GJ Code Standardization User Group and Clerk's User Group Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, January 9th, 2008

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

(602) 452-3193 #7002

1. "Wiretap" codes: At the last meeting, the group decided to change the "SW – Search Warrant" case category to "SW – Special Warrant". New case types should be created for this category. Also, we need to determine what Aztec codes should be used.

2. $18 Clerk's miscellaneous fee update

3. Update of Legal Issues 12/18/07 meeting regarding criminal contempt cases – should they be separate? Carrie will report the meeting results.

4. New Rule 65.2 (Employer Sanctions): New event codes for implementation in AZTEC and the Standardization report were recommended at the last meeting: "Order Suspending Business License", "Order Revoking Business License", and "Order Terminating Business License Suspension." Codes have been reserved in AZTEC and should be approved before implementation.

5. Need to identify the party statuses for the new civil case type: NCC – Employer Sanctions

6. In order to track DNA testing under 13-610, the following new events were recommended: "Order to Revoke DNA," "Order Expunge DNA," and "Petition expunge DNA." Codes have been reserved in AZTEC and should be approved before implementation.

7. New case type for excess proceeds in foreclosure sale? - Sue Hall

GJ Code Standardization User Group and Clerk's User Group Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, January 9th, 2008

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

Attendees: Beverly Frame, Debbie Young, Cindy Linnertz, Lily Shafer, Darla, Debbie Stevens, Delana Waite, Amy Johnson, Diane LaBarbera, Jeanne Hicks, Gordon Mulleneaux, Lori Thomas, Suzann Young, Mary Bellefeuille, Mary Edie, Andy Dowdle, Patrick McGrath, and Carrie Stoneburner

1. "Wiretap" codes: At the last meeting, the group decided to change the "SW – Search Warrant" case category to "SW – Special Warrant". New case types should be created for this category. Also, we need to determine what Aztec codes should be used. **Meeting update: Gordon and Beverly will provide Carrie with the recommended case types before the next meeting on January 16th. The committee agreed that AZTEC case type of R96 (Crim-Other Orders-Wiretap) should be used.**

2. $18 Clerk's miscellaneous fee update: **Meeting update: Carrie reported a productive meeting was held with the CMS team to gain understanding of the financial processing in AmCad. There are several ideas regarding the table set-up for this fee, and still need more information before selecting the best method. Carrie will update the team with the progress.**

3. Update of Legal Issues 12/18/07 meeting regarding contempt cases – should they be separate? Carrie will report the meeting results. **Meeting update: Carrie attended the Legal Issues meeting on 12/18/07 for assistance in determining the answer to case set up. The Legal Issues experts advised that if it was a criminal case, the criminal contempt case should be set up as a separate case (Rule 33.1 and/or 13-2810 were offered as guidance for the courts.). However, if the contempt case was civil, it would depend on the individual. If the individual was party to the original action, then it would not be a separate case. If the individual was not party to the case, then it should be set up as a separate case.**

4. New Rule 65.2 (Employer Sanctions): New event codes for implementation in AZTEC and the Standardization report were recommended at the last meeting: "Order Suspending Business License", "Order Revoking Business License", and "Order Terminating Business License Suspension." Codes have been reserved in AZTEC and should be approved before implementation. **Meeting update: The above three document types were approved and AZTEC codes will be implemented ASAP (notice to follow). Also, the team approved the addition of a generic civil document type of "Motion", subtype "Motion" and Hearing type: Motion.**

5. Need to identify the party statuses for the new civil case type: NCC – Employer Sanctions. **Meeting update: The team agreed the party statuses should mirror the "Contract" party statuses, with the exception of "Arbitration Appeal/Motion to Set." Statuses can be added or subtracted at a later date.**

6. In order to track DNA testing under 13-610, the following new events were recommended: "Order to Revoke **Release** DNA **Conditions**," "Order Expunge DNA" and "Petition expunge DNA." Codes have been reserved in AZTEC and should be approved before implementation. **Meeting update: The team approved the above document types and subtypes (with the addition of "Petition expunge DNA" to Hearing types). The AZTEC codes will be implemented ASAP (notice to follow).**

7. New case type for excess proceeds in foreclosure sale? - Sue Hall. **Meeting update: The team approved the new Civil case type: Excess Proceeds – Sale". Also, the party statuses should mirror the "Contract" party statuses, with the exception of "Arbitration Appeal/Motion to Set." The party roles will be "Petitioner" and "Respondent." Also, an AZTEC case type code will be created and distributed ASAP. Update: Gordon provided the following information: The trustee sale statute for the recovery of funds is 33-814**

8. **New business: Mary Edie requested code information for Adult Court cases. Yuma and Pima offered to forward Mary their codes to assist.**

Next Meeting: January 16th, 2008

GJ Code Standardization User Group and Clerk's User Group Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, January 16th , 2008

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

(602) 452-3193 #7002

1. Case types for "SW – Special Warrant" – Gordon Mulleneaux and Beverly Frame.

2. DNA testing follow-up issues:
   - If no information is filed on a person, but the DNA testing was done and they petition the court to have the results removed, what type of case is this? Is it Civil? We would not have had any criminal charges filed at that point in our court. (Sue Hall)
   - Fee charged for "Petition: expunge DNA"?

3. Clarify "Motion" document type: Should "Motion" be added to the generic hearing type of Petition/Application/Request?

4. Civil Cover sheet update (Patrick McGrath). A rule petition was filed on 1/10/08. We are looking for input for whether or not this would be beneficial for Probate and Family Law.

5. Begin to review AZTEC codes that have no matches in GJ Code Standardization (Carrie Stoneburner). Document to follow.

GJ Code Standardization User Group and Clerk's User Group Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, January 16th, 2008

Attendees: Mary Edie, Audrey Macdonald, Mary Bellefeuille, Debbie Young, Susann Young, Patrick McGrath, Gordon Mulleneaux, Cindy Linnertz, Andy Dowdle, Lily Shafer, Odette Apodaca, Debbie Stevens, Jeanne Hicks, Renee Braner, Sue Hall, Lori Thomas, Sheri Newman, Vicki Aguilar, Fran Ranaccelli, Cassandra Urias, Yolanda Waite, Beverly Frame, Dianne Jordahl, Diane LaBarbera, and Carrie Stoneburner.

New Business: Patrick advised the workload from the CMS team to the Standardization committee is increasing, and assistance is needed to meet the required deadlines. He will send a detailed email to the team regarding the formation of a new subcommittee to handle AmCad related code standardization issues.

1. Case types for "SW – Special Warrant" – Gordon Mulleneaux and Beverly Frame.
Meeting update: Gordon forwarded a list of recommended cases types: Search Warrant, Pen Register, Trap and Trace, Handwriting Exemplar, Seizure Warrant, GPS and Order to Obtain Physical Evidence. Along with "Wire Tap" and "Telephonic Search Warrant", these case types will be reviewed for standardization at the next meeting.

2. DNA testing follow-up issues:
   - If no information is filed on a person, but the DNA testing was done and they petition the court to have the results removed, what type of case is this? Is it Civil? We would not have had any criminal charges filed at that point in our court. (Sue Hall)
     Meeting update: The case will be "Civil".
   - Fee charged for "Petition: expunge DNA"?
     Meeting update: No fee will be charged. This issue will be presented at the next available Legal Issues meeting.

3. Clarify "Motion" document type: Should "Motion" be added to the generic hearing type of Petition/Application/Request?
Meeting update: "Motion" will be added as a new "Hearing" document subtype: Petition/Application/Request/Motion."

4. Civil Cover sheet update (Patrick McGrath). A rule petition was filed on 1/10/08. We are looking for input for whether or not this would be beneficial for Probate and Family Law.
Meeting update: Patrick advised a new rule petition was filed on 1/10/08 for civil cover sheets. Gordon advised Maricopa, by rule, has an existing coversheet and asked how this will be coordinated. Also, some counties have existing civil cover sheets and some don't. Some counties reported the cover sheets are not filed, but are "file stamped." Patrick advised a link to the rule petition will be forwarded once it is posted so that a discussion can be started regarding this type of cover sheet, along with other court type cover sheets.

5. Begin to review AZTEC codes that have no matches in GJ Code Standardization.
Meeting update:

Master Table Event Code	Description	Notes	Comments from 01/16/08 Code Standardization Meeting
931	ACCPNTCE OF SRVICE (OUT-OF-ST)	Do we need this?	Map to document type: Service, subtype: Acceptance (all court types)
846	CHK RTRND UNDELIVERABLE	could this be mapped to: correspondence: returned mail or do we need specific	Create new document type in all court types: Financial. Create new subtypes: 1) Check Returned Undeliverable 2) Stale Data. Map 846 code this new code.)
390	JUDGMENT (PARTIAL)	Do we need this?	Create new document subtype: Judgment (Partial) in document type: Judgment. (Civil court type). Map 390 code to this new subtype.
712	VERFIED ACCOUNTING	Do we need this?	Do not include in standardization
373	MOTION FOR JUDGMENT N.O.V	Do we need this?	Do not include in standardization
600	EMERGENCY ORDER PROTECT ISSUED	Do we need this?	Do not include in standardization
713	ATTORNEY'S AFFIDAVIT	Need to make this specific?	Jeanne Hicks to research. Review at 1/23/08 meeting
196	PRETRIAL MOTIONS	Is motion good enough?	Map to document type: Motion, subtype: Motion
753	PSYCHOEDUCATIONAL EVALUATION	Is "evaluation" good enough?	Create new document subtype: "Psych Evaluation" in document type "Report" in all court types. Map 753 code to this new subtype.
967	ORAL ARGUMENT	Do we need this?	Do not include in standardization
809	NON-JURY HEARING	Do we need this?	Do not include in standardization
236	STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS	Is statement: of facts good enough?	Do not include in standardization
380	PET FOR JUDGMENT DEBTOR EXAM	Do we need this?	Add to Civil court type, document type: Petition. Create new subtype: Judgment debtor exam. Map 380 code to this new subtype.
272	RECORD FORWARD TO CT OF APPEAL	Do we need this?	Create new document subtype" Forwarded to Court of Appeal" in Civil court type, document type: Record. Map 272 code to this new code.
771	DELINQUENCY PETITION CONTESTED	Do we need this?	Do not include in standardization

Next meeting: January 23, 2008.

GJ Code Standardization User Group and Clerk's User Group Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, January 23rd , 2008

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

(602) 452-3193 #7002

1. AmCad subcommittee update.

2. New Financial status codes. These will be used to track for contracts, payment plans, etc.
   - Active
   - Suspended
   - Completed

     - Should the party status be changed when the financial status is changed?

3. New events to support payment contracts in AmCad. These events will automatically post to the Register of Actions when a payment contract is created or modified:

   - Payment Contract Created
   - Payment Contract Suspended
   - Payment Contract Resumed
   - Payment Contract Completed

4. Case status for consolidated cases. AmCad needs to know what the case status of the child and parent cases would be at consolidation, and when the case is un-consolidated. Last year, the committee approved a new case status of "Consolidated", but additional questions were unresolved regarding the status of the case. For example, is the child case considered "closed" when consolidated with the parent case?

4. Review for approval the following case types for "SW – Special Warrant"
   - Search Warrant
   - Pen Register
   - Trap and Trace
   - Handwriting Exemplar
   - Seizure Warrant
   - GPS
   - Order to Obtain Physical Evidence
   - Wire Tap
   - Telephonic Search Warrant

     - Determine party roles (see Standardization report for available values)
     - Determine party status (see Standardization report for available values)

5. Determine party roles for new civil case type: "NCC – Employer Sanction"

6. Continue reviewing AZTEC "no match" codes (document attached):

GJ Code Standardization User Group and Clerk's User Group Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, January 23rd , 2008

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

(602) 452-3193 #7002

Attendees: Patrick McGrath, Susann Young, Mary Bellefeuille, Diane LaBarbera, Gordon Mulleneaux, Lori Thomas, Odette Apodaca, Mary Edie, Rene Braner, Sue Hall, Debbie Young, Jeanne Hicks, Audrey MacDonald, Lorraine Back, Cindy Linnertz, Andy Dowdle, Carolyn Farley, Lilly Shafer, Cassandra Urias, Laurel Waite and Delana Waite.

1. AmCad subcommittee update.
Meeting update: The following members have volunteered for the new "AmCad Workgroup": Debbie Stevens, Sandra Kay, Mary Edie, Sue Hall, Audrey MacDonald, Sheri Newman, Lori Back, Beverly Frame, Elaine DeBow and Odette Apodaca. This team will meet 6-8 hours per week for the next several weeks to address issues forwarded by the CMS team regarding AmCad. Therefore, the regular GJ Code Standardization meeting will go back to meeting monthly, starting February 20th. Carrie will send an email to the entire team with the new 2008 schedule, and will also send an email to the AmCad workgroup to obtain available meeting times.

2. New Financial status codes. These will be used to track for contracts, payment plans, etc.

- Active
- Suspended
- Completed

  - Should the party and case status be changed when the financial status is changed?

Meeting update: The team approved the above codes, and agreed the party and case status should not be changed when the financial status is changed.

3. New events to support payment contracts in AmCad. These events will automatically post to the Register of Actions when a payment contract is created or modified:

- Payment Contract Created
- Payment Contract Suspended
- Payment Contract Resumed
- Payment Contract Completed

Meeting update: The above events were approved to be implemented in all court types. The document type: Payment Contract and subtypes, Created and Completed, will automatically post to the Register of Actions.

4. Case status for consolidated cases. AmCad needs to know what the case status of the child and parent cases would be at consolidation, and when the case is un-consolidated. Last year, the committee approved a new case status of "Consolidated", but additional questions were unresolved regarding the status of the case. For example, is the child case considered "closed" when consolidated with the parent case?
Meeting update: The team agreed that upon consolidation, the parent case status will be "open" and the child case status will be "consolidated." If and when the cases become un-consolidated, the case status will become "open."

5. Review for approval the following case types for “SW – Special Warrant”

- Search Warrant
- Pen Register
- Trap and Trace
- Handwriting Exemplar
- Seizure Warrant
- GPS
- Order to Obtain Physical Evidence
- Wire Tap
- Telephonic Search Warrant

  - Determine party roles (see Standardization report for available values)
  - Determine party status (see Standardization report for available values)

Meeting update: The above case types were approved for the “SW” case category. The party status will remain the same as the “SW” case category: “Active”, “Terminated – Administrative”, “Terminated – Expired”, “Terminated – Executed”, and “Extended.” The party roles will be “State”, “Defendant” and “Other.”

6. Determine party roles for new civil case type: “NCC – Employer Sanction”
Meeting update: The party roles will be “State”, “Defendant”, “Petitioner” and “Other.”

7. Continue reviewing AZTEC “no match” codes. **Meeting update**:

Master Table Event Code	Description	Notes	Comments from 01/23/08 Code Standardization Meeting
737	SCREENING REPORT	is this Mental Health: Report: Pre-petition screening?	Map to document: Report, subtype report.
273	ORDER APPOINTING ARBITRATOR	Do we need this?	Create new document type: Order, subtype: appointing arbitrator (Civil Court type).
657	MOTION TO ENFORCE VISITATION	Do we need this?	Create new document subtype: enforce visition, under document type: Petition, Family Law Court Type.
418	NOTICE OF DISMISSAL/PARTY	Is this Order: dismissing party?	Create new document type: Notice, subtype: notice of dismissal/party in Civil Court Type.
935	ORDER VACATING TRIAL	is this the same as Order: Vacating?	New subtype: Vacating Trial (document type: Order). All court types.
643	POST TRIAL MEMORANDUM	map to Misc: Memorandum?	Map to Misc: Memorandum
509	REPORT OF COURT VISITOR	Do we need this?	Do not map to standardization
53	ORDER FOR CONFIDENTIAL WIRETAP	Do we need this?	Create new document subtype: order for wiretap, document type: order; criminal court type
389	AFF OF PERSONAL SRVC (OUT ST)	Do we need this?	Map to document: Service, document subtype: Affidavit.

Master Table Event Code	Description	Notes	Comments from 01/23/08 Code Standardization Meeting
883	CAL: PRE-TRIAL	Should we use Hearing: Pretrial conference	Map to Hearing type; Pretrial conference subtype
435	NOTICE OF PENDING FORFEITURE	This is a civil case type - do we need this?	Create new document type: notice; subtype: of pending forfeiture, civil court type.
504	ACCPT OF APPT AS P.R.	Should this be letters: Acceptance? And Acceptance?	Map to Letters: Acceptance
637	MOTION FOR SIMPLIFIED MODFCTN	Do we still need this?	Map to motion: modify
410	PET FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	Motion: Declaratory judgment? Or Notice: Filing Injunction?	create document subtype petition, under document type: petition. All court types.
714	AFF OF ATTORNEYS FEES	Do we need this?	Civil, family law, probate court type: affidavit (document type) and new subtype: Attorney fees.

Next Meeting: February 20, 2008

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, February 20th, 2008

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

(602) 452-3193 #7002

1. **Civil Cover Sheet Update** – Carrie Stoneburner and Patrick McGrath

2. **Interstate Compact** – Currently, Interstate Compact is located in the Standardization Report as an Administrative Case Category and Case Type. During a recent AmCad workgroup session, it was suggested that it should also be in Criminal.

3. **Order to Show Cause in Support** – During a recent AmCad workgroup session, it was noted that OSC has not been removed on Support. The new Family Law Rules set these via Orders to Appear. OSC's are now only Contempt or Sanctions. Also, a suggestion was made to add "SE" Support enforcement case category to show child support.

4. **Public access procedures for convictions that are set-aside** - Gordon Mulleneaux

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, February 20th, 2008

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

(602) 452-3193 #7002

Attendees: Debbie Stevens, Bert Cisneros, Patrick McGrath, Mary Edie, Tim Elliot, Andy Dowdle, Carolyn Farley, Jane Phillips, Martha Anderson, Beverly Frame, Keith Kaplan, Judy Waggoner, Debbie Young, Audrey McDonald, Lorie Back, Cindy Linnertz, Odette Apodaca, Sue Hall, and Carrie Stoneburner

1. Civil Cover Sheet Update – Carrie Stoneburner and Patrick McGrath
Meeting update: Patrick advised a meeting is scheduled for March 25, including representation from the Clerk's office and Court Administration. He also stated that a rule change was submitted for the new cover sheet. Please contact Patrick for the cover sheet link. Some of the concerns expressed were: Will the cover sheet docket to the ROA? Then sealed? Will case types be able to change? Will the court's case type description have to match the cover sheet (should match Standardization Report)? As soon as there is information to provide, an update will be sent to the committee.

2. Interstate Compact – Currently, Interstate Compact is located in the Standardization Report as an Administrative Case Category and Case Type. During a recent AmCad workgroup session, it was suggested that it should also be in Criminal.
Meeting update: Beverly advised that Yuma starts the action as a criminal probation case. Some courts issue criminal case numbers, but some do not. Bert advised that it may be an administrative case type because no disposition is entered at the end. The team agreed that a new case subtype: "Interstate Compact" will be created under the "Unclassified" Criminal case type, and to the Unclassified Juvenile Delinquency case type. It will no longer be available in the Administrative case category.

3. Order to Show Cause in Support – During a recent AmCad workgroup session, it was noted that OSC has not been removed on Support. The new Family Law Rules set these via Orders to Appear. OSC's are now only Contempt or Sanctions. Also, a suggestion was made to add "SE" Support enforcement case category to show child support.
Meeting update: The committee agreed that Hearing type: Order to Show Cause-Support should end in the Standardization report. Also, a new IV-D flag will be created in AmCad to identify support enforcement cases.

4. Public access procedures for convictions that are set-aside - Gordon Mulleneaux
Meeting update: Here are some of the comments expressed by the committee: Citizens have applied to have their civil rights restored, and suggested a public access page to display the results; Arizona has no true expungement law; we have created more descriptive codes to clarify court actions; the public is not familiar with the public access site and code meanings; 13-907 is not viewed by some of the LJ courts to authorize the removal of the guilty conviction; need to match DPS disposition; no follow-up on actions after convictions by background searches; and the action to set-aside is open to court interpretation as to whether guilty disposition is removed/changed. In conclusion, Carrie reported Dave Byers has requested this topic be added to the agenda of a future "Data Dissemination" meeting. As information is forthcoming, an update will be provided.

Next Meeting: March 26th, 2008

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, March 26th, 2008

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

(602) 452-3193 #7002

1. **Report on Legal Issues 2/19 meeting (fees charged in Employer Sanctions and DNA expungment cases) – Carrie Stoneburner**
2. **Support category – Odette Apodaca**
3. **Protective Order spreadsheet - Debbie Stevens**

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, March 26th, 2008

Attendees: Cheryl Clower, Denise Lundin, Diane LaBarbera, Linda Huston, Andy Dowdle, Cassandra Urias, Carolyn Farley, Sue Hall, Jane Phillips, Casey Streeter, Tim Elliot, Debbie Young, Lorrie Back, Debbie Stevens, Della (Mohave County), Ester Rios, Keith Kaplan and Carrie Stoneburner.

1) Report on Legal Issues 2/19 meeting (fees charged in Employer Sanctions and DNA expungment cases) – Carrie Stoneburner
Meeting update: Carrie attended the 2/19 legal issues meeting and obtained the following opinions:

- **Employer Sanctions:**

  Discussion:
  AZ Rules Civ. Pro., Rule 65.2(m) provides that fees assessed under the employer sanction legislation (A.R.S. § 23-212, etc.), shall be assessed as prescribed in A.R.S. § 12-284, etc. A.R.S. § 12-284(B) then authorizes a fee of $61.00 for filing an answer or initial appearance.

  Conclusion:
  A filing fee of $61.00 can be charged to a respondent under the new employer sanction legislation. **During the meeting, Carrie advised this is the base fee, not including local charges.

- **DNA Expungment Cases**

  Discussion:
  If the petition for an order to expunge a person's DNA is filed after an acquittal, the petition should be filed under the original case number and no fee should attach. If a charge was never filed, the petition should be opened as a new case, however, a filing fee still should not be charged, since the proceeding is criminal in nature. The petition for an order to expunge a person's DNA is not similar to an application to restore civil rights, because, with the application to restore civil rights, there is an underlying criminal conviction, whereas, with the petition for an order to expunge, there is no underlying conviction.

  Conclusion:
  The clerk of superior court should not charge a filing fee for a petition for an order to expunge a person's DNA from the Arizona DNA identification system, filed under A.R.S. § 13-610(M).

2) Protective Order spreadsheet - Debbie Stevens
Meeting update: Debbie Stevens reviewed her court's "training document" to assist her staff in selecting the correct events for Protective Orders, Orders of Protections, Injunction against Harassment and Injunction against Workplace Harassment. She recommended, and the committee agreed, to remove "Petition – Order of Protection" from the JD case category and replace in the JP case category. The team also agreed to change the description of the Unclassified Civil Case subtype: "Civil Emergency Order of Protection" to "Civil Emergency Protective Order. " Keith Kaplan also verified these cases expire at the next close of business day.

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting Agenda

AGENDA

Wednesday, May 21st, 2008

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

(602) 452-3193 #7002

1. **Request Input from committee concerning sealed cases, records, processes in On-Base, etc. – Jennifer Greene, AOC**

From the Rule 123 and Data Dissemination Advisory Committee, and is addressed to the Clerks' User Group. The issues they need input on are as follows:

1. Whether all superior court clerks are now storing case documents in On-Base
2. Whether everyone is using On-Base in the same way for sealed records and case types, and what their practices are
3. How practical would it be to exclude certain documents by code number or case type.

The Committee is considering a pilot program that would allow certain registered users to have remote electronic access to images of case documents in criminal, traffic, and "civil" cases (i.e. not including Family, Probate, or Juvenile cases or proceedings for an Order of Protection/Injunction Against Harassment).

It's likely the design of this pilot program will include restrictions on a short list of specific documents within the criminal and civil arenas, e.g., pre-sentence reports, warrants, and maybe a few others. The Committee may also want to exclude access to criminal cases involving sex crimes. So for those in the GJ Code Standardization Workgroup who are familiar with how their offices are using On-Base, the Committee would benefit from knowing how practical this approach will be.

2. Additions to GJ Standardization- P. McGrath, AOC

DOCUMENT TYPES and FINANCIAL ACTIONS NEEDED FOR AJACS
The following need to be added to AJACS GJCMS for the reasons stated in the table.

DOC TYPE	DOC SUB-TYPE	REASON	CIV	CRIM	FAM	PROB	G/C	JUV	ADMIN
ORDER:	ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCESS	Per FL Rule 66C			X				
PETITION:	DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE W/ CHILDREN	Need with and without children to accommodate courts that implemented Parenting Plan fees.			X				
PETITION:	DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE W/O CHILDREN				X				
PETITION:	LEGAL SEPARATION W/ CHILDREN				X				
PETITION:	LEGAL SEPARATION W/O CHILDREN				X				
PETITION:	ANNULMENT W/ CHILDREN				X				
PETITION:	ANNULMENT W/O CHILDREN				X				
REPORT:	ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION CONF REPORT	Per FL Rule 66C			X				
AFFIDAVIT:	OF FOREIGN PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE	Missing from Standardization				X			
HEARING:	APPOINT TEMPORARY CONSERVATOR	Missing from Standardization					X		
APPEALS:	APPEAL DISMISSED AND REMANDED	Missing from Standardization	X		X	X	X	X	
JUDGMENT:	FOR JURY FEES	For jury fees ordered and not paid	X						
ORDER:	FOR JURY FEES	Missing from Standardization	X						
ARBITRATION:	NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT OF CIVIL ARBITRATOR	We have the appointment, but not the assignment after peremptory strike period	X						
AFFIDAVIT:	OF FOREIGN JUDGMENT	Missing from Standardization	X						
NOTICE:	APPEAL (CRIMINAL)	We have specific for civil but not criminal		X					
ORDER:	DENYING WIRETAP	Need a specific order for tickler purposes		X					
FINANCIAL ACTIONS									
ACTION	**DESCRIPTION**	**REASON**							
FINANCIAL ACTION	FEES DEFERRED	Comply with System Requirement 1.7 of Gap Analysis / JAD Sessions							
FINANCIAL ACTION	FEES SUSPENDED	Comply with System Requirement 1.7 of Gap Analysis / JAD Sessions							

GJ Code Standardization and Clerk's User Group Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, May 21st, 2008

1. Request Input from committee concerning sealed cases, records, processes in On-Base, etc. – Jennifer Greene & Melinda Hardman, AOC

AOC requested information regarding the use of On-Base to determine the feasibility of allowing select members of the public access to electronic documents being maintained by the courts. The concern of the AOC is how to restrict access to sealed documents that should not be viewable by the public. The feasibility of this project is uncertain at this time. Jennifer Greene and Melinda Hardman will take the input given to them and reassess this project with the Data Dissemination Committee.

1. Whether all Superior Court Clerks are now storing case documents in On-Base -

    - It was determined that all General Jurisdiction Courts except for Pima and Coconino County Superior Courts use On-Base electronic document management system.

2. Whether every Court is using On-Base in the same way for sealed records and case types, and what their practices are -

    - Currently, some courts use a coversheet that states the documents contained are sealed when scanning sealed documents. Other courts scan the documents without the coversheet, but restrict access to those documents by select users with sufficient security rights.

2. Additions to GJ Standardization- AOC

A. The following codes are additions to GJ Standardization agreed upon by committee:

DOC TYPE	DOC SUB-TYPE	REASON	CIV	CRIM	FAM	PROB	G/C	JUV	ADMIN
ORDER:	ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCESS	Per FL Rule 66C			X				
REPORT:	ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION CONF REPORT	Per FL Rule 66C			X				
HEARING:	APPOINT TEMPORARY CONSERVATOR	Missing from Standardization					X		
APPEALS:	APPEAL DISMISSED AND REMANDED	Missing from Standardization	X		X	X	X	X	
JUDGMENT:	FOR JURY FEES	For jury fees ordered and not paid	X						
ARBITRATION:	NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT OF CIVIL ARBITRATOR	We have the appointment, but not the assignment after peremptory strike period	X						
NOTICE:	APPEAL (CRIMINAL)	We have specific for civil but not criminal		X					
ORDER:	DENYING WIRETAP	Need a specific order for tickler purposes		X					

FINANCIAL ACTIONS		
ACTION	**DESCRIPTION**	**REASON**
FINANCIAL ACTION	FEES DEFERRED	Comply with System Requirement 1.7 of Gap Analysis / JAD Sessions
FINANCIAL ACTION	FEES SUSPENDED	Comply with System Requirement 1.7 of Gap Analysis / JAD Sessions

B. After further research, it was determined the following codes are not necessary because the case types differentiating with or without children will be sufficient to allow for the user to set the difference in fees associated with these codes:

DOC TYPE	DOC SUB-TYPE	REASON	CIV	CRIM	FAM	PROB	G/C	JUV	ADMIN
PETITION:	DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE W/ CHILDREN	Need with and without children to accommodate courts that implemented Parenting Plan fees.			X				
PETITION:	DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE W/O CHILDREN				X				
PETITION:	LEGAL SEPARATION W/ CHILDREN				X				
PETITION:	LEGAL SEPARATION W/O CHILDREN				X				
PETITION:	ANNULMENT W/ CHILDREN				X				

PETITION:	ANNULMENT W/O CHILDREN				X				

C. After following up on the codes below, it was determined these codes are not necessary for code standards.

DOC TYPE	DOC SUB-TYPE	REASON	CIV	CRIM	FAM	PROB	G/C	JUV	ADMIN
AFFIDAVIT:	OF FOREIGN PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE	Missing from Standardization				X			
ORDER:	FOR JURY FEES	Missing from Standardization	X						

D. After following up on the code below, it was determined this code is necessary for code standards because it is a case initiating event with a fee schedule attached.

DOC TYPE	DOC SUB-TYPE	REASON	CIV	CRIM	FAM	PROB	G/C	JUV	ADMIN
AFFIDAVIT:	OF FOREIGN JUDGMENT	Missing from Standardization	X						