

STEERING COMMITTEE ON DATA-BASED COURT PERFORMANCE AND DATA STANDARDS

March 5, 2025

1:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m. Hybrid Attendance - In Person and Zoom Webinar
MINUTES

Members Present: Hon. James Beene, Ms. Rachel Cameron, Ms. Jennifer Curtiss, Hon. Pamela Frasher-Gates, Ms. Shawn Friend, Ms. Tina Mattison, Hon. Douglas Metcalf, Ms. Donna McQuality, Hon. Heidi Owens, Hon. Michael Peterson, Ms. Nancy Rodriguez, Mr. Jeff Schrade

Members Absent: Hon. Thomas L. Chotena, Hon. Don Taylor, and Hon. Trevor Ward

Presenters and Guests: Ms. Jennifer Ferguson, and Mr. Chris Phelps

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Staff: Mr. Stewart Bruner, Ms. Jennifer Jones, Mr. Michael Malone, Ms. Laura Ritenour, and Mr. Michael Wise

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The March 5, 2025, 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. Justice Beene conducted member roll call, established a quorum, and mentioned the meeting was being recorded. Justice Beene welcomed Rachel Cameron to the committee. Ms. Cameron is the Chief Information Officer of the Judicial Branch of Maricopa County. He welcomed Hon. Douglas Metcalf from the Superior Court in Pima County, replacing the Hon. Ken Lee. He welcomed Jeff Schrade, the new Deputy Director of the AOC, replacing Marcus Reinkensmeyer. He also welcomed Jennifer Jones, the new AOC Court Operations Manager, replacing Cathy Clarich.

B. Approval of the December 11, 2024, Minutes

The draft minutes from the December 2024 meeting of the Steering Committee on Data-Based Court Performance and Data Standards were presented for approval. Justice Beene called for any corrections to the minutes, and none were made. A motion was made by Judge Michael Peterson and seconded by Donna McQuality to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

II. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. Call to the Public

Justice Beene announced that the Steering Committee on Data-Based Court Performance and Data Standards will be moving the "Call to the Public" section to the beginning of its meetings to ensure everyone has an opportunity to speak. Justice Beene made a call to the public for comments. There was no answer.

B. Presentations to Committees on Proposed Time Standards Modifications

Laura Ritenour presented a list of committees that have or will hear the proposed modifications to the time standards and shared that she and the workgroup chairs have received positive feedback and support from committees so far. She, along with the workgroup chairs, will be presenting these modifications at the upcoming Arizona Judicial Council meeting and hopes it will result in an Administrative Order for changes to three of the time standards. Justice Beene expressed his appreciation for all of Laura's work.

C. 2024-2029 Strategic Agenda Draft Proposals

Justice Beene reported that Laura Ritenour would be facilitating a discussion on the draft proposals for meeting Goal 4.1 of the 2024-2029 Strategic Agenda. Members were encouraged to provide feedback on the wording, priority, and content of the proposals.

4.1.a.1

Laura Ritenour presented the proposals for goal 4.1.a.1. Rachel Cameron suggested incorporating metadata and data attributes, and Laura will follow up with her on this. Jennifer Curtiss emphasized the importance of prioritizing education and training, particularly case-type specific time standard training, to help determine when to publish data. It was agreed that training will be a priority, as Jerry Landau is working on DUI Time Standards training, which Laura recommended using as a framework for future sessions. Jeff Schrade highlighted that training is a key component across multiple sub-goals. Nancy Rodriguez stressed the need to include explanations in time standards reports to clarify their content and purpose, suggesting these explanations be added to both the reports and section D of the proposal.

With the inclusion of the proposed changes Judge Michael Peterson made a motion to approve proposal 4.1.a.1 and was seconded by Jennifer Curtiss. The motion passed unanimously.

4.1.b.1

Laura presented the proposal for goal 4.1.b.1. Tina Mattison asked if language should be added for non-AJACS and eBench courts, based on the phrase "already exist" in the goal. She also inquired whether the CCR would be included

in the proposal. It was suggested that the AO and AD for data and timelines could be incorporated into these proposals. A suggestion was made to use the CCR to pull dashboard data. Judge Doug Metcalf highlighted an obstacle of linking the dashboard to case files, enabling users to click on a case and access the case file. He questioned how these systems could connect. Laura Ritenour will further explore this, while the AOC is investigating time standards dashboards and system integration.

With the inclusion of the proposed changes Nancy Rodriguez made a motion to approve proposal 4.1.b.1 and was seconded by Donna McQuality. The motion passed unanimously.

4.1.b.2

Laura Ritenour presented the proposal for goal 4.1.b.2. Jennifer Curtiss suggested different language for “handbooks” and proposed “reference materials” may be more encompassing.

With the inclusion of the proposed changes Donna McQuality made a motion to approve proposal 4.1.b.2 and was seconded by Jennifer Curtiss. The motion passed unanimously.

4.1.b.3

Laura Ritenour presented the proposal for goal 4.1.b.3. Jennifer Curtiss questioned how the AOC would ensure all courts comply with section D and suggested revising the wording. Jeff Schrade suggested including the word “access”. He also brought up that goal 5 of the Strategic Agenda involves launching a clerk certification training program and maybe this could be infused with data standardization and field training. Jeff Schrade will follow up on this separately. Nancy Rodriguez raised a concern about the wording in section F, asking if it was intentional to focus on court management, as it involves much more than data and time standards. Jennifer Curtiss agreed, and they decided to work on alternative language for section F. Jennifer Curtiss also noted the need to address the term "access" in section D and will add that to the proposal.

With the inclusion of the proposed changes Jennifer Curtiss made a motion to approve proposal 4.1.b.3 and was seconded by Jeff Schrade. The motion passed unanimously.

4.1.b.4

Laura Ritenour presented the proposal for goal 4.1.b.4. Jeff Schrade asked if this is a good spot to insert the CCR into the proposal. He also brought up the possibility of using A.I. tools to extract business intelligence.

Tina Mattison made a motion to approve proposal 4.1.b.4 and was seconded by Judge Michael Peterson.

D. Draft Proposal re: Local Presiding Judges Acknowledgement of Time Standards Reports Submitted to AOC

Laura Ritenour presented the proposal. Judge Douglas Metcalf asked how judges would assess the accuracy of the reports. She clarified that the proposal is more about recognizing that the data belongs to the court and welcomed that feedback. She suggested adjusting the wording to emphasize acknowledging receipt and review of the data. Judge Michael Peterson agreed with Judge Metcalf's concerns, noting that it's valuable for the presiding judge to be involved in reviewing the reports to identify any significant discrepancies that may require further investigation.

With the inclusion of the proposed changes Donna McQuality made a motion to approve the proposal for Local Presiding Judges Acknowledgement of Time Standards Reports Submitted to AOC and was seconded by Judge Michael Peterson. The motion passed unanimously.

E. Data Standardization Advisory Committee (DSAC) Update

Mike Malone presented the summary, providing context on the DSAC, its purpose, and its members. He thanked everyone for their work. Shawn Friend raised concerns about probate cases, time standards, and the definition of a terminated case, particularly regarding the change of termination codes when a decision is made about a guardianship or conservatorship. Mike noted that the category is set for review, is complete, but is awaiting the yearly reports. He asked if this issue should be addressed by the DSAC committee. Laura Ritenour stated she will work with Shawn Friend to draft a proposal.

F. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:54 p.m.

III. NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

The next meeting is Wednesday, June 4, 2025, and is hybrid format, with attendees and members appearing either in-person at the State Courts Building or over Zoom webinar. In-person attendees and members should come to Room 331 at the State Courts Building, 1501 W. Washington, Phoenix AZ 85007.