

# Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission February 6, 2025, 9:30 AM Hybrid Meeting 1700 West Washington Street, Suite 230, Phoenix, Arizona 85007

A general meeting of the **Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission (AJJC)** convened on **February 6**, **2025**, notice duly given.

Members Present (18)	Members Absent (8)
Cindi Nannetti, Chair	Alice Bustillo-Levesque
Douglas Sargent	Don Walker
Earl Newton	Guadalupe Durazo
Ed Gilligan	James Molina
Erica Maxwell	Jane Kallal
Helen Gandara	Joseph Grossman
Jennifer Jermaine	Royce Hill
Joe Kelroy	Zion Givens
Jose Gonzales	
Joshua Jaeger	
Karen Pugh	
Maria Dodge	
Shaun Rieve	
Shawn Cox	
Suzanne Nicholls	
Tracy Darmody	
Vada Jo Phelps	
Veronica Guzman	
Staff and Presenters (12)	
Kate Spaulding, Pima County Teen Court	Shayne Johnson, GOYFF
Joshua Jaeger, Pima County Teen Court	Chantel Hutchinson, GOYFF
Elizabeth Fierro, Pima County Teen Court	Madeleine Dorn, GOYFF
Teen Court Bar Association Officers (4)	Jocelyn Bogar, Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central Arizona
	Martha DePriest, Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central Arizona

### **Call to Order**

• Cindi Nannetti, Chair, called the Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission (AJJC) to order at 9:31 AM with 18 members, 12 staff/guests present, and eight members absent. She reviewed the meeting procedures and thanked the attendees for their flexibility.

#### Welcome / Introductions / Roll Call

• Cindi Nannetti, Chair, asked members to acknowledge their attendance during the roll call.

## **Approval of Minutes**

• With the quorum met, **Cindi Nannetti**, **Chair**, requested a review of the **December 05**, **2024**, meeting minutes before requesting a motion to approve them as drafted.

- Jennifer Jermaine moved to approve the meeting minutes as drafted.
- Doug Sargent seconded the motion.
- Cindi Nannetti, Chair, asked for a discussion of the minutes, and no members requested amendments.
- Cindi Nannetti, Chair, called a vote, and at 9:36 AM, the motion to approve the meeting minutes as drafted passed with no dissenting votes.

#### **Announcements**

- Cindi Nannetti, Chair, informed commissioners that the Governor's Office of Youth, Faith and Family (GOYFF) will send a member survey to ensure the most up-to-date contact information.
- **Cindi Nannetti, Chair,** informed the commissioners about a scheduled field trip to Adobe Mountain School and provided details regarding logistics.

# **Compliance Monitor Report**

- Cindi Nannetti, Chair, introduced Madeleine Dorn, the GOYFF Juvenile Justice Compliance Monitor, to
  provide an overview of her role in ensuring Arizona's compliance with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency
  Prevention Act (JJDPA).
- **Madeleine Dorn** began her presentation by playing a video produced for Youth Justice Action Month (YJAM) before sharing the historical background of JJDPA.
  - The JJDPA was passed in 1974 to establish national standards for the juvenile justice system. It
    was most recently <u>reauthorized</u> in 2018 and is currently under consideration for another
    reauthorization process.
  - Facilities that detain juveniles must adhere to the JJDPA.
  - JJDPA helps secure federal funding for Arizona programs that focus on preventing delinquency.
  - The state must meet several core requirements that her role is responsible for monitoring, including the Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO), Jail Removal, and Sight and Sound Separation.
  - The JJDPA mandates that each state have a Designated State Agency (DSA) to oversee its implementation. In Arizona, this agency is the GOYFF but can differ from state to state; for instance, in some states, the DSA is the Department of Child Safety.
  - Additionally, the JJDPA requires each state to establish a State Advisory Group (SAG). Arizona's SAG is the Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission (AJJC), which operates under the authority of Executive Order 2023-20.
- Madeleine Dorn continued by discussing the components of compliance monitoring.
  - o **Identification**: This field identifies lockups, jails, detention centers, correction facilities, and court-holding facilities within Arizona; there are currently over 190.
  - Classification: This involves categorizing facilities into juvenile use, adult use, or both, secure or non-secure, and residential or non-residential.
  - Inspection: Conducted during site visits, with all facilities visited at least once during a three-year grant cycle that aligns with a federal fiscal year (October to September).
  - Data Collection and Verification: This occurs through juvenile reporting logs and violation forms submitted by law enforcement agencies to the DSA.
- Madeleine Dorn discussed best practices and reminders related to the core compliance requirements that she shares with agencies in the field.
  - Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO)
    - **Best Practices**: Place status offenders awaiting pickup in a non-secure area, such as a lobby or office, or report waiting areas in jails and lockups for adults.
    - Reminders: Placing a juvenile in a cell or lockable room (even if the door is open) or cuffing to a stationary object (cuffing bench, ring, rail, eyebolt, etc.) is considered secure. Rule violation occurs when a status offender enters a secure area of a secure facility.

#### Jail Removal

- Best Practices: Record the time each juvenile enters and exits the facility in the Juvenile Log to ensure that their time held does not exceed six hours in jails or adult lockups; timing begins when the juvenile arrives at the facility and ends when they leave the facility permanently.
- **Reminders**: A rule violation occurs 6:01 hours after the juvenile enters the facility. To maintain compliance with the six-hour rule, the juvenile must exit the facility through release or transport before 6:01.
  - A statewide standardized method tracks the time a juvenile is detained in a jail or lockup for adults. A juvenile's detention period begins once logged upon being placed in jail or locked up after an arrest. Once permanently removed from the facility, they log out; this occurs when the juvenile does not return from an area outside the jail or lock up before being transferred or released. If temporarily moved out of the jail or lockup, the entire time spent outside the facility is added to their total time detained.

# Sight and Sound Separation

- **Best Practices**: This applies to all institutions that may detain or confine juveniles, including those charged as adults, delinquents, status offenders, and non-offenders.
- Reminders: This includes any physical, clear, visual, or verbal contact that is not brief or inadvertent.
- **Doug Sargent** thanked **Madeleine Dorn** for her work and mentioned that his agency has a great relationship with the GOYFF.
- Cindi Nannetti, Chair, inquired about Arizona's current compliance status, as she is aware the state faced issues a few years ago.
  - Madeleine Dorn stated that Arizona is performing well and has an effective system. She also noted that a single agency may have multiple violations, which do not necessarily impact overall compliance due to aggregated data.
- Shawn Cox inquired if an annual report had been submitted.
  - Madeleine Dorn confirmed that the GOYFF annually submits a report to the federal agency.
- Maria Dodge inquired whether some jurisdictions experience more frequent violations.
  - Madeleine Dorn confirmed that this is sometimes the case. When she notices these violations, she
    investigates to identify the underlying issues. Often, the agencies are simply short-staffed rather
    than lacking the knowledge of what to do. Nonetheless, she collaborates with them to provide
    support and help minimize violations as much as possible.
- **Jennifer Jermaine** inquired if she works with Tribal law enforcement agencies that have partnerships with local state law enforcement.
  - Madeleine Dorn responded no, as the Tribes fall under federal jurisdiction in this case.
- Jennifer Jermaine inquired about any issues with Title II funding due to the federal freeze.
  - Madeleine Dorn responded that the GOYFF is operating business as usual.
- **Joshua Jaeger** inquired whether she frequently observes any specific violations.
  - Madeleine Dorn stated not really.
- Cindi Nannetti, Chair, expressed her curiosity about how the current personnel shortage will impact future
  operations and whether we can expect more violations.
  - Madeleine Dorn explained that she has noticed a trend where agencies facing staffing shortages prefer to handle juvenile cases directly in the field instead of bringing the individuals to facilities. This approach aligns with Arizona's desire for more direct engagement, regardless of staffing capacity.
- To view the presentation, <u>click here</u>.

#### Title II Program Highlight

• Cindi Nannetti, Chair, introduced Pima County Teen Court (PCTC) to discuss their work in Tucson.

- Joshua Jaeger introduced himself and shared that he has been with PCTC for about four years.
- **Kate Spaulding** introduced herself as the PCTC Manager, adding that she had been with the organization for 24 years. She noted that four Teen Court Bar Association Officers were present, and they introduced themselves, their roles, and how long they had been in the Teen Court.
- Kate Spaulding began the presentation by explaining PCTC's structure, stating that PCTC is not a county
  or court system program but a non-profit organization housed within the <u>YWCA of Southern Arizona</u> that
  partners with the court as a diversion program.
  - 92-95% of youth who come to the Teen Court complete the program and their assigned consequences.
  - What is unique about their structure is that peers take on different roles. The trained youth volunteers act as attorneys, bailiffs, clerks, and jurors.
  - The process includes youth accounting for the behavior that led to their arrest and receiving a constructive consequence to address the harm caused.
- The four Teen Court Bar Association Officers took turns sharing what a day at court looks like for youth.
  - Each family is assigned a specific arrival time and receives a copy of the police report, consent forms, and quizzes related to juvenile law.
  - Upon arrival, the youth undergoes a wellness screening (with parental consent) to assess any substance use or mental health concerns.
  - A teen defense attorney then interviews the defendant and their adult guardian to gather additional information about the case and prepare the defendant for court proceedings.
  - Teen attorneys representing the prosecution and defense present their cases during the hearing, and the defendant takes the stand. The parent or caregiver can make a statement in court on behalf of the defendant. Following this, the jury deliberates and decides on constructive consequences for the defendant.
  - After the hearing, the wellness screener will arrange a follow-up with the youth (if needed). An adult
    volunteer conducts an exit interview, working with the family to schedule all requirements assigned
    by the jury. Families leave the court knowing what steps they must take to comply with Teen Court.
- Kate Spaulding expanded on the wellness screening offered to youth utilizing the <u>Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT) Model</u> and motivational interviewing techniques to encourage changed behavior. They will also make referrals to treatment as needed.
  - Utilize evidence-based practices and strategies to assign constructive consequences. The goals of these consequences are to help the defendant repair the harm they caused, help the defendant understand why we have the laws we do, and help the defendant make better choices in the future.
- The four Teen Court Bar Association Officers took turns discussing the sentencing options for participants in Teen Court.
  - Basic Training: Mandatory sentence for all defendants that discusses family communication.
  - Jury Duty: Every defendant is required to fulfill one or two jury duty assignments, during which
    they must return to serve on the jury for other cases. This experience allows them to observe
    different cases and gain a better understanding of their own mistakes. It can also help them
    internalize necessary changes while contributing to diverse jury members.
  - Letter of Apology: The third mandatory item is that the jury must determine to whom to address the written document.
  - Other sentencing options depend on the type of offense (see sentencing options slide for more details).
- Tracy Darmody inquired about the youth's duration to complete their sentences and whether the
  organization continues to support them after that time has elapsed.
  - Kate Spaulding responded that the youth have 30 days from the court's decision to complete their requirements and that the organization will continue to work with them if the probation officer approves.

- Kate Spaulding continued by discussing the importance of family engagement and the many
  consequences that involve the teen's family, which helps create protective factors. It makes the Teen Court
  process easier to complete because there is buy-in and motivation for the youth to finish, and it allows the
  adult to know what's happening during the process.
- Kate Spaulding stated that the court organizes workshops led by youth facilitators who have completed
  Teen Court for their offenses. These youth work alongside adult trainers to provide valuable instruction. To
  acknowledge their time and experiences, participants receive a \$48 gift card for each workshop they
  complete.
- Joshua Jaeger discussed the impact of Teen Court, sharing statistics from 2023 (see the impact slide for more details).
  - **Shawn Cox** asked about the types of charges the court handles.
    - **Kate Spaulding** explained that they deal with misdemeanors and any felonies permitted by the district attorney.
  - Shawn Cox also inquired whether victims ever serve on the jury.
    - **Kate Spaulding** responded that there is limited interaction with victims; the focus is more on helping youth take responsibility and learn from their actions.
  - o Tracy Darmody asked what happens in cases where victims need restitution.
    - Kate Spaulding clarified that the juvenile court manages the restitution process.
- The four Teen Court Bar Association Officers retook turns sharing information about getting involved with the Teen Court and what the training entails.
  - All funding for PCTC comes from grants and donations; they plan to use financing from the GOYFF
    to expand their services into pre-arrest programs as they understand that any contact with the
    juvenile justice system can harm teens and that formally processing low-level cases often leads to
    worse outcomes.
- Joshua Jaeger mentioned that he is working on a senior capstone project centered on his passion for
  collaborating with and showcasing PCTC's successful practices. With nearly 30 years of experience, PCTC
  has developed effective strategies for teen courts. He aims to create a case study format highlighting their
  successes and methodologies to share with other Arizona teen courts. He aims to help these courts
  enhance their programs and make them more comprehensive.
- Cindi Nannetti, Chair, asked if any individuals have become lawyers.
  - Kate Spaulding replied that many have, and five are currently in law school.
- Cindi Nannetti, Chair, asked if they knew how many teen courts are in Arizona.
  - Kate Spaulding stated that the situation fluctuates, and the <u>AZ Teen Court Association</u> tries to
    monitor it. One of the reasons the PCTC has been sustainable is that it functions as a community
    organization rather than being tied to a specific judge or teacher.
- Earl Newton inquired about the involvement of adults and how PCTC handles specific populations, such as youth experiencing homelessness or those who don't have an adult available. If no adult is available, are youth unable to participate, or does PCTC have adult volunteers to fill in?
  - Kate Spaulding stated that an adult is usually available to support most of the youth referred by probation officers. It is uncommon for no adult to be present, and the relationship with the youth is key, as it can be anyone who has a connection with them. She noted that probation officers could have chosen to exclude certain youth from the program.
- Doug Sargent expressed his gratitude for their efforts and emphasized that everyone working in the
  juvenile justice system believes preventing youth from entering the system is the best approach. He also
  inquired whether they track the success rates of youths who stay out of the system after completing their
  Teen Court sentences.
  - Kate Spaulding noted that each jurisdiction collects data in its own way, complicating tracking
    efforts. The most recent data came from a 2009 survey funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice
    and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), allowing for a good comparison of numbers. The Teen Court
    has demonstrated statistically significant positive outcomes.

- Vada Jo Phelps inquired if PCTC has difficulty recruiting volunteers before asking if they have collaborated with schools to determine if students can receive school credit for volunteering.
  - Kate Spaulding stated there are no issues with the volunteers; many young people are eager to participate in this program. Several nearby school districts have expressed interest. A while ago, one district operated its own Teen Court program in a middle school and offered academic credits to the youth involved. However, no partnership currently provides credits for youth-serving at PCTC. She mentioned that PCTC has volunteer manuals, curriculums, and materials to share with individuals interested in creating a Teen Court.
- Maria Dodge inquired about the annual number of cases.
  - Kate Spaulding noted that 110 cases occurred in 2024; before the marijuana laws changed, the number was over 200.
- To view the presentation, <u>click here</u>.

#### **Title II Program Highlight**

- Cindi Nannetti, Chair, introduced Martha DePriest and Jocelyn Bogar from <u>Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central Arizona (BBBSAZ)</u> to discuss their new program, *Embedded in School Mentoring*.
- Martha DePriest began the presentation by discussing the history of BBBSAZ, which has been operating in the valley for over 60 years. In 2024, the organization served 1,300 youth in Maricopa and Pinal counties. It provides programs for youth aged 6 to 18 in both community-based and site-based settings.
- Martha DePriest discussed the Embedded in School Mentoring program.
  - Partnership with the <u>Arizona State University (ASU) Mary Lou Fulton College for Teaching and</u> Learning Innovation and Mesa Public Schools (MSP).
  - Launched at Whittier Elementary School in Mesa as one of eight national locations participating in the Atlanta-originated initiative.
  - Arizona follows the model established in Atlanta, having Atlanta mentor Arizona as it implements the program that provides 4th and 5th graders with tailored programming specific to the site's needs and collaborates with the school to support these youth best.
- Joshua Jaeger asked if the organization knew how many staff members would be needed at a school to implement similar programming.
  - Jocelyn Bogar responded that it would depend on the school's size. Three people are serving 25 youth, but they want to reach 100.
- Martha DePriest shared that their target service area is Mesa, specifically in the 85201 zip code, as their
  research indicated higher levels of poverty, a disproportionate number of incarcerations among people of
  color, and elevated crime rates when compared to a similar school located just a few miles away.
- Martha DePriest discussed the program design and outcomes.
  - Two lead mentors from ASU provide weekly instruction in group and one-on-one settings. They
    collaborate with the school counselor and family specialist to co-plan their efforts. Each mentor
    manages a caseload of 20 to 30 students.
  - Their evidence-based curriculum helps students develop resilience, reduce risky behaviors, foster cohesion within families and schools, handle peer pressure, improve academic success, and cultivate a sense of belonging.
- Tracy Darmody asked how frequently mentors meet with students.
  - Jocelyn Bogar stated that mentors work with students during the school day and weekly. The
    organization interviews each child before placement to determine whether the student would
    benefit more from individual support or a group setting.
- Earl Newton asked how Whittier was selected and how the organization chose the students they mentored.
  - Jocelyn Bogar explained that Whittier was selected based on an existing relationship with MPS.
     BBBSAZ inquired about areas with lower academic performance, higher rates of parent incarceration, and homelessness, and MPS noted a significant amount of crime in that region.
  - Jocelyn Bogar added that the organization collaborates with the principal to select students. They identified that the youth who struggled most following COVID-19 were primarily in the 4th and 5th

grades. The program serves the entire 4th and 5th-grade population, and now that they are on campus, the 6th-grade teachers are also showing interest. The goal is to continue expanding the program to support these students as they transition into middle school.

- Tracy Darmody mentioned being a former Big before inquiring about how the organization provides consistency and longevity for youth mentors.
  - Jocelyn Bogar stated they are still developing that piece since it is new. Because they are
    collaborating with ASU, they understand that circumstances can change from semester to
    semester. With that, volunteers commit for at least one semester, but they may seek help outside of
    college to ensure greater longevity.
- To view the presentation, <u>click here</u>.

## **Commissioner Updates**

• Cindi Nannetti, Chair, asked if the Commissioners had any updates to share. No members had updates to provide.

## **Upcoming Meeting**

• Cindi Nannetti, Chair, reminded members that the next meeting will be on May 1, 2025, at 9:30 AM.

#### Adjournment

- Cindi Nannetti, Chair, thanked everyone for being part of the meeting and asked for a motion to adjourn.
  - Vada Jo Phelps moved to adjourn.
  - Shawn Cox seconded the motion.
- Cindi Nannetti, Chair, asked if any further discussion was needed.
- With no other discussion, **Cindi Nannetti, Chair,** called for a vote, and at **11:05 AM**, the motion to adjourn the meeting passed with no dissenting votes.

Dated February 7, 2025, Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission Respectfully Submitted By: Shayne Johnson GOYFF