

DATA STANDARDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

September 24, 2024

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

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 Nimtz, 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 10th 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