

DATA STANDARDIZATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

March 25, 2025

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

MINUTES

Present: Laurie Allen, Odette Apodaca, Laura Bergan, Daniel Bowman, Summer Dalton, Niltza Flores, Ralph Garcia, Dean Hammel, Todd Herrera-Ridenhour, Susann Holland, Adele May, Ester Reeves, Ginger Rodas, Marcos Romero, Danica Sanchez, Katrina Solis, Adam Walterson, Michael Malone, and Jeanette Wiesenhofer

Not Present: Gil Bensinger, Mike Nimtz, Roopa Kalidindi, and Randy Kennedy

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and Guests: Anirban Mitra (AOC), Daniel Paulson (Mesa), Laura Ritenour (AOC), Jennifer Jones (AOC), Lorri Behunin (Chandler), Mary Bellefeuille (Mesa), Michael Wise (AOC), and Michele Gillich (AOC)

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The March 25, 2025, meeting of the Data Standardization Advisory Committee was called to order by Mike Malone, meeting chair, at 10:00 a.m. Mike took roll call, established a quorum, mentioned the meeting was being recorded.

B. February 25, 2025 Meeting Minutes

Mike Malone displayed the February 25, 2025, draft meeting minutes. Mike asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Ginger Rodas made a motion to approve the minutes and Niltza Flores seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

C. Call to the Public

Mike Malone announced that the Data Standards Advisory Committee will be moving the "Call to the Public" section to the beginning of its meetings to ensure everyone has an opportunity to speak. Mike made a call to the public for comments. There was no answer.

II. ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS AND NEW ITEMS

A. Update/Review/Discuss - Case Categories, Case Types, and Case Subtypes – Proposed Matrix for Superior, Justice, and Municipal Courts

Laura Ritenour presented, and Mike Malone emphasized the need to identify where courts are struggling with mapping. Ester Reeves asked if this relates to the LJ statistical reports, and wanted to confirm that these items should align with the 2016 version of the reports. Laura and Michael Wise will work over the next few weeks to ensure the complete list for the various case management systems aligns with the

statistical reports for cases filed and terminated. Laura hopes in the future that courts won't need to submit separate data for the reports. Marcos Romero sought clarification on whether courts should verify if they have any categories or sub-categories in their CMS that differ from the provided list, and how the presented list was created. Laura explained that the list was based on previously approved data, and courts should double-check on their end. Mike Malone mentioned that the AOC plans to pull statistics directly from the database at some point in the future, and that, in regard to Time Standards, courts sometimes had concerns about accuracy of their data. Mike said that if courts have concerns it'll fall back onto them to ensure the data they send is accurate when submitted to the AOC. Marcos then asked if courts should email Laura if they find discrepancies in categories, sub-categories, or case types. Mike confirmed they should email Laura by April 11th.

B. Review/Discuss/Vote - Code Standardization Requests

Laura Ritenour presented on the code sets below:

i. State Bar Associations

After feedback from the AOC Attorney Admissions Manager in Certification and Licensing, it was decided to include all 50 states and US territories. Laura Ritenour stated this field is desired for transmission—if it's not sent, there's no need to start sending it, but if it is sent, approved codes must be used. Marcos Romero asked if this would become a mandatory field once approved. Laura clarified that there are no current discussions to make it a required field, and that is not a required data element. Mike Malone noted that American Samoa and Arizona shared the same code, and Laura corrected it to AS and AZ, respectively. Ester Reeves wanted to confirm if their court captures this data that they need to align with these codes and send the data to the AOC. Laura stated this is not a required field but desired so it does not need to be sent, but if the court does start sending this data in then yes it would need to be aligned with the approved code set. Adele May expressed concern that these codes might be confused with general state codes and proposed adding "SB" in front of the state code. Ester said she is comfortable with the current format, as it will be associated with a bar number and is less likely to cause confusion.

Summer Dalton made a motion to approve this code set and Ginger Rodas seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

ii. Email Type

This is a desired field for transmission. Dean Hammel mentioned that Pima has more than three email type codes and proposed adding a few more. Dean will email Laura the additional codes, and they will be added to the April agenda. Ester asked about the business purpose for having

multiple email types and why they might need more than one email address. Laura will gather more information on this and include it in the request for April. Susann Holland noted that AJACs has primary and secondary email types to determine which one should be used and allows marking multiple email addresses as current, though there's no business logic based on the type of email. Mike encouraged anyone with additional email types to email Laura, and this will be discussed at the April meeting.

iii. Identity Types

Dean Hammel proposed adding a few more codes. Laura Bergan mentioned that Pima currently uses about 40 codes and that individuals can have more than one code associated. Laura Bergan asked if only one code should be sent over. Michele Gillich clarified that they can send as many codes as needed, and the CCR will accept them. She also noted that this is an optional, not required, field, so if no ID type is on file, it doesn't need to be sent. However, if sent, at least one code must be included. There was discussion about adding a "None" code to the proposal. Michele stated that the committee would need to decide if "None" should be included, but if left blank, the data won't be sent. Ester suggested adding "Null" or "Blank" instead. This will be discussed further at the April meeting.

iv. Person Suffix

This is a desired field for transmission and is not required. Dean Hammel said Pima has 4 additional codes they would like to add. It was stated that anyone with additional codes should email Laura Ritenour and this will be discussed further at the April meeting.

v. Post-Conviction Relief Notification Request

Dean said Pima doesn't fully understand this and wants to take this back to the business before approving it. It was stated that this is an event code so a document could be attached to it, Summer Dalton clarified it's more of a docket, or document, code. Mike Malone stated the form shown during the presentation was just an example and not what needs to be used. It will be further discussed during the April meeting.

C. Review/Discuss/Vote – Required Data Elements (RDE) for Discussion

Laura presented on these topics. Marcos Romero wanted to clarify to the 4-digit court code. Laura confirmed he was correct and stated it doesn't have to reside in CMS but has to be something in the transmission to the CCR. Mike Malone said we are taking direction on ethnicity from the federal level from the FBI. Marcos asked if the CMS have both race and ethnicity are those the right fields? Laura stated the race and ethnicity are separate data elements and should be separate fields.

D. Proposed Changes to DUI, Felony, and Juvenile Time Standards

Laura presented on this topic and reviewed the history of the workgroups regarding these time standards. The changes were voted on in support and waiting on an administrative order in the upcoming weeks. Hoping courts will have everything in place by July 2025 for these changes but understands that may not happen.

E. Updates, Comments and Questions from Members

There were no updates, comments, or questions.

F. Additional Call to the Public

Mike Malone made an additional call to the public for comments. There was no answer.

G. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Marcos Romero at 11:00 a.m.

H. Next Committee Meeting Date

Tuesday, April 29, 2025, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Zoom Webinar