remote electronic access to case records. This code section sets forth the procedure for providing that access. The public’s right of access to all non-sealed, non-confidential case records at a court facility, whether in paper or electronic format, shall not be limited by this section.

A separate section of this document is devoted to the approach for providing public access to court data and documents.

AZTurboCourt.gov

The AZTurboCourt.gov initiative represents an overarching vision to provide Court automation solutions to the public and government agencies via a common Web portal. This portal will highlight the different services that are available, describe them in various levels of detail, and direct them to the online products and services. AZTurboCourt e-Filing, for example, is a multi-year endeavor focused on providing private citizens and government agencies a means to pay for and file court documents in any court of the State and at any time of the day or night. Since the AZTurboCourt e-Filing system will guide filers through the entire case filing process, including capturing data and processing input via each court’s case management system, access to justice will be sped up, the accuracy and completeness of the information entering the court will improve significantly minimizing the amount of re-work typically associated with manual case file processing, court forms will be standardized, and the amount of manual paper handling will be reduced greatly.

The first AZTurboCourt e-Filing applications to launch will be the Pay & Print intelligent forms service. This service will enable filers to complete their forms and submit them over-the-counter. Immediately following the release of the AZTurboCourt Pay & Print services, integration with the various court case management systems will begin. Full E-Filing, as it is being called, will allow filers to complete, pay for, and electronically submit their filings to the court. Full E-Filing will negate the need for filers to physically travel or have couriers deliver documents to the various courts.

Other AZTurboCourt.gov portal services will also be made available, such as Public Access to Court Documents, FARE processing, and the Court’s Child Support Calculator. The ultimate goal is to provide one-stop access for all important court transactions.

Marketing and Training

Automating manual processes to improve court productivity and efficiencies, while a huge benefit to everyone involved, introduces certain challenges that require time and effort to address. Acclimating the public, government agencies, and court staff to perform certain tasks differently requires a combination of dedicated marketing and training.
Since the AZTurboCourt e-Filing initiative was announced in June of 2008, several presentations have been given to various interested parties, e.g., private citizens, law firms, the State Bar, and individual Court committees. Getting the word out about the initiative has been critical because it prepares citizens for the impending delivery of a service that will fundamentally change the way in which they conduct business with the Court. Additionally, as future users of the system, their feedback can help improve the products and services ultimately delivered by the Court. This will, in turn, improve the adoption of the AZTurboCourt E-Filing system.

Marketing materials such as brochures and posters have been created and are ready for distribution in courts who will be going live with the first of the AZTurboCourt services. Once Full E-Filing occurs, court staff must understand how they will track various documents and processes differently from their manual methods. This will require education and training as the program matures and extends its reach throughout Arizona.

As the AZTurboCourt system evolves, business and technical subject matter experts are helping to define what activities each court will be required to perform.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

- Deliver functional specifications for Probation automation system/CMS integration to AJACS team.
- Complete AJACS design and development for Probation/CMS integration.
- Finalize all remaining JOLTSaz application development including:
  1. Integration with AJACS CMS, including JOLTSaz modifications and CMS-related data conversion development;
  2. New requirements for needs/strengths assessment (interim and permanent solutions);
  3. New requirements for forms and letters using OnBase EDMS;
  4. Statewide identifier;
  5. Conversion of in-house JOLTS Crystal Reports to Microsoft SQL Server Reporting Services (SSRS); and
  6. Any remaining gap items and defects.
- Complete test preparation and training documentation.
- Perform full cycle (systems) testing at AOC for probation system/CMS integration with AJACS and all JOLTSaz functionality.
- Perform user acceptance testing at AOC.
- Perform on-site, fully functional pilot in first rural county.
- Convert data and implement production system for the first rural county.
PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2009

- Completed analysis and development of all JOLTSaz functional components, independent of integration with any CMS, on schedule in January 2009.

- Organized and facilitated numerous meetings with county clerks of court and juvenile probation departments to review processes and adopt standard business practices statewide (with goals to eliminate duplicate data entry, improve timeliness of data entry, reduce paper flow, and make information available to everyone who needs it when they need it).

- Continued successful partnership between AOC and Pima Juvenile development teams, each building specific functional modules of the new JOLTSaz system.

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

JOLTS is considered one of the most comprehensive juvenile court automation 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 Clerks 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 August 2010, and could continue beyond full statewide implementation in 2011.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- To provide a standard, reusable, enterprise web services portal query interface solution for end-users to access of data.
- To obtain electronic information in near real-time from diverse systems using a standard web portal interface.
- To expand and incorporate the solution architecture across multiple justice areas to enhance business productivity.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2009

- Assessed, identified and implemented overarching solution architecture including hardware and software that will be applied to other application interfaces in the future.
- Implemented JWI web portal test environment with DPS and Pima Adult Probation.
- Began planning for implementation with AOC Human Resources and site security officers.
The Justice Web Interface (JWI) program is an innovative computer application that efficiently connects various criminal justice entities with the Arizona Department of Public Safety (DPS) through a secure web page, linking local justice agencies and federal information sources through NLETS, the International Justice and Public Safety Information Sharing Network. JWI precludes the need to spend hours of research time switching among multiple screens to generate the compilation of potentially hundreds of individual computer query responses into a combined criminal history report for judges, attorneys, and investigators.

Designed, developed and implemented by the Integrated Criminal Justice Information System (ICJIS) Agency of Maricopa County, JWI has greatly improved productivity while enhancing public safety. Additional criminal justice database searches are being added to JWI as they become available, expanding its original objective of replacing "green screen" mainframe access methods for gathering information on criminal subjects, to the development of a much improved method for retrieving, grouping, and compiling a criminal history. JWI provides the ability to query data from multiple source systems via browser access and then populate data to a PC via a single interface mask.

Unlike previous data aggregation environments, JWI is not a centralized system or massive data repository. Each stakeholder maintains a case management system or systems and allows a subset of data from their system to be exchanged with other partner agencies. Sometimes the data is exchanged in real time, sometimes in near real time, or nightly. Shared information is consumed by the receiving agencies and is then made available within their own case management system.

Beyond being a single application, this particular solution architecture is transferable to other subject areas, providing significant productivity gain to end users as it dramatically reduces labor intensive activities associated to users having to go to multiple systems/applications to obtain data. It facilitates the ability to introduce new data feeds. In addition, it enables an end-user the ability to copy and paste data and eliminates the need to re-enter data manually and thus associated data entry errors.
This solution approach will be replicated for Juvenile and Adult Probation, the GJ CMS, and the LJ CMS.
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 2009

- Demolition work began in early December 2007 and construction was completed in June 2008. Migration of existing equipment completed in November 2008, bringing the project to a close.

SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New X</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 facilities project allows 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 has a self-contained HVAC and power system connected to a diesel-fueled emergency generator. This arrangement eliminates 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 longer-term growth and redundancy had to be eliminated to keep costs at a reasonable level; funds must be allocated at a later date.
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 2009**

- Completed the AJACS pilot court phase with Yuma Superior Court going live on July 14, 2008 and La Paz Superior Court going live on August 4, 2008.
- GJ CMS application named Arizona Judicial Automated Case System or AJACS in August 2008.
- Completed data conversion and implementation for four production courts:
  - Cochise Superior Court on December 20, 2008;
  - Mohave Superior Court on February 20, 2009;
  - Pinal Superior Court on June 5, 2009; and
  - Santa Cruz Superior Court on June 30, 2009.
- Provided regression training for Yuma Superior Court in June 2009.
- Deployed multiple version upgrades to the AJACS application between July 14, 2008, and May 11, 2009.
- Improved AJACS version control processes.
- Improved implementation processes via a series of “dry run” procedures beginning with the Pinal project.

<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, all requirements were incorporated into the application and those requirements not initially implemented in the pilot courts have been upgraded to complete their functionality. Subsequent updates of the application version have been delivered to all installed courts following release. Upon final payment, the source becomes 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>
</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 resulted in a conversion and go-live weekend of July 11 to July 14, 2008.

FY2009’s focus has been establishing best practices for deployment of the replacement software into the general jurisdiction courts of Arizona. With the completion of the pilot project phase, the emphasis became one of utilizing lessons learned from the pilot courts and each successive court to improve the deployment to the next court in the schedule. This has been a successful exercise; the numbers of defects resulting from the court implementation project has continued to decline from a high in Yuma of over 150 to the most recent court, Santa Cruz, having only 2. Although the vendor, AmCad, has been responsible by contract for the data conversion, training, and implementation of the first five courts, the sixth court, Santa Cruz, was largely completed by AOC staff with some of the most significant strides in improvements being accomplished. A contract revision allows the vendor to discontinue services of data conversion and training by February 1, 2010, and the AOC staff will complete the remaining deployment of the three final courts: Gila, Graham and Greenlee Superior.

The project budget remains unchanged even with the contract revision noted above.
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 legacy CMS functionality to a .NET environment.
- 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 2009**

- Continued to partner with Tempe Municipal Court in their efforts to develop and implement of a new Case Management System. This partnership was entered into in October 2004 with the understanding that this new CMS could be utilized by the AOC as a statewide replacement for the aging AZTEC application.

- Completed development of the Protective Order Module for Tempe CMS application. Conducted user assessments of two candidate LJ CMS applications (Tempe CMS and AmCad AiCMS).

- Prepared recommendation report and presentations on LJ CMS solution for COT and AJC. The recommended solution was a “hybrid” approach that would utilize AmCad’s AiCMS software as the baseline CMS product and enhance it by incorporating functionality favored in the Tempe CMS product with AZTEC system improvements developed by Scottsdale Municipal Court called AZTEC Wizard.

- Conducted site visits with AmCad of six LJ courts to observe business processes and review current system configurations and requirements.

- Conducted gap analysis sessions to identify and document additional LJ functional requirements resulting in the generation of an Internal/External Design Document.

- Completed contract amendments and entered into agreement with AmCad for development of limited jurisdiction functionality and enhancements.

- Received two LJ-related AJACS application builds that included certain functionality and requirements identified during gap analysis sessions. Scheduled all other documented functionality and requirements for delivery in four release cycles between July 1 and December 31, 2009.

<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.

The Judiciary has several second-generation statewide automation projects underway that 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 clearly defined standards.

Two possible solutions exist for the limited jurisdiction courts statewide: the Tempe CMS application currently under development in the Tempe Municipal Court or AmCad’s AiCMS, a vendor-developed, integrated case management system that has been selected as the second-generation general jurisdiction courts (GJ) case management system (CMS), replacing AZTEC.

Commission on Technology’s final recommended and AJC-approved solution for the LJ CMS is a “hybrid” approach that utilizes AmCad’s AiCMS software as the baseline CMS product and enhances it by incorporating functionality favored in the Tempe CMS product along with AZTEC system improvements developed by Scottsdale Municipal Court called AZTEC Wizard.

This statewide LJ CMS solution takes advantage of a great opportunity to consolidate approximately 10 separate case management applications that are currently utilized within the Arizona LJ court community down to four (4) at full implementation. Additional courts could be consolidated into this solution as their current applications age and become un-supportable. Significant, large volume, non-AOC-supported courts are prepared to collaborate with the AOC and the vendor through the provision of resources, funding, and business analysis to build upon the existing AiCMS application and develop a solution that meets the needs of all LJ courts, large or small, rural or metropolitan.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

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 2009

- Total of 136 courts in 14 counties with 1.44 million cases submitted with a value of $839 million.
- Backlog receivables project has realized over $134.7 million in collections to date.
- Approximately $38.6 million collected via electronic media, Web, and IVR.
- Online payments continue to be 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 488,500, with over 208,300 releases for a release rate of 42.7 percent.
- TTEAP continues to be a 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 Cochise, La Paz, Mohave, Santa Cruz, Yuma, and Pinal County Superior Courts. Due to a lack of FARE functionality in AJACS, cases submitted by La Paz, Mohave, Pinal, and Santa Cruz Superior Courts have been suspended from collection activity.

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. PEP morphed into the Fines, Fees and Restitution Enforcement (FARE) Project which was 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, 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. AO 2009-29 codified the FARE collections program in the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration as ACJA § 5-205.

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 per year; as of this date, a total of $25.5 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.

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 Traffic Ticket Enforcement Assistance Program (TTEAP)
- Electronic skip tracing
- Case record data enhancement
- Installment payment plan services
- Advanced collection and offender location services

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, 2007, and 2008 have been distributed. Fiscal Year 2009 expenses are being finalized and any excess funds will be distributed in early Fiscal 2010.
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.”
- Complete the dictionary of standard codes, descriptions, and definitions for the variety of superior-court-related events and functions.
- Establish a dictionary of standard codes, descriptions, and definitions for the variety of limited jurisdiction 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 2009**

- The AZTEC master tables were mapped and applied in AJACS. Individual mapping efforts were completed for each of the 13 Superior Court jurisdictions scheduled for transition to AJACS. Existing codes were mapped and reconciled with the standard set to be implemented as each county implements AJACS.

- AJACS workgroups were initiated to address and resolve issues as each new court approaches implementation and go-live. These groups are smaller and thus able to be more focused.

- Work continues on financial and calendar activities, and the development of civil and criminal statistical reports for Superior Courts.

- The Limited Jurisdiction Standardization Workgroup began working through coding issues in preparation for AJACS implementation in LJ courts.

- The Data Standards Committee approved by COT met twice in FY 2009 for status updates. No new issues were brought to this committee.

<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**

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. This project contributed 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 effort involves 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.

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, but are not limited to, 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

- Enhance and support the interface from the data warehouse to populate public access information for use by the public and interested government agencies.
- Enhance the Public Access Victim Notification application to include all courts.
- Develop and implement a Public Access Strategic Roadmap that accommodates new business and external user’s needs as well as dissemination of information such as AZTurboCourt and bulk data downloads.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2009

- Upgraded the public access website to meet AOC standards (3-tier/.NET architecture) which increased overall security, reduced data mining activity, and significantly enhanced application/user performance.
- Enhanced supportability through the implementation of new architecture/development standards and documentation.
- Continued support of the Public Access Victim Notification application using Maricopa Superior Court extracts / active criminal cases.
- Made numerous user interface enhancements, e.g., page format improvement to facilitate user viewing and overall webpage consistency.
SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>X 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 public access web application provides the public a means by which to search for a specific party and any related case information at a statewide level. The application displays basic case information, basic party information, charge information, and case docket (events) information. A victim notification feature allows users to register and select cases they would like to track. Whenever the selected data element (case, charge, disposition, event, minutes, or party) changes on the case, a notification e-mail is sent to the registered user indicating a change on the case. Currently, this feature is available only for Maricopa Superior Court cases displayed in public access. The information on public access is a subset of all data warehouse data; certain information gets filtered from public access, including witness information, victim information, probate case types, adoption case types, and any other "restricted" case types.
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 2009

• Upgraded and continued using server-based KSource training for technical programming and database staff at AOC.

• Held several IBM Websphere MQ “Boot Camps” for external agencies that needed to interface with the AOC.
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 2009 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 2009**

- Having implemented videoconferencing in the majority of superior court locations around the state using Fill the Gap grants to connect rural courts to resources in Phoenix, the AOC enhanced network performance by configuring Quality of Service (QoS) statewide to reduce average delay at the gateway, cell losses, and the transmission error rate. This has improved the quality of video arraignments and remote conferencing on AJIN, issues surfaced by the Remote Court Reporters' Project participants. Many rural court locations have established local videoconferencing (outside of AJIN) to local jails that handle the vast majority of remote initial appearances.

- The Criminal Rules Videoconference Advisory Committee (CRVAC) issued its final report on the types of criminal proceedings for which videoconferencing could be utilized, and the technical issues that needed to be addressed to effectively implement video appearances. Representatives of the AOC presented technical details to the committee as background to the report.

- CRVAC also proposed a new ACJA code section controlling the use of videoconferencing in criminal cases. CRVAC asked COT to provide minimum technical standards statewide to ensure remote participants are able to clearly see and hear the proceedings in the courtroom, and to ensure that court participants, including members of the public, can also see and hear remote participants-at the jail. Local court policies would also be established under the proposed code section to address infrastructure, resource, and operational issues specific to a particular jurisdiction.

**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 and continued emphasis on public safety, videoconferencing is becoming a very 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. Local courts and jails communicate via videoconferencing apart from the AOC on a county or city network.
The remote court reports program equipped one courtroom in each superior court with videoconferencing equipment. Once in place, the equipment can 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, may purchase additional systems to videoconference between locations for various purposes, including court reporting using resources in Maricopa County.

The Criminal Rules Videoconference Advisory Committee (CRVAC) was established by Administrative Order 2008-92. The genesis of the Committee was a Supreme Court rule petition, R-06-0016, which sought to expand the use of videoconferences in criminal proceedings pursuant to Rule 1.6 of the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure. CRVAC was directed by the chief justice to make recommendations for the appropriate use of video appearances, taking into account the legal concerns raised during the comment period for R-06-0016. The Committee was also directed to recommend the types of proceedings for which videoconferencing could be utilized, and what technical issues needed to be addressed to effectively implement video appearances. The members of CRVAC -- judges, court administrators, public attorneys, and sheriff commanders -- were also cognizant of fiscal concerns which were referenced in AO 2008-92, and the potential cost savings that might be realized with expanded use of videoconferencing for court proceedings.

The Arizona Judicial Council adopted CRVAC’s report and recommendations in June 2009. These recommendations included proposed amendments to Rule 1.6 of the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure that will be considered by the Court at its rules agenda in the fall of 2009. These proposed amendments exclude trials and contested probation violation hearings in felonies and misdemeanors as well as felony sentencing and felony probation violation dispositions from being conducted by an interactive audiovisual system. The proposed amendments allow six specified routine, “housekeeping” proceedings, including initial appearances and arraignments, to be done by interactive audiovisual systems, in the court’s discretion and without a stipulation, and permit any proceeding not otherwise identified in the rule to be performed using an interactive audiovisual system upon a court-approved stipulation of the parties.

A workgroup of the Committee on Limited Jurisdiction Courts recently made two recommendations to the AJC that involve video-conferencing. 1) Use video-conferencing to resolve more in-custody misdemeanor cases at the initial appearance stage. 2) Expand the use of video-conferencing for judicial meetings. Item 2 has inherent bandwidth and cost implications that must be addressed to be useful for committee and administrative purposes involving multiple counties.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

**PROJECT GOALS**

- Deploy replacement PCs to users statewide on four-year cycle.
- Deploy updated software to remain in support.
- Validate candidates for suitability as the replacement operating system for Windows 2000 and XP.
- Create an internal and external image for rapid deployment.
- Develop and execute training plan in support of new PCs.
- Assist courts in workarounds for local applications that are not yet compliant with new operating system and productivity software.

**PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2009**

- Deployed 3500 replacement PCs to users statewide.
- Deployed MS Word 2007, replacing WordPerfect.
- Validated Microsoft Vista for suitability as the replacement operating system for Windows 2000 and Windows XP.
- Created an internal and external Vista image.
- Developed and executed training plan in support of new PCs.
- Converted AZTEC forms for all supported courts from WordPerfect 8 to MS Word 2007.
- Assisted courts in workarounds for local applications that were not yet Vista compliant.

### 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 were tested to ensure continued operation in the new environment.

Since the AOC owns the PCs being taken out of service, a few PCs were left behind or re-deployed as a fallback plan to host applications until drivers existed and manufacturers updated their code to work in the Vista environment.

This two-year, statewide project (including testing, training, deployment, hardware recovery, and support) completed in October 2008. Provided sufficient funding exists, the next refresh cycle should be undertaken in FY 2012.
APPENDIX – A. HARDWARE ENVIRONMENT

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>106</td>
<td>Windows 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP Proliant</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Windows 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP Proliant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Windows 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP Proliant</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>VMWare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>AJACS (GJ CMS)</td>
<td>AmCad, Inc. Herndon, VA</td>
<td>6 courts, 602 users</td>
<td>New Court Case and Cash Management Software for the Arizona Court Automation Project (ACAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APETS (Adult Probation Tracking System)</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>26 sites, approximately 3500 APD users</td>
<td>Currently installed at all county adult probation departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC</td>
<td>Progressive Solutions, Inc. Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
<td>143 courts; 1500 court users</td>
<td>Old 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</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>CASPER</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>204 ACAP computers</td>
<td>Combined statistical reporting application</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>3463</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 2699 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 2007</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>Version 2000-52</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; 722 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>68</td>
<td>Phasing out with computer refresh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Software Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Software Application</th>
<th>Vendor/Internal Development</th>
<th>No. Users</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Support Calculator</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>280,336 per month</td>
<td>Internet application that calculates child support payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASA Volunteer Webpage</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>409 per month</td>
<td>Secure Internet application that uploads documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arizona Supreme Court and the Administrative Office of the Courts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Application</td>
<td>Vendor/Internal Development</td>
<td>No. Users</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Used for a variety of localized databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adobe Acrobat Professional</td>
<td>Adobe</td>
<td>233</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>95 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>741 Statewide</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>471 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>471</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>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>Defensive Driving</td>
<td>Internal development on AS/400</td>
<td>24 driving schools</td>
<td>Statewide-centralized database of defensive driving class participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependant Children's Activity Tracking</td>
<td>Internal on-going support on RS/6000 in PowerBuilder for this system built with a vendor on contract.</td>
<td>161</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>System (DCATS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excel</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>662 internal computers</td>
<td>Spreadsheet application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlook</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>662 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>156</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>662 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</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>Library Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logos</td>
<td>New World Systems Troy, MI</td>
<td>AOC: 21</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 – 643 V8.0 - 23</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>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>Microsoft Project</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Project planning tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MQ Series</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Server-based message broker software for integration projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MQ Series Integrator</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Server-based message broker software for content-based routing and application development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NetView</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Used to manage LAN and WAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Assistance Hotline</td>
<td>Internal development Remedy AR System</td>
<td>192</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>27</td>
<td>Development tool for new applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PowerGen</td>
<td>E Crane, Inc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Developer tool for PowerBuilder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW</td>
<td>Riverton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Case development tool, UML modeling tool; PowerBuilder and BV code generator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PowerPoint</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>662 internal computers</td>
<td>Primary presentations application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick Test Pro</td>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Test script execution product that supports regression testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Center</td>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>50</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>50</td>
<td>Records all user actions on a test application for developers to review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedy</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Call/service request tracking application used by IT Support Center; user access via web browser provided for lookup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Server</td>
<td>ThinQ</td>
<td>Internal: 22 Statewide: 2000</td>
<td>A learning management system tracking employee education, enhanced with an internally developed online web registration module</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</td>
<td>Statewide Dashboards 662</td>
<td>Visionary is an Internet-enabled, graphical development and deployment tool for creating visually rich, intuitive, analytic applications for corporate decision-makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visio</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>Client: 86</td>
<td>Diagram/flow charting software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Exception Time Reporting (WETR)</td>
<td>Internal development on AS/400</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>Records leave and weekly time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>662 internal computers</td>
<td>Word processing software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WETR Online</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>Intranet Application</td>
<td>AOC Intranet application used for timekeeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Leave Requirements</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>Intranet Application</td>
<td>AOC Intranet application used for leave requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACAP</td>
<td>Arizona Court Automation Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCH</td>
<td>Arizona Computerized Criminal History System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>Arizona Court eFiling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACJA</td>
<td>Arizona Code of Judicial Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACJC</td>
<td>Arizona Criminal Justice Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACJIS</td>
<td>Arizona Criminal Justice Information System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADRS</td>
<td>Arizona Disposition Reporting System</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJACS</td>
<td>Arizona Judicial Automated Case System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJB</td>
<td>Arizona Judicial Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJC</td>
<td>Arizona Judicial Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJIN</td>
<td>Arizona Judicial Information Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMCAD</td>
<td>American Cadastre, LLC., vendor for the AJACS case management system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>Administrative Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC</td>
<td>Administrative Office of the Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APETS</td>
<td>Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSD</td>
<td>Adult Probation Services Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARK</td>
<td>Automated Reporting Kiosk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Code</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARS</td>
<td>Arizona Revised Statutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS/400</td>
<td>IBM’s midrange business computing platform and operating system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTC</td>
<td>Arizona Traffic Ticket Complaint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZAFIS</td>
<td>Arizona Fingerprint Identification System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZiCMS</td>
<td>Arizona Integrated Case Management System, LJ Court Enhancement to AJACS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC</td>
<td>Arizona Courts’ legacy case and cash management system software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>Business Intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2C</td>
<td>Court to Court Electronic Records Transfer Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACC</td>
<td>Court Automation Coordinating Committee (formerly LVCC), as subcommittee of COT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASA</td>
<td>Court Appointed Special Advocate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT</td>
<td>Computer-Based Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>Common Case Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCM</td>
<td>Common Code Mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDR</td>
<td>Central Document Repository</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>Certification and Licensing Division of the AOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Case Management System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COJET</td>
<td>Committee on Judicial Education and Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLD</td>
<td>Computer Output to Laser Device</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOP</td>
<td>Continuity of Operations Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSR</td>
<td>Convicted Persons on Supervised Release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Commission on Technology, a committee of AJC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPOR</td>
<td>Court Protective Order Repository</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRVAC</td>
<td>Criminal Rules Videoconference Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSD</td>
<td>Court Services Division, a division of the AOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>Calendar Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCATS</td>
<td>Dependant Children’s Automated Tracking System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>Defensive Driving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDP</td>
<td>Defensive Driving Program (Automation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDS</td>
<td>Defensive Driving School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDTS</td>
<td>Defensive Driving Tracking System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>Department of Economic Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMZ</td>
<td>Demilitarized Zone (related to network firewalls and the Internet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>Department of Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS</td>
<td>Department of Public Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTEF</td>
<td>Drug Treatment and Education Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>Driving Under the Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Citation</td>
<td>An electronic means of opening a case within a CMS, typically by law enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Filing</td>
<td>Electronic filing of case-related information formerly done using paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-ROA</td>
<td>Electronic Record on Appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Signature</td>
<td>Electronic means of providing the function of a wet signature on a document, e.g., “/s/”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Enterprise Architecture, codified in ACJA §1-505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBP</td>
<td>Evidence-Based Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECF</td>
<td>Electronic Court Filing Specification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDM</td>
<td>Electronic Document Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMS</td>
<td>Electronic Document Management System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFM</td>
<td>Electronic Filing Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFSP</td>
<td>Electronic Filing Service Provider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESB</td>
<td>Enterprise Service Bus (formerly called “data bus”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC</td>
<td>Earned Time Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARE</td>
<td>Fines, Fees and Restitution Enforcement Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCRB</td>
<td>Foster Care Review Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIPS</td>
<td>Federal Information Processing Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAO</td>
<td>U.S. Government Accountability Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GITA</td>
<td>Government Information Technology Agency, an executive branch agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJ</td>
<td>General Jurisdiction (Court)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJXDD</td>
<td>Global Justice XML Data Dictionary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJXDM</td>
<td>Global Justice XML Data Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJXML</td>
<td>Global Justice Extensible Markup Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Global Positioning System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUID</td>
<td>Globally Unique Identifier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUI</td>
<td>Graphical User Interface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resources Department of the AOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICIS</td>
<td>Maricopa Superior Court’s and Justice Courts’ case management system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICJIS</td>
<td>Integrated Criminal Justice Information System (Maricopa County)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Identifier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEPD</td>
<td>Information Exchange Package Documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Internet Protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITAC</td>
<td>Information Technology Authorization Committee, an executive branch committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITD</td>
<td>Information Technology Division, a division of the AOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVR</td>
<td>Interactive Voice Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCEF</td>
<td>Judicial Collections Enhancement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJSD</td>
<td>Juvenile Justice Services Division, A Division of the AOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JLBC</td>
<td>Joint Legislative Budget Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTS</td>
<td>Juvenile Online Tracking System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>Justice of the Peace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPIJ</td>
<td>Judicial Project Investment Justification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUSTIS</td>
<td>Judicial Statewide Information Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWI</td>
<td>Justice Web Interface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ</td>
<td>Limited Jurisdiction (Court)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPOR</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Protective Order Repository</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEEDS</td>
<td>Minute Entry Electronic Distribution System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPLS</td>
<td>Multi-Protocol Label Switching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVD</td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Division (of the Arizona Dept. of Transportation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSC</td>
<td>National Center for State Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCIC</td>
<td>National Criminal Information Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td>Network Interface Card</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIEM</td>
<td>National Information Exchange Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASIS</td>
<td>Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACC</td>
<td>Probation Automation Coordinating Committee, a subcommittee of COT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Personal Computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCCJC</td>
<td>Pima County Consolidated Justice Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>Portable Document Format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEP</td>
<td>Penalty Enforcement Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKI</td>
<td>Public Key Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMO</td>
<td>Project Management Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Probation Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS</td>
<td>Pre-Trial Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QoS</td>
<td>Quality of Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAM</td>
<td>Random Access Memory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Request for Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN</td>
<td>Storage Area Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLAPR</td>
<td>Arizona State Library, Archives, and Public Records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRS</td>
<td>SQL Server Reporting Services (Replaces Crystal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWDD</td>
<td>Software Design Document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWID</td>
<td>Statewide Identifier (Juvenile Probation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Council, a subcommittee of COT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCPF</td>
<td>Traffic Case Processing Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Tax Intercept Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Urinalysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UETA</td>
<td>Uniform Electronic Transactions Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-LAN</td>
<td>Virtual Local Area Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM</td>
<td>Virtual Machine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOIP</td>
<td>Voice Over Internet Protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPN</td>
<td>Virtual Private Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAS</td>
<td>Wide Area Application Services, a Cisco product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XML</td>
<td>Extensible Markup Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX - D