

# Next Generation Court Technology Standards

## Phase 1

---

### Court Business Process Model Concept of Operations for Terminology Translation Tool

---

***March, 2016***



Funding for this project was provided in part by the State Justice Institute Award SJI-15-N-031. The points of view expressed are those of the National Center for State Courts and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the State Justice Institute.

# Acknowledgements

The project was supported by a Working Group of court practitioners and other subject matter experts established by the Joint Technology Committee (JTC) of the Conference of State Court Administrators (COSCA), the National Association for Court Management (NACM) and the National Center for State Courts (NCSC). Other participating organizations included the Court Information Technology Officers Consortium (CITOC) and the IJIS Institute (IJIS).



## JTC NextGen Standards Working Group:

---

Kevin Bowling (Chair)  
Michigan 20<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit

Sherri Dennis  
Nebraska Supreme Court

Giuseppe Fazari  
New Jersey Superior Court

Blake Hawthorne  
Texas Supreme Court

Christie Hency  
Scott County, Missouri Circuit Court Clerk

Layne Jones  
Oklahoma State Courts Network

The Honorable O. John Kuenhold  
Colorado Judicial Branch

Steele Price  
Arizona Supreme Court

Penny Rainaldi  
Utah State Courts

Virlynn Tinell  
Mohave County, Arizona Superior Court Clerk

Jeffery Tsunekawa  
Seattle Municipal Court

### ***Court Information Technology Officer's Consortium (CITOC)***

Chad Cornelius  
Colorado Judicial Branch

Barb Homes  
Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts

### ***IJIS Institute (IJIS)***

Jim Cabral  
MTG Management Consultants

Akbar Farook  
Sierra-Cedar Justice and Public Safety

### ***National Center for State Courts (NCSC)***

Jim Harris

John Matthias

Larry Webster

## CONTENTS

---

I. Overview .....	1
II. Terminology Translation Tool Operation.....	1

## I. Overview

Considerable variation exists in court in legal terminology among the states. The NextGen Court Business Process Model should allow courts in all states and jurisdictions to incorporate their unique terminology while retaining consistency within the model. The Terminology Translation Tool will perform global replacement of terms in the reference model to match the language traditionally used in that jurisdiction, while maintaining a relationship with the original terms, so the local instance of the reference model can be analyzed to improve the reference model for other courts.<sup>1</sup>

The Terminology Translation Tool will allow a court to substitute its own local label for the generic label in all of the tables identified below, while maintaining the generic label. The local label, if it exists, will be used in place of the generic label in all system displays and reports. Only an administrator can change the generic label in the model.

Key tables in the NextGen Court Business Process Model will have a generic label for each entry, along with a detailed definition. The key tables are:

- Court table
- Case type table
- Business process category table
- Business process group table
- Court/case type join table
- Case type/business process category join table
- Case type/business process group join table
- Elementary business process table
- State table
- Case type/elementary business process table
- Use case table
- Use case detail table
- Document table
- Use case/document join table
- Data element table
- Business rules table
- User requirements table

In addition, use case detail language will contain tokens that relate to the label names. The Terminology Translation Tool will substitute the local label for the token, if one is provided.<sup>2</sup>

## II. Terminology Translation Tool Operation

Upon starting the application, the user is asked to select the level of the model for which terminology translations will be made. The following options should be offered:

- Court

---

<sup>1</sup> This is one of the tools that would be developed along with the NextGen Court Business Process Model in a future phase of the project.

<sup>2</sup> The developers who create the Terminology Translation Tool may choose a different approach to accomplish this purpose.

- Case type
- Business process category
- Business process group
- Elementary business process
- Case state
- Use case
- Document
- Data element
- Business rules
- User requirements

When the selection is made, the system will present the list of values from that table, with an option for the user to enter a local label for each of these values.<sup>3</sup> If the number of entries is extensive, the user should be able to scroll or page through all of the values in the table.

The substitution of a local label for a generic entry on a table should not affect the database relationships with other tables. The user would indicate the state or local jurisdiction to which the terminology translation should apply.

Operation of Terminology Translation. The user would be able to enter a search term and select an item of terminology for localization. Tokens will exist in text fields of the use case detail table, the business rules table, and the user requirements table to indicate generic language that may be substituted. Whenever these table entries are displayed or printed, the local label should substitute for the token. For example, a use case detail table entry below shows the generic language surrounded by # \$ in the front and by \$ # on the backend:

Generate # \$ Order of Judgment and Sentence \$ #

The display or printed version of this generic text would be as follows, assuming that # \$ Order of Judgment and Sentence \$ # was the token for the document name Order of Judgment and Sentence:

Generate Order of Judgment and Sentence

If the court had substituted a local label for this document called “Sentencing Order,” the text should read after translation as follows:

Generate Sentencing Order

The system should prompt a user if an entry is made that duplicates a local or generic label entered anywhere in the table. All labels in the table must be unique.

When all changes are made, the user should be able to save the newly entered local labels and then return to the screen where another table can be selected. At the conclusion of the session, the user should have the option to print a report of all local labels added or changed during the session.

---

<sup>3</sup> If any local labels have already been entered, they will be displayed along with the generic label, and the user will be able to change these local labels, as well.

Users should be able to use the Terminology Translation Tool at any point in their business process analysis project.