

Arizona Supreme Court Data Standardization Advisory Committee

AGENDA

June 25, 2024, 10:00 am – 12 noon, Zoom Webinar

9:50 a.m.	Zoom Webinar Open for Members, Attendees and Presenters	Laura Ritenour
Meeting Opening		
10:00 a.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcome to Members and Roll Call of Attendees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Tony Sita as proxy for Adele May o Joe Hamilton as proxy for Ester Reeves - Review and Vote May 28, 2024, Meeting Minutes 	Cathy Clarich, Chair (substituting for Michael Malone)
Items from Previous Meeting/s		
10:05 a.m.	Review/Discuss (Michele Gillich and Laura Ritenour) - Updates on Proposed Implementation for Integration, Required Data Elements, and Code Standardization and Draft Administrative Order	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commission on Technology recommended approval of draft Admin Order - Draft Admin Order going through Legal and leadership review and approval process - “Master Plan” with timelines currently being reviewed by AOC staff, should be ready for committee review at July meeting 	
10:15 a.m.	Review/Discuss/Vote (Michele Gillich, Laura Ritenour, and Mary Bellefeuille) – Standardizing Warrant Codes for Public Safety Assessment Project and other future projects (ex: eWarrant)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Warrant Type - Warrant Reason - Warrant Authority - Bond Type on Warrant - Extradition 	
10:45 a.m.	Update (Laura Ritenour) - SB1197 Juvenile Offenders Monetary Sanctions –	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Courts still working through processing of cases, most courts expect to be done this fall - So far, from courts that have completed automation, over 16,000 cases affected and \$5M balances vacated 	
10:50 a.m.	Review/Discuss/Vote - (Laura Ritenour and Mary Bellefeuille) –Standardization Requests	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Request to Add Bail Eligibility to the Case Type Code Set - Request to Standardize Contact Status Definitions - Request to acknowledge Department of Public Safety (DSP) as authority of codes for Law Enforcement Agency Required Data Element* (ORI Numbers for courts and agencies) and 	

	United States Postal Service (USPS) as authority of codes for Driver License/ID State Required Data Element* (state abbreviations) *For these RDE's, AOC will provide link to the agency and inform members of updates		
New Items			
11:00 a.m.	Review/Discuss (Mary Bellefeuille) – Update Previously Approved Case Type table to reflect correct Case Category Association		
11:10 a.m.	Update (Laura Ritenour) - Highlights from June 6 th Data Standards Steering Committee Meeting		
11:15 a.m.	Review/Discuss (Laura Ritenour) - Counting Continuances – Courts' Perspectives and Information		
Ongoing Business			
11:45 am	Update (All Members)	Updates, Comments and Questions from Members	
11:55 am		Call to the Public	Cathy Clarich, Chair
	Reminder	Next Meeting: Tuesday, July 30, 2024, 10 a.m. – 12 noon, via Zoom Webinar – Michael Malone to chair	Cathy Clarich, Chair
12:00 p.m.	Adjournment (motion needed)		Cathy Clarich, Chair

Link to OneDrive folder with all DS Advisory Committee meeting videos (July 2023 – present): [DS Advisory Committee Recordings](#)

DATA STANDARDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

May 28, 2024

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., via Zoom Webinar

DRAFT MINUTES

Present: Laurie Allen, Odette Apodaca, Gil Bensinger, Daniel Bowman, Summer Dalton, Niltza Flores, Ralph Garcia, Todd Herrera-Ridenhour, Susann Holland, Randy Kennedy, Mike Malone, Adele May, Mike Nintz, Ester Reeves, Ginger Rodas, Marcos Romero, Danica Sanchez, Adam Walterson, Jeanette Wiesenhofer

Not Present: Roopa Kalidindi and Katrina Solis

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and Guests: Alexis Allen (Tempe Municipal Court), Lorri Behunin (Chandler Municipal Court), Tom Carroll (Phoenix Municipal Court), Cathy Clarich (AOC), Melanie Cluff (AOC), Jennifer Ferguson (Maricopa County), Michele Gillich (AOC), Joe Hamilton (Phoenix City Court), Leon Li (AOC), Anirban Mitra (AOC), Daniel Paulson (Mesa City Court), Chris Phelps (Scottsdale Municipal Court), and Laura Ritenour (AOC)

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The May 28, 2024, meeting of the Data Standards Advisory Committee was called to order by chair Mike Malone at 10:02 a.m.

B. April 30, 2024, Meeting Minutes

The April 30, 2024, draft meeting minutes were published Tuesday, May 21st for member review. Ginger Rodas moved to approve the minutes and Niltza Flores seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

II. ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

A. Proposed Implementation for Integration, Required Data Elements, and Code Standardization

Laura Ritenour presented an overview of how requirements for integration projects, required data elements, legislation, statistical reports, and code standardization will all be included in the Central Case Repository (CCR) Integration Design Specification documentation. The new plan is for all required data elements to be transmitted to the CCR. Courts shall first ensure that they meet all requirements in the documentation for integration projects. Then required data elements transactions will eventually be added to the documentation after input from committee members and approval by the Technical Advisory Council. Courts will be requested to give updates at the

Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) meetings on their progress to meeting the documentation requirements. Marcos Romero asked about CACC membership and the notification process. Chris Phelps, CACC Chair, was present and able to answer questions. Mike Malone discussed how to apply to committees. Ester Reeves asked AOC staff to develop a two-year overview plan for the implementation and Laura Ritenour said she will present that at either the June or July meeting. Ester Reeves asked if the transmission methods for MVD and TIP will eventually be moved to CCR and Michele Gillich said she will ask the IT manager for that project to respond to the committee. Marcos Romero spoke about the possibility of courts having to make changes to their CMS based on the new plan for submitting transactions to the CCR and that was acknowledged. Randy Kennedy asked for updates submitted to the Specification documentation to be included and for the latest version to be shared soon and Michele Gillich agreed to do that.

B. Updated Draft Administrative Order

Laura Ritenour presented the latest draft administrative orders for feedback. Ester Reeves requested, and other members concurred, that additional language regarding collaboration with the committee be added. Laura Ritenour will work on adding that language and the latest draft will be presented at the June 6th Commission on Technology (COT) meeting.

C. Warrant Code Standardization

Laura Ritenour displayed the updated spreadsheet with the comments from each court. Tempe's information seemed incorrect, and Laura Ritenour will follow up with that. AOC staff will meet before the next meeting to review the courts' answers and discuss next steps. This item will be on the June agenda.

D. SB1197 Updates

Laura Ritenour provided updates on the automation for vacating eligible unpaid monetary obligations for juveniles, their parents, and guardians. The next check in meeting is Friday, May 31st and the committee members had been invited. Members should reach out to Laura Ritenour if they need meeting invites sent to others as well. Once all participating courts have completed their automation, manual case processing, or both, an administrative directive will be sent out with timelines for data collection. Data collection is required by this legislation.

E. Time Standards Updates

Laura Ritenour provided updates on time standards including that a statewide memo will be sent in June reminding courts of the requirement to submit in July the Time to Disposition Summary reports for FY24. Laura reminded the members of the 30-minute time standards overview training on TraCorp and of the [SharePoint site](#) where court staff may sign up for upcoming time standards trainings.

III. NEW ITEMS

A. Data Standardization Advisory Committee Meeting Recordings

Laura Ritenour advised members that all meetings since June 2023 have been recorded and the recordings are now available on a SharePoint site. The link was provided in the agenda.

B. New Event Standardization

- i. **Request to standardize Court/Court Jurisdiction code set** - Laura Ritenour and Michele Gillich presented on the request to standardize Court/Court Jurisdiction for required data elements and for integration projects. Court is part of the data feed for all CCR transactions (CaseNumber1 of the Case Number 4 Part Key). The group discussed the request and a motion to approve the statewide standardization of the court/court jurisdiction codes and descriptions was made by Summer Dalton and seconded by Randy Kennedy. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.
- ii. **Request to add Bail Eligibility to the Case Type code set** - Laura Ritenour and Susann Holland presented on the request to add this code and description to the Case Type code set. Some superior courts are initiating a Bail Eligibility case when a Bail Eligibility Hearing is scheduled in a superior court for a case in which the Initial Appearance was held in the justice court, but the case has not yet been filed in the superior court. Bail Eligibility Hearings are required per AZ Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 7.2(b). Members asked questions and Mike Malone asked AOC staff to discuss this request on the May 30th Limited Jurisdiction Court Administrators' meeting. This item will be added to the June agenda.
- iii. **Request to standardize Contact Status Definitions** - Laura Ritenour presented on the request to standardize contact status definitions to increase clarity for this code set. Members asked questions specifically regarding the Future contact status and if logic is recommended that when a date attached to the Future contact status is reached that the Future contact become the Primary or another status. AOC staff will discuss and bring more information to the next meeting. This item will be added to the June agenda.
- iv. **Required Data Elements for Law Enforcement Agency and Driver License/ID State** - Laura Ritenour proposed that since these two elements are officially standardized by other organizations (ORIs by DPS and state by the United States Postal Service) that AOC staff would not be maintaining the code sets. Mike Malone suggested that the committee be asked to approve DPS and USPS as the official standards authorities. Laura Ritenour agreed, and that request will be brought to the June meeting.

C. Definition of Required Data Element Concurrent/Consecutive Sentence Flag

Laura Ritenour and Danica Sanchez presented the current definition and discussed how to make this definition more specific for data requests. Members discussed their ideas and AOC staff will discuss this further and bring this item back to the June meeting.

D. Continuance Data

Laura Ritenour proposed the committee begin to discuss a possible future statewide report for continuance data. All case management systems should send Laura Ritenour an email outlining how continuance data would be counted in their court and also report any challenges with gathering this data as well.

IV. ONGOING BUSINESS

A. Updates, Comments and Questions from Members

No updates, comments or questions were provided.

B. Call to the Public

Mike Malone made a call to the public for comments. Chris Phelps thanked the committee for its work.

C. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Marcos Romero. The meeting was adjourned at 11:51 a.m.

D. Next Committee Meeting Date

Tuesday, June 25, 2024, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Zoom Webinar

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

In the Matter of:)
)
SUBMISSION OF STANDARDIZED) Administrative Order
CASE-RELATED DATA) DRAFT No. 2024-XX
TO CENTRAL CASE REPOSITORY)
_____)

Accurate court case data is crucial for timely case resolution and efficient allocation of judicial resources. Additionally, court digital data is shared with various government agencies, impacting driving, criminal, and voting records. It can also influence warrant issuance, credit reporting, prison terms, gun ownership, employment, officer safety, military service, and other critical activities. Data standards play a vital role in measuring and analyzing case processing times achieved in Arizona courts. Defining what data to collect and who collects it is essential for staff training and accuracy monitoring.

Arizona Code of Judicial Administration (ACJA) § 1-501: Court Automation Standards requires that courts use state sponsored and authorized automation systems except where a local exception has been granted. The success of system integration projects depends on common code sets statewide, regardless of the automation system used. All courts' case management systems, including local exception systems, must be able to submit and accept standard data elements when populating statewide data repositories or participating in statewide technology projects.

To these ends, ACJA § 1-508: Required Data Elements seeks to ensure the quality, completeness, and consistency of Arizona court data across the judicial branch by ensuring that all courts collect and report certain standard data elements.

Therefore, pursuant to Article VI, Section 3, of the Arizona Constitution,

IT IS ORDERED that all general and limited jurisdiction courts shall submit data to the Administrative Office of the Court's (AOC) Central Case Repository (CCR) as specified in the CCR Integration Design Specification documentation.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Administrative Director shall promulgate a phased implementation schedule that shall be developed in coordination with the Data Standardization Advisory Committee.

Dated this __ day of _____, 2024.

ROBERT BRUTINEL,
Chief Justice

Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Warrant Type Description and Code, Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team

Background and Issue

The AOC Information Technology Team is requesting the standardization of the warrant type codes and descriptions. Standardizing the codes related to this data element would allow for more consistent reporting regarding elements associated with warrant types for future data requests. Having warrant types would also be helpful for the Public Safety Assessment (PSA) project for courts and other future projects.

Public Access and eAccess Display

Should this data be displayed on Public Access? No

Should be this document be displayed in eAccess? No

Possible Interfaces Affected: eWarrant

Requested Implementation Timeline

When approved, the codes would be added to the AOC's FME Data Translation Server and courts would need to transmit these codes per the CCR Integration Design Specification documentation by February 28, 2025.

Motion

Move to recommend the Warrant Type code and standard description listed below as statewide standards.

Warrant Type Code/Description

Proposed Standard Code	Proposed Standard Description
AW	Arrest Warrant
BW	Bench Warrant
SW	Search Warrant
EW	Extradition Warrant
DW	Dispossessory Warrant
CW	Capais Warrant

Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Warrant Reason Description and Code, Requested by: AOC Court Services

Background and Issue

Administrative Directive 2022-12 directs the implementation of Phase One of the Required Data Elements initiative. Warrant Reason is an element in the Appendix B list. Standardizing the codes related to this data element would allow for more consistent reporting regarding elements associated with warrant reasons for future data requests.

Public Access and eAccess Display

Should this data be displayed on Public Access? No

Should be this document be displayed in eAccess? No

Possible Interfaces Affected: eWarrant

Requested Implementation Timeline

When approved, the codes would be added to the AOC's FME Data Translation Server and courts would need to transmit these codes per the CCR Integration Design Specification documentation by February 28, 2025.

Motion

Move to recommend the Warrant Reason code and standard description listed below as statewide standards.

Warrant Reason Code/Description **(THOSE IN RED WERE ADDED BY PHOENIX)**

Proposed Standard Code	Proposed Standard Description
CAW	CIVIL ARREST WARRANT
FTA	FAILURE TO APPEAR
FTC	FAILURE TO COMPLY
IAW	INITIAL ARREST WARRANT
MWF	MATERIAL WITNESS (Felony case)

MWM	MATERIAL WITNESS (Misdemeanor case)
PTR	PETITION TO REVOKE
VRC	VIOLATION OF RELEASE CONDITIONS
GRJ	GRAND JURY
PCW	PROBABLE CAUSE WARRANT
PVW	PAROLE VIOLATION WARRANT
FAW	FIDUCIARY ARREST WARRANT
CAA	CHILD SUPPORT ARREST WARRANT
VPA	VIOLATION OF PROMISE TO APPEAR
FTP	FAILURE TO PAY
AW	ARREST WARRANT

Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Warrant Authority Description and Code, Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team

Background and Issue

The AOC Information Technology Team is requesting the standardization of the warrant authority codes and descriptions. Standardizing the codes related to this data element would allow for more consistent reporting regarding elements associated with warrant authority for future data requests. Having warrant authority would also be helpful for the Public Safety Assessment (PSA) project for courts (future project).

Public Access and eAccess Display

Should this data be displayed on Public Access? No

Should be this document be displayed in eAccess? No

Possible Interfaces Affected: eWarrant

Requested Implementation Timeline

When approved, the codes would be added to the AOC's FME Data Translation Server and courts would need to transmit these codes per the CCR Integration Design Specification documentation by February 28, 2025.

Motion

Move to recommend the Warrant Authority code and standard description listed below as statewide standards.

Warrant Authority Code/Description **(THOSE IN RED WERE ADDED BY OTHER COURTS)**

Proposed Standard Code	Proposed Standard Description
4000000	ARS 13-2506A1 Failure to Appear
4000001	ARS 13-2506A2 Vio of Written Promise/Notice to
4000002	ARS 13-2507A Failure to Appear Warrant
4000003	Failure to Appear Warrant (no prosecutor charge)
4000004	ARS 13-2810A2 Failure to Comply Warrant
4000005	ARS 13-3812 INITIAL ARREST WARRANT

4000006	ARS 13-4083A Material Witness Warrant
4000007	ARS 13-810A Failure to Pay Warrant
4000008	ARS 13-901C Probation Violation Warrant
4000009	JUVENILE WARRANT
4000010	Rule 3.1A1 Grand Jury Warrant
4000011	Rule 3.1D Pre-Adjudication Warrant
4000012	Rule 64.1B Civil Arrest Warrant
4000013	Rule 7.5B Breach of Condition of Release Warrant
4000014	Rule 94.2 Child Support Arrest Warrant
4000015	Rule 26.12C Post-Adjudication Warrant
4000016	Rule 3.1(e) Criminal ATTC
4000017	Rule 3.13C Long form pre-adjudication
4000018	Body Attachment (witness FTA warrant)

Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Bond Type Description and Code, Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team

Background and Issue

Administrative Directive 2023-10 directs the implementation of Phase One of the Required Data Elements initiative. Bond Type is an element in the Appendix A list. The AOC Information Technology Team is requesting the standardization of the bond type codes and descriptions to allow for more consistent reporting regarding this element for future data requests. Having bond type codes would also be helpful for the Public Safety Assessment (PSA) project for courts (future project).

Public Access and eAccess Display

Should this data be displayed on Public Access? No

Should be this document be displayed in eAccess? No

Possible Interfaces Affected: eWarrant

Requested Implementation Timeline

When approved, the codes would be added to the AOC's FME Data Translation Server and courts would need to transmit these codes per the CCR Integration Design Specification documentation by February 28, 2025.

Motion

Move to recommend the Bond Type code and standard descriptions listed below as statewide standards.

Bond Type Code/Description

Proposed Standard Code	Proposed Standard Description
4000000	CASH
4000001	SURETY
4000002	PROPERTY
4000003	DEPOSIT
4000004	SECURED
4000005	UNSECURE

Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Warrant Extradition Description and Code, Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team

Background and Issue

The AOC Information Technology Team is requesting the standardization of the warrant extradition codes and descriptions to comply with the codes accepted by the Arizona Crime Information Center (ACIC) and the National Crime Information Center (NCIC). Standardizing the codes related to this data element would allow for more consistent reporting regarding elements associated with warrant extradition for future data requests. Having warrant extradition codes would also be helpful for the Public Safety Assessment (PSA) project for courts (future project).

Public Access and eAccess Display

Should this data be displayed on Public Access? No

Should be this document be displayed in eAccess? No

Possible Interfaces Affected: eWarrant

Requested Implementation Timeline

When approved, the codes would be added to the AOC's FME Data Translation Server and courts would need to transmit these codes per the CCR Integration Design Specification documentation by February 28, 2025.

Motion

Move to recommend the Warrant Extradition code and standard descriptions listed below as statewide standards.

Warrant Extradition Code/Description

Standard Code	Standard Description
AZ	STATEWIDE
AJ	ADJACENT COUNTIES ONLY
CO	WITHIN COUNTY
LM	LIMITED (requires additional info in MIS)
BLANK	NO EXTRADITION
A	FULL EXTRADITION

B	LIMITED (requires additional info in MIS)
C	SURROUNDING STATE ONLY
D	NO EXTRADITION - IN-STATE PICK UP ONLY (requires additional info in MIS)
E	PENDING (requires additional info in MIS)
F	PENDING DETERMINATION
1	FULL EXTRADITION
2	LIMITED (requires additional info in MIS)
3	SURROUNDING STATE ONLY
4	NO EXTRADITION - IN-STATE PICK UP ONLY (requires additional info in MIS)
5	PENDING (requires additional info in MIS)
6	PENDING DETERMINATION

Data Standardization Workgroup – Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Case Type Code and Description for Bail Eligibility; Requested by: AOC Court Services

Background and Issue

The AOC Court Services is requesting to standardize the Bail Eligibility Case Type code and description (which was previously approved in 2017/2018) for General Jurisdiction courts only. The Bail Eligibility case type would be entered when a Bail Eligibility Hearing is scheduled in a superior court for a case in which the Initial Appearance was held in the justice court, but the case has not yet been filed in the superior court. Bail Eligibility Hearings are required per AZ Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 7.2(b).

Public Access and eAccess Display – not applicable

Requested Implementation Timeline

When approved, the codes would be added to the AOC’s FME Data Translation Server and courts would need to transmit these codes per the CCR Integration Design Specification documentation by February 28, 2025.

Proposed Motion

Move to recommend the previously approved Case Type code and description listed below as a statewide standard.

Case Type Table (GJ Only)

Previously Approved Code (GJ) - Proposed Standard	Standard Description
BEH	Bail Eligibility

Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Contact Status Definitions, Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

- The Contact Status codes and descriptions were approved by this committee on September 26, 2023. The AOC Information Technology Integration team is requesting the approval of definitions for each Contact Status to ensure that courts use each status for its intended purpose.
- NOTE: The statuses below do not replace the Record Security Indicators on each transaction submitted to the CCR. See CCR Integration Design Specification documentation for more information. For example, data feeds to CCR for Stage Address transactions still require flags set to 0=No and 1=Yes for IsMailingAddress, IsPrimaryAddress, etc.
- NOTE: Reporting of a data contact status of Primary or Protected is not required as a data contact status for CCR/CORE reporting since courts are required to also report as a separate indicator.

Public Access and eAccess Display – not applicable

Requested Implementation Timeline

When approved, the codes would be added to the AOC’s FME Data Translation Server and courts would need to transmit these codes per the CCR Integration Design Specification documentation by February 28, 2025.

Proposed Motion

Motion to approve the Contact Status definitions below.

Approved Contact Status Code	Approved Contact Status Description	Proposed Definition	Examples
ACT	Active	Refers to an address, phone number, and email address that a party identifies as being in a working or valid status. A party may have multiple addresses, phone numbers, and email addresses that are active.	Residential and employment mailing address; numbers for a cell phone and land line; multiple email addresses
FUT	Future	Refers to an address, phone number, and email address that will become valid or operational at a future date. A way of indicating where a party will be reachable once the transition occurs. A party may designate a date on which	The party plans to move to a new residence or a obtain a new phone number in the future.

		the contact will change from a future status to an active status.	
PRI	Prior	Refers to an address, phone number, and email address that was valid or in use by a party before a change occurred	A previous residence where someone lived, a phone number used prior to switching to a new one.
PRM	Primary	Refers to the contact information that a party identifies as being the main address, phone number, or email address. A party may have multiple Active address, phone number, and email address; however, only one may be marked primary for the contact type. A primary mailing address is where someone wants to receive their mail.	The party has both an active residential and employment address, but their primary mailing address would be the address they want to receive their mail at.
PRO	Protected	Refers to an address, phone number, and email address that a party has had officially designated as needing to be shielded or safeguarded from public disclosure or access which typically granted to those with safety concerns.	Victims of domestic violence, law enforcement officers
BAD	Bad/Undeliverable	Refers to an address, phone number, and email address to which mail, phone calls and email information cannot be successfully delivered and is no longer valid.	Incomplete or inaccurate address details, the party having moved without updating their address, the address provided being nonexistent or invalid

Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Approve Department of Safety (DPS) and United States Postal Service (USPS) as authorities for Law Enforcement Agency and Driver License State codes, Requested by: AOC Court Services

Background and Issue

Administrative Directive 2022-12 directs the implementation of Phase One of the Required Data Elements initiative. Law Enforcement Agency and Driver License State codes are elements in the Appendix A list. The ORI codes created by DPS will be used to identify a Law Enforcement Agency and the State codes created by USPS will be used to identify the Driver License State. As a result, AOC staff would not maintain these code sets and is seeking to approve DPS and USPS as the official standards authorities for these two code sets.

Public Access and eAccess Display

Should this data be displayed on Public Access? N/A

Should be this document be displayed in eAccess? N/A

Possible Interfaces Affected: eCitation, eWarrant

Tentative Implementation Timeline

Courts are expected to update their systems within 30 days of any newly approved ORI or Driver License state codes as they are made aware by DPS or USPS.

Proposed Motion

Move to approve DPS as the authority for the ORI codes and USPS as the authority for the Driver License State codes.

Data Standardization Workgroup – FYI

Code Request and Requestor

Update Previously Approved Case Type table to reflect correct Case Category Association; Requested by: AOC Court Services

Background and Issue

It was brought to our attention that the Certificate of Magistracy case type and 6 Civil case types were associated to a non-approved case categories on the Case Type spreadsheet posted to the Code Standardization website. The spreadsheet has been updated to reflect the approved case categories and codes.

Requested Implementation Timeline

When approved, the codes would be added to the AOC’s FME Data Translation Server and courts would need to transmit these codes per the CCR Integration Design Specification documentation by February 28, 2025.

Public Access and eAccess Display – not applicable

Updates Include:

The Case Type spreadsheet on the Code Standardization website has been update with the following:

Case Type Table Updates

Previous, Non-Approved Case Category	Updated Case Category	Updated Case Category Code	Case Type
Certificate of Magistracy	Misdemeanor – Non-Traffic	CM	Certificate of Magistracy
Civil Complaints	Civil	CV	Contract
Civil Complaints	Civil	CV	Debt Collection
Civil Complaints	Civil	CV	Eviction Action
Civil Complaints	Civil	CV	Other Civil Complaints
Civil Complaints	Civil	CV	Small Claims
Civil Complaints	Civil	CV	Torts

Highlights from June 5, 2024 Steering Committee on Data-Based Court Performance and Data Standards Meeting

[Steering Committee on Data-Based Court Performance and Data Standards \(azcourts.gov\)](https://www.azcourts.gov)

Reminder – Meeting Minutes are still in draft and will be reviewed by the committee at its September 4, 2024 meeting.

1. The draft minutes from the March 6, 2024, meeting of the Steering Committee on Data-Based Court Performance and Data Standards were approved.
2. Vice Chief Justice Ann A. Scott Timmer provided an overview the creation of the draft 2024-2029 Strategic Agenda. Her presentation focused on the draft Agenda's data and technology sections. Vice Chief Justice Timmer stressed the importance of data standards for statewide projects and the need for the judicial branch to be proactive when developing guidelines for the practice of law and artificial intelligence (AI).
3. Judge Anna Young, chair of the Committee on Juvenile Courts, reported that at its April meeting, the Committee on Juvenile Courts reviewed a memorandum regarding modification of Juvenile Time Standards. Judge Anna Young presented the recommendations and requested the creation of a collaborative workgroup. The motion for the workgroup was approved. Laura Ritenour will staff the workgroup.
4. Judge Kellie Johnson (Pima County) presented a request to add Remand to Grand Jury (Rule 12.9) as an excluded time reason for felony case time standards. For the felony time standards, there are currently five reasons in which time is excluded, or subtracted, from the total case age. Laura Ritenour mentioned that the AJACS court case management systems already subtract days from the case after the Order to Remand to Grand Jury is entered based on automaton developed pre-dating the time standards. The members approved this request. Courts should attempt to have this exclusion in place by January 1, 2025.
5. Laura Ritenour presented a recommendation that courts copy their local presiding judge when submitting the time standards reports to the AOC each July. At the May Coconino County Limited Jurisdiction Judge and Administrators Workshop, attendees suggested to Laura Ritenour that local presiding judges are copied when courts submit their yearly time standards reports to the AOC. The committee approved the motion that language be added to the current submission instructions that the committee recommends local presiding judges be sent copies of the court's time standards reports.
6. Laura Ritenour presented an overview of the updated Required Data Elements (RDE) implementation plan and a draft administrative order regarding data submission. Laura Ritenour reported that the same plan was presented last week to the Data Standardization Advisory Committee and their input is included in the draft administrative order. This draft administrative order will also be discussed at the June 6th Commission on Technology meeting.

7. At the March 2024 committee meeting, Judge Gates and Laura Ritenour presented on a new idea for felony case data collection that would focus on what cases are meeting the 90 and 180 day time standards for felonies. All three superior court case management systems have shared their initial data. In May, AOC staff met with the county caseload managers and other data points were added including charges, dispositions, priors listed on plea agreements, victims, attorney type, number of continuances, custody status at time of plea, attorney changes, trial settings, and in county/state defendant. Another update will be presented at the September meeting.
8. At its December meeting, the Steering Committee voted unanimously for the creation of a collaborative FCIC-DSSC workgroup to develop recommendations for process improvements and potential Family Law time standard changes. Judge Peterson is the chair of this workgroup and provided a brief update. Judge Peterson remarked on the work of a similar workgroup (the Committee on Family Court Research and Innovation Workgroup) and a meeting he had with that workgroup's chair, Judge Sklar, to ensure there is no overlap between the two workgroups. Another update will be presented at the September meeting.
9. Michael Malone, chair of the Data Standardization Advisory Committee, reported on the committee's progress since March.
10. Cathy Clarich provided an update on the DUI Case Processing Training for Judicial Officers Workgroup. The workgroup hopes to finish their work this fall for presentations at the December Governor's Office of Highway Safety conference and other events.
11. Laura Ritenour provided an update on the Post-Conviction Relief Instructions project. Laura Ritenour reported that the draft instructions are in their final phase of review before being translated into Spanish, and the English and Spanish versions being published on the AOC Self Service Center. She has received input from a variety of committee members, public defense attorneys, formerly incarcerated individuals, staff from Maricopa County's PCR unit, and AOC staff.
12. Justice Beene made a call to the public for comments. There was no answer.
13. The next meeting will be the committee's annual meeting and he hopes as many members can make this meeting in person as possible. If not, there will be a Zoom webinar link for those who must attend remotely. The meeting will be Wednesday, September 4th, 2024, from noon – 3:30 p.m. at the Arizona Connected Workspaces building, 1400 W Washington Street, Phoenix. It's diagonal from the State Court Building and has plenty of free parking. Lunch will be provided for \$5 for members and start at 11:30 a.m. in the same building.

Placeholder for “Counting Continuances”
PowerPoint to be presented at the
meeting