

# STEERING COMMITTEE ON DATA-BASED COURT PERFORMANCE AND DATA STANDARDS

March 1, 2023

1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m., Hybrid Meeting

---

**Present:** Hon. James Beene, Ms. Shelly Bacon, Hon. Thomas L. Chotena, Ms. Jennifer Curtiss, Hon. Pamela Frasher-Gates, Ms. Shawn Friend, Hon. Ken Lee, Mr. Rich McHattie, Ms. Donna McQuality, Hon. Heidi Owens, Hon. Michael Peterson, Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Ms. Charisse Richards, Mr. Eric Silverberg, Hon. Don Taylor, and Hon. Trevor Ward

**Absent:** No members were absent

**Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and Guests:** Ms. Mary Bellefeuille (AOC), Ms. Cathy Clarich (AOC), Ms. Jennifer Ferguson (Superior Court for Maricopa County) Mr. Michael Malone (AOC), Ms. Laura Ritenour (AOC), and Cindy Trimble (AOC)

---

## I. CALL TO ORDER

### A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The March 1, 2023, meeting of the Steering Committee on Data-Based Court Performance and Data Standards was called to order by the Chair, Justice James Beene, at 1:31 p.m. The Chair conducted member roll call and members were thanked for their attendance and service. Justice Beene welcomed to the committee its new members, Judge Heidi Owens from White Tank Justice Court and Judge Trevor Ward from Willcox Justice Court.

### B. Approval of the December 7, 2022, Minutes

The draft minutes from the December 7, 2022, meeting of the Steering Committee on Data-Based Court Performance and Data Standards were presented for approval. The Chair called for any omissions or corrections to the minutes, and none were made. A motion was made by Judge Don Taylor and seconded by Judge Michael Peterson to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

## II. REGULAR BUSINESS

### A. Data Standardization Workgroup Update

Michael Malone, chair of the Data Standardization Workgroup, presented a summary of the workgroup's progress over the past three months. The Data Standardization Workgroup meets once a month to discuss and recommend standardized docket codes and data element definitions. All case management

systems are represented on the workgroup, ensuing transparency during the standardization process. Since the December 2022 Steering Committee meeting, the Data Standardization Workgroup has met and has provided feedback on the Required Data Elements Phase One Rollout, reviewed the next set for of data elements for the Required Data Elements for implementation, and reviewed code tables for two more integration tables and a set of codes for the Mental Health – NICS Interface. Because the Workgroup only recently met before the Steering Committee’s March meeting, the tables and code set will be brought to the June meeting for approval. In 2023, the Data Standardization Workgroup will continue their work on reviewing and recommending standardized tables and new code requests and provide feedback on the implementation of the Required Data Elements Initiative. Members had no questions about the workgroup summary provided.

#### **B. Proposal - Delegation of Code Standardization Approval to Data Standardization Workgroup**

As the Data Standardization Workgroup moves forward with code and table standardization tasks that also assists the AOC Information Technology Division with their integration projects, a proposal for the Steering Committee to delegate approval to the Data Standardization Workgroup has emerged. Michael Malone, chair of the Data Standardization Workgroup, provided an overview of this proposal. The proposal recommended that Steering Committee delegate code and table standardization approval to the Data Standardization Workgroup. The time between Workgroup recommendation and Steering Committee approval could be made more efficient with a shifting of responsibilities. If this change is permitted, Data Standardization Workgroup Chair would still report on all code and table standardization approvals to the Steering Committee as part of their quarterly report. And if the Workgroup is recommending changes to previously approved codes and tables, the Workgroup Chair would bring those items forward to the Steering Committee for input as well. Members had no questions about this proposal. A motion was made by Judge Michael Peterson that the steering committee delegate code and table standardization approval to the Data Standardization Workgroup. The motion was seconded by Judge Ken Lee and the motion passed unanimously.

#### **C. Required Data Elements Initiative – Phase One Implementation and Next Steps**

Ms. Ritenour reported that the Required Data Elements 2022 checklists that were due by January 31, 2023 were all submitted on time and superior court presiding judges submitted their approvals for the county-wide reports before the March 1, 2023 deadline. In February, the courts and Clerks were surveyed on the

implementation. They provided positive feedback and ideas to make next year's process even smoother. Next steps are to begin work on standardizing the 2022 checklist data elements' statewide and look for training opportunities to improve consistency and to begin review of the next set of data elements for the 2023 checklists. Ms. Ritenour also provided an overview of Senate Bill 1588, an Arizona Criminal Justice Commission bill that would create a statewide criminal justice data repository. The AOC has been an active participant in the review of this bill.

#### **D. Felony Case Processing Technical Assistance Project**

Michael Malone presented an update on the Criminal Time Standards and Technical Assistance Project. Staff from National Center for State Courts and Retired Judge Jeff Coker have drafted their report and county plan for the seven counties that signed up for this project. The report will detail the pinch points for case processing and offer possible solutions and areas of collaboration. Judge Coker and the National Center will also provide technical assistance for 6 months after each report is released so that plan changes can be made as needed. The goal of each plan will be a framework for sustainable change. Mr. Malone reported on plans to video tape Judge Coker's presentations. There will be more information at the June meeting.

#### **E. Informal Family Law Trials (IFLT) Pilot Project**

(Note: This item was taken out of order on the agenda.) Judge Michael Peterson presented on the Informal Family Law Trials Pilot Project. Administrative Order 2022-159 authorized the establishment of an informal family law trial pilot program in the superior courts of Graham, Maricopa, and Pima counties. Judge Peterson provided an overview of this pilot project, its goals, and data to be collected. It was suggested that an additional data point would be any post-judgment motions filed on IFLT cases.

#### **F. FY22 Arizona Time Standards "Public" Report**

Mr. Reinkensmeyer provided an overview on the report's history. Over the past two years there have been several discussions at these meetings, as well as at the Presiding Judges Meetings, about publishing a public version of the Arizona Time Standards yearly report. Mr. Reinkensmeyer and Ms. Ritenour reviewed ideas for a "public version" of the annual report. The group discussed various issues and the consensus was reached that while some of the data is ready to be published, some case types need further research as there is the perception that the results being gathered are not reliable. This would be due to either the queries not capturing the necessary events correctly, or data entry errors. It was agreed that more work needs to be done to ensure that data matches the practice. Judge Gates reported that Maricopa County will be conducting a "deep dive" into several case types and will share their results with the committee. It was also decided that Justice Beene will meet with AOC staff to review these issues and develop possible solutions.

### **G. FY22 Arizona Time Standards Superior Court Results Review**

Ms. Ritenour presented the superior court time standard results in a table format so members could review statewide performance on each tier of each case type. Members discussed the results and echoed some of the same issues discussed in the agenda item above. Judge Gates reported that Maricopa County will be conducting a “deep dive” into several case types and will share their results with the committee. AOC staff will perform more research into results for AJACS courts as well.

### **H. Strategic Agenda Planning**

Every five years, the Chief Justice publishes their strategic agenda. Ms. Ritenour led the group through the current 2019-2024 agenda items pertaining to the work of this committee. Mr. Reinkensmeyer and Ms. Cindy Trimble (from the AOC Executive Office) presented the process for the next strategic agenda for 2024 – 2029. It was requested that committees provide recommendations and narrative for the plan. It was noted that this topic will also be on the June agenda as well.

### **I. Call to the Public**

Justice Beene made a call to the public for comments. There was no answer.

### **J. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:23 p.m. with a motion by Mr. Reinkensmeyer.

### **E. NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE**

June 7, 2023, 1:30 – 3:30 p.m., Hybrid - State Courts Building Room 331 & Zoom Webinar

## **Data Standardization Workgroup Summary for June 7, 2023 Steering Committee Meeting**

Michael Malone, Court Services Division Director

Since the March 1, 2023 Steering Committee meeting, the Data Standardization Workgroup has been reviewing and approving standardized tables and new code requests and provide feedback on the implementation of the Required Data Elements Initiative. The following tasks have been completed:

Reviewed and recommended for approval:

1. A standardized Fines, Fees and Restitution Enforcement (FARE) Program code set. The standardization of these codes ensures the FARE Program transactions are consistently applied across all courts in the state and reduce error reports.
2. Standardized codes for Defendant Identifiers like Hair Color, Eye Color, Race, and Gender associated with mandatory reporting to the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) and Arizona Motor Vehicle Division (MVD).
3. Updated codes in the Court Role Type, Case Status, Case Type, and Case Subtype tables. Some codes in these tables had to be changed due to programming limitations with other applications like AZPOINT and eFiling.
4. Standardized codes for the Commenced By and Filing Type tables, which is an important step for several of the Required Data Elements.
5. Standardized codes for the Offense Class table to assist with data integration projects.
6. Standardized a code for the Informal Family Law Trial project (related to Administrative Order 2022-159).
7. Standardized Protective Order document codes for AZPOINT.
8. Reviewed and provided feedback on Required Data Elements listed in Administrative Directive 2022-12 Appendices B and C. The Workgroup's ongoing support of the Required Data Elements Initiative is essential, and staff will continue to use their expertise to gain feedback while designing and implementing various aspects of the initiative.

## Code and Table Standardization Requests

The Data Standardization Workgroup is charged with vetting and recommending code and code table requests for implementation as statewide standards. The goal is to create consistent codes and tables for current and future integration projects, which could ultimately lead to more consistent and accurate data reporting. Below are the requests that were recommended unanimously from the March, April, and June 2023 Data Standardization Workgroup meetings.

If approved, the codes in all tables listed below would be added to the AOC's FME Data Translation Server by July 21, 2023 and courts would need to either transmit these codes or use their FME Data Translation Tool for transactions starting January 29, 2024. The Informal Family Law Trial appearance reason code has already been added to the Maricopa, Graham and Pima county databases for their pilot project start date of March 31, 2023.

### Standardize FARE (Fines/Fees and Restitution Enforcement) Program Events

#### Code Request and Requestor

Standardize FARE Events as requested by: AOC Information Technology Division, Integration Team

Proposed Motion: Move to approve the FARE event/docket/document codes and descriptions as listed below.

#### Background

AOC Information Technology Integration Team is requesting that all event/docket/document codes and descriptions associated with FARE be standardized statewide. Standardization would ensure FARE transactions are processed accurately and consistently and that the public would see consistency in FARE descriptions appearing in Public Access. The table is located in the file titled 02b Proposed FARE Descriptions and Event Codes for DSW March 2023.xlsx.

#### Public Access and eAccess Display

Should this data be displayed on Public Access and eAccess? Yes

Should be this document be displayed in eAccess? n/a (none are documents)

Standard Description	Proposed Standard Code
FARE CAP Default	2133
Recalled From FARE	9292
Fare CAP Court Recall	2153

<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>Proposed Standard Code</b>
TTEAP Registration hold has been released at MVD	9273
FARE CAP Completion	2136
TTEAP Hold Rejected by MVD - Person Deceased	9275
TTEAP Hold Rejected by MVD - Matching Record Not Found	9274
FARE Case Balance Correction	2137
FARE CAP Entry	2133
FARE: Collections Vendor Assigned - ACS	13574
FARE Delinquent Fee Added	9262
FARE Collections Fee Added	9261
FARE - A TTEAP hold has been placed at MVD	9272
Assign Non FARE Collections Agency	9270
Assigned To FARE	9260
AZTEC Conversion - FARE case	1447
Case Has Been Manually Removed From FARE Qualified Queue	9263
TTEAP Hold Rejected by MVD - Exact Match Not Found, Possible Match Returned	9276
Case Placed on Contract	9287
FARE CAP Reentry	2134
Contract Removed From Case	9288
Corrected Party Address Returned	9278
Current Party Address Has Been Marked Bad	9277
Defendant Has Been Referred to DOR/TIP	2002
Manually Sent to FARE	9291
Re-Added To FARE	9264
TTEAP Waiver Removed From Case	9284
Suspension has been lifted	9282

<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>Proposed Standard Code</b>
Case Has Been Placed on Suspension - "Suspension Type"	9281
FARE CAP Revoked	2147
Debt Set Off Released	2004
Debt Set Off Pending	2003
FARE: Legacy FARE Referral	2144
Debt Set Off Check Received	2005
"Notice" ntc_type "with notice number" ntc_num "was produced on" ntc_dt "for" ntc_bal?	9271
Web/IVR Payment Option Reinstated	9286
Web/IVR Payment Option Has Been Removed From Case	9285
TTEAP Waiver Placed on Case	9283
FARE: Enhanced FARE Referral	2145

## Standardize Defendant Identifier Tables for Hair Color, Eye Color, Race and Sex

### Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Defendant Identifier Tables for Hair Color, Eye Color, Race and Sex as requested by: AOC Information Technology Division, Integration Team

### Background

AOC Information Technology Integration Team is requesting standardized codes used by transactions for various integration processes, including AZPOINT, DPS, NICS, and NCIC.

### 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: Move to approve the Hair Color codes below be statewide standards.

### Hair Color (NCIC Codes)

Proposed Standard Code	Standard Description
BLD	Bald
BLK	Black
BLN	Blond or Strawberry
BLU	Blue
BRO	Brown
GRY	Gray or Partially Gray
GRN	Green
ONG	Orange
PNK	Pink
PLE	Purple
RED	Red or Auburn
SDY	Sandy
WHI	White
XXX	Unknown

Proposed Motion: Move to approve the Eye Color codes listed below be statewide standards.

**Eye Color Table (NCIC Codes)**

<b>Proposed Standard Code</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>
BLK	Black
BRO	Brown
GRN	Green
MAR	Maroon
PNK	Pink
BLU	Blue
GRY	Gray
HAZ	Hazel
MUL	Multicolored
XXX	Unknown

Proposed Motion: Move to approve the Race codes listed below be statewide standards.

**Race Table (NCIC Codes)**

<b>Proposed Standard Code</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>
I	American Indian or Alaskan Native
A	Asian or Pacific Islander
B	Black
W	White
U	Unknown

Proposed Motion: Move to approve the Sex codes listed below be statewide standards.

**Sex Table (NCIC and MVD)**

<b>Proposed Standard Code</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>FYI - Authority</b>
M	Male	NCIC
F	Female	NCIC
U	Unknown	NCIC
X	Non-Binary/Unspecified	MVD

## Standardize Court Role Type Table

### Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Court Role Type Table as requested by: AOC Court Services

Proposed Motion: Move to approve the codes listed below be statewide standards.

### Background

When we started the standardization process of the twelve integration tables last year, it assumed that the codes that were proposed had been fully vetted against all of our statewide applications. That assumption was incorrect. We had to reevaluate some of the tables that were approved last year. A second issue that was discovered was that some of the codes chosen for the Court Role Type table are already codes in the Protective Order Party Role Type table. In order to lessen the risk of issues, it was requested that the Protective Order Party Role Type table codes be unique codes. Therefore, AOC Court Services is bringing back to this workgroup some codes from some tables for re-consideration. Codes for consideration are listed in file titled 05b Court Role Type Request for March 2023 DSW Meeting file.

### 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

Recommended Statewide Standard Code	Standard Description
E	3rd Party Defendant
Q	3rd Party Plaintiff
AB	Arbitrator
AE	Adoptee
AF	Affiant
AG	Attorney General
AL	Attorney Law Firm
AM	AUTMA Minor
F	Applicant
AR	Adoptor
Y	Attorney
BA	Bailiff
Z	Bail Bondsman
BG	Groom
BR	Bride
CA	Child's Best Interest Attorney
CB	Court Appointed

CC	Cross Claimant / Plaintiff
CD	Cross Defendant
CE	Contestee
CF	Fiduciary
CG	Conflict/Court Appointed
CI	Court Appointed Investigator
CL	Clerk
CO	Court Reporter Organization
CP	Counter Plaintiff
CR	Contestor
C	Conservator
CT	Counter Defendant
CU	Court Reporter
DC	Deputy Clerk of Court
D	Defendant
DM	Demandant
F1	Marriage Applicant 1
F2	Marriage Applicant 2
GC	Guardian / Conservator
GE	Garnishee
H	Guardian Ad Litem
G	Guardian
HP	Harassed Party For W/P Harassment
IE	Interpreter
IN	Incapacitated Person
IP	Incapacitated / Protected Person
IR	Intervenor
IT	Interested Party
JA	Judicial Assistant
JDG	Judge
JS	Judicial Staff
JPT	Judge Pro Tem
A	Appellant
LD	Legal Defender
B	Appellee
LP	Legal Paraprofessional
MD	Mediator
M	Minor
MP	Mental Health Professional

MV	Minor Victim
K	Claimant
ODRVendor	ODRVendor
OF	Officer
OP (in the PO Party Role Type table)	Protected Party Other
OR	Objector / Respondent
X	Other
PA	Parent
PA (in the PO Party Role Type table)	Plaintiff Employer Agent
PB	Probationer
PC	Protected Child
PD	Proposed Fiduciary
PE	Petitioner
N	Probation Officer
PF	Public Defender
PH	Medical Examiner
P	Plaintiff
PE (in the PO Party Role Type table)	Plaintiff Employer
PN	Person
PP (in the PO Party Role Type table)	Plaintiff Protected
PO	Payor
OP	Protected Person
PR	Payer
PS	Prosecutor
PT	Patient
PCV	Process Server
PY	Property
PZ	Payee
I	Real Party in Interest
RS	Personal Representative
R (in the PO Party Role Type table)	Requested (for AZPOINT process)
RT	Respondent
SA	Special Administrator
SM	Special Master
ST	State
S	Surety Company
TG	Testamentary Guardian
TN	Trust Name
TR	Testator

T	Trustee
U	Decedent
UW	Underwriter
VA	Victim Advocate
V	Victim
W	Ward
WF	Will Filer
WP	Ward / Protected Person
WT	Witness

## Standardize Case Status Table

### Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Case Status Table as requested by: AOC Court Services

Proposed Motion: Move to approve the codes listed below be statewide standards.

### Background

When we started the standardization process of the twelve integration tables last year, it assumed that the codes that were proposed had been fully vetted against all of our statewide applications. That assumption was incorrect. We had to reevaluate some of the tables that were approved last year. Therefore, AOC Court Services is bringing back to this workgroup some codes from some tables for re-consideration. Codes for consideration are listed in file titled 06b Case Status Request Table for March DSW Meeting file.

### 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 Standard Code	Standard Description	Notes
ADJ	Adjudicated	
APPL	Appeal	General Jurisdiction only
APRULE32	Appeal/Rule 32	
CLOS	Closed	
CONSOL	Consolidated	
INACTIVE	Inactive	
OPEN	Open	
POAJ	Post-Adjudication	Limited Jurisdiction only
PRAJ	Pre-Adjudication	Limited Jurisdiction only
PRAR	Pre-Arraignment	Limited Jurisdiction only
RULE32	Post-Conviction Relief	
REACT	Re-Activated	
READJUD	Re-Adjudicated	
RECLOSED	Re-Closed	
REOPENED	Reopened	
STYD	Stayed	
STYDFED	Stayed - Federal Court	
STAYHIGH	Stayed - Higher Court	
UNDRADV	Under Advisement	

## Standardize Commenced By Table

### Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Commenced By Table Codes as requested by: AOC Court Services

Proposed Motion: Move to approve Commenced By codes listed below as statewide standards.

### Background

Several required data elements (ACJA § 1-508) pertain to parties that initiate a case or filing. Upon table review it was noticed that the current Commenced By tables in LJ and GJ AJACS contained dissimilar codes. To ensure consistency among tables with the same name in both GJ and LJ courts, the values are to be updated to match across both levels of court and the values held in the Commenced By table will be updated to align with the table name, i.e., Commenced By reflects who filed the case.

### 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 Standard Code	Standard Descriptions
AG	Attorney General
CP	City Prosecutor
CA	County Attorney
LE	Law Enforcement
LC	Lower Court
PA	Private Agency
PT	Private Attorney
PP	Pro Per/Self Represented Litigant
OT	Other

## Standardize Filing Type Codes

### Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Filing Type Codes as requested by: AOC Court Services

Proposed Motion: Move to approve Filing Type codes listed above as statewide standards.

### Background

Filing Type is a Required Data Element per ACJA § 1-508 and vital for CCR integration projects coordinated by AOC IT. Upon table review, it was noticed that the current Filing Type tables in LJ and GJ AJACS contained dissimilar codes. To ensure consistency among tables with the same name in both GJ and LJ courts, the values are to be updated to match across both levels of court and the values held in the Filing Type table will be updated to align with the table name, i.e., Filing Type reflects the type of document used to initiate the case.

### 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 Standard Code	Standard Descriptions
AF	Affidavit
AP	Application
CV	Change of Venue
CI	Citation (ATTC)
CO	Complaint
DE	Demand
DI	Direct Indictment
ID	Indictment
IN	Information
JU	Judgment
MO	Motion
NO	Notice
OR	Order
PE	Petition
RE	Referral
SI	Supervening Indictment
WA	Warrant

## Add an Appearance Reason: Informal Family Law Trial

### Appearance Reason Code Request and Requestor

Add an Appearance Reason: Informal Family Law Trial as requested by: Kay Radwanski

Proposed Motion: Move to approve the appearance reason code request of 'Informal Family Law Trial' to be added to Graham County Superior (AJACS), Maricopa and Pima and potentially statewide if the program is adopted as a statewide standard.

### Background

By [AO 2022-159](#), the Chief Justice established a pilot program for informal family law trials (IFLT) which will begin on March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2023 and will run through December 31, 2024. Part of the requirements for the pilot is for an interim report to be submitted in October 2023 on the program's effectiveness. Several meetings have been held with the courts that are piloting this project (Graham County Superior (AJACS), Maricopa and Pima), to identify the data to be collected by each court's case management system to evaluate the efficacy of this project. Therefore, a new Appearance Reason, to identify how many litigants are opting for an IFLT instead of a traditional trial, is needed.

### Public Access and eAccess Display

Should this data be displayed on Public Access and eAccess? Yes

Should be this document be displayed in eAccess? n/a

Proposed Appearance Reason Code	Proposed Appearance Reason Description
IFLT	Informal Family Law Trial

## Standardize Protective Order Document/Event Descriptions and Codes

### Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Protective Order Document/Event Descriptions and Codes as requested by AOC Information Technology Division, Integration Team

Proposed Motion: Move to approve the Protective Order Document/Event codes and standard descriptions listed below as statewide standards and appear in CCR CPOR and AZPOINT.

### Background

AOC Information Technology Integration Team is requesting standardized codes and descriptions for protective order documents that will be displayed in CCR CPOR and AZPOINT. These codes and descriptions will cover all protective order case types - Orders of Protection (OOP), Injunctions Against Harassment (IAH) and Injunctions Against Workplace Harassment (IWH).

For example, the proposed standard code POINIT would be related to OOP, IAH and IWH petitions and would display in CCP CPOR and AZPOINT as Protective Order Petition.

Proposed Standard Code	Standard Description
POINIT	PROTECTIVE ORDER PETITION

### Public Access and eAccess Display

Should this data be displayed on Public Access and eAccess? No

Should be this document be displayed in eAccess? No

Proposed Standard Code	Standard Description
POINIT	PROTECTIVE ORDER PETITION
PCTGD	PROTECTIVE ORDER GRANTED
PCTOD	PROTECTIVE ORDER DENIED
BRDYSET	PROTECTIVE ORDER BRADY FLAG SET
MODOP	PROTECTIVE ORDER AMENDED
POCSETX	PROTECTIVE ORDER TRANSFERRED
PETVACA	PROTECTIVE ORDER PETITION VACATED

<b>Proposed Standard Code</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>
PODS	PROTECTIVE ORDER DISMISSED
POINEFF	PROTECTIVE ORDER REMAINS IN EFFECT
POU	PROTECTIVE ORDER UPDATED
PORBA	PROTECTIVE ORDER REINSTATED ON APPEAL

## Standardize Charge Qualifier Code Table

### **Code Request and Requestor:**

Standardize Charge Qualifier Code Table as requested by AOC Information Technology Integration Team

Proposed Motion: Move to approve the statewide standardization of the Charge Qualifier codes and descriptions as listed below for any court submitting this data element to the CCR.

### **Background**

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

### **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

<b>Proposed Standard Code</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>
A	VULNERABLE ADULT
C	DANGEROUS CRIME - CHILD
D	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
L	LAW ENFORCEMENT
M	MINOR

## Research “Deep-Dives” into Post-Conviction Relief Cases for AJACS Courts

### Deep-Dive #1 - Age of Active Pending Cases

- Ran Post-Conviction Relief Age of Active Pending reports for all AJACS courts
- Reviewed cases to ascertain if petition was really still pending, or if resolved and appearing on report in error

#### Results from cases reviewed

- Found that some petitions disposed of years ago are still appearing on the report because a correct stop code was never entered
- Found that staff consistently added Readjudicated Case Status after judicial decision on petition
- Found that oldest pending petition across all AJACS courts is from November 2014

### Deep-Dive #2 - Time to Disposition Cases

- Selected Yavapai County (medium size AJACS court)
- Ran their Post-Conviction Relief Time to Disposition Report for FY 2022 (7/1/2021 – 6/30/2022)
- Exported data for cases older than the highest standard tier of 180 days (23 cases)
- Created a spreadsheet to document relevant milestones based on Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 32 and 33
- Gathered data on the cases using AJACS register of actions and met with Donna McQuality to view documents

#### Results from 23 cases reviewed

- 4 cases used statewide forms, 1 was handwritten
- 4 cases had notices docketed as petition in error, so they never should have appeared on the report in the first place
- 22 defendants had counsel, 1 did not
- 21 cases had continuances granted and 2 did not
- 4 cases had 1 continuance of 45 days each, all were extensions to file a petition
- 10 cases had 2 continuances, adding between 86-90 days to each case, all were extensions to file a petition
- 1 case had 3 continuances, unable to determine number of days total, all were extensions to file a petition
- 6 cases had 4 continuances, adding between 106-175 days to each case, all were extensions to file a petition or for continuing a hearing
- 1 case had an evidentiary hearing, the rest did not
- 2 cases were granted post-conviction relief, the rest were not

### Recommendations from Both Deep-Dives

- 1) Add another stop code (Readjudicated Case Status) to the stop code list on both Age of Active Pending and Time to Disposition Report in AJACS

- a. This will ensure disposed petitions no longer appear on the Age of Active Pending report in error
  - b. This will ensure disposed petitions have a more accurate “age” when appearing on the Time to Disposition report
- 2) Add November 2014 as a petition “start” date so that older petitions don’t appear on Age of Active Pending Report in AJACS
  - a. This will remove older petitions that have been resolved from the Age of Active Pending report
  - b. As older petitions are resolved, query will be updated with newer “start date”
- 3) Create Post-Conviction Relief instructions for filing notice and petition
  - a. An ad hoc workgroup could be created to draft instructions that could help defendants better understand the post-conviction relief process. This could help reduce the number of petitions being filed prematurely and resolve the issue with cases aging while multiple continuances to file a petition are granted.
  - b. Instructions would then be translated into Spanish and posted in Self-Help Center on [www.azcourts.gov](http://www.azcourts.gov), [www.azcourthelp.org](http://www.azcourthelp.org) and on Clerk’s Office webpages around the state.



**PLANNING FOR 2024-2029 STRATEGIC  
AGENDA COMMITTEE ITEMS**

## CASE MANAGEMENT



Our courts' ability to efficiently and effectively manage cases is essential for the ongoing success of the judicial branch. We must continue emphasizing and incorporating a variety of approaches, including training and identification of best practices, as well as updating the tools available to judges to assist them in case management and decision making. This may include use of emerging technology, such as business intelligence tools, which will make it easier for judges and court administrators to more readily measure court performance and identify areas in need of improvement.

*From 2019-2024 Strategic Agenda*

Item	Decision
Provide leadership and judicial officer training on principles of and the judicial role in case management.	
Strive to assure that each court adopts and follows case management practices and processes that constitute best practices for that particular court (i.e., appellate, general jurisdiction, or limited jurisdiction).	
Improve the accuracy of court data by training court deputy clerks and staff, auditing data accuracy, and identifying data needs for effective court management.	
Investigate the availability and applicable use of business intelligence tools to measure court and caseflow performance.	

## DATA-BASED DECISION MAKING



To effectively manage court processes and programs, we need to ensure judges and court managers have the tools to efficiently and effectively perform their duties. The data we collect is vital to helping direct the best course of action in individual cases as well as overall court processes and policies. We need to identify key data both judges and court managers find most useful in performing their caseload and oversight functions. We need to ensure this data is accurate and readily available to make informed operations and policy decisions.

*From 2019-2024 Strategic Agenda*

Item	Decision
Establish a workgroup to identify the types of court data judges and court managers need to effectively and efficiently manage cases.	Done – that’s this group 😊
Develop goals for the use of data for decision making purposes.	
Use technology to provide court management tools that assemble and present the data necessary to make informed policy and business-related decisions.	

Case Type	Standard	Statewide FY 22 Data	Recommendations for Next Steps
Misdemeanor - Tier One	75% within 60 Days	31% below standard	
Misdemeanor – Tier Two	90% within 90 Days	32% below standard	
Misdemeanor – Tier Three	98% within 180 Days	19% below standard	
Justice Court Civil – Tier One	75% within 180 Days	Within 5% of standard	
Justice Court Civil – Tier Two	90% within 270 Days	Met or exceeded standard	
Justice Court Civil – Tier Three	98% within 365 Days	Within 5% of standard	
Eviction	98% within 10 Days	14% below standard	
Civil Local Ordinances – Tier One	75% within 60 Days	16% below standard	
Civil Local Ordinances – Tier Two	90% within 90 Days	18% below standard	
Civil Local Ordinances – Tier Three	98% within 180 Days	Within 5% of standard	
Misdemeanor DUI – Tier One	85% within 120 Days	39% below standard	
Misdemeanor DUI – Tier Two	93% within 180 Days	28% below standard	
Small Claims – Tier One	75% within 100 Days	Met or exceeded standard	
Small Claims – Tier Two	90% within 150 Days	Met or exceeded standard	
Small Claims – Tier Three	98% within 180 Days	Within 5% of standard	
Civil Traffic – Tier One	80% within 60 Days	Within 5% of standard	
Civil Traffic – Tier Two	98% within 90 Days	Within 5% of standard	
Ex Parte Protection Orders	99% within 24 Hours	Within 5% of standard	
Contested PO Hearings Held – Tier One	90% within 10 Days	Met or exceeded standard	
Contested PO Hearings Held – Tier Two	98% within 30 Days	Met or exceeded standard	