AZSOMB Adult Guidelines and Standards Subcommittee Meeting-20261104_200048UTC-Meeting Recording

November 4, 2026,

1h 28m 50s

AI-generated content may be incorrect

Notice: This transcript was generated using Microsoft Teams automatic Recording & transcription technology. While every effort has been made to ensure accuracy, the nature of automated transcription means that it may contain errors, omissions, or phonetic misinterpretations of names, technical terms, and legal citations. This document is intended as a general record of proceedings and should not be treated as a verbatim record. In the event of a discrepancy, the original audio or video recording shall serve as the definitive source. Questions concerning this content can be directed to azsomb@azdps.gov.

Brecken Blades 0:04

Seven of us.

Quorum, is that right?

Jenna Mitchell 0:06

Six is Quorum.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 0:07

Can you hear me?

Brecken Blades 0:11

Yes, was that you, Jim?

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 0:13

I can't hear you guys.

Brecken Blades 0:15

Oh, we can hear you.

Okay. Okay, it is 1:01 p.m. on November 4th, 2026. This is the Adult Guidelines and Standards Subcommittee of the AZ Sex Offender Management Board. And let's go ahead and start the meeting with

Roll call, Major Mitchell, can you go through that, please?

Jenna Mitchell 0:48
Yes, ma'am. Chairwoman Blades is present. Miss Adkins.

AA **Amanda Adkins** 0:54
Present.

Jenna Mitchell 0:56
Mr. Barney.

BB **Blake Barney** 0:58
Present.

Jenna Mitchell 1:00
Mister Hanratty.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:02
Present.

Jenna Mitchell 1:04
Ms. Kaczorowski is excused. Dr. Miller.

SP **Sheridyn Miller PsyD** 1:08
Present.

Jenna Mitchell 1:10
Miss Musick.

MM **Missy Musick** 1:12
Present.

Jenna Mitchell 1:13
Mr. Naegele.

SCOTT NAEGELE 1:15
Present.

Jenna Mitchell 1:17
And Miss Panas.
is absent. Chairwoman, you do have a quorum.

Brecken Blades 1:25
Okay, great. Thank you. All right. Hi, everyone. Thanks for being here.
Okay, let's just jump right in. A couple of things I think we can maybe get through on in old business. So the first one is our first item is discussion and review of early termination of lifetime sex offender probation protocol and
That goes hand in hand with the protocol considerations and then also the early termination template that we've been working on. So Jenna and Ashlesha did a lot of work in terms of implementing our suggested changes kind of that we discussed last time and then also just updating some of the grammatical things so it doesn't, you know, taking out anywhere it said like, you should write this or, you know, just making it sound sort of more professional and streamlined. So.
I don't know if anybody, if you guys had a chance to take a look at it or if anybody has further kind of comments or...
changes that they want to make to either of these. Otherwise, I think we can probably...
put forward a motion to send them back to the larger board for review, Jenna, or the larger board deferred to us and we can just approve them. Not sure which.

Jenna Mitchell 3:01
I think it needs to go back to the larger board and I think Mr. Naegele pointed out prior to the meeting that there does need to be one revision and we were able to confirm that Senate Bill 1092 did pass and becomes effective on January 1st, 2027. So we'll update the document with that 2027, January 1, 2027 date.
Prior to sending it to the full board.

Brecken Blades 3:27
Okay.

Jenna Mitchell 3:29
I think there may have been a few outstanding.

BB **Brecken Blades** 3:30
So then both places in that paragraph.

Jenna Mitchell 3:36
Yes, both places.

BB **Brecken Blades** 3:36
Where it says 2026, right? Two spots. Okay.

SN **SCOTT NAEGELE** 3:37
Yeah, there were two, there were, there were two, there were two places in that paragraph where the same date, yeah.

Jenna Mitchell 3:39
Yeah.

BB **Brecken Blades** 3:41
OK, great.
Okay, were there other things, Major Mitchell, you wanted to point out?

Jenna Mitchell 3:50
There were a couple other little minor changes, like I think we referred to the polygraph, and I didn't know if that was the actual title of a specific polygraph that's in capitalization, that's capitalized in.

BB **Brecken Blades** 4:05
Oh, the sex history.

Jenna Mitchell 4:07
Yes, sex history polygraph, if that is that a title of a specific polygraph that requires? Capitalization.

Brecken Blades 4:15
You know, just a specific type of polygraph. I don't know, Jim, do you think that the, like, would you capitalize specific issue or maintenance polygraph as like a title of those words, or can we just make that lowercase?

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 4:32
We're talking about the sexual history.
Number the third bullet on that page 4.

Jenna Mitchell 4:40
The bullet is a sexual history.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 4:42
Yeah, third third bullet on page 4.

Jenna Mitchell 4:44
Yes, so there, that last sentence, it talks about or resolved the sex history polygraph. Like, is that an official title for?

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 4:53
Yes, it is a sexual history polygraph, correct.

Jenna Mitchell 4:54
Sexual.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 4:57
That is the title of the, that's the PCSOT standard for what that type of test is. Yes.

Brecken Blades 5:03
Okay, so it should be capitalized then.

Jenna Mitchell 5:03
And did I hear you say sexual? Because it says sex history now. Did you say it's sexual history?

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 5:09
Well...
Sexual history, yes.
I think that's proper grammar.
The sexual history polygraph is not called a sex history polygraph, it's a sexual history polygraph.

Brecken Blades 5:25
That's what we should do then. And then I think it's also in the...
Considerations document, too.

Jenna Mitchell 5:29
Correct. Yeah, item number 10 in the other document. Yeah, so we'll make those two changes as well.

Brecken Blades 5:36
OK, perfect.
Other things we had discussed.
Item 11, we had pretty significant discussion around that.
And so that's where we kind of landed on it.
Um, with with the kind of footnotes here to specify.
what we meant by that based on our discussion. And we talked about adding some more information about it needing to be behavioral and but I ultimately my concern is that
We all know that polygraphs, and I think Jim correct me if I'm wrong, but the PCSOT standards would say, would mandate what types of things are able to be tested in polygraphs, meaning like a behavior versus a fantasy. So I don't think that we need to say it again here, because we're assuming everyone's using the PCSOT standards.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 6:35
Right.

Brecken Blades 6:41
And my concern is, if we...

say too much about it being behavioral, then it then it pigeonholes kind of that risk relevant definition to only behaviors. But sometimes someone's fantasies or thoughts or what have you are risk relevant, even though they may not be able to be tested. by a PCSOT test, but those are still in terms of a broad definition of what is risk relevant, those categories are still. I strayed away from adding any of that, but otherwise nothing has changed. Missy, what do you have for us?

Missy Musick 7:18
So I want to check in with Jim because with that, two former clients came to mind. They made.
extensive offending history disclosures and
they were unable to pass a sex history polygraph and the extent of their disclosures, I can't imagine that they would be withholding anything. And I almost started to feel, so Jim, this is a question for you. I felt like their history of offending was so extensive. They could never really be sure if they...
captured all of their victims? Is that a possibility?

Attendee10 8:04
If copies talk about the ******* worst case scenarios, they don't talk about normal ******* people.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 8:08
Sure.

Brecken Blades 8:12
Hold on, somebody's not muted.

Missy Musick 8:12
I'm sorry, what?

Attendee10 8:15
Sex offender Management Board.

Brecken Blades 8:17

Oh, Jenna, I think maybe it's you. Jenna unmuted or somebody's not muted.
There we go.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 8:28
Okay, so you're right. If you think about it, if a person's perceptions about what victimization is as they progress in treatment, that's probably going to change their perceptions about that and their beliefs about that are going to change. So it wouldn't be uncommon for somebody who could pass or not pass a sexual history regardless, and then two or three years down the road, they add more people. That doesn't suggest that the polygraph was bad because they passed it or failed it. It was just the information has changed. So really the relevant thing about what you're describing is

Missy Musick 8:58
It.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 9:05
the information that they provided. That's the stuff that you're really going to use in your treatment or your quality of care with that individual. So I think to answering your question, can a person not pass a sexual history because
they have such an extensive list of victims. I think what I would say is, from an investigative point of view, is what victim they're not talking about is possibly a hang-up as to why they're not passing the polygraph. And that's why I think that prior allegation exam is so important because that's usually the gorilla in the room. You know, that would be somebody, that would be somebody that they may have access to or they might want to be able to reunify with or is a family member. And that poses a bigger problem. Sorry, that's my terrorist in the back room.
Um...
And I think that answers your question. And I'm going to put this on mute and put the dog away. Sorry.

Missy Musick 10:16
And I bring this up because both of these clients that I am recalling, like, they were working so hard. I had them in my office crying, saying, Missy, I am working so hard to change my life. I don't know what I'm missing on these. And

And yeah, maybe I was being duped, but the idea that these two men that showed deep investment in their treatment, if at some point that sex history polygraph would prevent them from an early termination because they had been a offending so long in their lives and they couldn't, like they could never be sure that they remembered everyone. That's my concern around that.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 11:07

Yeah, that's true. And that's probably a problem with the formulation of the questions. I mean, if we're going to try to get it all and count them all and try to get into a number game of how many victims there are, that's probably not really great polygraph, as opposed to is there somebody in particular that they're not talking about. Something that would be more single issue and more refined to that. Also, you have to keep in mind that the resolution or the resolved test, if you will, is really at the discretion of treatment and probation. If they're both willing to sign off on some historic sexual history that was never able to be re-explored. I mean, I've had several clients who couldn't pass a sexual history. They tried everything, including hypnotherapy, and that person just was not going to be able to pass their sexual history. And my belief was that they didn't want to talk about the grandchildren, which were allegations that were never really clarified and polygraphed to a point of resolution. So that person was probably going to be have a difficult time getting off probation because of that. And it was a great cloud that was following them. But in your situation where you have clients and I've had clients where I, you know, they went from 2 victims to 14 victims to 20 victims, and they're still trying to chase down a sexual history polygraph with clarity.

And at some point, you just have to say, look, I don't know what difference it's going to make on how many victims they've gotten. They're in double digits at this point. I think the resolution or the clarity of that's really going to be what we got, what we need. We may not ever resolve the sexual history. I think your question is,

Can we say that a person can't early terminate if they haven't resolved their sexual history? That's a good question. I don't know. I think the ball really would be in the court of treatment and probation and say, at this point, we're moving on.

BB **Brecken Blades** 13:08

Yeah, well, let me just jump in here for a second, Jim, because if Ashlesha, would you go up just a little bit on the page? Because we did say on number item 10, I think it

is, probationer has sex successfully passed or resolved the sex history polygraph if able to take a polygraph. So we did put that in there. So I think perhaps what would resolve this in terms of this document would be

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 13:08
Maybe that's...
Resolved, right?

BB **Brecken Blades** 13:30
Maybe Jenna, if we're able to split, I know more footnotes, if we're able to split footnote #3 into two sections so that the explanation, the sentence that explains what it means to resolve a polygraph can be footnoted in both 10 and 11.
And then the first part about the two years and the post treatment would just be a footnote specific to item 11. But then that way there would be a reference for cases like Missy's talking about that if there is some complex history, we're explaining what we mean by resolved as referring to, you know, to the satisfaction of the.
team. So I see your hand, Scott and Sheridyn, but I just wanted to put that out there. Okay, do you guys still have comments? Scott, you were first.

SN **SCOTT NAEGELE** 14:21
Jim, I think in part responded to it and what he was saying. And I think sometimes it's in some cases, like Missy's describing, it's an issue of question construction and the language being used in the test questions. As time has passed to address this issue, Jim, I'd be interested in your comments on this. Myself and Ben Galarneau have, we have worked to try to refine the language around some of this issue to use things like hiding and withholding, which are active processes in terms of the language of the question.
And then it's not this obtuse, obscure other thing looming in their consciousness, but it would have to be something they're actively interacting with and they know they're withholding. So that was going to be my comment. And I'm interested in what Jim has to say about that.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 15:18
Yes, question formulation is key. And again, when someone's not being able to pass a generic single issue sexual history about documenting all victims, it becomes really

kind of redundant and not really effective. So the wording would be super important. Is there some is there some minor that you're purposely not disclosing? Are you intentionally withholding information about any minor prior to your conviction? It is about the wording, but that really is where I think quality assurance of the testing procedures really got to be in place. So before anybody has some actionable conflict or consequence to the person who's taken the test, they probably ought to quality assure the fact that, you know, if they haven't passed two or three sexual histories, maybe it's time to look at what the questions were and, you know, get the polygraph examiner or a polygraph examiner in to suggest
hey, how can we resolve this? But at some point, I mean, I've had, it's rare, and I'm sure Missy would agree, it's rare when we have somebody who's putting forth the effort and is providing information and by all accounts, looks like there's progress. You know, there's that movement upward. And we have no reason to doubt with all the disclosures that they've made.
that there may be, you know, a skeleton under the, you know, under the floorboard. But maybe there is, and that would be the fear of a fear that a person would have that they can't pass a sexual history. But I think the caveat to let the treatment team, you know,
In good judgment.
chime in to say that, you know, by all other accounts, we have what we need. He's been successful or she's been successful in all other areas. Do we need to go back after eight years or whatever and say that he didn't pass the sexual history and therefore we're not going to support it? I think that's really a lack of
education on the part of maybe probation, I dare say. But both if the treatment provider and the probation officer are on the same page and they're both advocating and saying, yeah, this is we're good for early termination, then I think the judge is going to hear that. Not the fact that he could never pass the sexual history, but I mean,
I'm just saying this generally. I mean, there may be some other situations where... there's an allegation of a violent act and that's never been addressed. So then I would go back to the prior allegation examination to try to resolve that. I hope that answers your question, but I mean, these are one of those case by case things that don't happen very often, but when they do, good judgment needs to prevail.

Brecken Blades 18:16

Yeah, thanks, Jim. Yeah, I think I want to make sure we just like, so for the purposes of this document, we do have the wording of resolved. And then we have explained what resolved means. And then I think that, again, these are just considerations. They're not necessarily absolutes. And so that allows for the cases on, you know, either end of the spectrum to be
you know, kind of problem solved or workshopped as needed. Dr. Miller, do you still have a comment about the document?

SP **Sheridyn Miller PsyD** 18:46
Yeah, I was, I was just gonna say, you know.
These, I think they're guidelines. So any team or individual that wishes to petition for early termination, if they don't meet every single item, that is still the team's decision or the individual's decision. And I think like Jim said, if the probation team and treatment are all in agreement, I think the courts would hear that. And I also, I think most of us would agree that.
We would expect a sex history poly to be passed or resolved for early termination. There might be some that can't do it, and I think that's when the teams get involved. But for the most part, I think the expectation is sound. And to just remind whoever uses this, its guidelines.
because there's going to be a lot of caveats here and there.

BB **Brecken Blades** 19:43
Yeah.
Okay, okay, great. Any other comments or concerns or questions on any of the other items or footnotes that we have here on both of the documents?
Okay, does anyone want to put forward a motion to maybe kind of approve these on our level and send them back to the larger board for consideration?

SP **Sheridyn Miller PsyD** 20:22
Sheridyn Miller, I motion to present these to the larger board for approval.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 20:28
Jim Hanratty, I second.

Brecken Blades 20:32
Okay. All in favor, say aye.

SCOTT NAEGELE 20:36
Aye.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 20:37
Aye.

Missy Musick 20:37
Aye.

Blake Barney 20:39
Aye.

Brecken Blades 20:40
Anyone opposed?
Okay, anyone abstaining?
Okay, great. So the motion carries and we will thank you for making the changes in real time. We see that. I appreciate that happening. So I think they're ready then to go back to the larger board for the next meeting. Okay, great. So let's see the next. Okay, so the next one, let's just go in order today. So 2 is the discussion of standards for the adult sex offense specific evaluations. So I think we...
Yeah, we started to talk about it a tiny bit or kind of introduced it at our last meeting, but we were out of time. So on this document,
which was in our background for the last meeting, October meeting. Basically what I did was make a few changes I think that we had discussed or just to make sure that the language was consistent. For example, making sure the whole thing said psychosexual evaluation or versus sex offense specific or, you know, so to just clean up the language and then
And then I put in a couple of the comments that we got. So these are the pieces for us to kind of discuss, I think, as we think about putting it back to the board for them to look at. So, okay, so the first one, this is just my thinking out loud, kind of. So as we

So our wording says it is the position of the AZSOMB that voluntary pre-sentencing psychosexual evaluation should be utilized in all appropriate cases and goes on. So my question is, I guess because of the wording, the voluntary pre-sentencing psychosexual evaluations, does this sound like we're promoting
That people.
utilize a private.
Yes, see in their case.
Maybe it doesn't sound like that. But if it does, is that our intent? Or does that lead into that third question that's like, what if a PSE is done privately and then it's contract? I don't know. I just wanted to, I guess, put that out there to you guys to make sure we like the wording.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 22:59
Is that a can be or should be?

BB **Brecken Blades** 22:59
I guess.
Which one?

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 23:03
on the sentence there, voluntary with pre-sentence psychosexual evaluation should be utilized or can be utilized.

BB **Brecken Blades** 23:12
Um, I mean...

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 23:12
Are you mandating it?

BB **Brecken Blades** 23:14
We have, we have should, I think, because it's a little stronger and because what we communicated, Ms. Kaczorowski did kind of a draft of this initially. And I think what we communicated to her was that we do feel strongly that an evaluation done pre-sentencing, so that information is available to the judge. We do feel that that's

important. So I think she went with should instead of can is my, without her here, that's my best guess.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 23:40
And if they, if they can't afford it, then what?

Brecken Blades 23:46
Well, this doesn't mean that they have to do it. It just would be that it should be utilized, that we would support it. We would recommend it being utilized. I think at that stage, depending on who requests the evaluation, in some counties, there's funding available for it.
For that evaluation, so Doctor Miller.

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 24:08
Yeah, I think the first sentence clarifies that both the court and the defendant can request it. So it could be court ordered or it could be sought out privately. And if the results are contradictory, I mean, that's standard in any court process that
The defense does a private eval. I mean, we're saying it should be done and should be utilized in court, but they don't have to.

Brecken Blades 24:38
Okay, okay, so we'll just leave the wording if everybody's okay with it. I just wanted to bring attention to it and then, okay, great. So, Scott.

SCOTT NAEGELE 24:51
I think part of what we're struggling with here, what I hear you perhaps struggling with, Brecken, is kind of like ultimately who is it that's doing these evaluations at the quest of defense attorneys. And I think as we get down the road and we get into this more, it may take us a while to get there. It will take us a while to get there.
We're going to start talking about, you know, the same kinds of things that Colorado did in terms of having approved treatment providers and approved evaluators and those kinds of things. But we're not there yet. So I think that the way it's languaged is appropriate. But I think we all recognize that down the road,

SCOTT NAEGELE 25:32

We're going to be addressing some of these things that you might have concerns about how it's getting played out. You know what I mean?

BB **Brecken Blades** 25:39
Yeah, I think you're probably right. Okay, great. I feel good about that. Okay, the next one was the question that kind of rolled over from the SOMB meeting. So the question was, if someone is placed on parole initially, do they need a PSE to start parole? Which I think...
Now, we all know, right, there is no more parole. I think that it's termed community supervision. But regardless,

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 26:07
Your audio is breaking up.

BB **Brecken Blades** 26:12
Okay. Can you guys hear me now? Okay. Or is it temporary? Okay.

AA **Amanda Adkins** 26:17
You're good.

BB **Brecken Blades** 26:18
I think the intent behind it is, you know, so we use parole for shorthand, even though that's not it anymore, the difference of parole versus probation. I have some thoughts on this. Does anyone have an initial thought, though, that they want to jump in with regarding whether they need the evaluation to get started on?
role or community supervision versus probation.

SP **Sheridyn Miller PsyD** 26:43
Can they be on both? So parole is early release from prison, correct? And would probation pick up?

BB **Brecken Blades** 26:48
Yeah.

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 26:52
After parole or does it pick up immediately?

Brecken Blades 26:56
I think after.

Amanda Adkins 27:04
Correct. Sometimes parole is even waived if there's lifetime probation.

Brecken Blades 27:11
Okay.
So I guess kind of to jump in, my thought on this is that what we've said a lot about in terms of the purpose of the evaluation is to talk about their need for treatment, what type is needed, their risk assessment, that kind of thing. So it wouldn't be necessary at the start of the parole or community supervision unless they were going to be ordered into treatment.
is my thought. And so I think that maybe we change the wording or perhaps they're not ever, maybe Amanda, maybe you know, maybe people aren't typically ordered to treatment when they're on.
That community supervision really, what should we be calling it, Amanda?

Amanda Adkins 27:51
Does it?
Amanda Adkins. I would stick with community supervision. There is a small, like there's a parole board still where people are granted early release, but, or the Board of Executive Clemency, excuse me. But traditionally, unless they have a long, a lengthy time on community supervision, they won't begin treatment. They will defer to probation. And then, like I said, oftentimes they do petition before they're released. Hey, can I skip my community supervision to go on to probation site since I have lifetime probation?
Rarely they do have both at one time, very rarely.

Brecken Blades 28:31
So maybe something in here that says placed on probation or required to participate

in treatment as a condition of community supervision, which sounds like you're saying would be rare.
But I don't know. Jim, did you have your hand up?

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 28:50
Yeah, I could have swore we didn't even have parole in Arizona, but I guess I'm wrong. I thought I heard at the last meeting one of the lawyers say that technically we don't have a parole.
Is that, is that incorrect?

BB **Brecken Blades** 29:08
I think that they are have renamed it community supervision. Is that right, Amanda?

AA **Amanda Adkins** 29:16
Correct.

BB **Brecken Blades** 29:18
So the concept still exists, but we're not, we can't call it parole anymore. That's why I was asking her like, what should I be calling it, Amanda, as we're talking? So she said, call it community supervision. So for now that means parole.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 29:18
Yeah.
Yeah.
Whatever.

BB **Brecken Blades** 29:32
Um...
Okay, what are other thoughts, I guess, on this question, or do we feel like what we have written is sufficient to address it?

SP **Sheridyn Miller PsyD** 29:43
I would leave it if it's so rare, then I, you know, rather than making a rule for the exception, I think.
You know, they can figure it out if that happens. But it sounds like if parole would

end first before probation, probation would be the one paying for the evaluation. So you should just wait.

Brecken Blades 30:05
And requiring it, yeah.
Okay.
And.
Okay, any other, any, I guess any other insight for us, Amanda, on that in terms of you said it is rare.
for someone to be on community supervision long enough that they're ordered into treatment. Right? But it does happen or...

Amanda Adkins 30:28
Correct. It does happen, but it is a little bit more rare. And then oftentimes just because of the, if there's dual supervision, the cost savings for like the state or probation, they'll have them only go to one.

Brecken Blades 30:41
Yeah, okay. And then once they're, do they...
So I guess sometimes someone could be on community supervision, but then not go on to probation, right?

Amanda Adkins 30:54
That is correct. It is pretty rare, but it does happen.

Brecken Blades 30:58
Okay. So then maybe we do need to put in here, because if they're just doing community supervision and it's lengthy and they're not going to have probation, we would want their treatment needs to be met appropriately, I think.
Blake.

Amanda Adkins 31:15
I would agree with that, yeah.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 31:17
Oops.

Blake Barney 31:21
So I guess that one of the things I'm just kind of thinking about through this and when I was reading through it is
If somebody is sentenced to probation, doesn't have any incarceration, the PSE that they do on their end, are they then required to do another PSE when they're going to start probation if it's within, you know,
six months of time, are they going to be required to take another PSE or is it one that there will be some kind of
you know, unless it's more than 12 months, they're not going to be required to take it again, or because it wasn't from a...
provider that is recognized by probation, they will have to take another one. That was something when I was reading through that I was just like, I'm wondering what happens with that.

Brecken Blades 32:16
Yeah.
Mhm.
Yeah, I mean, that's a good question. I mean, I think that's for us to figure out. I think kind of to Scott's comments earlier, as we get further along and we put forth more detailed and lengthy kind of standards for the evaluation and what's expected, or, you know, even get to a point where we say these are the credentials of a provider that's qualified to do this, that kind of thing, then perhaps that question becomes easier.
easier because then it's like if you have an evaluation that already fits all of these criteria, perhaps that would stand in. I think the issues that we're feeling now are like the potentially there are more discrepancies in terms of how individual providers are kind of going about the evaluations might be different. So I would say probably initially or at least we...
we leave it as we continue to kind of develop standards in the hope that those get kind of like streamlined. I don't know, Jim, what do you have for us?

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 33:24

I just had a question about the sexually violent predators. Do we still have that classification in Arizona, the sexually violent predators, and how does that relate to when they are civilly confined? Are they on community supervision? Is that considered parole? Is that civil commitment? Is that separately, completely different? And I'm assuming that there will be categorized in this guideline as well. They're obviously, I assume, going to have a PSE at some point. Is that correct?

Brecken Blades 33:57

I will defer to Dr. Miller as she is our resident expert on this topic.

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 34:05

So yes, we do have sexually violent persons in Arizona. We have an entire facility that provides housing and treatment. There's a whole court process that they go through in order to be determined SVP, and that includes a full psychosexual evaluation.
So I wouldn't expect like the post-sentencing PSC through probation to happen. That goes through the state instead as a SVP trial. And then they are annually evaluated using psychosexual evaluations.
Any community access they have, if they are granted community access, is supervised and monitored. And they're provided with psychosexual treatment for the duration of their civil commitment. So it is civil commitment, which is indefinite until they are no longer high risk to reoffend.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 35:03

So, there's still, yeah, that I appreciate that information. It's good information, so they still do polygraphs, I assume, as part of that.

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 35:03

I hope that answers all of this.
They don't actually.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 35:11

I do know. Oh, interesting.

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 35:14
There, yeah, we don't do polygraphs. We've discussed the benefit of polygraph, but there's a cost associated with that and a whole court proceeding. So it gets a little dicey.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 35:29
Understood. Thank you for that information.

Brecken Blades 35:31
So maybe do we need to clarify this to say post-sentencing each convicted adult sex offender who is placed on probation and not determined to be an SVP shall be required or do we not? Do you know what I mean? Because you have some guys there who are...
on probation at the same time that they're committed. And so how do we, how do we word it so that they don't have to take one when they get there? Maybe they need one once they're like released or level 6, but do you know what I mean?

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 35:56
So, I would...
Yeah, so I would say like post-sentencing, each convicted adult sex offender who is placed on probation or community supervision shall be required to submit to a PSE post-incarceration, da da da da da, for individuals determined.
to be sexually violent persons, they...
shall be required to submit to a PSE upon discharge prior to beginning.
either prior to beginning treatment or upon discharge prior to beginning treatment with probation. We do have some.
when they move out into the community, we request that probation, refer them for treatment so that they can start, you know, planning for that cost, incorporating that cost into their budgeting, establish a support system, including their
their psychosexual group before discharge so that when they're discharged, everything's there and they're good to go. There's no major changes on that front. So some residents will hopefully have already done the PSE with probation before discharge, whereas others won't have progressed.

Brecken Blades 37:26
Mhm.

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 37:29
to that point and should do it upon discharge.

Brecken Blades 37:35
Okay, so we should say...
for individuals determined to be sexually violent persons.
Shall be required to submit to the PSE.
Prior to...
beginning treatment as required by probation or because if they're discharged and they're not on probation, they're not going to have to do it at all, right? So.

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 38:00
Correct. Yeah, so it should just be for probationers.

Brecken Blades 38:04
Okay, individuals determined to be sexually violent persons.
who are also on probation shall be required to submit.

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 38:13
or probationers.
Probationers determined.

Brecken Blades 38:15
Huh? Yeah, so...
It's not all of them. So it's only individuals who are SVP and on probation.
And then they'll need the PSE.
Prior to beginning.
like community-based treatment as required by probation, maybe something like that.
Okay, I can keep working on that.
Can we make the, where it says placed on probation or community supervision, and

instead of it saying or community supervision, can it say or required to participate in treatment as a condition of community supervision, which I know is long, but I don't think it's our intent to just make everybody who's on community supervision for 18 months.
do one of these. I think it's just if that's their long-term placement, they're getting treatment.
Right?
as a condition of community supervision.
OK, what do we think about how this paragraph stands right now?
This information.
shall be required to be treatment, risk and needs and procedures required for monitoring of behavior to protect special victims for individuals who need to be.
On personal.
I would just say instead of for individuals, I would just capitalize the I in individuals and then say individuals determined to be sexually violent persons.
who are on probation.
Shall be required to submit to PSE upon.
discharge or prior to beginning community-based treatment? What do you think?

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 40:23
Yeah, and I would flip them.
Prior to beginning community-based treatment or upon discharge, since that's likely the order.

Brecken Blades 40:33
Do we need the discharge if it says community-based?
Treatment, because won't they? I mean, they'll they will be put in.
treatment, right, if they're discharged to probation, essentially.

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 40:45
Correct. Yeah, you could you could absolutely remove the upon discharge.

Brecken Blades 40:51
Okay, so submit to a PSE.
prior to beginning community-based treatment as required by probation or as a

condition of their probation or...
I just think maybe we need to say something because otherwise it's like, what if they're just, well, I don't know. What do you guys think?
On, because he already said on probation, so is that redundant?

SN **SCOTT NAEGELE** 41:21
I would avoid using the term as a condition of the conditions or mandated things by the court, but I think as a requirement of probation or something to that effect.

BB **Brecken Blades** 41:22
Okay. Do you think we even need that? Because earlier we said it's someone who's an SVP who's on probation. So is that, I guess that's what I'm saying. Is it redundant to then say.
The treatment would be a requirement of probation because that isn't is that isn't that implied kind of or no?

SP **Sheridyn Miller PsyD** 41:54
OK.
If probation requires it, I think it's redundant to say as a requirement of probation if we identify that they're already on probation.

BB **Brecken Blades** 42:07
Okay, sorry, you actually have to put that part back. That's the part that stays.
Is that Ashlesha making the changes? Sorry, Ashlesha.
Because the reason that has to stay is because not all SVPs are on probation. So we have to specify that we're just talking about, we're only talking about someone who's an SVP and subject to the conditions of probation. And those people will be required to submit prior to beginning community-based treatment.
And then we just leave it.
Scott.

SN **SCOTT NAEGELE** 42:41
Just a thought thinking forward down the line. At some point in time, given the new statute regarding people not getting off probation, you know, everybody that makes their way through the SVP program is at some point in time not going to be eligible

for release from probation.
So they're just, you know what I'm saying? So, I mean, now we have people in the SVP program who are sentenced to different periods of time and different laws are applicable to them, but at some point in time, 15, 20 years down the road, if the laws stay the same as they are about to be,
January 1st, you know, that's going to be less of an issue or a non-issue, whichever the case may be.

BB **Brecken Blades** 43:31
I don't know if I totally followed what you were saying. Maybe to clarify it for me. Not everyone who is determined to be an SVP is on probation. That's part of it.

SN **SCOTT NAEGELE** 43:42
I think what I'm saying is, is down the road there with the new law going into effect and most people currently being sentenced with a lifetime probation tail or sometimes even 2 lifetime probation tails.

BB **Brecken Blades** 43:49
Yeah.

SN **SCOTT NAEGELE** 44:01
The number of people coming out of the SVP program who aren't going to be on probation is going to be a limited number.

BB **Brecken Blades** 44:11
You're saying that it'll make most of them eligible for probation.

SN **SCOTT NAEGELE** 44:15
I think it will.
Not the lawyer, but I think it will.

BB **Brecken Blades** 44:22
Yeah, okay. Well, and again, I mean, these are living working documents, so at some point we can also modify it if it's not working or we think it's, you know, doesn't make sense anymore or something based on how things are changing.

Will you take out after PSE in that last sentence? It says PSE upon and prior and it should just say prior.
Okay.
I think I think it looks good how we have it right now. I so I don't know. I guess if anybody thinks there needs to be more changes, pick up now, but I think this is a good enough draft to.
move forward. The last question was just about similar kind of to what you had said, Blake, was about what if someone has contradictory results, you know, from an evaluation and then it was like, do they have to redo it? Or I guess to me, though, the term contradictory assumes that two evaluations have been done. Otherwise, the one would just stand on its own. So sort of inherent in that question is an assumption that this.
this evaluation will take place and then what if those two don't coincide?
I think as we develop more standards, ideally they will. I mean, it's not going to be exactly the same, but if everyone's using the same, you know, kind of assessments. The other thing I thought about that, maybe you guys have a different, you know, kind of take on this, is that I don't know if this small section of the document is the place to address that, was my other thought, is that that is.
potentially relevant for consideration as we get further into evaluations and like we have maybe a section on what is it, what do we do if someone's in denial? What do we do about this? What do we, we have kind of some of those. I just think this is like a very.
This is just like page one. We're trying to get past here. Very small piece of it. So that was my other thought, is that if we do need more wording specifically around that, and we might, that that would be in like a latter portion of the document.
I don't know, what do you guys think about that?

Blake Barney 46:38
I agree. I don't think we need to complicate it further. It was just one of the thoughts I had as I was reading through it. But you're right, I think we address it somewhere else and we have just the initial page one here that gives us the broad overlook of what we're presenting.

Brecken Blades 46:44
Mhm.

I agree with you that it's going to be an issue. I mean, especially initially, like it just is, there's going to be some growing pains. If we go ahead and adopt this and as we try to implement it, absolutely. And I do think we should address that. I just,
I don't know, that was my other thought is like, yes, that is important, but is right now the moment to answer that question? Because that was a question that came up from the board too. And so people are going to ask that, you know, I think it's relevant and valid.
Maybe we can like table that to section 2. Okay, anything further on this?
Document.
Okay.
How do we feel about about?
sending it back through the board for their review.
Everyone feels ready for that?

Jenna Mitchell 47:59
I do want to point out, there's a reference to footnote 3 here, but I don't see footnote 3 in the document.

BB **Brecken Blades** 48:03
Uh-huh.
Hmm.
That's not good. And it's not up above it.

Jenna Mitchell 48:12
Yeah, It was referencing 133828D, but I don't find the, here's one.

BB **Brecken Blades** 48:19
Right, it goes.
One, two, 4.

Jenna Mitchell 48:23
Yes, thank you. I think I'm not seeing it between 2 and 4, which is where I would think to find it.

BB **Brecken Blades** 48:25

Ohh, no!
You, that would be...
Most of the time, three becomes comes between 2 and 4.
Okay, well, then maybe we, I'm not sure I'm going to be able to look at it and figure out exactly where it needs to go right at this moment.
But what if, could we motion maybe to send it through with the caveat that we'll find out where that goes and include it in the proper, you know, referenced spot in the text?

Jenna Mitchell 49:02
Yes, I think that would be appropriate.

BB **Brecken Blades** 49:03
For next time, that's not a substantive change. I think it's still there. We're just making sure it's.

Jenna Mitchell 49:06
Yeah, I can and we can research it and find out if it was in a prior version or where that came from. So.

BB **Brecken Blades** 49:13
Yeah, it's probably my fault. I'm sure I probably was editing it and changing things and didn't, you know, didn't, yeah. So before I submitted this to you all the first time, I'm sure I did that. So we can, I can look at prior versions and see. Dr. Miller.

SP **Sheridyn Miller PsyD** 49:31
I reluctantly raise this issue. So as we go through the PSE guidelines, I know the AZ SOMB statute, you know, mentions that the Arizona Community Protection and Treatment Center will implement any and all essentially board recommendations. So would the PSE guidelines apply to ACPTC's psychosexual evaluations? And would we want to carve that out, make mention of that, exclude it?

SP **Sheridyn Miller PsyD** 50:12
Or is this specifically for court and probation?

BB **Brecken Blades** 50:20
I think that's a great question.
I, in my opinion, I think of those as a different type of psychosexual evaluation, honestly. So I don't know if maybe then as we get further and we specify that those have a slightly different name, you know, they're qualified as an SVP psychosexual or as it something different.
even in terms of their content, you know, say for example, the screening evaluation or the annual review are very different, you know, in terms of what's included.

SP **Sheridyn Miller PsyD** 50:51
Right.
I did not.
and not as all-encompassing as maybe a general psychosexual is because the referral question is different. The statute is specific. So I just...

BB **Brecken Blades** 51:05
Right, you're not looking at treatment needs like this. You're trying to determine, you know, the statutory criteria.

SP **Sheridyn Miller PsyD** 51:12
Right. So, I'm sure that might come up in different realms and I just wanted to see if we should start carving that in along or excluding it or making it its own section.

BB **Brecken Blades** 51:13
Okay.
Yeah, okay. Scott, did you have something you wanted to add about that too?

SN **SCOTT NAEGELE** 51:28
I think the two of you's continued dialogue about it pretty much spoke to what I was going to comment on.

Brecken Blades 51:35
Okay. Okay, great. Okay, so are you saying, Dr. Miller, you think maybe we should start to delineate that here or like later in the document? Maybe that's its own section or what are you kind of what's your thought?

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 51:51
Yeah, I think it's just, you know, something to keep in mind. I don't know if it, if we want to call, if we want to reference section about persons evaluations and annuals. later, just naming them different, you know, instead of a psychosexual evaluation that they're identified separately.

Brecken Blades 52:16
Mm.

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 52:17
so that it doesn't get confusing.

Brecken Blades 52:20
Yeah, no, I think that's a great thought. You're right. What we've done here, I think doesn't...
doesn't run counter to anything you guys are doing right yet. We haven't put ourselves in any kind of like predicament.
thus far, right? Because this is once they're discharged and, but you're right in terms of delineating that those are a different type of evaluation as we write the standards.

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 52:47
Yeah, because I could just see that coming up, like a court proceeding or filing one way or another. So.

Brecken Blades 52:47
Three.
Right.
No, and I think we're on solid ground to do that because there was some, it was a long time ago, like just you and I would have been barely getting into practice, but

they had, they had a court hearing about the procedures, you remember that, of the, of how the SVP evaluations are being done in Arizona and whether they met. standards and things like that. Maybe you remember that, Scott? It was a whole big thing. Anyways, they do. They were found, you know, the court approved them and so, but they are different. Do you know what I mean? So I think that gives us solid ground to say this is a different, you know, kind of, this is a different assessment type. Okay.

Okay, anything else on this document? Oh, Jim.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 53:43

I'm just curious, and this may be an ignorant question, but are we also providing guidelines for the state hospital, which used to be called ASH, I think? I remember doing polygraphs there for years in the facility, which we're trying and very interesting clientele. But since they're not doing polygraphs now, I mean,

What I'm hearing you say is that it's going to be treated separately from the folks that are in community supervision under probation, and there'll be separate guidelines for that, or are we completely not touching SVP folks?

As far as guidelines go.

SP **Sheridyn Miller PsyD** 54:22

So the way the SOMB statute reads is that ACPTC will implement, I can't find, shall implement, says the Arizona Community Protection and Treatment Center on the grounds of the Arizona State Hospital, part of ASH.

shall implement any guidelines and standards for sex offender treatment and supervision that are established by the board. So it doesn't explicitly reference evaluation procedures, but we want to be in best practices, and I think we are. I just, you know, we have a litigious bunch, and if we're going to mention psychosexual evaluations, I don't

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 55:04

Yeah.

SP **Sheridyn Miller PsyD** 55:07

I think it would hurt to clarify that there is a difference to ensure best practices are

kept, but to delineate that a psychosexual evaluation and SVP evaluation are similar yet different.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 55:14
Understood.
Very good, thank you.

BB **Brecken Blades** 55:24
Yeah.
I don't know that it even that we're going to have to make up guidelines or standards for the SVP evaluation so much as just indicate in this document that when we're referring to a PSE, we are recognizing those as something else. And that these standards that we're writing apply to all the situations that we've talked about thus far and should not be.
be construed as guidelines for how to do a screening evaluation to see if someone meets criteria for SVP statute. You know what I mean?
I think that's a great question, Jim. It is. It is relevant. Okay. Does anyone like to motion? Are we ready for that to have this reviewed at the larger board?

AA **Amanda Adkins** 56:14
Amanda Adkins, I propose we take this document to the larger board for approval.

BB **Brecken Blades** 56:21
You wanna want to second that?

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 56:23
Jimmy Hanratty, I second.

SN **SCOTT NAEGELE** 56:23
Uh, I'll second that, Scott Naegele.

BB **Brecken Blades** 56:27
OK. All in favor.

Missy Musick 56:31
Aye.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 56:32
Aye.

Amanda Adkins 56:32
Aye.

Blake Barney 56:32
Aye.

Brecken Blades 56:35
Any opposed?
Anyone abstaining?
All right, the motion passes, so we will also have this document for everyone to review, so that's great. Okay, let's jump to...
I think.
Okay, let's jump down to A4 and look at the calendar quickly, because I think our discussion of the CMT Teams model is going to be potentially longer, maybe. But the dates, maybe we can just also get that kind of checked off the list. Did anybody
I guess does anybody have comments on them? Do we want to go ahead and adopt them?
Conflicts, questions.
We left it, staff left it at the same time for us in the afternoon so we can just stay consistent with what everybody's already kind of got marked into their calendar.
Anybody have concerns with the dates?
No? Okay. Okay, so then I will motion that we adopt the proposed 2027 adult guidelines and standards subcommittee meetings dates.
Anyone have want to second that?

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 58:00
Sheridyn Miller a second.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 58:00
Jim Hanratty, I second.

BB **Brecken Blades** 58:03
Okay. I think, I guess I maybe not even sure that we had to do this, but all in favor?

SP **Sheridyn Miller PsyD** 58:09
Aye.

BB **Brecken Blades** 58:10
Aye.

MM **Missy Musick** 58:10
Aye.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 58:10
Aye.

BB **Blake Barney** 58:11
Aye.

AA **Amanda Adkins** 58:12
Aye.

BB **Brecken Blades** 58:15
Okay, anyone oppose?
Okay, anyone abstaining?
Okay, great. So that motion passes, and then these will be the dates. Thank you so much, Jenna and Ashlesha, for putting that all together and getting the dates out. It's really helpful. So.
We're good with those. And then, okay, the last agenda item is the CMT Teams model document.
I was looking at, there were two in the review packet, but I...
And.

I think the one that we probably want to look at has the, yeah, this one with the comments by Ms. Kaczorowski also, Karolyn.
Um...
There are a lot of comments on this document. Did you guys take a look at it?
Okay, Scott.

SN **SCOTT NAEGELE** 59:20
Real quick, just for the edification of the group assembled here, what's the point of departure for this document? Whose world did this exist in and where did this initially come from?

BB **Brecken Blades** 59:34
What an excellent question. Okay, I'm laughing because I'm not the one that put forward this document, so I will do my best to say. My best guess is that this is a document or at least a model that exists in another jurisdiction that has a board, an SOMB.
and that we have adapted it here for our purposes. And by we, I think it was the chairwoman who provided it the first time, and then made some comments. So her comments are in the blue. And then Karolyn

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:00:16
Made some comments in the red.
So, I don't know if that answers your question, Doctor Miller.

SP **Sheridyn Miller PsyD** 1:00:28
Colorado currently uses the Teams model. I took a training on this model many, many years ago, and I struggle to recall the differentiation, the true differentiation between the Teams model and the containment model. I don't.
I can't wrap my head around the true distinction between the two.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:00:54
Okay.
I couldn't tell you. This one certainly is broken out into more elements, is what it seems like. But in terms of kind of a functional difference, I'm not sure. Jim?

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:01:07

I think if you go to the title page of that document, you'll see the five elements of that containment. It's the same process, but they're adding assessment and the engagement management. I think it's you're right, though. It's hard to differentiate the roles because the roles are still going to be the same. You know, probation treatment and polygraph.

Um...

However.

I don't know if this is the one that I made comments on. Did you see my comments on this one?

Anything that was related to polygraph where I thought there needed to be clarity. I don't know if I didn't see my name on any of that, but there were some comments, short ones, I promise. There was only like three or four of them, and maybe it didn't get updated before she sent it, but there are some comments and I'll go back over it and make sure that

Brecken Blades 1:01:43

Oh.

Okay.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:02:01

We talk about those when time permits.

Brecken Blades 1:02:10

Yeah, I know that, I don't know if I saw separate ones from you, Jim. It's very long. I...

Jenna Mitchell 1:02:18

This is Jenna. I don't have any on record from Jim. When would those have been submitted?

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:02:30

about a week and a half ago when I reviewed it and

I think I sent it to Beth.

Jenna Mitchell 1:02:40
Oh, I wouldn't have access to it then if it was sent to Beth.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:02:40
So...
Okay.
So it was my understanding that she put this together and I put in my two cents where it was relevant to polygraph. So if it's not in there, I'll certainly make sure that, like I said, when time permits, we'll address those issues as necessary.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:03:05
Well, I think we probably have to decide how we want to attack this document. So Karolyn's not here today. I think last time she was willing to kind of go through her comments with us. We don't have the benefit of her input here today. So I think we could probably, I don't know, we could do a couple of things. We could just start on page one and go through the comments, you know, one by one as we
kind of and just make it through as much as we can with the understanding that this probably will be a document that rolls into our next meeting as well.
I don't know if we could look at it sort of more broadly or if there's a way to, I'm not sure if discussion would be more fruitful at a larger board meeting if we need Beth and Karolyn here to comment on their comments. I don't know, Beth, what do you think? I mean, sorry, Blake.

BB **Blake Barney** 1:04:00
So I was actually going to just comment on the outside perspective of this. We say the containment model currently, I think that the Team's model might
be something, even though it's not that much different, it might be better received with the idea that this is a team approach that we are working with offenders and it is not probation, you know, controlling everything or treatment controlling everything. There's an entire team that is working with the offender to help them be successful and to, you know, assimilate back into society and no longer be a risk to the community. So
I personally think that from an outside perspective, it's better received as a team approach, even though we still have very similar facets of the containment model. It

might just be the wording itself, the title that might be well received from an outside perspective. And sometimes, even though it's not that different, it is just a better approach. So having done CMTs in Idaho.
Things did not happen unless every, at least one person from every facet was present. And that might be something that also is a better implementation. So if there's a staffing, it's not.
just probation and treatment, it's, you know, whoever else might be relevant to the situation. And the team's model approach might lend to that better than the containment model currently. I mean, I'm just kind of giving out my two cents on it. And then reading all the comments, my thought on that is we kind of need both Chairwoman Goulden and Karolyn to be present so they can give us the explanation beyond this as a grammatical issue.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:06:27
Okay.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:06:31
Jim Hanratty, maybe it would be advisable that we just get a chance to review it. I don't know how many people have actually skimmed through this or reviewed it, but before we can make any really legitimate comments about it, we ought to digest it.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:06:32
Um...
Yeah, no, I agree with that. It is lengthy. But yeah, it was, it was on, it was on, like I said, our agenda for last time and then we didn't get to it. We have it here again. Okay.
Okay, so I guess then the question would be, should we even go through the comments that we think we can handle, like some of the grammatical things or awkward, you know, awkward sentencing, things like that, or spell out an acronym? Or you guys, are we leaning towards just tabling this and seeing if they can join us for the discussion?
Jim seems to think table.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:07:28
Yeah, I agree.

Brecken Blades 1:07:33
Anyone else?
Would you be in favor of it?

Blake Barney 1:07:35
I think the grammatical stuff, we can easily check that off the list. That way, there's far less things to address with both of them next time. And it also demonstrates that we are actively reviewing the document and not that we've tabled it two months in a row.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:07:52
Well, I appreciate that, but time permitted, I still need to resolve what we did last time regarding the polygraph and those definitions to the satisfaction of this board or subcommittee. And I think that would be an easier take and an easier goal to accomplish today, as opposed to trying to go through a
52-page document for grammatical errors, but that's my two cents.

Brecken Blades 1:08:21
You mean going through here, Jim, to just add in the polygraph comments right now is what you want to do, or you're talking about a different document?

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:08:28
No, I'm talking about the last meeting we had regarding the definition of what's resolved, what's risk relevant, and adding the specific issue to the grid as per Missy's request to have you guys look at that to see if it makes sense, if you had any comments about how we should adjust that, if you still wanted me to put in examples or not.
which we kind of said no before, but I can see why somebody would like to see examples at the bigger board, and I can do that as well. But either way, I think I'd like to be able to submit something to DPS so we can at least say, okay, here's the document, and I promised Jenna that I would get that to her.
If, if there's no opposition to getting that done now, or if you'd like to wait until next time.

Brecken Blades 1:09:20
Is it a document that we have already in our, that was, that was, you're talking about something we had maybe for last time in the background that we could look at?

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:09:29
Well, I'd have to share my screen to show it to you. It was the same thing I showed you last time. I just haven't submitted it yet because I added things to it. So I needed to get finalization from the subcommittee members before I submitted it to Jenna.

Brecken Blades 1:09:36
Got it.
Okay. I just don't think that we're able to have like substantive discussion about things that are not on the agenda. I think all we can do about things that are not agendized is add it to the next agenda. Correct me if I'm wrong, Jenna, but I think that's where we might be stuck is that it's not.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:09:51
So be it.

Brecken Blades 1:10:01
Not.
listed on here unless we consider it discussion of standards for the adult sex offense specific evaluations. And then in that, if that is what it's part of, then that is agendized.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:10:12
That's what it was part of.

Brecken Blades 1:10:12
Um...
OK.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:10:15
Because it was the contributor, you know, how does polygraph contribute to the

treatment risk assessment contribution and the risk management contribution? You remember the grid? I think you have it up there. I don't, if you'll scroll down, scroll down just to the bottom of that, I don't think you'll see that at the very bottom there should be one added.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:10:27
Yeah.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:10:35
for specific issue. And that's really the only thing that I added to it. So that, you know, because clearly we do use what we refer to as specific issues, which really more is more accurately described as a single issue screening test. But

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:10:39
Okay.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:10:54
It should still be in there for sure, because we utilize it to sometimes resolve tests.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:11:00
Okay, so we are saying you would like this document to go to the larger board for their review as kind of the polygraph piece of some of the evaluations?

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:11:12
No, that's not what I'm saying. What I'm saying is I need the subcommittee's input as to the additions that I made to it before we do that.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:11:21
Does this does this one that we're looking at have the additions? No.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:11:24
No, it does not.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:11:25

Okay, okay, so then maybe for our next agenda, we can review the one with additions. Does that work?

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:11:32
Sure, unless you want to see it right now, just take a second.

Brecken Blades 1:11:38
And.
Okay.
Okay, so I guess, so what you're saying is instead of the CMT teams model discussion.
for us to do that instead.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:11:51
And table the other one while we all have a chance to read it. I'm sure there's some members here who haven't even seen it yet.
The CMT thing.

Brecken Blades 1:11:59
Well, I know, but that's where I'm saying, like, technically it's been on our background material for two months. So that might be the case, but we all at this point should have at least, you know, looked at it a little bit to some degree. I know that it's long, but I think where we're landing is that it would be more helpful to have input of the people who wrote the comments.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:12:17
Absolutely, I agree with that.

Brecken Blades 1:12:18
you know, then to go through it all on our own. I do think there are some grammatical things that I think we can probably agree to that wouldn't, that don't change the substance of the...
paragraph, like for example, that could just be.
Agreed upon, like, for you know, in this first paragraph, she she put a strike through

with the with each other to, you know, just simplifying the sentences, um, kind of like Blake said.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:12:47
Okay, whatever you want to do, Doctor.

Brecken Blades 1:12:47
Okay.
Well, I don't think we have to go through all of those. I'm saying we could probably, you know, adopt those in the document as a whole. So if you have your document, Jim, go ahead.

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 1:13:38
I think you're muted.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:13:38
I'm sorry. I think I did accidentally. I'm sorry. So this is the document that I'm proposing to submit after, you know, comments or feedback from the subcommittee members. The only thing I really added on the grid was this bottom part here, the specific issue. And I'll remind everybody that

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:13:58
The columns are...
the primary purpose, the treatment slash risk assessment contribution, and the supervision slash risk management contribution. So on that specific issue, it really just kind of depends on what kind of test was originally done. The specific issue may be used to clarify or resolve an identified allegation or disputed behavior.
It's single issue in nature. It's singular, so it's not a mixed issue. It's not another maintenance. It may be an element of the maintenance that's parsed out in a single issue format, which kind of raises the reliability of the test result. It's not to be confused with a diagnostic outcome, like an instant offense where there's actually an event that we're testing for that's known. So it does support the treatment planning, the risk assessment and management, and it provides guidance for community supervision strategies to manage risk and promote compliance. So you can say I put those in there and I was kind of hoping that if anybody had any experience,

as treatment providers with specific issues with polygraph, if they felt that that was suitable to describe those elements for the specific issue examination, or if I should add something.
I'm hearing crickets, so I'm supposing that everybody likes it.
I also put together this, how it fits together, because I think Dr. Blades, you had some initial questions initially a couple months back about how polygraph ties into assessment. So I put it all together in a kind of a document here for the purposes and appropriate use of polygraph. Everybody can read this on their own, I guess.
This is consistent with what I described before. The thing I would emphasize is this part right here.
The recommended policy, or in this case, I put training statement because obviously we also do training. And that's important. I can take training out if you want to, but I think this is really an important statement that should be augmented somewhere in the guidelines.
I don't need to read it out loud, but I'm sure you guys can all read it.
And again, time permitting, I'm trying to be quick about it. If there's any feedback, this is what I'm proposing that we submit for upload to DPS, as I promised.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:16:41
Okay, does anybody have questions for?
About the document or comments or?

BB **Blake Barney** 1:16:52
I would just say my comment is, Jim, you're the expert in this and what you have created here seems very clear. And to me, it looks like something that we could submit to the larger board and get any kind of feedback they may have. But
I have a hard time commenting on things that I'm certainly not an expert in. So it looks great to me.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:17:19
Okay. Scott, do you have any feedback as far as the risk relevant behaviors or should I put a separate definition in there? I think we talked about that last time that we had it kind of had that resolved where you wanted me to flip-flop the paragraphs. So it made it very clear that we're talking about PSOCT testing and it's a, you know,

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:17:40
Anything, any feedback on that from you?

SCOTT NAEGELE 1:17:43
I would only say if you did what we talked about, then I'm good with that. To be perfectly honest with you, this is so microscopic on the screen right now. I can't hardly read it as it exists. So it's not your fault. It's just I can't.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:17:56
No, I'm sorry.

SCOTT NAEGELE 1:18:01
And, but it, but if you incorporated what we talked about, or you made the switch that we talked about, then, then I'm good with that. I think Sheridyn has a question or a comment to make.

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 1:18:15
Yeah, I think this is, you know, really comprehensive and I'll echo that you're the expert in this. I think before we present it to the board, maybe
We can clean up just the formatting. I know there's a spacing issue and some inconsistent type, like font types or sizing, but it looks great.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:18:33
Yeah.
Yeah, OK.
Okay, so do you want to table this to another discussion or you just want me to make the appropriate formatted proofreading?

Brecken Blades 1:18:51
I think I just, procedurally, Major Mitchell, are we, is it fine for us to move this forward or do we need to have had it?
Reviewed in a different way, or are we are we okay?

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:19:03

Well, I wasn't planning on presenting it. I mean, I'm sorry, I wasn't planning on uploading it until after we submit it to the board for review. So first, my goal was to get feedback from you folks in the subcommittee and then let the big board look at it and let them have their comments about it and then we could submit it. Isn't that how we typically do it?

Jenna Mitchell 1:19:23
For procedurally, what we normally do is have documents submitted to AZSOMB the e-mail address. And then if it's assigned to the subcommittee, we'll include it as background material with the documents for the subcommittees to review. And then we will send it

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:19:31
Mhm.

Jenna Mitchell 1:19:42
to the full board once the subcommittees have determined that it's ready for it. If it's something that's submitted that goes directly to the full board, then once again, it comes to us, to azsomb at azdps.gov through e-mail, and we distribute it to the board members. So happy to do that for you. I know that we try to get those documents out to the board.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:19:57
Understood.

Jenna Mitchell 1:20:02
the board committee, the board members and the subcommittee members, you know, at least three to four days ahead of a meeting so that you have time to review it, you know, make notes, provide meaningful feedback. So happy to do that for you if you'd like us to do that. We just don't have this updated document and it wasn't included as part of the background material. So I'm not sure that
if the subcommittee's feels ready to approve it or not.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:20:30
That's really what I'm looking for at this point. If you'd like to table it until another

time and time permits to discuss it, we can do that. I can make the appropriate formatting corrections and have Jenna's crew take a look at it for those formatting issues. It wouldn't affect content if that's amenable to everybody.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:20:57
Well, does everybody feel like they would like to read it first, or this is similar to what you presented to us, right, Jim, in terms of it being the verbal presentation you gave, and then we've already had the information, correct?

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:21:05
Yes, it's a summary.
Correct. The only thing that I probably would add is the risk relevant definition, just for the sake of honoring what we talked about last time and flip-flopping those two paragraphs. And I'll remind everybody what that looks like here.
That's.
That's these two. So instead of having the note down at the bottom, I'm going to incorporate this paragraph on the bottom. Can everybody see this?

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:21:46
Yeah.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:21:48
Yeah, having that incorporated to the risk relevant behavior definition so that it's very clear that this is a PCSOT purposes thing and not to be confused with an actual risk assessment instrument. It's just something that we

AA **Amanda Adkins** 1:21:48
Yep, and bigger. Thank you.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:22:07
Contribute, and I think, Doctor.
Somebody, somebody said it last time that we didn't need this because the pattern of conduct was enough to address that we're not talking about fantasies. This came up in the bigger in the bigger meeting where I think Katie had mentioned that it doesn't always, you know, how are the courts going to look at fantasies and

perceptions and other things? I believe that was her point.
This doesn't.

Jenna Mitchell 1:22:39
Unmute me so I can ask.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:22:41
What's that?

Jenna Mitchell 1:22:43
Jim, this is Jenna with DPS. So I don't know what documents you're showing, but what I'm seeing on the screen is that separate from the table that you showed earlier, because these definitions, my understanding was, were provided and were incorporated into the early termination considerations as footnotes.
explanations. So I don't know. I don't know what you have up. Is this just a standalone document? Is it part of your other?

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:23:02
Correct.
This is, this is, this is where that came from.
So, I mean, I'm fine with just leaving it in the early termination, but I think we should also have it in the build that we put together for polygraph in general for the guidelines. We only put it in that document because we were talking about risk assessments and how polygraph fits into that.
For the early term.

Jenna Mitchell 1:23:37
So I just want to be clear because to Dr. Blade's earlier point, we don't have agendized I'm not sure exactly how you said it, but guidelines for polygraph examiners, I think is what you said a few minutes ago. Are we working on a separate document for polygraph examiners? Guidelines
For them, or is it part of something that?

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:23:58
I think, no, it's part of the standards for the item 2A2, the standards for the adult sex

offense specific evaluations in that we're continuing on kind of with the discussion of the polygraph standards and evaluations. But I do, I do think, Jim, that I
I would probably appreciate being able to see the document all full and put together. And that way I can have eyes on it as background and material and give everybody a chance to look at it all kind of as one consistent document. I know you've gone over it with us before, but I want to give it the, you know, the time and the review that it's due because you put time and effort into this and

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:24:24
Okay.
No problem.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:24:40
Um, so I think it's worth.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:24:41
If you don't have a deadline for me, I'll be happy to take my time and put it together and you guys can all look at it at the same time. I'm real okay with that.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:24:49
Okay, great. Thank you. Well, I think so then for future agenda items, we'll add, you know, the review of this document and it says deadline to submit December 2nd at noon. So I think that would be the deadline, but that provides you, you know, almost a month. Right, so.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:25:03
Okay, that should be plenty of time.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:25:05
Okay.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:25:06
Great. Thank you. You just let me off the hook a little bit.

Jenna Mitchell 1:25:06
And Jim, if there's anything that Ashlesha, I can do.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:25:07
Okay.
Yeah.

Jenna Mitchell 1:25:10
Jim, if there's any help you need from Ashlesha and I, please let us know. We're happy to help you get that document ready.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:25:22
I'm sorry, what was your question?

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:25:30
They were just saying if there's any help you need putting it together, they can help you.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:25:36
Sorry. No, I don't think I need any help. I'll just, I noticed that there was some formatting errors, but I'll go ahead and change the font size on the one section and go through it a little bit better and make sure it meets the.
you know, the need. I'll resolve it. And I'll also make sure that the definition for the risk relevant behaviors is flip-flopped in or incorporated in a way that makes it very clear. And of course, any feedback that you guys will have when we do discuss it will be greatly appreciated.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:26:10
Thanks, Jim. Amanda, do you have your hand up?

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:26:11
You bet.

AA **Amanda Adkins** 1:26:13

I just wanted to quickly throw out in regards to the CMT model, I noticed that a lot of the time discretionary, but one of the things is that everyone has to agree 100%. I wanted to throw out the idea of maybe like an 80 or a 90% agreement from the panel, just not from our team, but like for people out.
in on probation trying to get off. A lot of it's very discretionary.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:26:39
Mhm.
I agree with you. I think there's things that are going to require our discussion. There's another piece that says that like a supervisor has to coordinate a meeting of the CMT like right away. So some of those would be.

AA **Amanda Adkins** 1:26:53
And like they talk about a progression, they talk about a progression, but they don't actually put like a step down or like a what that looks like. Like it's pretty clear with SVP what that step down phases are, right? So maybe we could model something similar after that process. Just an idea to, you know, really throw things in the works at the end.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:27:05
Yeah.
Well, I think because aside from maybe the just sort of the grammatical pieces of this, we're going to table this document. So, and then invite Beth to our next meeting and then hopefully Karolyn is available. And then that way it gives you more time. If you, if anybody has any other.
comments or things they want to add to this, there would be time to submit those prior to the next meeting when I would imagine if other people are present, this is probably a large portion of what will take up our time, I would guess.
So any further thoughts on this document or?
Okay, any other future agenda items?
Okay, thanks for being here, everybody. Should we do...
Does somebody want to move to adjourn the meeting?

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:28:15
Jim, I move that we adjourn the meeting.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:28:19
OK, great.

AA **Amanda Adkins** 1:28:19
Amanda, I second that.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:28:22
Thank you. Okay, all in favor.

SN **SCOTT NAEGELE** 1:28:25
Aye.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:28:25
Aye.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:28:25
Aye. Anyone opposed.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:28:30
Anyone abstaining from this vote? Okay. All right. That's the end. Thanks, everyone. Thanks for your work today. This was a great meeting. Appreciate it. Bye.

◉ stopped transcription