

STEERING COMMITTEE ON DATA-BASED COURT PERFORMANCE AND DATA STANDARDS

March 24, 2021

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

Virtual Meeting

APPROVED 7/7/2021

Present: Hon. James Beene, Ms. Shelly Bacon, Hon. Thomas Chotena, Ms. Jennifer Curtiss, Hon. Jill Davis, Hon. Pamela Frasher-Gates, Ms. Shawn Friend, Hon. Ken Lee, Ms. Donna McQuality, Mr. Rich McHattie, Hon. Michael Peterson, Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Ms. Charisse Richards, Hon. Keith Russell, Mr. Eric Silverberg, and Hon. Don Taylor.

Absent/Excused:

Presenters/Guests: Mr. Gil Bensinger, Mr. Terrance Cheung

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC): Mr. Stewart Bruner, Ms. Catherine Clarich, Ms. Summer Dalton, Mr. Karl Heckart, Mr. Don Jacobson, Ms. Marretta Mathes, Mr. Patrick McGrath, Ms. Marisa Shaffery, Mr. Craig Washburn

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The March 24, 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 9:00 a.m. The Chair asked for member roll call and introductions of staff and guests.

B. Approval of the January 13, 2021 Minutes

The draft minutes from the January 13, 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. There were none.

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

II. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. New Data Standards Workgroup and Committee Reporting Structure

Administrative Order 2020-200 expands this committee's charge to create a process to govern and maintain a set of branch wide code and data standards. The Data Standards Workgroup has been formed for this purpose. Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer provided an overview of the process and reporting structure.

The workgroup's charge is to standardize data elements to ease data sharing internally and externally. Specific data elements will be codified. Data translation tables may be necessary for some courts to report data in the standardized form.

The workgroup will make recommendations to this committee, in consultation with other standing groups and committees, for approval on standardizing data elements, beginning with the elements that are necessary for statewide integration projects.

B. Data Standards Workgroup Methodology

Mr. Karl Heckart presented on the methodology that will be utilized by the Data Standards Workgroup. Trial courts are supported by 12 different automation projects that each capture different parts of data. The ability for these systems to communicate with each other and outside partners is of vital importance.

Without a standardized data system, the project cost is inflated because each local data set will have to be assessed. If data cannot be read, it cannot be communicated, thus preventing the flow of information from one entity to another.

The workgroup will first identify programs currently in use that need to communicate with each other to standardize the necessary data elements. New projects will then be examined. Translation tables can be used in non-AJIN courts. Additionally, training will be required to ensure data entry accuracy.

C. Criminal Felony Workgroup

Judge Pam Gates reported on the work of the Criminal Felony Time Standards Workgroup. The workgroup met in February and discussed methods helpful in meeting the felony time standards, as well as obstacles negatively impacting the same.

The workgroup looked at different time intervals, examining the level of compliance within each interval. Problem solving and early resolution courts were discussed. Based on Maricopa's data, lower level felonies seem to move through the system more quickly. The older cases appear to have more complex issues and are aging the overall total.

The workgroup will discuss the available data and look to the high compliance courts for best practices. The group will examine the 90-day compliance standard for possible adjustment. The group will also look at the possibility of excluding time for post-plea programs that impact sentencing.

D. Juvenile Time Standards

The AOC has been working to determine whether the level of compliance reported in juvenile cases is a data issue or a case processing issue. Staff met with the Juvenile Dependency and Juvenile Justice Services Divisions of the AOC to discuss data from operational reviews as compared to data from the time standards reports. Courts will be asked to look at the time standards reports and validate the data.

E. Juvenile NODS Elements

Juvenile NODS elements are currently stored in different case management systems in many counties. The level of effort to retrieve the element will be dependent on whether the element must come from one case management system or it can come from multiple case management systems. This committee will need to decide where the juvenile elements should be derived.

F. NODS Elements Review (Taken out of order)

Justice Beene presented the NODS, with effort levels assigned to each data element, for approval for mandatory collection.

The elements in the NODS "Case" Category were reviewed.

A motion was made by Judge Don Taylor to mandate collection of the following elements:

1. Court Case Identifier (Element #1 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Judge Gates, passed unanimously)
2. Court (Element #2 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Judge Gates, passed unanimously)
3. Primary Case Category (Element #3 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Mr. Reinkensmeyer, passed unanimously)
4. Civil Case Category (Element #4 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Mr. Reinkensmeyer, passed unanimously)
5. Criminal Case Type (Element #8 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Mr. Reinkensmeyer, passed unanimously)
6. Current Case Status (Element #12 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Mr. Reinkensmeyer, passed unanimously)
7. Case Initial Filing Date (Element #16 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Mr. Reinkensmeyer, passed unanimously)
8. Disposition Date (Element #20 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Mr. Reinkensmeyer, passed unanimously)
9. Case Closed Date (Element #21 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Judge Gates, passed unanimously) Discussion was held related to clarifying element to ensure a consistent definition of "closed."
10. Judicial Officer Identifier (Element #22 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Mr. Reinkensmeyer, passed unanimously)
11. CMV Indicator (Element #43 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Mr. Reinkensmeyer, passed unanimously)

12. Traffic Accident Indicator (Element #44 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Mr. Reinkensmeyer, passed unanimously)
13. Fatality Indicator (Element #45 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Mr. Reinkensmeyer, passed unanimously)

A motion was made by Mr. Reinkensmeyer to mandate collection of data element "Interpreter" (Element #24 in meeting materials). The motion was seconded by Eric Silverberg. The motion passed unanimously.

The values for data element "Appeal" (Element #23 in meeting materials) were revised for derivation from a Y/N flag to derivation from a Y/N flag, case event, or case status. A motion was made by Judge Russell to mandate collection of data element "Appeal" as revised. The motion was seconded by Mr. Reinkensmeyer. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Reinkensmeyer to defer mandating collection of the following data elements:

1. Linked Case (Element #25 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Judge Russell, passed unanimously)
2. Linked Case Jurisdiction (Element #26 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Judge Russell, passed unanimously)
3. Linked Case Type (Element #27 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Judge Russell, passed unanimously)

A motion was made by Judge Gates to not mandate collection of data element "Expedited" (Element #15 in meeting materials), seconded by Judge Ken Lee. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Judge Lee to not mandate collection of data element "Intestate Flag" (Element #28 in meeting materials), seconded by Mr. Reinkensmeyer. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Judge Taylor to not mandate collection of data element "Filing Type" (Element #31 in meeting materials), seconded by Judge Gates. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Judge Gates to refer the following elements to the Data Standards Workgroup to define standard values for these elements prior to voting for approval:

1. Civil Case Type (Element #5 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Judge Russell, passed unanimously)
2. Probate Case Type (Element #6 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Judge Russell, passed unanimously)
3. Dependency Case Type (Element #7 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Judge Russell, passed unanimously)

4. Family Case Type (Element #9 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Judge Russell, passed unanimously)
5. Traffic Case Type (Element #10 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Judge Russell, passed unanimously)
6. Associated Legal Issue (Element #11 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Judge Russell, passed unanimously)
7. Specialty Court Assignment, previously Calendar Assignment (Element #13 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Judge Taylor, passed unanimously)
8. Case Disposition Category (Element #17 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Judge Taylor, passed unanimously)
9. Case Disposition Detail (Element #18 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Judge Taylor, passed unanimously)
10. Case Manner of Disposition (Element #19 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Judge Taylor, passed unanimously)
11. Case Closure Reason (Element #29 in meeting materials. Motion seconded by Judge Taylor, passed unanimously)

A motion was made by Judge Gates to retitle data element “Track” to “Procedural Track” (Element #14 in meeting materials) and to identify values for general jurisdiction courts as:

- Arbitration
- Non-arbitration
- Tier 1, 2, and 3
- Commercial
- Complex
- Any pilot program classification

Limited jurisdiction court values would be any procedural track identified. The motion was amended by Judge Gates to refer this element to the Data Standards Workgroup to further define the values for limited jurisdiction courts. The motion was seconded by Judge Lee. The motion as amended passed unanimously.

G. July 2021 Meeting

There is a need to meet prior to September. Staff will organize a meeting in July.

III. CALL TO PUBLIC

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

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

V. NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

July 7, 2021
9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
Virtual Meeting