

Policy Team of the Information Technology and Systems Improvement Committee
Minutes
June 14, 2012

A public meeting of the Policy Team of the Information Technology and Systems Improvement Committee of the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission was convened on June 14, 2012 at the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, 1110 W. Washington, Suite 250, Phoenix, AZ 85007.

Members Present:

Karl Heckart, Chairperson, Administrative Office of the Courts
Cathy Allen, Coconino County Sheriff's Office
Cathy Clarich, Glendale City Court
Cheryl Harris, Navajo County Attorney's Office, by conference call
Mark Hendershot, Maricopa County Adult Probation
Michael Keran, Scottsdale Police Department
Mark Marino, Gilbert Police Department
Julio Marroquin, Yavapai County Attorney's Office
Marna McLendon, Retired Attorney
Bill McDonald, Maricopa County Attorney's Office, Gary Peet representing
Andrew Pacheco, Attorney General's Office, Dan Sands representing
Jeff Raynor, Department of Public Safety

Members Absent:

Shelly Bunn, Maricopa County Sheriff's Office
Frank Gonzales, Pima County Sheriff's Department
Jeff Hood, Department of Corrections
John Neeley, Tucson Police Department
Rob Peck, Pima County Attorney's Office

Staff Participating:

Pat Nelson, Program Manager
Wendy Boyle, Executive Secretary

Guest Participating:

Mike Morrision, Scottsdale Police Department

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Karl Heckart at 9:00 a.m. Roll was taken and a quorum was declared present.

II. Minutes of the May 11, 2012 Meeting

Chairperson Heckart called for a motion on the minutes. Cathy Clarich entered a motion to approve the minutes of the May 11, 2012 meeting. The motion was seconded by Jeff Raynor and was unanimously approved by the Committee.

III. AZ Strategic Priorities

Pat Nelson, Program Manager provided an update of the May 24, 2012 Commission meeting where information was shared relative to the Arizona Strategic Priorities.

Ms. Nelson reviewed the information found in the tables shown on pages 10-12 of the agenda that outline high priorities for FY13. They include: 1) Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS) rollout; 2) Criminal History Records Clean-up and Completion; 3) Warrant Repository-eWarrants Process; 4) Support of National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) Task Force Project; and 5) NIEM Standards and Education. She also discussed how these priorities support the goals and objectives of the Information Sharing Strategy. Ms. Nelson concluded with the list of medium priority projects for FY13 and the priorities designated for FY14 on page 13 of the agenda.

Ms. Nelson provided an overview of the comments and recommendations shared by the Commission following a review of the priorities. Some of the questions and comments expressed include: 1) How do we make sure to provide assistance and inclusion in initiatives such as ADRS, e-citation, e-warrant, JW1 and Coplink for smaller jurisdictions; 2) How will performance metrics

be used to validate overall effectiveness; 3) How do we determine the roadblocks and identify measures to overcome them; 4) We need to brief other organizations on the strategy and the priorities such as presentations to the Arizona Prosecuting Attorneys Advisory Council (APAAC), Arizona Association Chiefs of Police (AACOP); Arizona County Attorneys Sheriffs Association (ACASA); and 4) Who will have the responsibility of project management to carry out the strategy?

Ms. Nelson provided further explanation on the project management of the state strategy. The scheme of managing the overall project will be a collaborative approach handled by various committees, workgroups and individual stakeholder agency's project management teams. The priorities stated in the strategy are overarching and provide benefits to all criminal justice stakeholders. Individual agencies will manage and implement various elements of the tactical pieces but stakeholders will collaborate while a project goes through the analysis, development and implementation phases so that the solution will be beneficial to all.

Ms. Nelson reviewed the Policy Team's mission, goals and objectives and commented that a number of projects are linked together. A few of the more dynamic goals and objects include, Goal (1): develop, communicate and implement a strategic plan for integrating criminal history information; Goal (2): establish performance measures to improve the accuracy, completeness and timeliness of criminal history records; Goal (5): promote the leveraging of resources through the collaboration of criminal justice agencies; and Objective (8): provide an annual update to the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission in regard to the Record Improvement and Information Sharing Program and funding initiatives.

This agenda item was presented for informational purposes and did not require Committee action.

IV. Action Plan for Tactical Priorities

Pat Nelson, Program Manager explained that each year the Commission will receive a report on the progress of the strategy. The target date for next update will be May 2013, which will include the progress the Policy Team has made in responding to recommendations offered by the Commission this year. Ms. Nelson pointed out that it will be critical to establish an evaluation tool or scorecard to measure the success of the goals. The Policy Team was referred to the action plan development handout that lists the tactical priorities.

Chairman Heckart first reviewed the Criminal History Clean-up and Completion priority. The Committee then discussed the areas to be addressed in FY13. Some of the topics covered were identifying key points such as establishing a baseline matrix by breaking down the components of the criminal records reporting process. The Committee then discussed developing and mapping procedures so agencies can be educated and trained. Ms. Nelson recommended the Committee utilize the subject matter experts in the Disposition Business Process Improvements Workgroup to assist with the mapping. A number of the Policy Team Committee members attended the Workgroup meetings and Ms. Nelson asked that a couple of the Policy Team Committee members serve as a lead to carry the momentum forward. Lt. Col. Jeff Raynor, Department of Public Safety and Cathy Clarich, Glendale City Court volunteered to co-lead the Disposition Workgroup through the process mapping exercises.

Next, the Committee discussed the ADRS. The first area of discussion was how to measure the performance of the system. Some of the outcome measurements include capturing the user's statistics or developing an annual reporting mechanism. The Committee discussed focusing on the agencies that are primarily involved with the number of convictions that are making it to the system and to identify what is missing. Another measurement tool is to track the number of cases processed and the actual quality of the process. The Yavapai County Attorney's Office was offered as a pilot to be used as a model for comparison. Some of the obstacles for the ADRS are the lack of equipment by the smaller agencies and the non-standard process issues. The Committee also talked about training and the need for process mapping. Mr. Heckart stated the implementation schedule for the ADRS rollout in the new court management system should be completed by October. He suggested a marketing component could include a presentation to APAAC.

The Warrant Repository/eWarrants priority was the next topic of discussion. Ms. Nelson explained that the Commission approved the five percent set aside for the CJRIP program that would support the second phase of the analysis and the design of the electronic warrant system and repository.

Ms. Nelson commented that the Information Technology Committee was given a presentation on the eWarrants process in May. The DISPO workgroup and the NICS Task Force

are working on the warrant process issues. The Committee discussed the analysis of the failure to appear (FTA) warrant process and recommendations for improvements. The action plan includes: 1) continue being involved in the study and analysis conducted by the Administrative Office of the Court; 2) continue discussions through the different initiatives that play into the warrants process; 3) have the DISPO Workgroup and NICS Task Force provide updates to the Policy Team on progress of initiatives; and 4) monitor and advise on recommendations coming forward for improvements to the process.

Ms. Nelson reported on the NICS Task Force initiative. Work has been done with specific agencies for the cleanup of the dispositions that were missing in the repository and on the analysis for automating the mental health adjudication from AOC to DPS. Funding was approved by the Commission under the CJRIP program to automate the exchange of mental health adjudications from the AOC to the Department of Public Safety. The technical project teams continue to work on the NIEM data exchange.

Ms. Nelson stated a grant application was submitted to the Bureau of Justice Statistics under a two year funding cycle to focus on data exchanges, the warrant process, and the missing dispositions for felony offenses. The Committee also discussed that the action plan for this priority will be to monitor and advise. The NICS Task Force will meet in July with a draft of the recommendations to bring back to the Policy Team.

Mike Morrison, Scottsdale Police Department and Technical Team member spoke about the NIEM Standards and Education as the last priority. Mr. Morrison explained that the Technical Team is working on standards to assist in educating technical stakeholders. The Technical Committee will be meeting in August and will focus on establishing a sub-committee to start an action plan. The Policy Team discussed what avenues are available for technical assistance training and three different sources were named, SEARCH, BJA and online training through NIEM.gov.

Next, Mr. Heckart discussed the NIEM model as it relates to how it will impact the way agencies will use it and how to plan for the transition. The Committee decided the best action plan is to receive an assessment from the Technical Team on the transition of standard for NIEM and to advise on the coordination of the other projects where there are standard requirements.

After review and discussion, Chairperson Heckart called for a motion on Item IV. Marna McLendon entered a motion to table the item so the Committee can review the development of the action plans discussed and the responsibilities for the tactical priorities at the next Policy Team meeting. The motion was seconded by Cathy Allen and was unanimously approved by the Committee.

V. Call to the Public

Chairperson Heckart made a call to the public. No members of the public addressed the Committee.

VI. Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting

The next Policy Team meeting will be held at the call of the Chairperson.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



John A. Blackburn, Jr.
Executive Director