

# Arizona Supreme Court Data Standardization Advisory Committee

## AGENDA

October 29, 2024, 10:00 am – 12 noon, Zoom Webinar

9:50 a.m.	Zoom Webinar Open for Members, Attendees and Presenters	Laura Ritenour, AOC Staff
<b>Meeting Opening</b>		
10:00 a.m.	Welcome to Members and Roll Call of Attendees  Review and Vote September 24, 2024, Meeting Minutes	Cathy Clarich, Chair, substitute for Michael Malone
<b>Items from Previous Meeting/s</b>		
10:05 a.m.	Review/Discuss/Vote (Michele Gillich and Laura Ritenour) – Standardizing Warrant Codes  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Warrant Authority</li> <li>- Bond Type on Warrant</li> <li>- Authorize DPS as Authority for Extradition</li> <li>- FYI – Updated Warrant Analysis spreadsheet</li> </ul>	
10:30 a.m.	Review/Discuss (Michele Gillich, Stewart Bruner, and Laura Ritenour) - Implementation for Integration, Required Data Elements, Legislation, Code Standardization and Data Translation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft Administrative Directive</li> <li>- Requests for Extension of Time – Draft Template</li> <li>- Case Category Standards and Public Access Functions - tabled to next meeting</li> </ul>	
10:45 a.m.	Update (Laura Ritenour) Counting Continuances Concept - tabled to next meeting	
<b>New Items</b>		
11:00 a.m.	Review/Discuss (Janita Zendejas and Laura Ritenour) Inmate Release Court (IRC) Event Codes and Appearance Reason	
11:15 a.m.	Review/Discuss (Laura Ritenour and Michele Gillich) Contact Status – New Code Request and Definitions	
11:30 a.m.	Review/Discuss/Vote (Laura Ritenour) Proposed 2025 Meeting Schedule	
<b>Ongoing Business</b>		
	FYI – Several courts are presenting operational dashboards at the December 11 <sup>th</sup> Data Standards Steering Committee meeting. Meeting agenda and materials will be <a href="#">posted here</a> about one week prior to the meeting. Meeting starts at 1:30 p.m. and dashboard presentations will begin after 2 p.m. This is a public meeting and anyone can attend.	

	Updates, Comments and Questions from Members		
	Call to the Public		Cathy Clarich, Chair
	Reminder	<p>Next Meeting: Tuesday, November 19, 2024, 10 a.m. – 12 noon, via Zoom Webinar</p> <p>There is no December 2024 meeting. After November meeting, committee will meet again in January 2025.</p>	Cathy Clarich, Chair
12 noon	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

September 24, 2024

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

**DRAFT MINUTES**

---

**Present:** Laurie Allen, Odette Apodaca, Gil Bensinger, Laura Bergan, Daniel Bowman, Summer Dalton, Niltza Flores, Ralph Garcia, Todd Herrera-Ridenhour, Susann Holland, Roopa Kalidindi, Randy Kennedy, Adele May, Michael Nimitz, Ester Reeves, Ginger Rodas, Marcos Romero, Danica Sanchez, Katrina Solis, Adam Walterson, and Jeanette Wiesenhofer

**Not Present:** Michael Malone

**Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and Guests:** Lorri Behunin (Chandler Municipal Court), Stewart Bruner (AOC), Melanie Cluff (AOC), Cathy Clarich (AOC), Leon Li (AOC), Anirban Mitra (AOC), Laura Ritenour (AOC), Michele Gillich (AOC), Tina Knezovich-Hladik (AOC), Teri Munn (AOC), Jennifer Ferguson (Maricopa County), Daniel Paulson (Mesa), Laura Navarro Cobos (Paradise Valley), Joe Hamilton (Phoenix Municipal), Alexis Allen (Tempe), Chris Phelps (Scottsdale), and Fahmida Wahab (AOC)

---

## I. CALL TO ORDER

### A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The September 24, 2024, meeting of the Data Standards Advisory Committee was called to order by Cathy Clarich, meeting chair, at 10:01 a.m. Mike Malone was unable to attend. Cathy Clarich welcomed Laura Bergan as a new committee member and Fahmidha Wahab as an AOC employee taking notes for Michele Gillich.

### B. August 30, 2024, Meeting Minutes

Laura Ritenour, staff for the committee, displayed the August 30, 2024, draft meeting minutes and the members had no comments or concerns. Katrina Solis moved to approve the minutes and Randy Kennedy seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

## II. ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS AND NEW ITEMS

### A. Proposed Implementation for Integration, Required Data Elements, and Code Standardization and Draft Administrative Directive

Laura Ritenour invited members to provide feedback on the September 10<sup>th</sup> CCR Specifications review meeting. Several members provided feedback related to the meeting format and Q&A session. Michele Gillich informed the members that the

session was recorded, and she will put links on the Technology Integration SharePoint site soon.

Laura Ritenour then displayed the current draft administrative directive (AD) for feedback. Several members provided feedback on the following: 1) to move the first two deadlines from February 28, 2025 to June 30 or July 31, 2025; 2) to move the third deadline from September 30, 2025 to September 30, 2026; and 3) to move the fourth deadline from September 30, 2025 to September 30, 2026 or 2027. The reasons given included: more realistic based on level of effort needed to meet deadlines, potential issues with AOC resources during testing process, and to align with fiscal year. Laura Bergan specifically asked for more time to analyze the level of effort needed. She will provide Pima County's feedback before the October meeting. Members asked questions about the July 1, 2020 date in the draft. Laura Ritenour and Summer Dalton explained how this date would align with the past implementation of eFiling in superior courts and the upcoming implementation of eFiling in limited jurisdiction courts. Members asked about the extension of time section of the draft AD and Laura Ritenour and Cathy Clarich stated that once the AD is signed, any court that cannot meet the deadlines in the AD need to file an extension. Laura Ritenour stated that at this time there is no specific template for an extension of time for this draft AD. Several members stated their courts are meeting with Tyler representatives.

Michele Gillich then reviewed a document in the meeting packet related to Contact Status and the CCR Specifications. A member asked how opting in/out for text messaging would relate to the CCR Specifications, specifically the "IsTextEnabled" indicator in the Stage Phone section (located on page 11 of the meeting packet). Michele Gillich answered that the current Stage Phone transaction is at the case-level and therefore if a person opted out, the value would be "0/No" for that case only. Michele Gillich explained that that particular indicator could have different options depending on the case type. For example, in protective order cases, the AZPOINT petition portal asks the petitioner if the phone number they have entered is text-enabled. If the petitioner answers Yes, then the phone can receive texts and if they answer No, then the phone cannot receive texts (like a landline). Therefore, in protective order cases, the "IsTextEnabled" indicator is about the capability of the phone, not whether or not the petitioner wants to opt in or out of text messaging.

Laura Ritenour stated that the Case Category Standards and Public Access Functions discussion that had been tabled from July to this meeting would be postponed one more month to the October meeting.

## **B. Warrant Code Standardization**

Laura Ritenour presented an overview of the warrant code standardization request from AOC's Technical Integration Team. There are five code sets to be reviewed. The only one that is currently Required in the CCR Specifications is Warrant Reason. The other

code sets are marked as Desirable. The members discussed the tables presented and changes were made to the tables based on that discussion. The members decided on a Warrant Reason code set that was the code set presented with the removal of the Fiduciary Warrant and Parole Violation Warrant. Todd Herrera-Ridenhour moved to approve the updated Warrant Reason code set and Summer Dalton seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously. The members had no discussion on the Warrant Type code set. Odette Apodaca moved to approve the Warrant Type code set and Katrina Solis seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously. The group had further questions on the Warrant Authority, Extradition, and Bond Type code sets and therefore those three code sets were tabled to the October meeting.

### **C. Continuance Data**

Laura Ritenour reported that the Counting Continuances Workgroup met twice and there is no report-out ready for this meeting. There will be a summary for the committee at either the October or November meeting.

### **D. SB1197 Juvenile Monetary Sanctions Bill Update**

The current data collected on this project is 25,155 cases affected and \$6.9 million vacated. The courts reporting in so far: all AJACS superior courts, some LJ AJACS courts, some non-AJACS LJ courts. The courts not reporting in so far: Maricopa County and Pima County Superior Courts. Maricopa County Superior has reported they hope to finish verifying their data in the next two months. Pima County will have their data ready around March 2025. Laura Ritenour is meeting with JOLTSaz staff next week to review their data and find out what unique cases (non-duplicates from AJACS data) and those balances will be added to the report to the Legislature, which is due by December 2025.

### **E. Updates, Comments and Questions from Members**

There were no updates, comments, and questions from members. Cathy Clarich mentioned that Teri Mun and Tina Hladik had been attending the meeting as they are embarking on gathering required data elements for jury management (separate from Laura Ritenour's RDE project).

### **F. Call to the Public**

Cathy Clarich made a call to the public for comments. There was no answer.

### **G. Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Niltza Flores at 11:28 a.m.

### **H. Next Committee Meeting Date**

Tuesday, October 29, 2024, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Zoom Webinar

## Code Request

### Code Request and Requestor

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

### Background and Issue

The AOC Information Technology Team is requesting the standardization of the warrant authority codes and descriptions. Standardizing the codes would allow for more consistent reporting for future projects. The Warrant Authority code is currently listed as Desirable in the CCR Specifications 4.1.

### 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 if their court transmits the Warrant Authority per the Administrative Directive (currently in draft form) deadline for StageWarrant associated with the CCR Integration Design Specification documentation.

### Motion

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

### Warrant Authority Code/Description

Warrant Authority Proposed Standard Description	Warrant Authority Proposed Code
ARS 13-2506A1 Failure to Appear Warrant	13-2506A1
ARS 13-2506A2 Vio of Written Promise/Notice to	13-2506A2
ARS 13-2507A Failure to Appear Warrant (Felony)	13-2507A
ARS 13-2507A Failure to Appear Warrant (No Prosecutor Charge)	13-2507A-nocharge
ARS 13-2810A2 Failure to Comply Warrant	13-2810A2
ARS 13-3812 Initial Arrest Warrant	13-3812

ARS 13-4083A Material Witness Warrant	13-4083A
ARS 13-810A Failure to Pay Warrant	13-810A
ARS 13-901C Probation Violation Warrant	13-901C
Rule 3.1A1 Grand Jury Warrant	RULE 3.1A1
Rule 3.1D Pre-Adjudication Warrant	RULE 3.1D
Rule 64.1B Civil Arrest Warrant	RULE 64.1
Rule 7.5B Breach of Conditions of Release Warrant	RULE 7.5B
Rule 94.2 Child Support Arrest Warrant	RULE 94.2
Rule 26.12C Post-Adjudication Warrant	RULE26.12C
ARS 8-386.01 Juvenile Warrant	JUV or 8-386.01???

## 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 the Public Safety Assessment (PSA) project for courts, data requests, and future projects. The Bond Type code is currently listed as Desirable in the CCR Specifications 4.1 and in the future may be upgraded to Required.

The Bond Type code set would be used for both the Bond Type to be associated to the warrant when issued and to the Bond Type ordered when the defendant appears. AOC staff will work on updating the current Bond Type RDE to be two RDEs - Bond Type with Warrant and Bond Type at Appearance.

### 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 if the court transmits Bond Type per the Administrative Directive (currently in draft form) deadline for StageWarrant associated with the CCR Integration Design Specification documentation.

### Motion

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

### Bond Type Code/Description

Proposed Standard Code	Proposed Standard Description
------------------------	-------------------------------

CASH	CASH
SURE	SURETY
PROP	PROPERTY
DEPO	DEPOSIT
SECU	SECURED APPEARANCE
UNSE	UNSECURED APPEARANCE

## Code Request

### Code Request and Requestor

Approve Department of Safety (DPS) as the authority for Warrant Extradition Descriptions and Codes 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 the Public Safety Assessment (PSA) project for courts, data requests, and future projects. The Warrant Extradition code is currently listed as Desirable in the CCR Specifications 4.1.

### Public Access and eAccess Display

Should this data be displayed on Public Access? No

Should 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 if the court transmits Extradition codes per the Administrative Directive (currently in draft form) deadline for StageWarrant associated with the CCR Integration Design Specification documentation.

### Motion

Move to approve DPS as the authority for the Warrant Extradition codes and standard descriptions.

### For Court Information - Warrant Extradition Code/Description

DPS Code	DPS Standard Description
AZ	STATEWIDE
AJ	ADJACENT COUNTIES ONLY
CO	WITHIN COUNTY
LM	LIMITED
BLANK	NO EXTRADITION

A	FULL EXTRADITION
B	LIMITED
C	SURROUNDING STATE ONLY
D	NO EXTRADITION - IN-STATE PICK UP ONLY
E	PENDING
F	PENDING DETERMINATION
01	FULL EXTRADITION
02	LIMITED
03	SURROUNDING STATE ONLY
04	NO EXTRADITION - IN-STATE PICK UP ONLY
05	PENDING
06	PENDING DETERMINATION



## ACJIS Additions to the NCIC Extradition Limitation (EXL) Codes

Effective June 9, 2014, additional Extradition Limitation (EXL) codes in *warrant entry, modify, and query* will be added to ACJIS. The NCIC 06 and A–F EXL codes were added by prior NCIC Technical and Operational Updates (TOUs); however they were not added to ACJIS until now.

DPS Information Technology Bureau will not force misdemeanor warrants sent to NCIC to use the alpha codes, A–F; NCIC allows either numeric or alpha EXL codes.

Some EXL codes will require a miscellaneous (MIS) entry on the warrant for the following:

- \* 4 and D, per TOU 14-1; same as 2, 5, B, and E
- \* 6 and F

If you have a computer interface, please provide this information to your IT staff. Your IT may need to add these additional EXL codes to your interface system before you are able to use them. *Please review the NCIC Operating and Code Manuals for proper EXL code use.*

The following is currently in **Test ACJIS** (additional EXL codes when *No Extradition is 'Yes'* (NEX=Y):

- \* 01–06 for Felonies and Misdemeanors; OTY/F default 0=01
- \* A–F for Misdemeanors, OTY/M; errors on blank, no default

**THE ABOVE EXL CODES WERE MOVED INTO ACJIS PRODUCTION ON MONDAY, JUNE 9, 2014**

### ACJIS QW RESPONSE VALUES

#### FOR NEX=Y

01– FULL EXTRADITION	A – FULL EXTRADITION
02– LIMITED-SEE MIS	B– LIMITED-SEE MIS
03– EXT SURR STATES ONLY	C– EXT SURR STATES ONLY
04– NO EXTRADITION-MIS	D– NO EXTRADITION-MIS
05– PENDING-SEE MIS	E– PENDING-SEE MIS
06– PENDING DETERMINATION	F– PENDING DETERMINATION

#### FOR NEX=N

AZ– STATEWIDE
AJ – ADJACENT COUNTIES
CO – WITHIN COUNTY
LM – LIMITED-SEE MIS
BLANK – NO EXTRADITION

## ACJIS INTERFACE AGENCIES

All interface agencies are required to maintain both a 'TEST' and a 'PRODUCTION' ACJIS interface with DPS. The test system should be utilized for any system changes or enhancements before they are placed into the production environment of the ACJIS interface. This information is a part of the agency's interface documentation package.



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

---

In the Matter of: )  
)  
SUBMISSION OF STANDARDIZED ) Administrative Directive  
CASE-RELATED DATA TO ) No. 2024 – XX )  
CENTRAL CASE REPOSITORY )  
- PHASE ONE )

On June 26, 2024, the Supreme Court issued Administrative Order 2024-123 which ordered that all general and limited jurisdiction courts, including those that do not utilize the state sponsored case management system, submit data to the Administrative Office of the Court’s (AOC) Central Case Repository (CCR) as specified in the CCR Integration Design Specification documentation (“the CCR Specifications”. It was further ordered that the Director would provide a phased implementation schedule developed in coordination with the Data Standardization Advisory Committee.

IT IS DIRECTED that all courts transmit data using the “core\_ xxx” transactions identified within the FARE, NICS, and Public Access Repository sections of the CCR Specifications by June 30, 2025. Maricopa County Superior Court will not be required to transmit FARE data until such time they are participating in the FARE program. All data transmitted to CCR must include the proper Security Indicators and align with code standards.

Commented [RL1]: Was February 28, 2025

IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that all courts transmit either the “pm\_ xxx” or “core\_ xxx” transactions as required by Administrative Order 2019-143 and identified within the Protection Order section of the CCR Specifications by June 30, 2025. All data transmitted to CCR must include the proper Security Indicators and align with code standards.

Commented [RL2]: Was Feb 28, 2025

IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that all courts transmit case data starting at the time a case is initiated using the “core\_ xxx” transactions identified in the Stage Data Feeds section of the CCR Specifications by February 28, 2026. All data transmitted to CCR must include the proper Security Indicators and align with code standards.

Commented [RL3]: Was September 30, 2025

IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that all courts will provide a bulk load of existing case data from cases filed on or after July 1, 2010 using the “core\_ xxx” transactions identified in the Stage Data Feeds section of the CCR Specifications by February 28, 2026. All data transmitted to CCR must include the proper Security Indicators and align with code standards.

Commented [RL4]: Was September 30, 2025

IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that court leadership may request an extension of time to one or more of the deadlines listed above based on a compelling business reason, along with a plan for timely implementation:

1. With approval of the local presiding judge of the court, written requests for extensions of time to implement a deadline listed above may be submitted to staff of the Arizona Supreme Court Commission on Technology.
2. The court shall submit the request using the AOC's Enterprise Architecture Standard Exception template (to be inserted as Attachment A).
3. The staff of the Arizona Supreme Court Commission on Technology will add the extension request to the next meeting agenda for discussion and decision. The Commission's decision will be written and sent back to the local presiding judge after the meeting.

Dated this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2024.

\_\_\_\_\_  
DAVID K. BYERS  
Administrative Director of the Courts

## Extension Request Form for Administrative Directive 2024-XXXX

Please complete this form in its entirety and ensure the signatures are obtained prior to submittal. Email the completed form to the Court Services Division (CSD) of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) at [DataStandards@courts.az.gov](mailto:DataStandards@courts.az.gov). If additional space is needed, please attach any additional sheets(s) as an addendum. All requests will be forwarded to the Commission on Technology (COT) staff person for review, follow-up, and addition to the next COT agenda. The requestor and technical project manager will be invited to the COT meeting to present their request and answer questions.

Court: \_\_\_\_\_

Requestor's Name and Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Requestor Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Requestor Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Code Standards Technical Project Manager Name and Title (If different than Requestor):

\_\_\_\_\_

Technical Project Manager Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Technical Project Manager Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

- 1) This request is pertaining to the following section/s in Administrative Directive 2024-XXX:

[ ] IT IS DIRECTED that all courts transmit data using the "core\_xxx" transactions identified within the FARE, NICS, and Public Access Repository sections of the CCR Specifications by June 30, 2025. Maricopa County Superior Court will not be required to transmit FARE data until such time they are participating in the FARE program. All data transmitted to CCR must include the proper Security Indicators and align with code standards.

[ ] IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that all courts transmit either the "pm\_xxx" or "core\_xxx" transactions as required by Administrative Order 2019-143 and identified within the Protection Order section of the CCR Specifications by June 30, 2025. All data transmitted to CCR must include the proper Security Indicators and align with code standards.

[ ] IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that all courts transmit case data starting at the time a case is initiated using the "core\_xxx" transactions identified in the Stage Data Feeds section of the

CCR Specifications by February 28, 2026. All data transmitted to CCR must include the proper Security Indicators and align with code standards.

[ ] IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that all courts will provide a bulk load of existing case data from cases filed on or after July 1, 2010 using the “core\_XXX” transactions identified in the Stage Data Feeds section of the CCR Specifications by February 28, 2026. All data transmitted to CCR must include the proper Security Indicators and align with code standards.

2) The court requests a later deadline of (enter month and year): \_\_\_\_\_

3) State the reason(s) the court cannot meet the current deadline in the Administrative Directive. Include current and applicable processes, conditions, background information, and statistics.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4) Estimate the cost of bringing the current case management system into compliance with code standards: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

5) Provide a brief explanation of how you arrived at the estimated cost in question 4.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Requestor Signature and Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Manager Signature and Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Local Presiding Judge Signature and Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**For Court Services Division and Commission on Technology Use Only**

This Extension Request was received by Court Services Division on [date] and forwarded to the COT staff person on [date].

The Extension Request was presented and discussed at COT's [date] agenda. COT's decision on the Extension Request was:

Granted       Denied       Granted with the following conditions: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Commission on Technology Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



# IRC Code Standardization

Data Standardization Advisory Committee 10.25.24

Janita Zendejas – IRC Program Coordinator

# Background

- The **Inmate Release Court (IRC) Program** is a partnership between the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and Arizona Department of Corrections, Rehabilitation and Reentry (ADCRR) - Second Chance Center.
- Focuses on resolving open cases in LJ courts for inmates participating in the Second Chance Program.
- **Administrative Order 2023-223** - Established the IRC as an official statewide program for LJ Courts.
- **Administrative Directive 2024-03** – Adopted the IRC Participant Agreement Form.
- Currently **132** out of **153 LJ** courts participating in IRC.
- **32** out of the **34 non-ACAP** courts are participating.

# Docketing IRC Events - Challenges

- No designated IRC docket events in the CMS.
- Courts are selecting the closest matching events for the:
  - IRC Participant Agreement Form
  - IRC Participant Removals
  - Certificate of Completion
  - IRC Judicial Order
- Difficulty for courts to track IRC cases and generate reports.

# Current Process

---

How are the courts currently processing and docketing the forms in the CMS?

- Utilizing the closest matching event.
  - *Miscellaneous*
  - *Correspondence*
  - *Order*
  - *Notice*
- Failing to docket relevant events.
  - *Certificate of Completion*
  - *IRC Removals*

# Benefits of Code Standardization

---

- Assists the courts with a uniform process for correctly processing and docketing IRC events in the CMS.
- Eliminates the courts having to guess which event type should be used.
- Creates an ability to track and follow up on IRC cases statuses on both the courts and AOC's side.
- Assists the IRC program with tracking IRC data and eliminates the need for courts to generate and send reporting to the AOC.

# Questions/Comments

Janita Zendejas – IRC Program Coordinator

[jzendejas@courts.az.gov](mailto:jzendejas@courts.az.gov)

(602) 452-3271

Angelica Burris – FARE/DSO Business Analyst

[anburris@courts.az.gov](mailto:anburris@courts.az.gov)

(602) 452-3345

## Data Standardization Advisory Committee

### Business Need and Code Standardization Request

**Date:** 10/17/2024

#### **Tentative Implementation Timeline**

1. If the business need and code standardization request is approved, then the approval will be shared with the AOC Integration Technology Team, who will draft specifications.
2. The Technical Advisory Council (TAC) will review and decide on a final version of the specifications.
3. If the specifications are approved, then they will be added to the CCR Specifications document.
4. An administrative directive with timelines for implementation will be drafted in consultation with the advisory committee. The administrative directive will list the deadline for implementation.

**Requestor:** AOC Court Services Inmate Release Court (IRC) Program

#### **Background and Issue**

The Inmate Release Court (IRC) Program is a collaborative partnership between the AOC and the Arizona Department of Corrections, Rehabilitation & Reentry's Second Chance Program (a program designed to prepare inmates for release). The IRC program was established to resolve open cases in limited jurisdiction courts for inmates participating in ADCRR's Second Chance Program. It is guided by [Administrative Order 2023-223](#).

#### **Public Access and eAccess Display**

- Should this data be displayed on Public Access? Yes
- Should this element be displayed in eAccess? Yes

**Possible Interfaces Affected:** eFiling, CCR

The IRC Program is requesting event codes and an appearance reason for defendant tracking and statewide data.

**Reporting**

IRC Program Coordinator wants ability to track and create reports with the following data:

- Number of Participation Agreements completed
- Number and percentages of agreements granted and denied
- Number of defendants completing and not completing the program
- Number of orders of completion signed by judges
- Number of financial worksheets entered
- Number of status review hearings set

Proposed Standard Code	Proposed Standard Event Code Description	Comments
4000058	IRC Participation Agreement Form	This is a standard form completed by all defendants wishing to enter the program. They complete two sections of the form and then send it to the court that sentenced them. The court would scan and attach this form to this event in the ROA and then send the case to the judge for review and decision.
4000059	IRC Participation Granted	After the judge reviews the participation agreement form in (1), if they deny participation they select a box on the form, and this form with their decision and signature would be scanned and attached to this event in the ROA.
4000060	IRC Participation Denied	After the judge reviews the participation agreement form, if they deny participation they select the denial box on the form, and this form with their decision and signature would be scanned and attached to this event in the ROA.
4000061	IRC Program Certificate of Completion	Document from Second Chance Center when the defendant successfully completes the program. The certificate of

		completion is provided to the court and is scanned and attached to this event in the ROA.
4000062	IRC Financial Worksheet	Along with the form above, a financial worksheet is completed, and scanned and attached to this event in the ROA.
4000063	IRC Not Completed	If the defendant is allowed into the program and does not complete the program, this event is entered into the ROA.
4000064	Order of IRC Program Completion	Order created by the court and signed by the judge that orders the financial adjustments, lifting of other sanctions, and credit for outstanding mandates.

**Proposed Motion:** Move to approve the standard event codes and event descriptions related to the IRC Program, as listed above, to be standards for limited jurisdiction courts.

Proposed Standard Code	Proposed Standard Appearance Reason Description	Comments
IRC	IRC Status Review	For hearings that a court schedules with a defendant after they complete the IRC Participation Agreement Form to check on the defendant's status on the program. This event should not be schedule after a defendant was denied entry into the program or did not complete the program.

**Proposed Motion:** Move to approve the standard appearance reason code and description related to the IRC Program, as listed above, to be standards for limited jurisdiction courts.

## Code Request

### Code Request and Requestor

1. **Standardize Contact Status Definitions**, Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team
2. **Add a new Code Status for Standardization**, Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team and Consolidated Collections Unit

### Background, Summary, and Intended Use

- The Contact Status codes and descriptions listed below (except FBAD) were approved by this committee on September 26, 2023.
- The Consolidated Collections Unit and AOC Information Technology Integration team are requesting the addition of a new contact status code, FBAD.
  - The FBAD code will be sent by courts to the CCR upon receiving a Bad Address status from the FARE vendor. This is sent once the court has updated their address status and is notifying the CCR of the status change. The CCR will update their address status but will not send a transaction to the vendor since the status originated with them, as opposed to the court marking an address as bad.
  - This updated process is part of the new person-based feeds included in the new CCR specifications. These feeds are currently optional for non-AJACS courts.
- The AOC Information Technology Integration team is also 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 the date stated in the Administrative Directive 2024-XX (still in draft as of 10/02/2024).

### Proposed Motions

1. Motion to approve the Contact Status definitions below.
2. Motion to approve the FBAD code, description, and definition 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 contact will change from a future status to an active status.	The party plans to move to a new residence or a obtain a new phone number in the future.
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

FBAD	Bad/Undeliverable - FARE Vendor	This code is sent by the court to the CCR when receiving a Bad Address status from the FARE vendor.	The FARE Vendor receives an undeliverable notice in the mail and sends a Bad Address status to the court.
------	------------------------------------	---	---

**Excerpt from Stage Address section of current CCR Specifications as an example:**

IsBadAddress	[bit]		D		If Address is NOT VALID then this flag should be set to TRUE. 0 = Not bad 1 = Bad
IsCollectionAddressBad	[bit]		D		<b>Note: Applicable only for FARE cases.</b> ACS has determined that the address is bad
IsCollectionAddressNew	[bit]		D		<b>Note: Applicable only for FARE cases.</b> ACS has provided a new address determined by skip tracing
IsPOContactAddress	[bit]		D		<b>Note: Used only when the case is a PO case</b> Indicates if this address can be used to contact about Protection Order
IsMailingAddress	[bit]		REQ	0 = No (Not Mailing) 1 = Yes (Mailing)	Indicates if the address is a Mailing address
IsPrimaryAddress	[bit]		REQ	0 = Not Primary 1 = Primary	Indicates if the address is a Primary address
IsRestricted	[bit]		REQ	0 = Not Restricted 1 = Restricted	Indicates if the address record is restricted
IsRemovedFromPublicAccess	[bit]		REQ	0 = No 1 = Yes	Indicates if the record must be removed from public access
IsSealed	[bit]		REQ	0 = No 1 = Yes	Indicates if the address record is sealed

## Data Standardization Advisory Committee

### Proposed 2025 Meeting Dates and Times

All meetings would be held via Zoom Webinar, from 10 a.m. – 12 noon

- January 28<sup>th</sup>
- February 25<sup>th</sup>
- March 25<sup>th</sup>
- April 29<sup>th</sup>
- May 27<sup>th</sup>
- June 29<sup>th</sup>
- July 30<sup>th</sup>
- August 26<sup>th</sup>
- September 30<sup>th</sup>
- October 28<sup>th</sup>
- November 18<sup>th</sup> as November 25<sup>th</sup> is during Thanksgiving week
- OR move it to the first Tuesday in December, December 2<sup>nd</sup>???
- No December meeting or no November meeting if Dec 2<sup>nd</sup> chosen

### Proposed Motion

Motion to approve the proposed meeting dates listed above for the year 2025.