

COT e-Court Subcommittee

“The Lid is Rattling”



Progress Update: November 3, 2006

Justice Andrew Hurwitz

Mission: Drive and coordinate the statewide evolution of electronic case processing in Arizona, using a business-centric rather than technology-centric perspective.

Subcommittee Membership

- Justice Andrew Hurwitz, Appeals Courts, *Chair*
- Donna Killoughey Bird, State Bar of Arizona
- Robert Brutinel, General Jurisdiction Courts
- Karl Heckart, Administrative Office of the Courts ITD
- Jeanne Hicks, Superior Court Clerks, Rural
- Donald Jacobson, Court Administrators
- Michael Jeanes, Superior Court Clerks, Metro
- Dennis Lusk, Limited Jurisdiction Courts
- Stewart Bruner, Staff

E-Court Principles

- **Approach: Courts should create a competitive, multi-provider environment under which any provider who meets the certification criteria will be able to file.**
- **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.**
- **Courts are too resource constrained to provide extensive technical support themselves for filing attorneys and the public.**
- **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.**
- **The path to success involves general consistency with national standards and cooperation between courts and private sector ventures.**
- **Privacy and access issues must be adequately addressed.**
- **While the conceptual model for e-filing includes criminal cases, the courts, not vendors, are responsible for criminal justice integration activities.**


General Strategy

Oversee the business decisions, change process, and plans necessary to

- Expand court-to-court electronic filings of records
- Create and leverage a disposition reporting system that acts as a clearinghouse for criminal history updates from justice partners
- Create a statewide attorney/public e-filing system leveraging standard, interactive forms as its foundation

Approach Taken

- **Divide the elephant by levels of court and function**
 - **General Jurisdiction**
 - **Limited Jurisdiction**
 - **Appellate Courts**
 - **Criminal Filing**
- **Determine best projects, realistic timelines, barriers**
- **Return to COT to communicate**



General Jurisdiction

- **Projects – Multi-vendor proof of concept, EDMS pre-requisite**
- **Timelines – Expansion beyond Maricopa requires decision on CMS to use; 2 of last 3 superior courts in EDMS procurement phase <1 year**
- **Barriers – Decision needed: Spend the time and effort on making AZTEC work for multi-vendor filing or wait for AGAVE? Tie in the EFM from Maricopa? Signature rules need to be changed or defined for electronic realm**

Limited Jurisdiction

- **Projects – e-Citation, Forms Data Standardization**
- **Timelines – Oro Valley implementation by Nov 30; Associations working on forms thru Feb 28, then vetting begins**
- **Barriers – Lack of ownership for statewide contract; vendor reticence to make software changes; risk of development with end of life AZTEC; adoption of statewide set of forms even if AOC hosts them; forms’ “look and feel” prior to full e-filing**

Appellate Courts

- **Projects – e-ROA, EDMS implementation, Integration with Appellamation, e-Distribution (e-copies w/ PRs)**
- **Timelines -- Yavapai 6 mo. pilot well underway; EDMS procurement underway, timeline defined; OnBase integration underway; rules revisions for Supreme Court e-copies filed and in comment**
- **Barriers – Fully define and communicate e-ROA interaction with superior courts; signature rules on judgments; judges' technology needs; back-office process changes; backup/business continuity strategy for e-records**

Criminal Filing

- **Projects -- ADRS Phase II as foundation for statewide criminal justice data integration**
- **Timelines – Basic functionality demo December 16 at ACJC Symposium; project completion July '07**
- **Barriers – Completion of specifications for justice partner systems to talk to ADRS; Funding stream to operate once built; DPS assuming ownership**

E-Court Subcommittee Next Steps

- Relay answers to e-Court subteams
- Draft groups to attack specifics
 - Rules changes
 - Technical details
- Continue to monitor progress of solutions
- Elevate barriers to COT



What is an e-Court?



- Full process automation
- Information captured at its origin and passed on digitally
- Work that flows automatically
- Knowledge not data to decision makers
- Targeted information filtering & delivery

The Dream of e-Filing

- **Very Big, Complex Project**
- **Culture Change**
- **Very Much Needed**
- **Must be Simple**
- **Must be Consistent**

