



SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA

---

**CASE PROCESSING ASSISTANCE FUND POLICIES**

---

Administrative Order No. 87-22

In order to administer funds provided to the Arizona Supreme Court pursuant to A.R.S. §41-2401(B)(7), and in accordance with A.R.S. §41-2401(E) which requires that the Supreme Court expend such monies for the purpose of enhancing the ability of the courts in Arizona to process criminal and delinquency cases,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. The attached policies governing the administration of the Case Processing Assistance Fund (CPAF) are adopted;

2. The new policies hereby adopted shall take effect July 1, 1987, and shall supersede the Administrative Requirements approved by the Court on April 23, 1985; and

3. A copy of the policies shall be distributed to the Chief Judges of the Court of Appeals, presiding judges of the Superior Court, justices of the peace, and presiding judges of the municipal courts no later than seven days after the effective date of this order.

DATED AND ENTERED this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of June, 1987, at the State Capitol in Phoenix, Arizona.

For The Court:

---

FRANK X. GORDON, JR.  
Chief Justice

Supreme Court Of Arizona

**CASE PROCESSING ASSISTANCE FUND POLICIES**

Effective July 1, 1987

**A. Purpose**

The Case Processing Assistance Fund (CPAF) is comprised of monies allocated to the Supreme Court from the Criminal Justice Enhancement Fund created in A.R.S. §41-2401. Pursuant to A.R.S. §41-2401(E), the Supreme Court shall expend monies received for the purpose of "enhancing the ability of the courts to process criminal and delinquency cases" in accordance with rules adopted by the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission. Therefore, the following policies shall apply to the use of all CPAF monies.

**B. Authorized Uses Of Fund Monies**

1. To enhance the ability of courts to process criminal and delinquency cases in accordance with the provisions of A.R.S. §41-2401(E), the Supreme Court will, where appropriate, approve and allocate CPAF monies for the following purposes:

- a. To reduce existing caseloads and backlogs;
- b. To develop innovative or experimental programs designed to reduce case processing time and delay;
- c. To educate and train court personnel in case management methods and techniques to reduce delay;
- d. To support research and related activities to identify the causes of case backlog and to develop methods and systems to avoid future case backlog; and
- e. To provide technical assistance and consulting services in modern case management techniques designed to alleviate delay in case processing.

2. Case processing funds may be allocated for uses not listed above to the extent that such uses clearly enhance the ability of courts to process criminal and delinquency cases.

3. Where appropriate to further the purpose of A.R.S. §41-2401(E) and to achieve the optimal statewide impact in the use of these funds, the Supreme Court may, at the discretion and through the action of the Chief Justice, directly expend fund monies for any or all of the foregoing uses, and may set aside a portion of the funds to establish innovative case processing and delay reduction demonstration projects.

4. The sole purpose of funding pro tempore positions is to assist courts in overcoming a clearly documented case backlog or an inability to process criminal or delinquency cases routinely in a timely manner in accordance with appropriate laws and Supreme Court rules.

### **C. Administration**

1. The Administrative Director shall develop, and, with the approval of the Chief Justice, implement the specific requirements, guidelines, and procedures needed to execute these policies.

2. The Administrative Director shall review all applications submitted for CPAF monies and shall recommend to the Chief Justice approval or disapproval. The Chief Justice may accept or reject such recommendations. Grants to courts within a single county shall not exceed 50 percent of the total amount of all CPAF grants awarded statewide in a fiscal year. Upon approval of funding by the Chief Justice, the Administrative Director shall proceed with the appropriate disbursement of fund monies consistent with the applications and related funding agreements.

3. The Chief Justice or the Administrative Director may require grantees, as a condition of receiving monies, to consider procedural changes in order to encourage grantees to develop alternative long-term solutions to backlog problems, and to avoid simplistic solutions to backlog and delay.

4. The Administrative Director is authorized to amend or modify a funding agreement up to but not exceeding 15 percent of the initial funding agreement. Amendments or modifications which exceed that amount must be approved by the Chief Justice. In the event the Administrative Director declines to approve a request to amend or modify a funding agreement, the request along with a written statement of the reason for denying the request shall be submitted to the Chief Justice for consideration and final determination.

5. The Administrative Director is authorized to conduct or contract for periodic evaluations of CPAF programs, and is authorized to inspect, audit or to have audited any records, financial or otherwise, relating to the use and expenditure of CPAF funds.

6. The Administrative Director is authorized to allocate and spend an amount equal to but not more than 10 percent of the previous fiscal year's deposits to the fund to cover the costs of administering the fund in any given fiscal year. Administrative costs may include, but are not limited to, full- or part-time staff, operating expenses, equipment, training, and travel. These monies may also be used by the Administrative Director to conduct the evaluations and audits authorized in these policies.

7. The Administrative Director shall supply to all courts the forms needed to implement these policies.