

STEERING COMMITTEE ON DATA-BASED COURT PERFORMANCE AND DATA STANDARDS

March 4, 2026

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

Members Present: Hon. James Beene, Hon. Robert Brooks, Ms. Rachel Cameron, Hon. Thomas L. Chotena, Ms. Jennifer Curtiss, Ms. Niltza Flores, Ms. Shawn Friend, Hon. Douglas Metcalf, Hon. Heidi Owens, Hon. Michael Peterson, Ms. Nancy Rodriguez, Hon. Don Taylor

Members Absent: Ms. Donna McQuality, Mr. Jeff Schrade, and Hon. Trevor Ward

Presenters and Guests: Mr. Todd Zweig, Ms. Nikki Tascoe, and Ms. Jennifer Ferguson

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The March 4, 2026, meeting of the Steering Committee on Data-Based Court Performance and Data Standards was called to order by the Chair, Justice James Beene, at 1:30 p.m. Justice Beene conducted member roll call, established a quorum, and mentioned the meeting was being recorded.

B. Approval of the December 3, 2025, Minutes

The draft minutes from the December 2025 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 Jennifer Curtiss to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

I. REGULAR BUSINESS

C. Call to the Public

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

D. Follow-up Reports on Criminal Case Management Efforts in Superior Courts

Justice Beene introduced Todd Zweig, Court Administrator from the Superior Court in Pinal County, to provide a follow-up on their criminal case management efforts. Mr. Zweig reported that the court has implemented continuance policies and conducts quarterly reviews of cases that fall outside of the time standards. He highlighted that a new caseload manager recently reviewed and cleaned up more than 400 criminal cases over the past month and a half, improving data accuracy and time standards reporting. He noted that changes to the felony time standards and more accurate data entry have had the greatest impact on improving performance.

When discussing challenges during these efforts, Mr. Zweig noted that getting the new county attorney up to speed on the project and aligning stakeholders and decision-makers were among the more difficult aspects of the work. To maintain progress, the court conducts quarterly reviews of cases that fall outside of the time standards and works with judicial assistants to help move those cases forward. Monthly reports are also shared comparing judges' caseloads and compliance with the time standards.

E. Strategic Agenda Goal 4.1.b. – Presiding Judge Process to Review Compliance with Time Standards

Justice Beene introduced Judge Michael Peterson, who was requesting feedback and recommendations from the committee for next week's meeting with the superior court presiding judges. Committee members discussed how different counties review time standards data, including whether courts generate regular reports and how those reports may be shared with judges. Some courts, such as Pima County, use online dashboards rather than static reports. Maricopa County stated they run monthly reports and then the full set of time standards reports twice each year, typically in January and May, for review by presiding judges ahead of fiscal year reporting. The committee also discussed the potential value of reports that compare individual judicial officers' performance with county averages or time standards goals.

Laura Ritenour will prepare a summary of the discussion and provide it to Judge Peterson for use in next week's presiding judge meeting.

F. Data Standardization Advisory Committee (DSAC) Update

Michael Malone provided an update on recent activities of the Data Standardization Advisory Committee. In recent months, the committee approved new statewide codes for the online citation payment process and small claims case subtypes. Work has also begun on the Required Data Elements (RDE) checklists for 2027–2030. Laura Ritenour noted that the appellate courts are beginning standardization work for Divisions I and II, and she is attending meetings to highlight ongoing data standardization efforts across both general and limited jurisdiction courts.

G. DUI Time Standards and Caseflow Management Training Workgroup

Justice Beene introduced the topic, and Laura Ritenour provided an update on the DUI Time Standards and Caseflow Management training. Laura reported that 91 attendees participated in the recent GOHS training session, and 33 participants completed the training evaluation. The training received an average rating of 4.55 out of 5 for the likelihood that participants would apply the information in their work.

Minor adjustments will be made to the content for the upcoming session at the June Judicial Conference to accommodate those who were unable to attend the December training. The December session was recorded and has been uploaded to TraCorp, where it is now available for viewing.

H. Update on Time Standards Report Accuracy Workgroup

Laura Ritenour provided an update on the Time Standards Report Accuracy Workgroup. The workgroup met in January and February and will hold its next meeting in March. The group is currently focusing on family law time standards and examining whether start and stop codes accurately reflect case processing activity. Additional topics discussed include staff turnover, data entry practices, county processes, document titles, and how report queries interact with those factors.

A more detailed report with recommendations will be presented at the June steering committee meeting. Preliminary recommendations include increased judicial and staff education and training, reviewing and standardizing start and stop codes, implementing parameters for cases filed on or after certain dates to address older cases, improving case management system user interfaces, and potentially surveying judges to gather additional input.

I. Adjournment

Judge Michael Peterson made a motion to adjourn, and the meeting was adjourned at 2:17 p.m.

II. NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

The next meeting is Wednesday, June 3, 2026, 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.