

Arizona Supreme Court Steering Committee on Data-Based Court Performance and Data Standards

June 1, 2022 Meeting Agenda
Teams Meeting and Room 331, State Courts Building
9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Call to Order

Welcome/Opening Remarks

Hon. James Beene, Chair

9:00 – 9:05

➤ Roll Call

9:05 – 9:10

➤ Motion to Approve Minutes*

**Action Item*

Hon. James Beene, Chair

Regular Business

9:10 – 9:15

➤ Data Standardization Workgroup Update

Ms. Laura Ritenour

➤ Data Translation Software Proof-of-Concept Update

Mr. Karl Heckart

9:15 – 9:30

➤ Code Standards Requests*

- QRTP
- IPAC
- Notice: Modify Level of Intensive Probation
- Table: Case Status

Ms. Laura Ritenour

**Action Item*

9:30 – 10:20

➤ ACJA § 1-508 Required Data Elements

- Data Elements Updates*
- Implementation Update

Ms. Laura Ritenour

**Action Item*

10:20 – 10:30

➤ Time Standards

- FY22 Report Process Overview
- Juvenile Time Standards Update
- Proposed PO Contested Hearing Scheduled Time Standard Update

Ms. Laura Ritenour

10:30 – 10:40

➤ Criminal Time Standards and Technical Assistance Project Update

Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer

10:40 – 10:50

➤ Publication of Time Standards

Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer

All times are approximate. The Chair reserves the right to set the order of the agenda. For any item on the agenda, the Committee may vote to go into executive session as permitted by Arizona Code of Judicial Administration §1-202. Please contact Marretta Mathes at (602) 452-3966 with any questions concerning this agenda. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation by contacting Marretta Mathes at (602) 452-3966. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange for the accommodation.

	➤ Next Meeting: Wednesday, September 7, 2022	Hon. James Beene, Chair
--	--	-------------------------

Call to Public

10:50 – 11:00		Hon. James Beene, Chair
---------------	--	-------------------------

Adjourn

	➤ Adjournment	Hon. James Beene, Chair
--	---------------	-------------------------

All times are approximate. The Chair reserves the right to set the order of the agenda. For any item on the agenda, the Committee may vote to go into executive session as permitted by Arizona Code of Judicial Administration §1-202. Please contact Marretta Mathes at (602) 452-3966 with any questions concerning this agenda. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation by contacting Marretta Mathes at (602) 452-3966. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange for the accommodation.

STEERING COMMITTEE ON DATA-BASED COURT PERFORMANCE AND DATA STANDARDS

March 2, 2022

9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m., Hybrid Meeting

Present: Hon. James Beene, Ms. Jennifer Curtiss, Hon. Jill Davis, Hon. Pamela Frasher-Gates, Ms. Shawn Friend, Hon. Ken Lee, Mr. Rich McHattie, Ms. Donna McQuality, Hon. Michael Peterson, Ms. Charrise Richards, Hon. Keith Russell, Ms. Nancy Fraire as proxy for Mr. Eric Silverberg, and Hon. Don Taylor

Absent: Ms. Shelly Bacon, Hon. Thomas Chotena, Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer

Presenters/Guests: Mr. Michael Albers, Mr. Gil Bensinger

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC): Ms. Sarah Baker, Mr. Stewart Bruner, Ms. Catherine Clarich, Ms. Melanie Cluff, Ms. Summer Dalton, Mr. Karl Heckart, Mr. Michael Malone, Ms. Laura Ritenour, Mr. Richard Rivera, and Mr. Craig Washburn

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The March 2, 2022 meeting of the Steering Committee on Data-Based Court Performance and Data Standards was called to order by the Chair, Justice James Beene, at 9:01 a.m. The Chair conducted member roll call and members were thanked for their continued service.

B. Approval of the December 1, 2021 Minutes

The draft minutes from the December 1, 2021 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.

A motion was made by Judge Ken Lee and seconded by Ms. Jennifer Curtiss to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

II. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. Data Standardization Workgroup Update

Mr. Michael Malone, as the workgroup chair, provided an update on the Data Standardization Workgroup. The workgroup is currently reviewing each approved data element and the definition associated with it as defined by the National Center

for State Courts. The workgroup reviewed the proposed ACJA code section and several code requests and began to standardize the Disposition Code table.

B. Data Translation Software Update

Mr. Stewart Bruner, as staff for the Commission on Technology, provided an overview on this project sponsored by the Commission on Technology's Technical Advisory Council. The proof-of-concept phase of this project will start and run through the end of March. If successful, the Superior Court of Pima County will pilot the translation of data to and from the state warehouse in April and May. The Commission on Technology is expecting a report at its June meeting on the data translation software pilot project and a report will be presented to this committee as well.

C. Code Standards Requests

Ms. Laura Ritenour, as staff for the committee, presented information on three data code standardization requests that have been reviewed and recommended by the Data Standardization Workgroup at its January and February meetings.

AOC Automation Services requests a code for use in filing case specific questionnaires and responses from jurors with regard to recent rule changes to Civil Rule 47(b) and Criminal Rule 18.3. If adopted the codes *Jury: Case Specific Questionnaire* and *Jury: Case Specific Responses* would be statewide standards. Discussion was held and a motion was made by Judge Pamela Gates and seconded by Judge Russell to recommend for adoption *Jury: Case Specific Questionnaire* and *Jury: Case Specific Responses* as statewide standards. The motion passed unanimously.

AOC eCourt Services requests to add Mailing (MA) to the Address Type standard code table approved at the December 2021 Steering Committee meeting. eFiling programming uses this designation when a filer's address is added during the case initiation process. Discussion was held and a motion was made by Judge Ken Lee and seconded by Judge Michael Peterson to recommend for including Mailing (MA) as a statewide standard to the Address Type table. The motion passed unanimously.

AOC Information Technology Integration Team to have a new Protective Order Party Role Code of "R" added by courts to their case management systems. The new code would be used in situations when the judge has not granted or denied a petition but has set the matter for a hearing. The party data would have the "R" Protective Order Party Role Code until the judge rules the petition. If adopted this code would ensure a party that is not yet considered in protected status is accidentally marked as protected.

Discussion was held and a motion was made by Ms. Jennifer Curtiss and seconded by Judge Michael Peterson to recommend for adoption a new Protective

Order Party Role Code of “R” as a statewide standard. The motion passed unanimously.

D. Proposed ACJA § 1-508 Required Data Elements

Laura Ritenour, as committee staff, presented on a proposed code section on required data elements. In 2020 this Steering Committee reviewed all the National Open Court Data Standards (NODS). Out of the 368 data elements, this committee recommended 247 data elements for adoption for statewide collection. Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer presented these data elements to the Arizona Judicial Council in October and they approved the elements for statewide collection and a phased implementation approach. The proposed code section is the codification of those efforts and would be a high-level guide for the project. Implementation will be developed with the courts and distributed through administrative directive. Discussion was held and a motion was made by Judge Keith Russell and seconded by Judge Keith Lee to recommend the adoption of the proposed code as written. The motion passed unanimously.

E. Criminal Time Standards and Technical Assistance Project

Michael Malone presented on behalf of Marcus Reinkensmeyer, on Criminal Time Standards and Technical Assistance Project. The Felony Time Standards Workgroup Summary was presented at the December 2021 meeting of the Presiding Judges. At the meeting, there was extensive discussion regarding causes of delay and possible modification to the Arizona Time Standards. Presiding Judges from counties at or near the current Arizona Time Standards presented information on their case management policies and procedures, including best practices in working with justice system stakeholders, etc. The early disposition court in Yavapai county was discussed as a possible model for other courts. Discussion turned to re-engineering criminal case management with local stakeholders. Several presiding judges expressed an interest in this kind of project. The AOC has entered into a consulting contract with National Center for State Courts (NCSC) and Retired Judge Jeff Coker to provide technical assistance on criminal case management in 8 counties. 7 counties have signed up for this project and kick-off meetings will be commenced in early March. The 7 counties are: Pinal, Yuma, Graham, Cochise, Gila, Mohave, and Coconino. NCSC will conduct a detailed data analysis for each court, along with a report and recommendations for systems improvement.

F. Publication of Time Standards

Michael Malone reported on behalf of Marcus Reinkensmeyer that this topic was tabled at the December 2021 Presiding Judges meeting until the March 2022 Presiding Judges meeting. Additional feedback is expected for the June meeting of this committee.

III. CALL TO PUBLIC

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

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by motion of Judge Ken Lee and seconded by Ms. Jennifer Curtiss at 9:35 a.m.

V. NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

June 1, 2022, 9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., Hybrid - State Courts Building & Teams

DRAFT

Data Standardization Workgroup Summary May 20, 2022

Michael Malone, Court Services Division Director

Since the March 2nd Steering Committee meeting, the Data Standardization Workgroup has met three times and has completed the following tasks:

- Reviewed and recommended for approval a standardized Case Status table and several new statewide code requests. This is an important component of AOC IT's Integration Service Unit's goals as they work towards implementing the Central Case Repository (CCR).
- Reviewed and approved definitions for almost all Required Data Elements. This will increase the effectiveness and consistency when the Required Data Elements Initiative is rolled out to the courts this fall.
- Provided feedback and support on ACJA § 1-508 Required Data Elements. 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.
- Received updates from AOC IT on the Data Translation Proof of Concept with Pima County. Data Translation software would be an important tool for both the Required Data Elements Initiative and the Central Case Repository project. The software would convert data sent by the non-AJACAS courts into standard formats to allow easier use by the CCR and for Required Data Element reporting. This would reduce the amount of necessary coding changes by the courts.

Between the upcoming June and September Steering Committee meetings, the Data Standardization Workgroup will continue their work on reviewing and approving standardized tables and new code requests and provide feedback on the implementation of the Required Data Elements Initiative.

Data Standardization Workgroup – Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Motion: Approval of QRTP Placement and Order: Approving QRTP Placement by Karen Wilkes, Office of Clerk of Court, Yavapai County

Background and Issue

Rules of Procedure for the Juvenile Court, Rule 52.1 states the process for placement of children in a qualified residential treatment program (QRTP).

Currently, courts use a generic Motion and Order event for this process. At the January 2022 GJ AJACS Users Group meeting, it was requested these specific events be created. There are many Motion and Order events on a juvenile dependency case, and this would allow judges and staff to quickly find this important milestone on a case.

Motion

Move to approve the code request of Motion: Approval of QRTP Placement to be a statewide standard

Move to approve the code request of Order: Approving QRTP Placement to be a statewide standard

Data Standardization Workgroup – Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Motion: Approval of IPAC Services and Order: Approving IPAC Services by Karen Wilkes, Office of Clerk of Court, Yavapai County

Background and Issue

A.R.S. § 8-272 states the process for requesting and receiving an inpatient or outpatient mental health assessment for a child. IPAC is the abbreviation for inpatient psychiatric acute care.

Currently, courts use a generic Motion and Order event for this process. At the January 2022 GJ AJACS Users Group meeting, it was requested these specific events be created. There are many Motion and Order events on a juvenile dependency case, and this would allow judges and staff to quickly find this important milestone on a case.

Motion

Move to approve the code request of Motion: Approval of IPAC Services to be a statewide standard.

Move to approve the code request of Order: Approving IPAC Services to be a statewide standard.

Data Standardization Workgroup – Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Notice: Modify Intensive Probation Level by Della Hiser, Clerk of Court, Mohave County

Background and Issue

[Administrative Order 2021-144](#) (signed September 2021) allows probation officers to modify the level of intensive probation without a petition to the court. Previously, probation officers had to petition the court and obtain a court order to modify the level of intensive probation.

The new code would be created so the Notice document would be attached to the docket entry. It would also allow judges and court clerks know the level has changed for data entry and tracking purposes.

Motion

Move to approve the code request of Notice: Modify Intensive Probation Level to be a statewide standard.

Data Standardization Workgroup – Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Case Status Table by Data Standardization Workgroup, 5/23/2022 Meeting

Request

The Data Standardization Workgroup have been working together to develop a standard list of case statuses for the purpose of creating consistent codes for current and future integration projects. At their May meeting, they were able to unanimously agree on the list of case statuses below.

Standard Code	Proposed Report As Code	Standard Description
ADJUD	AD	Adjudicated
APPL	AP	Appeal
APRULE32	AR	Appeal/Rule 32
CLOS	CL	Closed
CONSOL	CS	Consolidated
INACTIVE	IN	Inactive
OPEN	OP	Open
POAJ	PO	Post-Adjudication
PRAJ	PA	Pre-Adjudication
PRAR	PR	Pre-Arraignment
RULE32	RU	Post-Conviction Relief
REACT	RT	Re - Activated
READJUD	RJ	Re-Adjudicated
RECLOSED	RC	Re-Closed
REOPENED	RO	Reopened
STYD	ST	Stayed
STYDFED	SF	Stayed - Federal Court
STAYHIGH	SH	Stayed - Higher Court
UNDRADV	UA	Under Advisement

Motion

Move to approve the codes listed in the Case Status table as recommended by the Data Standardization Workgroup.

Required Data Elements – Recommended Updates and Items for Discussion

As of 5/24/2022

Elements Tabled from Previous Steering Committee Meetings

Worksheet Name	Data Element	Definition and Examples	Suggestions
Case	Linked Case	Court case identifier for any associated case	<p>NCSC suggested that these 3 elements could be used to enter information on a case transfer from one jurisdiction to another, a change of case number, if a case participant is involved in multiple cases (like a juvenile in a dependency case also has a delinquency case) or if an LJ Appeal case is appealed to a GJ court.</p> <p>Issues: setting up processes to update the case numbers entered into these fields for linking and unlinking cases – How would courts get this information from other courts? Who would be responsible for updating it? What if one of the cases got sealed? Workgroup this might not work for a state without a statewide CMS.</p>
Case	Linked Case Jurisdiction	The court of the linked case	
Case	Linked Case Type	The primary case type of the linked case	
Participants	Identifier	Anonymized series of characters that identify the same individual within the court system, across cases and courts within the state.	AJACS has a unique number that is generated, but there is no way to tie this system to the non-AJACS courts so that the number would be used to identify the same individual across the entire court system in Arizona
Charges	Filing Charge Modifiers	The specific type of mitigator or enhancer associated the filed charge (Attempt, Conspiracy, Solicitation, Domestic Violence)	<p>What our courts call case qualifiers, NODS is calling a case modifier. Should we allow the data element to be names “modifiers” but contain a list of qualifiers? Should we change the name to Filing/Disposition Charge Qualifiers instead?</p>
Charges	Disposition Charge Modifiers	The specific type of mitigator or enhancer associated the disposed charge (Attempt, Conspiracy, Solicitation, Domestic Violence)	

Elements Recommended for Name Changes by Data Standardization Workgroup

Worksheet Name	Data Element	Definition and Examples	Suggestions
Pleadings	Answer	The pleading is an answer and/or denial to the initiating complaint	Recommend this data element be renamed "Answer/Response" as it is collected on Civil, Family, Probate and Dependency case types
Orders	Warrant	The reason the warrant is no longer active (returned due to error, served, quashed, recalled, expired, etc.)	Recommend this data element be renamed "Warrant Disposed" to more accurately reflect the data element and definition
Probate Review and Monitor	Bond Filed	Date proof of bond filed with the court	Recommend this data element be renamed "Bond Filed Date" to more accurately reflect the data element and definition
Probate Review and Monitor	Event Reminder	Date the court issued a reminder to the guardian/conservator for reporting requirements	Recommend this data element be renamed "Event Reminder Date" to more accurately reflect the data element and definition
Post-Trial	Probation Violation	Date petition to revoke was filed	Recommend this data element be renamed "Probation Violation File Date" to more accurately reflect the data element and definition AND recommend this data element be collected for Juvenile cases (in addition to Criminal and Traffic cases)

Elements Recommended for Removal from List by Data Standardization Workgroup

Worksheet Name	Data Element	Definition and Examples	Suggestions
Attorney/Advocate	Entry Date	Date attorney/advocate added on the case (NOA date? Other date?)	Recommend this data element be removed as a standard. Not consistently added to case, especially for non-attorneys like LPP, CASA, etc.
Attorney/Advocate	End Date	Date attorney/advocate released from case (order withdraw case)	Recommend this data element be removed as a standard. Not consistently added to case, especially for non-attorneys like LPP, CASA, etc.
Sanctions	DL Suspend End	Date driver's license was reinstated after suspension	Recommend this data element be removed as a standard. Courts are not aware of when the MVD has reinstated a party's DL. Date is not sent to courts from MVD so there is no way to verify if a date is accurate or not.
Sanctions	CDL Disqualifying End	Date commercial driver's license was reinstated after disqualification	Recommend this data element be removed as a standard. Courts are not aware of when the MVD has reinstated a party's CDL. Date is not sent to courts from MVD so there is no way to verify if a date is accurate or not.

Elements Recommended for Case Type Changes by Data Standardization Workgroup

Worksheet Name	Data Element	Definition and Examples	Suggestions						
			Civil	Family	Probate	Dependency	Juvenile	Criminal	Traffic
Case	Disposition Date	The date when a court renders a judgment or “disposes” of a case	x	x	x	x	x	[x]	[x]
Case	Interstate Flag	Indication multiple states are involved in the case		x	x	x	[x]	[x]	
Case	International Flag	Indication multiple countries are involved in the case		x		[x]			
Case	Case Disposition Detail	A more detailed description of how a case was resolved	x	x	x	[x]	[x]	x	x
Participants	Driver License/State ID Number	Driver's license number or state identification number issued to the participant					[x]	x	x
Participants	Country	The defendant's country of residence					[x]	[x]	x
Attorney/Advocate	Advocate Type	Type of non-attorney court-appointed advocate (CASA, GAL, Victim Advocate, LPPs, etc.)	[x]	x	x	x	x	x	[x]
Pleadings	Filing Party	Party filing the pleading/legal document	x	[x]	x	[x]	[x]	[x]	[x]
Pleadings	Complaint	The pleading that initiates a civil or criminal action.	x					[x]	
Pleadings	Answer to Intervenor Claim	The pleading is an answer to an intervenor claim	x			[x]			
Hearings and Events	Days in Trial	Total number of court days the trial was conducted	x	[x]		x	x	x	x
Orders	With Prejudice	Indication if the matter was dismissed with prejudice –	x				[x]	x	[x]
Orders	Evaluation Party	The party that was ordered to participate in evaluation		x	x	x		[x]	
Charges	Agency ID	Agency of the arresting or citing law enforcement official					[x]	[x]	x
Charges	Legal Speed Rate	A legally designated speed limit in the area where an incident occurred (numeric)					[x]		x
Charges	Recorded Speed Rate	The speed at which the offender was observed (numeric)					[x]		x
Charges	Offense Location	Location of the offense (address; latitude/longitude; crossroads)					[x]	[x]	x
Charges	Ticket Number	Citation number					[x]	[x]	x
Charges	Citation Date	Date the offender received the citation					[x]	[x]	x
Charges	Probation/Technical Violation	Indication that a probation violation or technical violation was filed					x	[x]	[x]

Worksheet Name	Data Element	Definition and Examples	Suggestions						
Charges	Violation Reason	Reason for the determination of violation (missing appointments, unexcused school absence; fail drug test, fail to adhere to expectations of supervision)					x	[x]	[x]
Charges	Plea Type	Type of plea entered by the defendant (guilty, not guilty, no contest, etc.)					[x]	x	x
Charges	Plea Date	The date a plea was entered					[x]	x	x
Pre-Trial Intake	Pretrial Release Decision	The decision made by the court for the defendant's pretrial custody status (release on recognizance, held on bond/bail, held without bond/bail)					[x]	x	x
Post-Trial	Failure Type	Defendant has been found to have failed to comply with legal obligation to pay, attend, or follow other court orders (FTP, FTA, FTC)					[x]	x	x
Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)	All elements	(Referral Date, ADR Date, Court Ordered, Type of ADR, Result of ADR, Hearing/Event Outcome)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

Elements Recommended for Further Clarification by Data Standardization Workgroup

Worksheet Name	Data Element	Definition and Examples	Comments
Sanctions	DL Suspension Length	Length of time of court-ordered DL suspension	In some cases, the length of time is known as part of the sentence (like 1 year for DUI). But for some situations, the court doesn't know if the license is suspended or not. For example, a civil traffic case goes into default for failure to appear. Was the intention that the CMS count how long the case was in default (which probably means their license was suspended)? What data do we hope to gain with this data element?
Sanctions	DL Suspend Start	Date driver's license was suspended	What data do we hope to gain with this data element?
Sanctions	CDL Disqualification Length	Length of time of court-ordered CDL disqualification	Same situation and question as above for DL Suspension Length
Sanctions	CDL Disqualifying Start	Date commercial driver's license was disqualified	What data do we hope to gain with this data element?
Sanctions	Community Restitution Hours	Number of hours ordered to serve	Workgroup feels this is already covered in the data element Sentence Types. Instead, they would like to change this one to count Community Restitution Hours Served in Lieu of fines and fees