



Commission
to Prevent Violence
Against Women

Arizona Commission to Prevent Violence Against Women
November 15, 2022
10:00 a.m.
Executive Tower, Governor’s Second Floor Conference Room
1700 W. Washington, Phoenix, AZ 85007

A general meeting of the Commission to Prevent Violence Against Women was convened on November 15, 2022, notice having been duly given.

Members Present (14)	Members Absent (3)
Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair	Nicole Bidwill
Kate Brophy McGee, Co-Chair	Patricia Klahr
Kirstin Flores	Eve Scarff
Sheila Sjolander	
Nicolette Chingofor Proxy for Tene Marion	
Margaret Trulson	
Kay Radwanski	
Jenna Panas	
Ed Mercurio-Sakwa	
Beth Hoel	
Jon Smith	
Richard Jessup	
Monica Yelin	
Neil Websdale	
Jon Eliason	
Staff and Guests Present (8)	
Ariana Abbarello	Amy Peep
Emily Uline-Olmstead	Rachel Mitchell
Kainoa Spenser	Trevor Umphress
Raymond Chaira	Greg Giangobbe

Call to Order

- **Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair**, called the Commission to Prevent Violence Against Women meeting to order at 10:02 AM with 15 members present, and quorum met.

Welcome/Introductions

- **Kate Brophy McGee, Co-Chair**, welcomed everyone and conducted the roll call.

Commendations

- **Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair**, introduced **Emily Uline-Olmstead**, Justice Program Manager at the Governor's Office of Youth, Faith and Family (GOYFF), and administers the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) STOP (Services, Training, Officers, and Prosecutors) Violence Against Women Grant.
- **Emily Uline-Olmstead** thanked the commission for allowing her to present on behalf of Executive Director Maria Cristina Fuentes. She commended the commission on the efforts and impacts that the members have had over the last eight years.
- **Ms. Uline-Olmstead** discussed the successes of the commission including the annual Lighting Arizona Purple event, which unfortunately was canceled for 2022 due to weather. However, the members were still able to amplify efforts through the social media campaign.
- **Emily Uline-Olmstead** discussed the Arizona Protection Order Initiation and Notification Tool (AZPOINT), mentioning that **Kay Radwanski** would discuss this in more detail later in the meeting. She also stated that **Dr. Neil Websdale** and **Greg Giangobbe** would be discussing the Arizona Intimate Partner Risk Assessment (APRIS) tool and protocols.
- **Ms. Uline-Olmstead** continued highlighting the efforts of the commission such as with the expansion of the Adult Sexual Assault Investigation Training, established in 2019. As of today, the training has educated more than 800 individuals throughout the state on adult sexual assault investigations.
- **Emily Uline-Olmstead** discussed the initiatives that the commission have been involved with including the MyPlan app, Vulnerable Adult Protocol, Arizona Child and Adolescent Survivor Initiative (ACASI), County Protocol updates, and grant-funded work through the GOYFF.
- **Kate Brophy McGee, Co-Chair**, addressed the commission stating she is proud to have worked over ten years on legislation that positively impacts populations that often do not have a voice, emphasizing the commission serves as a voice for these individuals. She stated that working both individually and organizationally has greatly increased the commission's effectiveness. She continued that each member has given their heart to helping those suffering, not just by getting reports, but identifying best practices that are shared with one another in order to break down silos. The commission has worked to follow-up on failures in order to turn them into successes, and has demonstrated effectiveness and passion. **Kate Brophy McGee, Co-Chair**, praised **Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair**, for working alongside her.

Approval of Minutes

- **Kate Brophy McGee, Co-Chair**, requested a review of the **August 16, 2022**, meeting minutes.
 - **Richard Jessup** motioned to accept the **August 16, 2022**, minutes with no amendments. **Monica Yelin** seconded the motion with no members opposed and no members with abstentions.

Community-Based Outreach Service Centers

- **Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair**, advised the commission that the posted agenda has been rearranged due to scheduling conflicts. **Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair**, introduced **Jenna Panas** to present on Community-Based Outreach Service Centers. **Ms. Panas** is the Chief

Operating Officer at Arizona Coalition to End Sexual and Domestic Violence (ACESDV). Before moving to Arizona, she ran multiple nonprofits, including the Dallas Area Rape Crisis Center, YWCA of Tarrant County, and the Catholic Charities Fort Worth.

- **Jenna Panas** started her presentation by stating the network of community-based organizations consists of over 100 different organizations, and thus unable to provide a comprehensive list of all the services they provided. However, **Ms. Panas** defined community-based services. These service providers are non-governmental entities, typically non-profit organizations within the community; they do not include law enforcement, prosecutor or court offices, or other entities within government agencies.
- **Ms. Panas** continued by identifying the three areas of change within the state. The first change is within service standards. Through collaborative efforts between ACESDV and the Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES), the Arizona Service Standards for Sexual and Domestic Violence Service Providers was developed in 2016 as a best practice tool for service providers. **Jenna Panas** highlighted that standards were recently updated in 2021, with reviews and updates on a five-year cycle. **Ms. Panas** stated that the impact of this guide is that Arizona's practices match or exceed the national standards.
 - She addressed that funding from the Arizona Department of Health Services (ADHS) is connected with the Service Standards for Domestic Violence and Sexual Violence. In order for providers to receive funds, they must adhere to these defined standards, thus providing accountability for the standards or services in Arizona to meet or exceed the national standards.
- The presentation progressed with **Ms. Panas** addressing the second area of change, which was the Sexual Violence Services Fund created in 2021 and allocated \$8 million to providers of sexual assault services. This funding allowed a shift from Family Advocacy Centers, or the Dual Model, to open another door with a specialization in sexual violence, as well as the opening of two Rape Crisis Centers within Maricopa County. The goal is to expand to other counties throughout the state.
- **Jenna Panas** continued by discussing the expansion of the Domestic Violence Services Fund (DVSF), explaining DVSF has always had a line item in the state budget but there have been two increases over the last eight years. The first increase was in 2016 from \$2.22 million to \$4 million, and in 2022 from \$2.22 million to \$4,000,200. This 200-dollar increase allowed for ACESDV to focus on culturally specific services, including Spanish-speaking, individuals with disabilities, indigenous and black populations.
- The next area of change occurred during COVID-19 as addressed by **Jenna Panas**. She attested to the increase in domestic violence cases nationally, and Arizona responded appropriately. The state directed \$11.5 million dollars to survivors of domestic violence, and \$4 million dollars directly to indigenous survivors. **Ms. Panas** explained that the additional funding has offset the loss of funds during COVID-19 for many service providers. The funds have also been able to retain those essential services while ensuring the survivors received financial assistance with the rising inflation and housing costs to find and secure safe housing.
- **Ms. Panas** continued her presentation by discussing conversations with the service providers, coalition and other interested parties about limiting barriers to healing and seeking safety. **Jenna Panas** started with pets as they are often a reason individuals decide to stay in an unsafe environment, and oftentimes are also abused in these

households, **Ms. Panas** stated due to the struggle individuals felt deciding between leaving a pet for safety or staying to protect their pet, she emphasized a statewide conversation about pet inclusive services. She continued to address that majority of state shelters accept pets or have a way to keep pets safe while the individuals seek services. **Jenna Panas** addressed the coalition of partnerships, including veterinarians and animal welfare agencies that recognize that violence directed towards pets is sometimes a warning sign of other violence in the home. Arizona is leading the nation in these conversations and training in this area.

- The conversation continued with **Jenna Panas** addressing the increased awareness of the needs of individuals with disabilities, focusing on survivors with disabilities. These disabilities range from deaf or hard of hearing, blind to physical disabilities or intellectual or cognitive disabilities. The focus, **Ms. Panas**, stated, is on providing interpretation and assistive technology to make sure shelters are able to assist individuals with varied abilities. **Jenna Panas** acknowledged that this is a complex conversation that is just starting, but they are hopeful that collaborative efforts with disability service providers will be necessary to solidify the needs and nuances of the community.
- The last conversation element ACESDV has been working towards is a culture shift. **Jenna Panas** recognized that within the provider community, the belief and thoughts that oppression creates violence, and addressing racial inequity and racial injustice is necessary to solve violence in the community. She continued with the shift of conversations in the for-profit space being more positive and having less stigma around domestic violence and sexual violence. There has been an increase in support from the Governor's Office during Domestic Violence Awareness Month and Sexual Assault Awareness Month. These increases in awareness have caused an increase in callers to the helpline. This increase in callers, **Ms. Panas** explained, means that more people are comfortable with seeking assistance.
- **Jenna Panas** asked for questions. **Jon Eliason** asked about the rape crisis center. **Jenna Panas** discussed the two new rape crisis centers through A New Leaf and A New Life centers, focusing on the lifetime effects of assault, including both the immediate after and the necessary healing that occurs until an individual's last day. **Jon Eliason** asked if they could take a tour of the centers. **Ms. Panas** stated they would like to have individuals see the spaces.
- **Monica Yelin** asked **Ms. Panas** to elaborate on the expenditure increase. **Ms. Panas** explained that the amount is set by the legislative expenditure authority and that is the amount that is due to spend on the budget. **Jenna Panas** stated that it is set by the legislative budget but that every dollar matters. **Ms. Yelin** asked if they provided an explanation for the increased amount. **Ms. Panas** stated that the 200 dollars were just a match, but the big spend was the \$11.5 million.
- **Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair**, called for more questions, when none were asked. She thanked **Jenna Panas** for her presentation.

Child and Family Advocacy Centers

- **Trevor Umphress** was introduced by **Kate Brophy McGee, Co-Chair**, to highlight the legislative success and successes of Arizona Child and Family Advocacy Network (ACFAN). **Trevor Umphress** started his career in nonprofits with Amberly's Place assisting in their sustainability. He then started his journey with the ACFAN as the Executive Director.

- **Trevor Umphress** stated that he gets to see firsthand the reports and collaborative efforts of the Multidisciplinary Team (MDT) approach. He addressed the history of success is due to the collaboration of the MDT model. **Mr. Umphress** stated that ACFAN is the accredited body of the National Children's Alliance, an organization that created the national standards for child advocacy centers. **Trevor Umphress** stated that the centers are working to fill a void where all counties have the same services. He explained that Arizona has a hybrid where some facilities are non-profit, law enforcement, or government based, which allows the financial backing to remain open.
- **Mr. Umphress** reviewed the history of the process of making this model and standard. He expressed that this started back in the 70's by funding facilities, and then in the 90s it started in Arizona with only four facilities with majority being in Maricopa and one in Flagstaff. These facilities, **Trevor Umphress**, explained were received well and their services were provided so well, they grew quickly. Today, in Arizona, there are 24 facilities across Arizona and 8 facilities in Maricopa County.
- **Trevor Umphress** defined what a center is, which he simplified as a one-stop neutral location to address the healing services of a victim on their journey to a survivor. **Mr. Umphress** shared that in facilities many members wear plain clothes with no badges for the comfort of the individuals seeking services. He also shared that with small rural communities like Yuma, seeking services can be difficult due to the close proximity of community members; this differs in facilities since they provide services for the needs of victims.
- **Mr. Umphress** reports that one in three girls and one in five boys will experience sexual assault before age 18, and these facilities provide a safe environment to seek services and not be charged for those services. At all 24 facilities in Arizona, no charges occur for the services that are provided. These no-charge services include Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) exams, therapy, ongoing services, and even food boxes to promote healing and empower victims. **Trevor Umphress** explains that these facilities give individuals with families options and a place to go where children are welcome.
- **Trevor Umphress** highlighted what sets Arizona apart from the other states is it is the only state that has this one-stop facility for victim needs model. The simpler process ensures that victims are not sent to different facilities based on circumstances or needs, they can be provided everything in one location which assists in reporting.
- **Mr. Umphress** continued his presentation by highlighting the victims that are served. He expressed that domestic violence occurs in many forms, as does child abuse. **Trevor Umphress** also highlighted that during COVID-19, Arizona was the only state that did not shut down its centers. While other states were doing teleservices, Arizona remained open to perform exams as requested and collect evidence, having the option for victims to to use teleservices if they wanted, but that was not the only option in Arizona.
- **Trevor Umphress** explained that they use a team model, in which all the professionals involved work with community partners and other professionals in the field. He continued that without one central location, victims often have to retell their stories and seek out the services they need themselves. With the center, the necessary professionals come to the victim, limiting the number of retellings and re-traumatization.
- **Mr. Umphress** expressed how prior to 2017, the legislative goal was to codify the legal definition of child and family advocacy centers and obtain direct funding. It was introduced and failed to pass. However, in 2017 legislation passed defining and codifying

child and family advocacy centers, giving immunity to the advocacy centers, and providing general funds to the centers.

- **Trevor Umphress** continued that in 2018, a small pot of funding was offered to the centers, but this was a start to funding. He addressed how Arizona, like many states, will face cuts to Victims of Crime Acts (VOCA) funding, but the legislative approval allows the state to assist these services and be part of the core services provided. **Mr. Umphress** also explained that Arizona was the 32nd state to have final legislation that was passed, the 20th state to have funding allocated, but the first state to have general funds allocated for centers.
- **Mr. Umphress** explained that the general funds demonstrated Arizona's trust in victims, allowing them to seek funding when they meet criteria, and that best practices are being followed. He explained that whether a report is made in one county, it will have the same level of services as if it were reported in another. These best practices ensure a high level of care for all individuals served.
- **Trevor Umphress** addressed the focus on Senate Bill 1593, which aided the no-cost model of advocacy centers. He stated that some centers were charging additional fees when seeking services, however, Governor Ducey has addressed this concern and wanted to end these additional fees. **Mr. Umphress** stated this was a big win for Arizona, and now thanks to this Bill they will no longer be charged to receive services.
- **Trevor Umphress** thanked the officials and Governor Ducey for their stance and for being the voice for victims.
- **Kate Brophy McGee, Co-Chair** thanked **Trevor Umphress** and called for questions.
- **Jenna Panas** added a clarification that providers were not charging for forensic exams, and there is no evidence that this has occurred in Arizona. It is possible that providers did have side charges and no exams were paid for by victims. **Trevor Umphress** agreed that no exams were paid for but some victims at different facilities were paying for parts of the process, not the exam. However, the legislation provides uniformity in this area.
- **Kate Brophy McGee, Co-Chair**, added that these are good conversations to have and having uniformity when it comes to bills and money is important. And this legislation has addressed this issue.
- **Monica Yelin** thanked **Trevor Umphress** and his organization for their work and dedication. She asked about medical exams at the advocacy centers, specifically if they have all the equipment necessary to perform the exam. **Mr. Umphress** responded that each facility is different in the extent to which they can provide medical exams. He provided Amberly's Place as an example, where a person can receive a Jane or John Doe exam at the facility. However, if the individual needs extensive medical care, ICU, or medical imaging they would need to be transported to the hospital with the team.
- No other questions were asked and **Kate Brophy McGee, Co-Chair**, thanked **Mr. Umphress** for his work.

Kayleigh's Law

- **Rachel Mitchell** was introduced by **Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair**, to provide a description of the Domestic Violence Diversion Program at the Maricopa County Attorney's Office. **Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair**, discussed Rachel Mitchell's expertise and experience in the field of protecting families, prosecuting crimes against children, ensuring integrity in our legal system, and leading prosecutors to hold criminals accountable.

- **Rachel Mitchell** started her presentation with background pertaining to Kayleigh's Law. **Ms. Mitchell** explained that Kayleigh was a victim of child molestation by her soccer coach and when Kayleigh disclosed her victimization, the event was traumatic, not only due to the molestation, but the community's response to her disclosure as the coach was beloved, attractive, and married. Thus, the community found it hard to believe.
- **Ms. Mitchell** stated that the coach was sentenced and received lifetime probation, but attempted to get early termination of his lifetime probation, which has become more and more common in **Ms. Mitchell's** office. **Rachel Mitchell** continues telling the story of how Kayleigh did not want to have contact with her offender but lived in a small community so it was more than likely that it would happen.
- **Rachel Mitchell** continued that Kayleigh went to obtain an order of protection in case her offender received early termination, she would not have contact with him, but learned that unless the offender had done something recently, an order of protection cannot be issued. Kayleigh called **Ms. Mitchell** for assistance. **Rachel Mitchell** and Senator Kerr ultimately ran a bill, as well as a second bill last year to allow victims to get an order of protection for longer than a year or two.
- **Ms. Mitchell** continued in her presentation with the mechanics prospectively, which is going forward from the passing of the law. At the request of the victim or prosecutor at the time of sentencing, the court shall issue a lifetime injunction that prevents the defendant from contacting the victim. **Ms. Mitchell** explained that this can be requested when the defendant is convicted of one of the qualifying offenses.
- **Rachel Mitchell** highlighted the qualifying offenses as any felony offense, completed or preparatory, meaning these offenses include a sort of attempt for these felony offenses. **Ms. Mitchell** explained all of the ARS chapters, titles, and offenses that are included. Some she pointed out included 13.706, chapters 14 and 35.1, advising that these injunctions are served at the time of sentencing and thus are effective immediately.
- **Ms. Mitchell** highlighted the injunction is for the defendant's natural life and can only be terminated at the request of the victim. She stated that the courts may request a hearing to address the request to ensure that the victim is not being pressured to lift the injunction. **Rachel Mitchell** explained that once the injunction is made, it is transmitted to the Arizona Department of Public Safety (DPS) and entered into the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) to notify the victim. There is no timeframe in the statute for when this has to happen.
- **Rachel Mitchell** continued with Kayleigh's case, discussing how the offense happened in the mid-2000s and sentencing has ended. She explained that the bill allowed for retrospectively or retroactive allowance of the law. Victims can petition the court requesting an injunction if they were sentenced prior to the law's effective date. **Ms. Mitchell** explained that the injunction is served free of charge and served for the defendant's natural life. However, she notes the victim can request the injunction to be removed with a written request.
- **Ms. Mitchell** explained the process by which a victim can request the injunction. The victim will need to file the request with the same court of the conviction. The file must include the petition, confidential victim information sheet, and any supporting documents the court may request. However, the victim does not need to provide a reason for the injunction. **Rachel Mitchell** explained that the crime itself is reason enough for the injunction.

- **Rachel Mitchell** called for questions. **Richard Jessup** asked since the passing of the law how many lifetime injunctions have been issued. **Rachel Mitchell** stated that she did not know the number but will check and relay back as necessary. **Jon Eliason** added that he knew he was seeing three or four in his unit weekly.
- **Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair**, asked if there were any other states that have similar laws. **Ms. Mitchell** stated that Kayleigh is determined to get legislation passed, and so far similar legislation has been passed in Wisconsin, but Arizona was the first.
- **Kirstin Flores** stated she had not heard the story behind Kayleigh's Law and was interested in what happens if they run into each other. **Ms. Mitchell** stated that in incidental instances they requested to withdraw, but they cannot initiate contact. Any violation of the order would be a misdemeanor.
- **Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair**, requested additional questions from the commissioners, and none were asked. **Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair**, stated that she has had Rachel and Kayleigh on the Arizona Prosecuting Attorneys' Advisory Council (APAAC) podcast, and thanked **Rachel Mitchell** for being at the meeting.

AZPOINT

- **Kay Radwanski** was introduced by **Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair**, covering her accomplishments throughout the year, including her current role as a Senior Court Policy Analyst in the Court Services Division at Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), Arizona Supreme Court. At AOC, she staffs the Committee on the Impact of Domestic Violence and the Courts (CIDVC) and the Committee on Superior Court project. **Ms. Radwanski** practiced law at South Jersey Legal Services, a public interest law firm, where she represented low-income clients in domestic violence, divorce, child support, parenting time, custody, and other civil matters.
- **Ms. Radwanski** began her presentation by discussing the Arizona Protective Order Initiation and Notification Tool (AZPOINT), established in 2018. The project was introduced with a major policy shift introduced by House Bill 2249. This bill impacted how orders of protection were to be served, including how the court needed to assign an order of protection to an agency. Once served within 72 hours, the serving agency must report service to the court and must contact the Plaintiff if the order is not served within 15 days of issuance. The bill also mandated that the Arizona Supreme Court maintain a central repository for protection order data and the court must transmit data on served protection orders to NCIC.
- **Kay Radwanski** questioned how Arizona was going to automate these processes. Looking at the needs they needed to create a process which assigned service to the appropriate law enforcement or constable with one database. The courts needed law enforcement and constables to be able to report services quickly, and then transmit that data to NCIC from one centralized database. These needs led to the development of AZPOINT.
- **Ms. Radwanski** continued that AZPOINT allows a person to prepare a petition for an order of protection, injunction against harassment, or an injunction against workplace harassment. However, only orders of protection are assigned and served with AZPOINT, injunctions still require individuals to arrange services themselves. This portal does allow for all three conditions to be filed.
- The project was developed in junction with the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC), **Ms. Radwanski** explained. She stated that ACJC was responsible for drafting

the legislation in collaboration with stakeholders around the state. The commission's goal was to automate the protective order process to increase the number of orders being served, and enlarge the number of orders of protection reported to NCIC. Until March, only 50% of the orders of protection were actually served because service was a decision to be made by the plaintiff.

- **Kay Radwanski** addressed the barriers plaintiffs faced which included getting the order of protection, the plaintiff would have to get the order and keep it, they would have one year to serve the order and sometimes they struggled to find which law enforcement agency to serve the order of protection. However, **Ms. Radwanski** explained that with NCIC, the national database, if served in NCIC the order of protection becomes enforceable nationwide, with any law enforcement agency in any state.
- **Ms. Radwanski** states that ACJC partnered with other agencies including the Governor's Office to secure grant funding to support this project. This project was a large technology project with only 18 months to build the system from the ground up. When the project was finished and ready to launch ACJC took responsibility for training victim advocates and law enforcement, while the AOC took responsibility for training the court staff.
- **Kay Radwanski** emphasized prior to House Bill 2249, each of the 15 County Sheriff's maintained their own repository. However, the Court Protective Order Repository (CPOR) was created as a statewide database for petitions that have been filed, denied, withdrawn, served, and unserved. **Ms. Radwanski** explained that CPOR collects and transmits data for the courts, law enforcement, and NCIC. She stressed that each entity requires different information, so it is an effort to make sure each entity gets the information they need for one petition process.
- **Ms. Radwanski** reflected that before CPOR's creation, some locations used a centralized management system called AJAX that was supported by AOC, but other courts had their own case management system with the larger city courts maintaining their own case management systems. The undertaking to get all the courts' technology to collect data that then could flow into the CPOR was vast. **Kay Radwanski** explained the pieces in which the information flows including: the petition portal which is the public-facing portion; the clerk portal which is the court-facing portion; and the service portal which is the law enforcement, constable, and processed servers portion.
- **Kay Radwanski** stated that AZPOINT is primarily known for the public-facing portal. She highlighted the numerous features in AZPOINT that make it stand out including the portal being free to use, password protected, contains hover help, FAQs, and guided interview questions similar to online tax filing systems. She also pointed out that the petition is stored for 90 days allowing the user to come back, providing resource information for the user, and a floating safety button for a quick exit from the website. **Kay Radwanski** stressed the importance of safety planning and ensuring that individuals understand that they need to have a plan in place. Although orders of protection can deter someone from continuing abuse, this is not always true. The website ensures that individuals know resource information is available. Once the individual has created the petition and submitted it, the petition is in Court Ready status. The user will obtain a petition confirmation number, which is prominently displayed for the user.
- **Kay Radwanski** continued to explain the process by which an individual can file their petition. She stated that they may call the court they wish to file in and file remotely, unless they have a family court case already open. If this is the case, they must file with the court that their case is open.

- The process continues with the court accessing the clerk portal, **Ms. Radwanski** explained. The court, whether over the phone or in person, uses the confirmation number provided to access the information for that petition. **Ms. Radwanski** expressed that AJAX, or any AOC supported case management system, is fully integrated with AZPOINT allowing court cases to instantly be created in the system. The non-AJAX courts have created their own systems to extract the information necessary to create their own cases. The clerk with the use of the information provided by the system will get the person an ex parte protection order hearing.
- **Kay Radwanski** continued by discussing how after the order of protection is granted, the next movement is to the service portal. This then allows orders of protection to be assigned to the appropriate agency. This is based on the defendant's location and the court that issued the order. **Ms. Radwanski** highlighted this not including the injunction request. These must be printed and brought to law enforcement or process servers by the petitioner.
- **Ms. Radwanski** explained the next step includes the assigned law enforcement agency receiving notification of the service assignment. She explained that the agency then has access to the necessary information to print the documents and they may proceed with locating and serving the defendant. **Kay Radwanski** informed the commission that law enforcement has one year to serve the petition, however, they are serving them as fast as they can.
- **Kay Radwanski** continued that law enforcement will update the service portal with the status of the order. This information goes back to AOC, which then sends the information back to the court that issued the order of protection and the NCIC. Law enforcement has the obligation to keep the plaintiff informed of the status of the order, so if they have not been able to serve the order in 15 days they must contact the plaintiff and continue to service the account. This triggers another form called the Service to Process Information form, which may include crucial information to locate the defendant and who provided it.
- **Ms. Radwanski** explained that AZPOINT was introduced in January 2020 at the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, allowing individuals to access the courts and file paperwork from the safety of their homes. As a result, **Kay Radwanski** states the pandemic procedures have been adopted, explaining that remote ex parte hearings are now presumptively preferred to be remote. The Chief Justice issued an administrative order on remote, presumptively remote, and predominantly in-person for all sorts of court cases. **Ms. Radwanski** stated that the bright spot of the pandemic was that the courts learned that processes could be done remotely and thus gave people access to the courts.
- **Ms. Radwanski** addressed that the use of AZPOINT over paper filing for protection orders has remained similar from 2021 to 2022. This includes roughly two-thirds of individuals using technology, and one-third of individuals using paper. These numbers were explained to translate across injunctions against harassment, although a smaller number of filing injunctions for workplace harassment favors using AZPOINT.
- **Kay Radwanski** projected where AZPOINT is going, discussing the new grant funding procured by ACJC. The project is currently working with a vendor to improve the user experience with the portal. The new advancement will be made to simplify the account setup process, and how to streamline processes when setting up an account in the courts themselves. She also advised that AOC is working on translating the portal into Spanish. AOC also has plans in 2023 to refactor the service portal.

- **Ms. Radwanski** highlighted the impact AZPOINT has had in Arizona including access to the courts, access to information for plaintiffs, guiding plaintiffs to victim advocates, encouraging safety planning, automated process to implementing legislations, increasing speed and efficiency of service of orders of protection, aiding enforceability, and a single statewide database.
- **Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair**, thanked her and her team's work with AZPOINT and called for questions. No questions were asked. **Kirstin Flores** commented that AZPOINT is unable to process lifetime injunction requests. **Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair**, thanked her for the information.

Future Meeting Dates

- **Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair**, announced the upcoming 2023 meeting dates and asked commissioners to mark them on their calendars.

APRAIS

- **Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair**, introduced **Dr. Neil Websdale** and **Greg Giangobbe**. She explained **Dr. Neil Websdale** is the Director of the Family Violence Center at Arizona State University (ASU) and has published work on domestic violence, the history of crime, policing, social change, and public policy. **Dr. Websdale's** social policy work involves helping to establish networks of domestic violence fatality review teams across the United States and elsewhere. His extensive fatality review work has contributed to the National Domestic Violence Fatality Review Initiative (NDVFRI) receiving the prestigious 2015 Mary Byron Foundation Celebrating Solutions Award.
- **Greg Giangobbe** is the Assistant Director at the Family Violence Center at ASU, and his work includes training personnel, field observation rides, policy development assistance, and all forms of technical assistance (TA) support to ensure each agency has successfully transitioned to the Arizona Intimate Partner Risk Assessment Instrument System (APRAIS) tool. He has over 33 years of public safety experience, including service at the Phoenix Police Department, completing assignments in patrol, neighborhood policing, and community action.
- **Dr. Neil Websdale** emphasized that he was able to do some unique things under Governor Ducey's administration. Through a partnership with the Governor's Office and utilization of STOP Grant dollars, they were able to share Intimate Partner Violence Risk Information. **Dr. Websdale** explained that it took three years to build APRAIS in Yavapai County. During this time, there were statewide developments, including changes to the bail statute, requiring judges to consider the results of reversibility penalty assessment. In 2017, the Supreme Court approved the supplementary petition of APRAIS and amended the APRAIS tool to law enforcement release questionnaires. **Dr. Websdale** highlighted that this was a great achievement within the state.
- **Dr. Neil Websdale** informed the commission of a committee made up of 40-50 people to develop the APRAIS tool, highlighting numerous project partners engaged by the Governor's Commission to Prevent Violence Against Women, the Committee on the Impact of Domestic Violence, CIDVC, APAAC, GOYFF, AZPOST, and AOC. He emphasized that this effort was a statewide team effort.
- **Dr. Neil Websdale** acknowledged **Greg Giangobbe** as the project lead and deserves credit for these developments over the past couple of years. **Mr. Giangobbe** stated that with the APRAIS project, they wanted to build policing philosophy. He stated that **Dr.**

Websdale trains prior and current law enforcement officers to lead APRAIS, which is unique across the country for Risk Tools. This philosophy focuses on policing being a noble profession. The discussions **Mr. Giangobbe** and **Dr. Websdale** have around the country include decision-making with officers impacting people's lives and police wanting to be servants to the community. These pieces of training also highlight the human interaction portion of APRAIS, active listening, and trauma-informed interviews with victims.

- **Greg Giangobbe** stated that the project had good feedback on breaking the routine of how law enforcement handles intimate partner violence (IPV) calls. The team has been able to be humanistic while gathering more information than before and sharing that through the system. **Mr. Giangobbe** stated they had increased collaboration, communication, and coordination among agencies while respecting their autonomy.
- **Greg Giangobbe** addressed the current status of the APRAIS project, which boasts 70 law enforcement agencies using the APRAIS tool in the field. A total of 123 agencies will respond to domestic violence calls, so over half of the agencies use the APRAIS tool. **Mr. Giangobbe** continued that in 2022 the APRAIS team had updated AZPOST DV basic training curriculum to include the APRAIS Form4C protocols and philosophy for all police academies.
- **Mr. Giangobbe** informed the commission that the APRAIS training had in-state sponsorship from AZPOST, which allows them to offer the training as credits for officers. Nationally, APRAIS has built online modules that are accredited by the International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement Standards and Training (IADLEST). APRAIS is the only risk assessment in the United States to have IADLEST certification.
- **Greg Giangobbe** advised that interest has grown outside of the state due to the support from APRAIS partners and the Governor's Office. This interest has led to APRAIS being adopted by agencies in Kansas, Montana, Wyoming, Missouri, and Minnesota. APRAIS has also gained interest in being adopted in Utah, New Hampshire, and Nebraska. **Mr. Giangobbe** stated that APRAIS has been highlighted in the Police Chief Magazine and the Prosecutor Magazine; they had recently completed an interview with the United States Department of Interior.
- As APRAIS looks forward to the next year, **Mr. Giangobbe** is hopeful that they will be able to get all agencies on board with using the tool and be the first in the country to accomplish this.
- **Dr. Neil Websdale** added that ASU is currently working with partners in El Salvador to bring community-informed risk assessment and the APRAIS tool to three locations: San Salvador, San Miguel, and Santa Ana. **Dr. Websdale** addressed the support from the country and how tremendous it has been to the success of the program. He stated that these successes with APRAIS were due to the balance of victim safety and fair justice. The implementation and success have been guided by colleagues at the Supreme Court and individuals on the Commission to Prevent Violence Against Women. **Dr. Websdale** thanked the commission for their guidance on balancing the rule of law and due process.
- **Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair**, thanked **Dr. Neil Websdale** and **Greg Giangobbe**. She added that she is excited to see what happens with the continued interest in the country.

Adjourn

- **Elizabeth Ortiz, Co-Chair**, called for adjournment at 11:58 AM.
 - **Richard Jessup**, motioned to adjourn. **Monica Yelin** seconded the motion. The motion to adjourn was approved unanimously.

Dated the 16th of November 2022
Commission to Prevent Violence Against Women

Respectfully Submitted By:
Ariana Abbarello
Program Administrator, GOYFF

DRAFT