



In this Issue

Message From the Presiding Judge.....2

Newsmakers.....3

Assessing the Court of Public Opinion.....4

In Memoriam.....6

Focus On: CTS.....7

The *Judicial Branch News* is an online newsletter published by the Media Relations and Community Outreach Department.

If you wish to contribute to this newsletter, please send articles, news items, photos or other correspondence to: karra@superiorcourt.maricopa.gov.

"Committed to the Timely, Fair and Impartial Administration of Justice."



Record Numbers of Jurors Report

On November 27, a massive parade of 705 jurors walked through the entrance of the West Court Building, setting a record for the numbers of jurors reporting for duty in one day in an Arizona courthouse.

To accommodate the large group of jurors, Maricopa County Superior Court filled the jury assembly room and, thanks to the assistance of the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors, packed the remaining jurors into the Board of Supervisors Auditorium.

"November 27th was the busiest day of our busiest year," **Jury Management Director Bob James** said. "In 2006, almost 60,000 jurors have already come to Superior Court, which is 20 percent more than all of 2005, and a third more than all of 2004."

To manage the growing number of trials, Superior Court judges on civil calendar assignments are shifting their calendars to include criminal trials. The purpose is to reduce delay in resolving criminal cases that could be dismissed if not resolved within mandatory time limits.

The change creates minor adjustments to the civil department judges' dockets and is not expected to cause unnecessary disruption in civil case matters. They will add criminal trials to their schedules on a rotating basis.



The Board of Supervisors auditorium was turned into a makeshift jury assembly room.

"This plan provides for an orderly and functional approach, but may delay civil trials for the one week per month that each civil judge will be assigned to assist the criminal divisions," said **Civil Department Presiding Judge Anna Baca**.

Criminal trials take precedence over other pending cases because of "speedy trial" rules that require resolution of criminal matters within 180 days for defendants who are out on bond awaiting trial and 150 days for incarcerated defendants awaiting trial.

Not all lawyers and parties with pending civil trials will be affected. Those impacted will be given advance notice if scheduled hearings and trial dates in their civil cases could be changed as the assigned judge serves on the rotating criminal trial assignment.

"The increase is definitely affecting the way we do business, but once again the Jury Office staff and Court Security team were phenomenal in serving all of those jurors and the trial divisions that needed them," James said.

Message From the Presiding Judge



Barbara Rodriguez Mundell
Presiding Judge

Over the past few months, Superior Court Judges have been advising me about the assignment they would like to be on, which is how the process of rotations begins. This is one of the most difficult and important duties of the presiding judge.

Court staff, particularly those working directly in one of the 94 divisions of the court, as well as court customers and lawyers, may find the business of rotating judges every couple of years inconvenient, perhaps even disruptive.

What drives rotations is our commitment to improving the court and its judges by assuring each judicial officer is trained and competent in the practice of civil, criminal, family and juvenile law. New assignments keep judges fresh, and they are crucial in maintaining a bench of full-service judges.

Different opinions have been expressed about rotations. Some think it is more efficient to indefinitely keep a judge on an assignment in which he or she has attained a high level of effectiveness and expertise. But our "Judicial Assignment and Rotation Guidelines," written in 2000, fosters a judicial philosophy of "service above self." The challenge for judicial officers is to place service to the public above self-interest. The guidelines also point out that "all assignments are considered to be vitally important to the public interest."

June is the traditional time for rotations. But reassignments can occur throughout the year to meet special needs – such as filling calendars vacated by judges who retire or resign, shifting assignments when new judges are appointed to the bench, and realigning the number of judges who comprise a department (family, criminal, etc) because of increased case filings, new programs, and the like.

Soon, night and Saturday calendars will be implemented for Family Court at the Northeast Court Facility and in Juvenile Court at the Durango Court Center. Shifting work schedules of judges and court staff is necessary to assure success of these alternative court dockets being created in an effort to provide optimal service and access to litigants. Each individual working these alternative shifts has volunteered for the assignment.

"It is this flexibility and willingness to change that has earned our court a national reputation for excellence and innovation."

Barbara Rodriguez Mundell
Presiding Judge

It is in that same spirit that judges are asked in the months prior to a planned rotation where they would like to serve. Many judges prefer to preside over cases where they feel most competent and prefer to stay on the same assignment where they are most comfortable. Sometimes, when judges submit their requests, it provides information where they don't want to go, instead of where they do want to go. Each judge has an assignment history which is reviewed to help make good decisions when placing judges in areas where they haven't yet served.

Family Court drives rotation. It is where stress and burn-out of judicial officers and their staffs drive the "need" for change after serving the presumptive two-year assignment.

Nearly three years ago, the Arizona Supreme Court, which has the authority and responsibility to maximize effective and efficient use of judges, criticized this court for failing to use its most experienced judges in family court, juvenile court and the other assignments. That criticism led to an ambitious reorganization of Family Court which included the inclusion of senior members of the bench on Family Court calendars.

It is this flexibility and willingness to change that has earned our court a national reputation for excellence and innovation. We constantly look for ways to do things better. As we're about to launch our night and Saturday courts, we're already in the midst of a new project. We're researching and evaluating the feasibility of creating a capital case panel of judges to handle death penalty cases. Judicial rotations are key to the success of new court projects and programs.

Over the next several weeks, the 2007 rotation plan will be finalized as I continue to review judges' requests and weigh the needs of the court. Training will then begin for judicial officers and their staffs who will be moving to new assignments. As noted earlier, this is one of the most important and most difficult duties of the presiding judge.

Judicial Branch Newsmakers

Juvenile Probation Elves Packing Food Boxes

The Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Department Elves have been busy raising money and collecting food for their 34th annual Christmas Food Box Project.

The Food Box Project was developed in 1973 when a group of juvenile probation officers realized that many families in the community were struggling to meet basic needs during the holiday season.

This year's goal is to distribute more than 500 food boxes to families in the community. Although probationers' families are given priority, many of the families who receive food boxes have no current involvement with the juvenile justice system.

The Christmas Food Box Project is an important part of this agency's history of community involvement. This project has continued for 34 years because of the support and participation of Juvenile Probation staff, donating generously of their time and resources. In addition, the project also receives support from a variety of community partners.

Each food box contains a turkey, canned vegetables, beef stew, chili, two boxes of macaroni and cheese, apples, oranges, five pounds of potatoes, five pounds of rice, five pounds of beans, a bag of prepared salad, two loaves of bread and candy canes. Staff also collects toys and personal hygiene items for the food boxes.

Throughout the year, the various divisions and units of the Juvenile Probation Department organize and facilitate fund raising events. Fund-raising activities include book/bake sales, rummage sales, special drawings, themed lunches, detention theme shirt days, and a turkey and canned goods food drive.

Administrator Appointed to Supreme Court Board

Juvenile Court Administrator **Sheila Tickle** was appointed by **Chief Justice Ruth McGregor** as the chair of the Arizona Supreme Court's Confidential Intermediary Board.

Tickle, who will begin her duties on January 1, 2007, will serve as the chair for three years. Tickle will be responsible for leading a committee that puts adoptive children and parents in contact with the child's birth parents and siblings, while protecting court and agency records and the anonymity of those who desire it. The Confidential Intermediary Program is administered by the Arizona Supreme Court and applies to adoptions that have been finalized in Arizona.

"I look forward with great anticipation to serving the Court in this new capacity. This is an exciting opportunity. I am grateful to receive such an honor and hope to make a positive impact on the children, youth and families served by the program," Tickle said.

The Confidential Intermediary Board is made up of one Superior Court administrator; one attorney; two public members; one clerk of the Superior Court or designee; one adoption agency related representative; and one additional member appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Former Presiding Judge Retires

Superior Court **Judge Colin F. Campbell**, who served as the top judge in Maricopa County from July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2005 notified Gov. Janet Napolitano that he is retiring.

"It has been a high honor and privilege to serve the State of Arizona as a trial judge since January 1990," he said in his letter to the governor. His final day on the bench is Friday, January 19.

Judge Campbell will return to his prior law firm of Osborn Maledon. In addition to working in the law firm, he also will continue to serve as an adjunct faculty member at the new Phoenix School of Law.

Justice of the Peace Changes

On Jan. 1, seven new justices of the peace are taking the bench, while seven current justices of the peace are preparing to move on to retirement or new careers.

East Mesa – Judge R. Wayne Johnson retires after 16 years. **Mark Chiles** becomes the Justice of the Peace.

Hassayampa – John Henry is retiring after 8 years, to be replaced by **Chris Mueller**.

Kyrene – Don Calender, who was appointed in 2006 to fill the remainder of a term. **Elizabeth Rogers** successfully ran for election.

Lake Pleasant – Judge Lex Anderson is retiring after 20 years. Former Glendale Mayor **John Keegan** was elected.

Manistee – Judge Quentin Tolby retired after 12 years and now serves as Administrative Justice of the Peace. His successor is **Gary Handley**.

Maryvale – Judge Hercules Dellas is being replaced by **Andy Gastelum**.

San Marcos – Judge Ron Johnson did not seek re-election, ending a 15-year court career. **Keith Frankel** won the election for this precinct.

Assessing the Court of Public Opinion

“Do you think you were treated fairly today in Court?” “Were you treated with courtesy and respect?” “Did you understand what happened in Court today?”

These are just a few of the questions the court asks the public in a 10-question survey designed to gather opinions on how the court is perceived as accessible, fair, and committed to treating the public with respect.

The survey is a part of CourTools, a program developed by the National Center for State Courts to help Courts become more user-friendly, efficient and cost effective.

On June 28, 2005, with a small team of volunteer court employees, the first exit survey was conducted at the Northwest Court Facility.

Litigants and their families and friends, victims and witnesses, attorneys, law enforcement officers, social service agency employees, and other non-court staff were asked to complete the brief survey as he/she exited the courthouse on the selected “typical” day.

Of the 160 visitors, 117 completed the Northwest survey

resulting in an unprecedented response rate of 73 percent.

Since then, seven other surveys at various courts have been conducted. Total number to date of respondents is 1,368.

What do users say about the courts?

95% strongly agreed or agreed that “court personnel treated me with courtesy and respect.”

94% strongly agreed or agreed that “I understand what happened in court today.”

What do users say about the judges?

Initially, court users were asked if they “thought that the judge listened and was courteous, respectful, and fair.” 84% strongly agreed (*this 84% represents the combination of answers from the first three sites surveyed -Northwest Court, Southeast Court, and Durango).*

However, when the multi-faceted question was broken down to 3 separate questions, the outcome changed.

Reworded questions and results:

The judge listened to my case: 96% strongly agreed or agreed;

The judge was courteous and respectful: 96% strongly agreed or agreed;

The way my case was handled was fair: 90% strongly agreed or agreed.

What types of court cases did users attend?

Family cases: 35%

Domestic violence: 3%

Juvenile cases: 16%, but at both juvenile court sites surveyed, over 30% of the non-lawyer respondents reported they came for a family case rather than a delinquency or dependency case

Civil cases: 6%

Criminal cases: 12%

Other court business: 28% came to file or to get paperwork.

Additional demographic information gathered from the surveys:

Gender: 53% of respondents were women, and 47% were men;

Race and Ethnicity: 57% of respondents were white, 27% were Latino, and 7% were African-American;

Education: 38% of respondents have a high school education or less; 28% have some college or trade school training or a degree;

Income: 20% of respondents had annual incomes of \$20,000 or less; 23% had incomes of \$50,000 or less;

Disability: About 10% report a disability, and generally describe this as a physical disability;

Technology: About 88% report that they are using a computer.



Two court visitors take some time to provide feedback on their courthouse experience.

Assessing the Court of Public Opinion...Continued

What do these results say to the court?

First, it is important to wait for additional results before drawing substantial conclusions from this preliminary data. However, we can easily make use of some of the information:

Demographics: A substantial number of court users are not Anglo-European. This is even more evident from the survey results taken at the 2 juvenile court sites.

Types of cases: Clearly the public comes to court primarily for matters related to families and children.

Public impressions of staff and judges: The public agrees that staff and judges are courteous and respectful. Additionally, when specifically asked, the public agrees that judges listen. A majority of court users agree that their cases were handled fairly.

What is next?

Over the past year and a half, seven court sites have been surveyed. These include: Northwest Court, Northeast Court, Southeast Court, Durango, Old Courthouse, Southeast Juvenile, and the downtown court buildings.

With the assistance of our Court Technology Services Department, the survey is now in ScanTron format and is currently being translated into a Spanish version.

In January 2007, the cycle of surveys will start again, beginning at the Northwest Court. Surveys will be conducted yearlong and results will be shared with all court employees once they have been calculated.

Story submitted by Karin Philips

CourTools Performance Measures

1. Access and Fairness

Public surveys are administered to court visitors year-round at various court locations.

2. Case Clearance Rates

Clearance rates are calculated by dividing the number of case terminations each month by the number of new filings within each case type category.

3. Time to Disposition

This measure is calculated as the percentage of cases disposed of or otherwise concluded within time frames for each court department.

4. Age of Active Pending Caseload

This measure is the average number of days from filing until time of disposition.

5. Trial Date Certainty

This measure considers the average number of times cases scheduled for trials are rescheduled before they are heard.

6. Reliability and Integrity of Files

The percentage of files that can be retrieved within established time standards, and that meet established standards for completeness and accuracy of contents is determined.

7. Monetary Penalties and Compliance

Payments collected and distributed within established timelines, expressed as a percentage of total fines, fees, restitution, and costs ordered by a court is measured.

8. Effective use of Jurors

This measure uses an index that combines two measures as follows: Juror yield - is calculated by dividing the number of jurors reporting for service by the total number summoned. Juror utilization - is calculated by dividing the number of jurors sent to a courtroom by the number of jurors reporting for service.

9. Court Workforce Strength

Employee surveys are conducted yearly and measure efficiency, effectiveness, and customer satisfaction.

10. Cost per Case

The average cost for processing a single case, by the case type is calculated.

In Memoriam

Former Presiding Judge C. Kimball Rose

Judge C. Kimball Rose, who in his 24-year judicial career served as Presiding Judge of Superior Court in Maricopa County (1990-1995) and 11 years as Presiding Juvenile Court Judge (1978-1989), passed away on Tuesday, Nov. 28.

"Believing he was helping the young people with whom he worked, Kim felt he had found his niche in juvenile court," said his wife of 46 years, Carol.

During his years in juvenile court, he worked to improve the lives of the children who came to the court because of alleged criminal misdeeds or because they were victims of abuse, neglect or abandonment. To that end, he was key in creating an association of volunteers who worked with children

in the "system," to be sure their rights were protected and their needs fulfilled.

"He activated and organized the Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) program in the state of Arizona," Carol Rose explained. In 1989, he was the first recipient of the National Court Appointed Special Advocate Association's Judge of the Year Award. He accepted the award at the organization's national conference in San Diego.

Judge Rose was a 1957 graduate from Arizona State College (now ASU) with a bachelor of arts degree in secondary education. He went on to study law and received his law degree at the University of Arizona College of Law in 1962. He



Honorable C. Kimball Rose

worked in private practice in the Valley until his appointment to the Bench in 1972.

Judge Michael O' Melia's Portrait Dedicated



Widow Betty O'Melia (left) and the daughters of deceased Superior Court Judge Michael J. O'Melia stand alongside his newly dedicated portrait.

On December 4, Betty O'Melia unveiled the new portrait of her husband, deceased Judge Michael J. Omelia, during ceremonies in the Old Courthouse in Phoenix. The painting will join the memorial judicial portrait gallery in the Central Court Building walkway.

Judge Omelia served from 1984-2005 on the Superior Court Bench. At the time of his death, Judge O'Melia was serving as an Assistant U.S. Attorney in Phoenix. He was admitted to the Arizona State Bar in 1972 and practiced with the firm of Langerman, Begam & Lewis until 1980. He earned his undergraduate degree from the University of Wisconsin in 1963, and his law degree from Marquette University in 1968.

Focus On Court Technology Services

Data Center Relocated

On Veterans' Day weekend, November 10 – 12, the Court Technology Services (CTS) moved its Data Center equipment from the West Court Building to the new Downtown Justice Center. The move involved establishing a telecommunication infrastructure at the new site, purchasing and installing a new room UPS (uninterruptible power supply) along with a PDU (power distribution unit), relocating 77 servers and their racks, moving a robotic tape drive and all the associated tasks such as addressing electrical and security needs.

Friday morning, November 10, the move began with redirecting all iCIS transactions from the primary enterprise server platform to the Disaster Recovery hardware platform several miles away. This task allowed the 24x7 customers and some customers who were working that weekend to continue to work on the iCIS application even though the hardware was unplugged. This activity worked very well. The move was very successful. However, the credit for success, preparation, and coordination belongs to many. The County Telecommunications Department did a terrific job establishing an excellent network infrastructure. The CTS staff and its vendors went the extra mile to see that all the work was done correctly. Most of all, we are grateful to our customers who worked with us to make this move successful for everyone.

CTS Moves to New Justice Center

Court Technology Services (CTS) has moved its offices to the new Downtown Justice Center at 620 W. Jackson St – 2nd Floor. The Justice Center was established to serve customers better, taking into account the growing population of Maricopa County. The new location is capable of delivering four training classes simultaneously, compared to one class at the previous location.



A new CTS training classroom

A **Data Center** is a facility used for housing a large amount of electronic equipment, typically computers and communications equipment. The facility is usually maintained by an organization for the purpose of handling the data necessary for its operations. It can occupy one room of a building, one or more floors, or an entire building.

Disaster Recovery Successful

The CTS team along with the HP Relocation Services team packed data servers and moved them to the new location. At the new site, new server racks were already set up with network and power cabling. The UPS (uninterruptible power supply) and PDS (Power distribution Units) were in place. The two teams began the long and tedious process of un-racking and re-racking the servers from old racks into the new ones. Six server disk drives were lost during the physical move process and were replaced the next day. That evening, iCIS transactions back to the primary platform, now located in the Downtown Justice Center. That redirection was successful.



CTS servers have arrived at their new site.

Submitted by John King

Courtside

Photo Highlights



Carol L. Boone (Left) congratulates June Yvonne Martinez (Right).

Juvenile Probation Supervisor June Yvonne Martinez was selected as the Arizona Detention Officer of the Year by the Directors/Chiefs of County Probation Departments in Arizona.



Law Library Assistant Director Jennifer Murray and Management Analyst Cindy Reid discuss strategic planning during a meeting with Dr. John Martin in the Old Courthouse.

For the past six months, Dr. John Martin has been working with the Judicial Branch of Arizona in Maricopa County as a project consultant in developing a court-wide strategic plan. Martin is recognized nationally as an innovator in: strategic planning, culturally appropriate service delivery and performance measures for courts and justice systems.

"I am honored to be part of the Court's on-going strategic planning, work process improvement, and cultural competency initiatives. By undertaking these efforts today, the court will be among the very few courts across the nation able to serve the increasing demands of the far more culturally diverse community of tomorrow," Martin said.



Senator Meg Burton-Cahill meets Judge Margaret Mahoney during Superior Court's *View from the Bench* program. *View from the Bench* gives Arizona lawmakers a chance to shadow a Superior Court Judge to become familiar with the daily duties of a judge.

