

AZSOMB Juvenile Guidelines and Standards Subcommittee Meeting-20260730.UTC-Meeting Recording

July 30, 2026,

AI-generated content may be incorrect

JM Jenna Mitchell 2:24
Judge Young, can you hear me?

YA Young, Anna 2:28
Yep, I can hear you fine. Can you hear me okay?

JM Jenna Mitchell 2:30
Now I can. You couldn't hear me before now.

YA Young, Anna 2:32
No, not till now.

JM Jenna Mitchell 2:33
Okay. Okay. Did you hear Chairman Naegele start the meeting?

YA Young, Anna 2:38
Nope, I didn't hear anything until you just spoke, so.

JM Jenna Mitchell 2:41
Okay, we will try again.

YA Young, Anna 2:43
Okay.

JM Jenna Mitchell 2:45
Round 2. My name is Scott Naegele. I am the Chair of the Juvenile Subcommittee of the Arizona Sex Offender Management Board. I need to call the meeting to order and ask for a roll call.
Thank you, Chairman Naegele. The date is July 30th 2026 and the time is now 1:33.
Chairman Naegele is present. Mr. Barney.

B Blake 3:05
Present.

JM Jenna Mitchell 3:06
Mr. Galarneau.

Present

JM Jenna Mitchell
Miss Opheim is not present. Doctor Rivera.
Dr. Rivera, are you there?

CD Clinical Director 3:31
I'm here, sorry.

JM Jenna Mitchell 3:33
Thank you. And then Judge Young.

YA Young, Anna 3:36
I'm here, thank you.

JM Jenna Mitchell 3:38
Thank you. We do have a quorum, Chairman.

Very good. I guess I want to turn the discussion to the matters on the agenda on under board old business. Perhaps I ask for some input regarding matter number one, which is discussion and potential adoption of the Juvenile guiding principles.

I'm not entirely sure where we're at. We had had a long discussion about this and some changes were made. So if somebody could help trigger my brain as to where we enter this discussion and proceed so that they perhaps take a vote today and decide whether they can adopt them as they currently exist.

YA Young, Anna 4:24
Chairman Naegele, this is this is Judge Young. I can give you an update.

Okay, can I make judge on just one second? Can I ask if we try to turn the volume up just a little bit for us to be able to hear you? Like it vaguely hears you, but I want to make sure I don't miss anything.

YA Young, Anna 4:30

Up.
Okay.

JM Jenna Mitchell 4:46
Okay. All right, try that, Judge Young.

YA Young, Anna 4:49
Okay, is that better?

It is

YA Young, Anna 4:52
Okay, perfect. All right. So the draft principles with the red line was generated after Joe Kelroy and I sent out a joint e-mail to all of the presiding juvenile judges in Arizona, so all 15 counties. And then we also sent those draft principles

YA Young, Anna 5:12
to the directors of juvenile court. So that's probation chiefs basically around the state. And so we collected a bunch of feedback. And then this red line version is the latest, greatest draft that I've seen to my knowledge.

So, this includes the most recent changes to any.

YA Young, Anna 5:33
Yes, I looked through it and I compared it to what I had in my e-mail and I didn't see. I it appeared to me that it had all the changes in it.

I haven't had an opportunity to compare its line to line with the previous version, so I don't know that I exactly know where additional changes may be made. Are you in a position that you could perhaps share that with the group?

YA Young, Anna 6:00
Sorry, you're a little fuzzy. I'm having a hard time making out what you're saying.

Thank you.

I was saying that I haven't had a chance to compare this most recent draft with the way it was when we had a prior discussion about this and I'm wondering if you might call us to attention to where there were changes made and allow for discussion there.

YA Young, Anna 6:19

I can't do that specifically because I don't have a variety of the red line versions. I have this one and then...
I.

YA Young, Anna 6:28

To my knowledge, I didn't think anybody had made any additional changes since we'd looked at it last after the group had given feedback.

But that's why I was trying to get my brain around this application. I have to be honest with you, this process of throwing lines through things and getting knowledge and stuff is a foreign language to me, and it makes it very difficult for me to track that. So I just want to make sure that there's something different than the last time we all had a discussion about this.

Yeah, we return to that and talk about that until we proceed with perhaps taking a vote.

YA Young, Anna 7:06

Maybe staff in the room could elaborate on that.

JM Jenna Mitchell 7:06

Mr. Chairman. Yeah. Thank you, Judge. Yes. Mr. Chairman, we, the department did take, staff did take the changes and sent those out in an e-mail that took the original draft that was approved by the board and put the changes using track changes in Word, which underlines new language to the document, and it strikes through language that's being proposed to be deleted. So that is what you're looking at. It has the changes that Judge Young referenced. No other changes were made to the document. The draft document we have.

Correction, I will tell you we did make a few non-substantive changes that you had requested.

Like, for example, if we had changed

If it was proposed to change the language to sexually abusive behavior instead of sexual offenses, and that wasn't done consistently throughout, we did apply those changes. They were non-substantive.

Perfect. That's part of what I was trying to make sure that what we're sitting in front of us is inclusive of all of the different kinds of changes that you talked about in the last week.

It seems to me, and I guess I'm saying this out loud so that people can chime in, but it seems to me that we've pretty adequately vetted what's sitting in front of us, and that we've asked for input from all the cognitive parties around the state. And I guess my question is, do we need to have more discussion about this or

And can I ask for a motion to vote on whether or not we adopt these guidelines as they presently exist?

JM Jenna Mitchell

And Mr. Chairman, for the record, I would just like to reflect that Ms. Opheim is present. Thank you.

Judge Young, anything that you feel important to add before may I ask for a motion to take a vote? Let's see.

YA Young, Anna 9:15

Not that I can think of, but it looks like Blake's got his hand up.

And thank you for that. Blake.

B Blake 9:22

So I just want to say that reading through this, it seems like aside from a couple of maybe partial paragraphs that were added, it's very similar to the original. It's just rewording, kind of like a wordsmithing of it, which may be better for the court process, recognizing more of the court involvement in all of this. But it does seem like for the most part, it's, you know, kind of the same bones of what we had originally. So I don't know that it's necessarily that different. It's just worded.

Maybe more.

methodically for the purpose of the court process of all this. So maybe I've misinterpreted it that way and there's significant changes, but for me, that was what I noticed. So I just wanted to throw that out there.

Yeah, I appreciate that, Blake. I mean, that's my observation as well. I don't know that there is, you know, anything particularly substantive that was taken out or put in. I think we tried and it seems that the effort was to try to language this in a way that's forward fending. and inclusive of language and terminology that we've all recognized this appropriately as we work with juveniles. And I agree with what you're saying.

YA **Young, Anna** 10:56
Now that I said that, I see a typo on the screen. It says decision making and there's no G at the end of making.

JM **Jenna Mitchell** 10:56
Okay.
Yeah.

YA **Young, Anna** 11:06
I've looked at this several times and that just jumped out at me because it's not my own screen I guess. So if we...

YA **Young, Anna** 11:13
If we could just put a G on the end of making, it's in the red under paragraph 8. It's that perfect. Yeah.

JM **Jenna Mitchell** 11:21
Yeah.

B **Blake** 11:22
Third line down. Yep. I saw it immediately too, Judge Young. And I didn't say anything about it, but I saw it immediately and went, oh, Making, okay.

YA **Young, Anna** 11:33
Yeah.
We're making decisions some.

B **Blake** 11:36
Yep.

YA **Young, Anna** 11:39
Alright, well, I'd like...

With that in mind, go ahead.

YA **Young, Anna** 11:41

I'd make the motion, Chairman Naegele, to adopt the guiding principles as revised in this redline version.

OK, can I ask for a second so that we can take it?

All in favor, please say aye. Aye.

YA **Young, Anna** 12:01
Aye.

CD **Clinical Director** 12:02
Aye.

B **Blake** 12:02
Aye.

Okay.

And anyone wanted to oppose.

Anyone abstaining?

It seems like the Ayes have it. We want to go forward with a clean copy of this for everybody needs to review prior to the larger board meeting in the next month and allow for discussion in that forum. And depending on when that discussion holds or if everybody's comfortable. with where we're at, perhaps take a vote in that meeting to adopt these valuable principles that are relation to juveniles here in Arizona.

Alright, thank you for that.

On the second item on the agenda is discussion and framework and format for psychosexually evaluating reports.

I guess I want to ask the question. I guess perhaps it's similar to the to ensuring that to the extent we vetted the guidelines process that we what we can do. We feel like we have the input of everybody that we need from around the state in terms of gathering information about

the individual pieces of testing that everybody's using to be psychosexual for juveniles. And we feel like we have that aggregate at this point and present in our little bridge with stuff which then created.

That's a question on this for everybody.

YA **Young, Anna** 13:36
Chairman, Naegele, if I may.

Yes, ma'am.

YA Young, Anna 13:39

Sure, Anna Young. So what I did on this one is in follow up to our last meeting is I sent out the query again to all of the presiding juvenile judges around the state, as well as the directors of juvenile court probation chiefs.

YA Young, Anna 13:58

And I had them go through the beautiful spreadsheet that Ashlesha did in Excel that originally we only had feedback from Yuma, Yavapai, Mojave, and now I believe in Maricopa maybe the first go around. And so what we did was we sent this spreadsheet. Well, I sent this spreadsheet.

to all of the counties, including the ones who had already responded. And I said, please take a look at this Excel spreadsheet. Let me know if there are any changes for your column, any additions, any additional assessments. Some counties like Coconino came back with a couple other assessments that we added on. And I've heard back from all of the counties except for four.

And they were Graham County.

JM Jenna Mitchell 14:42

Yeah.

YA Young, Anna 14:47

La Paz. I was trying to get information from Santa Cruz. I had an e-mail exchange going with them and I cannot for the life of me remember which one is the 15th county.

But La Paz County, they lost their judge earlier this year. He passed away. And so I don't think the judge who's filling in really has probably even seen a psychosexual because it's such a small jurisdiction. And the other jurisdictions that I didn't hear back from, I even had Joe Kellroy follow up with all of the juvenile directors.

JM Jenna Mitchell 15:04

Yeah.

YA Young, Anna 15:20

after my follow up e-mail, just to see if we could get feedback from the last four counties. And at this point, I think that we've heard back from everyone that we're going to hear back from. And so this is a comprehensive Excel spreadsheet of all of the different evaluations that

the counties are receiving in juvenile psychosexuals. If you look at the Coconino column, there are some things towards the bottom of the page that we're looking at right now, like the PTSD symptom scale and things like that. Some of those I think we see on regular psychological evaluations, not necessarily in the psychosexual. So I just wanted to put that in as a caveat. But yeah, I think from the court perspective, we've heard from everyone that we're going to hear from.

Yeah, it sounds like that. That's really one of what I was trying to find out is like if my recollection was is that you were going to try to do exactly what you just described and that was have people weigh in for a second time until we decide kind of what what what direction or what step to take next. It also sounds like I don't want to speak for you, but it sounds like you're saying there might be some things in here that people have put forward that are actually part of standard psychological evaluations that are not really part of psychosexuals. Is that is that fair statement?

YA **Young, Anna** 16:38
That is a fair statement, yes.

But, you know, I want to think, I mean, I was thinking about what the next step was, and I don't think we're in a position where we can, we can put forward, take any kind of voting about, you know, what we all believe needs to be part of the protocol if you went for the psychosexual. But I think the next step is to ask the question of whether or not, with respect to the domains that we have currently listed here, if people feel comfortable with those domain names. And then thereafter begin to perhaps weed out and remove some things from each of those domain names that really are not germane, from my perspective, to the task at the end. And then to talk about some things that we absolutely see as, you know, non-negotiables that have to be part of the process. I mean, so I throw that out and ask for people to weigh in on that.

B **Blake** 17:46
So Chairman Naegele, this is Blake Barney. I don't know if it would make it easier for, you know, us to kind of narrow things down here. So just looking at all the check marks, I kind of get lost in it. But if it was possible to see like, 80% of the counties responded with this assessment, and we just identify all the ones that, you know, at least 80% of the counties are doing this particular assessment. And then maybe

we would identify some other ones that we feel like, you know, should be definitely in the psychosexual evaluation that are maybe only used in two or three counties. But if we can identify the ones that are being used for the most part across the board in these counties, I think that helps us understand The... Main ones that are being used throughout the state.

Like this, this is Scott responding to what you're saying. I think I think your suggestion about how to go about doing that is a sound one, but as I look at, as I look at this check mark grid, it appears to me that it's more like bird shop than it is anything consolidating around. Real clear things, so I, I, I don't really know what the answer is. With how to proceed.

B

Blake 19:13

So, yeah, so I'm with you on that. Like the one that stands out to me based off of what's on the screen would be the WRAT, the WRAT 5. So it looks like everybody except for maybe Pinal County has used that. So that would be at least 80% of the responding counties. right? Another one would be the J-SOAP. Looks like that would be one that most of them are using. And the MACI. So that's what I mean is just kind of identifying ones that have the most counties.

with a check mark, because that gives us somewhat of a starting point for these are the ones that are already being utilized by almost all the counties. So let's maintain those. And then if there's other ones that we decide as a group, hey, these should also be in there, even though only two or three counties are using it.

It is incredibly useful as a tool for assessment. Let's, you know, put this in there as well.

YA

Young, Anna 20:26

And Chairman Naegele.

JM

Jenna Mitchell 20:27

Yes, ma'am.

YA

Young, Anna 20:29

My understanding too is that the AOC contract that pays for the vast majority, if not all of these psychosexual evaluations, it has categories. And basically the practitioner is allowed to pick like one test from the category, one assessment from the category.

Okay.

Yeah.

YA Young, Anna 20:48

It might be useful for us to hear from the administrative office of the courts, from that division that does the contracts for the providers, for the psychosexual evaluations. Maybe if we could get them on the agenda for the next meeting, they could explain to us that framework that they give the providers.

Sure, that would be great. And ask for some historical information about how that came to be and why whatever they share with us is part of that. That makes sense to me.

YA Young, Anna 21:22

Okay, yeah, maybe if we can put them on the agenda then for the next time, we can ask them to be there.

JM Jenna Mitchell 21:24

Mr. Chairman, Jenna Mitchell, with DPS, we have requested the presentation from AOC regarding their procurement and contract process. I think that's one piece of that is what you're talking about. And they were preparing that to present at our October 22nd meeting.

YA Young, Anna 21:44

Perfect.

Can I also ask that?

Those that are part of this subcommittee really take a hard and fast look at This lengthy list of things.

Try to identify.

the essential pieces from their perspective and reasons why, so that we can use some of that thought process to guide where we're going here. I mean, I envision this truly, given how lengthy this list is and how scattered it is,

that in the end, we perhaps eliminate 50% or more of what's on here and try to distill this down to the essential pieces and what those essential pieces bring to the equation of us Comprehensively assessing risk in the.

And if we do this right, I think, we will put forward a protocol that I think informs us to the greatest extent possible in a semi-standardized way, no matter where these evaluations are getting done across the state. Am I making sense?

Yeah.

YA Young, Anna 23:08
Yes.

Thank you.

B Blake 23:10
Yeah, I think so.
So, Chairman Naegele.

I mean, I have to go ahead. I'm sorry.

B Blake 23:18
Is it okay for me to request that staff, Ashlesha, so or whoever, just highlight the assessments that do have at least 80% of the county so we can clearly see that for our next meeting and we can identify or even before then.
and identify the ones that seem to be, you know, for the most part across the board being used, just so that visually it's a little bit easier.

Yep.

Yes, asked and already responded, and they will take care of that, yes.

B Blake 23:52
Okay, awesome.

Yep, yep. I don't know where it was that I saw it in the journey that we've been on with respect to trying to identify categories and instruments for the psychosexually, but somewhere I recall, I mean, somebody knows where it's at. I mean, Appreciatively telling me what it was. I don't want to ask some questions about it, but somewhere somebody said something about the ERASOR and made the statement that it's being invalid. I don't know where I saw that, and I don't know what document that was, but if anybody can comment on that, I'd like to hear what that means of that.
And then say some more about that.

YA Young, Anna 24:38
That was feedback that we got from the AOC.

It makes a solution.

Where did the AOC get that?

YA Young, Anna 24:43

I don't remember and had to have to go through a lot of emails to find it. I can't remember what they said. Maybe we could just ask them to add that to their presentation.

Okay.

That would be fine. I mean, if I may, only because we're talking about it, I want to just comment on that. Because I have a because I think I think that that statement may have been erroneously arrived at, and I'll tell you why. Doctor Jim Worling and an associate of these.

YA Young, Anna 24:54

Okay.

are the ones that created the ERASOR and did a revision of the ERASOR at some point in time. And has been here in Arizona at the request of Arizona ATSA to do presentations for us more than one time. In his last presentation, when he came to teach everyone about his new protective and risk factors instrument called PROFESOR. He someone asked someone in the audience asked the question, but does that mean we shouldn't use the ERASOR anymore? And Dr. Worling's response was, well, I'm not telling you if you should or he shouldn't. I'm telling you that I probably won't.

use it anymore, because I think it makes more sense to use the PROFESOR in moving forward. So I don't, I mean, I don't know if that's the basis for where this is not valid anymore comes from or not, but I would say that if that's the basis for it, that's not actually what transpired. And if that's true with respect to the eraser, then frankly, that would be true for JSOAP as well. And I am an advocate of not throwing either one of them out. I am an advocate for frankly, keeping them both in and also using the PROFESOR.

Because I think that the JSOAP and the ERASOR, even though we need to be careful and not call them actuarial risk assessment scales, or that they have good psychometric properties about predicting risk, but the items in each of those instruments are are really good markers for the kinds of things that we need to identify and work on and treat with our clients. Some of those things will be present for some clients and some of them won't be for other clients. But from my perspective, I think that knowing those domains and knowing the answers of whether or not those things are present as identified by those variables, both on the ERASOR and the

JSOAP, helps us inform us about what we do and don't need to work on with individual kid.

So

I feel like I'm rambling, but I wanted to put that all out and I guess get anybody who responds to their thoughts about that as well.

YA Young, Anna 28:03

Yeah, I think we can certainly ask the AOC during their presentation to talk about the issue regarding the ERASOR and how they've

YA Young, Anna 28:12

how they've divided up the different categories of assessments as far as what's included in the psychosexuals.

Right, don't need.

I guess I want to ask the question out loud just to be sure, and the questions for me, I want to do my best to answer them, but is what I'm saying, does that make sense? I mean, is that digestible?

YA Young, Anna 28:44

I hear what you're saying. I think I just need more information.

Yeah.

Sounds good.

YA Young, Anna 28:49

Yeah.

Mr. Galarneau was saying to me, perhaps I can talk a little bit about, I mean, I guess I would really say this. If you haven't already, please take the time to familiarize yourself with the items that are on both the JSOAP and the ERASOR. And there is some overlap, but there's not 100% overlap between the two of them.

But both of those scales came into existence because of research across the last 25 years and a professional consensus about things that we thought were risk factors or potential treatment interventions. And that's how those scales came about.

Now, part of the reason that they stopped being used or appropriately so, I would say, to predict risk is they never were actuarial risk assessment scales. They were empirically guided risk assessment scales based on either the existing research at the time they were created or professional consensus about the issues that were important for working with humans with these issues.

So I think perhaps part of the issue is that...

People want to take these scales and the PROFESOR as well, frankly, and they want to they want to turn them into, you know, highly instruments that are highly predictive of who's going to re-offend and who's not going to re-offend. And we've been cautioned by the creators of all of those instruments to not do that.

and that any ratings that we derive from any of those instruments should be time limited, and that we should revisit them at a minimum every six months and restore to go on. But

It's my belief that continuing to use them as long as we clearly state what we're using them for and the limitations and advantages of them.

that we can use these instruments, all three of them, to help us guide whether or not we're making progress.

And in our attempts to do treatment with clients and everything. That's where I'm going to.

Blake 31:15

B

So, Scott, my thoughts on that this is Blake Barney. My thoughts on that, Scott, is, as long as we are not narrowing this down to one assessment only, we are giving the opportunity for, you know, more than one assessment to be used. And to Judge Young's point, if

Jenna Mitchell 31:16

JM

I need.

Thank you.

See.

Blake 31:35

B

We can get an understanding from AOC on how they determine, you know, what. goes into a psychosexual or what they will cover the cost of. I think that's going to help. But yes, each one of them has its benefit and drawbacks. So not narrowing it down to you can only use this, I think eliminates a lot of the concerns of

Blake 32:01

B

downfalls or shortcomings of a particular assessment because we're giving freedom of choice to the person who's doing the assessment.

Right. And I don't want us to narrow it down to only using one. That's not at all what I'm saying. I am, but I am also saying if under this list of assessment of risk and protective factors, we have any scales or instruments under that space that we think We shouldn't be using, we should be having that discussion too. Like for example, item number two, Juvenile Sex Offender Recidivism Risk Assessment Tool, the JSORRATT 2. I don't, I can't make an argument why I think that's the one that we should, we should use, we should leave on the list. I think there's a balance that's going to need to be struck, at least in my view, about how much flexibility we allow and how much we are prescriptive. I don't want to be so prescriptive that individual evaluators can't bring what they believe is important to the equation, but I don't want this to be left with this laundry list of three pages that we're looking at, because I think that undermines our ability to do this in a systematic way.

B

Blake 33:23

I don't disagree with you. I think that's accurate. And I wasn't saying that you were trying to say narrow it down to one. I'm just saying I think that eliminates some of the concern is that we still have options there, but specific to the assessment of risk and protective factors, you know, four or potentially 3, that we have on there. And then these other ones we look at, you know, absolutely no county is using it, then we can just remove that from the list unless we think it's, you know, absolutely necessary to do so.

Yeah, and and the other thing, Blake, um, that I mean...

There may be, I mean, each of these categories.

where certain measures are under each one of these categories.

We've kind of already said this by virtue of looking at what really doesn't need to be on this list. But I want to provide enough structure that we get, that we're getting some measure of the same kind of data, no matter who's doing the evaluation and where it's being done around the state. That's

That's really all I'm trying to make a case for.

So, I mean, I would just simply ask people to look at this laundry list and really just kind of make a decision from your own perspectives about what doesn't need to be on this list, because it's going to help us narrow and focus this discussion a great deal. And let's remember that these are not psychological, we're not

We're charged with doing a psychosexual evaluation, and we could have a long philosophical debate about what is a psychosexual evaluation, but these are not standard psychological evaluations. So if there are things that are part of this that people are doing that really don't need to be part of this, because that's not the task at hand, then we should make

recommendations that they just not be part of this list.
Comments, thoughts?

YA Young, Anna 35:51

This is Anna Young. I think that makes sense.

I'll be really interested to see if the AOC has like some stats over, you know, what they're seeing as far as when they are, you know, doing these contracts with the individuals who are doing the psychosexual evaluations. I don't necessarily think that we're seeing inconsistency across the state based on my review and my conversations that I've had with the other presiding judges.

I think just some of the evaluators, you know, when they're looking at the options of, you know, for instance, which test they want to do, which assessment they want to do for, you know, risk and protective factors, some of them are choosing one over the other. And so I don't necessarily see that we're seeing inconsistencies. So.

Okay.

Except for the grid might suggest otherwise. I mean, I don't know if inconsistencies is the word, but differences and disparities, I don't know what the right language is.

YA Young, Anna 36:50

It's one of those things, though. I mean, obviously, we want, you know, kids to have their cognitive, intellectual, you know, and mental status, you know, evaluated. And so I'm fine with the evaluators making the decision, you know, for themselves, which test they want to give to a particular young person.

Yeah, as far as IQ.

YA Young, Anna 37:07

So I think that goes to what Blake was saying about like, you know, having people having like three or four choices in a different area of assessment.

Right. And the reality is, is even though we've attempted to lump these measurements under categories, some of them fit under these categories cleaner and more appropriately than others do. You know, we've had no discussion about, you know, whether or not those are actually measures of what that category says it is.

So, I mean...

You know, I'd like people to think about, you know, you know, what are the non-negotiables? From my perspective, I think we need an intellectual assessment, just like you just said, Judge Young. We need a measure of personality assessment. We need some measure of psychosexual functioning, whether that's, you know, an MSI, a MDSA, or... a multitude of other questionnaires. I think we need a measurement of sexual interests, whether that's the ABLE assessment for sexual interest or the LOOK assessment. That needs to be part of this. And somewhere in here, at least a discussion needs to take place about polygraph testing with respect to history and stuff. So I guess I ask everybody on this subcommittee just to look closely at this list, scrutinize it.

Get out your highlighter, draw lines through things that you think really don't need to be part of this, and let's, you know, come back and gather information from the AOC and further this discussion.

Is there anything else we should talk about before we move on from this agenda item?

YA Young, Anna 39:01

If I get any other feedback from any of the four straggler counties, I'll go ahead and I'll update Jenna or Ashlesha so that way for the next meeting we've got the latest, greatest information.

Sounds great. Thank you for that.

YA Young, Anna 39:15

You're very welcome.

All right, moving on to next item, discussion and review of DCS response to query raised in the April 16th, 2026 juvenile subcommittee meeting. What was the query?

The numbers question, right? Is that what we were trying to determine? How many kids are duly adjudicated? Of the kids that are in the DCS system who present with these issues, how many of them are adjudicated, delinquent, as well as being wards of the state? That was part of the question, right?

YA Young, Anna 40:00

I think the real question was how many kids are dependent that aren't delinquent? Because we know the delinquency numbers for the state, and we can tell the delinquency and the dependency numbers from our state data. It's the kids who are only dependent who might have sexually maladaptive behaviors.

Those are the kids that we don't have identified. And I think that's what DCS was getting to in this.

Yeah, do you see an answer to that question in this document that was forwarded to the committee? I don't. I guess I should say that.

YA **Young, Anna** 40:34

And this is Anna young, I don't see an answer, but I'm not surprised because I don't think that that's any metric that they're set up to measure.

Um...

I think that, you know, on the juvenile justice center, on the juvenile justice side, we are set up because we have, you know, our Jolt system where we can track dually adjudicated kids. And we've done, you know, a lot of work, starting years ago with Georgetown University to identify dually adjudicated kids.

It.

YA **Young, Anna** 41:03

And so we're able from the juvenile justice side, but from the dependency side, there's nothing in our data system from the court side where I can identify in my data system that I've got a kid who's dependent who has sexually maladaptive behaviors if they're not juvenile justice involved, if that makes sense. And I think that's what this e-mail says from DCS. They have the same issue.

Yeah.

Yeah, so I guess I posed the question.

I don't mean to ask and answer it in the same sentence, but does it make sense to recommend that they begin to try to figure out how to do that?

Melony Opheim, they do respond saying that they do not have the ability to verify. And 2 different questions or two different answers, they say, we do not have the ability to reliably pull data. We do not have the ability to verify whether a child has these issues. They do finally say at the end, DCS has between 40 and 50 beds licensed to care for children. They do finally say at the end, DCS has between 40 and 50 beds licensed to care for children. you know, children in the DCS that determined to fit the SMB criteria.

But it gives a pretty lengthy, I mean, the four responses were very, we can't do that, so I'm not sure if you're suggesting that.

And I&I appreciate that and I&I read that and understood that too. I guess I'm simply

asking out loud.

Is there not a way?

to structure oneself.

to be able to track that kind of information so that we have increased clarity about that.

I'm just posing a question out loud.

I mean.

B Blake 42:38

So, Scott, I think that I think that the answer to that question is kind of built into this, which is into their response, which is only some of the...

places have access to the JAX system. It's not statewide. And so it would probably require a system that is accessible for any of the juveniles in the system.

Yeah.

B Blake 43:05

And that would have to be a statewide system that everybody has access to. So that would probably be the tracking mechanism to do so. Whether that's possible or not, I don't know for sure, but Judge Young, you're shaking your head, so I'll have you explain why it's not.

YA Young, Anna 43:20

Yeah.

So JAX is a Maricopa only system. The rest of the 14 counties, we use JOLTS. And so JOLTS AZ is the statewide data tracking system that tracks kids who are dependent and kids who are delinquent. And so all delinquency kids, they have like a statewide identifier number basically that's in there.

And so that way, if they have charges in another county, you can track across all 14 counties their involvement in the juvenile justice system, as well as the dependency system. And JAX's.

Their data, I believe, feeds into AJAX now. The problem is the kids who don't have the juvenile justice involvement. And even having JAX and involvement, you know, and accessibility statewide, wouldn't solve the problem of the dependent kids who have sexually maladaptive behaviors.

YA Young, Anna 44:18

who don't have a delinquency charge. Because really, the only way to track that would be through DCS's internal system. I think that's the only way DCS would ever be able to give us a number about how many of the dependent kids have sexually maladaptive behaviors, if that

was a way to track that in Guardian, which is their data management system.
And I don't believe that Guardian has any way of tracking that in there.
If that makes sense.

So, so really, yeah, that makes total sense. So, what I really hear being said is, we don't have an existing way to do this because the systems don't, the tracking systems are not being used universally and they don't line up across the board. But, but I, but I asked the question,

Is there a reason why?

The folks at DCS.

Shouldn't figure out a way.

to track the number of kids that are not adjudicated, but present with these issues so that we as a system know how to structure ourselves

in terms of the level of treatment services that are needed, and in going back to our discussion about assessment and such, it doesn't matter what system these kids sit in, from my perspective, it's a matter of have we appropriately assessed them?

And are we appropriately intervening with?

their needs, their risk, their risk issues and their treatment needs. So I just, so yeah, I mean, I read this really clearly. We can't do it because of the way we're structured at this point in time. Asking a different question. So can we structure ourselves in a different way? That's what I'm asking the question of. And perhaps nobody in this mix has the answer to that.

And I would ask why we wouldn't want to do that.

Judge, can I ask maybe a naive question, but can we do some reverse math? If the AOC and the Justice Department, justice system knows how many of their delinquent youth are also dependent, I mean, we can do a little bit of the subtraction from the 40-50 they have in the DCS system.

So, that's not, but do you know, have your number?

It does say 40 or 50 beds.

That's not kids though, that's beds.

YA **Young, Anna** 46:42
Mel can get Mel can you?

Okay, they're pretty full. Well, I guess. I mean, I guess they don't give us an accurate number of what they have, but I'm just saying if we knew at least like you guys have 25, you know, I don't know, because I mean, I know you guys have more data than they do, but yeah, it just sounds like the two systems aren't talking and why not in Guardian have a box that says, is

this child on probation?

you know, or for what, or is this an adjudicated kid? It just seems like, yeah, we should be able to just add a little bit more information to their systems so that it can be tracked and we can have data.

YA Young, Anna 47:17

Yeah, I mean, we can track it from our side. Certainly, if a kid is dependent and they have a delinquency charge related to sexually maladaptive behavior, yeah, I mean, Joe Kelroy's division, they can totally run those numbers. But where these kids are that are dependent but not adjudicated delinquent, and maybe they've never even been charged with something involving sexually maladaptive behavior,

Right.

YA Young, Anna 47:39

Those are the kids that we're losing in all of this, because those are the kids that we can't measure.

I agree. But if they told us they had, for example, 100 kids and you knew that 20 of them were on probation, I would know that 80 of them are not. You know, I'm just trying to get my math somehow by knowing your numbers and what their actual numbers were, which we do not have. But it just seems like somehow we'd still be able to come up with a semi estimate of how many kids are not adjudicated.

Depending on how many they have and then how many of them are yours.

YA Young, Anna 48:09

You mean how many kids are dependent that, so hang on, Mel, let me ask a couple questions if I can to just drill this down what you're asking. So certainly we could tell you how many dependent kids are in the state and we can tell you how many delinquent kids are in the state. We can tell you how many crossover kids are in the state. And so we could tell you how many dependent kids

It's a it's a fact.

YA Young, Anna 48:28

are also delinquent, but we can't tell you how many dependent kids have sexually maladaptive behaviors who are not juvenile justice involved.

Right.

I understand, but if they had an accurate number and we knew your number, we can deduce what the remainder is. Does that make sense? Or am I not explaining it very?

YA Young, Anna 48:40

Yeah.

Yeah, I mean, if they, if they knew how many kids, and yeah...

I mean, it's not the concrete way to do it, but it just seems like whatever you guys have, and then if they have a total of this number, we know the rest are not accounted for in the juvenile justice system and are only dependent.

YA Young, Anna 49:01

Right, but just to play devil's advocate, if you've got a dependent child, how do you decide whether or not they have sexually maladaptive behaviors if they've never had juvenile justice involvement? Like, let's say there's never been a police report. How does DCS determine that those kids have sexually maladaptive behaviors?

That's a great question. One I've been asking, but they have DCS SMB homes and QRTPs where they place them. So that's a bigger question. And we did ask that. What causes you to place in your three different homes? How do you guys come up with who belongs in which home? So that's a question for them. But absolutely, if it's never had a charge, never been to the justice system,

YA Young, Anna 49:17

If they're only dependent, yeah.

What makes you put a kid as a high risk in an SMB home as opposed to just a regular GMH congregate care? That's an excellent question, but we've been asking that too. But if they're putting him in an SMB home, I would assume they know they have SMB issues.
It.

YA Young, Anna 49:51

Well, maybe the way to do it is to reframe the question to them. Maybe our question is to the Department of Child Safety is, how many children do you in fact have placed in your SMB

group homes? And out of those children in those SMB group homes, how many are on probation?

I think they might say they don't know, but I agree we should ask.

YA Young, Anna 50:14

Yeah, I mean, they'll know how many kids are in their group homes for SMB. That they will know because those beds are what the beds are. And they do know which kids are on probation.

The probation part, correct.

Yeah.

Then I'm not sure how we don't have a better answer of SMB kids in SMB homes and how many of them on probation and how many of them are not. It seems like we should be able to come up with some numbers.

YA Young, Anna 50:38

Well, because I think the problem, Mel, is there are probably kids who have sexually maladaptive behaviors that are not in SMB homes. And those are the kids that we're not measuring. Yeah, those are the kids we're not measuring. Yeah.

So we're clearly not just having a discussion about the kids that are in out-of-home placement in the DCS system who present with these issues. We're having a discussion about how many of these kids are there and how are we going about, if we're going about it, just determining who presents with these issues.

And then once we have answered the question about who presents with these issues, which ones of them are needing what levels of care? I mean, I think a piece of it starts with...

What kind of questions are you asking at the outset of a dependency situation? What, you know, and what, in which of those cases are presenting with some degree of sexually maladaptive behavior?

I, I, my sense is, is that it's probably a lot more than we than than we even are aware of, which, which, if I'm right, we're we're missing, we're missing opportunities to intervene appropriately.

YA Young, Anna 51:59

Generally, when the dependency petition is filed, it just talks about abuse and neglect on behalf of the parent, on the part of the parent. It doesn't talk generally about kids' conduct and

everything like that. I mean, you might have a case that's open for a while, you know, maybe based on parent substance abuse and inability to meet the child's need. And then you find out later that the child has maybe some kind of sexually maladaptive behaviors. Maybe they get charged, maybe they don't. But that's the problem is you don't necessarily have information about the children and their actions when a dependency is filed, if that makes sense. Because and that's I think that speaks to what DCS says in their e-mail about they don't investigate sexual abuse perpetrated by 1 minor against another minor. That's not within their statutory authority to investigate.

They investigate abuse and neglect on the part of a parent.

Or Guardian, yeah.

And that makes sense to me. Perhaps I'm asking a different question, that's all. And that is, what are we doing in those cases to identify which kids in those family systems might be presenting with these types of issues?

Whether it's germane to the dependency discussion or not, are we asking those kinds of questions and are we trying to determine whether or not that's part of the equation of what's going on?

You know, if the task of this subcommittee is to be comprehensive in making recommendations about the oversight, assessment, intervention, and supervision of juveniles who present with these issues, then I feel compelled to turn over every rock and look under it myself.

Just saying.

So I...

I guess I ask at the end of this discussion here today, are there other more targeted questions that we feel a need to ask of the folks at DCS?

YA Young, Anna 54:21

I think asking specifically how many kids they have in those beds.

I mean, it does say 40 to 50 beds licensed and at any given time they're full. So they're giving us a semi, you know,

YA Young, Anna 54:32

I know it says...

No, Mel, it says those beds are not typically all filled at any given time.

Okay, I got to look at the bigger screen. All right, not filled. Okay, so I...

YA Young, Anna 54:42

Yeah.

Yeah. So that could be 10 kids, that could be 5 kids, that could be 49 kids. I mean, we just don't have a number. That's probably a number that they can give us and maybe they could give us, you know, broken down, you know, month by month over the last two years. They could tell us how many kids are in those beds.

Yes.

Yeah, and even though it won't be the actual accurate number, we could also ask, what's the number for kids who are receiving outpatient services in the community for these types of issues? It'll be much lower since they're not all required to have outpatient therapy in these homes.

And that's based on the, it's not on DCS to pay for the treatment. It's on the high needs case management. So it's another whole system trying to get data. Yeah. But it would be nice if DCS had these numbers. They should, you know, I don't know why we can't ask for DCS to track how many of their clients are in the.

involved in the juvenile justice system, as well as how many are involved in the high needs case management. It would be definitely, I don't think it's too much to ask for them to know which kind of kids they.

YA Young, Anna 55:47

We can totally tell, Mel, we already have, we already know how many kids are in DCS and who are involved in the juvenile justice system. I can tell you, I get a monthly report from juvenile probation telling me how many crossover kids I have. I mean, that's an easy number to find. The hard number is the kids who are not juvenile justice.

Yeah.

Yeah.

But then subtract, then subtract from all the kids that are in their homes or that they deal with these issues and you have the number that are not involved.

I'm just saying it should be a subtraction issue then.

YA Young, Anna 56:16

No, because the kids with sexually maladaptive behaviors aren't necessarily in the DCSSMB

homes.

They might be placed with a relative, you know, they might be in a regular foster home, they might be in a regular group home.

I understand. I guess I would just be happy to know.

in the beginning, which ones are in the homes. Like if they, I think that for them to say they're not always filled, I know of.

four different group homes, QRTPs that are full. So I can think of at least 35 kids that I know that are in these homes and I have 10 of my own that are dependent in my home. So I know they didn't give us a number and they say they're not always filled. But even if we just started there, how many of those kids that you've deemed in the home that are not part of the juvenile justice, you know, is it 50%? Is it 20%? How many of those kids are also part of your system, which I know you know that part. But even if I just knew those homes to start with, but then yes, I guess there's all the outliers of in the homes and with the aunt and with the victims still and all those things. I understand. I just want to start somewhere.

But the QRTPs that are getting a lot of federal government money to do treatment with SMB population, if they don't know how many of those are not part of the juvenile justice system, I mean, I know a client that I had for six weeks that then went on to be at six different SMB home, sometimes the same one, he would bounce around. He had seven different victims and the cops were never called. So I get that the juvenile justice isn't always involved. That kid was told he didn't have to do treatment. I just feel like there's those that were just, if at least if they say, get our group homes, 50% of them have juvenile justice and 50% don't, And of those, only 20% receive services. I just think it would be very transparent to know how many kids in SMB, DCS homes are actually held accountable or have somebody they're talking to about their issues, or if we're just placing them in these homes.

And, for me, it's about...

Providing appropriate intervention services, and...

taking steps to do whatever we can to mitigate risk and create safety.

So I think we've bantered about this item, perhaps enough for today, but if you have targeted questions that you think we could ask of the folks at DCS, please pass those along to staff and I'm confident they'll follow up with those for us.

Let's move on to the next item, which was discussion review of ADJC, just the facts publication. I guess this is kind of, does anybody have any questions about that? And if they do, we happen to be fortunate enough that we could probably ask somebody sitting in the room to answer those for us.

And.

YA Young, Anna 59:25

I just included it in the packet because I thought it was a, it's a very interesting publication. I read it every month when I get it because it tells me, you know, how many offenses kids have on average, you know, length of stay, number of kids, how many are extended jurisdiction kids and things like that. Breaks it down by county. And so I just wanted everybody to see it just because it doesn't break it down by necessarily the kids who are in the unit.

YA Young, Anna 59:50

doing sexually maladaptive behavior. That's not included in here, but they do have their high profile youth. And if you can see like sexual assault is one of those categories for like how many kids they have in their facility. And they've got at least an adjudication of sexual assault. So.

Okay, anything else with respect to that agenda item?

Moving on to future agenda items. We already have one item on there and I think I heard that they're planning to give a presentation about that at our October meeting.

Correct.

Is there anything else other than to carry over?

the psychosexual evaluation discussion for future agenda items.

Anyone, please.

The deafening silence says, we're good for now.

YA Young, Anna 1:01:00

Chairman Naegele, if I think of anything between now and the next meeting, can I just e-mail it to Jenna and she'll run it by you to put on the agenda?

Absolutely, you can, for sure.

YA Young, Anna 1:01:07

Okay, perfect. Appreciate that. Thank you.

Yep. Thank you for asking that, because I think that's what happens with a bunch of us spontaneously. We think about something after the fact, unless we have a mechanism to

respond to it, we miss it. So yes, for sure. Is there anything definitive that anybody thinks we need to put?

On.

Our next meeting's agenda.

If not, I'm gonna...

Ask for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Melony Opheim, motion to adjourn the meeting.

Can we get a second?

Ben Galarneau, second.

We need to take a vote, or are we just good to adjourn?

All in favor?

 **Young, Anna** 1:01:55
Aye.

Aye.

 **Clinical Director** 1:01:57
Aye.

 **Blake** 1:01:57
Aye.

Thank you so much.

 **Young, Anna** 1:02:01
Thanks, everyone.

See you next time.

 stopped transcription