



**Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission  
 Governor’s Office of Youth, Faith and Family  
 1700 West Washington Street, Suite 230, Phoenix, Arizona 85007**

A general meeting of the Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission (AJJC) was convened December 3, 2020, via teleconference, notice having been duly given.

Members Present (15)	
Cindi Nannetti, Chair	Randi Alexander proxy for Michael Faust
Joseph Grossman	Tracy Darmody
Jane Kallal	Shaun Rieve
James Molina	Robert Thomas
Joseph Kelroy	Shawn Cox
Maria Dodge	Helen Gándara
Don Walker	Jeff Hood
Nicole Schuren	
Staff/Guests Present (3)	Members Absent (10)
Kate Howard, Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections	Guadalupe Durazo
Steve Selover, GOYFF	Tom Callahan
Kim Brooks, GOYFF	Jose Gonzales
	Earl Newton
	Dennis Pickering
	Dorothy Wodraska
	Mindy Flannery
	Alice Bustillo
	Vada Jo Phelps
	Heather Carter

**Call to Order**

- **Ms. Cindi Nannetti**, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m. with 15 members and three staff and guests present.
  - **Ms. Nannetti** provided instructions to members for teleconference meetings.
  - **Ms. Nannetti** advised members of the public to submit their comments through the Governor’s Office of Youth, Faith and Family (GOYFF) website.

**Introductions**

- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, asked members to acknowledge their attendance during roll call.

**Approval of Minutes,**

- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, requested a motion to approve the September 3, 2020, meeting minutes.
  - **Mr. Joseph Grossman** motioned to approve the minutes as drafted.
  - **Ms. Shawn Cox** seconded the motion.
- The motion passed with no dissenting votes.

## Juvenile Justice System Updates

### Report from the Administrative Office of the Courts

- **Mr. Joseph Kelroy**, Juvenile Justice Services Division (JJSD) at the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) provided an update for probation.
  - Detention and probation continue to meet regularly with the Arizona Department of Health Services to provide status updates and gather current information.
  - The juvenile courts continue to manage the volume of cases while maintaining safety precautions.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, stated she is very impressed with the staff at the juvenile court center who have been assisting the judges with the necessary technology needs. As a result, operations are running quite well during the pandemic.

### Report from the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections

- **Mr. Jeff Hood**, Director at the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections (ADJC), provided a department update.
  - There are currently 186 juveniles housed securely at Adobe Mountain, with 166 males and 20 females making up the population. Over the past approximately two months, Adobe Mountain has housed the most females in the last four years, which has stretched housing capacity as it is currently configured.
  - January through November 2020, the department has received 164 new commitments. Compared to similar time frames, this is down 17 from 2019 and 30 from 2018, which puts the agency on target to receive the lowest number of new commitments in three years.
  - 145 youth are supervised in the community throughout the state, with 63 males and six girls serving on parole and 76 youth on interstate compact.
  - 48 youth, slightly below 19 percent, are dually-involved with the Department of Child Safety.
  - There are 17 youth on extended jurisdiction, with 13 housed in secure care, and four on parole.
  - October's edition of the "Just the Facts" brochure was referenced and distributed to commission members. The November publication should be available next week.
  - The ADJC annual demographic comparison report was referenced. It compares the current year's data points with the previous four years. The document is a good source of information for commission members in that it provides information on trends, such as mental health and substance abuse issues, seen with youth coming into state custody.
- **Ms. Helen Gandara** asked if there are any theories to explain the increase in the female population at Adobe Mountain. **Director Hood** responded that while the current number is about double the lowest female population numbers over the past four years, it is still too early to speculate that a trend is occurring. The department will continue to closely monitor the situation.
- **Ms. Tracy Darmody** asked if ADJC reported on the ethnic distribution of committed juveniles. **Director Hood** responded that the annual report referenced earlier contains this information, though the department has not found any significantly concerning trends related to race and ethnicity as captured during the five year span of the report.
- **Mr. Grossman** asked if there was speculation that the downward trend in youth commitments is related to restrictions placed on the juvenile court due to COVID-19. **Director Hood** responded that it is likely the recent downward trend is related to the pandemic as it aligns with the implementation of various restrictions and other modified practices by the agency and other systems that impact commitments, such as law enforcement and the courts. For example, limiting the frequency of transferring youth into AJDC from counties allows incoming juveniles to be grouped into cohorts to minimize the risk of COVID-19 outbreaks within the facility. Also, warrants for supervised juveniles are triaged to concentrate most resources on apprehending youth who are a risk to themselves or public safety.

- **Ms. Kate Howard**, Government Affairs and Public Relations Administrator at ADJC, provided an update on agency operations related to Covid-19.
  - 60 youth have tested positive to date. 59 have since recovered and one continues to remain in medical isolation. 33 of those who tested positive are still in secure care, with the remaining 27 released to community supervision or into the custody of other agencies.
  - 58 employees have tested positive to date. 52 have returned to work.
  - The modified version of in-person visitation implemented in August was suspended in November in response to the increase of cases throughout the state.
  - Video visitation has again been expanded to allow families to connect with detained youth. The department is working to ensure youth remain in regular contact with their loved ones during the holiday season, as this can be an especially challenging time with separation.
  - In November, saliva-based testing for COVID-19 was used with Adobe Mountain staff. Saliva testing will continue over the next several weeks to catch potential asymptomatic cases among staff.
  - Testing for COVID-19 regularly occurs for all youth at intake and with the general population as needed.
  - Volunteers that typically work at the facility during the holidays to provide youth treats are currently prohibited from entering Adobe Mountain. However, in lieu of volunteers serving desserts to youth this year, desserts were donated to the agency and served to youth by facility staff.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, asked if there is testing for antibodies. **Ms. Howard** responded that the department has access to antibody testing for employees and has tested one or two staff members on-site, but this is not currently being done on a regular ongoing basis.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, asked while conducting visitation virtually, does it seem most families have access to technology that allows them to connect with their child remotely. **Ms. Howard** responded that parole officers are willing to go to the family's residence and utilize ADJC technology to allow access for those who have challenges with the electronic visitation. In addition, the department has seen an increase in virtual visitation by families compared to in-person visitation when both were offered.
- **Mr. Grossman** asked if expanding virtual visitation after the pandemic is being considered as an extra behavior incentive for the population. **Ms. Howard** responded that it is intended that video visitation will be offered as an option post-pandemic.

### OJJDP/CJJ Conference Recap

- **Mr. Steve Selover**, GOYFF Program Administrator, provided a summary report of the November national virtual conferences conducted by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and the Coalition for Juvenile Justice.
  - The OJJDP conference focused primarily around the JJDP title II operations, including compliance monitoring, submitting the state's application for funding, and state advisory group operations.
  - This year, the OJJDP conference was able to provide a greater number of outside speakers as compared to previous training. Mr. Selover participated on a panel to share what data resources the state uses to develop the Three-Year Plan.
  - Due to the overlapping of conference days, Mr. Selover attended only one day of the CJJ conference. He attended several youth panels, which were found to be engaging and inspiring.
  - Sessions were recorded and are available to view online for conference attendees.
  - A significant change noted from the previous in-person format was the limited interaction and networking opportunities among attendees.

- An additional advantage of the virtual platform was the ability to invite commissioners to attend without the usual travel complications.
- **Ms. Maria Dodge** stated highlights of the CJJ conference included a discussion of extended jurisdiction in other states, some implementing age increases in increments to manage the transition. She also recommended a report by the Annie E. Casey Foundation on juvenile probation, which found youth typically respond better with positive incentives rather than punitive sanctions, in addition to providing potential best practices for improving the system.
- **Dr. Robert Thomas** stated he attended the OJJDP conference and found overall that Arizona is doing well and in some cases ahead of other states as it relates to compliance, commission operations, and Title II administration.
- **Helen Gandara** stated she attended the voting session on Friday. The main focus was on four reports, created through research and input by subject matter experts, for addressing racial and ethnic disparities in the justice system as it relates to policing, schools, training and investing in communities of color. Most discussion took place related to the schools report, specifically related to the role of school resources officers, and a proposal on limiting the use of police officers in schools. The group will further consider these matters through continued discussion.
- **Mr. Grossman** expressed concern over removing school resource officers (SRO) from schools. **Ms. Gandara** asserted that rather than removing SROs, the discussion focused around establishing clear memorandums of understanding between schools and law enforcement agencies. **Ms. Gandara** advised that the overall consensus of states was the development of best practices. She expressed hopes the state will maintain its involvement in the development of these best-practice reports and will provide input and utilize them locally rather than duplicate efforts.
- **Ms. Nannetti** advised that the state hosts an annual SRO training for new officers, which might be helpful toward creating best practices.

## Dispositional Matrix

- **Mr. Kelroy**, provided an overview of the disposition matrix tool.
  - The purpose of the tool is to facilitate evidence-based decision making.
  - The three main components were reviewed, including the Arizona Youth Assessment Survey (AZYAS) to measure risk level, the recommendation matrix and the Correctional Program Checklist for evaluation.
  - The matrix is incorporated with the risk assessment to determine the most serious adjudication to guide probation officers on the level of supervision needed.
  - The matrix was created based on Arizona recidivism data, input from probation in all jurisdictions across the state and technical assistance from Georgetown University.
  - The recommendation matrix is a tool to help probation determine the level of supervision needed based on risk level. Based on risk and offense information, options are identified according to the rules that instruct which option is appropriate.
  - Service level is generally based on risk, with lower risk juveniles receiving the lowest amount of supervision and the medium and high risk youth receiving greater structure and supervision, which could include out-of-home care.
  - The matrix is considered very user friendly, it is data driven to support probation officer decision-making with the goal of achieving the best outcomes possible as they relate to public safety and reducing recidivism.
  - The matrix was based on a model from Florida. The data shows that when the optimum service is provided to the juvenile based on the recommendation of the tool, the recidivism rate is approximately 18 percent.
  - Research from Florida has shown that when decisions made by probation or judges that are not aligned with the matrix recommendations, recidivism has as high as 50 percent for decisions that are under the recommended level and up to 34 percent when decisions go above the recommended level. Arizona data shows similar outcomes for responses that are both above and below recommended levels.
  - Categories in the matrix for the most serious delinquent offense are based on definitions from state statute.

- The plan moving forward is to review one year of data from the use of the matrix to ensure that it still aligns with the expected outcomes initially found. The AOC will also track how probation and courts use the matrix, including outcomes when they override the tool. The tool will be revised as needed based on the data collected.
- The matrix is strictly a tool for probation officers. It will not limit recommendations or decisions by attorneys and judges.
- An administrative order is expected January 1, 2021, to include risk-based decision-making and supervision into the administrative code. Risk-based supervision will go into effect April 1, 2021, and the matrix will go live July 1.
- The AOC is currently involved in the training of the trainers for use of the recommendation matrix.
- The Correctional Program Checklist is an assessment used to create a standard for research and quality assurance. Its general purpose is to determine where any given program is at currently, where it needs to go and how to get there.
- Nine staff at JJSD are trained to evaluate programs. ADJC has been using the checklist for a longer period of time, prior than that of the AOC.
- Several county researchers have worked with AOC staff and Georgetown University to assist with the lengthy development and implementation process.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, asked will the matrix impact the use of plea offers. **Mr. Kelroy** responded that the matrix would not be utilized for cases that go from adjudication to disposition on the same day. The tool will only be utilized when probation has time to conduct the AZYAS in addition to the matrix.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, asked will judicial officers receive training on this. **Mr. Kelroy** responded yes.
- **Mr. Grossman** asked how frequently the tool be re-evaluated. **Mr. Kelroy** responded that the objective is to evaluate after one year and subsequently on an ongoing basis to ensure it aligns with the outcomes as initially determined.
- **Mr. Grossman** asked how will program evaluation account for service availability for youth who may have limited access to services recommended by the matrix. **Mr. Kelroy** responded that this is an issue that has been a challenge for a long time. Due to COVID-19, increase in remote counseling has expanded services to more individuals who may not have nearby providers in their community. The majority of services for court-involved youth are administered by AHCCCS, with the remaining 40 percent of treatment services contracted with AOC. These are the programs that would be evaluated by the checklist. Overall, this is a problem the state should continue to strategically work on.
- **Mr. Grossman** asked the perspective of ADJC with evaluation of assessments and if it is working similarly as well in corrections. **Director Hood** responded the agency has been using the reentry assessment to determine supervision levels for youth released on parole since February 2020. The agency is just now starting to assess how using the various supervision levels has impacted outcomes. Currently, it is too early to determine statistically significant outcomes given the short time this has been in practice and the relatively low number of parolees to sample, with about 94 youth so far having been released with the assessments in use. It is important for the different youth serving systems to use the same tools when possible, and share outcomes to get a more accurate view of the overall picture.
- **Ms. Dodge** asked if there is anticipation that the matrix will adversely impact the plea process and requested Mr. Kelroy to clarify the implementation timeline. **Mr. Kelroy** responded that the administrative codes for using the risk based supervision and matrix will go into effect April 1 and July 1, respectively. The training and incremental implementation process was explained.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, asked if there any offenses that are not eligible for the matrix, such as violent or sex offenders. **Mr. Kelroy** responded that research in Arizona shows that with sexually abusive behavior, recidivism depends substantially on other criminogenic factors involved. Additional assessments would be used in conjunction with the AZYAS as needed to account for special cases, such as sex offenses. The training provided by the AOC addresses this issue. Furthermore, while the tools provide guidance, decision-making based professional expertise and experience is also factored into the overall process.

- **Ms. Shawn Cox** asked if analysis research is available on the use of risk assessments. **Mr. Kelroy** responded yes, the research exists nationally and can be found at the Georgetown Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, in addition to local documentation. Ms. Nannetti
  - **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, suggested that members provide feedback regarding the recommendations through email, and prior to the next meeting, the commission will vote on the recommendations as a component of the completed report.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, suggested the commission receive an update on this topic next year.

## Staff Updates

### AJJC Biennial Report

- **Mr. Selover** provided a review of the most updated version of the AJJC Biennial Report, noting the areas that have been revised since the last meeting.
  - Added to the report was the inclusion of program outcomes, compliance monitoring outcomes for 2019, the letter from the chair and recommendations.
  - The commission is welcome to contact staff for questions or concerns regarding the content within the report. The document is currently moving through the final approval process required prior to dissemination to the commission and general public.

### Three-Year Planning Next Steps

- **Mr. Selover** provided an overview of the proposed process for the AJJC Three-Year plan.
  - The plan will be a required component of the state's application for Title II funding.
  - A simple logic model outlined the various components needed to develop the plan. Among the next steps is to form a planning workgroup and to postpone the next full commission meeting to allow time for the workgroup and staff to develop recommendations.
  - **Ms. Nannetti** and **Ms. Gandara** volunteered to participate in the workgroup. Members were asked to reach out to Mr. Selover if interested in serving on the workgroup.

## Workgroup Updates

### Grants Workgroup

- **Mr. Selover** provided an update of the Grants Workgroup on behalf of the workgroup chair.
  - Title II programs were renewed in October for Year 3 funding. This is the final year for currently funded programs, with the process restarting again in the summer of 2021.
  - Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community declined to reapply to fund their diversion program based due to complications related to COVID-19. This leaves a vacancy for at least one new tribal-operated program. **Ms. Darmody** advised she has contacts with whom she could share this information that might assist with funding tribal programs.
  - An update on the subgrantee partner survey was provided. The survey has been approved by GOYFF leadership. The Grants Workgroup plans to release the survey in January when most schools are back in session.

## Adjournment

- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, reminded members that a meeting date will be scheduled for the next meeting.
- **Ms. Nannetti** requested a motion to adjourn.

- **Mr. Grossman** moved to adjourn the meeting.
- **Ms. Darmody** seconded the motion.
- Motion carried with no dissenting votes. Meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

Dated December 7, 2020  
Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission  
Submitted by Steve Selover  
Program Administrator, GOYFF

DRAFT