

Arizona Supreme Court Data Standardization Advisory Committee

AGENDA

June 27, 2023, 10:00 am – 12 noon, Zoom Webinar

[Meeting Materials](#)

9:50 am	Zoom Webinar Open for Members, Attendees and Presenters		Laura Ritenour
Meeting Opening			
10:00 am	Welcome and Roll Call		Cathy Clarich for Michael Malone (Chair)
Items from Previous Meeting/s			
10:10 am	Review/Approval	Statewide Standardization of: - Offense Class Table - Mental Health NICS Codes (approved at February 2023 Meeting)	Laura Ritenour, Mary Bellefeuille, and Michele Gillich
10:20 am	Update	Update on SB1588 – Arizona Criminal Justice Commission Criminal Data Repository Bill	Laura Ritenour
10:25 am	Update	Court Role Type table with Court Designations	Laura Ritenour and Mary Bellefeuille
New Items			
10:30 am	Review	Expectations of Data Standardization Advisory Committee Members	Cathy Clarich
10:40 am	Review	Statewide Standardization of: - Preparatory Offense Table - Language Code Table Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Akateko (Akateco) • French Sign Language • Mexican Sign Language (For Voting at July 25, 2023 Meeting)	Laura Ritenour, Mary Bellefeuille, and Michele Gillich
10:45 am	Discuss	Request for New Required Data Elements - Rule 11 Flag (For Voting at July 25, 2023 Meeting)	Summer Dalton
10:55 am	Review	Party Role Definitions (For Voting at July 25, 2023 Meeting)	Laura Ritenour, Mary Bellefeuille, and Michele Gillich

Ongoing Business			
11:00 am	Update/Review	Required Data Elements Initiative - Continue Detailed Review on Appendix C Elements	Laura Ritenour
11:30 am	Review	June 7, 2023 Data Standards Steering Committee Highlights	Laura Ritenour
11:40 am	Update	Updates, Comments and Questions from Members	All Members
11:50 am		Call to the Public	Cathy Clarich
11:55 am	Reminder	Next Meeting: Tuesday, July 25, 2023, 10 a.m. – 12 noon, via Zoom Webinar – Michael Malone to chair	
12 noon	Adjournment		Cathy Clarich

Data Standardization Workgroup – Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Offense Class Code

Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

Courts report monthly to the AOC on filings, sentencings, and dispositions. Some of these reports use “most serious charge” ranking in the counting and grouping of case data. Therefore, it is necessary to standardize the criminal class of offense category for criminal statistical reports. The AOC Information Technology Integration Team is requesting standardized codes and descriptions for Offense Class values that will be displayed in CCR and used by the AOC for statistical reporting.

Tentative Implementation Timeline

When approved, the codes would be added to the AOC’s FME Data Translation Server by July 21, 2023 and courts would need to transmit use these codes or use their FME Data Translation Tool for transactions starting January 29, 2024.

Public Access and eAccess Display – not applicable

Proposed Motion

Motion to approve the statewide standardization of the Offense Class codes and descriptions as listed below.

Proposed Class of Offense	
Codes	Proposed Class of Offense Description
UN	UNDESIGNATED
F	FELONY (UNCLASSIFIED)
F1	FELONY 1ST DEGREE
F2	FELONY 2ND DEGREE
F3	FELONY 3RD DEGREE
F4	FELONY 4TH DEGREE
F5	FELONY 5TH DEGREE
F6	FELONY 6TH DEGREE
M	MISDEMEANOR (UNCLASSIFIED)
M1	MISD. 1ST DEGREE
M2	MISD. 2ND DEGREE
M3	MISD. 3RD DEGREE
PO	PETTY OFFENSE
T1	CIVIL TRAFFIC
NC	NON-CRIMINAL
PK	PARKING

Code Request and Requestor

Mental Health – NICS Interface Event/Docket Codes, Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team

Background and Issue

AOC Information Technology Integration Team is requesting standardized codes that when entered would trigger a quality record submission under NICS Category 5 - *A person adjudicated mental defective or involuntarily committed to a mental institution or incompetent to handle own affairs, including dispositions to criminal charges of found not guilty by reason of insanity or found incompetent to stand trial.* Please see the Scope and AJACS GJ Requirements HB2322 Implementation file for more details. This request was reviewed by the GJ User Group at their January 2023 meeting with no suggested changes.

Proposed Motion

Motion to approve the statewide standardization of the Mental Health – NICS Interface event/docket codes and descriptions as listed below.

1. Finding of Incompetency:

Pursuant to [A.R.S. 13-609A](#): *Person is found incompetent by a court pursuant to rule 11*, has been applied by the court:

Event/Docket Code	Description
2000483	NICS: Finding of Incompetency – NICS Transmission

2. Restoration of rights:

Pursuant to ARS. [13-925 - Restoration of right to possess a firearm; mentally ill persons; petition \(azleg.gov\)](#)

A person adjudicated as a prohibited possessor may file a petition under the same case to restore their right to possess a firearm If the relief is granted, the following

Event/Docket Code	Description
2000484	NICS: Competency Resorted - NICS Removal

3. Defendant is found guilty but insane:

Pursuant to [A.R.S. 13-609C](#): Person is found guilty except insane

- **Disposition Code: GI**

- **Disposition Description:** Guilty but Insane
- There is not an assigned event/docket code

4. Appointment of a Guardian Within Finding of Mental Incapacitation:

Pursuant to [A.R.S. 14-5304G](#): Unless the court makes a specific finding that the appointment of a guardian is due solely to the ward's physical incapacity under subsection F of this section, at the time of appointing a guardian, the court shall transmit the information to the Department of Public Safety

Event/Docket Code	Description
2000485	NICS: Incapacitated/Guardian Appointment – NICS Transmission

5. Terminating Guardianship and or Conservatorship

Event/Docket Code	Description
14026	Ordering – Terminating Guardianship
14028	Order: Terminating Guardians/Conservatorship

6. Correction, event entered in error:

Event/Docket Code	Description
2000482	NICS: NICS Removal (Correction)

7. Mental Health Ordered Treatment Ordered per A.R.S. 36-540(O)

Pursuant to ARS 36-540(O): If a person has been found, as a result of a mental disorder, to constitute a danger to self or others or to have a persistent or acute disability or a grave disability. Requirements of title 13, chapter 31 and title 32, chapter 26, event codes below trigger when to submit to NICS and when to remove from NICS.

Event/Docket Code	Description
13322	Order: Court Ordered Treatment
13781	Order: Restoring Right to Own or Carry Firearm
14046	Order: Treatment
2000486	NICS: Restoration of Rights to Own or Carry Firearm

Approved Court Role Type Table with Court Designations (draft 06/20/2023)

Code to be entered into AOC FME before July 21, 2023	Standard Description	Role Type	Court (MN, JP, SC)
E	3rd Party Defendant	Party	JP, SC
Q	3rd Party Plaintiff	Party	JP, SC
AB	Arbitrator	Judge	MN, JP, SC
AE	Adoptee	Party	SC
AF	Affiant	Party	MN, JP, SC
AG	Attorney General	Attorney	MN, JP, SC
AL	Attorney Law Firm	Participant	MN, JP, SC
AM	AUTMA Minor	Party	SC
F	Applicant	Party	MN, JP, SC
AR	Adoptor	Party	SC
Y	Attorney	Attorney	MN, JP, SC
BA	Bailiff	Court	MN, JP, SC
Z	Bail Bondsman	Participant	MN, JP, SC
BG	Groom	Party	JP, SC
BR	Bride	Party	JP, SC
CA	Child's Best Interest Attorney	Attorney	SC
CB	Court Appointed	Participant	MN, JP, SC
CC	Cross Claimant / Plaintiff	Party	JP, SC
CD	Cross Defendant	Party	JP, SC
CE	Contestee	Party	SC
CF	Fiduciary	Participant	SC
CG	Conflict/Court Appointed	Attorney	MN, JP, SC
CI	Court Appointed Investigator	Participant	SC
CL	Clerk	Court	MN, JP, SC
CO	Court Reporter Organization	Participant	MN, JP, SC
CP	Counter Plaintiff	Party	JP, SC
CR	Contestor	Party	SC
C	Conservator	Participant	SC
CT	Counter Defendant	Party	JP, SC
CU	Court Reporter	Court	MN, JP, SC
DC	Deputy Clerk of Court	Court	MN, JP, SC
D	Defendant	Party	MN, JP, SC
DM	Demandant	Party	SC
F1	Marriage Applicant 1	Party	JP, SC

F2	Marriage Applicant 2	Party	JP, SC
GC	Guardian / Conservator	Participant	SC
GE	Garnishee	Participant	JP, SC
H	Guardian Ad Litem	Participant	SC
G	Guardian	Participant	SC
HP	Harassed Party For W/P Harassment	Party	MN, JP, SC
IE	Interpreter	Court	MN, JP, SC
IN	Incapacitated Person	Party	SC
IP	Incapacitated / Protected Person	Party	SC
IR	Intervenor	Party	JP, SC
IT	Interested Party	Participant	MN, JP, SC
JA	Judicial Assistant	Court	MN, JP, SC
JDG	Judge	Judge	MN, JP, SC
JS	Judicial Staff	Court	MN, JP, SC
JPT	Judge Pro Tem	Judge	MN, JP, SC
A	Appellant	Party	MN, JP, SC
LD	Legal Defender	Attorney	MN, JP, SC
B	Appellee	Party	MN, JP, SC
LP	Legal Paraprofessional	Attorney	MN, JP, SC
MD	Mediator	Judge	MN, JP, SC
M	Minor	Party	MN, JP, SC
MP	Mental Health Professional	Participant	MN, JP, SC
MV	Minor Victim	Party	MN, JP, SC
K	Claimant	Party	JP, SC
ODRVendor	ODRVendor	Participant	MN, JP, SC
OF	Officer	Participant	MN, JP, SC
OP (in the PO Party Role Type table)	Protected Party Other	Party	MN, JP, SC
OR	Objector / Respondent	Party	SC
X	Other	Other	MN, JP, SC
PA	Parent	Party	MN, JP, SC
PA (in the PO Party Role Type table)	Plaintiff Employer Agent	Participant	MN, JP, SC
PB	Probationer	Participant	MN, JP, SC
PC	Protected Child	Party	MN, JP, SC
PD	Proposed Fiduciary	Participant	SC
PE	Petitioner	Party	MN, JP, SC
N	Probation Officer	Court	MN, JP, SC
PF	Public Defender	Attorney	MN, JP, SC
PH	Medical Examiner	Participant	SC

P	Plaintiff	Party	MN, JP, SC
PE (in the PO Party Role Type table)	Plaintiff Employer	Participant	MN, JP, SC
PN	Person	Participant	MN, JP, SC
PP (in the PO Party Role Type table)	Plaintiff Protected	Party	MN, JP, SC
PO	Payor	Participant	MN, JP, SC
OP	Protected Person	Party	MN, JP, SC
PR	Payer	Participant	MN, JP, SC
PS	Prosecutor	Attorney	MN, JP, SC
PT	Patient	Party	SC
PCV	Process Server	Participant	MN, JP, SC
PY	Property	Item	MN, JP, SC
PZ	Payee	Participant	MN, JP, SC
I	Real Party in Interest	Participant	JP, SC
RS	Personal Representative	Participant	SC
R (in the PO Party Role Type table)	Requested (for AZPOINT process)		MN, JP, SC
RT	Respondent	Party	MN, JP, SC
SA	Special Administrator	Participant	SC
SM	Special Master	Judge	SC, JP
ST	State	Party	MN, JP, SC
S	Surety Company	Participant	MN, JP, SC
TG	Testamentary Guardian	Participant	SC
TN	Trust Name	Item	SC
TR	Testator	Participant	SC
T	Trustee	Participant	SC
U	Decedent	Party	SC
UW	Underwriter	Participant	MN, JP, SC
VA	Victim Advocate	Participant	MN, JP, SC
V	Victim	Party	MN, JP, SC
W	Ward	Party	SC
WF	Will Filer	Party	SC
WP	Ward / Protected Person	Party	SC
WT	Witness	Participant	MN, JP, SC

Expectations of Data Standardization Advisory Committee Members

Administrative Order 2023-85 establishes the Data Standardization Advisory Committee and outlines its purpose, membership, organization, and other information. Below are more details on the various sections of the administrative order.

- A. The advisory committee's purpose is to assist in the implementation of the Required Data Elements (ACJA § 1-508) and to review and decide on data elements, codes, and table requests for the purposes of data standardization.
 - a. This means that code and table requests will be reviewed, discussed, and voted on by the advisory committee membership. Items approved by the advisory committee will no longer be added to the Data Standards Steering Committee agenda for their review and approval, only as informational updates.
- B. The advisory committee's membership shall be appointed by Justice Beene, the Steering Committee chair.
 - a. Workgroup members interested in participating in the advisory committee need to complete and submit their application as soon as possible. Justice Beene's decisions on applications will be sent out in mid-June.
 - b. Advisory committee staff will work to ensure representatives from each case management system are members of the advisory committee.
 - c. Appointments will be through December 31, 2025, consistent with the Data Standards Steering Committee term.
 - d. Members are advised to notify the Advisory Committee chair when they can no longer serve or wish to be replaced.
- C. The current AOC Court Services Division Director, Michael Malone, will serve as the advisory committee chair. He may create ad hoc subcommittees and workgroups as needed.
- D. Advisory committee members should plan to attend and participate at all meetings.
 - a. Advisory committee staff will request RSVPs from members to anticipate a quorum.
 - b. Members unable to attend are recommended to submit a completed Proxy Form to be made available to all members. The Proxy Form approval process will follow ACJA § 1-104.
 - c. Members should follow up with their court on all approved decisions to ensure that new codes and tables are implemented timely.
- E. Advisory Committee meetings shall comply with the public meeting policy of ACJA § 1-202.
 - a. Advisory committee staff will be publishing all meeting materials the week before the meeting. A new public-facing website [Data Standardization Advisory Committee \(azcourts.gov\)](https://www.azcourts.gov) has been created with links to meeting materials.
 - b. The current Data Standardization Workgroup SharePoint site will continue to be available for members to access past documents.
 - c. Future (June 2023 onwards) Data Standardization Workgroup Teams meetings will be cancelled and new Advisory Committee Zoom webinars will be scheduled.
 - d. Minutes will be drafted and voted on by members at meetings.
 - e. Public notice of the advisory committee meetings will be published online and at the AOC at least 48 hours prior to the meetings.

- f. Public comment period will be added to all Advisory Committee agendas.
- F. Voting items will only be approved if a quorum exists and if the item receives a majority of votes. The Advisory Committee Chair will have the discretion to raise issues to the Steering Committee for consideration and final decision.

[Link to Membership Application](#) (in DS Advisory Committee folder)

[Link to Proxy Rules and Form](#)

Data Standardization Workgroup – Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Preparatory Offense Codes

Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

Preparatory Offense codes are necessary for criminal history reporting for Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS) and Final Disposition Reporting (FDR). These are a field on the bottom of each form and the codes listed below are from the forms.

FME (Feature Manipulation Engine) requires standard code sets and as a result the AOC Information Technology Integration Team is requesting standardized codes and descriptions for Charge Reduction values that will be displayed in CCR.

Tentative Implementation Timeline

When approved, the codes would be added to the AOC’s FME Data Translation Server by July 21, 2023 and courts would need to transmit use these codes or use their FME Data Translation Tool for transactions starting January 29, 2024.

Public Access and eAccess Display – not applicable

Motion

Motion to approve the statewide standardization of the Preparatory Offense codes and descriptions as listed below.

Proposed Preparatory Offense Codes	Proposed Preparatory Offense Descriptions
F	FACILITATION
S	SOLICITATION
A	ATTEMPTED
C	CONSPIRACY

Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Update and add additional languages to the previously standardized Language Code table; Requested by: AOC Court Services Division and Maricopa County Superior Court

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

At their January 7, 2023 meeting the Data Standards Steering Committee approved a table of standardized language names. Having a standard list of language names allows for more accurate integration with other applications like eFiling.

Since that meeting, Maricopa County reported the misspelling of the Akateko language and the AOC's Language Access Specialist informed the team of two additional sign languages – French and Mexican. FYI – Spanish Sign Language is already on the list. Spanish Sign Language and Mexican Sign Language are different languages with different signs.

Tentative Implementation Timeline

When approved, [put date/s here].

Public Access and eAccess Display

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

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

Proposed Motion

Motion to approve the addition of one updated language spelling and two new languages as listed below.

Current Code	Former Language Name	Proposed Language Name
110004	Akateco	Akateko (Akateco)
New Proposed Code	Proposed Language Name	
110037	French Sign Language	
110038	Mexican Sign Language	

Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Party Role Definitions, Requested by: AOC Integration Team

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

[content here]

Tentative Implementation Timeline

When approved, [put date/s here].

Public Access and eAccess Display

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

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

Proposed Motion

Motion to approve the statewide standardization of the definitions as listed below.

Party Role Type	Proposed Standard Definition	Examples
Party	The people or entities who are directly involved in a case.	Plaintiff, petitioner, defendant
Court	The individuals that are involved with court proceeding or have an instrumental role during the court process (excluding judicial officers)	Clerk, bailiff, court reporter
Participant	Depending on the type of case under consideration, people who are not a named party that participate in court proceedings.	Officer, victim advocate, Witness
Judge	Person who presides over court proceedings, either alone or as a part of a panel of judges	Judge, Mediator, Arbitrator
Attorney	A person who practices law.	Attorney, Legal paraprofessional
Item	Object that is in dispute or related to a case.	Case exhibits, Property, Trust Name
Other	Used to refer to a person or thing that is different or distinct from one already mentioned or known about.	Other

Category	Data Element	Business Definition and Examples	Civil	Family	Probate	Criminal	Traffic	AD 2022-12 Appendix
3 - Attorney/Advocate	Attorney/Advocate Address	Mailing address of attorney/advocate	x	x	x	x	x	C
1 - Case	Primary Case Category	The starting point in a hierarchy that classifies a case (Civil (CV), Criminal (CR), etc.)	x	x	x	x	x	C
1 - Case	Court	Jurisdiction where the case was filed. Jurisdiction (A, S, J, M) followed by the 4-digit Court Location (for example 0700 for Maricopa County Superior Court) Recommendation move to Appendix D	x	x	x	x	x	C
1 - Case	Court Case Identifier	Court case number (including the 4-digit year). Recommendation move to Appendix D	x	x	x	x	x	C
4 - Status	Case Status Date	Date of status change	x	x	x	x	x	C
4 - Status	Case Status Date	Date of status change	x	x	x	x	x	C
1 - Case	Current Case Status	Case lifecycle stage	x	x	x	x	x	C
1 - Case	Appeal filed	Indication the case was appealed to a higher court	x	x	x	x	x	C
1 - Case	Civil case type	Level three of the hierarchy that classified a civil case (Tort: Auto, Intentional, Medical Malpractice, etc.)	x					C
1 - Case	Civil Case Category	Level two of the hierarchy that classified a civil case (Tort, Contract, etc.)	x					C
1 - Case	Dependency case type	Level two of the hierarchy that classified a dependency case						C
1 - Case	Family case type	Level two of the hierarchy that classified a domestic case		x				C
1 - Case	Probate case type	Level two of the hierarchy that classified a probate case			x			C
1 - Case	Criminal case type	Level two of the hierarchy that classified a criminal case				x		C
1 - Case	Traffic case type	Level two of the hierarchy that classified a traffic case					x	C
5 - Pleadings	Filing Party	Party filing the pleading	x	x	x	x	x	C
9 - Charges	Charge Filed by	The party that filed the charge (Prosecutor, County Attorney, Attorney General, etc.)				x	x	C
2 - Participant	Country	The defendant's country of residence (if not the USA)				x	x	C
3 - Attorney/Advocate	Advocate type	Type of non-attorney court-appointed advocate (CASA, GAL, Victim Advocate, LPPs, etc.)		x	x	x		C
3 - Attorney/Advocate	Attorney Type	Type of Attorney (arbitrator, LPP, prosecutor, private, public defender, etc.)	x	x	x	x	x	C
6 - Motions and Filings	Filing party	Party filing the motion	x	x	x	x	x	C
1 - Case	Case Disposition Category	The way a case was resolved (Judgment, etc.)	x	x	x	x	x	C

9 - Charges	Adjudicated Delinquent	Judicial decision about delinquency							C
9 - Charges	Disposition NCIC Code	The NCIC code associated to the charge at disposition				x	x		C
14 - Dependency - Permanency	Plan Implementation Type	The type, or what, was implemented (return to parent, adoption, guardianship, etc.)							C
9 - Charges	Charge Disposition	The judgment, or disposition, entered by the court for each charge (guilty, dismissed, bindover/transfer, etc.)				x	x		C
1 - Case	Initiating Instrument	A charge-based initiating document for example, warrant, long-form complaint, citation, etc.				x	x		C
10 - Pre-Trial Intake	Grand Jury Indictment	Indication that the grand jury issued an indictment, for those jurisdictions where a grand jury is used to determine whether there is enough evidence to prosecute				x			C
5 - Pleadings	Complaint	The pleading is the initiating complaint in the case	x			x	x		C
5 - Pleadings	Initial Probate Pleading Type	Type of pleading initially filed in a probate case (Petition for Adult Adoption, Affidavit of Succession for Transfer of Real Property Title)			x				C
9 - Charges	Disposition Charge Description	The definition, or description, of the violation at disposition				x	x		C
1 - Case	Disposition Date	The date when a court renders a judgment or "disposes" of a case	x	x	x				C
5 - Pleadings	Pleading Date	Date pleading was filed	x	x	x	x	x		C
9 - Charges	Charge Filing Date	Date the charge was filed				x	x		C

where we left off

Highlights from June 7, 2023 Data Standards Steering Committee Meeting

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

Reminder – Minutes are still in draft and will be reviewed by the committee at its September 6, 2023 meeting.

- Justice Beene announced that member Richard McHattie recently ended his term with the committee as he took a new, non-court position with the county. The application process for his replacement is nearly complete.
- Justice Beene also announced that Eric Silverberg is retiring as Court Administrator from Tucson City Court in August. He thanked Eric for his service to the committee and wished him well in his future endeavors.
- The draft minutes from the March 1, 2023, meeting of the Steering Committee on Data-Based Court Performance and Data Standards were approved.
- Justice Beene welcomed Judge Coker to the meeting and presented background on this topic. AOC entered into a consulting contract with National Center for State Courts (NCSC) and Retired Judge Coker to provide technical assistance on criminal case management in seven counties. Judge Coker and his team conducted detailed data analysis, facilitated county stakeholder meetings, and drafted reports and recommendations for system improvement in the counties that participated. Judge Coker presented an overview on the findings of this project. These findings included issues with recruitment, training and retention of court and Clerk's Office staff, case management system complexity, data entry issues, increased percentage of complex cases, increased mandatory sentencing, less plea deals, and discovery issues.
- Michael Malone, chair of the Data Standardization Workgroup, was unable to attend the meeting but a written update on the Workgroup's progress was provided in the meeting materials.
- The Chief Justice signed Administrative Order 2023-85 making this change. Cathy Clarich provided members with an overview of the administrative order and the roles and responsibilities of members as the workgroup becomes the Data Standardization Advisory Committee.
- Ms. Laura Ritenour, as staff for the committee, presented information on code and table standardization requests recommended by the Data Standardization Workgroup at its March, April, and May meetings. Each individual request discussed below is located in the [June 7, 2023 Meeting Materials packet](#) published online. The approved tables and codes were:

- Fines/Fees and Restitution Enforcement (FARE) Program Events
 - Defendant Identifier Codes for Hair Color, Eye Color, Race and Sex
 - Court Role Type Table
 - Case Status Table
 - Commenced By Table
 - Filing Type Table
 - Informal Family Law Trial (IFLT) Appearance Reason
 - Protective Order Document/Event Codes
 - Charge Qualifier
- Laura Ritenour reported that every July, courts throughout the state submit their time to disposition time standards reports to the AOC. A statewide memo was sent by Michael Malone to various court leadership and training groups across the state giving an overview of the submission process. This memo was also forwarded to all court staff who submitted reports last year. If courts have questions about the reports or cases on the reports, they can feel free to contact Laura Ritenour and Mary Bellefeuille for assistance.
 - Laura Ritenour and Mary Bellefeuille have researched post-conviction relief cases in AJACS, and Laura presented their findings.
 - Justice Beene requested that Marcus Reinkensmeyer present possible items for the next Chief Justice Strategic Agenda. Marcus reviewed the items from the current report with the members and Laura Ritenour will submit the current recommended list to Cindy Trimble.
 - The limited jurisdiction court time standards fiscal year 2018-2022 data results were reviewed. Members discussed the results and requested that additional research be done on misdemeanor and DUI data.
 - Justice Beene made a call to the public for comments. There was no answer.
 - The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.
 - Next committee meeting date: September 6, 2023, 1:30 – 3:30 p.m., Hybrid - State Courts Building Room 331 & Zoom Webinar

New Data Element at the case level:

Rule 11 Case Flag

Definition:

Flag to identify if an Order for Rule 11 evaluation exists in the case

Usage of this data in CCR:

This would be used to identify cases that should be included in the MH repository, or a future Rule 11 Repository, or even helpful with ad-hoc stat requests.

Trigger for this flag:

- Flag would be set as true when an Order for Rule 11 evaluation, or equivalent, is docketed on a case.

Removal of flag:

- Based on discussion with Internal Stakeholders, the only time they would want the case flag to be removed is if it was docketed in error. They have stated they want the case to be identified as a Rule 11 case even if the outcome is a Finding of Competency.

Discussion/Considerations:

The existence of a docket code could suffice if all courts used a standard docket code consistently. However, the flag at the case level allows a very simple query to identify qualifying cases.