

Arizona Supreme Court Data Standardization Advisory Committee

AGENDA

July 25, 2023, 10:00 am – 12 noon, Zoom Webinar

[Meeting Materials](#)

9:50 am	Zoom Webinar Open for Members, Attendees and Presenters		Laura Ritenour
Meeting Opening			
10:00 am	Welcome and Roll Call Review and Approval of June 27, 2023 Meeting Minutes		Michael Malone (Chair)
Items from Previous Meeting/s			
10:10 am	Review/Approval	Statewide Standardization of: - Preparatory Offense Table - Party Role Category Definitions	Laura Ritenour, Mary Bellefeuille, and Michele Gillich
10:20 am	Update/Review	Required Data Elements Initiative – Review Latest Draft of Appendix B and C Elements	Laura Ritenour
10:35 am	Update	Court Role Type table with Court Designations	Laura Ritenour and Mary Bellefeuille
New Items			
10:40 am	Discuss	Expectations of Utilization of Statewide Standard Codes	Cathy Clarich
10:50 am	Review/Discuss	Statewide Standardization of: - SB1310 Automation Implementation - Phone Type Codes - Data Status (Address/Phone) Codes - Plea Codes - Duration Length Codes (For Voting at August 29, 2023 Meeting)	Laura Ritenour and Mary Bellefeuille
11:00 am	Review/Discuss	Required Data Elements – Proposed Elements for January 2025 Checklists	Laura Ritenour
Ongoing Business			
11:40 am	Update	Updates, Comments and Questions from Members	All Members
11:50 am		Call to the Public	Michael Malone

11:55 am	Reminder	Next Meeting: Tuesday, August 29, 2023, 10 a.m. – 12 noon, via Zoom Webinar – Michael Malone to chair	
12 noon	Adjournment (motion needed)		Michael Malone

DATA STANDARDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

June 27, 2023

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Zoom Meeting

DRAFT MINUTES

Present: Michael Albers, Laurie Allen, Odette Apodaca, Daniel Bowman, Summer Dalton, Ralph Garcia, Jennifer Harrold, Todd Herrera-Ridenhour, Susann Holland, Randy Kennedy, Adele May, Cynthia Navarro (as proxy for Niltza Flores), Laura Navarro-Cobos (proxy for Jeanette Wiesenhofer), Mike Nimtz, Ester Reeves, Marcos Romero, Danica Sanchez, Adam Walterson, Leslie Zak (as proxy for Gil Bensinger)

Absent: Michael Malone, Katrina Solis

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and Guests: Mary Bellefeuille (AOC), Cathy Clarich (AOC), Melanie Cluff (AOC), Michele Gillich (AOC), Faith Hager (Mesa Municipal Court), Joe Hamilton (Phoenix Municipal Court), Anirban Mitra (AOC), Laura Ritenour (AOC)

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The June 27, 2023, meeting of the Data Standards Advisory Committee was called to order by the acting Chair, Cathy Clarich, at 10:05 a.m. The Chair conducted member roll call and attendees were thanked for their attendance and support.

II. ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

A. Code and Statewide Table Standardization Requests

Laura Ritenour, staff for the committee, presented information on code and table standardization requests. Each individual request discussed below is in the [June 27, 2023 Meeting Materials packet](#) published online

Offense Class Table: Laura Ritenour reported the AOC Information Technology Integration Team is requesting that offense class codes be standardized for all courts statewide. Further, offense class codes are used by the AOC for statistical reports and their use on a statewide level will ensure the data is more accurate and consistent. A motion to approve the statewide standardization of the Offense Class codes and descriptions was made by Odette Apodaca and seconded by Laurie Allen. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

Mental Health NICS Codes: Laura Ritenour reported the AOC Information Technology Integration Team is requesting standardized codes that when entered would trigger a quality record submission under NICS Category 5. This request was previously presented to the group and recommended for approval; however, they were never brought forward to the Data Standards Steering Committee for approval. A motion to approve the statewide standardization of the Mental Health – NICS Interface event/docket codes and descriptions was made by Summer Dalton and seconded by Cynthia Navarro. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

B. Update on SB1588

Laura Ritenour informed the committee that the governor vetoed this bill due to a last-minute amendment. Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC) is working with a federal funding agency, Justice Counts to continue the project. If it moves forward, the AOC still intends to transmit any required court data. Since this project is under review, and may move forward in a slightly different way, this item will be removed from future agendas for now.

C. Court Role Type Table with Court Designations

Laura Ritenour informed the committee that a Court column has been added to the previously approved Court Role Type table which designates which jurisdictions the approved Court Role Type would be applicable to. The information contained in this column is informational in nature and is not part of the statewide approved table. The committee provided feedback on a few Court Role Types, e.g., Bride & Groom, and the Court column has been updated to reflect the proper jurisdictions based on the feedback provided.

III. NEW ITEMS

A. Expectations of Data Standardization Advisory Committee

Cathy Clarich informed the committee that its designation as an advisory committee allows the group to approve codes in a more expedited manner as the Steering Committee on Data-Based Court Performance and Standards only meets quarterly. The Advisory Committee members were informed of the expectation that they ensure the approved codes are implemented in their courts by the implementation date provided. Members were encouraged to send a proxy from their organization if they are unable to attend and inform Laura Ritenour via the [proxy form](#) available online. Finally, Ms. Clarich informed the Advisory Committee that a quorum is required and that the votes will represent the majority of the members attending. If necessary, the Committee Chair has the discretion to bring contested items, or items of a complex nature, to the Steering Committee for consideration and final ruling. The Expectations of Data

Standardization Advisory Committee Members document can be found on pages 9-10 of the [June 27, 2023, Meeting Materials packet](#) published online.

B. Code and Standardization Requests

Preparatory Offense Table: Laura Ritenour reported the AOC Information Technology Integration Team is requesting that preparatory offense codes and descriptions be standardized for all courts statewide. Preparatory Offense codes are necessary for criminal history reporting for Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS) and Final Disposition Reporting (FDR). Ester Reeves asked for additional time to review these codes. As a result, this item will be brought up to vote at the July 25th meeting.

Language Code Table: Laura Ritenour reported that the Data Standards Steering Committee approved a table of standardized language names at their January 7, 2023, meeting; however, since that meeting it was revealed that there was a misspelling on one language description. Further, the AOC's Language Access Specialist informed the team of two additional sign languages – French and Mexican that were needed. A motion to approve the updated languages was made by Marcos Romero and seconded by Randy Kennedy. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

C. Request for New Required Data Element

Summer Dalton proposed the addition of a flag or indicator to identify if an Order for Rule 11 evaluation exists on a case, which would be used to identify cases that should be included in the Mental Health repository, or a future Rule 11 Repository, and assist with ad-hoc statistics requests. A motion to approve the Rule 11 Case Flag as a required data element was made by Susann Holland and seconded by Randy Kennedy. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

D. Party Role Definitions

Laura Ritenour requested that the courts review and provide feedback on the proposed Party Role Type definitions. The committee was informed that Michele Gillich requested that these definitions be standardized on a statewide level so that when these terms are used across agencies or projects, all groups have a standard definition and are using terms consistently. This item will be brought up to vote at the July 25th meeting.

IV. ONGOING BUSINESS

A. Required Data Elements – Appendix C

Laura Ritenour presented the proposed Appendix C required data elements and allowed for discussion among the committee members. Further research and follow up is required on the following elements:

- Advocate Type - should this element apply to Civil cases?
- Case Disposition Category - more examples are needed.
- Disposition NCIC Code – is this element necessary?
- Initiating Instrument – should this apply to Civil to capture Civil Non-Traffic local ordinance cases?
- Disposition Charge Description - should this apply to Civil to capture Civil Non-Traffic local ordinance cases?
- Disposition Date – is there a separate element for this under charges?
- Charge Filing Date - should this apply to Civil to capture Civil Non-Traffic local ordinance cases?

The Appendix C items will be discussed again at the July 25th meeting.

B. Data Standards Steering Committee Highlights

Laura Ritenour provided a top-level overview of the items discussed at the June 7, 2023, Data Standards Steering Committee meeting. The members had no comments or questions. The meeting highlights document can be found in the [June 27, 2023 Meeting Materials packet](#) published online.

C. Call to the Public

Cathy Clarich made a call to the public for comments. There was no answer.

D. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:37 a.m.

E. NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

July 25, 2023, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Zoom Webinar

Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Preparatory Offense Codes

Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

Preparatory Offense codes are necessary for criminal history reporting for Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS) and Final Disposition Reporting (FDR). These are a field on the bottom of each form and the codes listed below are from the forms.

FME (Feature Manipulation Engine) requires standard code sets and as a result the AOC Information Technology Integration Team is requesting standardized codes and descriptions for Charge Reduction values that will be displayed in CCR.

Tentative Implementation Timeline

When approved, the codes would be added to the AOC's FME Data Translation Server by August 2023 and courts would need to transmit use these codes or use their FME Data Translation Tool for transactions starting January 29, 2024.

Public Access and eAccess Display – not applicable

Motion

Motion to approve the statewide standardization of the Preparatory Offense codes and descriptions as listed below.

Proposed Preparatory Offense Codes	Proposed Preparatory Offense Descriptions
F	FACILITATION
S	SOLICITATION
A	ATTEMPTED
C	CONSPIRACY

Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Party Role Category Definitions, Requested by: AOC Integration Team

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

When working with courts during the development and programming for AZPOINT, the AOC Integration Team saw the need for creating party role categories. These categories will be helpful for future programming as the AOC, AJACS and non-AJACS courts work together on other integration projects, especially those with an emphasis on defining parties. It would be beneficial if all courts have a standard definition and are using terms consistently.

Tentative Implementation Timeline

When approved, the AOC Integration Team will add these definitions into their requirements documentation immediately and will ensure it is added to future project documentation as well.

Public Access and eAccess Display

Should this data be displayed on Public Access and eAccess? N/A

Should be this document be displayed in eAccess? N/A

Proposed Motion

Motion to approve the statewide standardization of the party role categories definitions as listed below.

Party Role Category	Proposed Standard Definition	Examples
Party	The people or entities who are directly involved in a case. A person or entity who constitutes the plaintiff or defendant in an action, or by or against whom an action is brought. The person or entity who seeks the reversal or upholding of a lower court's decision.	Plaintiff, petitioner, defendant, respondent, appellant, claimant, or appellee
Courtroom Staff	The individuals that are involved with court proceeding or have an instrumental role during the court process (excluding judicial officers) Any municipal, county, or state employee assigned to perform case-related duties in the courtroom.	Clerk, bailiff, court reporter
Participant	Depending on the type of case under consideration, people who are not a named party that participate in court proceedings.	Officer, victim advocate, Witness

	Individuals, other than parties, who secondarily are involved in a court case.	
Judge	<p>Person who presides over court proceedings, either alone or as a part of a panel of judges</p> <p>A public official appointed or elected to hear and decide legal matters in court.</p>	<p>Judge, mediator, arbitrator</p> <p>Justice, Judge, city magistrate, justice of the peace, commissioner, hearing officer mediator, arbitrator (NOTE: non-judges serve frequently in AZ as mediators and arbitrators)</p>
Attorney	<p>A person who practices law.</p>	<p>Attorney, legal paraprofessional</p> <p>Attorney, Legal paraprofessional (NOTE: Legal paraprofessionals in AZ are prohibited from practicing law---two different animals)</p>
Item	Object that is in dispute or related to a case.	Case exhibits, Property, Trust Name
Other	Used to refer to a person or thing that is different or distinct from one already mentioned or known about.	Other

RED = Mesa Suggestions

Placeholder for RDE Appendix B and C Excel file

Approved Court Role Type Table with Court Designations

Code to be entered into AOC FME before July 21, 2023	Standard Description	Role Type	Court (MN, JP, SC)
E	3rd Party Defendant	Party	JP, SC
Q	3rd Party Plaintiff	Party	JP, SC
AB	Arbitrator	Judge	MN, JP, SC
AE	Adoptee	Party	SC
AF	Affiant	Party	MN, JP, SC
AG	Attorney General	Attorney	MN, JP, SC
AL	Attorney Law Firm	Participant	MN, JP, SC
AM	AUTMA Minor	Party	SC
F	Applicant	Party	MN, JP, SC
AR	Adoptor	Party	SC
Y	Attorney	Attorney	MN, JP, SC
BA	Bailiff	Court	MN, JP, SC
Z	Bail Bondsman	Participant	MN, JP, SC
BG	Groom	Party	JP, SC
BR	Bride	Party	JP, SC
CA	Child's Best Interest Attorney	Attorney	SC
CB	Court Appointed	Participant	MN, JP, SC
CC	Cross Claimant / Plaintiff	Party	JP, SC
CD	Cross Defendant	Party	JP, SC
CE	Contestee	Party	SC
CF	Fiduciary	Participant	SC
CG	Conflict/Court Appointed	Attorney	MN, JP, SC
CI	Court Appointed Investigator	Participant	SC
CL	Clerk	Court	MN, JP, SC
CO	Court Reporter Organization	Participant	MN, JP, SC
CP	Counter Plaintiff	Party	JP, SC
CR	Contestor	Party	SC
C	Conservator	Participant	SC
CT	Counter Defendant	Party	JP, SC
CU	Court Reporter	Court	MN, JP, SC
DC	Deputy Clerk of Court	Court	MN, JP, SC
D	Defendant	Party	MN, JP, SC
DM	Demandant	Party	SC
F1	Marriage Applicant 1	Party	JP, SC

F2	Marriage Applicant 2	Party	JP, SC
GC	Guardian / Conservator	Participant	SC
GE	Garnishee	Participant	JP, SC
H	Guardian Ad Litem	Participant	SC
G	Guardian	Participant	SC
HP	Harassed Party For W/P Harassment	Party	MN, JP, SC
IE	Interpreter	Court	MN, JP, SC
IN	Incapacitated Person	Party	SC
IP	Incapacitated / Protected Person	Party	SC
IR	Intervenor	Party	JP, SC
IT	Interested Party	Participant	MN, JP, SC
JA	Judicial Assistant	Court	MN, JP, SC
JDG	Judge	Judge	MN, JP, SC
JS	Judicial Staff	Court	MN, JP, SC
JPT	Judge Pro Tem	Judge	MN, JP, SC
A	Appellant	Party	MN, JP, SC
LD	Legal Defender	Attorney	MN, JP, SC
B	Appellee	Party	MN, JP, SC
LP	Legal Paraprofessional	Attorney	MN, JP, SC
MD	Mediator	Judge	MN, JP, SC
M	Minor	Party	MN, JP, SC
MP	Mental Health Professional	Participant	MN, JP, SC
MV	Minor Victim	Party	MN, JP, SC
K	Claimant	Party	JP, SC
ODRVendor	ODRVendor	Participant	MN, JP, SC
OF	Officer	Participant	MN, JP, SC
OP (in the PO Party Role Type table)	Protected Party Other	Party	MN, JP, SC
OR	Objector / Respondent	Party	SC
X	Other	Other	MN, JP, SC
PA	Parent	Party	MN, JP, SC
PA (in the PO Party Role Type table)	Plaintiff Employer Agent	Participant	MN, JP, SC
PB	Probationer	Participant	MN, JP, SC
PC	Protected Child	Party	MN, JP, SC
PD	Proposed Fiduciary	Participant	SC
PE	Petitioner	Party	MN, JP, SC
N	Probation Officer	Court	MN, JP, SC
PF	Public Defender	Attorney	MN, JP, SC
PH	Medical Examiner	Participant	SC

P	Plaintiff	Party	MN, JP, SC
PE (in the PO Party Role Type table)	Plaintiff Employer	Participant	MN, JP, SC
PN	Person	Participant	MN, JP, SC
PP (in the PO Party Role Type table)	Plaintiff Protected	Party	MN, JP, SC
PO	Payor	Participant	MN, JP, SC
OP	Protected Person	Party	MN, JP, SC
PR	Payer	Participant	MN, JP, SC
PS	Prosecutor	Attorney	MN, JP, SC
PT	Patient	Party	SC
PCV	Process Server	Participant	MN, JP, SC
PY	Property	Item	MN, JP, SC
PZ	Payee	Participant	MN, JP, SC
I	Real Party in Interest	Participant	JP, SC
RS	Personal Representative	Participant	SC
R (in the PO Party Role Type table)	Requested (for AZPOINT process)		MN, JP, SC
RT	Respondent	Party	MN, JP, SC
SA	Special Administrator	Participant	SC
SM	Special Master	Judge	SC, JP
ST	State	Party	MN, JP, SC
S	Surety Company	Participant	MN, JP, SC
TG	Testamentary Guardian	Participant	SC
TN	Trust Name	Item	SC
TR	Testator	Participant	SC
T	Trustee	Participant	SC
U	Decedent	Party	SC
UW	Underwriter	Participant	MN, JP, SC
VA	Victim Advocate	Participant	MN, JP, SC
V	Victim	Party	MN, JP, SC
W	Ward	Party	SC
WF	Will Filer	Party	SC
WP	Ward / Protected Person	Party	SC
WT	Witness	Participant	MN, JP, SC

Code Request – Updated 07/20/2023

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize SB1310 Automation, Requested by: AOC Automation Services Unit

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

SB1310 establishes procedures regarding the commitment, detention, conditional release, and discharge of a defendant deemed incompetent, non-restorable and dangerous. The legislation outlines requirements for the treatment of a committed defendant. As a result, the following automation impact is proposed: new event codes, new appearance reason, and new case sub type. This is 2022 Legislation with a delayed effective date of 1/1/2024.

Tentative Implementation Timeline

General jurisdiction courts are expected to have required codes and reporting requirements in place by January 1, 2024.

Public Access and eAccess Display – not applicable

Motion

Motion to approve the statewide standardization of the event codes, appearance reason and case sub type and descriptions as listed below.

New Event Codes

Event Category	Event Codes	A.R.S.	Reporting Requirements ARS 13-4521(L)
ORDER	ORDER: Bench Trial to Determine if Defendant is Dangerous	13-4517(A)(4)	13-4521(L)(1) <u>The number of court orders for a trial pursuant to section 13-4517, subsection A, paragraph 4, including the number of jury trials that were held.</u>
ORDER	ORDER: Jury Trial to Determine if Defendant is Dangerous	13-4517(A)(4)	13-4521(L)(1) <u>The number of court orders for a trial pursuant to section 13-4517, subsection A, paragraph 4, including the number of jury trials that were held.</u>
ORDER	ORDER: Proof Evident Hearing	13-4521(A)	
MINUTE ENTRY	MINUTE ENTRY: Proof Evident Hearing	13-4521(B)	
MINUTE ENTRY	MINUTE ENTRY: Finding of Dangerous	13-4521(F) - 13-4521(I); 36-425.06(A)	13-4521(L)(2) <u>The number of defendants who are committed after a trial pursuant to this section.</u>

MINUTE ENTRY	MINUTE ENTRY: Finding of Not Dangerous	13-4521(E)	
MINUTE ENTRY	MINUTE ENTRY: Finding of Not Dangerous Restored	36-4003.1	(L)(4) <u>The number of committed defendants who are restored to competency or determined to not be dangerous and who are discharged.</u>
MINUTE ENTRY	MINUTE ENTRY: Finding of Not Dangerous Discharge	36-4003.2(a)	(L)(4) The number of committed defendants who are restored to competency or <u>determined to not be dangerous and who are discharged.</u>
ORDER	ORDER: Conditional Release to a Less Restrictive Alternative	36-4003.2(b)	(L)(3)The number of committed defendants who are conditionally released to a less restrictive alternative.

New Appearance Reason

Calendar Appearance Reason	Jurisdiction
Proof Evident Hearing	GJ

New Case Sub Type

Case Sub Type	Jurisdiction
Dangerous	GJ

Probate Case Creation Example

Court Type: Probate

Case Category: Mental Health-Probate

Case Type: Mental Health- Adult

Case Sub Type: Dangerous

Filing Type: [Agency Name]

Commenced by: Order

Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Phone Type Code

Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

Knowing the phone type is important for current AZPOINT and FARE programming and for future eFiling programming. Standardizing the phone type would allow these applications to send accurate data back and forth between the courts and the AOC's applications.

FME (Feature Manipulation Engine) requires standard code sets and as a result the AOC Information Technology Integration Team is requesting standardized codes and descriptions for Phone Types that will be displayed in CCR.

Tentative Implementation Timeline

When approved, the codes would be added to the AOC's FME Data Translation Server by August 2023 and courts would need to transmit use these codes or use their FME Data Translation Tool for transactions starting January 29, 2024.

Public Access and eAccess Display – not applicable

Motion

Motion to approve the statewide standardization of the Phone Type codes and descriptions as listed below.

Proposed Standard Code	Proposed Standard Description
CELL	Cell Phone
EMP	Business Phone
FAX	Fax Number
HOME	Home Phone
OTH	Other

Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Address Status Description, rename table to Data Status, and use table for Address Types, Phone Types, and any future applicable tables

Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

Knowing the phone status is important for current AZPOINT and FARE programming and for future eFiling programming. Standardizing the phone status would allow these applications to send accurate data back and forth between the courts and the AOC's applications.

FME (Feature Manipulation Engine) requires standard code sets and as a result the AOC Information Technology Integration Team is requesting standardized codes and descriptions for Address (Data) Status that will be displayed in CCR.

Tentative Implementation Timeline

The functionality that will use these codes requires further analysis for development. As a result, an implementation timeline will be provided at a meeting later this year.

Public Access and eAccess Display – not applicable

Motions

Motion to approve renaming the Address Status table to Data Status.

Motion the statewide standardization of the Data Status description as listed below.

Standard Code	Proposed Standard Description
UND	Undeliverable/Bad
Current Standard Code	Current Standard Descriptions
ACT	Active
FUT	Future
PRI	Prior
PRM	Primary
PRO	Protected
UND	Undeliverable

Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Plea Codes

Requested by: AOC Court Services Division

Administrative Directive 2022-12 directs the implementation of Phase One of the Required Data Elements initiative. Plea Type is an element in the Appendix B list. Standardizing the codes related to this data element would allow for more consistent reporting regarding plea type for future data requests.

Tentative Implementation Timeline

When approved, the codes would be added to the AOC's FME Data Translation Server by August 2023 and courts would need to transmit use these codes or use their FME Data Translation Tool for transactions starting February 2024.

Public Access and eAccess Display – not applicable

Motion

Motion to approve the statewide standardization of the Plea codes and descriptions as listed below.

Proposed Standard Codes	Proposed Standard Descriptions
AP	Alford Plea
GI	Guilty/Insane
GU	Guilty/Responsible
NC	No Contest
NG	Not Guilty/Not Responsible

Code Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize Duration Codes, Requested by: AOC Court Services

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

Administrative Directive 2022-12 directs the implementation of Phase One of the Required Data Elements initiative. Unit of Sentence Length is an element in the Appendix B list. Standardizing the codes related to this data element would allow for more consistent reporting regarding elements associated with duration for future data requests.

Tentative Implementation Timeline

When approved, the codes would be added to the AOC's FME Data Translation Server by August 2023 and courts would need to transmit use these codes or use their FME Data Translation Tool for transactions starting February 2024.

Public Access and eAccess Display – not applicable

Motion

Motion to approve the statewide standardization of the Duration codes and descriptions as listed below.

Proposed Standard Codes	Proposed Standard Descriptions
DAYS	Days
WEEK	Weeks
MONT	Months
YEAR	Years
LIFE	Lifetime

Placeholder for Proposed RDE List for January 2025

Excel File