

COURTS IN COCONINO COUNTY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLAN 2017-2019



LOCAL INITIATIVES, DRIVERS, AND PRESSURES

- Expand services provided via web presence, including forms and alternative language support for pro se litigants – pilot AZCourtHelp virtual access and resource center.
- Continue to increase technology usage in the courtroom, including presentation systems, remote interpreting, audio/videoconferencing, Wi-Fi, and real-time minute entries in case management system.
- Prepare for participation in statewide projects including limited jurisdiction CMS, e-filing, and eWarrant.
- Construct local automation and reporting to meet statewide case processing standards.
- Expand and enhance county criminal justice integration effort.

CY 2014/15 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Provided ability to make online payments in Flagstaff courts.
- Replaced FTR recording product with Liberty in all courtrooms across county
- Replaced ACAP PCs throughout county as part of Technology Refresh Project.
- Provided Probation resources with read-only access to needed AJACS records.
- Installed security cameras for video surveillance in Flagstaff Muni and county justice courts.
- Improved video capabilities in Fredonia.

Statewide Projects: Impacts, Concerns, and Participation Plans

LJ CMS	Desire integration for citations and dispositions; will be late adopters.
JOLTSaz	Desire full integration with AJACS; will be a mid-cycle adopter.
LJ EDMS	Uninstalled disconnected scanning throughout county; will adopt scanning with AJACS.
e-Filing/Std Forms	Anxious to improve customer service and business process flow; understand implementation requires new CMS; will be mid-cycle adopter.
Bench Automation	Judges desire OnBase and AJACS access on the bench; will be early adopters.
LJ Case Worksheet	No input received.

Risks and Concerns (Security and Architecture)

- Don't perform local development apart from OnBase workflow at Superior Court and Flag Muni.
- Plan in place for ongoing testing / upgrading of products on subscriptions.

- Expanding from local file servers only to hosting local applications and automated reports.
- Not upgraded to statewide OnBase release yet; not participating in central document repository.

TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS					
Project	Year/ Status	Project Detail Provided			Comments
		Full¹	Skeletal²	Mention³	
Web Page Expansion, Ph 2	FY17		X		All Courts
Self-Help Videos	FY17		X		All Courts
Electronic Data Transfers (CJI)	FY16		X		All courts in county
Explore e-Courts and e-Filing	FY16		X		All courts in county
Courtroom Presentation Systems	FY17		X		Superior Court & Williams Courts
Electronic Citations	FY17		X		Flagstaff Muni; All Justice Courts
Replace Aging Videoconference Systems	FY19		X		All Courts; req'd for remote court interpreter support
Call-Out System	FY18		X		Flagstaff; reduces FTAs
Electronic Calendar Display	FY16		X		Flagstaff Muni, Superior Court; paper reduction
Update COOP and ERP to Electronic Format	FY16		X		All courts in county
Page Courthouse Expansion	FY18		X		Page Courts; AOC
Move to SSRS	FY17		X		Architecture project to replace Crystal 10
New City Court Facility	FY18		X		Flagstaff Muni

TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS					
Project	Year/ Status	Project Detail Provided			Comments
		Full¹	Skeletal²	Mention³	
LJ CMS	FY18	X			All Limited Jurisdiction Courts
eWarrants	FY17	X			Statewide project
Case Processing Standards	FY17		X		All Coconino courts
Electronic Minute Entries	FY18		X		Superior Court
Video Surveillance	FY17		X		Superior Court and Page Justice Court; multiple applications involved
Windows Testing / Maintenance	ongoing		X		All courts; Windows 10
Expand Wi-Fi	FY16		X		Superior Court; Flagstaff Justice
Official Payments Reports	FY16		X		Williams Justice Court
AZ CourtHelp Pilot	FY18		X		Superior Court

Note 1:

An “X” in “Full” indicates that the court has provided full detailed information about the project according to the general parameters outlined in the Commission on Technology’s Project Management Methodology. Also, risk analysis, impact, project costs and funding information has been provided.

Note 2:

An “X” in “Skeletal” indicates that the court provided detail about the local project in the master projects listing spreadsheet. Complete information, usually risks, impact analysis, project costs and funding, was not provided.

Note 3:

An “X” in “Mention” indicates that the court mentioned this project in a summary or listed it in an initiative. It may have been a phrase or a full paragraph of description, but did not contain detailed project-oriented information. If these projects are related to pursuing standards or directions already adopted (e.g., OnBase EDMS implementation, Jury+ upgrade, digital audio in the courtroom), then any mention which includes appropriate funding information is sufficient.