

OK TO DISTRIBUTE

NATIONAL CENTER FOR STATE COURTS

NCSC
KFA
2910.5
A3
A98
v.2
c.3

**ARIZONA ADMINISTRATIVE
OFFICE OF THE COURTS
COURT OPERATIONS ANALYSIS
OF THE
TUCSON CITY COURT**

Volume Two

**Final Report
April, 1999'**

Project Consultants

**Timothy F. Fautsko, Project Director
Cynthia K. Dietrich, Project Staff
Paul C. Gomez, Project Staff
Penelope J. Wentland, Project Staff**

Vice President

James D. Thomas

**COURT SERVICES DIVISION
1331 Seventeenth Street, Suite 402
Denver, Colorado 80202
(303) 293-3063**

**Library
National Center for State Courts
300 Newport Ave.
Williamsburg, VA 23187-8798**

Rec'd 5-12-99

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Preface	1
II. History of the Court.....	3
III. Methodology	4
IV. Analysis of Processes.....	6
A. Overview.....	6
1. Case Initiation	6
2. Case Maintenance.....	9
3. Calendaring of Cases.....	11
4. Case Disposition	13
5. File Tracking	20
6. Defendant and Plaintiff Case Tracking.....	21
7. Public Information.....	26
8. Agency and Public Access.....	27
9. Statistics and Reporting	27
10. Financial Management.....	28
V. Specific Workflow Modifications	28
VI. Conclusion	29

I. Preface

The Large Volume Court Committee Project Office of the state of Arizona Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) contracted with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to: (1) review the FACTS™ operations manual for limited jurisdiction courts developed by the AOC, (2) conduct an analysis of processes and procedures of the Tucson City Court, and (3) recommend how to better utilize Progressive Solutions, Inc. (PSI) FACTS™ case processing application in the Court.

The Court has a large staff of approximately 135 positions, including 12 full-time magistrates, 2 limited special magistrates, 3.3 contract special magistrates, and other contract personnel. The city of Tucson is the 31st largest city in the country and, therefore, has a large volume of cases processed through the court. In FY 1997-98, the Court processed approximately 200,000 cases. Like other busy, urban court systems in the country, many of the Court's day-to-day processes and procedures have evolved over time and are in need of improvement and automation.

The on-site analysis of the Court conducted by the NCSC project team included a review of the Court's five divisions and the processes and procedures they use for civil and criminal traffic cases, parking tickets, criminal misdemeanors, and other cases such as civil infractions, domestic violence orders of protection, and harassment injunctions. As a result of the study, the project team developed a Volume One report with recommendations for improvements in the divisions and to those processes, procedures, and methods of operation presently used by the Court. It is believed that the implementation of the many recommendations contained in the Volume One report will directly assist the Court to implement FACTS™ on or before the proposed start up date of mid-1999. At the request of the AOC, the project team developed this Volume Two report that presents a more detailed analysis of the Court's case processing functions.

Division managers and court staff working in the Court suggested some of the process improvements contained in this report for the Tucson City Court. Moreover, a great deal of time and effort was put forth by court administration, division managers, and staff to develop and agree upon the many recommendations and operational changes presented in this report.

Special thanks are extended from the National Center for State Court's project team to the following individuals for their outstanding cooperation during the review of the Court. Listed in alphabetical order they are: Maryanne Battock, Administration Manager, Honorable Michael J. Brown, Presiding Judge, Martha Hesla, Court Administrator, Marie O'Hagin, FACTS™ Trainer, Ray Paulino, Budget and Research Manager, Honorable Michael P. Pollard, Associate Presiding Judge, David Rabenda, Systems Analyst, Sue Reyes, Public services Manager, Jack Schwartz, Probation and Sentencing Manager, Laura Spain, Case Management Manager, Eunice Stroud, Judicial Services Manager, and Becky Williams, Court Services Manager. NCSC would also like to thank the Arizona Supreme Court, Administrative Office of the Courts, and Louie Chaboya, System Integrator, Tim Lawler, Project Manager, L.V.C.C., Information Technology Division, and Pat McGrath, L.V.C.C. Training Specialist, Information Technology Division, for their assistance and participation.



II. History of the Court

Established in the early 1900's, the Tucson City Court processes all civil and criminal traffic cases, parking tickets, criminal misdemeanors, and other cases such as civil infractions, domestic violence orders of protection, and harassment injunctions. The C is staffed by 135 employees including 12 full-time magistrates, 2 limited special magistrates and 3.3 contract special magistrates, and other contract personnel. The Court's annual caseload of approximately 200,000 filings is growing and becoming more demanding, especially in the area of domestic violence cases.

The Court's facilities include two arraignment rooms – a large one for out-of-custody arraignments and a smaller one for arraignments conducted by video from the jail – a mitigation hearing room for civil traffic and parking violations, two hearing rooms, and twelve courtrooms. The building was originally designed as a parking garage and consequently, the Court and other judicial offices are inefficiently configured over six floors, compromising security and service to the Court's and the City's internal and external customers.

Over the years, as the Court's caseload grew, new magistrates or court were requested in the budget and usually funded by the City. Operational procedures in the Court also evolved over the years and functions within divisions were shifted to reduce errors or solve problems. In time, case processing, calendaring, forms management, and record keeping were done differently between divisions.

In 1997, a new associate presiding judge was appointed after the previous associate presiding judge ascended to the Superior Court bench. The court administrator was appointed in 1998, following the retirement of the previous court administrator in 1997. From this time, the Court has improved operations, increased employee morale, and developed a general strategic plan to continue to move the Court forward. In prior years, the Court's management team participated in a strategic planning process facilitated by the Supreme Court. In 1998, the court administrator requested assistance from the City's training department to facilitate a strategic planning retreat that included managers, representative judicial officers, and other city officials. In January of that

year, the AOC asked the Tucson City Court to become one of the sites to test a new version of the FACTS™ case processing application. Mid-year, some of the executive components of the Court participated in a strategic planning process that has provided more direction to the development of policy and procedure. Besides participating in strategic planning and piloting FACTS™, court administration requested technical assistance and consulting services from the American University, the Justice Management Institute (JMI), and the National Center for State Courts (NCSC).

III. Methodology

Once the contract to review the Tucson City Court had been signed by the Arizona Administrative Office of Courts and the National Center for State Courts, the project director started Task 1 by conducting telephone interviews with the Court's primary stakeholders. In compliance with Task 2, an initial on-site visit was made in December 1998. In order to complete Task 3, the NCSC project team conducted two on-site visits; one the week of January 11, 1999 and the other on February 11, 1999, to observe court processes, interview judges and court staff, and to collect information on the implementation of FACTS™. Tasks 4 and 5 of the project involved the preparation of the Volume One report at the NCSC and presentation of that report on-site to AOC and court officials.

During its three on-site visits, the project team observed and interviewed the work of many individuals; including judges, court administration, FACTS™ project staff, division managers, court staff, and other stakeholders in the Court. Interviews and observations were conducted to better document current caseflow and management practices primarily in the five divisions, as well as in other areas of the overall operation of the Court. Prior to the on-site visits, the project team reviewed manuals and procedures relating to the Court and to FACTS™. In essence, and based on that information, the Volume One report focused on interrelationships regarding case processing and communication between the Court's five divisions. Further, it is

important to note that during each interview the project team sought input regarding current issues facing the court and how process improvement related to FACTS™.

During the on-site visits, project team members observed operations in the divisions and attended court sessions. Project team members also reviewed numerous documents that judges, court administration, division managers, and court staff provided. These included orders of court, documented procedures, daily calendars, forms, job descriptions, organizational charts, staffing patterns, court rules, statutes, various memoranda, financial documents, and statistical reports. The project team also analyzed this information to identify how to improve current operational practices of the court system. More specifically, various in-office procedures that had impact on the efficiency and effectiveness of the Court's organization, staffing, calendaring, caseflow, sentencing and financial enforcement, and customer service were also closely reviewed.

In its evaluation of the Court, the project team referenced the American Bar Association's national standards and recommended practices for limited jurisdiction courts, entitled *Standards Relating to Trial Courts*. In addition, data was gathered, analyzed and compared to the guidelines set forth in the *Trial Court Performance Standards*. National research and trial court experience have proven that achievements of these standards are vital components of effective court operations. It is important to note that some of the recommendations contained in this report are based on these standards, as well as objective and factual data gleaned by project staff from interviews and observation of procedures.

After the project sponsor reviewed the Volume One report, the Center was asked by the AOC to develop a Volume Two report that would more specifically detail procedures that should be changed prior to the implementation of a new case processing system in the Court. As requested by the project sponsor, recommendations for change in case processing contained in Volume Two are not reflective of what the Court can accomplish now. Rather, the recommendations, contained herein, present procedural changes that should be made when a generic case processing system is implemented. It was necessary for the project team to present this type of analysis since the new version of FACTS™ was not available for analysis screen by screen. Based on this reality, the project team was unable to relate specific screen information from FACTS™ to specific

changes in the Court's procedures. However, with the information contained in this report and bolstered by the changes the Court is making from the 44 recommendations contained in the Volume One report, the NCSC project team believes the Court will be much better prepared for the June 1, 1999 implementation of FACTS™.

IV. Analysis of Processes

A. Overview

The following section will discuss functions used in case processing by the Court and put forth recommended procedural changes that would better prepare the Tucson City Court to prepare for the implementation of a new version of FACTS™. The report is divided into the various functions performed by court staff to process civil, traffic and criminal cases. None of the recommendations contained herein are intended to change or redesign the Arizona Administrative Office of Court's new version of the FACTS™ system. However, the findings and recommendations for change are intended to present a best case scenario for alterations of procedures presently used by the Court.

1. Case Initiation

Case Initiation is a function that starts all case processing and record keeping in the Court. The functional analysis of this process is broken down into Arrest and Booking, Service, New Case File Preparation, and New Case Data Entry.

a. Arrest and Booking

The Court initiates all cases received from law enforcement, the prosecutor, attorneys of record, and from the public. In criminal cases, court records should be electronically prepared by and transferred from law enforcement agencies to the Court for initiation into the FACTS™ case management system.

Recommended Procedural Change: Hand-held ticket writers (see Appendix A) or mobile data computers should be used by all law enforcement officers for preparing and issuing citations in the city of Tucson. This new procedure would electronically capture a defendant's citation data as a ticket is issued. At the end of each working day, law enforcement personnel should provide citation data to the Court. Then, the Court should electronically enter this information into the new case processing system which will provide them timely and accurate information on defendants. Data from law enforcement and data needed by the Court should integrate into the new case processing system by the Court's data entry clerks. For example, once law enforcement has cited an individual and has electronically recorded basic identification information on that defendant, the Court should be able to download that information from law enforcement into the new case processing system. When a case is initiated by the Court, that same basic identification information received from law enforcement should be used to start a new case on the system.

Recommended Procedural Change: Law enforcement officers at the Tucson City Jail should be able to enter arrest and booking information on in custody defendants on their case processing system at the time a defendant is brought to the jail and placed in custody. Once this information is entered, it should be electronically transferred to the prosecutor who will determine if charges should be filed. Once the prosecutor has determined charges should be filed, that information should be electronically presented to the Court for entering into the new case processing system. This change in procedure would save court staff valuable time currently spent picking up case information on defendants at 5:00 a.m. each morning during the regular work week. It would also reduce the workload of data entries clerks in the Court and allow them to assist in data entry in the courtrooms and other tasks.

b. Service

Typically, most courts issue service on citations through a contractor for certain case types. This process takes time and costs a great deal of money for the Court to

support. Further, there is a great deal of paper that is generated from this process and the filing and re-filing of service on citations wastes staff time.

Recommended Procedural Change: Service on a citation, whether criminal or traffic, should be prepared by having the new computer system generate the citation notice to the defendant. The service letter should contain basic identification information on the defendant, as well as the next date of appearance. Service on civil actions directed by the Court should be accomplished in the same manner.

c. New Case File Preparation

Presently, court staff prepare new case files manually. Once citations are counted, sorted, and the case is entered, court staff record the case number on the file folder and also record the case number on the citation. Then, the citation is placed in a pre-numbered file folder which is shelved for future action.

Recommended Procedural Change: Once case information is entered into the system and a case number is assigned, a computer-generated register of actions (see Appendix B) should be printed for all traffic and parking citations that are scheduled to appear in court or have exceeded the payment due date. All *prepayable* citations that have been paid before the payment due date should be entered and closed out on the system. A new file should be prepared only for cases that will be heard in court. Once a case is prepared, the register of actions should contain all basic information about the defendant, the citation number, the case number, the assigned judge and the next date of appearance. The use of a standard register of action for all case types will not only standardize the information that is presented to a judge, but will make data entry in the courtroom easier. All future actions in a case should be recorded on the register of actions through data entry into the new computer system.

d. New Case Data Entry

Data entry clerks (for all case types) work independently from one another and rely on their division manager or supervisor for direction. At times, data entry of new

cases has been backed up for a week or more in the Court. This situation causes duplication of effort between divisions (to find out the status of a case), it degrades the quality of information in the system, and creates additional work for court staff that are dealing with a person's existing case or a citation that has not yet been entered on the system.

Recommended Procedural Change: Data entry clerks that enter new citations should work in teams. They should be responsible for data entry of certain case types. Each team should have a team leader who provides quality control of information entered into the new system. When data entry clerks get behind on data entry of citations, because of a holiday or by a *sweep* of a TPD traffic team, court staff from other divisions should be brought in to assist. A goal of having citation information in the system within 48 hours of receipt should be established and adhered to.

2. Case Maintenance

Case maintenance is a function that entails all the processes that are used by the Court to store active cases, entry of motions before hearing, transfer of the case to court, file tracking, and record retention. The following analysis is functionally divided into Active Case Storage, Transfer of Cases, File Tracking, and Record Retention.

a. Active Case Storage

The Court stores active cases on shelves in the Case Management division. In time, they are transferred to an assigned courtroom. New cases are taken off the shelf for various reasons before they are transferred to a courtroom for hearing. Some cases get lost in this process.

Recommended Procedural Change: Newly prepared and active cases are usually placed on the "active cases only" shelves in a clerk's office. They are either organized by case number, date of appearance, or by judge. When a case is removed from the shelf, the "checkout" should be noted on the system and the file replaced with a plastic "check

out” folder. The folder should show to whom the case is checked out. It should be designed to accept any subsequent paper that may be filed in the Court for transfer to the assigned judge. The Court should also consider the bar coding of case files. Such a system, if used properly, will locate files and provide information to court staff regarding the number of active cases that have been transferred to a judge’s chambers.

b. Transfer of Cases

Presently, court cases are manually transferred (or by *dumb waiter*) by court staff to a judge’s chamber or to a courtroom for hearing. There is not an automated system in place that effectively provides information to court clerks as to which cases should be transferred or have been transferred to a judge’s chamber or to a courtroom.

Recommended Procedural Change: Court staff should rely on the new case processing system to provide them a listing of case files that need to be in a judge’s chamber or in a particular court on a certain day. Files should be pulled from this computer generated list, checked out, transferred, and returned to the appropriate location daily.

c. File Tracking

Presently, court staff does not always have a good idea of where files are in the courthouse. Sometimes, files may be with a judge, a prosecutor, a public defender, or others. Trying to find a lost file or one that cannot be easily located wastes the time of staff and creates a great deal of stress for judges, judicial assistants, division managers, and supervisors alike.

Recommended Procedural Change: The procedure to inventory and track files must be changed and improved by court staff with the use of the new case processing system. When case files in the Court are bar coded, court staff can perform regular inventories of where files are located that are not on the active or the closed shelf. This information can be stored and provided by the system. By conducting regular bar coding inventories, reports can be prepared regarding the length of time a file has been in a

certain location and if it needs to be forwarded to another office in the courthouse for further action.

Recommended Procedural Change: Only court personnel should be allowed to check files in and out of the Court. Private attorneys, prosecutors and public defenders should be required to have their own record of a traffic or criminal case they are prosecuting or defending. The Court's file should always be the official record of the Court.

d. Record Retention

Most state courts follow state rules and guidelines for record retention which specifies the length of time a case type should be processed before it is disposed. The Court generally follows requirements outlined by administrative order for record retention. When shelf room is needed, the Court moves its closed files to other locations. In some instances, it tends to hold its closed files longer than necessary before movement or destruction.

Recommended Procedural Change: Court staff should rely on monthly records retention reports generated by the system. These reports should provide court staff the date a certain case type should be destroyed and which cases can be moved to long term storage.

3. Calendaring of Cases

The Court uses a bifurcated method of assigning cases. The system that is presently used assigns cases to courtrooms and to judges. Judges change calendar assignment every two weeks. An assignment judge hears domestic violence cases and most judges hear civil actions in court.

Recommended Procedural Change: The Court should establish a walk-in courtroom that can hear and process parking citations and civil infractions. The walk-in

courtroom should be staffed by a team. As presented in the Volume One report, the team should consist of a judge, a judicial assistant and a data entry clerk. The types of cases heard in walk-in court should be combined for other matters such as emergency hearings or domestic relations cases. The establishment of this type of court would greatly reduce workload, the number of hearings and appearances by defendants, and cut back on the amount of time it takes to handle certain cases.

Recommended Procedural Change: In order to streamline case processing procedures, the Court could switch to an individual calendaring system for all case types, or continue to use the master and individual calendar system that is presently in place. An individual calendaring system is a system in which each case type filed in the Court is randomly assigned to an individual judge. This change would provide each judge and their in-courtroom team individual responsibility for a specific caseload from start to finish. Judges could rotate responsibility for “clearing court,” arraignments, domestic violence hearings, and the walk-in court. With this “individual responsibility” the judge and his or her team would become fully accountable for whether cases proceed to disposition in a timely fashion according to state guidelines. As well, the burden of the Court’s large annual caseload would be evenly distributed through the use of an individual calendaring system. Whatever calendaring system is used, court staff need to understand and use the new case processing system to support a master and/or individual calendar system. Further, all calendaring activities in the Court should be accomplished through the new system.

Recommended Procedural Change: Court staff should access calendar information from the daily criminal and civil calendar only from the new system. Each court team should be able to print their calendar for the day of appearance from the system the afternoon before. Court Services should be able to collect and transfer cases to judges’ chambers for the next day’s calendar. Public Services should be able to print and post the calendar for customer’s edification. And, the calendar should be available for public review on monitors in the Courthouse.

4. Case Disposition

The manner in which the Court defines when a case is disposed directly affects statistics on pending caseload. How the Court electronically monitors judges' compliance with disposition time standards is integral to reaching set goals. Criminal cases in the Court are usually disposed of when a final order in the case is complied with. Civil cases are disposed when the verdict is announced in court. With the exception of warrants issued in criminal cases, case review, entry of appearance, disposition, fine recordation, next setting date and notice generation are steps that must be accomplished in all case types. The following functional analysis discusses Case Review Access, Courtroom Activity, Data Entry of Dispositions and Appearances, Warrant Entry and Quashing, Fine Recordation, Next Event Settings, and Notice Generation.

a. Case Review Access

Once a case is entered into the system, judges and court personnel usually review the information contained in the file folder manually. The present case processing system operating in the Court (REACT) is not used as the official court record.

Recommended Procedural Change: Once data is entered in the new computer system, the Court must rely more on citation information in criminal cases and on complaint, answer, and motion information provided by parties of record. The procedural change necessary will require the judge and his or her courtroom team to use computer screen data to review cases on screen in the courtroom and in chambers more and more. The entire team must become less dependant on the case file and the papers contained therein. The less the Court relies on paper copies of documents and more on data presented electronically (information that has been data entered from those documents) case processing in the Court will become more accurate and time efficient. Changing peoples attitudes regarding the use of paper files vs. computer generated files can only happen if the courtroom procedures used by judges are standardized. Note: It is also important that judges use information provided by the new case processing system in post judgment activity. In the prosecution of criminal cases, it is the prosecutor's

responsibility when trying a case, to present criminal histories of the defendants to the judge.

b. Courtroom Activity

Presently, in the Court, data entry of appearance (on all case types) takes place outside of the courtroom. The manual procedures used by court staff to record and process cases are one of the biggest bottlenecks in case processing the Court faces. The Volume One report speaks to the many duplicative procedures the Court uses to get defendants to the Courthouse, before a judge, and to adjudicate their case. None of this is always accomplished in an efficient or customer-friendly manner.

Recommended Procedural Change: The Court must alter the methods by which they are processing both civil and criminal cases in courtrooms. In a thoughtful and organized manner, data entry must be accomplished in the courtroom and for all case types, including arraignments. Again, this can be successfully accomplished by the development of teams. Each team should consist of a judge, a judicial assistant and a data entry clerk. To streamline the flow of papers and people in courtrooms, the Court must reassign duties to team members. In a team, the judge, judicial assistant, and data entry clerk must share the responsibility to get accurate information into the new system in a timely and efficient manner.

Recommended Procedural Change: Minute orders and other forms used by teams in criminal and civil cases must be standardized. Only forms that have been integrated into the new case processing system should be used by the Court.

Recommended Procedural Change: Terminals with *read only access* should be available in courtrooms. When defendants to a criminal action or parties to a civil case appear before the judge, the judge, and at least one of his or her team members, should call up the case on the new computer system. The prosecutor, public defender, and

attorneys of record should have *read only access* to all information that has been data entered on the case¹.

Recommended Procedural Change: Defendants (and plaintiffs) who appear in court should leave with a hard (paper) copy of information that tells what they are expected to do next. This includes paper copies of notices for subsequent appearances, probation assignment data, and assigned fines and fees and collection information. Hard (paper) copies of information should be printed out in the courtroom.

Recommended Procedural Change: All courtrooms must be equipped with a PC for each team member and *read only access* terminals should be placed at the prosecution and defense tables. A virtual office should be developed in each courtroom consisting of PC's, silent keyboards, printers, (with the ability to vary the number of copies printed for each case), forms, fax machines, and telephones.

c. Warrant Entry and Quashing

Currently, the process used for warrant issuance entry doesn't start in the courtroom. When a defendant or party does not appear for a hearing without good cause, the judge eventually signs a warrant for that person's arrest. The Court manually transfers the judge's order for warrant from courtrooms to a data entry clerk for input into REACT. Once the case is reviewed for other case dispositions, the warrant is printed and sent to the judge and then, depending on the type of warrant, to the prosecutor for signature. Some warrants get lost in this process or, at the very least, there are delays before it is hand copied and sent to the Tucson Police Department (TPD) for action. When a warrant is to be quashed, a judge's signature must be ascertained, the quash is entered on REACT and the information is manually recorded on a form and faxed to

¹ In the Jefferson County District (limited jurisdiction) court in Louisville, Kentucky judges and prosecutors and public defenders or counsel (civil cases) have access to their court's computer system data on an individual case-by-case basis. In this court, the judges enter minute orders by themselves on the computer in the courtroom. Courtroom clerks are used to issue warrants, process fine information and print out case related orders and forms, again in the courtroom.

TPD. Additional copies of the faxed form are put in the file as well as the fax receipt or documentation.

Recommended Procedural Change: Once a judge decides to sign a warrant in a case being heard in court, information on that decision should be entered into the computer system. Once it is entered and the warrant is prepared by a data entry clerk, it should be jointly signed by the judge and the prosecutor² (per law) and placed in the case file. After the warrant is signed, a member of the courtroom team should electronically transmit (through the computer system) a copy of the warrant to the TCP³ where they should print it out and enter it onto their warrant system. Note: warrant information from the Court's system and the TPD's system should interface. The signature line on the transmitted warrant should read, "judge and prosecutor's signature available in the official court record." End of the day warrant transmittal reports should be printed and reviewed by the TPD and the Court for accuracy. This procedure will save court staff a great deal of time entering and processing warrants. Additional court staff should be added to the courtroom team and special procedures should be developed to effectively use this procedure for arraignments and in the in-custody courtroom.

Recommended Procedural Change: To quickly and to accurately quash warrants, the Court must follow much of the same procedures in the courtroom described above. Further, all defendants with outstanding warrants who appear at Public Services or who are brought into the jail, should be able to post bond (unless a judge specifically orders no bond) and promise to appear on a specific court date, and then have their warrant (immediately) quashed in the system. Out of court, only designated court personnel in Public Services should be able to quash a warrant. When a warrant is quashed it should be electronically removed from the TCP automated warrant database. The associate presiding judge could issue a *blanket order* determining a bond schedule and authorizing and providing designated court personnel the ability to accept the bond, to quash the

² In the court, FTA warrants can be singularly signed by a judge, whereas other types of warrants must be jointly signed by the judge and the prosecutor.

³ To expedite the processing of warrants the TCP should develop a civil and criminal division.

warrant, and to set another date of appearance or to ask TCP that the defendant be remanded into custody. All of this information should be entered on the new computer system. Signatures on FTA warrants can be completed by a signing judge or the judge assigned to the walk-in court. All defendants that have an active warrant must be required to post bond (as per a judge's order) and not just be given a new court date, i.e., "GOJF cards."⁴

d. Fine Recordation

The recordation of fines, fees, and assessments in the Court is prepared manually. Once assessed, the defendant goes to the Public Services counter to pay the full amount of assessment on his or her case. If the defendant wants additional time to pay the assessment, they will go to the Financial Enforcement department at Sentencing Services to work out a payment plan which is recorded manually. Data on an assessment is not always entered in a timely fashion and sometimes defendants walk out of the Courthouse without paying. This causes more work for court staff. The entry into the Court's computer system of financial information on defendants is duplicative. It is entered once in Financial Enforcement when the payment plan is established, and again in Public Services when the defendant pays.

Recommended Procedural Change: Court staff in Public Services should use the new case processing system to accept, separate and calculate the distribution of fines, fees, and costs paid at Public Services. This may require all judges to determine separate totals for a fine, a fee, and a cost assessed in court rather than just assessing one total for all three. The in-courtroom entry of this type of disposition on the system should immediately alert court staff that money is owed to the court.

⁴ "GOJF" is the court's acronym for "Get Out of Jail Free" cards. Defendants who appear in the Court and get a new court date will get a paper from the Court stating they have a new court date. If they get picked up by TCP, et al before their next date of appearance and/or before the outstanding warrant information is taken off TCP's computer system, they show the "GOJF" card (paper) he or she received from the Court. It was assumed by the project team that this process will reduce false arrests.

e. Next Event Settings

At this time, once a case is filed, subsequent calendar settings are manually recorded in the courtroom or at the Public Services counter. The processes used to set new dates of appearance for defendants in criminal cases and for parties in civil actions vary from judge to judge. The Court does not have a consistent calendar setting policy and tends to deal with the cases over and over. This creates duplication of effort and wastes judicial and non-judicial officers' time. Most new calendar settings are done manually and then transferred to data entry clerks for entrance onto REACT. Several changes in procedure must occur if the Court is to streamline its processes for calendar settings.

Recommended Procedural Change: The bench must set a firm and consistent continuance policy that will reduce the number of continuances that are given to defendants in criminal cases. In some courts of limited jurisdiction, defendants and parties to civil actions are provided only one (1) continuance in their case and only for documented extenuating circumstances, i.e., physical disability. In other courts, for criminal and civil actions, the judge requires attorneys to get the signed approval of their client for the continuance. Further, only one case management conference is set before trial. When the Court⁵ sets a "one only" continuance policy and "one only" case management policy, they will see judges and court staff workload dramatically decrease.

Recommended Procedural Change: The courtroom team must enter calendar settings on every case in the courtroom and in chambers. The arraignment and high volume courtrooms will require additional staff to complete the following procedure. When a next appearance date is granted and entered into the system by the team, the defendant, prosecutor, public defender and/or counsel should receive an immediate printed notice of the new setting date. A copy should also be placed in the case file for future reference.

⁵ The judges of Tucson City Court must set this policy.

Recommended Procedural Change: When a defendant or parties to a civil action request a calendar change at the Public Services counter, either in person or by phone, court staff should be authorized by the associate presiding judge's *blanket order* to provide only one continuance in the case and only with good cause as defined by court rule. Specific regulations for this new procedure must be developed by the bench⁶. Once the continuance is given, court staff should immediately enter the information on the new case processing system. The defendant or party should receive a paper copy of the new date of appearance as generated by the system. A copy should be placed in the file and the courtroom team scheduled to hear the case should be notified of the change. All changes in calendar settings should be reflected in the daily calendar that is publicly posted. Font size and spacing on the publicly posted calendar should be improved and made easier to read.

f. Notice Generation

The Court generates notices to set and remind parties of future hearings in criminal and civil actions. At times, this is accomplished from the courtroom and at times from chambers. Much of this paper processing is done manually, which takes staff time and costs the Court money. In some cases, court staff use the scheduling module that is available to them to make settings in order to determine judge availability and dates and times a case can be heard.

Recommended Procedural Change: Whenever possible, notices sent to defendants or parties to an action should be generated by the system and distributed in the courtroom. A copy of the notice should be placed in the file. This will change the present procedure used by the Court and save a great deal of judge and court staff time notifying people to return to court. This new procedure will also reduce the number of next date of appearance "no shows."

Recommended Procedural Change: When defendants or parties appear at the Public Services counter to reset a hearing, court staff should set the new date on the new

⁶ Judges of the Tucson City Court.

case processing system. Once the date is set, court staff should print out a notice immediately, give the defendant or party to a civil action their copy, and have the defendant or party sign the Court's copy as received before it is placed in the file.

Recommended Procedural Change: When a criminal defendant or party to civil actions telephones the Court to change their date of appearance, they should be required to come to the Public Services counter to show good cause in order to change the date. The Court's one continuance rule should be in effect.

Recommended Procedural Change: Court staff should use the new case processing system to electronically send copies of notices to other criminal justice agencies including probation, diversion programs and the jail.

5. File Tracking

The physical tracking of cases is usually done manually by court staff. A great deal of time is spent looking for certain cases when new papers or motions have been filed with the Court. At times, cases simply "become lost" or must be reconstructed, or "turn up" at a later date. Another method used to track the status of cases by the Court, is to print-out open case reports for court administration and judges' teams to use in determining case status, length of time the case is open (from time of filing to present), and the number of continuances that have been granted on a case. When the Court develops courtroom teams, changes case assignments to individual calendars (or continues to use a mix of master and individual calendars) and standardizes forms and in-courtroom procedures, the use of case tracking reports generated by the new case processing system will become integral to effective and efficient case management.

Recommended Procedural Change: The Court must depend more on the new case processing system to provide the location and status of cases. When case files are physically transferred to the courtroom team, information noting the transfer should be entered on the system. When case files are returned to Court Services, that action should also be logged in. This file tracking can also be accomplished through the use of bar

coding. To improve the methods the Court uses to physically locate files, both systems could be used.

Recommended Procedural Change: With the advent of courtroom teams, individual calendaring (or a mix of master and individual calendaring), standardizing forms and procedures, judges and court staff must use “case status” reports more and more to manage their cases. This is especially important to stay within the established time standards promulgated by Arizona’s Supreme Court.

6. Defendant and Plaintiff Case Tracking

The Court has a great deal of difficulty tracking defendant’s and plaintiff’s status in a case once the case is entered into REACT. Based on the number of defendants the Court sees each year and on the manual methods that are used to track and process defendants, a great deal of time is spent by court staff and judges obtaining information on and updating compliance with court orders. This is especially true in the Court’s Sentencing Services division. In the Probation Department, monitoring of orders on defendants and their participation in court ordered programs is difficult to track. Test requirements, that defendants have been ordered to follow, are processed manually. Court orders are not always sent from Court to the Probation Department or to the Sentencing Enforcement Department in a timely fashion. This results in duplication of efforts, error, and confusion for defendant’s that are trying to comply with court orders. The interview of applicants to set up payment plans and the process of collection of money is not always efficient or effective. Notice letters are not regularly generated to and received by defendants who owe the Court money. The process does not always work, and at times, defendants walk away from courtrooms without having seen a sentencing enforcement (collections) officer. The following section discusses Probation Monitoring, Testing Requirements, Court Ordered Compliance, and Sentencing Enforcement.

a. Probation Monitoring

The Probation Department does a good job of interviewing and tracking defendants that are on their caseload. At times, they have difficulty interviewing and, once they have been in court, monitoring their compliance with court orders.

Recommended Procedural Change: When a defendant is sentenced in the courtroom, a member of the courtroom team should immediately enter the sentencing information into the new case processing system. After sentencing, a copy of the sentence should be given to the defendant, a copy should be electronically sent to the Probation Department by the new case processing system (and to other criminal justice agencies) and electronically entered on their case processing module, and a copy should be placed in the case file.⁷ Then the defendant should be told to go or be escorted to the Probation Department.

Recommended Procedural Change: Since some defendants do not always follow the judge's orders to report directly to the Probation Department, volunteers or court staff could be used to escort defendants from the courtroom to the Probation Department. It is important to note that this change in procedure will eliminate the work that is involved with tracking an estimated 20% to 25% of defendants that do not appear in the department after sentencing. The Court's new case processing system and probation's system should interface. Once the defendant is in the Probation Department, the intake officer should call up the case on a *read only access* terminal and verify sentencing information from a hard copy sent from the courtroom that the sentencing information on the defendant has been entered by the courtroom team. At the time of the first encounter with Probation, court staff should set a specific time the defendant should have his or her first meeting with a probation monitor. At the initial interview, the defendant should be

⁷ In most courts, case processing systems operate independently from the probation department's case processing system. However, in the Court, the Probation Department's system could operate independently from the new system or be a module of the new system. In either scenario, the Probation Department should not be able to change data that has been entered by authorized court staff into the new system. Rather, they should be able to integrate certain probation information in the new system regarding a probationer's compliance or violation.

provided with a computer generated copy of a form that specifies the time and location of their next appointment. All of the above actions should be accomplished on the Probation Departments own computer system and electronically integrated with the Court's new system.

Recommended Procedural Change: Probation monitors should direct their computer system to generate letters to defendants at their office rather than having the city's information system generate (letters) mass mailings periodically. These notices should be electronically integrated with the Court's new case processing system.

b. Testing Requirements

By court order, the Probation Department requires defendants to come to the office to self-administer antibuse, submit the results from a urinalysis test and/or take a Breathalyzer™ test. This time consuming procedure is recorded manually and probation monitors can only have access to the information upon request.

Recommended Procedural Change: The recording of testing requirements should be entered immediately, at the time of the defendant's compliance, on the Probation Department's computer system. The entries should be integrated into the Court's new case processing system. Like data entry in the courtroom, this change in procedure will provide probation monitors and judges information regarding the status of defendants, compliance with testing procedures, and recommendation for probation revocation. Moreover, after the compliance information is entered, the defendant should receive a confirmation (hard copy) of their compliance with the court order.

c. Court Ordered Compliance

Defendant's compliance with court orders is regularly reviewed by probation monitors. Each monitor, whether supervising home detention defendants or defendants assigned regular probation, must keep track of defendants (caseload) by themselves. Presently, there is not an integrated computerized reporting system detailing the status or

non-compliance of defendants from the Probation Department's computer system to the Court's computer system.

Recommended Procedural Change: Probation staff should monitor the progress of each defendant's case on their computer system and on the Court's new case processing system. Information regarding next date of appointment, next appearance in court, compliance with court orders or participation in a rehabilitation program should be available and integrated with defendant's court case in the Court. Reports from the Court's case processing system, containing which defendants are out of compliance, revoked, or have an active warrant issued against them should be reviewed regularly by probation monitors. These reports should be used by all probation staff in the management of their caseload.

Recommended Procedural Change: Probation monitors and sentencing enforcement officers should use the reports they receive from the Court's new case processing system to establish a "call back" program when defendants miss appointments or get behind in their payment schedule.

Recommended Procedural Change: Probation monitors should use their computer systems to develop standard contracts of agreement reflective of the defendant's orders from court.

d. Sentencing Enforcement

The Sentencing Enforcement Department (collections) interviews defendants and approves their applications to pay fines, fees, and other assessments due the Court. Defendants are sent from court to Sentencing Enforcement where they are interviewed and make arrangements for payments. Data on assessed fines and fees is not always available in REACT and sentencing enforcement officers rely on information from the court file or papers carried to them from defendants or court staff. Data manually recorded from the interview process is sometimes duplicative to data entered by Public Services. Once defendants are interviewed, they are required to go to the Public Services

counter to wait in line again to pay all or part of their assessment. At times, defendants leave the Courthouse without paying. If they appear at the counter, Public Services staff must enter similar data into the case processing system again, thus duplicating part of Sentencing Enforcement's work.

Recommended Procedural Change: As outlined in the Volume One report, it is imperative that the Sentencing Services Department be combined into and co-located with the Public Services Division. This combination of functions and locations would greatly improve the flow of people, improve customer service, and reduce paperwork in the department. For example, defendants, who have plead guilty and come out of arraignment court, could be processed by a sentencing enforcement (collection) officer and pay their assessment at the Public Services counter if both functions were located in the same area. All data from the plea of guilty, assessment, interview, and payment of the assessment should be captured on the new case processing system.

Recommended Procedural Change: Once information on fines, fees and assessments has been entered in the courtroom, the defendant should be directed or escorted to the Sentencing Enforcement Office. Sentencing enforcement officers should call up defendant case information on the new case processing system and immediately add their interview information and time payment plan information on the system. A copy of the defendant's payment agreement should be printed, signed, and a copy given to the defendant with a payment booklet and (stamped) envelopes to expedite payment. After this process is completed, the sentencing enforcement officer should escort the defendant to a payment window (part of Public Services counter area). At this point, a counter person, perhaps dedicated to receipting money for sentencing enforcement customers, can call up the case on the new system as updated by the sentencing enforcement officer, accept and receipt partial or full payment and update the payment again on the Court's new case processing system. This change in procedure presents a seamless method of processing defendants from the courtroom to payment without interruption and duplication of effort by court staff.

Recommended Procedural Change: Probation monitors and sentencing enforcement officers should use the new case processing system to monitor and track cases. Over time, there should be less dependence and need for them to use (paper) case files. To verify information on defendant's, once that information has been entered on the system.

7. Public Information

The public gets its information from a bulletin board located on the second floor of the Courthouse, from security officers, or from court staff. Public information is not centralized and, at times, customers of the Court spend a great deal of time trying to find out where they are supposed to go and when they are supposed to be there. The functional areas discussed below are Public Access and Security.

a. Public Access

As stated above, public access to the Court is not centralized and people going to court simply do not get there on time or sometimes at all. Forms, pamphlets, and/or pro se packets of information regarding public access to proceedings, or other information about the Court is not easy to ascertain.

Recommended Procedural Change: The Court must improve its procedure regarding public access. After the Public Information Office is established⁸ court staff should be able to provide the Court's customers information from the system regarding where defendants or parties to a civil action should be in the courthouse, at what time, as well as the status of their case.

b. Security

Information entered on the case processing system must be accessible and secure.

Recommended Procedural Change: Without proper authorization, information on the new system should not be accessible. All court staff should have access to the

system, but at different levels of penetration. For example, the courtroom team, including the judge, judicial assistant, and data entry clerk should be able to enter and change data on certain case types. For tracking purposes, team members should be able to automatically record which judicial or non-judicial officer made a specific entry on the register of actions on a case. Probation officers should only be able to add new information to a case, not change it. The same is true for sentencing enforcement officers. The prosecutor's, law enforcement officers, public defenders, and attorneys should have *read only access* capability on all case types.

8. Agency and Public Access

As stated in the Volume One report, user (agency) involvement is necessary at all stages of implementation of the new case processing system; including planning, training, testing, roll-out, and evaluation. At this time, criminal justice agencies working with the Court and the public do not have acceptable access to the Court's case processing system information-REACT.

Recommended Procedural Change: In order for the Court's new case processing system to be fully effective, court staff must provide a *read only access* to other criminal justice agencies and the public in the city and county⁹. The major change in procedure is that *read only access* terminals, allowing criminal justice agencies access, must be placed in their offices and in courtrooms. As well, the public, including criminal defendants and parties to criminal actions should have access to certain case information through *user friendly* terminals. Access and penetration levels for the public must be decided beforehand.

9. Statistics and Reporting

The Court's REACT case processing system provides certain statistical and case management reports to court administration. The reports are not always used to the fullest advantage of the judges and the Court.

⁸ See the Volume One report, page 35 section 2.a.

⁹ This does not include confidential matters designated by law or by court order.

Recommended Procedural Change: The reporting of new filings, dispositions, the age of cases, sentencing data, information on continuances, and other internal management reports should be used by the Court to manage cases, set policy, and to form a basis for any further operational change.

10. Financial Management

The Court's REACT system provides certain fiscal reports on a regular basis that court administration uses for internal accounting, fees distribution to the city, and to other agencies. These financial reports do not always provide definitive and predictive information to court administration to better manage the Court.

Recommended Procedural Change: Court administration, judges and court staff should utilize reports from the new case processing system to more specifically determine the efficiency and effectiveness of their internal accounting system. Collections reports should provide percentages of collected assessments, from month to month, and identify case types and individuals whose assessments are in arrears.

Recommended Procedural Changes: Court staff needs to utilize the Crystal Reports that the new system will produce. This will necessitate training since, as of this writing, only three court staff members have been trained in their production and use.

V. Specific Workflow Modifications

Appendix C of this report contains functional decomposition narratives of workflows for the Tucson City Court Public Services Division, the Court Services Division, and the Case Management Division. While it is expected that the work in these divisions may undergo considerable change, the basic integrity of various functions will remain static. A reset is a reset is a reset whether the actual data entry is performed at the front counter, in the courtroom, or in a back office data entry operation.

Some of the suggestions for functionality for FACTS™ may exceed FACTS™'s current capabilities, i.e., electronic noticing of actions required by various divisions based

upon data entered in the case management system. It is suggested that these capabilities be viewed as potential enhancements to FACTS™ because of the potential for savings in both people and material resources and, most of all, time. These suggestions represent only a brief review of what can be re-engineered. It is recommended that the Court use these suggestions as a starting point for a complete process review in conjunction with any re-organization of functions they may be contemplating.

VI. Conclusion

This Volume Two report should be utilized by the Court and officials from the Arizona AOC as a guide to creating procedural change before the implementation of the Court's new case processing system. Although the report presents many recommendations for procedural change, there are several integral suggestions that are necessary for the success of the new system. They are as follows: the Court must develop judges, judicial assistants, and data entry clerks into (courtroom) teams. Court staff using the new system must be trained to understand and use the system to reduce their workload. Further, if the new case processing system is going to be effective, data entry on all cases must occur in the courtroom and defendants and parties to actions should receive written documentation as to what is the "next step in the process." The constant return of defendants and "churning of cases" must end. Guidelines for a one continuance policy, and a one case management conference must be developed and supported by all the judges. Serious consideration must be given by the bench to adopting an individual calendaring system or improving the existing one. Whichever system is used, it must support timelines set forth by the Arizona Supreme Court. Moreover, customers of the Court must be provided case information in a timely and accurate fashion. The new rule, not the exception, must be *one stop shopping* for the Court's customers. This simply means that if you come to court you can have your case heard, the decision made, the result of the proceedings immediately entered on the system, and the case ultimately disposed of in a timely fashion. Further, if you owe the Court money, you will be expected to pay at the time of appearance and if you do not, a fair and equitable payment plan will be set up for you to follow. In short, in the

community, due to the new case processing system and the new procedures that support it, orders of the Tucson City Court will have integrity and will be enforced.

In closing, it is important to note that it was a pleasure for NCSC's project team to work in a court that was not only open to but also ready for change. And, it was heartening to work with individuals that were willing to learn from their past and move toward their vision – better service to the customer.

“The Roman bridges of antiquity were very inefficient structures. By modern standards, they used too much stone, and as a result, far too much labor to build. Over the years we have learned to build bridges more efficiently, using fewer material and less labor to perform the same task.”

-Tom Clancy (The Sum of All Fears)



Appendix A

Ticket Writer

Sample of an Issued Ticket



**CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER
PARKING VIOLATION**

CITATION # 45773254

DATE		PLATE NUMBER	
04/10/99		ETY9700	
PLATE TYPE		STATE	
A		CO	
YEAR LIC.	MAKE	VEH. STYLE	
1999	MERZ	4DR	
TIME MARKED		TIME ISSUED	
		03:35 PM	
LOCATION			
1726 Market St.			
OFFICER'S NAME			
Kelly			
BUREAU		BEAT	
05		SAT	
METER #		BADGE #	
MK-1726		0104	
COMPLAINANT SIGNATURE			
X			

45773254

IN VIOLATION OF ORD.# 54-514a
Meter Violation

OFFICER'S COMMENTS:

FINE AMOUNT: **\$15.00**

AFTER 04/30/99 AMT. DUE \$30.00

For information or to dispute this citation
contact (303) 296-2595, or send written
inquiries to:

Denver Parking Violations Bureau
P.O. Box 46500
Denver, CO 80201-6500

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR
IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS

TO VIOLATOR:

Within 20 days you must respond to the charge(s) of violating the revised Municipal Code of the City and County of Denver, Colorado, and/or Airport Rules and Regulations, which violation(s) occurred in the City and County of Denver.

If payment is not received within 20 calendar days, the fine is increased to the following:

<u>Viol. Code</u>	<u>\$ Due After 20 Calendar Days</u>
23	\$50 (No Penalty)
All Others	Fine Amt. is Doubled

FAILURE TO PAY PARKING FINES
MAY SUBJECT MOTOR VEHICLE TO
SEIZURE

PAYMENT:

Mail Check or Money Order Payable To:
Denver Parking Violations Bureau
P.O. Box 46502
Denver, CO 80201-6502

To Pay-By-Phone using Visa or Mastercard
Call: (303) 296-2595

DO NOT SEND CASH



Appendix B

Register of Actions

Sample Forms

REGISTER OF ACTIONS
MISDEMEANOR / TRAFFIC / INFRACTIONS

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF

VS.

Case #

COUNTY COURT, COUNTY OF
STATE OF

Division/Judge/Magistrate
DEFENDANT, Name, address, DOB

BOND INFORMATION

Bond set at \$
Surety
Bond reduced to \$
Bond filed
Bond ordered returned
Defendant's attorney

Complaint Filed
Summons Issued
Complaining Officer
First Appearance
Continued to
Continued to

FIRST APPEARANCE / ADVISEMENT / FURTHER ACTION

Date
Defendant ☐ Pro Se ☐ with counsel
☐ Advised of rights, nature of charges, possible penalties
☐ Written entry and plea by
☐ Telephone setting by
☐ Defendant failed to appear; bench warrant to issue
☐ B/W issued Continued
☐ B/W terminated
☐ Defendant failed to appear; default judgment entered
☐ Default judgment paid
☐ Waiver / Guilty Plea

CHARGES / PLEAS

Date
Defendant ☐ Pro Se ☐ with counsel
Charge Statute Offense Description Plea
#1
#2
#3
#4
#5

DISMISSALS / AMENDMENTS / PLEAS

Date
Defendant ☐ Pro Se ☐ with counsel
Charge ☐ People's motion to dismiss the following granted.
#1
#2
#3
#4
#5

HEARING / TRIAL / SENTENCE

Date
Defendant ☐ Pro Se ☐ with counsel
☐ Sentence Trial to ☐ Court ☐ Jury of
Charge Findings Fine Suspended Costs Total Due SQE to Jail Suspended
#1
#2
#3
#4
#5

PRE-SENTENCE / PROBATION

☐ Alcohol evaluation ordered. ☐ Pre-sentence report ordered.
☐ Hearing set for
☐ Probation granted for to
☐ Probation denied. ☐ Stay of execution during probation.
☐ Deferred prosecution granted for to
☐ Deferred sentencing granted for to
☐ Restitution of \$ ordered by
☐ Other stipulations. ☐ Probation Terminated. Case Closed.
☐ People's motion allowing defendant's guilty plea to be withdrawn, granted.
Defendant discharged from deferred sentence.
☐ Advisement given per Sec. 24-72-308, CRS.
☐ Final Adjudication. So ordered and approved.

Date Judge/Magistrate

FISCAL DATA

Type Date Receipt # Amount
Bond
Returned
Jury Fee
Returned
Fines \$
Victim Assistance Fee (37%) \$
Court Costs \$
Sheriff Fee/Witness Fees \$
Probation Fee \$
Alcohol Fee \$
Victim Compensation Fee \$
Attorney Fee \$
LEAF \$
UPS Fee \$
Total Due \$
Payment \$

**REGISTER OF ACTIONS
CIVIL / SMALL CLAIMS**

COUNTY COURT, COUNTY OF
OF

NATURE OF ACTION

- ☐ MONEY DEMAND \$
☐ FED
☐ NAME CHANGE
☐ OTHER

Plaintiff's Attorney, Address, Tel. #

Case #
Plaintiff

vs.

Division/Judge/Magistrate

Defendant

Summons Filed
Complaint Filed
Return Filed
Alias summons returned
Answer Filed
Counter Claim Filed
Case Closed

Return Date
Continued to
Continued to
Trial date
Continued to
Continued to
Continued to

FISCAL DATA

DATE RECEIPT # AMOUNT

Tax And
Filing Fee
Answer Fee
Process Fee
Jury Fee
Other

PRE-TRIAL / TRIAL ACTIVITY

- ☐ Dismissed without prejudice
☐ Dismissed with prejudice
☐ Default Date
☐ Default judgment \$
plus attorney fee \$

☐ Reason:

plus costs \$

plus Interest \$

Trial to: ☐ Court ☐ Jury of

After hearing and considering the testimony, evidence, and authorities, the
finds, and the court enters judgment in favor of

☐ Court ☐ Jury

and against

for \$

plus Costs \$

plus Attorney Fee \$

plus Interest \$

Date

Judge/Magistrate

PROCEEDINGS

Appendix C

Public Services, Court Services, and Case Management Functional Decomposition Diagrams Modifications by NCSC

Suggested modifications to procedures by NCSC are presented in Arial Black, italicized, 12-point font and inserted into current procedure decomposition modules. Re-engineering which may be accomplished will depend on the functionality provided by FACTS™.

1. INFORMATION BOOTH

1.1. Process Motions

1.1.1. Date and Time Stamp

1.1.2. Add event (motion for) to REACT. (*)

Update FACTS™ for new event.

1.1.3. Send to Records to pull file for judicial review.

FACTS™ should automatically trigger a notice to Records to pull file for judicial review. Both motion and case file can then be delivered to assigned judge.

1.2. Set Court Dates

1.2.1. Prepare Re-set Notice

Add scheduled event to FACTS™.

1.2.2. Add scheduled event to REACT. (*)

FACTS™ should automatically print reset notice for defendant.

1.2.3. Distribute Copies

Give defendant reset notice printed by FACTS™. FACTS™ should automatically notice prosecutor's office and generate witness letters for mailing by prosecutor's office.

1.3. Prepare Payment Slips

1.3.1. Query REACT to determine docket number, and place on slip along with collection amounts. (*)

Disposition (including payments) should automatically be printed once it has been entered in the courtroom. Printed copy should include docket number.

1.3.2. Give defendant completed green slip to take to cashier.

Give defendant completed copy of disposition before leaving the courtroom. Included in the

disposition copy are details of the payment obligations.

2. CASHIER

2.1. Query REACT to Determine Docket Number. (*)

Query FACTS™ by docket number found on disposition copy given the Cashier by the defendant.

2.2. Collect Payment

2.3. Print Receipt. Copy to defendant and for end of shift balancing.

Record payment in FACTS™. Print out receipt. Control copy (whether paper or electronic) will be available for end of shift balancing.

3. FRONT COUNTER UPDATING

3.1. Responsible Pleas - Civil

3.1.1. Modify Charge Disposition. (*)

3.1.2. Add Sentence. (*)

3.1.3. Close scheduled event. (*)

3.1.4. Add collections. (*)

3.1.5. Prepare amended minute entry.

3.1.6. Prepare green slip.

3.1.7. Send defendant to cashier (with green slip).

Update FACTS™ to record responsible plea.

FACTS™ should generate disposition (including sentence), close scheduled event, detail payment schedule, and prepare and print a copy of the disposition to give to the defendant to take to the cashier.

3.2. Mitigation Court Hearings

3.2.1. Select Court date utilizing scheduling module. (*)

3.2.2. Close scheduled event. (*)

3.2.3. Print hearing Notice. Copy to defendant / original to file.

3.2.4. Prepare Mitigation Court Notice/Default Judgment form.

3.2.5. Pull file and place in Mitigation Court cabinet.

Update FACTS™ with request for mitigation hearing. FACTS™ should suggest next available, appropriate court date based on case type and calendar assignment. Clerk can accept court date or request another. Once court date

established, FACTS™ should prepare and print notice to defendant. FACTS™ should update Mitigation Calendar and prepare Mitigation Court Notice and Default Judgement form for inclusion in file.

3.3. Continued Civil Arraignments/ Extensions (to show proof, pay, DDS, Civil compliance).

3.3.1. To continue arraignment, add scheduled event, and close event. (*)

Update FACTS™ with request to continue arraignment. FACTS™ should suggest next available appropriate date. Clerk may accept or reject date. Upon acceptance, FACTS™ should add continued arraignment date and close out open event.

3.3.2. To extend show proof or payment, add collections, modify charge disposition, add sentence, close scheduled event, prepare amended minute entry. Copy to defendant and file. (*)

Update FACTS™ to record extension of show proof or payment. FACTS™ should generate disposition (including sentence), close scheduled event, detail payment schedule, update Register of Actions, and prepare and print a copy to give to the defendant.

3.3.3. To update proof of compliance, copy the proof, prepare amended minute entry, delete scheduled payment, reduce finance record, modify charge disposition, add sentence, add event of proof shown. (*)

Update FACTS™ with proof of compliance adding to Register of Actions. Copy proof for file. Update of proof of compliance event should amend payment schedule, add disposition (including sentence).

3.4. Not Responsible Pleas (Timely)

3.4.1. Select Court date (scheduling module). (*)

3.4.2. Close scheduled event. (*)

3.4.3. Print Hearing Notice, and copy to defendant / file.

Update FACTS™ with the not responsible plea.

FACTS™ should suggest next available, appropriate court date based on case type and calendar assignment. Clerk can accept court date or request another. Once court date established, FACTS™ should prepare and print notice to defendant. Update of court date should close any pending scheduled event.

3.5. Request for Hearing (Default Status)

3.5.1. Defendant files motion

3.5.2. Add event to REACT. (*)

3.5.3. Forward motion to Records.

3.5.4. File pulled for judicial review.

Update FACTS™ for new event. FACTS™ should automatically trigger a notice to Records to pull file for judicial review. Both motion and case file can then be delivered to assigned judge.

3.5.4.1. If approved, default is set aside, case is set for hearing, copy to defendant and file, file goes back to Records.

If approved, update FACTS™ to note approval on Register of Actions. This update should trigger assignment of an appropriate, available court date based on case type and calendar assignment. The clerk may accept or reject the court date. Upon acceptance, FACTS™ should generate appropriate notice(s) for deliver to parties.

3.5.4.2. If denied, add event to REACT, copy to defendant and file, file goes back to Records.

If denied, update FACTS™ to note denial on Register of Actions. This update should trigger preparation of notice by FACTS™ to the parties concerning the judge's action.

3.6. Reset Failure to Appear

3.6.1. Assigned Case

3.6.1.1. Coordinate court date with judicial rotational calendar and judge's personal preference.

3.6.1.2. Prepare re-set notice.

3.6.1.3. Add scheduled event to REACT. (*)

3.6.1.4. Copy to defendant, prosecutor, file.

3.6.1.5. Notice placed in Records basket.

FACTS™ should suggest next appropriate, available court date based on case type and calendar assignment when clerk updates reset of Failure to Appear. Clerk may accept or reject suggested date. Once accepted, scheduled event is updated and appropriate notices are generated. Database is searched for outstanding warrant and, if found, an electronic notification is triggered to take action to quash the warrant.

3.6.2. Unassigned Case

3.6.2.1. Select Court date (scheduling module). (*)

3.6.2.2. Prepare re-set notice.

3.6.2.3. Copy to defendant, prosecutor, file.

3.6.2.4. Notice placed in Records basket.

FACTS™ should suggest next appropriate, available court date based on case type and calendar assignment when clerk updates reset of Failure to Appear. Clerk may accept or reject suggested date. Once accepted, scheduled event is updated and appropriate notices are generated. Database is searched for outstanding warrant and, if found, an electronic notification is triggered to take action to quash the warrant.

3.6.3. Arrest Immediately

3.6.3.1. Call Marshals (or current procedure)

3.6.3.2. Pull file

3.6.3.3. Defendant escorted to assigned judge.

3.6.4. Warning Letter - Request for Mitigation

3.6.4.1. Defendant files application to set aside default.

3.6.4.1.1. Select court date (scheduling module). (*)

3.6.4.1.2. Add event to close scheduled event.

(*)

3.6.4.1.3. Print hearing notice.

3.6.4.1.4. Copy to defendant and file

3.6.4.1.5. Prepare mitigation order/default judgment.

3.6.4.1.6. Pull file and place in mitigation file cabinet.

Update FACTS™ with request for mitigation hearing. FACTS™ should suggest next available, appropriate court date based on case type and calendar assignment. Clerk can accept court date or request another. Once court date established, FACTS™ should prepare and print notice to defendant. Update of next court date should close any open scheduled date. FACTS™ should update Mitigation Calendar and prepare Mitigation Court Notice and Default Judgement form for inclusion in file.

4. PARKING

4.1. Citations (Data Entry)

4.1.1. Case Initiation. (*)

4.1.2. File.

Parking citations should be entered into FACTS™ electronically by the issuing agency.

4.2. Failure to appear

4.2.1. Query MVD terminal from weekly REACT printout of FTAs. (*)

FACTS™ should monitor failures to appear by noting court dates that remain open after the date of the scheduled event. License plate or VIN queries to the MVD system should be automatically generated and sent by FACTS™.

4.2.2. Print defendant information obtained from license plate or VIN number. (*)

4.2.3. Add defendant's name and address to REACT. (*)

Defendant name and address should be

automatically updated on FACTS™ upon receipt of data from MVD. Exceptions will be handled manually.

4.2.4. Delinquent notices prepared weekly (batch). (*)

4.2.5. Delinquent notices mailed to defendants.

On a pre-determined schedule, FACTS™ should generate delinquent notices for mailing.

4.3. DEFAULT LIST

4.3.1. Add event. (*)

4.3.2. Modify charge disposition. (*)

4.3.3. Add open charge disposition. (*)

Default should be automatically generated by FACTS™ once payment date has passed.

Automatic generation of default should add necessary items to Register of Actions and modify disposition.

4.4. Responsible Plea

4.4.1. Payment in full.

4.4.1.1. Modify charge disposition. (*)

4.4.1.2. Add sentence. (*)

4.4.1.3. Close scheduled event. (*)

4.4.1.4. Add collections. (*)

4.4.1.5. Enter payment. (*)

Update FACTS™ to record responsible plea.

FACTS™ should generate disposition (including sentence), close scheduled event, detail payment schedule, and prepare and print a copy of the disposition to give to the defendant to take to the cashier. Record payment in FACTS™. Print out receipt. Control copy (whether paper or electronic) will be available for end of shift balancing.

4.4.2. Extension to pay.

4.4.2.1. Prepare minute entry.

4.4.2.2. Modify charge disposition. (*)

4.4.2.3. Add sentence. (*)

4.4.2.4. Close scheduled event. (*)

4.4.2.5. Add collections. (*)

4.4.2.6. Add scheduled payment date. (*)

4.4.2.7. Copy to defendant and file.

Update FACTS™ to record extension of payment. FACTS™ should generate disposition (including sentence), close scheduled event, detail payment schedule, update Register of Actions, and prepare and print a copy to give to the defendant.

4.5. Not Responsible Plea

4.5.1. Modify defendant name and address. (*)

4.5.2. Coordinate hearing date with judge's calendar.

4.5.3. Add scheduled event. (*)

4.5.4. Print hearing notice.

4.5.5. Copy to defendant and file.

Update FACTS™ with the not responsible plea. FACTS™ should suggest next available, appropriate court date based on case type and calendar assignment. Clerk can accept court date or request another. Once court date established, FACTS™ should prepare and print notice to defendant. Update of court date should close any pending scheduled event.

5. CIVIL INFRACTIONS

5.1. Responsible (without hearing)

5.1.1. Initiate Case. (*)

5.1.2. Pull docket.

5.1.3. Prepare minute entry.

5.1.4. Modify charge disposition. (*)

5.1.5. Add sentence. (*)

5.1.6. Close scheduled event. (*)

5.1.7. Add collections. (*)

5.1.8. Payment made to cashier.

Citations should be entered into FACTS™ electronically by the issuing agency. Record responsible plea. Disposition (including sentence) should be automatically generated by FACTS™. Disposition should include payments due to Court. FACTS™ should generate

defendant copy. Record payment in FACTS™. Print out receipt. Control copy (whether paper or electronic) will be available for end of shift balancing.

5.2. Responsible (abatement hearing)

5.2.1. Initiate Case. (*)

5.2.2. Pull docket.

5.2.3. Set hearing (coordinate with judge's calendar). (*)

5.2.4. Add scheduled event. (*)

5.2.5. Close event. (*)

5.2.6. Copy to defendant and city agency.

5.2.7. File.

Citations should be entered into FACTS™ electronically by the issuing agency. Record request for abatement hearing. FACTS™ should suggest an appropriate, available court date based on case type and calendar assignment. Clerk can accept court date or request another. Once court date established, FACTS™ should prepare and print notice to defendant and city agency. Update of court date should close any pending scheduled event.

5.3. Completion of hearing (or abatement).

5.3.1. Prepare minute entry.

5.3.2. Modify charge disposition. (*)

5.3.3. Add sentence. (*)

5.3.4. Close scheduled event. (*)

5.3.5. Copy to defendant and file.

5.3.6. Add collections. (*)

5.3.7. Payment made to cashier.

5.3.8. File.

Update FACTS™ to record hearing completion. FACTS™ should generate disposition (including sentence), close scheduled event, detail payment schedule, and prepare and print a copy of the disposition to give to the defendant to take to the cashier. Record payment in FACTS™. Print out receipt. Control copy (whether paper or electronic) will be available for end of shift

balancing.

6. DV - ORDERS OF PROTECTION / INJUNCTION AGAINST HARASSMENT

6.1. Process filing

- 6.1.1. Assist plaintiff with forms.
- 6.1.2. Place forms in folder for judge.
- 6.1.3. Initiate Case. (*)
- 6.1.4. Set hearing (if required). (*)
- 6.1.5. Distribute copies.

Initiate case in FACTS™. If hearing requested, FACTS™ will suggest court date based on case type and calendar assignment. Clerk may accept or reject court date. Upon acceptance, FACTS™ will print appropriate copies for distribution.

6.2. Service of process

- 6.2.1. Plaintiff utilizes process server
 - 6.2.1.1. City contracted or private.
 - 6.2.1.2. County- provide process server list.
 - 6.2.1.3. County- fees waived Pima County.
 - 6.2.1.4. Constable.

6.2.2. Collect applicable fees.

6.3. Return of Service

- 6.3.1. Copy original
- 6.3.2. Send certified copies of affidavit of service/ order.
- 6.3.3. Send certified copy of affidavit of service to plaintiff
- 6.3.4. File.

6.4. To Set Hearing (defendant's request).

- 6.4.1. Verify proof of service.
- 6.4.2. Copy defendant's I.D.
- 6.4.3. Select hearing date. (*)
- 6.4.4. Notify plaintiff telephonically and by mail.
- 6.4.5. Copy of hearing notice to defendant.
- 6.4.6. File.

Record request for hearing in FACTS™. FACTS™ will suggest next available, appropriate court date based on case type and calendar assignment. Clerk may accept or reject date. Once court date accepted, FACTS™ will generate appropriate notices for distribution.

6.5. Out of court updating.

6.5.1. Close scheduled event. (*)

6.5.2. Add new event. (*)

6.5.3. Send modification to process server for service.

6.5.4. File.

The goal is to have updating done at the time the event either occurs or is scheduled regardless of whether that action occurs in the courtroom or at the public service counter.

7. MAIL - Mail is time stamped, opened and placed in appropriate basket.

7.1. Processing incoming mail.

7.1.1. Responsible plea

7.1.1.1. Modify charge disposition. (*)

7.1.1.2. Add sentence. (*)

7.1.1.3. Add collections. (*)

7.1.1.4. Close scheduled event. (*)

7.1.1.5. Stamp back of checks/money orders "Deposit Only".

7.1.1.6. Cashier posts payment.

7.1.1.7. Balance input.

7.1.1.8. Deposit revenue.

7.1.1.9. Loose paperwork to file.

Record responsible plea. Disposition (including sentence) should be automatically generated by FACTS™. Disposition should include payments due to Court. Record payment in FACTS™. Control copy (whether paper or electronic) will be available for end of shift balancing.

7.1.2. Not Responsible.

7.1.2.1. Post Deposit

7.1.2.2. Copy receipt.

7.1.2.3. Pull file.

7.1.2.4. Send file to Case Management to set hearing.

Record not responsible plea in FACTS™. Record deposit in FACTS™. Control copy (whether paper or electronic) will be available for end of shift balancing.

Request assignment by FACTS™ of next appropriate, available court date based on case type and calendar assignment. Clerk may accept or reject date. Once accepted, FACTS™ should generate notice to be sent to defendant.

7.1.3. Monthly payments

7.1.3.1. Stamp "Deposit Only" on back of check/money order.

7.1.3.2. Add payment to REACT. (*)

7.1.3.3. Balance input.

7.1.3.4. Deposit revenue.

Record payment in FACTS™. Control copy (whether paper or electronic) will be available for end of shift balancing.

8. PHONE COMMUNICATION

8.1. Assist public with Incoming calls.

8.2. Query REACT. (*)

8.3. Modify Address information from returned mail. (*)

Use FACTS™ as necessary to obtain information to assist the public. Modify address data if necessary.

1. FILE MANAGEMENT

1.1. Add record into REACT to track location of file. (*)

1.1.1. docket number

1.1.2. date

1.1.3. location sent

1.1.4. note field (option)

File tracking should be done using bar codes and light pens to minimize the number of keystrokes necessary to enter the information.

2. MOTIONS TO WITHDRAW

2.1. Add scheduled event with date and time of event. (*)

3. CASE TRANSFERS

3.1. Add event to note a case has been transferred to other jurisdiction. (*)

3.1.1. Date

3.1.2. Event

3.1.3. Name of Judge who ordered transfer.

3.1.4. Action

3.1.5. Result

3.1.6. Note field (option)

4. CRIMINAL SET ASIDES

4.1. Criminal set aside application is completed by defendant.

4.2. Application and file are sent to judge for ruling.

4.3. Ruling is added to system using an event. (*)

4.4. Copies distributed to appropriate parties.

5. RESETS AFTER FAILURE TO APPEAR

5.1. Paperwork received from Public Services.

5.2. Information is verified. (*)

5.3. File pulled and sent to Calendaring or Arraignment section.

Essentially all of the above actions can be accomplished through noting the event in FACTS™ and having FACTS™ generate appropriate notice copies for distribution.

6. CALENDARING

6.1. Scheduled events for a court session are downloaded from REACT to a PC in Calendaring. (*)

6.2. File is formatted into calendar form (Word Perfect). (*)

6.3. Case files are located and matched with each case on the calendar.

6.4. Courtrooms and judges are assigned to each scheduled event.

(*)

6.5. Calendar is printed and distributed. (*)

6.6. Files sent to appropriate courtroom with copy of calendar attached.

FACTS™ should provide calendars upon request and at other pre-determined intervals. No intervention or downloading to a different computer for reformatting by word processing software should be necessary. Calendars should be a standard report.

7. ARRAIGNMENTS

7.1. Arraignments scheduled for a particular session are downloaded from REACT into a PC in the Arraignment section. (*)

7.2. File is formatted into calendar form (Word Perfect). (*)

7.3. Case files are located and matched with each case on the calendar.

7.4. Case files are sent to appropriate courtrooms on date of arraignment. .

7.5. Roll Call taken in court, and plea is recorded manually on session docket.

7.6. Judge rules and minute entry is completed.

7.7. Case files of defendants who have failed to appear are sent to Case Management for preparation of warrant.

FACTS™ should provide the arraignment calendar both upon request and at other pre-determined intervals. No intervention or downloading to a different computer for reformatting by word processing software should be necessary. Pleas are recorded in FACTS™ as they are taken on the session docket. Judges' rulings are also recorded in FACTS™. Should a defendant fail to appear, the judge's issuance of a bench warrant is recorded in FACTS™ and triggers preparation of the warrant outside the courtroom.

8. APPEALS

8.1. Defendant files request for appeal.

8.2. Transcript is typed, or copy of the audio tape is made for Superior Court.

8.3. Case file copied and forwarded to Superior Court.

8.4. Case disposition is entered into REACT as stayed pending appeal. (*)

8.5. Upon ruling, updated disposition is entered into REACT. (*)

The filing of the appeal is noted in FACTS™. This entry on the Register of Actions should modify the case disposition to Stayed Pending Appeal. Upon ruling, the disposition is updated.

9.0 MOTIONS

- 9.1. Motions are filed daily by attorneys and pro se litigants.
- 9.2. Corresponding files are located.
- 9.3. File and motion are routed to appropriate Judge for ruling.
- 9.4. Upon ruling, files are sent to appropriate division for REACT update. (*)

Update FACTS™ for new event. FACTS™ should automatically trigger a notice to Records to pull file for judicial review. Both motion and case file can then be delivered to assigned judge. FACTS™ should then be updated with the judge's ruling before the file is returned to Records.

10. RECORDS REQUESTS

- 10.1. Request for information received by any customer.
- 10.2. Files pulled for customer review.
- 10.3. Requested copies made for requester.

11. PULLING TERMINATED CASES

- 11.1. Aging report is generated on terminated cases based on the case type. (*)
- 11.2. Report is utilized to pull corresponding case files.
- 11.3. Files are boxed, labeled, and sent to City warehouse for storage and eventual destruction.

12. PULLING AND FILING CASE FILES

- 12.1. Case files, are pulled upon customer request.
- 12.2. Returned files are re.f1led in the record library.

13. BONDS

- 13.1. Out of jurisdiction bond received through mail.
 - 13.1.1. Mail clerk updates REACT. (*)
 - 13.1.2. FTA warrant is set for arraignment and notifications sent. FTPF warrant is quashed by Case Management. (*)
- 13.2. Bond Poster. Poster appears at Public Services to post bond for defendant in custody.
 - 13.2.1. PS clerk retrieves file and calls jail for bond information.
 - 13.2.2. PS clerk accepts bond and issues receipt.

13.2.3. PS clerk updates REACT. (*)

13.2.4. FTA generates paperwork, original to file. (*)

13.2.5. FTPF goes to Bond Clerk, REACT updated, bond converted.

13.3. Superior Court Bond. Taken In at Superior Court and forwarded to City Court.

13.3.1. For cash bond, REACT updated, copy of documentation to suspense file. (*)

13.3.2. For surety bond, REACT updated, copy of documentation to case file. (*)

Bonds must be posted in FACTS™ and appropriate receipts and control copies generated. Update of FACTS™ should trigger receipt. Manual receipt of funds should not be permitted unless FACTS™ is inaccessible for some reason. Once a bond is updated and receipted, a check for outstanding warrants should be made and steps to schedule hearings and quash warrants should be triggered.

1. CASE PROCESSING

1.1. Case Initiation

1.1.1. Citations are sorted by case type, and distributed to employees for entry.

1.1.2. Citation data is entered into the REACT system. (*)

1.1.2.1. Initiate case in REACT using SCREENPAC (INT2).

1.1.2.2. Scheduled event of ARRM is created. Date entered is the date officer assigned when issuing the citation.

1.1.2.3. Charges are entered using SCREENPAC (CRG1.CRG9), and each charge has a separate violation code. Also, each charge has a specific complaint number.

1.1.2.4. System generates sequential docket number.

1.1.3. Docket number is recorded on citation.

1.1.4. Corresponding file is pulled and citation is placed in file.

1.1.5. File is sent to appropriate location. Civil citations are sent to Records for filing. Criminal citations are sent to Court Services arraignment team.

Wherever possible, initiation of a citation on the system should be done by the issuing agency.

Where the Court must enter citations, this should be done prior to any scheduled court date.

Where individuals are in custody, the jail should be able to transfer to FACTS™ appropriate information in order for the court to initiate the court case.

1.2. Civil Default Warning Letter

1.2.1. Defendant fails to appear at Civil Arraignment.

1.2.2. REACT reads files and generates warning letters to those with a past due scheduled event record. (*)

1.2.2.1. At initiation, a scheduled event of ARRM is created when arraignment date is entered.

1.2.2.2.

1.2.3. REACT generates a listing of cases receiving warning letter from past due scheduled event of ARRM. (*)

1.2.4. A scheduled event record is manually added to REACT on cases which received warning letters. (*)

1.2.4.1. Scheduled event added is WARN.

1.2.5. Warning letters are hand carried by staff to City mail room.

When a defendant has failed to appear at civil arraignment, the scheduled event remains open. Once the date is past, FACTS™ should generate a warning letter and update the Register of Actions with a notation that a warning letter has been sent. FACTS™ will also note the expectation that the warning letter will be satisfied by a pre-determined date.

1.3. Civil Defaults

1.3.1. Defendant fails to respond to default warning letter.

1.3.2. Report is generated from REACT listing all cases that match default criteria. (*)

1.3.2.1. Default criteria is case with past due scheduled event of WARN.

1.3.3. Records are added to REACT to initiate suspension of the defendant's driver's license. (*)

1.3.3.1. Disposition indicator is changed to "Y," and MVD disposition code is entered as 58 for Title 28 violations and 55 for Title 20 violations.

1.3.3.2. MVD Interfaces with REACT, extracts 55s and 68s, then notifies defendant of license suspension.

Should a defendant fail to respond to a warning letter, FACTS™ will trigger the license suspension procedure by updating appropriate codes.

1.4. Civil Hearing Set and Notify

1.4.1. Defendant mails in not responsible plea and a bond for a citation.

1.4.2. Case file is pulled and sent to Case Management.

1.4.3. Court date for defendant is determined using scheduling module. (*)

1.4.3.1. From the scheduling module (SCHD), the scheduled event CVHR is created.

1.4.4. Civil hearing notice is printed manually. (*)

1.4.5. Copies of notice are distributed to parties.

The not responsible plea is recorded in FACTS™

as is the bond. This should trigger assignment of an available, appropriate court date based upon case type and calendar assignment. Clerk may accept or reject court date. Upon acceptance, FACTS™ will automatically generate appropriate notice to all parties for distribution. Notice to the defendant should include a receipt for bond.

1.5. In-Custody Videos

1.5.1. Citations and paperwork are received from Court Services after arraignment session.

1.5.2. Citations are entered into REACT using procedures in 1.1.2 (*)

This entire process will be different if the jail enters data to initiate the court record and updating in done in the courtroom.

1.6. Dismissals

1.6.1. Notification is received from officer requesting that citation be dismissed.

1.6.2. Records added to REACT to reflect dismissal. (*)

1.6.2.1. Event CTDS is added.

1.6.2.2. Charge Disposition Is modified to 0851, and MVD Disp to 59.

1.6.3. Copies of dismissal distributed to parties.

Dismissal is recorded in FACTS™ like any other case event. Copies of the disposition are generated for distribution to parties.

2. WARRANTS

2.1. Warrant Issuance

2.1.1. File received from court after hearing and/or ruling.

2.1.2. REACT queried to determine if any other case dispositions have been added. (*)

2.1.3. Warrant codes entered into appropriate fields. (*)

2.1.4. Warrant/FTA printed. (*)

2.1.5. Obtain prosecutor and judge signature on printed warrant/FTA

2.1.6. Warrant filed and copy sent inter-office mail to TPD.

The fact that a warrant has been issued will be recorded in the courtroom on FACTS™. This will

trigger preparation of the warrant outside the courtroom. The judge and prosecutor may view the warrant electronically and apply electronic signatures or the warrant may be forwarded to them for signing. TPD should be notified electronically of the warrant and this notice should generate a data stream for entry in TPD's warrants system.

2.2. Warrant Quashing

2.2.1. Order to quash received.

2.2.2. Quash codes entered In REACT. (*)

2.2.3. Quash information is manually recorded on "quash form" and faxed to TPD.

2.2.4. Copies of faxed "quash form" and fax receipt for documentation.

Order quashing warrant is updated in FACTS™. This should trigger electronic notification to TPD that the warrant is quashed and also generate a data stream to remove the warrant from TPD's warrant system.

2.3. Mass Quash & Dismiss

2.3.1. Report generated from REACT identifying cases matching quash criteria. (*)

2.3.2. Quash codes entered to quash and dismiss charges. (*)

2.3.3. Mass Quash list faxed to TPD.

2.3.4. Copies in file for documentation.

Cases where warrants are eligible for quashing will be identified by FACTS™. A quash docket should be prepared for the prosecutor and assigned to a calendar. Once warrants have been quashed and charges dismissed, FACTS™ will be updated with the disposition and this will trigger the necessary communication with TPD.

3. COURT UPDATING

3.1. Resets

3.1.1. Event is added and new scheduled date is added. (*)

3.1.2. Past scheduled is deleted with addition of new event.

FACTS™ will suggest court date based on case type and calendar assignment. Once accepted by clerk, appropriate notice will be generated for distribution. Calendaring of the next event will automatically close any open scheduled event.

3.2. Dismissals

3.2.1. Event is added to reflect court order. (*)

3.2.2. Codes added to disposition and reason for dismissal.
(*)

3.2.3. Dismissal code added and sent to MVD. (*)

Dismissal of charges is a disposition like any other. FACTS™ is updated with the disposition and appropriate notice is sent to MVD.

3.3. Judgments

3.3.1. Judgments added and sent to MVD. (*)

3.3.2. Charge disposition modified as necessary. (*)

3.3.3. Sentencing records added. (*)

Update FACTS™ to record judgment. FACTS™ should generate disposition (including sentence), close scheduled event, detail payment schedule, and prepare and print a copy of the disposition. MVD should be notified electronically whenever possible.

3.4. In Custody Videos

3.4.1. Same procedures as resets or judgments in accordance to particular ruling. (*)

FACTS™ will suggest court date based on case type and calendar assignment. Once accepted by clerk, appropriate notice will be generated for distribution. Calendaring of the next event will automatically close any open scheduled event.

3.5. Civil

3.5.1. Civil hearing results entered in REACT. (*)

Civil hearing dispositions are updated in FACTS™ like any other disposition or court event.

3.6. Set and Notify

3.6.1. Orders to set future hearing (sometimes done from judge's chambers).

3.6.2. Set using scheduling module. (*)

3.6.3. Copies printed and distributed to parties.

Update FACTS™ with hearing request. FACTS™ should suggest next available, appropriate court date based on case type and calendar assignment. Clerk can accept court date or request another. Once court date established, FACTS™ should prepare and print notice to parties.

4. MISCELLANEOUS FUNCTIONS

4.1. Calendar Check

4.1.1. REACT queried weekly to check accuracy of calendar.
(*)

The intention is for all calendaring to be done through FACTS™. Therefore, no manual calendars will exist to be used for verification of data accuracy in FACTS™. Calendars will be defined by a set of business rules outlining the circumstances a case must meet and bringing those circumstances together with available dates.

4.2. Long Forms

4.2.1. Manually logged in and assigned sequential docket number.

4.2.2. Copy to process server for service.

4.2.3. Affidavit of service filed.

All court activity should be recorded in FACTS™. Any assignment of tracking numbers should also be done by FACTS™. Once affidavit of service has been filed, that event should be recorded in FACTS™.

4.3. MVD Interface

4.3.1. Weekly tape electronically transmitted to MVD consisting of reportable citations and dispositions. (*)

FACTS™ should trigger appropriate reporting to MVD based upon conventions defined to the system.