

Committee on Juvenile Courts

Committee Minutes

Meeting Date: January 30, 2020

The meeting was called to order by
Judge Quigley at 10:04 a.m.

Minutes taken by: Shantelle Bagnall
and Kathy Gillmore

Call to Order

Present:

Hon. Bryan Chambers (Gila), Hon. Joseph Kreamer (Maricopa), Hon. Monica Stauffer (Greenlee), Hon. Kathleen Quigley (Pima), Hon. Daniel Washburn (Pinal), Hon. Anna Young (Yavapai), Hon. Sam Thumma (COA, Div. 1), Joannie Collins (Public Member), Eric Meaux (Maricopa County Juvenile Court Director), Tina Mattison (Proxy for Jennifer Torchia, Pima County Juvenile Court Director). Caroline Lault-Owens (AOC).

Telephone:

Hon. C. Allan Perkins (Apache), Hon. Travis Ragland (Graham), Hon. Ted Reed (Coconino), Tyson Ross (Proxy for Hon. Jessica Quickle-La Paz), Hon. Michala Ruechel (Navajo), Natalie Eggers (proxy for Hon. Rick Williams-Mohave), Hon. Kami Hart (Gila River Indian Community Court), Hon. Kathryn Stocking-Tate (Yuma), Hon. Christopher Staring (COA, Div. 2), Tim Hardy (Yuma County Juvenile Court Director), Hon. Terry Bannon (Cochise), Janet Garcia (Public Member)

Excused/Absent: Valerie VanAuker (FCRB), Hon. Thomas Fink (Santa Cruz)

Guests/Staff Present:

Shantelle Bagnall (DCSD), Kathy Gillmore (JJSD), Nina Preston (AOC), Holly Reynolds (JJSD), Liana Garcia (AOC), Chris Varner (JJSD), Susan Pickard (AOC), Jerry Landau (AOC), Stacy Reinstein (AOC), Mark Meltzer (AOC), Hon. Peter Hochuli (Pima), Jeff Hood (ADJC), Beth Broeker (ADJC), Mike Faust (DCS), Virginia Herrera-Gonzales (AGO), Nicole Valenzuela (GOYFF), Steve Selover (GOYFF), Hon. Maurice Portley, Ret. (Casey Family), Kate Howard (ADJC), Randi Alexander (DCS), Erika Richardson (AGO), James Simpson (AGO), Jonell Sullivan (DCS), John Asher (DCSS), Maria Hoffman (AZ Legislature)

Introductions were made around the room and on the telephone.

Adoption of Minutes:

Motion: To accept and adopt minutes from the October 31, 2019 meeting.

Moved by: Judge Stauffer; **Seconded by:** Judge Kreamer

No discussion.

Action: Motion passed unanimously.

Announcements:

On April 30, 2020, following the COJC meeting, the Juvenile Justice Today training will be held. Joe Kelroy has invited all the presiding judges and asked that the presiding judges pass this information on to their juvenile judges. COJC will meet from 8:30am to 9:45am and the judicial training will begin at 10am and end at 3pm. There will be hotel rooms available for those who are traveling.

Two years ago, the Adult Set Aside Committee was formed, along with the Juvenile Set Aside Destruction of Records Subcommittee. There were a couple of things left over that are important to address: fines and fees and destruction of records. The Juvenile Set Aside Destruction of Records Committee hangs out there because the adult committee has concluded. The thought is to bring the Juvenile subcommittee under COJC. Members of COJC are invited to be on the committee. Judge Quigley distributed a handout, the PCAT Juvenile Workgroup Distribution List.

It was noted that the Court Improvement Advisory Workgroup, which includes several judges and various multidisciplinary stakeholders, has existed for years and has traditionally been used by the COJC needed for dependency-related issued.

Topic: ADJC Update

Speaker: Jeff Hood, *Director; ADJC*

Summary of Discussion:

In the last meeting, the Length of Stay Guidelines was presented. Feedback was invited. The guidelines will be published as part of the agency policy in the next few weeks.

There are 220 children in secured care, including 200 male youth and 20 female youth. Community Corrections Officers are supervising 124 youth, including 42 boys and 4 girls on parole and 80 youth on ICJ from various jurisdictions around the country. 51 out of the 220 youth are dually involved with DCS. This is about 19% of the population. As of the end of December, the Education Department has awarded 41 GED's through the education program. 14 youth on Extended Jurisdiction, 11 boys and 3 girls. Of the 14, 13 are in the secured care facility and one is currently on community supervision.

For calendar year 2019, 32 tours were conducted. That includes tours of college students that are in criminal justice programs from Phoenix College and Estrella Mountain Community College, but many of the tours have been for judicial officers and probation staff. The next tour is scheduled for March 31, 2020 and then two tour dates in April, May and June. 10 groups have toured since last October, this includes: three judicial officers, two state legislators, some of the governor's staff, probation officers from Mohave County, and a group of college students from Phoenix College.

A pilot program has been running since October 2019 in the Community Corrections Bureau using the AZYAS re-entry risk assessment tool and combining it with a matrix of supervision, to tie the duration and intensity of supervision to the risk level. There should be preliminary data to share at the next COJC meeting.

Working with the Department of Transportation, the plan is to have by the end of March an official state identification card issued through ADOT for every youth that is released to the community. With this plan in place, the youth are not relying on a printed ID card or school ID card. Once this is up and running, we'll start working on the ability to take the steps necessary to issue driver's permits for eligible youth. This would require the cooperation and agreement of the youth's family. Some things that are a challenge on re-entry is identification and transportation. Hopefully this is a step in a better direction to prepare the youth for release and a better experience.

Topic: DCS Update

Speaker: Mike Faust; *Director; DCS*

Summary of Discussion (PowerPoint):

The volume to the DCS hotline remains consistent. In the October time frame, there was more call volume to the hotline. There were roughly 14,000 to 15,000 calls, which has resulted in 4,400 reports a month being assigned to the field. There has been a lot of improvement with the screen in rate to make sure the agency is responding to the correct calls. As the population continues to grow there will be more reports assigned to the field.

There should be 7,000 to 8,000 reports opened at any given time. Policy states that DCS should reach a finding within 45 days and the report should be closed within 60 days. Of the 7,035 open reports, safety has been assessed on 85%. This does not speak to the safety plan; it just recognizes that the agency has responded and made a safety determination.

About 50% to 54% of in-home cases are reasonable candidates for in-home care. There has been steady progress serving families in-home. Approximately 10% of kids who start as in-home come into care within six months.

Approximately 80% of youth have been entering care off a court authorization. 91% of court authorization requests are responded to within 90 minutes and 96% of them are responded to within 2 hours.

We have seen a slight increase, approximately 300 children, in the under 18 population. 40-42% placed with kin, 40% in foster homes, and 15% in congregate in care.

If children are categorized by their time in care, the state ranks low for children achieving permanency within 12 months but does well for children 13 months and 24 months and beyond for achieving permanency. This is a great opportunity to work together as a system to look at how we are identifying conditions for return and making sure that we are constantly talking about safety plans and what it takes to transition youth home if that is the case plan goal.

There are about 685 children that have been in the adoptive relative placement, but the case has not progressed. The agency is going to staff these cases to discuss barriers and challenges that can be resolved so that those children can achieve permanency.

30% to 33% of children exit to adoption, 55% exit to reunification and roughly 900 kids a year are turning 18 in care.

Arizona is 4th in the nation for how low we rank for kids re-entering care within 6 months. Our kids may stay in care a little longer but when they go home, they stay home. If kids do come back into care, they are coming back within 90 to 120 days.

A lot of active efforts are taking place in the department for runaway youth. There are case reviews going on every week, reviewing if policy has been followed. (ex. notified law enforcement) The department is making active efforts to go out and locate children. Overtime has been offered to staff to complete this task. OCWI research team has been using social media and other tools to help locate children.

900 youth a year turn 18 in care. They can voluntarily stay with the department until they turn 21. 780 youth a year have been served but in the last year that number has jumped to 950. The department could be serving as much as 2,700 youth. Working with staff to work with the youth to opt in to staying with the department. In February, the department will be going out to solicit new semi-independent living facilities.

Comments:

- Comment asking if judges were going to start seeing orders regarding extended foster care
- Judge Young is seeing them on all her youth that are aging out.

What the department is measuring is, of the youth who turned 18 with the department, which youth are still with the department at 18 and 1 month. Of those youth, what percentage are with the department at 19 and what percentage are with the department at 20. What has been found is that if the department has success at enrolling youth at the age of 18 then they stay with the department at 19 and 20.

Two things are being measured for the Referral Wait List: the number of families that are on a service referral wait list and, on average, does the family wait for those services? The department makes 300 to 400 referrals. In the urban areas, the family will wait approximately 8 days. The rural areas are more of a challenge. The department has been working very closely with providers to build additional capacity and in some cases, there is talk of in-sourcing some of those services.

Comments:

- Is it possible to get numbers regarding reunification broken out by county?
 - o Director Faust is going to investigate this.
- Question if Families First has impact on extended foster care.
 - o There should be very little impact based on the way the department is designing the placement caregiver array.
- About the kids waiting for adoption by relatives, are the cases on appeal being tracked?

- The department does not have the data point that shows what is up on appeal.

940 children are identified as ICWA. 120 youth have not yet been identified.

Topic: Adoption and Existing Child Support Orders

Speaker: Jonell Sullivan, *DES, Project Director for the PJAC Grant*

Summary of Discussion (PowerPoint):

PJAC – Procedural Justice Informed Alternative to Contempt

Arizona was awarded this five-year grant in 2017. The grant period runs from July 1, 2017 to September 30, 2021. The cases are selected by random assignment out of Maricopa County and are assigned by the custodial parent. Maricopa County was chosen because some of the supportive services would be easier to obtain.

The purpose of the grant is to measure the practices of case qualifying for judicial contempt versus an enhanced child support services which is to resolve the barrier to nonpayment.

One of the barriers identified is adoption. The group is unaware when a child has been adopted. They continue all the processes on the case. A parent can tell a case manager that they can't see their children, the case manager will then tell the parent to get a copy of the court order. When a child is adopted, the order has been signed, and the case sealed, the parent cannot receive a copy of the adoption order to give to the case manager.

In 2017 there were 2,611 children on the adoption report, 1,044 had child support cases and of those 248 had open IV-D cases. This report is generated by a unit under the Attorney General's Office.

Some of the consequences that occur when a case continues to be enforced are; administrative income withholding, state and federal tax intercept, asset seizures, credit bureau reporting, passport denial, property lien, lottery winnings, unemployment insurance benefits, workman compensation benefits, and federal administrative offsets. The judicial actions that can take place are license suspension or revocations and request for judicial enforcement.

Currently the adoption is unable to be verified. The challenge is receiving these adoption orders. There are two units in the Attorney General's Office that work with these cases but there is no one dedicated to work the cases. It is a matter of if they can get to it.

There are a lot of cases that need to be worked. Resources are being used to take parents to court where the obligation has ended. Resources need to be used on cases that need it.

We are requesting that an automated feed come into DES. Cases must stay open unless they qualify under a federal closure code. The requirements for an adoption case to close is the order number

of the adoption, the effective date of the adoption order, the name and birthdate, and whether there were any arrearages mentioned in the last order.

Ms. Sullivan stated that this is just informational for COJC. It was suggested that an automated feed would be helpful in solving IV-D cases but there will be cases out there unsolved because they are not IV-D. It seems it would be helpful if the judges had a notification in the family law case when a child was adopted.

Topic: Legislative Update

Speaker: Liana Garcia, *Legislative Liaison, AOC*

Summary of Discussion (*Legislative Update handout*):

It is day 18 of the legislative session and over 1,200 bills have been filed.

Many recent bills filed that deal with DCS and the Courts will probably not move forward.

HB2037 overview.

HB2038 overview.

HB2041 overview. This bill has received a lot of feedback from judges and juvenile probation. It has been assigned to two different committees and will have a difficult time moving forward.

HB2153 overview. This bill adds an evidentiary standard. Feedback has not been provided from anyone.

HB2223 overview. There has been some feedback on this, the Court may order fingerprints of a child in an out of home placement to be taken in specified situations. This will be more of a burden on DCS than on the Courts.

HB2229 overview.

HB2256 overview.

HB2275 overview. If this bill moves forward, Liana will check with the bill's sponsor to get JPO's removed.

HB2301 overview.

HB2413 overview. This bill will be moving forward. It plays cleanup on a bill that was ran last year about extending juvenile court jurisdiction after someone has turned 18. There is a workgroup currently working on an amendment to this bill having to do with the admonition language that the court must give to a juvenile offender.

HB2421 overview.

HB2449 overview.

HB2479 overview.

HB2569 overview.

HB2696 overview. This bill is trying to recognize that victims of domestic violence don't necessarily report to the authorities even though they may have a lot of medical evidence, video, and audio recordings but because of the cycle of violence they may not have the type of evidence that is required in the current statute.

HB2701 overview.

SB1013 overview.

SB1076 overview.

SB1080 overview.

SB1141 overview. This bill has passed the Senate Judiciary Committee and is moving forward.

Comments:

- In HB2413 there is most likely a word missing. Page 2, subsection K, should be an either/or in the wording.
 - o It is most likely a drafting style but will ask counsel.
- HB2413 there was an addition talking about the juvenile applying for the restoration of gun rights, in the application process there was an addition where the Clerk of Court needs to provide notice to the County Attorney's Office. Subsection D was asking for the restoration of civil rights to be served upon the County Attorney by the juvenile and the Clerk's Office was also supposed to give notice. Did we intend for both of those to apply going forward or could the new addition be satisfactory, and the juvenile didn't need to serve the County Attorney?
 - o The intent was following the protocols we used in all the areas where the juvenile would be filing pro per and instead, have the Clerk of the Court send it to the County Attorney because the juvenile probably wouldn't know to do that. The sentence will be removed.
- HB2275 Recommendation to remove the JPO's from this bill. There are liability issues for the county and the state. Chances of the bill moving forward is small.
- HB2223, 2701, and 2421 Director Faust met with Representative Barto on these bills. HB2223 and 2701 will be reworked as a result of their conversation.
- HB8341 there was redrafting of the language to make it more youth friendly. Discussion takes place about the language of the bill.

Topic: Mental Health Curriculum Development Project

Speaker: Stacy Reinstein, *Court Services, AOC*

Summary of Discussion (Handout):

The work of the Committee on Mental Health and the Justice System has been focused on improvements to the civil and criminal justice system as well as the limited jurisdiction courts. The committee's full report is located at <https://www.azcourts.gov/cscommittees/Mental-Health-and-the-Justice-System> and has been approved by the Arizona Judicial Council. The committee has been tasked to provide the judiciary with training on mental health. The committee will also put together five online chapters for each of the five major benches. These include juvenile, civil, criminal, probate/mental health and family. The purpose of the chapter trainings is for judicial officers and court staff to get a better understanding of how to interact with a person with mental health issues in their courtroom. It is also to help understand the different pathways that the individual may have taken so that the committee can improve the service, delivery, and administration of justice for that individual. A judicial officer may be able to enter an order or RHBA to provide services. If a judge understands what those services are within their provider plan, he/she could order that those services take place. There are documents that could be requested

to be reviewed. A subject matter expert team is being organized. This team will help with developing the curriculum. If the COJC knows of someone in the community or the Court to help build the curriculum, please contact Stacy Reinstein.

Call to the Public:

None

Topic: Guardian ad Litem in Delinquency/Dependency Matter; Attorneys/Non-Attorneys

Speaker: Judge Anna Young, *Presiding Juvenile Judge, Yavapai County*

Summary of Discussion:

An issue came up as part of the Juvenile Rules Taskforce as they continue the process of rewriting the dependency and delinquency rules. This issue is whether there should be a rule that says the appointed GAL in a dependency or delinquency case should be an attorney. Right now, the statute states it could be an attorney or a CASA. During discussion the breakout groups had heard rumor that the more rural counties were using non-attorney GAL's in dependency and delinquency cases. The taskforce would like to know if there is any objection to having a rule that says in order to be a GAL you must be an attorney. Something to keep in mind is that according to rules 40.1 and 40.2, the requirement is that the GAL files things such as pleadings. If you have a non-attorney GAL, you cannot have them engage in the practice of law.

Comments:

- Judge Stauffer has not used a non-attorney GAL and has not heard of other small counties/courts using non-attorney GAL's.
- Judge Perkins: sometimes it is difficult to find enough attorneys but so far, they have been successful in finding attorneys to fulfill the role as GAL. He has no objection to a rule requiring the GAL be an attorney.
- Judge Reuchel: the rumors may have come from Navajo County. The rule was read that the GAL didn't have to be an attorney and it was suggested that other qualified individuals should be appointed as GAL's.
- Judge Stocking-Tate: Yuma does not appoint non-attorney GAL's. She has no opposition to the rule stating the GAL must be an attorney.
- Judge Chambers: has not heard of anyone appointing anyone other than an attorney being appointed as GAL. He does not object to the rule stating the GAL must be an attorney.
- Judge Washburn has always used attorneys as GAL's and that is all they allow on the GAL list. He does not object to the rule stating the GAL must be an attorney.
- If there are any afterthoughts, please reach out to Judge Young so that she may bring it back to the taskforce.
-

The COJC agreed that a GAL should be an attorney.

Topic: Title IVE Reimbursement for Parent and Child Representation in Dependency Cases: Update

Speakers: Caroline Lantt-Owens; *Director; DCSD, AOC*

Summary of Discussion:

There has been a change in policy regarding the Social Security Act Title IVE reimbursement. The change now allows counties to seek partial reimbursement for attorneys who represent children and parents in dependency cases.

For a county to seek the reimbursement, they have been asked to sign a three-way agreement with DCS and AOC. The agreements have gone out to all 15 counties. DCSD has received four agreements back: Pima, Pinal, La Paz, and Yuma. DCSD has been in touch with many of the other counties to check on the status of the agreement. The agreements allow for each county to go back for the entire year of 2019 to claim reimbursement. The agreements need to be returned to DCSD by March 31, 2020. The forms for reimbursement are very simple but the stipulation is that 75% of the reimbursement must be used to enhance or support parent and child representation in these cases. The other 25% can be used as the county desires.

Topic: Rule 41: A Call for Input

Speaker: Judge Quigley

Summary of Discussion:

The Juvenile Rules Committee wanted to bring Rule 41 to COJC to ask if Rule 41 is working for the judges as far as practical application and enforcement. HB2038 proposes an amendment and adds the language, “A parent is permitted to authorize the disclosure of any Department of Child Services information concerning that parent.” If this passes, Rule 41 can focus on the judge’s control of the courtroom as well as the protection of the children. The Juvenile Rules Committee is asking for any thoughts as to how this rule could be rewritten or restructured to better assist judges.

Comments:

- The difficulty here is that at each hearing there may be someone new in the audience. This is a difficult statute to comply with. Repeating the statement at every hearing, every time is difficult.
- It is suggested that a specific admonition be written instead of the current language. The current language can lend itself to a lot of different forms of admonition. It is not user friendly. A lot of courts would appreciate specific language that should be read in court. A provision should be considered that the admonition is read if anyone in the courtroom may not have previously heard the admonition.

- If there are any suggestions or thoughts about this rule or any other rules, please let Judge Quigley know.
-

Topic: Juvenile Justice System Improvement Project (JJSIP) Update

Speakers: Holly Reynolds, *Specialist, JJS*

Summary of Discussion (Handout):

JJS has been working with Georgetown University for quite some time on this project. There are three components:

- **Arizona Youth Assessment Instrument (AZYAS):** The AZYAS disposition tool is completed post-adjudication and identifies the juvenile's risk level. It has been in place for seven years. The data was recently validated by the University of Cincinnati, and we are currently in the planning stages of providing a refresher training for all probation staff, to be completed by the early part of next year.
- **Dispositional Recommendation Matrix-** This is a guideline for probation, to look at the seriousness of offense, and then take the risk level to evaluate what level of supervision best meets the juvenile's needs. This is a collaborative effort, as we have a workgroup made up of county probation representatives and JJS staff, as well as a data subcommittee, consisting of four county researchers and our own AOC research unit. Georgetown University provides us with technical assistance and support. We will train judicial officers with the AZYAS, making the matrix a part of the AZYAS. It is a simple, quick-look tool. When used correctly, we can get recidivism in the 20-25% range, which is significant. We hope to finalize this by the end of the week. We will be conducting regional trainings, which are county specific, but anyone can attend any training as conflicts may arise. The goal is to give a high-level overview with judges, county attorneys, public defenders and leadership within probation, so that they can look at it, understand it and ask questions. We would like to go live with this by **July 1, 2020**.
- **Correctional Program Checklist (CPC)** – This is an evaluation of our providers in relationship to criminogenic risk. We have partnered with ADJC on this. We will be doing “an evaluation on the evaluation” at the end of the first year, once we get through all our residential programs, to determine if the tool itself is meeting the need of what we intended.

There are regional Matrix rollout presentations coming to the counties. Georgetown will be at all the presentations except for Graham and Greenlee Counties. It is requested that probation leadership of each county be present. The goal behind the presentation is to give a better and more informed understanding about how all these systems work together and how do we work collectively together to improve the lives and outcomes of our kids. If you have questions before the presentation, please contact Joe Kelroy or Holly Reynolds.

During the rollout process we will be collecting data to see how the Recommendation Matrix is working to understand why and how a probation officer may recommend an override or underide. When the data is gathered, we'll be able to understand; if the tool is working, can we make the tool work better and how do we make it work better?

Old Business:

Regarding the prior approval that was done of the polygraph change; is COJC going to revisit what was approved?

- The matter has not been taken to the Chief Justice with an administrative order to adopt it at this point. There is a review occurring right now but the matter has been put on hold.

Update on 8272, the department has made some good steps, along with the AG's office, with training and guiding their employees on the statutory requirements. Would like to look at it again in six months but at this point, progress is being made.

Around the State/Upcoming Trainings:

Judge Perkins (Apache County): Attorney Dependency Training on February 7th. Started the process on the second Legacy Teen Center in Eager/Springerville.

Judge Chambers (Gila County): Getting ready to open the Route 87 Community Teen Center. The dedication is scheduled for a few weeks from now.

Judge Ragland (Graham County): Wanted to take a moment to thank the AOC, there was a problem with transportation and the AOC jumped in and helped in getting parents to their services.

Judge Stauffer (Greenlee County): Training set for Tuesday May 5, 2020. Attorneys brought up that they would like to have more training available locally. Putting together a full day training to get the hours that they need. Everyone is welcome to attend, would just need to know if anyone is being sent.

Judge Quickle (La Paz County): N/A

Judge Kreamer (Maricopa County): Maricopa has 500 of the 900+ children Director Faust mentioned that are ICWA. In the process of identifying two judicial officers for an ICWA Court.

Judge Williams (Mohave County): N/A

Judge Ruechel (Navajo County): Dependency Attorney Training on February 7th. There are a few extra slots for any attorneys that still need their training. Juvenile Assessment Center is up and running. The goal is to keep the juveniles in a safe place and not have to transport them to Pinal County only for them to be released the next morning.

Family Resiliency Conference on March 23rd. Derek Clark will be one of the keynote speakers, he speaks on Trauma to Triumph. He was in the foster system for 13 years and talks about his life then and now. Judge Goss and Judge Green are also keynote speakers and they'll be speaking on Sex Trafficking.

Judge Washburn (Pinal County): Next week a class is being held called Dependency 101, not to be confused with the attorney training. This has been set up for parents, foster families or anyone

from the public that wants to learn about the process. March 10th, juvenile court in Casa Grande will be starting.

Judge Young (Yavapai County): In the process of finalizing our MOU with youth advocate programs. They have agreed to have a yearlong pilot program. They will take our 15 toughest kids and work with them to avoid them being removed from their homes. They have committed to spending \$500,000. Will be launching this program within 60 days. They will co-locate in the Juvenile Justice Center.

We have completely retooled our in-house substance abuse residential program. We decided we would go with 7 Challenges; this is an 8-week program. For 6 weeks they live in repurposed pods in the detention center, they are not detained, and they attend a transition school.

Judge Stocking-Tate (Yuma County): Going to be starting a cohort with the Successful Futures Program. There was a study a couple of months back and it appears that we're having some positive results. There has been an increase in dependency filings in the last few months.

Judge Hart (Gila River Indian Community Court): In our culture we raise each other's children. Customary Adoption allows for the court to permanently suspend the parent's rights and then an adoption is granted to a family member. Customary Adoption allows the adoptive parents to receive the adoption subsidy that they would not normally receive if the case was transferred to the tribe. There have been four applications for Customary Adoptions, three were granted. We have been looking to take it to the legislature and get it codified in the Arizona Statute.

Judge Thumma (COA, Division One): If there are things that we are doing that jurisdictionally slow down the permanency process, please let us know.

Judge Staring (COA, Division Two): N/A

Joannie Collins (Public Member): Today the foundation is holding a regional E-sporting competition built around one of the iCivics games. Across the state youth are competing in Esports using one of the education games that is on iCivics.org. The top winners will advance to an Esporting tournament in Maricopa County. The winners will receive iPads. The detention centers will also be participating in an Esporting tournament. The logistics are being worked out since the youth cannot leave their facilities.

Tim Hardy (Yuma County Juvenile Probation): Started running statistics on all of our programs to see the value and success. We know that we waste a lot of resources on minimum risk youth. Our first cohort of Successful Futures which is based on the Four Destinations of Kids at Hope was offered to minimum risk youth. The youth did well. Because they did well, we ran a group of youth through the normal phase of standard probation. The group that went through Successful Futures were more successful. What it shows is that every kid, no matter if they're on probation or in the community, can use life skills.

Jennifer Torchia, Tina Mattison (proxy) (Pima County Juvenile Probation): Preparing to meet with National Center for State Courts as well as the AOC to look at the DAP program. Marion County, Indiana is making a trip to Pima County to look at the juvenile center and meeting with family law judges to talk about family law protocols.

There is a new juvenile mental health diversion program. This was a collaboration with the County Attorney, Public Defender, Probation, Judges and Behavioral Health. Behavioral Health has agreed to expedite services if the juvenile qualifies for the 90-day program.

Caroline Lantt-Owens (DCSD/AOC): The court has submitted a budget request to expand the DAP program. We are happy to see that it has made it into the Governor's budget. We are hoping it makes it through to the final budget for the state. If it does get approved, we will be working with each county to try to get some type of DAP program implemented.

Closing Comments/Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned by Judge Quigley at 1:10 p.m.

Next COJC Meetings:

The next COJC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 30, 2020 at 8:30am in the Arizona Courts Building, Room 345A/B.