

# STEERING COMMITTEE ON DATA-BASED COURT PERFORMANCE AND DATA STANDARDS

July 7, 2021

9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Virtual Meeting

---

**Present:** Hon. James Beene, Ms. Shelly Bacon, Hon. Thomas Chotena, Ms. Jennifer Curtiss, Nancy Fraire (for Mr. Eric Silverberg), Hon. Pamela Frasher-Gates, Ms. Shawn Friend, Hon. Ken Lee, Ms. Donna McQuality, Hon. Michael Peterson, Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Ms. Nancy Rodriguez (for Mr. Rich McHattie), Hon. Keith Russell, and Hon. Don Taylor

**Absent/Excused:** Hon. Jill Davis, Ms. Charisse Richards

**Presenters/Guests:** Mr. Terrance Cheung

**Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC):** Ms. Catherine Clarich, Ms. Summer Dalton, Ms. Marretta Mathes, Mr. Patrick McGrath, Ms. Marisa Shaffery, Mr. Craig Washburn

---

## I. CALL TO ORDER

### A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The July 7, 2021 meeting of the Steering Committee on Data-Based Court Performance and Data Standards was called to order by the Chair, Honorable James Beene, at 8:59 a.m. The Chair asked for member roll call.

### B. Approval of the March 24, 2021 Minutes

The draft minutes from the March 24, 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. The minutes should reflect that Judge Thomas Chotena was present.

A motion was made by Judge Don Taylor and seconded by Judge Keith Russell to approve the minutes as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

## II. REGULAR BUSINESS

### A. Review Committee Task and Charge

Justice Beene reviewed the committee's task and charge of:

1. Identifying court data that is needed to make data-based decisions related to case processing, court policy and management decisions, allocation of court resources, and data exchanges with other government entities.
2. Making recommendations regarding what data elements need to be collected in each case type, data governance, and other steps needed to improving data quality.
3. Reviewing time standards data on an annual basis.

The first two parts of the charge are fulfilled by the NODS review and determining which data elements should be collected in Arizona courts. Administrative Order 2020-200 was issued to create a process for governing and maintaining a set of branch wide codes and data standards, which was the rationale for creating the Data Standardization Workgroup. We are in the process of ensuring that all courts that do not use the statewide case management system will be represented on this workgroup.

As the committee works through the NODS, standardization discussions should be left for the workgroup. The decision as to whether an element should be approved should not hinge on the values listed on the NODS spreadsheet, because these values will change when the element goes to the Data Standardization Workgroup.

The focus of this committee should be on whether an element should be collected because it adds value to the ability for courts to make data-based decisions or exchanges with other governmental agencies. Members can assume that any elements requiring standardization of values will be referred to the Data Standardization Workgroup.

## **B. Data Standards Workgroup Update**

Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer provides an update on the Data Standardization Workgroup. The GJ Code Standardization Workgroup was dissolved upon the formation of the Data Standardization Workgroup, as this was an opportunity to look at the process and restructure.

The workgroup has had 3 meetings with very good attendance. The workgroup has standing monthly meetings. The focus is on elements where we need to do data exchange. There are housekeeping items as well, for example, Prop 207 items. However, this committee will make final policy decisions.

The workgroup has spent a lot of time on the case numbering schema. The workgroup has also discussed values for address types, address status, alias values, and country codes. The workgroup is still doing some work on case categories. It is important to standardize so that the data will be useful. By the next committee meeting, the workgroup will likely have a detailed recommendation for this committee to review.

### C. Code Standards Request

Mr. Pat McGrath presented on event codes that are being requested for use. 11 items are being presented for approval. Some were already put into AJACS out of necessity for Prop 207. The following are the codes for which this committee's approval is sought:

- **(1) Response to Petition Expunge Records & (2) Reply to Response to Petition Expunge Records.** Any discussion? Ms. Donna McQuality expresses concern about these codes not being in typical format, with event category listed first. Judge Taylor asks what we are approving. We are standardizing the action. If non-AJACS courts have a different way of recording, that is okay, but it needs to come to AOC in the approved format. Judge Taylor indicates that if we are going to require collection of specific events, that is a big policy decision.

Counting the petition is the most important piece. The other elements might be important if there is an integration project. Motion to approve by Mr. Reinkensmeyer, second by Judge Russell. Motion passed unanimously.

- **(3) Request Court Reporter.** Motion to approve by Ms. McQuality, second by Judge Ken Lee. Motion passed unanimously.
- **(4) Notice of Intent to Retain Jurisdiction.** Motion to approve by Judge Taylor, second by Judge Michael Peterson. Motion passed unanimously.
- **(5) Application for Restoration of Right to Possess Animals & (6) Application to Possess Animals – Good Cause Exception.** Motion to approve by Ms. Jennifer Curtiss, second by Judge Lee. Motion passed unanimously.
- **(7) Application: Certificate of Second Chance & Certificate of Second Chance.** Motion to approve by Judge Russell, second by Ms. Shelly Bacon. Motion passed unanimously.
- **(8) Notice: of Application for Interstate Transfer & (9) Reply: to Application for Interstate Transfer.** Motion to approve by Mr. Reinkensmeyer, second by Judge Russell. Motion passed unanimously.
- **(10) Minute Entry: Expungement Hearing.** Motion to approve by Judge Taylor, second by Judge Russell. Motion passed unanimously.
- **(11) Appearance Reason: Expungement.** Motion to approve by Ms. McQuality, second by Judge Peterson. Motion passed unanimously.

### D. NODS Elements Review

At the last meeting, there were a list of elements that were not approved because this committee voted to send them to the Data Standardization Workgroup. Justice Beene asks whether we can move forward with approving these elements, given that the values will be standardized by the workgroup. Mr. Reinkensmeyer reminds members that local courts can continue to use their codes and use translation tables. If there are reporting requirements, translation would be done locally. AOC would give plenty of time for changes.

A motion was made by Judge Taylor and seconded by Judge Russell to mandate collection of the following **Case** elements:

5. Civil Case Type (Civil)
6. Probate Case Type (Probate)
7. Dependency Case Type (Dependency)
9. Family Case Type (Family)
10. Traffic Case Type (Traffic)
11. Associated Legal Issue (Family)
13. Specialty Court Assignment, previously Calendar Assignment (Civil, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal)
14. Procedural Track (Civil)
17. Case Disposition Category (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
18. Case Disposition Detail (Civil, Family, Probate, Criminal, Traffic)
19. Case Manner of Disposition (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
29. Case Closure Reason (Probate)

The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Judge Peterson and seconded by Judge Russell to approve the following **Case** elements:

30. ICWA Case Flag (Family, Dependency, Juvenile)
32. Fee Waiver Date (Civil, Family, Probate)
33. Minors Involved Flag (Family)
34. Interstate Flag (Family, Dependency)
35. International Flag (Family, Dependency)

The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Reinkensmeyer and seconded by Ms. Curtiss to approve the following **Case** elements:

36. Finding of Domestic Violence Flag (Family)
37. Dependency Court Judgment Flag (Family, Probate)
38. Initiating Instrument Flag (Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
39. Detention Flag (Juvenile)
40. Law Enforcement Agency (Criminal, Traffic)

The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Judge Peterson and seconded by Judge Lee to approve the following **Case** elements:

41. Law Enforcement Arrest Tracking Numbers (Criminal, Traffic)
42. Law Enforcement Incident Tracking Number (Criminal, Traffic)

The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Judge Russell and seconded by Ms. Curtiss to approve the following **Participant** elements:

1. Party Name (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
2. Party Opt-in to Text Notifications (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
3. Type of Electronic Service (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
4. Alias (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
5. Date of Birth (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)

The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Judge Taylor and seconded by Mr. Reinkensmeyer to approve the following **Participant** elements:

6. Race (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
7. Ethnicity (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
8. Gender (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
9. Special Needs/ADA Flag (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
10. Zip Code (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)

The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion was held regarding the feasibility of collecting Participant data element #11 "Identifier." Members agreed that this element should be pulled out for further study on how it could be collected consistently across the state. A motion was made by Judge Taylor and seconded by Judge Lee to approve the following **Participant** elements:

12. ICWA Child Flag (Dependency, Juvenile)
13. Relationship to Action – Probate, Family, Dependency (Probate, Family, Dependency)
14. Relationship to Action – Civil (Civil)
15. Date of Death (Probate)

The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Judge Lee and seconded by Judge Peterson to approve the following **Participant** elements:

16. Driver License/State ID Number (Criminal, Traffic)
17. Driver License/ID State (Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
18. FBI Number (Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
19. Biometrically Linked Number (Criminal, Traffic)
20. Driver License Country (Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)

The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Judge Chotena and seconded by Judge Lee to approve the following **Participant** elements:

21. Country (Traffic)
22. Endorsement Code (Traffic)
23. License Class Code (Traffic)
24. License Restriction Code (Traffic)

The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Reinkensmeyer and seconded by Judge Chotena to approve the following **Participant** elements:

25. Parenthood Status (Juvenile)
26. Legally Emancipated (Dependency, Juvenile)
27. Dually Adjudicated Flag (Dependency, Juvenile)

The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Ms. Curtiss and seconded by Judge Russell to approve the following **Attorney/Advocate** elements:

1. Attorney/Advocate Name (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
2. Firm Name (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
3. Attorney/Advocate Address (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
4. Attorney/Advocate ID Number (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
5. Attorney Advocate Email Address (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)

The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Judge Peterson and seconded by Mr. Reinkensmeyer to approve the following **Attorney/Advocate** elements:

6. Attorney/Advocate Phone Number (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
7. Pro Hac Vice (Civil, Family, Probate Juvenile)
8. State of Admission (Civil, Probate)
9. Attorney/Advocate Entry Date (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
10. Attorney/Advocate End Date (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)

The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Judge Russell and seconded by Judge Taylor to approve the following **Attorney/Advocate** elements:

11. Limited Scope (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
12. Associated Party/Participant (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
13. Attorney Waiver (Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal)
14. Attorney Type (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
15. Advocate Type (Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal)

The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Reinkensmeyer and seconded by Judge Lee to approve the following **Status** elements:

1. Case Status Date (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
2. Case Status (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
3. Reason Placed on Inactive (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)

The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Judge Taylor and seconded by Mr. Reinkensmeyer to approve the following **Pleadings** elements:

1. Pleading Date (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)

2. Filing Party (Civil, Probate)
3. Complaint (Civil)
4. Answer (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency)
5. Cross-Claim (Civil)

The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Judge Russell and seconded by Judge Lee to approve the following **Pleadings** elements:

6. Counterclaim (Civil)
7. 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Claim (Civil)
8. Answer to Cross-Claim (Civil)
9. Answer to Counterclaim (Civil)
10. Answer to 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Claim (Civil)

The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Judge Taylor and seconded by Judge Russell to approve the following **Pleadings** elements:

11. Intervenor Claim (Civil, Dependency)
12. Answer to Intervenor Claim (Civil)
13. Amended (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
14. Amount in Controversy (Civil)
15. Initial Probate Pleading Type (Probate)
16. Subsequent Probate Pleading Type (Probate)
17. Fee Waiver Date (Civil, Family, Probate)

The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Reinkensmeyer and seconded by Ms. Curtiss to approve the following **Motions Filings** elements:

1. Date Filed (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
2. Filing Party (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
3. Motion/Filing Type (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
4. Pleading/Motion Outcome (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)
5. Agreed/Stipulated (Civil, Family, Probate, Dependency, Juvenile, Criminal, Traffic)

The motion passed unanimously.

**E. September 2021 Meeting**

Discussion was held regarding whether meeting should continue virtually, move to in person, or be a hybrid. Members indicated that a hybrid approach is favored.

**III. CALL TO PUBLIC**

The Chair made a call to the public. There was none.

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:59 a.m.

**V. NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE**

September 22, 2021  
9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.  
State Courts Building / Teams

DRAFT