

Steering Committee on Arizona Case Processing

Wednesday, April 13, 2016

1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

State Courts Building

1501 W. Washington, Phoenix, AZ 85007

Conference Room 230

Present: Justice Robert Brutinel; Mr. Kent Batty *proxy Ron Overholt*; Judge Kimberly Corsaro; Judge Jill Davis; Judge Pamela Frasher-Gates; Judge Charles Gurtler; Mr. James Haas; Mr. Don Jacobson; Judge Eric Jeffery; Judge Andrew Klein *proxy Elaine Cano*; Judge Steven McMurry; Judge John Rea; Mr. John W. Rogers; and Mr. Bill Verdini.

Telephonic: Ms. Donna McQuality; Ms. Michelle Matiski; Judge Mark Moran; Judge Tony Riojas; and Judge Sally Simmons.

Absent/Excused: Judge Richard Fields and Ms. Jane Nicoletti-Jones.

Presenters/Guests: Ms. Kelly Roberts Freeman, Judge Keith Russell and Mr. Steven Gonzales

Administrative Office of the Courts: Ms. Kelly Gray; Ms. Jennifer Mesquita; Ms. Lisa Robinson; and Ms. Amy Wood.

I. Regular Business

A. Welcome, Opening Remarks and Announcements

The April 13, 2016 meeting of the Steering Committee on Arizona Case Processing Standards was called to order by Chair, Honorable Robert Brutinel, at 1:30 p.m. The Chair asked for member roll call and introductions of staff and guests.

B. Approval of the October 2015 Minutes

The draft minutes from the October 14, 2015 meeting of the Steering Committee on Arizona Case Processing Standards were presented for approval. The chair called for any omissions or corrections to the minutes from October 14, 2015 meeting. There were none.

- A motion was made and seconded to approve the draft meeting minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

II. Phase One Update

A. Overview of Data Received

A review of the Phase One data received was presented to the committee on October 14, 2015. The 2013 and 2015 data provided for the General Jurisdiction Civil and Felony case types was labelled inaccurately. The data was recalibrated to accurately convey which counties were included. The findings were re-presented to the committee as outlined below.

i. General Felony Statistics Fiscal Year 2015

The 2015 Felony Time Standards results reported from 12 General Jurisdiction courts were:

42% within 90 days
70% within 180 days
90% within 365 days

The Arizona standard is:

65% within 90 days
85% within 180 days
96% within 365 days

For the 90 day standard, 2 courts met the standard and 2 courts were within 10% of the standard. For the 180 day standard, 3 courts met the standard and 2 courts were within 10% of the standard. For the 365 day standard, 3 courts met the standard and 9 courts were within 10% of the standard.

ii. Civil Statistics Fiscal Year 2015

The 2015 Civil Time Standards results reported from 12 General Jurisdiction courts were:

50% within 180 days
64% within 365 days
72% within 540 days

The Arizona standard is:

60% within 180 days

90% within 365 days

96% within 540 days

For the 180 day standard, 8 courts met the standard and 3 courts were within 10% of the standard. For the 365 day standard, 7 courts met the standard and 4 courts were within 10% of the standard. For the 540 day standard, 2 courts met the standard and 7 courts were within 10% of the standard.

Ms. Mesquita also presented data to the Committee showing the results without Maricopa County Superior Court to demonstrate the skew that can occur upward or downward due to Maricopa County Superior Court's statistically significant caseload volume.

The committee discussed and agreed that one possible explanation of the downward trend from 2013 to 2015 could be data clean-up that occurred, utilizing time standards reports. When a court begins to run reports, it can discover many pending cases that need to be disposed. The disposition of these cases can create a downward trend in the court's time standards data until the court has time to recover from the impact of such clean-up. If the data is the result of this clean-up process, it could take several reporting cycles before the committee sees upward trends in data across all counties.

Ms. Mesquita reminded the committee that annual fiscal year data for Phase 1 will be submitted by July 31, 2016 to be analyzed and presented at the October 2016 meeting. She stated that the ability to analyze a year of data as opposed to a quarter of data may provide a more complete picture and allow for a more robust discussion.

B. Juvenile Delinquency Update

Ms. Wood reviewed the state of the Juvenile Delinquency and Status Offense time standards reports for the committee.

The Juvenile Delinquency and Status Offense time standards reports were released for use and then a number of issues were identified leading to inaccuracies. Delving further into the framework for the reports, these errors cannot be fixed in the current reports because of the following factors:

1. Disparate usage of JOLTS and AJACS results in data inconsistencies in both case management systems
2. Barriers to tracking excluded time due to lack of information available in either system and,
3. JOLTS is person-centric whereas AJACS is case-centric.

The committee discussed what delinquency time standards reporting would be available from JOLTSaz. Ms. Wood indicated the AOC is addressing how the JOLTSaz reports will be written and this work is pending. It would not be revisited until after the JOLTSaz rollout is completed. A committee member questioned whether JOLTSaz would allow for unique identifiers for juveniles. Ms. Mesquita responded that juvenile cases do have statewide identifiers (SWID numbers) that function as unique person identifiers.

The Juvenile Workgroup proposes the committee recommend adoption of a revised time standard as follows:

Delinquency and Status Offense Youth (both in and out of detention):

75% within 60 days
90% within 90 days
98% within 135 days

Judge Sally Simmons moved to recommend that the Juvenile Delinquency and Status Offense time standard for youth both in and out of detention be revised to

75% within 60 days
90% within 90 days
98% within 135 days

Judge Simmons' motion also stated that any cases with the following events would be excluded entirely from calculations: (1) warrants. (2) diversion or (3) mental competency proceeding. Mr. Verdini seconded the motion.

Mr. Don Jacobson made an amendment to the motion to ensure that the issue of revisiting incorporation of the "in detention" standards back into the delinquency time standards is tracked for the future. The amendment was accepted by Judge Simmons and Mr. Verdini. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Phase Two Update

A. Administrative Order and Memorandum

Ms. Mesquita summarized the Administrative Orders issued and statewide memorandums released since the last meeting of this body.

The Arizona Judicial Council recommended approval of the revision of Civil Traffic standards for Phase 2 on October 27, 2015. Administrative Order 2015-99 was signed by Chief Justice Bales on November 25, 2015. The order adopted revised case processing standards for the Civil Traffic case type.

Along with Administrative Order 2015-99, Memorandum #10 (12/2/15) Phase 4 – Standards for Six Case Types -- was sent to the general and limited jurisdiction Presiding Judges, the general and limited jurisdiction Court Administrators, and Clerks of Court and addressed this revision to the Phase 2 Civil Traffic case type.

B. Overview of Data Received

Ms. Mesquita provided Phase 2 data for FY13 and one quarter for FY16 for General Jurisdiction time standards for Dissolution and Allocation of Parental Responsibility and Juvenile Dependency Adjudication Hearings and for Limited Jurisdiction time standards for Civil Traffic. The results of analysis are outlined below.

i. Dissolution Statistics, Fiscal Year 2016

The 2016 Dissolution Time Standards results reported from 9 General Jurisdiction courts were:

75% within 180 days

90% within 270 days

95% within 365 days

The Arizona standard is:

75% within 180 days

90% within 270 days

98% within 365 days

For the 180 day standard, 3 courts met the standard and 1 court was within 10% of the standard. For the 270 day standard, 3 courts met the standard and 3 courts were within 10% of the standard. For the 365 day standard, 3 courts met the standard and 4 courts were within 10% of the standard.

ii. Juvenile Dependency Adjudication Hearing STATISTICS Fiscal Year 2016

The 2016 Juvenile Dependency Adjudication Hearing Time Standards results reported from 8 General Jurisdiction courts were:

76% within 100 days

The Arizona standard is:

98% within 100 days

For the 100 day standard, 2 courts met the standard and 1 court was within 10% of the standard.

iii. Civil Traffic STATISTICS Fiscal Year 2016

The 2016 Civil Traffic Time Standards results reported from 110 Limited Jurisdiction courts were:

77% within 60 days
91% within 90 days

The Arizona standard is:

80% within 60 days
95% within 90 days

For the 60 day standard, 25 courts met the standard and 27 courts were within 10% of the standard. For the 90 day standard, 26 met the standard and 42 courts were within 10% of the standard.

IV. Phase Three Update

Ms. Mesquita summarized the Administrative Orders issued and statewide memorandums released since the last meeting of this body.

Phase 3 is currently awaiting submission of reports for data analysis. Reports will be due July 31, 2016.

Administrative Order 2015-60 was signed by Chief Justice Bales on June 24, 2015. The order adopted final case processing standards for the following case types:

- 1) Probate Estate Administration
- 2) Probate Mental Health Cases
- 3) Probate Guardianship/Conservatorship
- 4) Justice Civil
- 5) Misdemeanor

Along with Administrative Order 2015-60, Memorandum #9 (7/2/15) Phase 3 – Standards for Five Case Types -- was sent to the general and limited jurisdiction Presiding Judges, general and limited jurisdiction Court Administrators, and Clerks of Court.

V. Phase Four Update

Ms. Mesquita summarized the Administrative Orders issued and statewide memoranda released since the last meeting of this body.

The Arizona Judicial Council recommended approval of the standards for Phase 4 on October 27, 2015. Administrative Order 2015-99 was signed by Chief Justice Bales on November 25, 2015. The order adopted final case processing standards for the following case types:

- 1) Criminal Post-Conviction Relief
- 2) Family Law Temporary Orders
- 3) Eviction Actions
- 4) Civil Local Ordinance
- 5) Misdemeanor

Along with Administrative Order 2015-99 Memorandum #10 (12/2/15) Phase 4 – Standards for Six Case Types – was sent to the general and limited jurisdiction Presiding Judges, general and limited jurisdiction Court Administrators, and Clerks of Court.

Reports will be due October 31, 2016 for July 1 – September 30, 2016. Ms. Mesquita reminded the committee this data will not be available for review at the October 2016 meeting.

VI. Phase Five Update

A. Small Claims Update

The original provisional standards for the Small Claims case type were:

- 75% within 90 days
- 90% within 120 days
- 98% within 180 days

After review of sample data, the Justice Court Workgroup identified the following new provisional standard:

- 75% within 100 days
- 90% within 150 days
- 98% within 180 days

The increase from 90 to 100 and 120 to 150 days respectively occurred because these increases resulted in statistically significant increases in time standard compliance (i.e., approximately 10%).

Based on a sample of 26 AZTEC Justice Courts, Pima Consolidated Justice Court, and Maricopa County Justice Courts, Ms. Mesquita gathered the following time standard report data using the new proposed provisional standard:

39% of cases disposed within 100 days

57% of cases disposed within 150 days
64% of cases disposed within 180 days

For the 100 day standard, three courts met the standard and three courts were within 10% of the standard. For the 150 day standard, two courts met the standard and seven courts were within 10% of the standard. For the 180 day standard, two courts met the standard and five courts were within 10% of the standard.

The committee discussed that the sample shows this time standard will be a challenge for the Justice Courts. Members acknowledged that small claims has not traditionally be a focus of case processing statistics, as such, this data is revealing. Rule changes may need to be considered regarding service and distinguishing small claims from civil cases. In addition, best practices for aiding self-represented litigants in small claims cases may be needed. Despite the anticipated challenges implied by the sample analysis, the committee agreed a standard is needed to begin the conversation with courts.

Judge Jill Davis moved and Judge Steven McMurry seconded a motion to recommend that the following standards be approved as final for Small Claims cases:

75% within 100 days
90% within 150 days
98% within 180 days

The motion passed unanimously.

B. Development Plan

For the next committee meeting, Ms. Mesquita anticipates reports will be developed for the following case types:

Family Law Post-Judgment Motions
Protection Orders Ex Parte Hearings
Protection Orders Contested Hearings

Business requirements have been completed for AZTEC and general jurisdiction AJACS. However, the focus needs to be on developing and launching the limited jurisdiction AJACS time standards for active phases. Ms. Mesquita expects Phase 5 general jurisdiction AJACS reports will be developed upon completion of limited jurisdiction AJACS time standards reports for Phases 3 and 4.

Judge McMurry offered the Maricopa County Justice Courts recently reprogrammed their calendars to reflect the expired time on cases. The court has found that this information has been very helpful for the judges to have when making decisions while interacting with attorneys and litigants on the bench.

VII. New Business

A. Training Update

Ms. Mesquita relayed that statewide training efforts were completed during mid-March and early April. Ms. Mesquita visited Flagstaff, Prescott, Florence and Tucson to provide in person training as well as offered training in Phoenix and via WebEx. Ms. Mesquita also offered a WebEx specifically for Field Trainers.

Ms. Wood and Ms. Mesquita will attend the upcoming Magistrate Conference to present on time standards.

B. Limited Jurisdiction Time Standards Report Update

Ms. Mesquita reports that limited jurisdiction AJACS Time Standards Reports are in testing and will be deployed in the near future for Phases 1 and 2. Phases 3 through 5 require business requirements to be completed. These business requirements are already in draft format.

Ms. Mesquita also shared that limited jurisdiction AJACS conversion issues exist that impact time standards reports. Training is being developed for limited jurisdiction AJACS courts to guide them through those issues. Examples of issues include: (1) some events not converting over from AZTEC to limited jurisdiction AJACS and (2) offense-based case types cannot have case status manually changed.

C. Committee on Civil Justice Reform

Justice Brutinel reported that the Committee on Civil Justice Reform is a Supreme Court ad hoc committee analyzing Superior Court Civil case processing and is chaired by Mr. Don Bivens with Justice Brutinel serving on the committee. The Committee on Civil Justice Reform may have overlap with the Steering Committee on Arizona Case Processing Standards. Justice Brutinel will keep this committee apprised of any pertinent developments from the Committee on Civil Justice Reform.

D. Next Meeting Dates and Other Items

i. Next Meeting Dates

The committee discussed possible meeting dates in October 2016 for the next committee meeting. Ms. Mesquita agreed to send an email with suggested dates as soon as possible.

Editor's Note: Ms. Mesquita provided the committee with several dates via email. The responses tallied indicate the best date and time was October 19, 2016 from 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

ii. Other Items

Mr. Jacobsen offered comment on the criminal misdemeanor time standards. Flagstaff Municipal Court has encountered the need for case processing improvements due to the use of body cameras. Footage from body cameras are becoming more frequently a part of discovery. Almost every case has a discovery request for video. Their court has reached the conclusion that this has resulted in an overall 30 day delay in case processing. One hundred percent of officers in the Flagstaff Police Department have body cameras.

VIII. Call to Public

The chair made a call to the public. No members of the public present requested to speak.

IX. Adjournment

Justice Brutinel adjourned the meeting at 2:54 p.m.

X. Next Committee Meeting Date:

Wednesday, October 19, 2016
State Courts Building
1501 W. Washington St., Phoenix, AZ 85007

Steering Committee on Arizona Case Processing Standards

Wednesday, October 19, 2016

1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

State Courts Building

1501 W. Washington, Phoenix, AZ 85007

Conference Room 345A/B

Present: Justice Robert Brutinel; Judge Pamela Frasher-Gates; Mr. Don Jacobson; Judge Eric Jeffery; Judge Steven McMurry; Mr. John W. Rogers; and Mr. Bill Verdini

Telephonic: Judge Andrew Klein; Ms. Michelle Matiski; Ms. Donna McQuality; Judge Mark Moran; Ms. Jane Nicoletti-Jones, Ron Overholt (for Kent Batty); and Judge Tony Riojas

Absent/Excused: Judge Kimberly Corsaro; Judge Jill Davis; Judge Richard Fields; Judge Charles Gurtler; Mr. James Haas; Judge John Rea; and Judge Sally Simmons

Presenters/Guests: Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer, AOC-Court Services Division Director; Mr. Keith Russell; Mr. Steve Gonzales; Ms. Michelle Dunivan

Administrative Office of the Courts: Ms. Marretta Mathes; Ms. Lynn Golden

I. Regular Business

A. Welcome, Opening Remarks and Announcements

The October 19, 2016, Meeting of the Steering Committee on Arizona Case Processing Standards was called to order by the Chair, Honorable Robert Brutinel, at 1:29 p.m. The Chair asked for member roll call and introductions of staff and guests.

The Chair noted the passing and contributions of Ms. Jennifer Mesquita to the Arizona courts, the AOC, and to this committee. The Chair introduced Ms. Marretta Mathes, Court Services Specialist, who will now serve as support staff for the Steering Committee on Arizona Case Processing Standards.

B. Approval of the April 2016 Minutes

The draft minutes from the April 2016 meeting of the Steering Committee on Arizona Case Processing Standards were presented for approval. The Chair called for any omissions or corrections to the minutes from April 2016. There were none.

A motion was made by Judge McMurry and seconded by Judge Gates to approve the draft meeting minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

II. Updates

A. Arizona Appellate Case Processing Time Standards

Ms. Marretta Mathes, AOC Staff, spoke on the Arizona Appellate Case Processing Standards. Chief Justice Bales signed Administrative Order (AO) 2016-51 on June 29, 2016, adopting final case processing standards for Arizona appellate cases.

Administrative Order 2016-66, effective July 1, 2016, was signed by Chief Justice Bales on August 3, 2016, amending a small typo in Appendix A of AO 2016-51 regarding the timeframe for processing Criminal, Civil, and Industrial Commission Cases.

The Appellate Courts will report under the CourTools measures for FY16. For FY17, Time to Disposition Measures will be reported under the Time Standards. For Case Clearance and Age of Active Pending, they will report under the CourTools measures.

B. Presiding Judges and Court Administrators June 2016 Meeting

Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer, AOC Court Services Director, spoke on the Presiding Judges and Court Administrators June 2016 Meeting. This meeting was important because it was the first time case data (Phases 1 and 2) by court and case type was shared. In the months preceding the meeting, the courts worked to ensure that data was no longer missing or incomplete so that the data presented at the June 2016 meeting would be a complete and accurate representation. Accordingly, inquiries from the group focused on how caseload could be improved.

Mr. Reinkensmeyer indicated that they inquired as to some of the obstacles courts face in case management; best practices; and systemic steps the group would recommend. Mr. Reinkensmeyer noted that Limited Jurisdiction courts were not discussed. The group provided the following feedback regarding obstacles:

Criminal – Obstacles included the ability to sustain leadership, turnover in attorneys, changes in defense counsel, calendar conflicts, ability to implement more efficient calendaring systems, plea policies, and staff turnover.

Juvenile – Obstacles included many of those listed for criminal, in addition to a shortage of attorneys in dependency cases, and overlap of mental health cases with juvenile matters. The Chair noted that the committee specifically discussed Rule 11 and excluded time in juvenile cases, and time is being excluded for these matters.

Civil – Obstacles included issues in ability to coordinate with attorneys, resulting in issues with scheduling orders, early case management resolution, setting deadlines, etc. There was also some concern with rulings coming from the Court of Appeals, but no particular case was named. Further research into this concern did not yield any results that would suggest the denial of a Motion to Continue would necessarily prejudice the moving party.

Family – Mr. Reinkensmeyer noted that we are at, or exceeding, standards. However, obstacles reported included the existence of a high number of unrepresented litigants. While national research has shown that these litigants need more assistance to navigate the system, the issues may be less complex, leading to faster turnaround. However, courts often have to ask the litigants to modify or resubmit paperwork, which might create a delay. It was suggested that we could do more with self-service centers.

There was much discussion about data quality and control. Some courts also felt the standards did not take into account factors beyond their control (examples – forensic report delays, expert witnesses, etc.).

Finally, they asked what is working. Responses included awareness of the effort through the whole system; bringing in stakeholders; early case resolution; and more training for staff and judges.

The group was also asked what the AOC can do to assist. Suggestions included expanding caseload management in New Judge Orientation (NJO). They also indicated that generic case management training does not work well; specific case type training works better. Court Services has been meeting with Education Services to look at options. Working with the State Bar is something we need to do as well. Another round of regional training for improved data quality was suggested, including making video available for staff who cannot attend in person.

In conclusion, Mr. Reinkensmeyer expects this subject to become an annual exercise at this meeting. It will expand as we add other case types or phases.

Judge Moran shared his insights on the meeting. He shared the standards are “something new”, but the initial good numbers show courts are really not that far off from the standards. He is confident that by next year we will

be in a much better place. Judge Moran indicated that the only negative feedback he received is that for Family Law cases, judges would have liked the clock to start at service instead of at filing. The Chair stated the standards take that into account and are longer than they otherwise would be, but this has been an ongoing concern. The takeaway is that the standards are a work in progress, and if they do not accurately reflect what is possible, we will look at revising them.

Judge Gates stated that the only category that she believes may need a second look is Criminal, which is out of the judge's control on disposition due to the date the prosecutor extends the plea offer. There is no mechanism for resolution before that occurs, and while a pre-trial conference can be set to facilitate discovery, a plea offer cannot be mandated. This might make the data seem "off" and unachievable. Accordingly, she suggests that perhaps this standard should be revisited.

Judge Moran offered to assist with the judicial training and work with Jeff Schrade in Education Services. Mr. Reinkensmeyer stated that through the efforts of Judge Gates, Judge Moran, and Judge Jeffery, they have started the work for this training, so perhaps we can now start to work on a more in-depth training.

III. Phase 1 Update

Ms. Mathes summarized data, administrative orders, and memoranda since the last meeting of this body.

1. AO 2016-50 and Memorandum #16

At the April 2016 meeting, this Steering Committee recommended the removal of the "in detention" standard for juvenile delinquency cases, and to exclude entirely from the calculation cases with warrants, diversion, or mental competency proceedings. Chief Justice Bales signed Administrative Order 2016-50 on June 29, 2016, adopting this recommendation.

Along with Administrative Order 2016-50, Statewide Memorandum #16 – *Phase 5 Standards for one case type and Phase 1 Standard revision for one case type* was sent to the general and limited jurisdiction Presiding Judges, Clerks of the Court, Court Administrators, and Chief Clerks.

Ms. Mathes gave an overview of data received.

2. General Jurisdiction Felony – Excluding Maricopa and Pima Counties

65% within 90 days – AZ Standard
42% within 90 days – FY15 Q4, 12 courts reporting
44% within 90 days – FY16, 15 courts reporting

85% within 180 days – AZ Standard
70% within 180 days – FY15 Q4, 12 courts reporting
72% within 180 days – FY16, 15 courts reporting

96% within 365 days – AZ Standard
90% within 365 days – FY15 Q4, 12 courts reporting
93% within 365 days – FY16, 15 courts reporting

3. General Jurisdiction Felony – All Counties

65% within 90 days – AZ Standard
41% within 90 days – FY16

85% within 180 days – AZ Standard
70% within 180 days – FY16

96% within 365 days – AZ Standard
91% within 365 days – FY16

For the 90 day standard, three courts met the standard, zero were within 10% of the standard, and 12 were not within 10% of the standard.

For the 180 day standard, two courts met the standard, two were within 10% of the standard, and 11 were not within 10% of the standard.

For the 365 day standard, four courts met the standard, 11 were within 10% of the standard, and zero were not within 10% of the standard.

4. General Jurisdiction Civil – Excluding Maricopa and Pima Counties

60% within 180 days – AZ Standard
50% within 180 days – FY15 Q4, 12 courts reporting
62% within 180 days – FY16, 15 courts reporting

90% within 365 days – AZ Standard
64% within 365 days – FY15 Q4, 12 courts reporting
83% within 365 days – FY16, 15 courts reporting

96% within 540 days – AZ Standard

72% within 540 days – FY15 Q4, 12 courts reporting
91% within 540 days – FY16, 15 courts reporting

5. General Jurisdiction Civil – All Counties

60% within 180 days – AZ Standard
62% within 180 days – FY16

90% within 365 days – AZ Standard
83% within 365 days – FY16

96% within 540 days – AZ Standard
92% within 540 days – FY16

For the 180 day standard, nine courts met the standard, five were within 10% of the standard, and one was not within 10% of the standard.

For the 365 day standard, one court met the standard, 12 were within 10% of the standard, and two were not within 10% of the standard.

For the 540 day standard, one met the standard, 12 were within 10% of the standard, and two were not within 10% of the standard.

6. Juvenile Dependency Permanency Hearings

Under 3 years of age:

98% within 180 days – AZ Standard
91% within 180 days – FY15 Q4, 9 courts reporting, 1,992 cases
88% within 180 days – FY16, 12 courts reporting, 3,237 cases

3 years of age and older:

98% within 365 days – AZ Standard
96% within 365 days – FY15 Q4, 9 courts reporting, 1,992 cases
95% within 365 days – FY16, 12 courts reporting, 3,237 cases

For the Under 3 years of age standard, one court met the standard, two were within 10% of the standard, and nine were not within 10% of the standard.

For 3 years of age and older standard, three courts met the standard, seven were within 10% of the standard, and two were not within 10% of the standard.

7. Juvenile Dependency Termination of Parental Rights

90% within 120 days – AZ Standard
52% within 120 days – FY15 Q4, 9 courts reporting, 994 cases
50% within 120 days – FY16, 12 courts reporting, 4,101 cases

98% within 180 days – AZ Standard
72% within 180 days – FY15 Q4, 9 courts reporting, 994 cases
69% within 180 days – FY16, 12 courts reporting, 4,101 cases

For the 120 day standard, one court met the standard, two were within 10% of the standard, and seven were not within 10% of the standard.

For the 180 day standard, one court met the standard, five were within 10% of the standard, and four were not within 10% of the standard.

Two of the courts had no Termination of Parental Rights cases to report and add to the data.

IV. Phase 2 Update

Ms. Mathes gave an overview of data received.

1. Dissolution and Allocation of Parental Responsibility – 15 courts

75% within 180 days – AZ Standard
75% within 180 days – FY16 Q2
73% within 180 days – FY16

90% within 270 days – AZ Standard
90% within 270 days – FY16 Q2
87% within 270 days – FY16

98% within 365 days – AZ Standard
95% within 365 days – FY16 Q2
94% within 365 days – FY16

For the 180 day standard, three courts met the standard, five were within 10% of the standard, and seven were not within 10% of the standard.

For the 270 day standard, two courts met the standard, seven were within 10% of the standard, and six were not within 10% of the standard.

For the 365 day standard, one court met the standard, 10 were within 10% of the standard, and four were not within 10% of the standard.

2. Juvenile Dependency Adjudication Hearings

98% within 100 days – AZ Standard
76% within 100 days – FY16 Q2 (9 courts, 1,757 cases)
72% within 100 days – FY16 (12 courts, 8,711 cases)

Two courts met the standard, five were within 10% of the standard, and five were not within 10% of the standard.

It was requested that a representation of cases by county be made available and would be beneficial.

V. Phase 3 Update

Ms. Mathes reported on the Phase 3 General Update.

Time to disposition reports for Justice Court Civil have been developed for AZTEC courts, but are being tested and have not yet been deployed to the courts.

Justice Court Civil, Probate Administration of Estates, Probate Guardianship/Conservatorship, and Probate Mental Health quarterly data will be discussed at the next meeting.

VI. Phase 4 Update

Ms. Mathes reported on the Phase 4 General Update.

Phase 4 addresses quarterly data due October 31, 2016 for July 1 – September 30, 2016 (Q1 FY17). The focus of this data includes Criminal Post-Conviction Relief, Family Law Temporary Orders, Eviction Actions, Civil Local Ordinance, and Misdemeanor cases (which are part of Phase 3, but have Phase 4 reporting dates). See Administrative Order 2015-99, dated November 25, 2015.

Phase 4 is currently awaiting submission of reports for data analysis.

Judge McMurry once more touched on identifying individual courts, specifically, to report on the figures for eviction actions. There has been a rule change for eviction actions, which is a new “experimental” Change of Judge rule. One of the concerns regarding this rule change relates to how it might impact timeframes related to the processing of eviction action

cases. Maricopa County is working out a plan to deal with this issue, but outlying and smaller counties may have more difficulty with the impact of this rule change.

VII. Phase 5

Chief Justice Bales signed Administrative Order 2016-50 on June 29, 2016. This AO adopted final case processing standards for small claims cases as follows:

-  75% within 100 days
-  90% within 150 days
-  98% within 180 days

Administrative Order 2016-79 was signed by Chief Justice Bales on August 17, 2016, amending a small type in Appendix A of AO 2016-50 regarding tier 2 of the case processing standards for small claims cases. These standards became effective on August 1, 2016.

Along with Administrative Order 2016-50, Statewide Memorandum #16 – *Phase 5 Standards for one case type and Phase 1 Standard revision for one case type* was sent to the general and limited jurisdiction Presiding Judges, Clerks of the Court, Court Administrators, and Chief Clerks.

VIII. New Business

A. Limited Jurisdiction Appeals Time Standards

Ms. Mathes reported on the Limited Jurisdiction (LJ) Appeals Time Standards. Currently, no national time standards for LJ Appeals exist. The Chair asked for member input on whether we should explore establishing a standard for these cases. Judge McMurry believed there should be a workgroup formed before creating this standard because of the differences across counties. The Chair would like a mix of LJ and Superior court judges on the workgroup. Judge McMurry, Judge Jeffery, and Mr. Don Jacobsen volunteered to work on this workgroup. Judge Moran volunteered telephonically. The Chair will continue to consider additional members for this workgroup.

Mr. Verdini inquired as to whether data has been collected on LJ Appeals cases. Ms. Mathes said no. The Chair asked if data can be collected. It was explained that it may have to go across multiple databases, and we would need to determine whether the data is even there. Judge McMurry

suggested that even if there is currently no data, we should start trying to collect this data.

The Chair will put together a workgroup to consider all these issues.

B. LJ AJACS Time Standards Reports Update

Ms. Mathes reported on the status of LJ AJACS Time Standards Reports. The DUI and Civil Traffic (Phases 1 and 2) reports have been developed and are undergoing final testing. We hope to have securities released on all four reports for each case type next month.

C. Extension of Committee Term

Justice Brutinel spoke on an extension of the Committee's term. Administrative Order 2014-96 extended the committee's term to December 31, 2016. The Chair intends to ask the Chief Justice to extend the committee term an additional year. The Chair acknowledged the service of the committee members to date.

IX. Next Meeting Dates and Other Items

Justice Brutinel shared the following proposed dates for the Committee's next meeting in 2017:

-  Wednesday, January 4, 2017
-  Tuesday, January 17, 2017
-  Monday, January 23, 2017

Ms. Mathes will gather information from the members regarding any conflicts or meeting preference dates and send out information on the next Committee meeting date as soon as possible.

X. Call To Public

The Chair made a call to the public. There were no responders.

XI. Adjournment

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 2:47 p.m.

Next Committee Meeting Date:

February 1, 2017

1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

State Courts Building Conference Room 345 A/B

1501 W. Washington, Phoenix, AZ 85007