





Guardianship/Conservatorship Monitoring

Recommended Data Elements

June 2024 (2nd Ed.)



This project is supported by State Justice Institute Award No. SJI-15-P-237, Conservatorship Accountability Project: Modernizing Conservatorship Process and Improving the Protection of Assets.

The second edition is supported by State Justice Institute Award No. SJI-21-P-038, Implementing National Open Court Data Standards in Pilot Courts.

The opinions, findings, and recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the State Justice Institute.

Introduction

State courts are responsible for appointing and monitoring guardians and conservators¹, ensuring the protected person's best interests are the basis for the personal and financial decisions made. To effectively manage these cases, courts need accurate data to monitor both the court's and the guardian's and conservator's performance. Multiple studies have attempted to collect state-level data to inform a national picture of the volume and type of these cases in the United States (Schauffler & Uekert, 2008, CEC Results of Online Survey, 2010, Uekert & Van Duizend, 2011, Uekert & Schauffler, 2014). Each effort highlights the lack of information available without consistent data, it is impossible to enumerate incidents of exploitation or fraud and understand root causes. In November 2016, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) released a report documenting the lack of this state-level information on guardianship abuses. As stated in the title of the report, "[t]he extent of abuse by guardians is unknown" (GAO-17-33, 2016). The report goes on to explain that there is "limited data on the numbers of guardians serving older adults, older adults in guardianships, and cases of elder abuse by a guardian" (p. 6).

Recommendations have called for improving data collection through clear definitions and consistent methodology (CCJ/COSCA Resolution 14, Encouraging Collection of Data on Adult Guardianship, Adult Conservatorship, and Elder Abuse Cases by All States, 2009; National Probate Court Standards, 2013). However, resource constraints, locally governed courts, and outdated paper or legacy systems for tracking results in many states unable to confidently report the most basic statistics on the number of guardianship and conservatorship cases under court oversight. More specific information regarding the number of cases where there are concerns of exploitation or maltreatment are even more elusive. Tragic media stories and national attention have brought this issue front and center. State courts are responding with multiple states are making concerted efforts to improve the collection of data and the corresponding monitoring practices. At this critical time, this report provides guidance on recommended data elements and the context for why collecting this information is critical.

Using this Guide

The <u>Court Statistics Project</u> (CSP)² and <u>National Open Court Data Standards</u> (NODS)³ provide frameworks for data collection, with the goal of presenting a national picture (CSP) or working to standardize information to be able to promote data exchanges for research (NODS). This guide is a complement to these other efforts and uses NODS framework and recommended data elements as a starting point. The guide is divided into sections that align with the NODS organizational structure. Each section describes relevant data elements, providing additional context for guardianship and conservatorship cases.

Not every data element from NODS is included in this guide. Priority is given to those elements that are specific to guardianship cases and need more context or explanation on the "how and why" for collection. Additional elements that are out of scope for NODS but nonetheless important for guardianship cases are included in this report.

Not every data element necessary for case management is included in this guide. Instead, the list aims to focus on what information is needed to initiate and monitor guardianship and conservatorship cases and to answer policy questions. The list is informed by past research, and by NCSC engagement with state and local courts about current, promising, and best practices. However, it may not cover all needs for a court

¹ In this report the term guardian is used to reference those appointed to make personal/well-being decisions and conservator is used to reference those appointed to make financial decisions. Local use of these terms varies widely.

² www.courtstatistics.org

³ www.ncsc.org/nods

or state. This guide should be viewed as a living document. Recommendations will change, especially as courts incorporate technology solutions more fully.

For easy reference, each section is labeled with the NODS tab number. Additionally, NODS data elements are in **bold**. Sample values from the NODS data elements spreadsheet are *italicized*. Elements out of scope for NODS but in this guide for case-level monitoring at the local or state level are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Principles of data collection

There are a few principles that guide data collection around monitoring guardianship and conservatorship cases as these have some unique characteristics from other civil, family, or probate cases. The data elements included in this report attempt to address these factors.

It is necessary and important to collect information on changes over the life of case.

Guardianship/conservatorship cases may remain under the court's watch for decades, with the needs of the protected person changing over time. It is unlikely that a guardianship or conservatorship case open for many years will have a single judicial officer. Maintaining historical data is key, as well as being able to look at the current needs versus what was originally presented. For example, what power was requested in the petition versus what power is granted? Are some of the powers no longer necessary or are additional ones needed? Who was the original conservator and why was that conservator removed? Are the assets being managed in a way to provide for the person over their lifetime?

Courts need data to identify problems and responses to those problems.

In some guardianship and conservatorship cases, problems arise due to abuse, neglect, fraud, or mismanagement. Having accurate data increases the chances that courts will become aware of and respond appropriately to problems, identify trends or patterns, and improve the protection of vulnerable citizens.

To protect individuals subject to guardianships or conservatorships, courts must communicate with other courts and other entities.

Both those subject to a guardianship/conservatorship as well as those serving as guardians or conservators cross jurisdictional, county, and state lines. Being able to share data and exchange information is critical to detect and prevent abuse and fraud.

Tab 1: Case Information

Probate Case Types

Understanding a court's current guardianship/conservatorship caseload is basic but critical information. For each case, three pieces of information should be known. Ideally this information would be collected at filing of the petition and again after adjudication (when the guardian/conservatorship is granted.)

- 1. Type (Guardianship, Conservatorship, or Both)
- 2. Age of Vulnerable Person (Adult or Juvenile)
- 3. Powers granted to the guardian/conservator (Full or Limited)

In some guardianship or conservatorship cases, the court may grant type or powers different from the petition. For example, the petitioner may have sought full guardianship of an adult. Based on the facts presented, the court granted limited guardianship of an adult. In a case such as this, capturing the type and powers is important for ongoing monitoring. There are several ways to accomplish this:

- 1. Update the case type based on what the court actually granted, maintaining case type history (e.g. the original case type is Guardianship-Adult but the court granted only limited guardianship, so the case type is changed to Limited Guardianship-Adult).
- 2. If a new petition were filed, reopening the case with the appropriate case type based on the new petition, maintaining case type history.
- 3. Retaining the original case type, but capturing the powers granted in a separate field (e.g. the case type is Guardianship-Adult and the powers granted are "limited guardianship").

Ultimately, the goal is for the court to know the current case type and how it has changed over time.

Table 1a: Probate Case Types

| Probate Case Type | Definitions & Notes | | |
|------------------------|--|--|--|
| Guardianship-Adult | Case establishing a legal relationship between an adult determined to be unable to make their own personal decisions and the person(s) granted powers to make those decisions. *Note: For this definition, guardianship authorizes well-being decisions, such as health care, accommodation, and education. | | |
| Guardianship- Juvenile | Case establishing a legal relationship between a juvenile unable to make their own personal decisions and the person(s) granted powers to make those decisions. *Note: For this definition, guardianship authorizes well-being decisions, such as health care, accommodation, and education. | | |

| Conservatorship-Adult | Case establishing a legal relationship between an adult determined to be unable to make their own financial decisions and the person(s) granted powers to make those decisions. *Note: For this definition, conservatorship authorizes financial decisions, such as selling property and managing finances. |
|---|---|
| Conservatorship- Juvenile | Case establishing a legal relationship between a juvenile unable to make their own financial decisions and the person(s) granted powers to make those decisions. *Note: For this definition, conservatorship authorizes financial decisions, such as selling property and managing finances. |
| Both (G&C)- Adult | Cases establishing a legal relationship between an adult determined to be unable to make their own personal <u>and</u> financial decisions and the person(s) granted powers to make those decisions. |
| Both (G&C)- Juvenile | Cases establishing a legal relationship between a juvenile unable to make their own personal <u>and</u> financial decisions and the person(s) granted powers to make those decisions. |
| Limited Guardianship- Adult | Cases establishing a limited legal relationship between an adult determined to be unable to make their own personal decisions and the person(s) granted specific powers to make those decisions as outlined/specified in the petition or order *Note: For this definition, guardianship authorizes limited well-being decisions, such as health care decisions only. |
| Limited Guardianship- Juvenile | Cases establishing a limited legal relationship between a juvenile unable to make their own personal decisions and the person(s) granted specific powers to make those decisions as outlined/specified in the petition or order. *Note: For this definition, guardianship authorizes limited well-being decisions, such as health care only. |
| Limited Conservatorship- Adult | Cases establishing a limited legal relationship between an adult determined to be unable to make their own financial decisions and the person(s) granted specific powers to make those decisions as outlined/specified in the petition or order. *Note: For this definition, conservatorship authorizes limited financial decisions, such as only selling property. |
| Limited Conservatorship- Juvenile | Cases establishing a limited legal relationship between a juvenile unable to make their own financial decisions and the person(s) granted specific powers to make those decisions as outlined/specified in the petition or order. *Note: For this definition, conservatorship authorizes limited financial decisions, such as only selling property. |
| Limited Both (G&C) -Adult | Cases establishing a limited legal relationship between an adult individual determined to be unable to make their own personal <u>and</u> financial decisions and the person(s) granted specific powers to make those decisions as outlined/specified in the petition or order. |

| Limited Both (G&C)- Juvenile | Cases establishing a limited legal relationship between a juvenile unable to make their own personal <u>and</u> financial decisions and the person(s) granted specific powers to make those decisions as outlined/specified in the petition or order. |
|---------------------------------|---|
|---------------------------------|---|

Case Type Classification/Re-Classification Example:

Table 1b: Class type classification

| Event | Probate Case Type | Notes |
|--|--------------------|--|
| Petition filed for <i>Both</i> (G/C) with full powers | Both (G&C)-Adult | Assign based on petition filed |
| Judge grants a Guardianship- Adult, as the only income/ assets known is social security and a representative payee is needed | Guardianship-Adult | Re-categorize case as Guardianship-Adult. Maintain history on the original petition type (case type). |
| After 2 years, Court is made aware of multiple accounts that have been inherited by vulnerable person. | Both (G&C)- Adult | New petition is filed, and judge orders "Both" powers to the individual. Maintain history of first petition granted. |

Current Case Status

Guardianship/conservatorship cases are often under the court's watch for many years, so tracking the current status of the case is especially important. Historically, some courts have left cases as "open/ pending" or "active" for the entire life of the case. This skews the calculation of time to disposition and makes it more difficult for the court to distinguish between cases with a petition pending and those being monitored by the court. Other courts have "closed" cases as soon as the petition is granted. This makes it difficult for the court to determine which cases require monitoring.

Table 1c: Status categories

| Current Case Status | Definition |
|------------------------|--|
| Open/Pending | An open case is one with a petition pending before the court. |
| | An inactive case is one whose status has been administratively changed to inactive during the reporting period due to events beyond the court's control. The court can take no further action on an inactive case until an event restores the case to the court's active pending caseload. |
| Inactive | *Note: Inactive should not be used for guardianship/conservatorship cases that are disposed/set for review. The court has authority to review annual accounting or call a hearing when concerns arise. |

| Disposed/Set for Review | A case that, following an initial Entry of Judgment, is awaiting regularly scheduled reviews involving a hearing before a judicial officer. For guardianship and conservatorship cases, the status should be Set for Review if they are scheduled for administrative or audit reviews, even if they do not always result in a judicial hearing. The designation of set for review is very helpful in distinguishing between cases in which a petition is pending (open) and those that are active for the court but in which no petition is pending. |
|----------------------------|--|
| | A case is disposed/closed if additional court action would require a new petition to be filed. For Guardianship and Conservatorship cases, this may occur because: |
| Disposed/Closed | the petition was denied, the vulnerable person has died, the juvenile under guardianship/conservatorship has reached age of majority, or competency has been restored. |

Filing Type

Tracking the filing type is also valuable information, as these cases may be reopened or transferred from state to state or court to court. Data that tracks the history of the case (where it came from when transferred) will be useful if there are concerns over the wellbeing of the person subject to guardianship/ conservatorship. More detailed information on case statuses can be found in the Court Statistics Project, <u>State Court Guide to Statistical Reporting</u>.

Table 1d: Filing Types

| Filing Type | Notes |
|-------------|--|
| New | Case filed for the first time in the court |
| Reopened | Case where a new petition has been filed after the adjudication. This could be to change the type of powers granted (e.g., changing from a full to a limited conservatorship). |
| Transferred | Cases that originated in another court or jurisdiction. |

Linked case data elements (linked case, linked case jurisdiction, and linked case type) can also be useful for monitoring cases, including those that are transferred using these fields to track past case numbers and case types. Linked case jurisdiction should include the originating state or county and the originating court, which may require more than one field. For transferred cases, capturing the originating jurisdiction information allows the court to seek earlier records if needed. Additionally, as professional guardians and conservators can practice in multiple jurisdictions, this information can be used to find patterns of abuse or neglect.

Linked case data can also be used to associate cases within the same state or jurisdiction. For example, when multiple siblings or spouses are subject to guardianship/conservatorship, it may be beneficial to consider their finances and well-being together. The **linked case** data element may also be used to track related criminal cases that come from findings of abuse, neglect, or fraud. It may also be used to track related civil or family matters such as divorce.

Case Closure Reason

Guardianship and Conservatorship cases should only be considered closed when a final disposition is entered, and the court is no longer responsible for monitoring the case. Not only should the way the case is closed be captured (**Case Disposition Category**), it is also important to track the reason why the case is closed. This will allow courts to better understand the important subset of cases where a guardianship or conservatorship is no longer needed (restoration of rights) or when a least restrictive alternative was reached.

Table 1e: Case Closure Reasons

| Case Closure Reason | Notes | |
|--|--|--|
| Restoration of Rights | Guardianships and Conservatorships are a last resort, and when no longer necessary, the court should restore rights. | |
| Reached Age of Majority | Applicable in juvenile Guardianships and Conservatorships | |
| Death | | |
| Transfer | | |
| *Transfer to State/County | For cases that are transferred to another state or jurisdiction, track where the cases go | |
| *Transfer to Jurisdiction/ Court | the cases go | |
| Order Expired | Typically used for temporary orders of guardianship | |
| Dismissal | | |
| *Less Restrictive Alternative | Increasing attention is given to least restrictive alternatives for those not needing guardianship/conservatorship. Knowing the number of cases that were dismissed or closed for this reason will allow a court or state to track this trend and to illustrate guardianships or conservatorships are not being used when unwarranted. The definition and alternatives will vary from state to state, but it is important to consider how to capture this information. | |
| Other | Ideally, other would not be needed as the more specific Closure Reasons would capture this detail. However, there may be other reasons not included. | |

Flags

A number of items in NODS are indicated as flags. Courts may collect and record this information in multiple ways, but for purposes of data sharing they can be mapped to flags. Relevant case flags for Guardianship cases are shown in Table 1f.

Table 1f: Flags

| | Data Element | Definition | Values |
|----|----------------------|---|-----------|
| 24 | Confidentiality Flag | Case includes confidential information (e.g. legal minors, medical information) | Yes No |
| 25 | Appeal filed | Flag to indicate the case was appealed in a higher court. | Yes No |

| 26 | Interpreter Flag | An interpreter deemed qualified by and ordered by the court was used in the case for a party or witness | Yes No |
|----|--------------------------------|---|-----------|
| 32 | ICWA case flag | Indication that ICWA has been raised as a potential factor in the case | Yes No |
| 33 | Contested flag | indication that the case was contested at some point | Yes No |
| 35 | Excluded time flag | Indication the case was subject to excluded time at any point in the life of the case. Excluded time can be due to factors such as psychological evaluation, active duty military, or awaiting action by another court | Yes No |
| 39 | Interstate Flag | Flag to indicate the case involves multiple states. | Yes No |
| 44 | Dependency Court Judgment Flag | Flag to indicate there was a judicial finding in a dependency case associated with a minor/child involved in the current case (e.g., legal custody). | Yes No |

Tab 2: Participant Information

In addition to the typical data collected for parties to a case, key data elements are needed to assist in monitoring guardianships/conservatorships. Unfortunately, demographic information is often missing from case management systems (CMS), creating problems accurately identifying the person within the CMS and tracking information important to individuals subject to guardianship or conservatorship.

Table 2a: Information about the Person Subject to Guardianship or Conservatorship

| Data Element # | Data Element | Definition | Data Values | Use Case |
|----------------------|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | Party Name | Full name of Party | | |
| 2 | Party Opt-in to Text Notifications | Has Party opted in to text message notifications? | Yes No | Automated reminders and notices to help monitor required regular submissions and reports. |
| 3 | Type of Electronic Service | Destination for electronic notifications from court | Text message Email Telephone Social media | Automated reminders and notices to help monitor required regular submissions and reports. |
| 4 | Alias | Alias used by the individual, including maiden name | | Obtaining relevant records |
| 5 | Date of Birth | Individual's Date of | date | Monitoring |

| | | Birth | | |
|------------|--|--|---|---|
| 6 | Race | Party's identification with one or more social groups | White Black or African American American Indian or Alaska Native Asian Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Other | Identifying disproportionate use of guardianship |
| 6a | Race source | The source or agency where the race data was collected | Court (direct inquiry) Driver's license Law enforcement Jail Corrections/Probation Prosecutor Petitioner Another state agency Unknown | In data exchange, to know who "owns" the information |
| 6b | Race self- identified or observed | An indicator for whether the race source relies upon self-report by the party or an observation from someone else (e.g., law enforcement) | Self-reported Observed or perceived | To determine appropriate use in research |
| 7 | Ethnicity | Party's identification with an ethnicity | Hispanic/Latinx/Latino/Latina Non- Hispanic/Latinx/Latino/Latina | Identifying disproportionate use of guardianship |
| 7 a | Ethnicity source | The source or agency where the ethnicity data was collected | Court (direct inquiry) Driver's license Law enforcement Jail Corrections/Probation Prosecutor Petitioner Another state agency Unknown | In data exchange, to know who "owns" the information |
| 7b | Ethnicity self- identified or observed | An indicator for whether the ethnicity source relies upon self-report by the party or an observation from someone else (e.g., law enforcement) | Self-reported Observed or perceived | To determine appropriate use in research |
| 8 | Gender | Party's self- identified gender | Male Female Non-binary | To determine disproportionality |
| 8a | Transgender | Party identifies as | Yes/No | To determine |

| | | transgender | | disproportionality |
|----|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 9 | Sex | Individual's biological sex/sex assigned at birth | Male/Female | To determine disproportionality |
| 10 | Entity Type | Party entity type | Individual Insurance Company Hospital/Clinic Nursing Home/Rehab Education Law Enforcement Other Agency Other Business Other Government Agency | To be able to track petitioners and other parties |
| 11 | ADA Flag | Flag to indicate accessibility needs the court should address with accommodations. | Yes No | Ensure the person has what they need to participate, including communication aids |
| 12 | Zip Code | Zip code of Party | Postal Code | To determine disproportionality, for imputation of race |
| 13 | State Firearm Restrictions | Party is subject to firearm restrictions at the state level | Yes No | To determine rights retained |
| 14 | Ever Represented | Has Party ever been represented? | Yes No | To determine representation |
| 15 | Primary Language | Individual's primary language if limited English proficient | | To identify when interpreters are needed, and in what languages |
| 16 | Identifier | Anonymized series of characters that identify the same individual within the court system, across cases and courts within the state. | Text/Numeric | To track individuals across cases |
| 17 | ICWA child determination date | Date that a judicial officer made a ruling that the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) applies to this child. | date | To indicate if there is potential tribal involvement and if ICWA provisions apply |
| 18 | Relationship to Action | Participant's role/standing in the case. | Petitioner Nominated Party Respondent Subject of the Petition | Access to information, connecting related cases |

| | | | Interested Party Parent Foster parent Relative caregiver Guardian Conservator Executor | |
|-----|---|---|---|--|
| 20 | Relationship of the Executor/ Guardian/ Conservator to Person | Participant's relationship to person subject to the petition | Lay (Family/Friend) Professional Public Other | Monitoring and reporting, determining guardian needs |
| 21 | Date of Death | Party's date of death | date | Important if death was the reason for case closure |
| n/a | *Proof of Death | Confirmation of person's death | Death certificate Signed statement by the funeral director Coroner's report | Monitoring, timely case closure, trigger for final reports |
| 22 | Residential Status | Current residential placement of person subject to the petition | *Independent Living (Own Home) *Independent Living (Group Home) *Independent Living (Family/ Friend Home) Assisted Living Skilled Nursing Acute Care (hospital, LTAC) | Necessary for case monitoring |
| 25 | Indigency status | Indicator of whether individual was determined to be indigent at any point during the case. | Yes No | Qualification for counsel |
| 26 | Indigency method | the method the court used to determine indigency | screening judge determination individual receives qualifying state assistance other | |
| 42 | Marital Status | Marital status of individual | Never married married separated divorced widowed | Impacts financial matters, possible qualification for benefits |
| 44 | Veteran/Military status | Indication of whether the individual is currently or has previously served in the armed | Yes - United States Yes - another country No | Possible qualification for benefits, examining possible disproportionality |

| | | forces. | | |
|-----|-------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|
| 45 | Tribal affiliation | Person's membership or affiliation with a Tribe | Federally recognized Tribes | Possible qualification for benefits, examining possible disproportionality |
| n/a | *Mailing Address | Complete address at which mail is received | | Necessary for notice and other court documents |
| n/a | *Residential Address | Complete address where the person subject to guardianship or conservatorship is living | | Necessary for case monitoring |

These elements in Table 2b are important to collect for the guardian or conservator. It is particularly important to be able to connect all of the clients of a professional guardian/conservator in the event that abuse or fraud are alleged. At the party level it is also important to track characteristics of the guardian/conservator along with maintaining history of those characteristics.

Not every state requires a guardian or conservator to be qualified or certified. If that is a requirement in your jurisdiction, being able to run a report on conservators who were certified, etc. will allow the court to follow up on guardians/conservators of concern. Dates for when certifications expire should also be captured.

Table 2b: Guardian and Conservator information

| Data Element # | Data Element | Definition | Data Values | Use case |
|----------------------|--|--|-------------|--|
| n/a | *Qualified | Whether the person has met the requirements to serve as guardian | Yes No | Compliance with court orders |
| n/a | *Certified | Whether the person is a certified guardian | Yes No | Compliance with court orders |
| 23 | Date of Guardian/ Conserva- tor registration | The date a guardian or conservator was registered | date | Tracking guardian eligibility |
| 24 | Rep Payee Flag | | res No | If a guardian or conservator is discharged for cause, SSA should be notified (and vice |

| | | | | versa). |
|-----|-----------------|---|-----------|---|
| 24a | VA Fiduciary | Guardian/Conservator is also serving as the fiduciary for Veterans Affairs | Yes No | If a guardian or conservator is discharged for cause, VA should be notified (and vice versa). |

Other Relevant Case Information

Other data elements are common to many case types, including guardianships. Note that guardianship cases may be considered civil, domestic, or probate, depending on the jurisdiction.

Table 1g: Other Case Data Elements

| | Data Element | Definition | Values |
|----|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 1 | Court Case Identifier | Series of characters that identifies the court case | alphanumeric |
| 2 | State | State where the case was filed | State name |
| 3 | Court | Court where the case was filed (e.g., county, court code, court level, locality) | County or Court name or number |
| 4 | Primary Case Category | the subject area of the case | civil criminal domestic juvenile dependency probate traffic |
| 17 | Case Initial Filing Date | Filing date of original petition/complaint | Date |
| 18 | Case Disposition Category | Category indicating the manner in which the case was disposed | Judgment Settlement/Plea Dismissal Transfer other |
| 20 | Case Manner of Disposition | method by which the primary petition or complaint was decided | jury trial bench trial non-trial |
| 21 | Disposition Date | date of the entry of judgment or other disposition on the primary petition or complaint | Date |
| 22 | Case closed date | Date upon which the final dispositional event for the case occurred (judgment or dismissal of last party) and additional court action would require a new petition to be filed | Date |
| 23 | Judicial Officer Identifier | Name or License number issued by the State Bar Association to the attorney. | Name or ID |
| 27 | Linked case | Court case identifier for any associated case | case number |
| 28 | Linked case jurisdiction | the court of the linked case | |
| 29 | Linked case type | the primary case type of the linked case | |
| 34 | Filing type | manner of filing or status of the case when filed with the court | new reopened reactivated transferred |

| 36 | Fee waiver | Date a fee waiver request/petition was filed | Date |
|----|------------|--|------|
| | date | | |

Tab 3: Attorney and Advocate Information

To monitor these cases, it is important to know what attorneys and advocates are involved and which events they attend. Attorney fees, especially when an attorney is serving multiple roles, need to be monitored to ensure billing rates are appropriate for the tasks performed (see Probate Review and Monitoring Section). Being able to identify and run reports on the multiple actors involved in a case will allow for cross case monitoring when issues arise.

Table 3a: Attorney & Advocate type

| Data Element # | Data Element | Definition | Values | Use Case |
|----------------------|------------------|---|---|---|
| 14 | Attorney Type | Type of attorney | Private Attorney Public defender State's attorney/ prosecutor Legal aid/legal services attorney Protection & Advocacy (P&A) attorney Allied Legal Professional GAL/best-interest attorney Other | Understanding the role of the attorney, particularly between those representing the person and those representing the best interests of the person. |
| 15 | Advocate Type | Type of non- attorney court- appointed advocate | Non-attorney GAL Court Visitor | Tracking monitoring or visits to the person |

The following elements are important for many types of cases. Use cases relevant to guardianship are provided.

Table 3b: Attorney and Advocate Information

| Data Element # | Data Element | Definition | Values | Use Case |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|--|--------------|--|
| 1 | Attorney/Advocate Name | Full name of attorney/advocate | | Notice, reports |
| 2 | Firm Name | Attorney/advocate's firm at time of entry into the case | | Identify all cases connected to a particular firm |
| 3 | Attorney/Advocate Address | Mailing address of attorney/advocate | | Notice, reports |
| 4 | Attorney/Advocate ID Number | ID number assigned by bar, supreme court, state, court, or case management | alphanumeric | Identify all cases connected to a particular attorney |

| | | system | | |
|----|----------------------------------|--|-----------|---------------------------------|
| 5 | Attorney/Advocate E-mail Address | Attorney/advocate's e-mail address | | Communication |
| 9 | Attorney/Advocate Entry Date | Date attorney/advocate entered case | Date | Notice, tracking representation |
| 10 | Attorney/Advocate End Date | Date attorney/advocate exited case | Date | Notice, tracking representation |
| 11 | Limited Scope | Attorney retained to provide assistance on only some aspects of the case | Yes No | |
| 12 | Associated party/participant | the party(ies) or participant(s) represented or advocated for by this advocate | | Notice |

Tab 4: Status

For guardianship and conservatorship cases, being able to distinguish which cases are under the court's watch is critical, and historically a challenge for courts to distinguish pending caseloads from those that are Set for Review. Courts have come up with a variety of methods to mark these cases, and many terms are used (e.g., Administratively Closed, Statistically Closed, Adjudicated Case- Report Review). Regardless of terminology used, what is key is to be able to distinguish cases that are:

- Open/Pending
- Disposed and Set for Review
- Disposed/Closed.

See Case Section for more detail and definitions on these Case Statuses. If a new petition is filed, such as when an old guardian is discharged and a new one appointed, the case status will change from disposed and set for review to reopened, which is mapped to open status in the NODS data elements. The case status of reopened or open indicates that there is a petition pending. Once that petition is adjudicated, the status will revert to disposed and set for review.

Other case statuses, including inactive, are not commonly used for guardianship or conservatorship cases.

Table 4: Case Status in Guardianship Cases

| Data Element # | Data element | Values | Definition | Use Case |
|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|--|---|
| 1 | Case Status Date | date | | |
| 2 | Case Status | Open/pending | An open case is one with a petition pending before the court. | Identifying cases with a petition pending |
| | | Disposed/closed | A case is disposed/closed if additional court action would require a new petition to be filed. For Guardianship and Conservatorship cases, this may occur because: - the petition was denied, - the vulnerable person has died, - the juvenile under guardianship/conserva torship has reached age of majority, or - competency has been restored. | Identifying cases that no longer require monitoring because the guardianship is no longer in effect |
| | | Disposed & set for review | A case that, following an initial Entry of Judgment, is awaiting regularly scheduled reviews involving a hearing | Identifying cases requiring monitoring |

| before a judicial officer. For | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| guardianship and | |
| conservatorship cases, the | |
| status should be Set for | |
| Review if they are scheduled | |
| for administrative or audit | |
| reviews, even if they do not | |
| always result in a judicial | |
| hearing. The designation of | |
| set for review is very helpful | |
| in distinguishing between | |
| cases in which a petition is | |
| pending (open) and those | |
| that are active for the court | |
| but in which no petition is | |
| · | |
| | guardianship and conservatorship cases, the status should be Set for Review if they are scheduled for administrative or audit reviews, even if they do not always result in a judicial hearing. The designation of set for review is very helpful in distinguishing between cases in which a petition is pending (open) and those |

Tab 5: Pleadings

Information valuable to courts in tracking and monitoring guardianships is all-too-often buried in the text of pleadings or in docket notes. While these are useful when reviewing a particular case, they do not allow a court to receive a holistic view of the docket or look for patterns in abuse, neglect, or financial exploitation. These data fields are important to capture complaints or concerns about guardianships.

Table 5: Pleadings

| Data Element # | Data Element | Definition | Values relevant to guardianships and conservatorships | Use case |
|----------------------|--|--|---|---|
| 1 | Pleading Title | Statement of Claim | Text field | Locate relevant documents |
| 2 | Date Filed | Date pleading or motion was filed | Date | Tracking actions in the case |
| 3 | Filing Party | Party filing the pleading | Text field | Understanding the relationship between the petitioner and the party potentially subject to guardianship |
| 5 | Answer | Does pleading contain an answer and/or denial to the initiating complaint? | Yes No | Identifying contested cases |
| 15 | Amended | Is this an amended pleading? | Yes No | Tracking actions in the case |
| 26 | Initial Probate Pleading Type | The type of pleading filed | Emergency/Temporary/ Special | Used when the need for a guardianship or conservatorship is immediate |
| | | | General/Summary | Used when a full guardianship or conservatorship is sought |
| | | | Successor | Used when there is a replacement guardian being appointed |
| | | | Limited | Used when only a limited guardianship or conservatorship is sought |
| 27 | Initial | The reason the | Medical Condition | This data element allows for |
| | Probate | pleading was filed | Financial Exploitation | tracking the underlying |
| | Pleading Reason | | Disability | reason for the guardianship |
| | | | Death/Testamentary | conservatorship. |
| | | | Abuse Neglect/Abandonment | |
| | | | Substance Abuse | |
| | | | Other | |
| 28 | Subsequent | The type of | Contested Issue | |

| | Probate Pleading Type | subsequent pleading filed | Responsive Pleading | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | Hearing/request/notice | | |
| | | | *Modification | These will be mapped to | |
| | | | *Termination | modification/termination/suc | |
| | | | *Successor | cessor in NODS, but courts are likely to find it helpful to | |
| | | | | be able to split them out. | |
| | | | Distribution | | |
| | | | Bond | | |
| | | | Other | | |
| 29 | Subsequent Probate Pleading | Reason subsequent pleading filed | Restoration | Used when the pleading is to restore the protected person's rights | |
| | Reason | | Financial Exploitation | Used to track the type of | |
| | | | Abuse | concerns necessitating | |
| | | | Neglect/Abandonment | court action. The reason is | |
| | | | Substance Abuse | important to track malfeasance | |
| | | | Fees and Costs | | |
| | | | Modification/Change in Guardianship or Conservatorship | Track requests for changes in type of guardianship | |
| | | | Death/Incapacity/No longer willing | Used when the current guardian or conservator can no longer serve | |
| | | | Other | | |
| 30 | Pleading/ Motion | | Granted (full, partial) | Track granted guardianships | |
| | Outcome | | Denied | Track how many were denied | |
| | | | Dismissed/withdrawn | Track how many were dismissed or withdrawn | |
| 32 | Fee waiver date | Date a fee waiver request/petition was filed | date | Eligibility for waiver | |

Tab 6: Motions & Filings

Tracking motions and filings helps to ensure that the case moves at an appropriate pace.

Table 6: Motions & Filings

| Data Element # | Data Element | Definition | Values relevant to guardianships and conservatorships | Use case |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | Motion/Filing Title | Title of motion or filing | Text | Identifying relevant documents |
| 2 | Date Filed | Date pleading or motion was filed | Date | Tracking events in the case |
| 3 | Filing Party | Filing party | Text | |
| 4 | Motion/Filing type | Type of motion or filing | Administrative Affidavit of inability to pay costs Continuance Discovery Dispositive Motion to dismiss Motion to suppress evidence Post-Trial Speedy trial Other | Tracking developments in the case |
| 5 | Pleading/ Motion Outcome | Order decision associated with specific motion(s) | Granted (full, partial) Denied Dismissed/withdrawn | Tracking the results of a motion |
| 6 | Amended | Is this an amended motion/filing? | Yes No | Tracking characteristics of a motion |
| 7 | Agreed/ Stipulated | Is this motion/filing agreed/stipulated? | Yes No | Tracking characteristics of a motion |
| 8 | Opposed | Is this motion/filing opposed? | Yes No | Tracking characteristics of a motion |
| 9 | Opposition | Is this a filing in opposition to a motion/filing? | Yes No | Tracking characteristics of a motion |

Tab 7: Hearings & Events

The data elements for hearings and events allow courts to capture important questions including the flow of the case (based on **scheduled event date**, **hearing/event outcome** (whether it was held, continued, cancelled, or postponed/rescheduled), and **continuance/postponement reason**. These elements also capture some aspects of procedural fairness, including **parties present**, attorneys/advocates present, and interpreter present as well as the **hearing/event modality** to capture if the hearing occurred *in-person*, via *videoconference*, or *telephonically*.

Because most jurisdictions do not have jury trials in guardianship cases, those elements are not included here. However, they are included in the NODS Tab 7.

| Data Eleme | Data Element ent | Definition | Values relevant to guardianships and | Use case |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 1 | Scheduled Event Date | Date of scheduled hearing, trial, or conference | conservatorships Date | Timeliness of events |
| 2 | Judicial Officer | Judicial officer presiding at the event | Name or ID | Tracking cases by judge |
| 3 | Parties Present | The parties or case participants present for the event | Name, ID, or relationship to action | Tracking participation in the case |
| 4 | Attorneys/Advocates Present | The attorneys or advocates present for the event | Name or ID | Tracking participation in the case |
| 5 | Hearing/Event Outcome | Outcome of hearing or event | Held Continued Cancelled Postponed/Reschedule d | Identifying reasons for delay |
| 6 | Hearing/Event Modality | Way that the hearing was held | In-person video-conference telephonic combination | Tracking participation in the case |
| 7 | Continuance/Postpon ement Reason | Reason scheduled event was continued or postponed/rescheduled | Transportation Evaluation Illness Court closed Party/witness not available/FTA Lack of notice Insufficient time Incomplete Discovery/Crime lab delay Other | Identifying reasons for delay |
| 8 | Interpreter Present | Was a certified/professional court interpreter used during the event? | In-Person, Remote, None | Combined with participant language information, tracking service to litigants |
| 9 | Interpreter Language | Language of certified court interpreter | | Tracking needs, where interpreters |

| | | | | are and are not available |
|----|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 10 | Hearing Initiation | Manner in which hearing was initiated | Party's written motion Oral request (telephonic, in-court) Court's initiative | |
| 14 | Family Hearing Type | Type of family hearing | Pretrial/Temporary Trial/Contested hearing Contempt | When guardianship cases are heard as domestic cases |
| 16 | Probate Hearing Type | Type of probate hearing | Administrative (show cause, review, competency) Dispositive Evidentiary/Trial Other | When guardianship cases are heard as probate cases |
| 17 | Evidentiary | Was evidence introduced? | Yes No | |
| 18 | Continuance/Postpon ement party | The party/entity that requested the continuance/ postponement | Party Court | Tracking reasons for delay |
| 20 | Remote witness | Did any witness appear remotely? | Yes No | Tracking use of technology |
| 21 | Remote witness type | Manner of remote witness appearance | Audio Video | Tracking use of technology |
| 22 | Remote party(ies) | Did any party or attorney appear remotely? | Y/N | Tracking use of technology |
| 23 | Remote party type | Manner of remote party/attorney appearance | Audio, Video | Tracking use of technology |
| 24 | Conference Type | The type of conference scheduled | Status/Review Pre-Trial Settlement Case Management/ Scheduling Other | Tracking case activity and progress |

Tab 8: Orders

Court actions are captured through orders, and these can be in response to pleadings, hearings, events, or monitoring activity. Important data in orders is often captured in notes fields or case file attachments which are difficult to access. Working to standardize the collection of this information will improve monitoring.

In this data model, orders are the assumed method for capturing outcomes from hearings and pleadings. Recording the **probate order type** provides valuable information about the events of the case and the NODS project includes the following, grouped by the likely stage of the case.

Pre-appointment
Order for background check
Order for credit checks
*Order to obtain Bond

*Order to [meet state-specific certification/qualification requirements]

Appointment

Order/Letters/Judgment of Appointment of Guardian Order/Letters/Judgment of Appointment of Conservator Order/Letters/Judgment of Appointment of Guardian & Conservator

Review/Monitoring
Order for repayment
Order to surcharge Bond
Order to modify Bond
Order approving sale of assets
Order to show cause
Order suspending fiduciary/guardian
Order appointing investigator/auditor
Order removing fiduciary/guardian
Order for Competency Restoration
Order for Reinstatement
Order Appointing Successor
Order for Evaluation
Order for Treatment
Order for Hospitalization/Civil Commitment

In cases where a warrant is necessary, the relevant data fields are:

- Warrant Issued
- Warrant Returned
- Warrant End Reason
- Warrant Reason

Because many probate orders require action on the part of the guardian or conservator, jurisdictions might also find it helpful to capture the following elements, tied to a specific order:

- *Order Deadline: the date by which an action is to be completed
- *Order Met: whether the guardian/conservator complied with the order

The result of the order simply indicates if it was *granted*, *granted* in part, or *denied*. The NODS data elements also include service ordered, service type, service party, evaluation ordered, evaluation type, evaluation party, and service/evaluation outcome.

Tab 15: Probate Review and Monitoring

Having data that captures the review and monitoring process is essential, but often happens without official court documents, or may not get entered into a data system. However, for a court to establish automated reminders to guardians and conservators and to track compliance with reporting requirements, capturing these data elements is essential.

Establishing the baseline

Courts need to have a clear picture of the health and well-being of the person subject to guardianship/ conservatorship as well as the assets of that individual at the start of the case.

- Inventory Due Date
- Inventory Filed Date
- Financial Assets Value at Appointment
- Personal Property Value at Appointment
- Real Property Value at Appointment
- Total Assets Value at Appointment
- Qualification date (of the conservator or guardian)
- *Care plan

Once the initial inventory is submitted, maintaining the values as of the appointment date will allow for analysis on how the current values compare. If new or additional assets that were not initially reported come to light, an amended inventory should be submitted, and these data updated to show the correct figures.

In addition to the data elements identified in the NODS project, some courts also find having the following to be a useful baseline for financial monitoring:

- *Budget/Financial Plan
- *Fee Cost Schedule

Capturing a budget or financial plan and a schedule of the fees and costs charged by the guardian or conservator allows the court to compare the annual accounting to the submitted budget and fees. This will be helpful for those auditing the records by hand and for courts using machine learning and/or financial monitoring services.

Monitoring

Courts also monitor the well-being of the individual subject to guardianship and the assets of those subject to conservatorship. These data elements are necessary for monitoring.

- Well-being Report Due Date
- Well-being Report Filed Date
- Current Financial Assets Value
- Current Personal Property Value
- Current Real Property Value (may be broken down by in-state/out-of-state)
- Current Total Assets Value
- Accounting Due
- Accounting Filed
- Event Reminder (date)
- Reminder type (inventory, annual accounting, annual well-being report, other)

In some jurisdictions, courts may waive some reporting requirements. This must be tracked so that quardians/conservators are not ordered to show cause why they have not submitted waived

reports.

- Waiver
- Waiver Reason
 - court
 - document (parties, will)
 - statutory
- *Extensions granted

Finally, courts must be able to track when concerns are brought to the court.

- Concern Activity Date
- Complaint Source
- On-site Review

When the court orders an audit or other activity, those should also be tracked.

- *Audit Due
- *Audit Filed
- *Audit Finding



