

COURTS IN COCONINO COUNTY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLAN 2015-2017 SUMMARY



LOCAL INITIATIVES, DRIVERS, AND PRESSURES

- Expand services provided via web presence, including forms and alternative language support for pro se litigants.
- Increase technology usage in the courtroom, including presentation systems, remote interpreting, audio/videoconferencing, and real-time minute entries in case management system.
- Enable Probation Dept. access to court calendar and relevant case data.
- Prepare for participation in statewide projects including limited jurisdiction CMS, e-filing, eWarrant, PC refresh, and remote court reporting.
- Construct local automation and reporting to meet statewide case processing standards.
- Expand and enhance county criminal justice integration effort.

CY 2012/13 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Implemented electronic citations (AZTraCS) in all justice courts.
- Upgraded OnBase EDMS and expanded use of AJACS calendar.
- Implemented Mohave's web-based courtroom calendar display solution.
- Placed juror supplemental questionnaires online.
- Completed significant security and video surveillance improvements in Williams and Page.
- Automated judgment/commitment form in Flagstaff Justice Court.
- Harnessed county photocopiers to distribute public court documents via e-mail.

Statewide Projects: Impacts, Concerns, and Participation Plans

LJ CMS	Desire integration for citations and dispositions; judges desire OnBase and CMS access on bench; will be late adopters.
JOLTSaz	Desire full integration with AJACS; will be a mid-cycle adopter.
LJ EDMS	Some courts already using and desire document workflow; will be mid-cycle adopters.
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.
Architecture/Security	Don't perform local development apart from OnBase workflow and some MS-Access databases; Crystal 10 in containment status but plan exists to address.

TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS

Project	Year/ Status	Project Detail Provided			Comments
		Full ¹	Skeletal ²	Mention ³	
Web Page Expansion, Ph I	FY15		X		Includes forms standardization and self-help materials
Self-Help Videos	FY15		X		Physical media and Internet
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	FY15		X		Superior Court & Williams courts
Field Electronic Citations	FY17		X		Flagstaff Muni; Justice Courts
Replace Aging Videoconference Systems	FY15		X		Req'd for remote court interpreter support
Call-Out System	FY16		X		Flagstaff; reduces FTAs
Electronic Calendar Display	FY14		X		Flagstaff Muni, Superior Court; paper reduction
Video Surveillance	FY14		X		Flagstaff Muni, Fredonia Justice Court
Update COOP and ERP to Electronic Format	FY15		X		All courts in county
Page Courthouse Expansion	FY18		X		Page courts; AOC
Move to SSRS	FY16		X		Architecture project to replace Crystal 10
Disconnected Scanning	FY15		X		All Justice Courts
New City Court Facility	FY18		X		Flagstaff Muni

TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS					
Project	Year/ Status	Project Detail Provided			Comments
		Full¹	Skeletal²	Mention³	
LJ CMS	FY15	X			All Limited Jurisdiction Courts
PC Rollout	FY14	X			All ACAP Courts
eWarrants	FY17	X			Statewide project
Case Processing Standards	FY16		X		All Coconino courts
Electronic Minute Entries	FY15		X		Superior Court
Probation Access to Court Records	FY16		X		Multiple applications involved

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.