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January 26, 2016

Dear Justice 2035 Stakeholder,

I am pleased to announce that the Final Report of the Justice 2035 Strategic Planning Forum is available. This document is a result of your hard work, brainstorming, and dedication. The purpose of this project was to create a long-range vision for justice in Coconino County and a strategic action plan for the Courts in Coconino County with the active participation of local justice system stakeholders. The attached report contains the results of our most recent and highly successful Strategic Planning Forum.

Inside this report you will find all the expectations and strategic initiatives that were voiced in each of the small groups. You will also find a brief summary of how all the expectations and strategic initiatives will guide the management team in developing the Strategic Plan for Courts in Coconino County for the next 20 years.

Thank you to all of our stakeholders who have helped with the creation of this document. It is your input and dedication that will bring about the implementation of positive change in the Courts in Coconino County.

Thank you for your time and commitment.

Sincerely,

Mark R. Moran, Presiding Judge
Coconino County Superior Court
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2016-2020 Strategic Plan
Courts in Coconino County

Section 1: Introduction

The mission of the Courts in Coconino County is:

“To provide equal access to justice in a fair, timely, efficient, and courteous manner that instills and sustains trust in the judicial system.”

We are committed to excellence. We continuously strive to fulfill our mission and improve services to the people of Coconino County. To maintain our high standards of excellence, the Courts must anticipate and plan for the future. We must prepare for the future while building a collaborative, responsive, and adaptable court system that provides equal access and fairness to all and meets the needs of court users and the community.

The Courts developed our first long-range strategic plan in 2000. Every five years thereafter, through our Strategic Planning Forum, we update our Strategic Plan and Priorities. The Courts’ leadership continues to use the Strategic Plan, which includes input from justice system and community partners, to make strategic and operational improvements.

We have made many improvements over the past 15 years as a result of the Courts’ strategic planning efforts. A few of our most significant accomplishments are:

1. The successful establishment and continued operation of a Drug Court program
2. The Development of Continuity of Operations Plans for Courts in Flagstaff and outlying areas
3. The Successful development and implementation of multiple Veterans’ Courts
4. The Creation and continued operation of an Integrated Family Court within the Superior Court
5. Participation in the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council
6. The Development of Mental Health Courts
7. Criminal Justice Integration Program
8. Electronic Document Management Program
9. Numerous online payment and information portals
10. Improved customer service with a special emphasis on jurors

For more information, refer to the video prepared for the Justice 2035 Forum which highlights and provides more information about these and other accomplishments.

Below we present the Courts’ updated 2016 – 2020 Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan will guide and serve as a compass for the Courts over the next 5 years. Included are:

1. A summary of the Justice 2035 Strategic Planning Forum
2. A summary of external trends impacting the Courts
3. An assessment of the Courts, including the results of the 2015 Strategic Planning Survey
4. Revised strategic focus areas with brief descriptions, long-range goals, and objectives
The Courts’ Operational Plan is presented in a separate, companion document. It includes the specific strategic initiatives the Courts are working on to achieve the long-term goals presented here. The Operational Plan will be updated regularly to reflect progress and accomplishments. New strategic projects and initiatives will be added when warranted.

Section 2: Overview of Justice 2035 Strategic Planning Forum

The Courts’ first comprehensive Strategic Plan was completed in 2000. The Courts’ Strategic Plans were updated in 2005, 2010, and again in 2015 through large, Strategic Planning Forums facilitated by Dr. Brenda J. Wagenknecht-Ivey, CEO of PRAXIS Consulting, Inc., Denver, Colorado. Since 2000, the Courts of Coconino County have involved external justice system and community partners in the strategic planning processes. Their input and suggestions have helped shape the future direction and priorities of the Courts.

The 2015 Strategic Planning Forum (Justice 2035) was held on November 5, 2015, at the High Country Conference Center in Flagstaff. Many external partners, stakeholders, judicial officers, and court employees participated in the Forum. The table below shows a history of attendance at each of the Planning Forums over the past 15 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Planning Forum</th>
<th>Number of Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of the 2015 Planning Forum was to gather input from attendees to update the Strategic Plan and establish new strategic initiatives for improving justice services throughout the County. Specific areas of focus at this Forum were:

1. Completing a critical assessment of the Courts, summarizing the Courts’ greatest strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats/challenges (SWOT analysis)

2. Identifying and prioritizing suggested strategic initiatives in each of the five strategic focus areas

A summary of the small group discussions from the forum as well as the results of the 2015 Strategic Planning Survey are presented in the sections below. Additionally, see Appendices A, B, and C for a list of attendees, the forum agenda, a summary of forum feedback, and a list of suggested strategic initiatives.

---

1 Inclement weather affected attendance at the 2015 Planning Forum. 169 people RSVP’d to attend this year. However, a snowstorm resulted in numerous cancellations and no-shows. Nonetheless, the Courts were very pleased with the turnout in 2015.
Section 3: Assessment of the Courts and Summary of 2015 Strategic Planning Survey

External partners, stakeholders, judicial officers, and court employees were surveyed in 2010 and 2015 as part of the strategic planning process. The surveys were another method of gathering anonymous input and suggestions to inform and help shape the Courts’ future direction and priorities. The surveys were administered and analyzed by an independent consultant, Dr. Brenda J. Wagenknecht-Ivey. A summary and comparisons of the 2010 and 2015 results follow.

Overview: The following groups were surveyed in August 2015:

- Attorneys (public and private)
- City, County, and State Officials (elected and appointed)
- Law Enforcement
- Treatment Providers
- Community, Business, and Faith Based Leaders
- Judicial Officers and Court Employees

The response rates to the 2010 and 2015 surveys were excellent: 43% and 46% respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year and Total Number Invited to Complete the Survey</th>
<th>Response Rate and Number Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 (N=216)</td>
<td>43% (n=93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (N=208)</td>
<td>46% (n=96)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Questions: The survey included the following questions:

1. Level of familiarity with each of the Courts
2. Court performance in 2015 on key performance measures
3. Level of improvement in the past few years on five strategic focus areas
4. Overall performance in 2015
5. Greatest strengths
6. Barriers to accessing or using the Courts
7. Biggest challenges and emerging issues facing the Courts in the next few years
8. Most desired new programs and services
9. Most wanted changes and improvements in the next five years
10. Several demographic questions

Characteristics of Survey Respondents: Chart 3-1 below shows the demographics of respondents based on relationship to the Courts. Additional demographics are provided in the full Report in Appendix D.
Findings and Comparisons:

Key Court Performance Measures Include:

(1) Fairness, (2) Timeliness, (3) Quality/Effectiveness, (4) Collaboration, and (5) Accessibility. Each of these categories includes several individual questions that make up an index measure.

The Courts were rated higher in 2015 (than 2010) on Fairness, Timeliness, and Collaboration. Ratings on Accessibility in 2015 were lower than in 2010 and ratings on Quality/Effectiveness remained the same from 2010 to 2015 (Refer to chart 3-2).
There were statistically significant differences between judicial officers/staff and external partners on several questions included in the above court performance categories. Specifically, judicial officers and staff rated the following individual questions significantly higher than external partners:

- Making fair decisions based on the law/facts of the case (Fairness)
- Protecting the rights of all people (Fairness)
- Treating all parties equally (Fairness)
- Providing court customers with helpful resources and assistance (Quality/Effectiveness)
- Using technology/the Internet to increase access to the Courts (Accessibility)

Level of Improvement Over the Past 5 Years on Strategic Focus Areas:

The strategic focus areas of the Courts are: (1) Equal Access/Services, (2) Fair/Timely Resolution, (3) Public Education/Collaboration, (4) Employee Development/Satisfaction, and (5) Court Infrastructure. Chart 3-3 shows the ratings of all respondents on level of improvement over the past few years in these areas.

According to all respondents, the Courts have improved in each of these areas over the past few years. All average ratings are above the mid-point of the rating scale indicating improvement.

Overall Performance of Courts in 2015 vs. 2010:

Survey respondents rated the overall performance of each of the Courts in Coconino County higher in 2015 than in 2010, as shown in chart 3-4.
Greatest Strengths

In both 2010 and 2015, survey respondents identified the following as the greatest strengths of the Courts (in order by most frequently mentioned):

1. Judges and staff
2. Collaboration with partners and positive relations
3. Customer service/access

Barriers to Access/Using the Courts:

The most frequently mentioned barriers to access or using the Courts in 2015 were:

1. Distance to travel
2. Difficulty understanding what court users have to do once they get to court
3. Parking
Biggest Challenges/Emerging Issues:

In 2010 and 2015, survey respondents identified the same biggest challenges and emerging issues facing the Courts in the next few years. They are:

1. Lack of resources/declining budgets
2. Increasing need for legal assistance/services
3. Increasing need for treatment programs/services

Most Desired New Programs/Services:

The highest rated future priorities for the Courts in 2015 were:

1. Ability to do business remotely/electronically with the Courts
2. Enhancing self-help/pro se assistance
3. Implementing/enhancing specialty/problem-solving courts

Most Wanted Changes/Improvements in the Next Five Years

2015 survey respondents identified the following as the most wanted changes and improvements in the next 5 years (in rank order by most frequently mentioned):

1. Improve/expand technology
2. Improve facilities, space, parking, and security
3. Provide better customer service and enhance access

See Appendix D for a complete summary of the 2015 Survey Results.

Summary of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats:

As noted above, Planning Forum participants were asked to complete a critical assessment of the Courts based on their own experiences and the survey results. The strengths and weaknesses below are organized into each of the Courts’ Strategic Focus Areas (SFA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SFA 1: Access and Quality Services</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Competence of Staff: services, awareness, language access, consistency, ethical, committed workforce</td>
<td>1. Superior Court Parking: for jurors, two-hour limit, distance from Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Family Law Assistance: free meeting, contract providers, interpreters, attorney volunteers</td>
<td>2. Access: use of technology (telephone system, tablets, reaching a live person)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Language Access</td>
<td>4. Travel Distance and Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Customer Service: serve vulnerable populations</td>
<td>5. Court Documents: online access at all courts, timeliness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Problem-Solving Courts/Specialty Courts</td>
<td>6. Survey/Input/Feedback: some groups are under-represented, lack diversity of staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)</td>
<td>7. Information Booth to Provide Direction, Instructions, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Law Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cutting Edge Family Law Program: mediation, IFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Community Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SFA 1: Access and Quality Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strengths</strong></th>
<th><strong>Weaknesses</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Conciliation Court Round Tables</td>
<td>8. Services for Self-Represented Litigants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Collaboration with others, partners at Supreme Court, form new partnerships (NAU)</td>
<td>10. Serving Diverse Customers: Navajo liaison team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Open to New Ideas/New Programs</td>
<td>12. Interpreter Services for Aspects of the System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Court Administration is Involved in the Community</td>
<td>13. Services for Treatment Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Staff Turnover: loss of historical knowledge</td>
<td>15. Workflow Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SFA 2: Fair and Timely Resolution/Efficient Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strengths</strong></th>
<th><strong>Weaknesses</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Collaboration with Others: partners, stakeholders, NAU, etc.</td>
<td>1. Educational Resources: for self-represented litigants, on website, for transient populations – causes delays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment to and Monitoring of Timelines: uses statistics and reports on time standards, good case management program</td>
<td>2. Limited Training Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)</td>
<td>3. High Workloads on Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Wide Range of Resolutions</td>
<td>4. Lagging behind in IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Law Library</td>
<td>5. Funding: staff and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Focus on Sustained Performance: surveys and review of data</td>
<td>6. ADR Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Specialty Courts: good results for defendants</td>
<td>8. Hearings/Temporary Orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Providing Interpreters on Short Notice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SFA 3: Strong Relations and Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strengths</strong></th>
<th><strong>Weaknesses</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Progressive Thinking, Innovative, Willingness to Try New/Creative Ideas</td>
<td>1. Public Relations, Messaging, and Education: mixed messages, lack of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Collaboration and Cooperation (e.g., among judges/law enforcement) – increasing awareness of mental health/other issues and use of treatment/services – CJCC, meetings to identify and solve problems/issues, etc.</td>
<td>2. Funding: unable to keep pace with needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Professionalism of Community</td>
<td>3. Distrust of the Justice System (e.g., with the public, with tribal partners, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Similar Laws and Consequences: consistency</td>
<td>4. Conflicts between Judge Orders and Treatment/Partner Recommendations Re: level of care, differing view on what is appropriate or best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Culture of Seeking Input and Being Responsive, Openness to Learning Needs, Open to Suggestions and Feedback</td>
<td>7. Turnover of Staff/Loss of Relationships Due to Turnover, Recruitment, and Replacement Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Complex Nature of the Justice System, Lack of Understanding of Processes and Culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SFA 3: Strong Relations and Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Communication, Outreach, and Education</td>
<td>9. Failure to Consider Entire System during Implementation: Systems Thinking or Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Funding support: support of BOS for innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Judges and Staff: experienced/knowledgeable judges and staff, approachable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Shared/Common Vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Strive for Positive Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Fairness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SFA 4: Professional, Competent, and Engaged Workforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Collaboration and Cooperation Among Staff</td>
<td>1. Staff Workloads and Fatigue: increasing demands on staff, emotional drain/compassion fatigue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Innovative and Continue to Explore New Options/ Ideas</td>
<td>2. Staff Compensation: Inability to adequately compensate staff due to budget constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Good Leadership and Elected Officials: committed to mission of the courts</td>
<td>3. Technology Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Think Strategically and Long-Term, Concern for the Entire System</td>
<td>4. Lag Behind in Use of Technology, Lack Perks and Resources to Attract Next Generation of Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commitment to Values of the Judiciary, Professional</td>
<td>5. Retention and Turnover in some Areas of the Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Customer Service Focused and Driven: seek positive/successful outcomes; serve the public/community</td>
<td>6. Advancement Opportunities and Unclear Career Paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training Opportunities</td>
<td>7. Staff Morale in some Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Talented Pool of Job Applicants: from NAU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Seek Grants/New Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Diverse Workforce with Institutional Knowledge/ Very Experienced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SFA 5: Infrastructure of the Courts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increased Use of Technology: doing more with less, connect to other locations through video conferencing</td>
<td>1. Lack of Funding/Change in Fiscal Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Human Resources/IT Personnel</td>
<td>3. Bandwidth Limits and Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Some Ability to Share Appropriate Criminal Justice System Data (through CJIS)</td>
<td>5. Technology Literacy: public and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collaboration with Partners: ability to connect with the state</td>
<td>6. Data Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Commitment to Security/Local Policies</td>
<td>8. Quality Data and Data Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Some Facilities are Substandard: Flagstaff, Page, Fredonia City Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Location of some Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Standardized Training and Protocols</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, Forum participants identified the following threats or challenges facing the Courts in the future:

1. Size of County: location and distance
2. Transportation to get to Courts
3. Lack of Public Understanding of and Lack of Confidence in the Courts and Government
   Generally, Public Relations Issues, Racial and Ethnic Disparities in the System, Lack of Education
4. Economic Volatility: cost of living, local business growth, growth in tourism, etc.
5. Lack of Understanding the System
6. Unfunded Mandates
7. Budget/Adequacy of Resources
8. Poverty and Income Disparity
9. Cybersecurity
10. Cultural Awareness and Diversity
11. Parking
12. Aging Facilities/Safety Issues: balance physical security with access; cyber security
13. Access Barriers: telephone system
14. Ability to Keep Pace with and Use Technology
15. Lack of Timely Resolution
16. Distance between Providers and Users of the System, Failure to Empathize with Court Users
17. Lack of Needed Services (e.g., Mental Health, Substance Abuse, etc.) or Alternative/Evidence
    Based Programs
18. Changes in Behavioral Health and Arduous Court Process
19. Politics, becoming Political Pawns
20. Public Policy that is Restrictive
21. Recruiting and Retaining Skilled Workers
22. Turnover/Retirements: loss of institutional knowledge and relationships
23. Lack of Training Resources in the County
Section 4: Trends Analysis

Reviewing internal and external trends is vitally important when thinking and planning strategically. It is necessary to avoid planning in a vacuum. Below is a summary of the social/demographic, economic, policy/political, technological, justice system, and internal case and workload trends presented at the Justice 2035 Planning Forum.

Social/Demographic Trends:

Population: The population of Coconino County increased 18 percent between 2000 and 2014. Arizona’s population as a whole increased 31 percent during the same time period. Refer to chart 4-1.

Race/Ethnicity: The racial and ethnic composition of the County’s population is different from Arizona or the U.S. Coconino County has a higher proportion of American Indian population and a smaller proportion of Hispanic/Latino population than Arizona as a whole or the U.S. Refer to charts 4-2 and 4-3.
Median Age: In 2013, the population of the County of Coconino and the City of Flagstaff was younger than that of Arizona and the U.S. Refer to chart 4-4.

Additional Social Trends Affecting the Courts of Coconino County:

- Increasing service demands
- Changing work and lifestyle choices
- Explosion in the use of social media and networking as a way to maintain connections, communicate, and do business
- Increasing awareness of environmental issues and push for “going green”
Economic Trends:

Unemployment: The unemployment rate for Coconino County has declined steadily since its peak in 2010 mirroring the decline in unemployment for the U.S. as a whole. However, Coconino County’s unemployment rate has been higher than that in the U.S. and Arizona over the past five years. Refer to chart 4-5.

Median Household Income: The median household incomes (i.e., half are above and half are below) in 2013 for Coconino County and Flagstaff were comparable to that for the state of Arizona, but lagged behind that for the U.S. Refer to chart 4-6.
**Median Value of Owner-Occupied Housing and Median Gross Monthly Rent**: The median cost of housing and rent in Coconino County and Flagstaff are higher than the median values for Arizona and the U.S. Refer to charts 4-7 and 4-8.

**Individuals and Families Living Below Poverty**: Coconino County and the City of Flagstaff had a higher proportion of individuals and families living below poverty in 2013 than Arizona and the U.S.

---

**Policy/Political**

1. Ongoing debate over controversial issues such as same-sex marriage, legalization of marijuana, immigration reform, health care reform
2. Declining state and local budgets and depleted reserves
3. Continued scrutiny on how public tax dollars are spent
4. Continued polarization and gridlock among the major political parties
5. Increasing government intervention in what were once thought to be personal lifestyle choices
(e.g., smoking, obesity)

**Technological Trends**

1. Continuing wireless revolution and rapidly developing telecommunications/information technology – gadgets galore
2. Increasing inability or unwillingness to unplug, tune out, or turn off – always connected
3. Expectation for 24/7 access and services (e.g., 3-everything, easy access from anywhere anytime)
4. Increase in distance-learning
5. Continued need for data-sharing and data-networking
6. Increasing threat of cyber-attacks and need to protect data/information

**Justice System:**

1. Changing composition of court users (e.g., more non-English-speaking, self-represented, elderly)
2. Increasing and/or changing caseloads and workloads (e.g., increase in some case types and declines in others, more complex cases, increasing need for court user assistance)
3. Increasing number of litigants with mental health and/or substance abuse problems
4. Increasing emphasis on procedural fairness/justice
5. Increasing use of evidence-based/promising practices to achieve more effective results
6. Increasing need/demand for the use of technology to increase access and enable doing business remotely/electronically (e.g., e-filing, online payments, video conferencing, access to case information)
7. Graying workforce, especially among administrators/managers, lack of “ready now” successors.
8. Declining court infrastructure (e.g., facilities, technology, equipment, security)
9. Declining number of jury trials
10. Increasing paperless systems/digital records
11. Rising physical threats and violence against judges, prosecutors, etc.
12. Increasing collaboration among justice system partners to address system-wide issues

**Internal Caseloads**

1. Overall case filings for the Superior Court have been trending down since 2005. Refer to chart 4-9.
2. Overall case filings for Justice Courts have remained flat over the past 10 years, although there are annual fluctuations. Refer to chart 4-10.

3. Overall case filings for the Municipal Courts have been trending down since 2005, although, case filings increased in 2015. Refer to chart 4-11 (All projections for caseloads are based on 20 year history, for simplicity only the past 10 years are shown).
Section 5: Strategic Focus Areas (SFA), Goals, and Objectives

Below are the Courts’ revised Strategic Focus Areas\(^1\) with brief descriptions. Also included are long-range goals and objectives. The Courts’ strategic initiatives/projects for each area are provided in the Courts’ Operational Plan.

### Revised Strategic Focus Areas

(2015)

1. Access and Quality Services
2. Fair and Timely Resolution and Efficient Operations
3. Strong Relations and Partnerships
4. Professional, Competent, and Engaged Workforce
5. Court Infrastructure

---

\(^1\) Information Technology (IT) was eliminated as a separate, stand-alone strategic focus area in 2015 because technology and IT improvements are included in each of, and thus throughout, the Strategic Focus Areas. The Strategic Planning Committee believes it is more effective to embed strategies for making technological/IT improvements into each of the newly defined strategic focus areas. Technology/IT infrastructure is also included in the Court Infrastructure strategic focus area.
**SFA #1: Access and Quality Services:**

The Courts in Coconino County are committed to providing equal access to justice and the highest quality of services to the people of Coconino County. This includes: (1) enhancing access to court facilities and court information; (2) increasing the ability to do business with the Courts remotely and electronically; (3) making the Courts more understandable and accessible for all people, including non-English-speaking, self-represented, disabled, elderly, etc.; and (4) providing courteous, helpful, and timely services to all court customers.

**Long Range Goals and Objectives:**

**Goal 1:** The Courts will be easily accessible and understandable to all people:

Obj. 1: Enhance electronic access to court and appropriate case information

Obj. 2: Expand opportunities for court users to conduct court business using existing and emerging technologies (e.g., e-filing, e-pay, jury check-in, kiosks, video-conferencing, email, etc.)

Obj. 3: Enhance services and provide user-friendly resources for self-represented litigants

Obj. 4: Expand language and disability (ADA) assistance for court users

Obj. 5: Improve the juror experience

Obj. 6: Reduce access barriers such as transportation, cost, hours of operation, lack of legal representation, etc.

**Goal 2:** Judicial officers and staff will provide the highest quality of customer service – timely, respectful, and free of bias – to all court users:

Obj. 1: Establish, communicate, and reinforce a culture of service excellence

Obj. 2: Reduce wait times for service (e.g., less time in lines, less time waiting for appointments, timely response to questions)

Obj. 3: Treat all people respectfully, courteously, and fairly

Obj.: 4: Strengthen intra- and inter-court communication for meeting the needs of court users

See Appendix C for a list of suggested strategic projects from the Planning Forum.

See the Courts’ – the Operational Plan for the strategic projects currently being worked on by the Courts in this Strategic Focus Area.
**SFA #2: Fair and Timely Resolution and Efficient Operations:**

Resolving legal matters in a fair, timely, and efficient manner is a high priority for the Courts in Coconino County. This is essential to sustaining trust in the judicial system. This area includes: (1) managing cases effectively; (2) resolving matters within adopted time standards; (3) reducing unnecessary delay; (4) treating all people fairly; (5) streamlining and improving court operations, procedures, and work processes; (6) improving case management systems and use of data/information; and (7) using existing and emerging technologies to enhance efficiencies.

**Long Range Goals and Objectives:**

**Goal 1: The Courts will resolve legal matters in a timely manner, exceeding adopted time standards:**

Obj. 1: Reduce unnecessary delay from filing to adjudication

Obj. 2: Implement innovative and effective delay-reduction and case management principles and practices

Obj. 3: Use existing, new, and emerging technologies to increase timely resolution

Obj. 4: Involve and collaborate with external partners and stakeholders to improve timely resolution

Obj. 5: Start court events (trials, hearings, and appointments) on time

Obj. 6: Enhance and expand programs and services that assist in effectively and expeditiously resolving legal matters

**Goal 2: The Courts’ processes and procedures will be fair, understandable, efficient, and effective (procedural fairness):**

Obj. 1: Streamline and simplify court processes and procedures

Obj. 2: Use existing, new, and emerging technologies to improve efficiency and effectiveness

Obj. 3: Implement principles and practices that promote procedural fairness according to research findings

Obj. 4: Reduce wait times for court users

Obj. 5: Treat everyone respectfully at all times

Obj. 6: Provide court users with an opportunity to express their needs and/or tell their side of the story

Obj. 7: Ensure court users understand what was ordered and what they have to do to comply

Obj. 8: Use evidence-based, restorative, and other promising practices to achieve positive case
See Appendix C for a list of the suggested strategic projects in the SFA from the Courts’ Planning Forum.

The Courts’ Strategic Projects/Initiatives for this SFA are presented in the Operational Plan.
SFA #3: Strong Relations and Partnerships:

The Courts are part of a complex, interrelated justice system. While a separate and independent branch of government, the Courts are affected by the legislative and executive branches of government, and have many justice system, legal, and community partners and stakeholders. Having positive and collaborative relations and partnerships are vitally important to the Courts’ success. Additionally, ensuring the public is educated about the Courts and supports the work/programs of the Courts is an important component of positive external and public relations.

Long Range Goals and Objectives:

Goal 1: The Courts will have positive relations and collaborate effectively with stakeholders and justice system and community partners:

Obj. 1: Communicate and collaborate with the other branches of government and justice system and community partners on projects of mutual interest and benefit

Obj. 2: Inform, educate, and build support from partners and stakeholders about the Courts’ needs, priorities, etc.

Obj. 3: Increase transparency and accountability

Goal 2: The Courts will be more understandable to the public:

Obj. 1: Educate the public about the Courts using multiple methods and media.

Obj. 2: Strengthen connections with, reach out to, and be responsive to the community, including diverse communities

Obj. 3: Strengthen press and media relations

The strategic projects suggested at the Planning Forum are presented in Appendix C.

See the Courts’ Operational Plan for a list of the strategic projects currently underway in this SFA.
SFA #4: Professional, Competent, and Engaged Workforce:

The Courts in Coconino County must prepare for the workforce of the future, which will look very different than today. The work environment also must evolve within the Courts to ensure it is a satisfying and engaging place to work. Changes are needed to ensure the Courts are able to recruit and retain professional, competent, and engaged employees. Investing in the workforce is necessary to provide the highest quality of services to the people of Coconino County.

Long Range Goals and Objectives:

Goal 1: The Courts’ work environment will be positive, innovative, and engaging:

Obj. 1: Increase career development and promotional opportunities

Obj. 2: Engage staff in making organizational changes and improvements

Obj. 3: Enrich the jobs of staff and provide meaningful and interesting work

Obj. 4: Implement best practices to make the work environment engaging and satisfying (e.g., flexible work schedules)

Obj. 5: Promote, recognize, and reward innovation, implementing changes, and achievements of teams and staff

Obj. 6: Enhance teamwork and communication throughout the Courts

Obj. 7: Support and strengthen the supervisory, management, and leadership skills of supervisors and managers

Obj. 8: Increase professionalism and consistency within and across the Courts

Obj. 9: Provide fair and competitive compensation and benefits

Goal 2: The Courts’ workforce will have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to do their jobs/work well:

Obj. 1: Expand and improve education, training, cross-training, and professional development opportunities for judicial officers and staff

Obj. 2: Increase the cultural awareness, sensitivity, and competence of judicial officers and court employees

Obj. 3: Provide mentoring and on-the-job development opportunities for judicial officers and court employees

Obj. 4: Strengthen performance/job feedback and coaching
Obj. 5: Develop current and future judicial and administrative leaders and enhance succession planning

The suggested strategic initiatives/projects from Planning Forum participants are presented in Appendix C.

See the Courts’ Operational Plan for a list of strategic projects currently underway in this SFA.
**SFA #5: Court Infrastructure:**

The Courts’ infrastructure must be modern and up-to-date and adequately support the business of the Courts. Specifically, the Courts in Coconino County must continuously enhance their technological infrastructure to improve efficiency, effectiveness, and service delivery. Additionally, the Courts’ facilities must be safe and secure as well as modernized and improved to promote respect, trust, and confidence in the court system. Investing in and maintaining the needed technological and facilities infrastructure will ensure the Courts are able to provide the highest quality of justice to the people of Coconino County.

**Long Range Goals and Objectives:**

*Goal 1: Court facilities meet the current and future needs of judicial officers, court employees, and the public, and instill trust and confidence in the judicial system:*

  - Obj. 1: Build support for and pursue new and/or updated facilities
  - Obj. 2: Modernize and improve existing space
  - Obj. 3: Expand court service locations to meet needs
  - Obj. 4: Ensure all court service sites are easily accessible and safe
  - Obj. 5: Strengthen safety, security, and emergency response preparedness at all court facilities

*Goal 2: The Courts’ technological infrastructure will support the business, priorities, and operations of the Courts:*

  - Obj. 1: Enhance case management systems
  - Obj. 2: Develop integrated systems to share appropriate case information among courts as well as justice system partners
  - Obj. 3: Secure needed technology (hardware and software) to improve court performance (e.g., computers, printers, mobile devices, video-conferencing equipment, software)
  - Obj. 4: Implement emerging technologies to remain relevant and effective (e.g., mobile applications, case management/e-filing systems)
  - Obj. 5: Strengthen IT security to prevent and guard against cyber-attacks and theft of data/information

See Appendix C for a list of suggested strategic projects for this SFA.

Refer to the Courts’ Operational Plan for strategic projects underway in this area.
Section 6: Conclusion and Implementation

The Courts of Coconino County now have a revised strategic direction and priorities as set forth in this Strategic Plan and the Operational Plan. The Courts’ leadership wishes to again thank the partners, stakeholders, judicial officers, and staff who assisted in this process. The Strategic and Operational Plans will guide the Courts in the coming years. The plans will serve as a compass for making continued improvements, ensuring the highest quality of services to the people of Coconino County.

The Courts’ leadership will now focus on implementation and follow-through. As the Management Team has done in the past, each year, strategic projects will be identified and assigned to a lead person/committee. The team will meet regularly to assess progress and troubleshoot implementation issues as needed. The Management Team also will track and communicate accomplishments each year.

The strategic road map presented here is ambitious. To succeed, the Courts will need the involvement and assistance of many people. The Courts are looking forward to the journey ahead. They are committed to collaborating with others as they continue to improve justice to all people in Coconino County.
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Management Team

Honorable Mark Moran  
Superior Court Presiding Judge, Division III  
Coconino County Superior Court  
200 N. San Francisco St.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Mr. Gary Krcmarik  
Court Administrator  
Coconino County Superior Court  
200 N. San Francisco St.  
Flagstaff, AZ 8600185

Ms. Sharon Yates  
Deputy Court Administrator  
Coconino County Superior Court  
200 N. San Francisco St.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Ms. Martie Delgadillo  
Administrative Senior Manager  
Coconino County Superior Court  
200 N. San Francisco St.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Ms. Jessica Cortes  
Deputy Court Administrator  
Flagstaff Municipal Court  
15 N. Beaver St.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Mr. Don Jacobson  
Court Administrator  
Flagstaff Municipal Court  
15 N. Beaver St.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Mr. Dillon Harris  
Justice 2035 Project Coordinator  
Coconino County Superior Court  
200 N. San Francisco St.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Consultant & Forum Facilitator  
Dr. Brenda J. Wagenknecht-Ivey, Ph.D.  
President, PRAXIS Consulting, Inc.  
10111 Inverness Main Street, #407  
Englewood, CO 80112  
303-888-7939

Keynote Speaker  
Honorable Scott Bales  
Arizona Supreme Court Chief Justice  
1501 West Washington St.  
Phoenix, AZ 85007
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Facilitators

Mr. Kip Anderson  
Court Administrator  
Mohave County Superior Court  
401 E. Spring St.  
Kingman, AZ 86402

Ms. Theresa Barrett  
Court Programs Unit Manager, Court Services Division  
Arizona Supreme Court, AOC  
1501 W. Washington St. Suite 410  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Mr. Anthony Cornay  
Education Specialist V  
Arizona Supreme Court, AOC  
541 E. Van Buren  
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Ms. Janet Cornell  
Consultant/Educator/Facilitator  
Independent Court Consultant  
2035 East Topeka Drive  
Phoenix, AZ 85024

Ms. Jennifer Greene  
Assistant Counsel  
Arizona Supreme Court, AOC  
1501 W. Washington St. Suite 414  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Mr. Gabe Goltz  
Judicial Education Manager  
Arizona Supreme Court, AOC  
1501 W. Washington St.  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Ms. Kathy McCormick  
ADR Coordinator  
Yavapai County Superior Court  
120 S. Cortez Street #410  
Prescott, AZ 86303

Ms. Sue McLean  
1650 E. Linda Vista Dr.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86004

Mr. Ron Reinstein  
Superior Court Judge, Retired  
Arizona Supreme Court, AOC  
1501 W. Washington St.  
Phoenix, AZ 85007
Stakeholders

Ms. Alexis Allen  
Deputy Court Administrator  
Tempe Municipal Court  
140 East 5th Street  
Tempe, AZ 85281

Ms. Martha Anderson  
Caseflow Manager  
Coconino County Superior Court  
200 N. San Francisco St.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Honorable Mike Araujo  
City Magistrate  
Flagstaff Municipal Court  
15 N. Beaver St.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Honorable Art Babbott  
County Supervisor, District I  
Coconino County Board of Supervisors  
219 E. Cherry Ave.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Ms. Carla Baber  
Judicial Assistant, Division III  
Coconino County Superior Court  
200 N. San Francisco St.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Ms. Jonna Baker  
Court Reporter, Division III  
Coconino County Superior Court  
200 N. San Francisco St.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Mr. Frank Balkcom  
Chief of Police  
City of Page  
P.O. Box 3005  
Page, AZ 86040

Mr. Mike Baumstark  
Deputy Director  
Arizona Supreme Court, AOC  
1501 W. Washington St.  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Ms. Jennifer Brown  
Support Services Manager  
Flagstaff Police Department  
911 E. Sawmill Rd.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Ms. Susan Brown  
Director  
Coconino County Facilities Management  
2500 N. Ft. Valley Rd.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
Honorable Cathleen Brown Nichols  
Superior Court Judge, Division V  
Coconino County Superior Court  
200 N. San Francisco St.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Mr. Stewart Bruner  
IT Strategic Planning Manager  
Arizona Supreme Court  
1501 W. Washington St., Suite 415  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Mr. Sidney Buckman  
ADR Coordinator  
Coconino County Superior Court  
200 N. San Francisco St.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Mr. William Burke  
City Prosecutor  
City of Flagstaff  
107 W. Aspen Ave.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Ms. Adrian Burke  
Administrative Senior Manager  
Coconino County Public Defender’s Office  
110 E. Cherry Street  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Ms. Denise Burley  
Division Manager  
Coconino County Health Department  
2625 N. King Street  
Flagstaff, AZ 86004

Mr. Jack Callaghan  
Chief Executive Officer  
The Guidance Center  
2187 N. Vickey St.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86004

Ms. Jennifer Carter  
Administrative Manager  
Williams Justice Court and Municipal Court  
700 W. Railroad Ave.  
Williams, AZ 86046

Honorable Thomas Chotena  
Presiding Magistrate  
Flagstaff Municipal Court  
15 N. Beaver St.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Mr. John Comer  
Budget Analyst  
Coconino County Finance Office  
219 E. Cherry Ave  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Organization/Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Paul Julien</td>
<td>Judicial Education Officer</td>
<td>Arizona Supreme Court, AOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1501 W. Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ 85007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Wendy Kasprzyk-Roberts</td>
<td>Integrated Family Court Coordinator</td>
<td>Coconino County Superior Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200 N. San Francisco St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ 86001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Joanne Keene</td>
<td>Executive Vice President and Chief of Staff</td>
<td>Northern Arizona University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 4092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ 86011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Joseph Kelroy</td>
<td>Director of Juvenile Services</td>
<td>Administrative Office of the Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1501 W. Washington St., Suite 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ 85007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Peter Kiefer</td>
<td>Criminal Court Administrator</td>
<td>Maricopa Superior Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201 W. Jefferson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ 85003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Dana Kjellgren</td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td>Kjellgren &amp; Speed, PLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>408 N. Kendrick, Suite 2b-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ 86001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jennifer Kolodinsky</td>
<td>Parenting Plan Mediator</td>
<td>Conciliation Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200 N. San Francisco St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ 86001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorable Rob Krombeen</td>
<td>Justice of the Peace &amp; Magistrate</td>
<td>Williams Justice Court and Municipal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700 W. Railroad Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, AZ 86046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Caroline Lautt-Owens</td>
<td>Director of Dependent Children Services</td>
<td>Administrative Office of the Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1501 W. Washington St., Suite 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ 85007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ron Lee</td>
<td>District Director/Intergovernmental Relations</td>
<td>Office of Congresswoman Ann Kirkpatrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>405 N. Beaver St., Suite 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ 86001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mike Lessler</td>
<td>Chief Deputy</td>
<td>Coconino County Attorney's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110 E. Cherry Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ 86001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Wong Lia Chang</td>
<td>ICMA Fellow</td>
<td>Jalan Sultan Azlan Shah, 11700 Gelugor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Penang, MALAYSIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Casie Lightfoot</td>
<td>Probation Division Manager</td>
<td>Juvenile Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1001 E. Sawmill Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ 86001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Heidi Lofgren</td>
<td>Court Training Specialist</td>
<td>Flagstaff Municipal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 N. Beaver St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Bonny Lynn</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Coconino County Finance Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>219 E. Cherry Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ 86001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Todd Madeksza</td>
<td>Government Relations Director</td>
<td>Coconino County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>219 E. Cherry Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ 86001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jeff Mangis</td>
<td>Chief Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court</td>
<td>Coconino County Superior Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200 N. San Francisco St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ 86001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bryon Matsuda</td>
<td>Director of Juvenile Court Services</td>
<td>Coconino County Juvenile Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1001 E. Sawmill Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ 86001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorable Margaret</td>
<td>Juvenile Court Presiding Judge</td>
<td>Coconino County Juvenile Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCullough</td>
<td></td>
<td>1001 E. Sawmill Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ 86001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Michelle</td>
<td>Crime and Courts Reporter</td>
<td>Arizona Daily Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McManimon</td>
<td></td>
<td>1751 S. Thompson St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ 86001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms. Bethany Palmer
Acting Managing Attorney
DNA - People's Legal Services, Inc.
2323 E. Greenlaw Ln., Ste. 1
Flagstaff, AZ 86004

Ms. Ria Permana Sari
ICMA Fellow
Jl. Salemba Utan Barat No. 21, Matraman Palmeriam, Jakarta

Mr. Steve Peru
President/CEO
United Way of Northern Arizona
Palmeriam, Jakarta
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Ms. Erika Philpot
Director
Coconino County Human Resources
420 N. San Francisco St.
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Mr. John Philpot
Major
Arizona Department of Public Safety
1100 S. Kaibab Rd.
Flagstaff, AZ 86005

Honorable Bill Pribil
Sheriff
Coconino County Sheriff’s Office
911 E. Sawmill Rd.
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Honorable Ted Reed
Superior Court Judge Pro Tempore, Division VI
Coconino County Superior Court
200 N. San Francisco St.
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Ms. Janet Regner
Director
Community Services
2625 N. King Street
Flagstaff, AZ 86004

Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer
Director, Court Services Division
Arizona Supreme Court, AOC
1501 W. Washington St., Suite 410
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Ms. Patty Reyes
Technical Specialist
Coconino County Juvenile Court
1001 E. Sawmill Rd.
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
Mr. Stephan Riggs  
Development Director-Elect  
The Guidance Center  
2187 N. Vickey St.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86004

Mr. Corey Ringenberg  
Chief Security Officer  
Coconino County Superior Court  
200 N. San Francisco St.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Ms. Maia Rodriguez  
Administrative Senior Manager  
Flagstaff Justice Court  
200 N. San Francisco St.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Mr. Don Saylor  
Community Restitution and Veteran Liaison  
Volunteer  
Williams Justice Court  
700 W. Railroad Ave.  
Williams, AZ 86046

Ms. Deborah Schaefer  
Court Administrator  
Tempe Municipal Court  
140 East 5th Street  
Tempe, AZ 85281

Ms. Tracy Schatza  
Policy and Procedures Coordinator  
Maricopa County Juvenile Probation  
3125 W Durango St.  
Phoenix, AZ 85009

Mr. Jeffrey Schrade  
Director of Education Services  
Arizona Supreme Court, AOC  
1501 W. Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Ms. Ellen Seaborne  
Family Law Attorney  
Ellen Seaborne & Associates P.C.  
P.O. Box 30127  
Flagstaff, AZ 86003

Ms. Cynthia Seelhammer  
County Manager  
Coconino County  
219 E. Cherry Ave.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Ms. Alexandra Shroufe  
Attorney at Law  
Alexandra Shroufe, P.C.  
809 W. Riordan Rd., Suite 201  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
Ms. Jenee Silva
Judicial Assistant, Division IV
Coconino County Superior Court
200 N. San Francisco St.
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Honorable Dan Slayton
Superior Court Judge, Division II
Coconino County Superior Court
200 N. San Francisco St.
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Ms. Stephanie Smith
Assistant to the City Manager
City of Flagstaff
211 W. Aspen Ave.
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Mr. James Speed
Attorney at Law
Kjellgren & Speed, PLC
408 N. Kendrick, Suite 2b-1
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Ms. Joy Stavely
Member
Criminal Justice Coordinating Council
1117 East Marina Lane
Flagstaff, AZ 86004

Honorable Joshua Steinlage
Judge Pro Tempore
Flagstaff Justice Court
200 N. San Francisco St.
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Mr. Rudi Stephan
IT Manager-Programmer and Business Applications
Coconino County Information Technology
211 N. Agassiz
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Ms. Beya Thayer
Court Services Coordinator
Health Choice Integrated Care
1300 South Yale Street
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Honorable Bob Thorpe
District 6 Representative
Arizona State Legislature
1700 W. Washington, Room 331
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Mr. Mike Townsend
Deputy County Manager
Coconino County Manager’s Office
219 E. Cherry Ave.
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Tina Tsinigine</td>
<td>Staff Attorney</td>
<td>Tuba City Court</td>
<td>P.O. Box 725, Tuba City, AZ 86045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bob Tures</td>
<td>Parenting Plan Mediator</td>
<td>Conciliation Court</td>
<td>3725 N. Grandview, Flagstaff, AZ 86004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ladd Vagen</td>
<td>Director of Information Technology</td>
<td>City of Flagstaff</td>
<td>211 W. Aspen Ave., Flagstaff, AZ 86001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sixto Valdivia</td>
<td>DUI/Drug Court Coordinator</td>
<td>Coconino County Superior Court</td>
<td>200 N. San Francisco St., Flagstaff, AZ 86001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Risha VanderWey</td>
<td>Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td>CCESA</td>
<td>2384 N. Steves Blvd., Flagstaff, AZ 86001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Shannon Vieira</td>
<td>Administrative Senior Manager</td>
<td>Coconino County Adult Probation</td>
<td>110 E. Cherry Ave., Flagstaff, AZ 86001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Cindy Winn</td>
<td>Chief Probation Officer</td>
<td>Coconino County Adult Probation</td>
<td>222 E. Birch Ave., Flagstaff, AZ 86001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David Withey</td>
<td>Chief Legal Counsel</td>
<td>Arizona Supreme Court, AOC</td>
<td>1501 W. Washington St., Suite 410, Phoenix, AZ 85007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorable Valerie Wyant</td>
<td>Clerk of Superior Court</td>
<td>Coconino County Clerk of Superior Court</td>
<td>200 N. San Francisco St., Flagstaff, AZ 86001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael Zantopp</td>
<td>Utilization Director</td>
<td>The Guidance Center</td>
<td>2187 N. Vickey St., Flagstaff, AZ 86004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B:

JUSTICE 2035 RETREAT:
COURT-COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLANNING CONFERENCE

Agenda

| Date: | Thursday, November 5, 2015 – 8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. |
| Location: | High Country Conference Center |
| Purpose: | Update the strategic plan and develop a strategic action agenda for improving justice services in the Courts in Coconino County |

### Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Arrive, Register, Refreshments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Welcome and Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Justice Scott Bales, Arizona Supreme Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Planning for the Courts in Coconino County: A Historical Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Gary Krcmarik, Court Administrator, Superior Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overview of the Planning Conference – Purpose, Desired Outcomes, and Keys to Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Brenda J. Wagenknecht-Ivey Retreat Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Key Accomplishments of the Courts since 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Don Jacobson, Court Administrator, Flagstaff Municipal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning for the Future:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Results of Pre-Conference Survey – Highlight of Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trends – Overview of External and Internal Trends Impacting the Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Brenda Wagenknecht-Ivey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Don Jacobson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Small Group #1 – Parts A and B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A 15 min. break will be taken around 10:15 a.m.)</td>
<td>Overview of Small Group Task – Introduction of Updated Strategic Focus Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short Break and Move to Small Group Breakouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part A: Identify Strengths and Weaknesses of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Brenda Wagenknecht-Ivey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Courts in Coconino County

- Part B: Identify Opportunities and Threats (Challenges)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11:30 a.m. | Debrief Small Group Sessions  
- Brief Presentations by the Small Groups | Dr. Brenda Wagenknecht-Ivey |
| 12 noon  | Lunch – Provided                                   |                              |
| 1:00 p.m. | Debrief Small Group Sessions  
- Brief Presentations by the Small Groups | Dr. Brenda Wagenknecht-Ivey |
| 1:30 p.m. | Identify Strategic Projects  
- Review 5 Strategic Focus Areas  
- Review Innovative Practices – National Court Innovations  
- Small Group #2 – Brainstorm and Recommend Strategic Projects (in assigned area) | Dr. Brenda Wagenknecht-Ivey  
Small Groups |
| 2:30 p.m. | Break and Refreshments                             |                              |
| 2:45 p.m. | Debrief: Suggested Strategic Projects             | Dr. Brenda Wagenknecht-Ivey |
| 3:15 p.m. | Prioritize Strategic Projects                      | All                          |
| 3:45 p.m. | Wrap-Up:  
- Where We Go From Here  
- Closing Comments and Acknowledgements  
- Conference Feedback – Reminder to Complete Feedback Sheets | Judge Mark Moran |
| 4:00 p.m. | ADJOURN                                             |                              |
1. Overall, I thought the Justice 2035 Conference was ... (circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=40%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
1. Having attendees from outside the justice system give their ideas makes this conference a success.
2. Great breakout small group projects.
3. Great presentation of information. I enjoyed the video and the background.
4. I really enjoyed getting this many minds together from different areas within the system. This is visionary.
5. Location was comfortable. Food was good. Very good cross section of the community.
6. The conference is excellent; build on ability to have open discussions.
7. Well organized, supported by well-informed faculty and facilitators. Well done!
8. Well run and efficient use of time.
9. This opened my eyes to issues I didn’t even know we had and also gave solutions that I had never thought of.
10. Great video on successes.
11. Great collaboration.
12. Great job! Great facilitator, location, nice pace of agenda. Great day!
13. Diverse participants!
14. Best in Arizona!
15. Great conference.
16. Great participants with willingness to share ideas.
17. Great to get input.
18. This is the premier event related to strategic planning in the state. Keep it up.
19. It was impressive to see the number and interest level of attendees.
21. It is a great idea to get collaboration from many different groups on how to improve the court system.
22. Open exchange of ideas.
23. Not enough time to develop ideas.
2. **What was most valuable to you? Why?**

   Comments:
   1. To hear other perspectives.
   2. Views outside the I.T. realm.
   3. Networking & feedback from stakeholders.
   4. Collaboration and incorporation of community.
   5. Getting the overall/background info at the start of conference.
   6. Small groups, brain storming projects.
   7. 1st small groups most productive.
   8. The fleshing out what exists and how to dream big.
   9. The brainstorming on projects.
   10. Being part of the collaborative process.
   11. Insight from community members & materials.
   12. The ideas/suggestions.
   13. Creative ideas; many perspectives.
   14. Some really good, new ideas this time.
   15. Having an opportunity to participate and info on how the info is used to establish direction for the justice system.
   16. Project ID program.
   17. Hearing other people’s ideas & suggestions.
   18. Listening to how to improve court services and what the public wants.
   19. Helps to hear what is important to our stakeholders; see the differences and similarities.
   20. Group discussions- They were small which forced everyone to participate.
   21. As a first time participant it was useful to see/hear from many stakeholders in one forum.
   22. Opportunity for small group discussion and idea generation.
   23. Hearing what is important to the community.
   24. Met new contacts; learning experience.
   25. Getting all stakeholders together and interacting with those with diverse interests.
   26. Open and honest discussion with variety of viewpoints.
   27. Group discussions.
   28. Great idea sharing.
   29. Interaction with partners, stakeholders.
   30. Info/idea sharing – big think tank that generated a lot of great ideas.
   31. Catching up on all of the accomplishments and looking forward to a great future in Coconino.
   32. Longer small group time was appropriate – more info from others.
   33. Discussion in breakout sessions – exchange of ideas.
   34. Small group discussion processes.
   35. Small group discussions. A lot of good information was shared and debated.
   37. The broad range of participants; was great to get a well-rounded level of input.

   38. Interacting with stakeholders and learning what they are passionate about. It’s easy to get out of touch with local issues when working at the state level.
39. Interaction with other participants.
40. The same group discussions. They helped me reconnect with several folks I had not seen in quite some time.
41. SWOT analysis gave me a good overview of courts (I don’t work there).
42. Reviewing the updated trends and survey results.
43. Interaction with stakeholders.
44. Small groups; great discussions.
45. Small group discussions; different perspectives.
46. The ability to voice some ideas and get the ideas of others.
47. Open discussion in breakout groups; new ideas, old ideas with new viewpoints.
48. Working with colleagues; identifying shared concerns.
49. Learning that everyone had similar ideas and issues.
50. Broad overview.
51. Small group discussions.
52. Having open communication.
53. Interaction with other participants – see what is on their minds.
54. Reconnecting with others.
55. Hearing different perspectives.
56. Hearing many ideas/suggestions of things we already do – illustrating that we need to do a better job getting the word out about services and processes.
57. The knowledge diversity brought together.
58. Small group discussions and diverse points of view and expertise.
59. Attainable projects.
60. Groups working together.
61. The ideas and voting.
63. Meeting and working with great people in our county.
64. Collaborative conversations with stakeholders.
65. Hearing the high priority issues; to know what the professionals in the system feel are the most important.
66. Getting all these folks from different aspects of the system together – broadens the perspectives of the results.
67. Networking.
68. The PowerPoint on “trends/stats”: too fast, no background to absorb the info.
69. Input from other participants across a wide range of issues.
70. Small group discussions.

3. **What was the least valuable to you? Why?**

   Comments:
   1. The 1st part of the conference-too much info but loved the video.
   2. Trends data, too much.
   3. Extensive morning presentations.
   4. I wonder if part of the day should be devoted to meeting within specific groups (e.g., IFC, jury, municipal, etc.). I think there may be some missed opportunities.
   5. This was my first time attending so everything was of value to me.
   6. Some departments became defensive when suggestions were brought up in small groups- shutting down brainstorming discussions.
7. Statistical review time.
8. Monkey video (seen it twice before).
9. It was all valuable very exciting to see final results.
11. Opening stats. Black and white graphs and charts in stats packet are not useful = print in color.
12. N/A.
13. One of my group [members?] who needs to listen more.
14. Instruction sheet for the 2nd small group was not too helpful.
15. Nothing I can think of.
17. Slow pace down. Need more time in discussion groups.
18. The amount of information during the morning; was hard to digest – just too much data.
19. A lot of introductory materials; I’d rather have more break out time to sort and refine ideas. I feel like the breakouts didn’t get sufficient time.
20. The dots.
21. The excessive paper of what we needed to do in the small groups.
22. Can’t think of anything.
23. Participants should be able to choose group most pertinent to their expertise.
24. N/A
25. Too much time spent on introductions; too much time spent on “strengths.”
26. Strong relations and partnerships – not relevant to my role.
27. Our small group was very small and category very far ranging – made it a little chaotic.
28. When small group discussions were focused on a small section of the courts instead of the big picture.
29. Nothing – it was really all valuable.
30. Can’t think of anything.
31. All conversations were valuable.
32. Room for substantive issues - CJ reform, re-entry, etc. – was not available through the ____ _________?
33. Some of the small group discussions were not fruitful – facilitator needs to keep things focused.
34. None.
35. 2nd session – I felt there were some specific agendas and negative feeling.
36. Intro but necessary.
37. N/A
38. Handouts to be used during conference because there was not time to read it all. Should have been sent out prior to the conference.
40. Our small group facilitator struggled to encapsulate or define issues.
4. **How effective was the Conference format (i.e. mix of large and small group discussions, small group discussion questions) in accomplishing the stated outcomes?** (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Not at all Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 31</td>
<td>n = 36</td>
<td>n = 7</td>
<td>n = 0</td>
<td>n = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
1. More time to discuss in small groups.
2. A little more involvement from the small group facilitator to keep the group on task.
3. There was a mix-up with the two groups and we had a small group buy still productive.
4. Thank you!
5. No suggestions right now but good to keep thinking of how to improve.
6. This enabled everyone to have a voice.
7. People should be able to voice opinion.
8. More time in small groups would be better.
9. Well done!
10. Small groups were very productive – excellent facilitators.
11. Good balance of large group and small groups.
12. Great facilitators.
13. This is an excellent process which was very well planned and implemented.
14. Excellent conference; great information and networking.
15. Perfect mix.
16. More breakout time would lead to more refinement of ideas.
17. The breakout topics were in line with what needed to be discussed.
18. Too many stakeholders; groups can’t get small enough.
19. Socialization of participants increased by small/large group format.
20. I appreciated the video of what was done from the previous conference rather than just a list. The breakout groups were great.
21. Good discussions. Interesting to learn what people did and did not know about the services and programs that are already in place.
22. Too rushed in small groups.
23. Maybe add online participation.
5. **How effective are these types of meetings in involving external stakeholders and partners in the Courts’ strategic planning process?** (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Not at all Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n = 39</strong></td>
<td><strong>n = 24</strong></td>
<td><strong>n = 6</strong></td>
<td><strong>n = 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>n = 0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>54%</strong></td>
<td><strong>33%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

1. Everyone has a chance for their voice to be heard.
2. It is great to get feedback from all partners especially those not directly involved with the criminal justice system.
3. I think so, hope it truly is!
4. We are all potential consumers.
5. Excellent opportunity to incite change.
6. Keeps us from having tunnel vision.
7. Good ideas to blend from different groups
8. Brings everyone to a common goal.
9. Ideas come from everywhere; everyone should be involved.
10. Including all the stakeholders enables much better informed discussions/plans.
11. A 360 degree look at the issues.
13. Brings attention to different needs of groups.
14. #5 – based on programs already in place – shows these types of meetings work.
15. Need more non-court feedback.
16. There were not enough members of the general public in attendance.
17. Also helps external stakeholders understand need/purpose.
18. Collaboration of various minds bring out very successful results. Also there is more buy-in with all stakeholders being involved.
19. Not enough external stakeholders in attendance.
20. Too much to do in too short a time.
21. There should be more tribal member representation; plus, you should really consider trying to get more input from people who have been through the Courts such as parties in civil cases, adjudicated individuals, etc.
6. **How useful were the Conference materials and handouts?** (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Useful</th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not at all Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 21)</td>
<td>(n = 34)</td>
<td>(n = 16)</td>
<td>(n = 2)</td>
<td>(n = 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
1. Very useful during the group sessions.
2. The PowerPoint of planning survey results was difficult to interpret and should be in color.
3. Loved all the handouts; very useful.
4. I particularly enjoyed/appreciated the demographics handout as well as the survey overview.
5. It would have been better to receive in advance though.
6. Could you include email addresses on the contact sheet/info?
7. Introductory materials would be handy to have beforehand so we could get down to business more rapidly.
8. Handouts seemed excessive.
9. A little too much material?
10. The goals and objectives framed the context to keep the groups focused.
11. Focused us on what you wanted from each small group.
12. Very good materials to guide through entire day.
13. Materials would have been more useful if they would have been sent in advance so participants could review them in detail prior to the conference. This would be especially useful to the public members who are not involved in the justice system on a daily basis.
14. Not able to read all materials before the conference. Send them out prior to conference.

7. **How effective was the Conference facilitator?** (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Not at all Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 42)</td>
<td>(n = 21)</td>
<td>(n = 9)</td>
<td>(n = 1)</td>
<td>(n = 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
1. Kept us on task & provided direction.
2. Kept the discussion moving.
3. Brenda does an awesome job as always.
4. Our breakout facilitator seemed a bit flustered at times.
5. Survey was not easy to understand in comparing years.
6. Very good facilitator. I know how difficult that endeavor can be.
7. Gabe is the best! Conference facilitator did a great job.
8. She is great!
9. Conference facilitator was great! Very organized knowledgeable and “fun.” Kept good pace; made day go quickly.
10. Gabe did a great job, too.
11. Brenda is great!
12. Brenda did a great job except for the procedure repetition which was handled effectively by small group facilitators.
13. Brenda clearly does this frequently and has an effective process.
14. It seemed we got behind early. Do less background at the next one prior to the start.
15. Kept group focused and on task.
16. Very good at keeping on task and explaining the process.
17. She was entirely unnecessary however; any one of our own administrators could have done this.
19. Thank you!!!
20. Volunteer facilitators were very good.

8. Other Comments/Recommendations:
Comments:
1. Really liked the video.
2. More federal reps and discussion would be helpful.
3. A lot of discussion on creating formal relationship w/tribal communities, however, need better tribal representation at conference. Need better recruitment by organizers Thank you!
4. Less paper, more electronic; shorter presentation on trends/survey results; the video was awesome.
5. Shorter afternoon groups? Seemed more disjointed than morning.
6. Brenda came in to p.m. session & rushed us a bit or so it felt on the big ideas. Those take some time to ruminate on & discuss to determine our final recommendation. Pushing is fine, rushing doesn’t feel right.
7. Thank you for this innovative and educational program. It is nice to know the court is interested in how it is perceived and strives to improve.
8. I appreciated the opportunity to participate and hope it will be helpful to the future of our county’s judicial efforts.
9. Thank you!
10. Great job! The time spent planning is very evident in the success. Thank you.
11. Could use a more in-depth analysis of trends.
12. Great retreat!
13. Appreciate being asked to be a participant.
14. 1st time attendee; everyone did a great job.
15. Thank you!!
16. So for infrastructure, SFA 5, we had agreed that we should not recommend a consolidated building for all three courts but that only a new Municipal Court should be built!!!
17. I felt fortunate to participate. Thank you!
18. Very impressed with the level of participation and collaboration in the County. Congrats to all organizers!
19. Thanks for inviting me and the variety of other participants. Thanks for keeping on track and timely.
20. Progress update. Video was very effective in showing progress during 5 years.
21. Thank you for a wonderful experience.
22. Great conference.
23. Need a creative approach to communicating all the statistical information.
24. Thanks for another fantastic event. Love the Conference Center environment and the great mix of stakeholders.
25. Stress “no word-smithing!” in the small groups.
26. Very good event – we may want to consider a “state of the courts” presentation.
27. Keep us the good work; do follow-up with collective results.
28. Maybe a different way of voting for the best ideas?
29. None of this matters without implementation.
30. Great info and provided info for me to take back to my office.
31. SFA #5: project idea should be: recommend new Municipal Court (not necessarily consolidated Court)
32. Gabe was an awesome facilitator; made the process even more enjoyable.
33. Very, very good.
34. Job well done.
35. Could be very informative to have some users of the court/justice system attend the conference to see how their input meshes with that of the professionals.
36. We need a similar process for micro, or dept., or division level issues.
37. Involve the public/clientele of the courts in a non-threatening way.
38. The voting should be done electronically. Each of the final 5 priority or action lists should be collated first so that similar ideas are combined to a final ballot for voting.
39. I think it will be difficult to identify needs unless you involve more of the adjudicated folks in jail/prison/probation. A survey of just them might be a good idea.
Appendix C:  
Suggested Strategic Projects from the Justice 2035 Planning Forum

The lists below are the suggested strategic projects by the small groups at the 2015 Planning Forum. Each person was given a select number of blue and red dots to “vote” on the projects they thought were of highest priority and could be accomplished in 12-18 months. Each blue dot was weighted 1 point and each red dot was weighted/given 2 points. The suggested projects are sorted from highest point count to lowest for each of the 5 strategic focus areas.

**Strategic Focus Area 1: Access and Quality Services:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SFA 1: ACCESS AND QUALITY SERVICES</th>
<th># of Blue Dots = 1 pt each</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017 Strategic Projects</td>
<td># of Red Dots = 2 pts each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Establish an information center/book/booth/signs &amp; access to jury info</td>
<td>42 Blue 25 Red</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mediation center</td>
<td>28 Blue 15 Red</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expand satellite courts</td>
<td>25 Blue 12 Red</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improve telephone response and system</td>
<td>28 Blue 6 Red</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rural audio/visual centers</td>
<td>24 Blue 6 Red</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Open welcome desk/liaison/ NAU interns</td>
<td>18 Blue 6 Red</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Court-School partnership – Expand Our Courts Arizona</td>
<td>20 Blue 2 Red</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Improve public transportation from outlying areas (NAIPTA) (collaborate with other agencies)</td>
<td>19 Blue 1 Red</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Law Library marketing plan – self-help expansion (Quick win)</td>
<td>9 Blue 5 Red</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Citizen education and outreach</td>
<td>10 Blue 1 Red</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. General Community survey/analysis/ response</td>
<td>1 Blue 0 Red</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic Focus Area 2: Fair and Timely Resolution/Efficient Operations:

<p>| SFA 2: FAIR AND TIMELY RESOLUTION/EFFICIENT OPERATIONS |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2016-2017 Strategic Projects</strong></th>
<th><strong># of Blue Dots = 1 pt each</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total Points</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Technology (Online mediation for small claims, civil traffic, or other case types; Jury application online orientation and helpful information; Reminders of Court appearances, jury notices, etc. via text messages/email; Expanded use of video appearances for additional types of hearings - Implicates bandwidth; May result in more trials)</td>
<td>53 Blue 17 Red</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Task force multi-discipline team address expanding mediation/ADR throughout court system evidence based practices - civil/family/juvenile</td>
<td>32 Blue 17 Red</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Unified court hotline for all courts to provide legal info to the public AND to take payment and assist with outstanding warrant issues</td>
<td>32 Blue 14 Red</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Enhance/Expand Specific Courts (Family Law Drug/DUI court; Staff position focused on coordinating specialty courts and their resource needs; Make room for more participants in the specialty courts that are currently maxed out)</td>
<td>27 Blue 16 Red</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Court Admin expand use of IT to expand outlying area availability option/links to info/resources/kiosk inform public of opportunities</td>
<td>29 Blue 7 Red</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Stepping up initiative NACO/Expand mental health court/services in rural areas, family/criminal courts participate in stepping up (Quick win)</td>
<td>21 Blue 4 Red</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Staff Development (Computer based trainings for staff; Certification process to improve staff professionalism and sense of accomplishment; Develop a task list for staff positions; Reduces stress and takes advantage of senior employees institutional knowledge and experience)</td>
<td>26 Blue 2 Red</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Partner with local news media to get the word out on court programs and services (PSA’s, regular column, press releases)</td>
<td>5 Blue 4 Red</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. CJCC subcommittee addressing expanding ADR, evidence based practices, and criminal-adult-juvenile</td>
<td>8 Blue 1 Red</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Increased capacity for the courts use of social media</td>
<td>3 Blue 0 Red</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic Focus Area 3: Strong Relations and Partnerships:

<p>| SFA 3: STRONG RELATIONS AND PARTNERSHIPS |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2016-2017 Strategic Projects</strong></th>
<th><strong># of Blue Dots = 1 pt each</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total Points</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Study areas to expand use of video conferencing to other programs (i.e. title 36) and explore internet portal for submitting documents to courts</td>
<td>33 Blue 51 Red</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Court Processes 101 – internet clips and education on processes</td>
<td>40 Blue 6 Red</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SFA 3: STRONG RELATIONS AND PARTNERSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016-2017 Strategic Projects</th>
<th># of Blue Dots = 1 pt each</th>
<th># of Red Dots = 2 pts each</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Partner with organizations to better use existing technology and educate fellow stakeholders on appropriate access to information</td>
<td>29 Blue</td>
<td>1 Red</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Partnerships with NAU to expand intern/connect programs for increased coordination</td>
<td>22 Blue</td>
<td>4 Red</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pro Se clinic with required class attendance prior to case commencement. Possible rule change HV range of education topic/clinic</td>
<td>16 Blue</td>
<td>3 Red</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Exchange Forum – tribal partners (Learn how each operates/interacts; Joint understanding ex. MH &amp; involuntary commitments)</td>
<td>19 Blue</td>
<td>1 Red</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Collaborate with Navajo Nation to create audio/PSA recordings/cultural training opportunities for staff to identify areas to streamline the process and educate</td>
<td>16 Blue</td>
<td>1 Red</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Explore and expand current intern program and create/incorporate a volunteer program for the court</td>
<td>12 Blue</td>
<td>1 Red</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Elevator talk project – explore/identify of staff or to create a position to be a point of contact (or Court Ambassador/PIO) to communicate info to the public</td>
<td>1 Blue</td>
<td>1 Red</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Exchange forum, regional with partners (Networking; Increase formality)</td>
<td>0 Blue</td>
<td>0 Red</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Focus Area 4: Professional, Competent, and Engaged Workforce:

### SFA 4: PROFESSIONAL, COMPETENT, AND ENGAGED WORKFORCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016-2017 Strategic Projects</th>
<th># of Blue Dots = 1 pt each</th>
<th># of Red Dots = 2 pts each</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Evaluate current practices and procedures and abandon inefficient and outdated practices</td>
<td>41 Blue</td>
<td>30 Red</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase training staff and capacity for cross training</td>
<td>35 Blue</td>
<td>6 Red</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluate turnover to ID means to create a higher retention rates</td>
<td>27 Blue</td>
<td>8 Red</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Implement employee self-care programs</td>
<td>26 Blue</td>
<td>7 Red</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Build a formalized Career Ladder</td>
<td>34 Blue</td>
<td>1 Red</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Develop mentors and coaches to assist with retention of new employees</td>
<td>22 Blue</td>
<td>2 Red</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Increase number of video trainings specific to Coconino Courts</td>
<td>15 Blue</td>
<td>5 Red</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Create and implement a formal onboarding program that is specific for each job classification</td>
<td>12 Blue</td>
<td>3 Red</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SFA 5: Court Infrastructure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016-2017 Strategic Projects</th>
<th># of Blue Dots = 1 pt each</th>
<th># of Red Dots = 2 pts each</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Expand Bandwidth</td>
<td>51 Blue</td>
<td>22 Red</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. New Flagstaff Municipal courthouse or justice center (consolidate)</td>
<td>31 Blue</td>
<td>25 Red</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Build parking structure downtown</td>
<td>25 Blue</td>
<td>12 Red</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parking (Relocate Justice Agencies near Court and move non justice agencies out of downtown; Revisit 1996 decision of court location downtown; E-filing and e-access/collections/help desk/documents)</td>
<td>26 Blue</td>
<td>11 Red</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Change ARS rules to redefine “Appearance” for Court</td>
<td>32 Blue</td>
<td>6 Red</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Establish Coconino County Justice System Technology Advisory Council</td>
<td>20 Blue</td>
<td>4 Red</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Develop county wide court security standards</td>
<td>18 Blue</td>
<td>0 Red</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CJI Decentralize IT</td>
<td>11 Blue</td>
<td>3 Red</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Video Conference Interconnected include Native American Tribes (6-12 month project)</td>
<td>11 Blue</td>
<td>3 Red</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Shuttle from offsite parking lot(s) (Location TBD) to all court offices/locations</td>
<td>7 Blue</td>
<td>1 Red</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D:

COURTS IN COCONINO COUNTY

2015 STRATEGIC PLANNING SURVEY: RESULTS AND FINDINGS

November 2015

By: Brenda J. Wagenknecht-Ivey, Ph.D.,
CEO, PRAXIS Consulting, Inc., Denver, Colorado

Overview – Strategic Planning Surveys

- **Purpose:** Gather input for updating the Courts’ Strategic Plan. The information will be used to help shape the future direction, goals, and strategic priorities of the Courts in Coconino County.

- Survey was administered in August 2015 by Dr. Brenda Wagenknecht-Ivey

- The survey was similar to the survey administered in 2010.
Overview – Strategic Planning Surveys (cont.)

- Survey was sent to/completed by: (N=208)
  - Attorneys (public and private)
  - City, County, and State Officials (elected and appointed)
  - Law Enforcement
  - Treatment Providers
  - Community, Business, and Faith Based Leaders
  - Judicial Officers and Court Employees

- Survey Response Rate:
  - 2015: 46% (n=96 people out of 208)
  - 2010: 43% (n=93 people out of 216)

Overview – Strategic Planning Surveys (cont.)

- Survey questions:
  1. Level of familiarity with each of the Courts
  2. Court performance on key performance measures in 2015
  3. Level of improvement in the past few years on 5 strategic areas
  4. Overall performance level in 2015
  5. Greatest Strengths
  6. Barriers to accessing or using the Courts
  7. Biggest challenges/emerging issues facing the Courts in the next few years
  8. Most desired new programs/services
  9. Most wanted changes/improvements in the next 5 years
  10. Several demographic questions
Data Analysis Considerations

1. n=___: the number of respondents or responses

2. The “n” size may vary because some people did not answer the question or answered don’t know/not sure

3. The “n” sizes will be higher on multiple response questions (e.g., 3 greatest strengths of the Coconino County Courts)

4. The data are presented in either proportions (i.e., percentages) or mean ratings (i.e., averages).

5. Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.
6. The surveys included two ratings scales:
   - 7 point “level of improvement” rating scale: 7=Improved Significantly; 4=No change; and 1=Much Worse
   - 4 point Overall Performance rating scale: 4=Excellent, 3=good, 2=Fair; 1=Poor

7. Midpoints: 4 = midpoint of the 7 point scale and 2.5 = midpoint of a 4 point scale

8. Grand means for the groups of questions (e.g., Accessibility, Timeliness, etc.) were computed by averaging the means of the multiple statements in each category

9. Two common statistical tests were used to test for significant differences:
   - Tests for differences in means – t tests that look for differences between 2 groups
   - Analysis of Variance – ANOVA that looks for differences among multiple groups

10. Statistically significant differences are reported at the .05 or 95% confidence level (common for social science and survey research)
Interpretation of Data:

1. The higher the mean score, the higher the level of improvement or more favorable the rating (i.e., higher is better)

2. Mean ratings **above** the midpoint of the ratings scales are more favorable

3. Mean ratings **below** the midpoint of the rating scales and are less favorable.

Interpretation of Data (cont.)

4. Interpretation of statistical differences reported at the .05 or 95% confidence level
   ✓ A difference in mean scores is statistically significant if there is a less than 5% probability that the difference could have occurred by chance alone (significant at the .05 level)

5. Statistically significant differences are noted with **yellow shading** or with the following symbol: ★
Characteristics of Survey Respondents

Respondent Demographics
(in percentages; n=96)

- **Gender**
  - Did not answer (n=4), 4%
  - Male (n=46), 48%
  - Female (n=46), 48%

- **Race/Ethnicity**
  - Did not answer (n=6), 6%
  - Caucasian (n=74), 77%
  - Other (n=16), 17%

Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.
Respondent Demographics
(in percentages; n=96)

**Age**
- Did not answer (n=6), 6%
- 18-34 years (n=9), 9%
- 35-49 years (n=25), 26%
- 50 years or more (n=56), 58%

**Residential Location**
- Did not answer (n=3), 3%
- Northern/Central Cnty (n=10), 10%
- Outside Cnty (n=15), 16%
- Southern Cnty (n=68), 71%

Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Respondent Demographics
(in percentages; n=96)

**Relationship to Courts**
- Did Not Answer (n=4), 4%
- Attorneys (n=7), 7%
- Elected Off./Other Govt. (n=21), 22%
- Law Enf. (n=3), 3%
- Judicial Officers (n=11), 12%
- Court Employees (n=35), 37%
- Other (n=15), 16%

NOTE: Other includes treatment providers, general public, education community, community/business/faith-based orgs. Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.
Level of Familiarity with the Courts

(in mean scores\(^1\); n=96)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Not Familiar</th>
<th>Somewhat Familiar</th>
<th>Familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coconino County Superior Court</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagstaff Justice Court</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagstaff Municipal Court</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Justice Court</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Justice Court</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Municipal Court</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Municipal Court</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredonia Justice Court</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredonia Municipal Court</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Mean scores are computed by averaging the ratings of all respondents. A 6-point rating scale was used for this question where 6 = Very Familiar and 1 = Not At All Familiar. The higher the mean score, the more familiar respondents were with the Courts. The midpoint of the scale is 3.5. The averages exclude respondents who did not answer the question or answered don't know/not sure/not applicable.
Ratings on Key Court Performance Measures

Fairness, Timeliness, Quality/Effectiveness, Collaboration, and Accessibility

Ratings on Key Performance Categories – All Respondents: 2010 vs. 2015 (in mean scores; n=96)

1 Mean scores for each category (e.g., Fairness) are computed by averaging the means (i.e., the mean of means) of the various statements in each category. The means for each statement are computed using a scale from 1 to 4 where 1=Poor and 4=Excellent. For each category, the higher the mean score, the better the Courts’ performance in that area. The midpoint of the scale is 2.5. The averages exclude respondents who did not answer the question or answered don’t know/not sure/not applicable.
2015 Ratings on Key Performance Categories – Comparison By Respondent Groups (in mean scores \(^1\); n=96)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All Respondents (n=96)</th>
<th>Judges/Staff Only (n=44)</th>
<th>Comm. Memb/Partners (n=44)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality/Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(1\) Mean scores for each category (e.g., Fairness) are computed by averaging the means (i.e., the mean of means) of the various statements in each category. The means for each statement are computed using a scale from 1 to 4 where 1= Poor and 4= Excellent. For each category, the higher the mean score, the better the Courts’ performance in that area. The midpoint of the scale is 2.5. The averages exclude respondents who did not answer the question or answered don’t know/not sure/not applicable.

2015 Ratings on Key Performance Categories – Comparison Among Respondent Groups (in mean scores \(^1\); n=96)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All Respondents (n=96)</th>
<th>Judges/Staff Only (n=44)</th>
<th>Comm. Memb/Partners (n=44)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(1\) Mean scores for each category (e.g., Fairness) are computed by averaging the means (i.e., the mean of means) of the various statements in each category. The means for each statement are computed using a scale from 1 to 4 where 1= Poor and 4= Excellent. For each category, the higher the mean score, the better the Courts’ performance in that area. The midpoint of the scale is 2.5. The averages exclude respondents who did not answer the question or answered don’t know/not sure/not applicable.
### Fairness: Ratings on how well the Courts are performing on .... (2015 and 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>2015 Judges/ Court Staff Mean Score (n= )</th>
<th>2015 External Partners Mean Score (n= )</th>
<th>2015 Overall Mean Score</th>
<th>2015 Rank Order by Overall Mean Score (1-21)</th>
<th>2010 Overall Mean Score</th>
<th>2010 Rank Order by Overall Mean Score (1-21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairness:</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Making fair decisions based on the laws/facts of the case.</td>
<td>3.61 (n=41)</td>
<td>3.23 (n=35)</td>
<td>3.43 (n=76)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.28 (n=75)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protecting the rights of all people.</td>
<td>3.56 (n=43)</td>
<td>3.24 (n=37)</td>
<td>3.41 (n=80)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.25 (n=76)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Treating all parties equally.</td>
<td>3.53 (n=43)</td>
<td>3.22 (n=37)</td>
<td>3.39 (n=80)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.22 (n=76)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Treating all court customers with respect.</td>
<td>3.42 (n=43)</td>
<td>3.21 (n=39)</td>
<td>3.32 (n=82)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.19 (n=77)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings are based on a 4 point rating scale: 4 = Excellent and = Poor. Yellow highlights reflect statistically significant differences at the .05/95% confidence level.

### Timeliness: Ratings on how well the Courts are performing on..... (2015 and 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>2015 Judges/ Court Staff Mean Score (n= )</th>
<th>2015 External Partners Mean Score (n= )</th>
<th>2015 Overall Mean Score</th>
<th>2015 Rank Order by Overall Mean Score (1-21)</th>
<th>2010 Overall Mean Score</th>
<th>2010 Rank Order by Overall Mean Score (1-21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness:</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resolving disputes in a timely manner.</td>
<td>3.07 (n=42)</td>
<td>2.92 (n=36)</td>
<td>3.00 (n=78)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.00 (n=72)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing court services in a timely manner.</td>
<td>3.21 (n=42)</td>
<td>3.14 (n=36)</td>
<td>3.18 (n=78)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.99 (n=74)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Responding to questions/requests for information in a timely manner.</td>
<td>3.22 (n=41)</td>
<td>2.97 (n=37)</td>
<td>3.10 (n=78)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.11 (n=72)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings are based on a 4 point rating scale: 4 = Excellent and = Poor. Yellow highlights reflect statistically significant differences at the .05/95% confidence level.
### Quality/Effectiveness: Ratings on how well the Courts are performing on..... (2015 and 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>2015 Judges/ Court Staff Mean Score (n=)</th>
<th>2015 Judges/ Court Staff Mean Score (n=)</th>
<th>2015 External Partners Mean Score (n=)</th>
<th>2015 External Partners Mean Score (n=)</th>
<th>2015 Rank Order by Overall Mean Score (1-21)</th>
<th>2015 Rank Order by Overall Mean Score (1-21)</th>
<th>2010 Rank Order by Overall Mean Score (1-21)</th>
<th>2010 Rank Order by Overall Mean Score (1-21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Service/Effectiveness:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing court customers with helpful resources and/or assistance.</td>
<td>3.35 (n=43)</td>
<td>2.83 (n=35)</td>
<td>3.12 (n=78)</td>
<td>3.12 (n=78)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.04 (n=74)</td>
<td>3.04 (n=74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing safe and secure facilities.</td>
<td>3.05 (n=43)</td>
<td>2.83 (n=40)</td>
<td>2.94 (n=83)</td>
<td>2.94 (n=83)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.13 (n=78)</td>
<td>3.13 (n=78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Using public resources responsibly.</td>
<td>3.44 (n=41)</td>
<td>3.22 (n=36)</td>
<td>3.34 (n=77)</td>
<td>3.34 (n=77)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20 (n=75)</td>
<td>3.20 (n=75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Managing the courts efficiently and effectively.</td>
<td>3.26 (n=43)</td>
<td>3.18 (n=39)</td>
<td>3.22 (n=82)</td>
<td>3.22 (n=82)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.13 (n=78)</td>
<td>3.13 (n=78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implementing innovative approaches, programs, and/or services to meet the needs of court users and the community.</td>
<td>3.39 (n=44)</td>
<td>3.10 (n=40)</td>
<td>3.25 (n=84)</td>
<td>3.25 (n=84)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.14 (n=79)</td>
<td>3.14 (n=79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Using technology/the Internet to improve convenience and/or efficiency when doing business with the Courts.</td>
<td>2.79 (n=42)</td>
<td>2.50 (n=40)</td>
<td>2.65 (n=82)</td>
<td>2.65 (n=82)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.84 (n=76)</td>
<td>2.84 (n=76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings are based on a 4 point rating scale: 4 = Excellent and = Poor. Yellow highlights reflect statistically significant differences at the .05/95% confidence level.

### Public Education/Collaboration: Ratings on how well the Courts are performing on..... (2015 and 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>2015 Judges/ Court Staff Mean Score (n=)</th>
<th>2015 Judges/ Court Staff Mean Score (n=)</th>
<th>2015 External Partners Mean Score (n=)</th>
<th>2015 External Partners Mean Score (n=)</th>
<th>2015 Rank Order by Overall Mean Score (1-21)</th>
<th>2015 Rank Order by Overall Mean Score (1-21)</th>
<th>2010 Rank Order by Overall Mean Score (1-21)</th>
<th>2010 Rank Order by Overall Mean Score (1-21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/Public Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaborating with state and local justice system partners, stakeholders, and community leaders to prevent crime.</td>
<td>3.13 (n=38)</td>
<td>3.12 (n=34)</td>
<td>3.13 (n=72)</td>
<td>3.13 (n=72)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.93 (n=72)</td>
<td>2.93 (n=72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaborating with state and local justice system partners, stakeholders, and community leaders to enhance services.</td>
<td>3.25 (n=40)</td>
<td>3.16 (n=38)</td>
<td>3.21 (n=78)</td>
<td>3.21 (n=78)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.99 (n=79)</td>
<td>2.99 (n=79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communicating/sharing information with external partners/parties.</td>
<td>2.93 (n=40)</td>
<td>2.85 (n=39)</td>
<td>2.89 (n=79)</td>
<td>2.89 (n=79)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.85 (n=78)</td>
<td>2.85 (n=78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educating the public about the courts.</td>
<td>2.85 (n=39)</td>
<td>2.63 (n=38)</td>
<td>2.74 (n=77)</td>
<td>2.74 (n=77)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.51 (n=79)</td>
<td>2.51 (n=79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings are based on a 4 point rating scale: 4 = Excellent and = Poor. Yellow highlights reflect statistically significant differences at the .05/95% confidence level.
### Accessibility: Ratings on how well the Courts are performing on….. (2015 and 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>2015 Judges/ Court Staff Mean Score (n= )</th>
<th>2015 External Partners Mean Score (n= )</th>
<th>2015 Overall Mean Score</th>
<th>2015 Rank Order by Overall Mean Score (1-21)</th>
<th>2010 Overall Mean Score</th>
<th>2010 Rank Order by Overall Mean Score (1-21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing easy access to court information.</td>
<td>3.14 (n=43)</td>
<td>2.84 (n=37)</td>
<td>3.00 (n=80)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.03 (n=80)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing easy access to case information.</td>
<td>2.98 (n=41)</td>
<td>2.74 (n=35)</td>
<td>2.87 (n=76)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.89 (n=75)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing easy access to court facilities</td>
<td>3.30 (n=43)</td>
<td>3.08 (n=39)</td>
<td>3.20 (n=82)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.19 (n=80)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Using technology/the Internet to increase access to the Courts.</td>
<td>2.88 (n=42)</td>
<td>2.42 (n=38)</td>
<td>2.66 (n=80)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.78 (n=78)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings are based on a 4 point rating scale: 4 = Excellent and 1 = Poor. Yellow highlights reflect statistically significant differences at the .05/95% confidence level.

### Level of Improvement in 5 Strategic Areas Over the Past Few Years
Level of Improvement (Over the Past Few Years) on the Five Strategic Focus Areas – 2015 (in mean scores; n=96)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Improvement</th>
<th>Equal Access/Services</th>
<th>Fair/Timely Resolution</th>
<th>Public Educ./Coll.</th>
<th>Employee Dev./Sat.</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Mean scores are computed by averaging the ratings of all respondents. The means are computed using a scale from 1 to 7 where 1=Much Worse and 7=Significant Improvement. The higher the mean score, the more the Courts have improved over the past few years. The midpoint of the scale is 4.0 = no change. The averages exclude respondents who did not answer the question or answered don’t know/not sure/not applicable.

Level of Improvement Over Past Few Years - 2015

**Equal Access/Quality Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Improvement</th>
<th>By Mean¹</th>
<th>In Percentages² (n=96)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Mean scores are computed by averaging the ratings of all respondents. The means are computed using a scale from 1 to 7 where 1=Much Worse and 7=Significant Improvement. The higher the mean score, the more the Courts have improved over the past few years. The midpoint of the scale is 4.0 = no change. The averages exclude respondents who did not answer the question or answered don’t know/not sure/not applicable.

2. Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.
Level of Improvement Over Past Few Years - 2015

**Fair and Timely Resolution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Improvement</th>
<th>By Mean¹</th>
<th>In Percentages²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Worse</td>
<td></td>
<td>Don't Know/No Answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Mean scores are computed by averaging the ratings of all respondents. The means are computed using a scale from 1 to 7 where 1=Much Worse and 7=Significant Improvement. The higher the mean score, the more the Courts have improved over the past few years. The midpoint of the scale is 4.0 = no change. The averages exclude respondents who did not answer the question or answered don’t know/not sure/not applicable.

² Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Level of Improvement Over Past Few Years - 2015

**Public Education & Collaboration with Partners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Improvement</th>
<th>By Mean¹</th>
<th>In Percentages²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Worse</td>
<td></td>
<td>Don't Know/No Answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Mean scores are computed by averaging the ratings of all respondents. The means are computed using a scale from 1 to 7 where 1=Much Worse and 7=Significant Improvement. The higher the mean score, the more the Courts have improved over the past few years. The midpoint of the scale is 4.0 = no change. The averages exclude respondents who did not answer the question or answered don’t know/not sure/not applicable.

² Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.
Level of Improvement Over Past Few Years – 2015

Employee Development/Work Environment

By Mean

In Percentages\(^2\)

(n=96)

\[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\hline
\text{By Mean} & \text{In Percentages} & \text{All Respondents} & \text{Judges/Staff} & \text{Comm. Memb/Partners} \\
\hline
\text{Significant Improvement} & 7.0 & \text{Improved} & \text{Improving} & \text{No Change} & \text{Worse} & \text{Don’t Know/No Answer} \\
\hline
\text{No Change} & 4.3 & 18\% & 7\% & 23\% & 52\% \\
\hline
\text{Much Worse} & 0.7 & 5\% & 13\% & 9\% & 57\% \\
\hline
\end{array}\]

1 Mean scores are computed by averaging the ratings of all respondents. The mean improvements using a scale from 1 to 7 where 1=Much Worse and 7=Significant Improvement. The higher the mean score, the more the Courts have improved over the past few years. The midpoint of the scale is 4.0 = no change. The averages exclude respondents who did not answer the question or answered don’t know/not sure/not applicable.

2 Percentages may not equal 100\% due to rounding.

Level of Improvement Over Past Few Years - 2015

Infrastructure

By Mean

In Percentages

(n=96)

\[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\hline
\text{By Mean} & \text{In Percentages} & \text{All Respondents} & \text{Judges/Staff} & \text{Comm. Memb/Partners} \\
\hline
\text{Significant Improvement} & 3.6 & \text{Improved} & \text{Improving} & \text{No Change} & \text{Worse} & \text{Don’t Know/No Answer} \\
\hline
\text{No Change} & 4.9 & 18\% & 7\% & 23\% & 52\% \\
\hline
\text{Much Worse} & 1.0 & 5\% & 13\% & 9\% & 57\% \\
\hline
\end{array}\]

1 Mean scores are computed by averaging the ratings of all respondents. The means are computed using a scale from 1 to 7 where 1=Much Worse and 7=Significant Improvement. The higher the mean score, the more the Courts have improved over the past few years. The midpoint of the scale is 4.0 = no change. The averages exclude respondents who did not answer the question or answered don’t know/not sure/not applicable.

2 Percentages may not equal 100\% due to rounding.
Overall Performance of the Courts in Coconino County in 2015

Overall Performance of Courts in 2015
2010 vs. 2015 Ratings (in mean scores\(^1\); n=96)

1. Mean scores are computed by averaging the ratings of all respondents. A 4 point rating scale was used for this question where 1=Poor and 4=Excellent.
   The midpoint of the scale is 2.5. The averages exclude respondents who did not answer the question or answered don’t know/not sure/not applicable.
Overall Performance – 2010 vs. 2015

Coconino Superior Court

By Mean¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010 - All</th>
<th>2015 - All</th>
<th>2015 - Judges/Staff</th>
<th>2015 - External Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015 - In Percentages²
(n=96)

- Excellent: 10%
- Good: 9%
- Fair: 44%
- Poor: 29%
- Don't Know: 16%

¹ The mean score shows the average ratings of all respondents. The average excludes respondents who did not answer or answered don’t know/not sure. The mean of means was computed using a scale from 1 to 4 where 1=Poor and 4=Excellent. The midpoint of the scale is 2.5.

² Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Overall Performance – 2010 vs. 2015

Flagstaff Municipal Court

By Mean¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010 - All</th>
<th>2015 - All</th>
<th>2015 - Judges/Staff</th>
<th>2015 - External Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015 - In Percentages²
(n=96)

- Excellent: 29%
- Good: 14%
- Fair: 39%
- Poor: 2%
- Don't Know: 16%

¹ The mean score shows the average ratings of all respondents. The average excludes respondents who did not answer or answered don’t know/not sure. The mean of means was computed using a scale from 1 to 4 where 1=Poor and 4=Excellent. The midpoint of the scale is 2.5.

² Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.
Overall Performance – 2010 vs. 2015

Fredonia Municipal Court

By Mean¹

Excellent 4.0
Good 3.0
Midpoint
Fair 2.0
Poor 1.0

2015 - In Percentages²
(n=96)

1 The mean score shows the average ratings of all respondents. The average excludes respondents who did not answer or answered don’t know/not sure. The mean of means was computed using a scale from 1 to 4 where 1=Poor and 4=Excellent. The midpoint of the scale is 2.5.
2 Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Overall Performance – 2010 vs. 2015

Page Municipal Court

By Mean¹

Excellent 4.0
Good 3.0
Midpoint
Fair 2.0
Poor 1.0

2015 - In Percentages²
(n=96)

1 The mean score shows the average ratings of all respondents. The average excludes respondents who did not answer or answered don’t know/not sure. The mean of means was computed using a scale from 1 to 4 where 1=Poor and 4=Excellent. The midpoint of the scale is 2.5.
2 Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.
Overall Performance – 2010 vs. 2015

Williams Municipal Court

By Mean¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010 - All</th>
<th>2015 - All</th>
<th>2015 - Judges/Staff</th>
<th>2015 - External Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015 - In Percentages²

- Excellent: 23%
- Good: 57%
- Fair: 15%
- Poor: 2%
- Don't Know: 4%

¹ The mean score shows the average ratings of all respondents. The average excludes respondents who did not answer or answered don't know/not sure. The mean of means was computed using a scale from 1 to 4 where 1 = Poor and 4 = Excellent. The midpoint of the scale is 2.5.

² Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Overall Performance – 2010 vs. 2015

Flagstaff Justice Court

By Mean¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010 - All</th>
<th>2015 - All</th>
<th>2015 - Judges/Staff</th>
<th>2015 - External Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015 - In Percentages²

- Excellent: 26%
- Good: 16%
- Fair: 41%
- Poor: 15%
- Don't Know: 2%

¹ The mean score shows the average ratings of all respondents. The average excludes respondents who did not answer or answered don't know/not sure. The mean of means was computed using a scale from 1 to 4 where 1 = Poor and 4 = Excellent. The midpoint of the scale is 2.5.

² Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.
Overall Performance – 2010 vs. 2015

Fredonia Justice Court

By Mean¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>2010 - All</th>
<th>2015 - All</th>
<th>2015 - Judges/Staff</th>
<th>2015 - External Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015 - In Percentages²

- Excellent: 11%
- Good: 61%
- Fair: 23%
- Poor: 3%
- Don't Know: 2%

¹ The mean score shows the average ratings of all respondents. The averages excludes respondents who did not answer or answered don’t know/not sure. The mean of means was computed using a scale from 1 to 4 where 1=Poor and 4=Excellent. The midpoint of the scale is 2.5.
² Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Overall Performance – 2010 vs. 2015

Page Justice Court

By Mean¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>2010 - All</th>
<th>2015 - All</th>
<th>2015 - Judges/Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015 - In Percentages²

- Excellent: 10%
- Good: 56%
- Fair: 25%
- Poor: 4%
- Don't Know: 5%

¹ The mean score shows the average ratings of all respondents. The averages excludes respondents who did not answer or answered don’t know/not sure. The mean of means was computed using a scale from 1 to 4 where 1=Poor and 4=Excellent. The midpoint of the scale is 2.5.
² Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.
Overall Performance – 2010 vs. 2015

Williams Justice Court

By Mean¹

2015 - In Percentages²
(n=96)

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't Know

2015 - All
2015 - All
2015 - Judges/Staff
2015 - External Partners

¹ The mean score shows the average ratings of all respondents. The average excludes respondents who did not answer or answered don’t know/not sure. The mean of means was computed using a scale from 1 to 4 where 1=Poor and 4=Excellent. The midpoint of the scale is 2.5.

² Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Greatest Strengths
Greatest Strengths of the Courts in Coconino County\textsuperscript{1} – 2010 vs. 2015 (Rank order by most frequently mentioned)

**See next slide for examples of comments provided in 2015.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010 (n=136)</th>
<th>2015\textsuperscript{**} (n=194)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judges/Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Partners/Positive Relations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service/Access</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/Mgt./Court Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative/Open to New Ideas</td>
<td>4 (tie)</td>
<td>5 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Programs/Use of Alternative Programs</td>
<td>5 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning/Commitment to Improvement</td>
<td>4 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1} This was a multiple response, open-ended question; respondents were asked to type in up to 3 greatest strengths.

Greatest Strengths of the Courts in Coconino County – Examples of Comments in Each Category - 2015

**Examples of Comments - 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Examples of Comments - 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judges/Staff</td>
<td>• Competent and professional; fair/impartial judges; dedicated, kind, caring staff; judges and staff treat court users with respect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Partners/Positive Relations</td>
<td>• Cooperation and coordination of efforts among justice partners; coordinated delivery of justice; collaboration with criminal justice and community partners; positive relations between Courts and County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service/Access</td>
<td>• Strong customer service orientation; court is available; Law Library services and resources; ease of access; good customer service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/Mgt./Court Administration</td>
<td>• Excellent court administrative leadership; progressive leadership; excellent bench leadership; strong leadership of PJ and Ct. Admin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative/Open to New Ideas</td>
<td>• Willingness to innovate and change; use innovative approaches; willingness to make changes and adapt; willingness to try new programs and approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Programs/Use of Alternative Programs</td>
<td>• Implementation of diversion programs/specialty courts to assist vulnerable populations (e.g., veterans, mental health, drug, family); availability of problem solving courts; use of ADR and evidence based programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Biggest Barriers to Accessing or Using the Courts – 2010 vs. 2015

(Rank order by most frequently mentioned)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010 (n=93)</th>
<th>2015 (n=96)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance to travel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty understanding what they have to do once they get to court</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of hiring an attorney</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time it takes away from home/work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Biggest Challenges/Emerging Issues in the New Few Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comm. Memb/Partners</th>
<th>Judges/Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources/declining budgets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing need for legal assistance/services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing need for treatment programs/services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating evidence based/restorative approaches</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting/retaining a diverse and skilled staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Highest and Lowest Rated Future Priorities – New Programs and Services – 2015** (rank order by most/least frequently mentioned)

### Highest Rated

| Ability to do business remotely/electronically | 1   | 1   |
| Self-help/pro se assistance                    | 2   | 2   |
| Specialty/problem solving courts               | 3   |     |
| Services for families through Family Court     | 4   | 4   |
| Adequate facilities                            | 2   |     |

### Lowest Rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comm. Memb/Partners</th>
<th>Judges/Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services to jurors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language assistance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Most Wanted Changes/Improvements in the Next 5 Years

**Most Wanted Changes/Improvements in the Next 5 Years¹ – 2010 vs. 2015** (Rank order by most frequently mentioned)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010 (n=129)</th>
<th>2015** (n=195)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve/Expand Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Facilities, Space, Parking, Security</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Customer Service/Enhance Access</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Existing/Add New Programs and Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Timely Resolution/Case Mgt./Effectiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Specialty/Drug Courts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ This was a multiple response, open-ended question; respondents were asked to type in up to 3 greatest strengths.

**See next slide for examples of comments provided in 2015.**
### Most Wanted Changes/Improvements in the Next 5 Years – 2015 - Examples of Comments in Each Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Examples of Comments - 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve/Expand Technology</td>
<td>• Better use technology to increase access, improve efficiency, etc. – e.g., remote hearings, video-conferencing/appearances, e-file, e-pay, online access to court and case info., digital time sheets; better case mgt. system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Facilities, Space, Parking, Security</td>
<td>• Improve/update facilities, parking, security, building signage; new Flagstaff City Court facility; improve parking for Sup. Ct. and Justice Ct. (garage).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Customer Service/Enhance Access</td>
<td>• Improve access for poor and pro se litigants; improve phone access (to a live person); make it easier to get information; increase understandability; provide faster county service on busy days; expand hours of services; court hotline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Existing/Add New Programs and Services</td>
<td>• Enhance language/interpreter services; expand prevention programs; enhance mediation programs; greater use/reliance on evidence-based practices/risk and needs assmts; expand services to mental health and substance abuse; implement innovative programs/problem solving courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Timely Resolution/Case Mgt./Effectiveness</td>
<td>• Reduce time it takes to resolve felony cases; reduce unnecessary delay; increase timely resolution; better coordinate Sup. Ct. calendars – increase efficiency; standardize/more consistency in procedures/processes; more timely processing and dissemination of court documents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>