



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

COURT EXECUTIVES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/ceac.htm
ceac@jud.ca.gov

COURT EXECUTIVES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**JUDICIAL BRANCH STATISTICAL INFORMATION SYSTEM
SUBCOMMITTEE**

MATERIALS FOR DECEMBER 11, 2018

Meeting Contents

Notice and Agenda	1
Minutes	
Draft minutes from the October 5, 2018 Meeting	3
Discussion and Possible Action Items	
Item 1 – Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) Data Quality Control and Amendment Guidelines (Action Item)	6
Information Only Items	
Info 1 – JBSIS v3.0 Manual Revisions	



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

COURT EXECUTIVES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/ceac.htm
ceac@jud.ca.gov

Request for ADA accommodations
should be made at least three business
days before the meeting and directed to:
JCCAccessCoordinator@jud.ca.gov

COURT EXECUTIVES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

JUDICIAL BRANCH STATISTICAL INFORMATION SYSTEM SUBCOMMITTEE

NOTICE AND AGENDA OF OPEN MEETING

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1) and (e)(1))

THIS MEETING IS BEING CONDUCTED BY ELECTRONIC MEANS

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: December 11, 2018
Time: 2:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.
Public Call-in Number: 1-877-820-7831 Pass Code: 9857922 (Listen Only)

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Members of the public seeking to make an audio recording of the meeting must submit a written request at least two business days before the meeting. Requests can be e-mailed to ceac@jud.ca.gov.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of the October 5, 2018, Judicial Branch Statistical Informational System (JBSIS) Subcommittee meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(1))

This meeting will be conducted by electronic means with a listen only conference line available for the public. As such, the public may submit comments for this meeting only in writing. In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to ceac@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to Judicial Council of California, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, attention: Ms. Rose Butler. Only written

comments received by 2:00 p.m. on December 10, 2018, will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1)

Item 1

Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) Data Quality Control and Amendment Guidelines (Action Required)

Review proposed revisions to the JBSIS Manual that would outline requirements for regular data quality assurance of reported JBSIS data. Consider adopting specific guidelines to ensure that courts correct and amend JBSIS data errors. This item is in response to a request from the Judicial Council Advisory Committee for Audits and Financial Accountability for the Judicial Branch.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Jake Chatters, Chair, JBSIS Subcommittee
Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Manager, Budget Services
Ms. Emily Chirk, Senior Analyst, Budget Services

IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

Info 1

JBSIS v3.0 Manual Revisions

Make a report on the recommendations received from participating courts.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Manager, Budget Services

V. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

COURT EXECUTIVES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/ceac.htm
ceac@jud.ca.gov

COURT EXECUTIVES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

JUDICIAL BRANCH STATISTICAL INFORMATION SYSTEM SUBCOMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

October 5, 2018

10:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.

Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Mr. Jake Chatters (Chair), Ms. Sherri R. Carter, Mr. Chad Finke, Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Mr. Kevin Harrigan, Mr. Michael M. Roddy

Advisory Body Members Absent: Mr. Michael Planet, Ms. Kim Turner

Others Present: Mr. Chris Belloli, Mr. Bryan Borys, Ms. Liane Herbst, Ms. Noor Singh, Mr. Corey Rada, Mr. Harvinder Baraich

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the June 6, 2018 and August 10, 2018, Judicial Branch Statistical Information Systems Subcommittee, CEAC meetings.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-6)

Item 1

Update on Dispute Resolution Process

Action: The chair provided an update on the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) Dispute Resolution Process report that the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) would be presenting to the Judicial Council at its meeting in November 2018. The Dispute Resolution Process addresses how courts should report data to JBSIS and to provide the courts guidance and a framework from which to resolve disagreements that result when reporting statistical data to JBSIS.

Item 2

Update on Data Integrity Standards

Action: The chair of the subcommittee related that due to the implementation of JBSIS v3.0, the review of the report that Los Angeles Superior Court had submitted on data integrity standards, “*Support of Quality Assurance Practices in JBSIS Reporting*,” would be revisited at the subcommittee’s next meeting in December. The chair and Judicial Council staff would review the document and would present a draft report to the subcommittee at its December meeting with the intention to move the report forward to CEAC at its January meeting.

Item 3

Provide Input on JBSIS Subcommittee Workplan for 2019

Action: The chair of the subcommittee opened a discussion for members to provide feedback concerning the projects listed on the JBSIS Subcommittee Workplan that the CEAC would be approving at its meeting in January 2019. The Disposition Definitions and Categories (defining filing to disposition) and Case Aging Definitions and Categories (aging as it relates to disposition) are listed as the priorities for 2019. The third filing definition, Other Event-Level Data (hearings, continuances, etc.) would be taken up in 2020.

Item 4

Proposed Timeline and Process for Courts to Report JBSIS v2.3 and v3.0 Data

Action: Judicial Council staff provided an update on timeline and processes for courts to report JBSIS data. Under the current version, 2.3, the courts would be able to submit data, including amendments, until March 2019. Judicial Council staff also reported that they are making provisions to help the courts to finalize their reports before the March 2019 cut-off date as well as help the courts to get their system ready for v3.0 reporting.

Item 5

Update on Implementation Activities for Reporting Revised JBSIS Standards

Action: Judicial Council staff reported that they are working with Information Technology to come up with the final specifications that would be shared with all courts and vendors. The information would be posted on the JBSIS website. Staff also reported that based on conversations they have had with courts and vendors alike, that both would be ready for v3.0.

Item 6

Update on Revised JBSIS Implementation Manual v3.0

Action: Judicial Council staff introduced to the subcommittee the manual’s five new definitional changes on v3.0.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date December 6, 2018	Action Requested Please Review
To Court Executives Advisory Committee	Deadline N/A
From Emily Chirk Senior Research Analyst Office of Court Research	Contact Emily Chirk Office of Court Research 415-865-7453 phone emily.chirk@jud.ca.gov
Subject Data Quality Control and Amendment Guidelines	

Background

California Rules of Court 10.400 (a) states the purpose of the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS): “to provide accurate, consistent, and timely information for the judicial branch, the Legislature, and other state agencies that require information from the courts to fulfill their mandates.”

On April 17, 2018, Judge David Rosenberg, Chair of the Advisory Committee on Audits and Financial Accountability, wrote to Kimberly Flener, Chair of the Court Executives Advisory Committee, asking for the assistance of CEAC's JBSIS Subcommittee to consider various recommended enhancements to the JBSIS rules concerning data quality.

These recommendations were consistent with concurrent discussions of the subcommittee concerning data submissions. The subcommittee discussed the topic at its meeting in August and October 2018 and have incorporated these discussions into the following policy recommendations.

JBSIS Data Quality Standards

JBSIS data quality standards are hereby established to give courts guidance on steps they should take to ensure data quality prior to submission and upon identification of errors. Those standards, within the framework provided by Rule 10.400, suggest the following definitions for “accurate, consistent, and timely ” JBSIS data submissions:

- **Accurate:** All data must accurately reflect what actually happened and should be reported in an agreed-upon format which conforms to JBSIS standards. Data should be captured in full. All mandatory data items within a data set should be completed and miscellaneous free-form codes will only be used where appropriate.
- **Consistent:** The data being collected should be understood by the staff collecting it and data items should be internally consistent. JBSIS data definitions should be reflected in procedure documents.
- **Timely:** Data should be collected and reported at the earliest opportunity.

Roles

Court leadership has ultimate responsibility for JBSIS data submissions, there are many individuals at a court that have a hand in JBSIS data compilation and submission. However, there are many individuals at a court that ensure the accurate, consistent, and timely JBSIS data compilation and submission. These roles and responsibilities are outlined below, though they do not require distinct and separate individuals to perform them; it is possible for an individual to be responsible for multiple roles.

Data Entry Staff are responsible for the data they are entering into a system or systems. Responsibilities include, but are not limited to;

- Ensuring that the information collected is accurate and verified.
- Ensuring data is entered as close to real-time as possible.
- Ensuring required changes to data are reflected within the case management system.

Operations Managers, Supervisors, and Lead are responsible for:

- Ensuring staff are aware of their responsibilities towards data quality.
- Ensuring data capture processes are reviewed regularly.
- Ensuring data processes are maintained to ensure data entry staff are consistent in their approach to the quality of captured data.
- Ensuring feedback is provided to data entry staff where discrepancies in data are identified.

Analytical Staff are responsible for:

- Ensuring that data quality is monitored using audit and other operational reports and where anomalies are identified, they are reported to court leaderships and raised with data entry staff and IT support for correction.
- Collaborating with operations staff to ensure that data capture processes are reviewed regularly.
- Communicating with Judicial Council staff on clarification of data definitions.
- Communicating findings of quality review findings to court leadership.

IT Support is responsible for:

- Working with operations staff to ensure that the system configurations are accurate.
- Collaborating with the analytical staff to implement technical solutions as needed.

Court Leadership is responsible for:

- Supporting and encouraging a data quality culture amongst their teams
- Timely, accurate, and valid submission of JBSIS data.
- Overseeing court's action to resolve quality review findings.

Quality Assurance Framework

Each court must ensure that the JBSIS definitions are adhered to **even if the JBSIS reporting rules do not conform with local case processing or data reporting practices**. For instance, while civil harassment filings are reported as a civil matter in JBSIS, a court may process them in the family law courts and thus may include those cases in a local family law case management report. To help ensure accurate JBSIS reporting, courts should:

1. **Establish a *Data Quality Assurance Plan*** that recognizes two stages to quality assurance:
 - a. CMS entries must reflect the actual state of the case (e.g., cases that have been disposed have the appropriate disposition entry);
 - b. Case management system counts must match the JBSIS submission

The Data Quality Assurance Plan should at a minimum contain the following: 1) the process for staff and judicial officers to report identified errors or concerns; 2) the issue resolution process used in the court; 3) and a communication plan for ensuring training documents and other materials are updated and distributed when they are amended to correct a data reporting error or change.

2. **Use the JBSIS report results to cross-check other statistical reports used by the court.**

3. **Establish routine production and review of *exception reports* that identify common indicators of potential errors**, for example:
 - a. Cases with no future hearing date;
 - b. Cases that have a disposing event concluded (e.g., a judgment), but which appear as pending;
 - c. Routine comparison of periodic statistical reports against a previous period, to discover possible errors.
4. Systematic review of JBSIS reports is not the only useful form of diligence. Curiosity – and being open to finding and preventing reporting errors – is often the most fruitful quality assurance effort, particularly with newly implemented case management systems and practices.
5. **Ensure that written procedures, guidelines, FAQs and other appropriate documents reflect JBSIS rules** – and that, whenever local case processing practices differ from JBSIS reporting guidelines, written documentation makes those differences clear and understandable.
6. **Train court staff on the JBSIS reporting rules** so that the language of JBSIS becomes widely used. This practice helps to reduce data entry errors (for instance, so that a data-entry clerk understands the implications of docketing a document as a new filing).

In addition to the above guidelines, there are some specific steps that Portal-reporting courts should take:

- 7A. Periodically review the data extracts that provide source data for Portal entries to ensure that they comply with the JBSIS Manual; and
- 7B. Double-check data entries before submission to JBSIS.

Courts that report their data via automated processes (aka JBSIS courts) should also:

- 8A. Review the JBSIS mapping documentation for their CMS to check for compliance with the JBSIS Manual (this should be done by court staff, not only by the CMS vendor); and
- 8B. Periodically compare results in the JBSIS Data Warehouse with ad hoc data extracts directly from the CMS.

Error Discovery and Resolution

Known errors that result from any one of the following must be addressed as described in this section:

- a. Documented errors in an audit report;
- b. When the results of the annual data quality review by the Office of Court Research show that variation in data are the result of an error and not normal year-to-year differences;
- c. Findings and results of local quality assurance efforts as described elsewhere in these guidelines; or
- d. Ad hoc error discovery.

Error Quantification and Acceptable Error Rates

The size of an error relative to the number of filings in a given period affected determines how courts should remedy the error. An error rate of 2% for each major data element reported in the annual Court Statistics Report—filings, dispositions, trials, and time to disposition—in each JBSIS report column casetype is established as the threshold above which courts must submit amended data correcting the report. Error rates for other JBSIS data elements will be considered in future versions of these guidelines. The error rate is determined by the difference of the reported value and the correct value, divided by the reported value.

Errors above the 2% error rate are deemed to be “intolerable errors” and require courts to submit amended reports. Tolerable errors are considered error rates below the error rate and are optional for courts to submit amended reports, although courts must still remedy the underlying problem that results in the error.

Error diagnosis and prevention

The court's obligation to provide accurate data goes beyond remedying the erroneous report: the court should take affirmative steps to diagnose the source of the error and to prevent making it in the future. Intolerable errors should be studied to determine the root cause and remedied in the following manner:

1. Intolerable intermittent user errors should result in a training plan for court staff that addresses the errors.
2. Any intolerable error with a root cause in written policies, procedures, guidelines, desk manuals, etc., should result in appropriate changes to those documents.
3. Any intolerable error with a root cause in technology **must** result in a plan to address the error.

Error amendment

There is a presumption that data quality improves, rather than degrades, over time. All courts must amend reports containing intolerable errors of more than the allowable error rate. Courts

must amend intolerable errors prior to the reporting deadline at which the affected fiscal year's data become part of the dataset to be included in the RAS model (a date determined each year by the Office of Court Research). If the root cause analysis indicates that the source of the error is not unique to the most recent fiscal year, any amendments must be made to all three fiscal years that pertain to the upcoming RAS model calculations.

In the event that intolerable errors are found, courts should notify the Office of Court Research of these errors within two weeks. Courts should also provide documentation of resolution of intolerable errors. The Office of Court Research is to assist courts in submitting amended reports. If tolerable errors are found, courts should notify the Office of Court Research if they intend to submit amended reports.