



DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC SECURITY

Your Partner For A Stronger Arizona

Janice K. Brewer
Governor

Clarence H. Carter
Director

AUG 14 2012

The Honorable Janice K. Brewer
Governor of Arizona
1700 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Governor Brewer:

Arizona Revised Statute § 8-817 requires the Department of Economic Security (DES) to prepare a report by August 15 of each year that contains the following information for joint investigations by Child Protective Services, local law enforcement and county attorneys, of allegations of abuse or neglect that contain criminal conduct allegations:

- The number of criminal conduct allegations investigated.
- The number of reports that were jointly investigated pursuant to the established protocols.
- The reasons why a joint investigation did not occur.

In accordance with this requirement, DES is pleased to submit the enclosed report. If you have any questions, please contact me at (602) 542-5757.

Sincerely,

Clarence H. Carter
Director

Enclosure

cc: The Honorable Steve Pierce, President, Arizona State Senate
The Honorable Andy Tobin, Speaker, Arizona State House of Representatives
Maricopa County Attorney Bill Montgomery, Maricopa County Attorney's Office
Janet Fisher, Acting Director, Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records



DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC SECURITY

Your Partner For A Stronger Arizona

DIVISION OF CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES (DCYF) 2012 JOINT INVESTIGATION REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Arizona Revised Statute § 8-817 mandates that the Department of Economic Security (DES) develop, establish, and implement initial screening and safety assessment protocols in consultation with the Attorney General and statewide with county attorneys, chiefs of police, sheriffs, medical experts, victims' rights advocates, domestic violence victim advocates, and mandatory reporters. These inter-agency protocols are to guide the conduct of investigations of allegations involving criminal conduct. The Division of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF), which oversees Child Protective Services (CPS), has worked with the above mentioned agencies to comply with the requirements set forth in this statute.

This information fulfills DES' and the Division's responsibility for the reporting requirement under A.R.S. § 8-817 for state fiscal year 2012.

When a citizen calls the Child Abuse Hotline with a concern about suspected abuse or neglect, the staff will listen to the concern and if it meets pre-established criteria they will generate a report for investigation and assign it to a field unit. The initial tracking characteristic is assigned by the Hotline based on the information provided by the caller. If after the investigation, another tracking characteristic applies, then the field unit can add it to the case. A tracking characteristic is a circumstance that occurs in a report. It may occur independently of child abuse allegations or may carry a general description of a condition that exists in the family. Reports requiring a joint investigation with law enforcement have a tracking characteristic of Criminal Conduct (CC).¹

The first data element in the table that follows is the number of reports generated for field investigation that contained a Criminal Conduct (CC) allegation (Table 1). According to the protocols agreed to by all required parties under A.R.S § 8-817, any report that contains a "CC" characteristic must be reported to the appropriate law enforcement agency and a joint investigation must occur.

¹ "Criminal conduct allegation" means an allegation of conduct by a parent, guardian, or custodian of a child that, if true, would constitute any of the following:

- (a) A violation of section 13-3623 involving child abuse.
- (b) A felony offense that constitutes domestic violence as defined in section 13-3601.
- (c) A violation of section 13-1404 or 13-1406 involving a minor.
- (d) A violation of section 13-1405, 13-1410 or 13-1417.
- (e) Any other act of abuse that is classified as a felony.

**TABLE 1: NUMBER OF REPORTS CODED AS CRIMINAL CONDUCT (CC) ALLEGATIONS
RECEIVED BY THE DIVISION**

County	Number of Reports
APACHE	21
COCHISE	125
COCONINO	105
GILA	69
GRAHAM	31
GREENLEE	2
LA PAZ	18
MARICOPA	3085
MOHAVE	206
NAVAJO	73
PIMA	1038
PINAL	378
SANTA CRUZ	25
YAVAPAI	174
YUMA	133
Total	5,483

In SFY 2011, statewide there were 2,233 reports that contained a "CC" characteristic. In SFY 2012, there were 5,483 reports with a "CC" characteristic which is a 60 percent increase. As in previous reporting years, the majority of reports that contain the "CC" characteristic occur in Maricopa County. The next highest number of reports containing these characteristics occurs in Pima County.

The second data element reported is the number of cases that are jointly investigated according to the protocols (Table 2). As stated above, all reports that contain the "CC" allegation are intended to be jointly investigated by Child Protective Services and the appropriate law enforcement agency.

TABLE 2: NUMBER OF CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES REPORTS CATEGORIZED AS CC JOINTLY INVESTIGATED ACCORDING TO THE PROTOCOLS

County	Number of Reports
APACHE	15
COCHISE	73
COCONINO	38
GILA	55
GRAHAM	20
GREENLEE	2
LA PAZ	7
MARICOPA	1809
MOHAVE	99
NAVAJO	40
PIMA	558
PINAL	197
SANTA CRUZ	21
YAVAPAI	131
YUMA	89
Total	3,154

For a variety of reasons detailed below, some reports classified as CC are not actually jointly investigated. In FY 2011, the percentage of reports that required and actually received a joint investigation in Maricopa County was 74.7 percent. For FY 2012 that percentage fell to 58.6 percent. The statewide percentage of reports that were jointly investigated for FY 2011 was 70.7 percent; this year the statewide percentage decreased to 57.5 percent. The Division continues to work with law enforcement to identify barriers and strengthen relationships to improve on the number of reports requiring a joint investigation that are jointly investigated.

There are several reasons why a joint investigation between Child Protective Services and law enforcement may not occur (Table 3). The main reasons are:

- **Child Not Available:** At the time of the initial contact by CPS or law enforcement, the alleged child victim is not available to be interviewed. This occasionally happens, for example, if a report is received and the alleged child victim is located in another state at the time of the investigation.
- **CPS Not Available:** At the time of the initial contact by law enforcement, or during subsequent interviews with the alleged victim or perpetrators, the CPS case manager is unable to be present to participate in the investigation. An example is when a report is called in by the Victims Witness Advocate Office to report abuse or neglect of a child, where police interviews and the investigation have already occurred before CPS was notified.

- Law Enforcement Disagrees:** When the CPS case manager receives a report requiring joint investigation, contact is made with the appropriate law enforcement agency to make a police report and request the joint investigation. Law enforcement officials sometimes decline to accept the information as meeting criminal conduct standards and inform the CPS case manager to conduct the initial contact without law enforcement present. In these situations, CPS follows up with an additional report to law enforcement if the initial contact further indicates criminal activity.
- Law Enforcement Unavailable:** When the CPS case manager contacts law enforcement prior to the initial contact, there are times that due to other incidents, law enforcement is unable to provide an officer or detective for the initial response. In these situations, CPS follows up with an additional report to law enforcement if the initial contact further indicates criminal activity.
- No Jurisdiction:** If the alleged victim or perpetrator lives on either a federal military installation or Native American reservation, CPS does not have jurisdiction and the case is transferred to the appropriate agency. In addition, if it is determined that the alleged incident occurred on one of the above listed locations, CPS does not have jurisdiction and the case is transferred to the appropriate agency.

TABLE 3: REASONS WHY A JOINT INVESTIGATION DID NOT OCCUR

REASON THAT THE JOINT INVESTIGATION WAS NOT CONDUCTED						
County	Child Not Available	CPS Not Available	Law Enforcement Disagrees	Law Enforcement Unavailable	No Jurisdiction	Total
APACHE	0	1	5	0	0	6
COCHISE	2	2	23	14	1	42
COCONINO	2	3	7	5	2	19
GILA	0	0	5	7	1	13
GRAHAM	1	0	5	3	0	9
GREENLEE	n/a*	n/a*	n/a*	n/a*	n/a*	n/a*
LA PAZ	1	0	9	1	0	11
MARICOPA	56	66	409	129	4	664
MOHAVE	3	6	31	15	1	56
NAVAJO	1	5	17	1	2	26
PIMA	20	17	232	113	7	389
PINAL	1	2	99	24	0	126
SANTA CRUZ	1	0	2	0	0	3
YAVAPAI	0	2	20	9	0	31
YUMA	2	1	16	5	1	25
Total	90	105	880	326	19	1,420

*Greenlee County did not have any reports classified as "CC" where a joint investigation did not occur.

The number of joint investigation reports identified where a joint investigation did not occur significantly increased to 1,420 in FY 2012 compared to 491 in FY 2011. Continued partnerships between law enforcement and CPS provide opportunities for identifying and addressing systemic issues between the two agencies. Additionally, in February of 2012, DCYF hired an Advocacy Center Liaison who has begun working with local law enforcement throughout the state to identify and address these issues.

In addition to the circumstances requiring a joint investigation based upon the report to the Child Abuse Hotline meeting the criteria for the “CC” code, Child Protective Services often initiates and conducts a joint investigation with law enforcement in other situations. This occurs when the case manager encounters a situation where the initial report does not contain a “CC” code but when the investigation is started, information is discovered that leads CPS to initiate and conduct a joint investigation with law enforcement. In FY 2012, 138 of these types of joint investigations were conducted, as indicated in the following table.

TABLE 4: REPORTS THAT WERE NOT INITIALLY CODED “CC” BUT WHERE A JOINT INVESTIGATION WAS LATER CONDUCTED

County	Number of Reports
COCHISE	4
GILA	1
LA PAZ	2
MARICOPA	63
MOHAVE	4
NAVAJO	3
PIMA	43
PINAL	9
YAVAPAI	4
YUMA	5
Total	138