

The slide features five light purple circles arranged in two rows. The top row contains three circles, and the bottom row contains two circles. The text is overlaid on these circles.

# Code Standardization

Update for COT  
June 2, 2005

# History



- AZTEC (then FACTS) is a table driven system which rolled out throughout the state with a great deal of flexibility in using codes.
- Courts early in the process established codes to meet their needs prior to the state adopting the system.
- Each court has the ability to add/inactivate/change codes in the tables that drive the system.



# History

- As Arizona's courts became more and more reliant on information from case management systems, problems began to emerge:
  - Impossible to utilize one type of report statewide.
  - Significant effort required to obtain statistical information across courts.
  - Different levels of information collected on cases across the state.



# History

- In September of 2003, recognizing the issues related to the lack of standardization, COT passed TECH-03-18
- “A motion was made and seconded to **require development and use of standardized codes for general jurisdiction courts (9 months) and limited jurisdiction courts (12 months) before any new case management system implementations.**”



# History

- Greacen Associates, LLC was hired in May of 2004 and continues to work with the Limited Jurisdiction group to establish a standard set of codes.
- The General Jurisdiction Group continues to work independently (without vendor support) to establish codes.



# Examples of Types of “Codes”

- Calendar Codes
  - Case Types/Case Categories/Benches
  - Event Codes/Docket Entries
  - Financial Codes (Receivables)
- 
- Determine business elements that are discreet enough to require unique codes.
  - Ensure that codes (i.e., numbers) themselves are used universally across state.



Future

- We are in a position where a decision needs to be made to put Arizona's Judiciary in a pro-active or reactive posture with regard to the information collected in court case management systems.

# Future-Pro-active



- Once a standardized code set is put in place, a mechanism needs to be established for maintenance.
  - Oversight Committee
  - Staff Dedicated to Making Timely Changes
  - Tables Locked Down at Local Level
  - Education and Buy-In
  - Compliance Monitoring



# Data Standards Committee

- Comprised of representative members of the court community
  - Limited and General Jurisdiction
  - Court Administration and Clerk's Office
  - Rural and Urban Representation
  - Recommend inclusion of a field trainer as well



# Data Standards Committee

- Duties

- Authority and responsibility for putting procedures in place to act on request for adding/modifying/inactivating codes.
- Document guidelines for how decisions are made regarding codes.
- Involvement in discussions over contentious business issues that require resolutions in order to establish codes to support the work of the courts.
- Reports to COT.

# Data Standards Staff



- Responsible for carrying out approved entry/modification/inactivation of codes in an expedient manner.
- Responsible for staffing Data Standards Committee
- Recommend funding 2 Statewide positions

# Table Lock Down



- CMS can be created so that the tables driving the system (which hold standard codes) can be open to change locally or locked down locally.
- Leaving tables open to change relies on “gentleman’s agreements” for standardization.
- Recommend that COT take a stand that new systems should have tables locked down at the local level.
- Doesn’t preclude the possibility of having 2 sets of tables – this option requires mapping to state tables



# Education and Buy-In

- Important for all courts to be exposed to the reasons for and benefits of standardization.
- Education process can precede the deployment of new systems.
- Utilize all standing committees to get word out, stress to committee-members to take information back to those they represent.



# Compliance Monitoring

- #1 Concern is Data Quality
- Local Oversight
  - Routinely running reports to identify anomalies and problems.
- Statewide Oversight
  - Court audits.
- Bring issues to data standards committee.

# Future-Reactive



- Without putting mechanisms in place on the front-end of the process Arizona's Judicial Branch will be left with doing work on the back-end of the process.
  - Mapping codes at each court to a universal standard and keeping up with changes to that mapping process
  - Writing reports for individual courts without being able to share work.



# Recommended Motions

- 1. Establish a data standards oversight committee responsible for establishing policies for initiating new codes and for approving code-related decisions over time.



# Recommended Motions

- 2. Fund 2 new statewide positions to staff the data standards committee and carry out the approved entry/modification/deletion of codes in an expedient manner.



# Recommended Motions

- 3. All new case management systems intended for statewide deployment be deployed with tables locked down at the local level.



# Recommended Motions

- 4. Create COT team or designate the Data Standards Committee, if approved to be responsible for launching an education campaign regarding standardization.



# Recommended Motions

- 5. Each county to designate a person who will oversee compliance in each court. The person will report the compliance information to the county Presiding Judge.