



**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 5, 2019, at the Governor's Office of Youth, Faith and Family, 1700 West Washington Street, 2nd Floor Conference Room, Phoenix, Arizona 85007, notice having been duly given.

Members Present (21)	
Cindi Nannetti, Chair	Navin Crump
Helen Gándara	Joseph Grossman
Jane Kallal	Dorothy Wodraska
Alice Bustillo	Guadalupe Durazo
Joe Kelroy	Shawn Cox
Maria Dodge	Dennis Pickering
Leslie Quinn	Jeff Hood
James Beene	Shaun Rieve
Earl Newton	Vada Jo Phelps
Mindy Flannery	James Molina
Don Walker	
Staff/Guests Present (15)	Members Absent (9)
Tonya Hamilton, Deputy Director, GOYFF	Debra Olsen
Steve Selover, Program Administrator, GOYFF	Mike Faust
Nicole Valenzuela, Intern, GOYFF	Jose Gonzales
Kate Howard, ADJC	Robert Thomas
Holly Reynolds, AOC	Heather Carter
Bryant Grantling, DCS	Tom Callahan
Jacob Gardner, Community Bridges	Robert Brutinel
Jeremy Simko, Community Bridges	Jason Holmberg
Dr. Schantay Banikarim, Maricopa County Juvenile Probation	Nicole Schuren
Michaella Heslin, Maricopa County Juvenile Probation	
Daveon Lilly	
Scott Naegele	
David Coconos	
Terrilyn Miller, GOYFF	
Olivia Christiani, GOYFF	

Call to Order

- **Ms. Cindi Nannetti, Chair**, called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. with 21 members and 15 staff and guests present.

Introductions

- **Ms. Cindi Nannetti**, Chair, asked members to introduce themselves. In addition, **Ms. Nannetti** recognized the youth members present and asked them to share a little more about themselves. **Ms. Guadalupe Durazo** stated that she is a senior at Arizona State University and is an intern at Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Department. **Mr. Navin Crump** shared that originally from Singapore, he is currently a senior at Arizona State, and will be returning to Singapore when he graduates.

Approval of Minutes

- **Ms. Cindi Nannetti**, Chair, requested a motion to approve the May 2, 2019, meeting minutes.
 - **Ms. Joseph Grossman** motioned to accept the minutes as drafted.
 - **Ms. Dorothy Wodraska** seconded the motion.
- The motion passed with no dissenting votes.

Title II Presentation: Payson Youth Diversion Program

- **Mr. Jake Gardner** with Community Bridges, Inc. (CBI) introduced himself to the commission and the public. **Mr. Gardner** presented the overview of the Payson Youth Diversion Program.
- The program includes diversion classes to replace school and minor legal consequences through juvenile probation.
- The program collaborates with schools, juvenile probation, and other community stakeholders. The program goal is to increase school attendance, positive behavior change, reduce recidivism, and provide direct treatment referrals for youth and families.
- **Mr. Gardner** reported that the program hosts Community Involvement Meetings that have grown from the original six members to 13 active participants including; administration from all Payson School District Middle, High, and alternative schools, Mayor of Payson, Payson Police Department, and Gila County Probation.
- **Mr. Gardner** shared that these collaborations have provided positive accessibility toward future projects. He continued to explain the program services that include Botvin's Life Skills evidence-based curriculum, mentorship, family and teen resources, community restitution, direct treatment referrals, family education, and school education.
- **Mr. Gardner** shared that CBI facilitated five Educational Prevention Presentations at Payson High School reaching 243 students. **Mr. Gardner** also stated that the focus was substance use prevention.
- **Mr. Gardner** introduced **Mr. Jeremy Simko**, Adolescent Navigator, to the Commission. **Mr. Simko** shared the intake process for a youth that is referred to the program, and he reported that the results of the intake and assessment determine if the youth received Session 1, which is two hours of instruction; or Session 2, which is four hours of instruction per week.
- **Mr. Simko** stated that Session 1 includes effective planning and differentiating short-term and long-term goals. Session 2 includes analyzing the decision-making process, reducing risky behavior, reinforcing resistance to substances and positive coping to manage stressful situations and develop resilience.
- **Mr. Simko** shared that the Community Restitution assigned 305 hours of community services. The program provided services to the Humane Society, Payson Unified School District groundskeeping, and started a Graffiti Removal and Aluminum Can Recycling Program. **Mr. Simko** reported the first year program outcomes, which included:
 - 101 referrals
 - 49 enrolled in program
 - 42 completed program
 - 71% have shown an increased awareness of the harm of substances and missing school
 - 93% have been connected to additional support services
 - Zero youth committed additional offenses after completing the program
- **Mr. Simko** thanked the Commission for the opportunity to present about the successes of the program to the commission.

- **Ms. Wodraska**, asked how the program was measuring their outcomes. **Mr. Gardner** shared that they were administering a pre/post assessment to measure and report outcomes.
- **Mr. Grossman** asked the determinants and indicators that contribute to a youth being assigned to Session 1 or Session 2. **Mr. Gardner** stated that the seriousness of the offense the youth is being referred for and indicators on the intake assessment assist in determining assignment to one session or the other. **Mr. Grossman** asked if the program had tested the effectiveness of the two sessions. **Mr. Gardner** stated that they had not tested the effectiveness specific to one session or the other.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, asked if the program administration had identified why 51 of the 101 referred did not enroll. **Mr. Simko** stated that the number one reason was that the family did not want to engage with the program. **Mr. Simko** stated that some of the reasons included the family would rather the child receive the school consequences, poor communication and referral process at the school level, and that some families may believe there is stigma associated with attending a program facilitated by a behavioral health agency.
- **Dr. Leslie Quinn** asked who makes the decision for the youth to participate in the program. **Mr. Simko** stated that the parent or guardian makes the decision to agree for the child to attend the program. **Mr. Simko** added that CBI has the parent or guardian sign a Parent Agreement Form and CBI identifies and attempts to resolve any barriers that may prevent the child from attending, including providing transportation services for the participants. **Dr. Quinn** asked if they had thought about ways to incentivize participation in the program. **Mr. Gardner** stated that they have recently created a detailed one-sheet flyer to be provided to parents and youth to have a comprehensive understanding of the program. **Mr. Gardner** reported that the program has already seen an increase in referrals from the school that the flyer was provided.
- **Ms. Maria Dodge** asked if the program had pre-program data collected on the 101 referrals. **Ms. Dodge** acknowledged that a zero rate of recidivism is exceptional, but that it may be because these 42 children who completed had the support and motivation to complete the program and not recidivate. **Ms. Dodge** shared that it would be interesting to have pre-program data on the youth to see if they had multiple referrals to other programs are multiple arrests prior to referral to this program. **Mr. Simko** stated that the majority of their participants had very little to zero family involvement and many of these “cases” were very “tough” cases that yielded positive outcomes.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, asked if the program had any data collected on the 52 that did not enroll and if those youth had additional referrals. **Mr. Gardner** shared that they have a small amount of data from the schools discipline records, but of the 52 enrolled, four were re-referred to the program. **Mr. Gardner** shared that the county attorney and probation can re-refer youth to the program as well.
- **Mr. Earl Newton** asked what percentage of the 49 enrolled were referred by the school and what percentage were referred by juvenile probation. **Mr. Gardner** stated that 90% were referred by the school and 10% were referred by the probation department.
- **Mr. Grossman** suggested that the agency provide the definition of what is considered recidivism and to clarify what is meant by “handling in-house.” **Mr. Grossman** expressed concern that law enforcement is not being contacted by the school when necessary. **Mr. Grossman** stated that to understand the effectiveness of the program on recidivism that there should be a touchpoint with law enforcement. **Mr. Simko** acknowledged that the team does recognize that the school is not always calling the law enforcement when appropriate. **Mr. Simko** stated that the program defines handling “in-house” services as direct treatment referrals. **Mr. Gardner** added that the participating schools have a list of offenses that get automatic referrals to the program.
- **Mr. Crump** asked if the Community Involvement Meetings had youth attendees that could contribute to the discussion from the youth’s perspective. **Mr. Gardner** stated that the meetings are usually held during school hours and therefore youth do not attend; however welcomes parents to attend to get their feedback about the effectiveness of the program and what they could do better.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, thanked the presenters and stated she is looking forward to hearing about the program’s second year outcomes.

Crossover Youth Practice Model

- **Mr. Bryant Grantling** from Arizona Department of Child Safety (DCS) LEAN Team and **Ms. Holly Reynolds** from Arizona Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Division of Juvenile Justice Services provided an overview of the state's implementation of the Crossover Youth Practice Model (CYPM) initiative.
- **Mr. Grantling** shared a story of a 14 year-old crossover youth who successfully navigated being dually involved with child welfare and juvenile justice in San Diego County, which is credited to the CYPM and the collaboration between systems. The collaboration provided the support and services necessary for the youth to turn his life around.
- **Mr. Grantling** shared that the goals of CYPM are reduction of number of youth crossing over to become dually involved; reduction of number of youth placed in out-of-home care; reduction in the use of congregate care; and reduction in the disproportionate representation of youth of color.
- **Mr. Grantling** shared the pathways to becoming a crossover youth. **Ms. Reynolds** shared the history of the CYPM developed by Georgetown University center for Juvenile Justice Reform in 2010 and that there are over 100 jurisdictions that have implemented this model.
- **Ms. Reynolds** shared that the ideals of the CYPM are one judge, one family; collaborative efforts to reduce duplication and increase effectiveness and reduce cost; and consistent messaging to family.
- **Ms. Reynolds** shared that each Arizona county has a team that attended a certification program at Georgetown for the CYPM. **Ms. Reynolds** shared that the CYPM has an updated collaboration and information sharing tool that was revised in 2019. **Ms. Reynolds** reported that JJSD provides weekly reports to DCS identifying dually involved youth and DCS uses this information to flag these youth for improved collaboration of services.
- **Ms. Reynolds** shared the Task Force on Crossover Youth Data and Information Sharing was established by retired Chief Justice Bale to identify and minimize barriers to information sharing for CYPM practices.
- **Ms. Reynolds** shared that the local county teams are led by a juvenile court judge, and members include probation staff, DCS staff, judges, attorneys, community providers, and educators. **Ms. Reynolds** stated that they hold regular meetings to staff cases and discuss any barriers and develop strategies to improve outcomes for youth and families. **Ms. Reynolds** shared that they have developed standard protocols for all counties to improve effectiveness of the CYPM practices for better outcomes.
- **Mr. Grantling** shared that county and state level protocols will improve communication, increase family engagement, and improve outcomes for CYPM youth.
- **Ms. Reynolds** reported that the national research has shown the following positive outcomes: reduced use of pre-adjudication detention, increased use of diversion and dismissal, increased use of permanent living situation, increased involvement in prosocial activities, improved or reduced behavioral problems, improvement among those with mental health and or substance abuse problems, increased school enrollment or graduation, and fewer arrests at follow-up.
- **Ms. Reynolds** shared that the partners of the CYPM include youth and families, AOC, DCS, juvenile court judges, juvenile probation, county attorney, and defense attorneys, AHCCCS providers, and local school and community providers.
- **Mr. Grantling** reported that the next steps for CYPM include: continued collaborative efforts at local levels, continue institutionalizing CYPM at county and state levels, and continued collaboration with Georgetown in 2020.
- **Ms. Wodraska** asked if the reported national positive outcomes have been reported in Arizona. **Ms. Reynolds** shared that the data is currently being collected, but has not yet been analyzed.
- **Mr. Grossman** asked how the improved outcomes will be measured. **Ms. Reynolds** stated that they would use the same measurements as the national study.
- **Mr. Joseph Kelroy** advised that in the initial stages of CYPM he did not know how the implementation of this model would be possible. He stated that stakeholder development at the state, county, and law enforcement levels allowed for additional contact and collaboration when in the past it was limited to local offices only.

- **Mr. James Beene** shared that he did not have official data; however, he shared that he believes that the program is fantastic and effective. **Mr. Beene** shared that it was great to have all stakeholders in one room to synthesize the case and what was needed for best outcomes. **Mr. Beene** shared that he did feel there were some “kinks” to work out, but overall a great program.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, shared that she remembered when the youth were called dual wards and it was not easy to identify resources. She stated that it is great to see that state and county resources can be identified for local agencies to utilize. **Ms. Nannetti** added that she was looking forward to seeing the data when it is available.

Screening Procedures for Detained Youth

- **Ms. Michaella Helsin**, Maricopa County Deputy Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, introduced herself to the commission and to the public.
- **Ms. Helsin** stated that Maricopa County Juvenile Detention is attempting to normalize the detention centers to improve the experiences and outcomes of the youth. She stated they are improving screening procedures to identify and only detain higher risk youth because detaining a low risk youth could be more detrimental and have poorer outcomes for those youth.
- **Ms. Helsin** stated that each county utilizes a standardized index tool. She stated that they provide training to law enforcement regarding Juvenile Detention Alternatives Division (JDAI) and provide a call-in option for law enforcement to identify if the youth needs to be transported to the detention center.
- **Ms. Helsin** stated that when a youth arrives at detention the parent or guardian are contacted and the detention or probation officer on duty administers the Detention Screening Index (DSI). The tool is used to provide an objective criteria to determine whether an alleged juvenile offender should be detained based on the level of risk for re-offense or failing to appear to their court hearing. If necessary, a supervisor will evaluate the case and determine if there needs to be a system override to detain the youth. If the judge performs a custody review and determines the youth can be released, the parents, guardians, or placements are contacted.
- **Ms. Helsin** added that if a parent is unable to pick up their child due to lack of transportation or other legitimate reason, staff will offer to transport the child home or to an appropriate guardian.
- **Ms. Helsin** also reported that more recently, juveniles transferred to adult court may be detained in juvenile detention if their offense is non-violent or they have a history of violent behavior or present a danger to themselves, staff, or other youth.
- **Mr. James Molina**, stated that he understood the intention of JDAI, but shared that he felt that there may have been an overcorrection and youth are not receiving appropriate consequences. He asked **Ms. Helsin** what options are available when a youth has been screened and it has been determined that the youth be released back to a group home and the group home does not want them to return because there is an issue with their return. **Ms. Helsin** stated that there is a process for children who will not be received by a caregiver or placement, and that it is more detrimental to keep the child detained than to send them home. **Ms. Helsin** shared that she provides parents with resources to manage behaviors or crises when the child is returned home and understands that she is limited in the type of resources she can provide to congregate care facilities.
- **Mr. Molina** asked **Ms. Helsin** when the data was last gathered regarding the effectiveness of the DSI and its reliability to determine when to release a youth. **Ms. Helsin** stated that data is continuously being gathered, and advised that the most recent Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018 concluded that it was better to release when at all possible. **Mr. Kelroy** reported that Pinal County Juvenile Probation provides training to group home staff to assist in behavior management, crisis intervention, and de-escalation and explained that the continuum of interventions has assisted in identifying challenges occurring at group homes, which has led to decreased issues in these settings.
- **Ms. Helsin** introduced **Dr. Chantay Banikarim**, the Detention Integrated Health Services Director. **Dr. Banikarim** shared that they use integrated health and mental health interventions to improve the health and well-being of the youth in the Maricopa County juvenile detention facilities.

- **Dr. Banikarim** stated that the youth will receive a medical and mental health screening within 2-4 hours of arrival of the facility. She advised that the staff administer a SAFE-T suicide assessment to ensure that the youth does not have acute mental health needs that have to be addressed.
- **Dr. Banikarim** stated that the youth will receive a complete mental health assessment within 72 hours of arrival. She also advised that the clinic staff contact the parents, guardians, or placement to obtain a full medical history of the youth and will have a complete physical done within seven days of arrival at the facility.
- **Dr. Banikarim** shared that Arizona Lions Club provides vision services for the youth and the local dental school students provide preventative dental care for the youth. She advised that dental health is the number one health concern for this population.
- **Dr. Banikarim** reported that 70 percent of the youth have reported a mental health diagnosis and 60 percent have previously been prescribed medication. She stated that each youth receives individual counseling and acute and brief intervention services when needed.
- **Dr. Banikarim** added that they utilize the Columbia Suicide Assessment tool, which is a measurement for suicidality that has high validity and reliability.
- **Mr. Grossman** asked **Ms. Helsin** if youth who are awaiting the initial hearing for adult charges are segregated from general population. **Ms. Helsin** reported that the youth remain with the other youth while they await their initial hearing.
- **Mr. Grossman** asked **Dr. Banikarim** if youth that have substance use issues are segregated from general population. **Dr. Banikarim** stated that these youth are not segregated and provided individual counseling to address the issues contributing to the substance use.

AJJC Committee Reports

Children's Justice Committee

- **Mr. Steve Selover** shared that the committee continues to work on materials to define trauma and describe signs that may be noticed in children who are suffering from trauma. He also stated that with the recent resignation of the committee co-chair, a new co-chair will be selected and will help lead the workgroup's activities during the following year.

Grants Committee

- **Ms. Wodraska** advised that the Title II funded programs were renewed in October for their second year. She added that the committee has had difficulty scheduling meetings recently, but is working on a meeting schedule for next year.

Racial and Ethnic Disparities Committee

- **Ms. Helen Gándara** advised that the committee has on-boarded some new members to better represent systems and geographic diversity. **Ms. Gándara** stated that the committee is continuing to develop the work plan and will meet monthly during the following year, and added that staff will work on offering remote online participation to ease the burden for members coming from outside the county. **Ms. Gándara** completed her report by stating that she and some other members of the committee successfully presented at the national conference in November.

Staff Updates

- **Ms. Tonya Hamilton** advised that the Children's Justice Act program administrator resigned from her position and she is currently overseeing the grant in the interim. **Ms. Hamilton** stated that a competitive solicitation for the Children's Justice Act grant had recently closed and is currently in the review process. .

Upcoming Meeting Dates

- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, asked members to reference the list of upcoming meeting dates and to add them to members' calendars.

Adjournment

- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, advised of a new policy for public comment that requires comments be submitted to the Governor's Office of Youth, Faith and Family website.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, requested a motion to adjourn.
 - **Ms. Wodraska** moved to adjourn the meeting
 - **Mr. Grossman** seconded the motion.
- Motion carried with no dissenting votes. Meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

Dated December 6, 2019
Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission
Submitted by Steve Selover
Program Administrator, GOYFF

DRAFT