APPENDIX 1

Monthly Review FEB 2015 - JAN 2016

	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	YTD
Detention Probable Cause (number of cases)	15	9	13	17	13	14	12	9	10	17	15	13	157
Attorney Present	15	9	13	17	13	14	12	9	10	17	15	13	157
Attorney Present %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Affidavit of Complaint	15	9	13	17	13	14	12	9	10	17	15	13	157
Affidavit of Complaint %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Uncontested	5	5	3	7	5	6	4	5	2	6	4	3	55
Uncontested %	33%	56%	23%	41%	38%	43%	33%	56%	20%	35%	27%	23%	36%
Contested	10	4	10	10	8	8	8	4	8	11	11	10	102
Contested %	67%	44%	77%	59%	62%	57%	67%	44%	80%	65%	73%	77%	64%
By Oral Argument	10	4	10	10	7	8	8	4	8	11	11	10	101
Oral Argument %	100%	100%	100%	100%	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%
By Written Documents	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Written Documents %	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
By Live Witnesses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Live Witnesses %	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
By Continuance for Proof	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Continuance for Proof %	0%	0%	0%	0%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Statement of Attorney Regarding Notice and ADWisement of Rights	15	9	13	17	13	14	12	9	10	17	15	13	157
Statement of Attorney Regarding Notice and ADWisement of Rights %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Rights Form by Magistrate (protection from self-incrimination)	15	9	13	17	13	14	12	9	10	17	15	13	157
Rights Form by Magistrate (protection from self-incrimination) %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Numbers do not include Juveniles given DAT Release or summonses

Monthly Review FEB 2015 - JAN 2016

	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	YTD
Adjudicatory Hearing (number of cases)	16	16	16	16	18	16	16	16	16	17	15	16	194
Attorney Present	16	16	16	16	18	16	16	16	16	17	15	16	194
Attorney Present %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Rights Form (protection from self-incrimination) *excludes nolle pros	15	16	14	14	16	14	13	13	16	15	15	14	175
Rights Form (protection from self-incrimination) %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	93%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%
Petition *excludes nolle pros	15	16	14	14	16	14	14	13	16	15	15	14	176
Petition %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Amended Petition *excludes nolle pros	3	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	10
Amended Petition %	20%	0%	7%	7%	13%	0%	7%	0%	6%	7%	0%	0%	6%
Trial	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	9
Trial %	6%	0%	0%	6%	11%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	0%	0%	5%
Waiver and Admission	14	16	14	13	14	13	13	12	15	13	15	14	166
Waiver and Admission %	88%	100%	88%	81%	78%	81%	81%	75%	94%	76%	100%	88%	86%
Plea and Rights Form	14	16	14	13	14	13	13	12	15	13	15	14	166
Plea and Rights Form %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Order *excludes nolle pros	15	16	14	14	16	14	14	13	16	15	15	14	176
Order %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Nolle Pros by State	1	0	2	2	2	2	2	3	0	2	0	2	18

Monthly Review FEB 2015 - JAN 2016

	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	YTD
Transfer Summary (number of cases)													
Notice of Transfer Filed	12	24	12	9	5	13	7	15	13	21	11	19	161
Pre-Transfer Report Denied	0	3	3	6	2	2	0	2	3	2	2	2	27
Motion for Transfer Granted	6	4	4	10	3	4	1	1	1	3	6	6	49
Transfer Hearing Review (number of cases)	6	4	4	10	4	4	1	1	1	3	6	3	47
Attorney Present	6	4	4	10	4	4	1	1	1	3	6	3	47
Attorney Present %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Rights Form (Protection against self-incrimination)	6	4	4	10	4	4	1	1	1	3	6	3	47
Rights Form (Protection against self-incrimination) %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Petition	6	4	4	10	4	4	1	1	1	3	6	3	47
Petition %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Notice of Intent to Transfer	6	4	4	10	4	4	1	1	1	3	6	3	47
Notice of Intent to Transfer %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Transfer (Heard in Major Crimes)													
Granted	3	3	3	5	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	1	26
Granted %	50%	75%	75%	50%	25%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	17%	33%	67%
Waived	3	1	1	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	20
Waived %	50%	25%	25%	50%	50%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	83%	67%	31%
Denied	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Denied %	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Written Findings, Rationale for Transfer:	6	4	4	10	3	4	1	1	1	3	6	3	46
Written Findings, Rationale for Transfer: %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
The Extent and Nature of the Child's Prior Delinquency	6	4	4	10	3	4	1	1	1	3	6	3	46
The Extent and Nature of the Child's Prior Delinquency %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
The Nature of Past Treatment Efforts	6	4	4	10	3	4	1	1	1	3	6	3	46
The Nature of Past Treatment Efforts %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
The Childs Suitability for Additional Treatment	6	4	4	10	3	4	1	1	1	3	6	3	46
The Childs Suitability for Additional Treatment %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
The Nature of the Delinquent Act Alleged	6	4	4	10	3	4	1	1	1	3	6	3	46
The Nature of the Delinquent Act Alleged %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Monthly Review FEB 2015 - JAN 2016

	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	YTD
The Child Social Factors	6	4	4	10	3	4	1	1	1	3	6	3	46
The Child Social Factors % *excludes transfers denied	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
The Alternatives Within the Juvenile Justice System Considered and Rational for Rej	6	4	4	10	3	4	1	1	1	3	6	3	46
The Alternatives Within the Juvenile Justice System Considered and Rational f	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Whether the Juvenile Court and Juvenile Justice System can Provide Rehabilitation o	6	4	4	10	3	4	1	1	1	3	6	3	46
Whether the Juvenile Court and Juvenile Justice System Can Provide Rehabilit	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Defense Presented Evidence													
Opposing Probable Cause	3	2	3	5	2	3	1	1	1	3	0	1	25
Opposing Probable Cause %	50%	50%	75%	50%	50%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	33%	65%
In Support of Continued Juvenile Jurisdiction	3	2	3	3	2	1	1	0	0	3	0	1	19
In Support of Continued Juvenile Jurisdiction %	50%	50%	75%	30%	50%	25%	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	33%	43%
Defense Waived Evidence													
Opposing Probable Cause	1	2	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	18
Opposing Probable Cause %	17%	50%	25%	30%	50%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	67%	30%
In Support of Continued Juvenile Jurisdiction	1	2	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	18
In Support of Continued Juvenile Jurisdiction %	17%	50%	25%	30%	50%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	67%	30%

NOTICE OF TRANSFER and WAIVED TO CRIMINAL COURT MOTION FOR TRANSFER GRANTED 2011 - 2013

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
NOTICE OF TRANSFER	0	0	266	190	153
WAIVED CRIMINAL COURT-MOTION FOR TRANSFER GRANTED	121	99	90	77	47

NOTE: We didn't start tracking "NOTICE OF TRANSFER" in JCS until 2013.

NOTICE OF TRANSFER DENIED
2011 - 2015

		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
NOTICE OF TRANSFER DENIED	JANUARY	1	0	8	3	0
	FEBRUARY	2	1	3	5	0
	MARCH	0	1	4	2	3
	APRIL	2	1	5	4	3
	MAY	2	1	2	3	6
	JUNE	1	0	3	3	2
	JULY	1	2	5	1	2
	AUGUST	1	1	2	6	1
	SEPTEMBER	0	0	2	3	2
	OCTOBER	0	2	4	3	3
	NOVEMBER	1	2	5	2	2
	DECEMBER	0	2	10	2	2
	Total	**11**	**13**	**52**	**37**	**26**
Total		**11**	**13**	**52**	**37**	**26**

NOTE: This report is counting distinct juveniles. If a juvenile receives a disposition of "NOTICE OF TRANSFER DENIED" more than one time in the date range the juvenile will be counted once in each month and/or year but will only be counted one time in the overall total.

APPENDIX 2

PROBATION CONFERENCE REVIEWS

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	AVG YTD
# CASES REVIEWED	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
ATTORNEY													
None	39	39	40	39	40	40	38	39	40	40	39	39	
%	98%	98%	100%	98%	100%	100%	95%	98%	100%	100%	98%	98%	
Private							2						
%							5%						
Public Defender	1							1					
%	3%							3%					
Panel		1		1							1	1	
%		3%		3%							3%	3%	
PERSONS PRESENT													
PARENT													
Mother	27	28	30	30	32	28	32	30	32	31	30	29	
%	68%	70%	75%	75%	80%	70%	80%	75%	80%	78%	75%	73%	
Father	5	3	3	3	5	6	4	2	5	2	5	6	
%	13%	8%	8%	8%	13%	15%	10%	5%	13%	5%	13%	15%	
Both	5	5	3	2	2		2	3	3	5	1	2	
%	13%	13%	8%	5%	5%		5%	8%	8%	13%	3%	5%	
Guardian	3	2	3	5	1	5	2	4		1	4	3	
%	8%	5%	8%	13%	3%	13%	5%	10%		3%	10%	8%	
Other		3	2	1	1	3		1		1			
%		8%	5%	3%	3%	8%		3%		3%			
DEMOGRAPHICS													
Age													
< 10	1			1		2			1				
%	3%			3%		5%			3%				
10-12	6	3	1	5	6	6	2	3	2	4	2	3	
%	15%	8%	3%	13%	15%	15%	5%	8%	5%	10%	5%	8%	
13 - 15	16	10	19	16	20	17	17	15	11	11	18	17	
%	40%	25%	48%	40%	50%	43%	43%	38%	28%	28%	45%	43%	
16-17	16	25	19	16	14	14	21	21	26	23	19	19	
%	40%	63%	48%	40%	35%	35%	53%	53%	65%	58%	48%	48%	
18	1	2	1	2		1		1		2	1	1	
%	3%	5%	3%	5%		3%		3%		5%	3%	3%	

SEX/RACE												
MB	22	21	17	24	15	19	26	17	24	19	19	20
%	55%	53%	43%	60%	38%	48%	65%	43%	60%	48%	48%	50%
MW	2	1	1	2	6	1	3	5	3	5	2	2
%	5%	3%	3%	5%	15%	3%	8%	13%	8%	13%	5%	5%
M Other									1			
%									3%			
FB	13	17	17	11	16	19	11	14	12	15	19	17
%	33%	43%	43%	28%	40%	48%	28%	35%	30%	38%	48%	43%
FW	1	1	3	3	3	1		4		1	1	1
%	3%	3%	8%	8%	8%	3%		10%		3%	3%	3%
F Other	2		2									
%	5%		5%									
SPECIAL EDUCATION												
Yes	2		1	2	2	4	1	3	2	2	6	4
%	5%		3%	5%	5%	10%	3%	8%	5%	5%	15%	10%
No	38	40	39	38	38	36	39	37	38	38	34	36
%	95%	100%	98%	95%	95%	90%	98%	93%	95%	95%	85%	90%
OFFENSE												
Offense Level on Grid												
Level I	32	35	37	37	40	33	32	36	37	33	34	32
%	80%	88%	93%	93%	100%	83%	80%	90%	93%	83%	85%	80%
Level II	8	5	3	3		7	8	4	3	7	6	8
%	20%	13%	8%	8%		18%	20%	10%	8%	18%	15%	20%
Level III												
%												
Level IV												
%												
CONFERENCE												
Right to Remain Silent Understood												
Yes	40	40	40	40	40	39	40	40	40	40	40	40
%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
No						1						
%						3%						
Self Incrimination Understood												
Yes	40	40	40	40	40	39	40	40	40	40	40	40
%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
No						1						
%						3%						

Right to a lawyer Understood												
Yes	40	40	40	40	40	39	40	40	40	40	40	10
%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
No						1						
%						3%						
Collateral Consequences Understood												
Yes	40	40	40	40	40	39	40	40	40	40	40	40
%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
No						1						
%						3%						
Was a Lawyer Requested												
Yes	1	1		1				1			1	1
%	3%	3%		3%				3%				
No	39	39	40	39	40	40	40	40	40	40	39	39
%	98%	98%	100%	98%	100%		100%	100%	100%	100%	98%	98%
Process to obtain Lawyer Understood												
Yes	40	40	40	40	40	39		40	40	40	40	40
%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
No						1						
%						3%						
DISPOSITION												
Admitted Charge												
Yes	33	30	28	24	31	29	33	32	31	28	32	29
%	83%	75%	70%	60%	78%	73%	83%	80%	78%	70%	80%	73%
No	7	10	12	16	9	11	7	8	9	12	8	11
%	18%	25%	30%	40%	23%	28%	18%	20%	23%	30%	20%	28%
Disposition												
NPF					1			1	1	6		0%
%					3%			3%	3%	15%		
Verbal Warning	7	10	12	14	8	11	7	7	10	10	9	12
%	18%	25%	30%	35%	20%	28%	18%	18%	25%	25%	23%	30%
Warn/Counsel only	27	20	20	22	24	22	22	22	24	24	24	22
%	68%	50%	50%	55%	60%	55%	55%	55%	60%	60%	60%	55%
Non-custodial Diversio	1	3	2		1	1	5	2	3		5	1
%	3%	8%	5%		3%	3%	13%	5%	8%			3%
BYPASS												
%												
JC-180 (continue probation)												
%												
Evaluation & Referral (	5	6	6	3	4	6	6	5	2		2	5
%	13%	15%	15%	8%	10%	15%	15%	13%	5%		5%	13%
Forfeiture		1			2	1	1	1				
%		3%			5%	3%	3%	3%				

Sanction Level on Grid												
Level I	37	36	39	39	40	36	36	36	35	32	34	33
%	93%	90%	98%	98%	100%	90%	90%	90%	88%	80%	85%	83%
Level II	3	4	1	1		4	4	4	5	8	6	7
%	8%	10%	3%	3%		10%	10%	10%	13%	20%	15%	18%
Level III												
%												
Level IV												
%												
Sanction Consistent with Grid												
Yes	34	36	38	38	40	36	36	40	38	39	39	40
%	85%	90%	95%	95%	100%	90%	90%	100%	95%	98%	98%	100%
No	6	4	2	2		4	4		1	1	1	
%	15%	10%	5%	5%		10%	10%		3%	3%	3%	
Override w/ approval	6	4	2	2		4	4		1	1	1	
%	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%		100%	100%	100%	
SERVICES RECOMMENDED												
No Services Provided												
%												
Services Provided												
%												
Services Declined												
%												
Resource Directory												
Provided	8	12	11	10	8	6	11	7	9	7	4	
%	20%	30%	28%	25%	20%	15%	28%	18%	23%	18%	10%	
Declined	32	28	29	30	32	34	29	33	31	33	36	
%	80%	70%	73%	75%	80%	85%	73%	83%	78%	83%	90%	
E&R Referral												
Referred	5	6	6	4	4	6	6	5	7	3	5	5
%	13%	15%	15%	10%	10%	15%	15%	13%	18%	8%	13%	13%
Declined	35	34	34	36	36	34	34	35	33	37	35	35
%	88%	85%	85%	90%	90%	85%	85%	88%	83%	93%	88%	88%
SERICES RECOMMENDED												
Substance Abuse	2	5	3	2	1	2	1	4	3	3	1	2
%	5%	13%	8%	5%	3%	5%	3%	10%	8%	8%	3%	5%
Mental Health	1				2	3	2		1		2	
%	3%				5%	8%	5%		3%		5%	
Family Counseling	3	3	6	4	2	2	6	3	8	5	2	5
%	8%	8%	15%	10%	5%	5%	15%	8%	20%	13%	5%	13%

Anger Management	3	8	10	3	4	5	4	7	4	5	3	7
%	8%	20%	25%	8%	10%	13%	10%	18%	10%	13%	8%	18%
Domestic Violence Prc	1	1		1			1	1			1	
%	3%	3%		3%			3%	3%			3%	
Mentoring				2								
%				5%								

Juvenile Court of Memphis and Shelby County
616 ADAMS AVENUE MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38105
P.O. Box 310 MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38101

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bill Powell

FROM: Barry Mitchell, Chief Probation Officer

DATE: March 1, 2016

SUBJECT: December 2015 Monthly Review

The following information relates to the items being followed in a monthly sampling of 40 cases that were handled nonjudicially.

There was one request for a panel attorney. The parent and child are made aware that an attorney is available if requested.

The mother continues to be the most consistent party at the conference. A positive note is the presence of a parent or guardian at each conference.

Most of the children are in the 13 to 17 age group. This allows the Court to focus more diversion efforts for this group.

Most of the children present at the conference are either male or female black. On a positive note, the children are accompanying their parent or guardian to the conference.

Most of the children are not in a Special Education program. The Court does have a truancy counselor if needed.

Most offenses are handled at Level I of the graduated sanctions grid. (GSG). The counselors do an excellent job of reading and

explaining the Miranda rights to the children. The counselors do a good job of explaining what these rights mean.

Most of the children, with the consent of their parent, admit to the charge. The Miranda rights are effectively explained to and understood by both the parent and child. The counselors will ask if the child understands their rights. The counselor sometimes will ask for the child to state what a specific right means to them.

The most consistent disposition at the conference is either a Verbal Warning or Warned and Counseled. These dispositions are Level I and/or Level II dispositions and are consistent with the GSG.

Although most children decline a Resource Directory and show little interest in a referral to Evaluation and Referral, the counselors still provide this opportunity. When requested, services offered included substance abuse, mental health, family counseling, anger management, domestic violence, and mentoring.

This process under the oversight of good supervision appears to be operating smoothly. We are continuing to look for ways to improve the process.

	JAN	AVG YTD
# CASES REVIEWED	40	40
ATTORNEY		
None	39	
%	98%	
Private	1	
%	3%	
Public Defender		
%		
Panel		
%		
PERSONS PRESENT		
Mother	26	
%	65%	
Father	5	
%	13%	
Both	2	
%	5%	
Guardian	3	
%	8%	
Other	4	
%	10%	
DEMOGRAPHICS		
Age		
< 10		
%	0%	
10-12	3	
%	8%	
13 - 15	20	
%	50%	
16-17	15	
%	38%	
18	2	
%	5%	
SEX/RACE		
MB	23	
%	58%	
MW	3	
%	8%	
M Other		
%		
FB	13	
%	33%	
FW	1	
%	3%	
F Other		
%	0%	
SPECIAL EDUCATION		
Yes	5	
%	13%	

No	35
%	88%

OFFENSE

Offense Level on Grid	
Level I	37
%	93%
Level II	2
%	5%
Level III	1
%	3%
Level IV	
%	

CONFERENCE

Right to Remain Silent Understood	
Yes	40
%	100%
No	
%	
Self Incrimination Understood	
Yes	40
%	100%
No	
%	
Right to a lawyer Understood	
Yes	40
%	100%
No	
%	
Collateral Consequences Understood	
Yes	40
%	100%
No	
%	
Was a Lawyer Requested	
Yes	1
%	3%
No	39
%	98%
Process to obtain Lawyer Understood	
Yes	40
%	100%
No	
%	

DISPOSITION

Admitted Charge	
Yes	24
%	60%
No	16
%	40%

Disposition	
NPF	1
%	3%
Verbal Warning	18

%	45%
Warn/Counsel only	17
%	43%
Non-custodial Diversio	1
%	3%
BYPASS	
%	
JC-180 (continue probation)	
%	
Evaluation & Referral (	2
%	5%
Forfeiture	2
%	5%

Sanction Level on Grid

Level I	37
%	93%
Level II	2
%	5%
Level III	1
%	3%
Level IV	
%	

Sanction Consistent with Grid

Yes	40
%	100%
No	
%	0%
Override w/ approval	
%	

SERVICES RECOMMENDED

No Services Provided	2
%	5%
Services Provided	10
%	25%
Services Declined	28
%	70%
Resource Directory	
Provided	8
%	20%
Declined	32
%	80%
E&R Referral	
Referred	2
%	5%
Declined	34
%	85%

SERICES RECOMMENDED

Substance Abuse	4
%	10%
Mental Health	2
%	5%
Family Counseling	4
%	10%
Anger Management	4

%	10%
Domestic Violence Prc	1
%	3%
Mentoring	
%	

Probation Case Review
&
Narrative

Memphis and Shelby County
MS AVENUE MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38105
Box 310 MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38101

f Probation Officer

DATE: February 16, 2016

SUBJECT: January 2016 Monthly Review

The following information relates to the items being followed in a monthly sampling of 40 cases that were handled nonjudicially.

One child had a private attorney at the conference. The parent and child are made aware that an attorney is available if requested.

The mother continues to be the most consistent party at the conference. Our staff utilizes "flex schedules" to make the conference as convenient as possible for the parent and child.

Most of the children are in the 13 to 17 age group. This allows the Court to focus more diversion efforts for this group.

Most of the children present at the conference are either male or female black. On a positive note, the children are accompanying their parent or guardian to the conference.

Most of the children are not in a Special Education program. The Court does have a truancy counselor and other alternatives if needed.

Most offenses are handled at Level I of the graduated sanctions grid. (GSG). The counselors do an excellent job of reading and

explaining the Miranda rights to the children. The counselors do a good job of explaining what these rights mean.

Most of the children, with the consent of their parent, admit to the charge. The Miranda rights are effectively explained to and understood by both the parent and child. The counselors will ask if the child understands their rights. The counselor sometimes will ask for the child to state what a specific right means to them. We will continue to train staff in how to conduct a proper conference.

The most consistent disposition at the conference is either a Verbal Warning or Warned and Counseled. These dispositions are Level I and/or Level II dispositions and are consistent with the GSG.

Although most children decline a Resource Directory and show little interest in a referral to Evaluation and Referral, the counselors still provide this opportunity. When requested, services offered included substance abuse, mental health, family counseling, anger management, domestic violence, and mentoring.

This process under the oversight of good supervision appears to be operating smoothly. We are continuing to look for ways to improve the process.

APPENDIX 3

JD & PD Assignments 2013 - 2015
Report is counting distinct complaints based on the date the attorney was assigned

	2013	2014	2015
JUVENILE DEFENDER	3,099	2,054	1,582
PUBLIC DEFENDER	0	485	673

		2013	2014	2015
JUVENILE DEFENDER	JONES, SAMUEL	315	163	118
	CHASTAIN, AUTUMN B.	231	121	67
	WILLIAMS, JUAN	196	132	80
	GURKIN, J WHITTEN	192	127	80
	BALL, KATHLEEN ANN	165	124	69
	JOHN, MATTHEW IAN	145	109	81
	SANDERS, ARCHIE	162	101	69
	NANCE, LARRY	148	91	73
	KHUMALO, LINDA PARSON	117	104	78
	FRANKLIN, JAMES EDWARD	123	115	55
	KREHER, DAVID	127	98	67
	EDWARDS, ELBERT	106	98	70
	MELONI, KIM	105	104	51
	MILLER, DOROTHY INGRAM	131	78	48
	GATEWOOD, ERICA	83	79	50
	POLLARD, MITZI SPELL	153	50	0
	GLASGOW, WILLIAM RAY	136	56	0
	SANDERS, JAMES	189	0	0
	SHELTON, REGINALD E.	65	64	59
	MCKEITHEN, CARNITA	83	55	47
	BYNUM, RANDLE B.	46	46	58
	RUSSELL, STEPHANIE	66	53	22

		2013	2014	2015
JUVENILE DEFENDER	CAMPBELL, WARREN P.	62	38	38
	DONOHUE, ROBERT F	34	64	16
	GILLARD, VICTORIA W.	0	61	43
	ALEXANDER, CONSTANCE	1	28	44
	WILLIAMS, EVAN	0	0	62
	BURKS, ADDIE M	0	2	46
	RENFROE, SHEILA	0	2	44
	COLEMAN-DAVIS,	37	7	0
	WASHINGTON, ALICIA	0	5	39
	ROSS, MOZELLA	0	6	36
	BOYD, A. MELISSA	35	0	0
	BRADLEY, JOYCE D	1	0	0
	CAMPBELL, ETTA LIPSON	0	1	0
	DEROSSIT, JAMES	1	0	0
	ESKRIDGE, TAYLOR	1	0	0
	GALLAGHER, GREGORY S	1	0	0
	GRAVES, THOMAS	0	1	0
	JOHNSON, VIOLA E	0	1	0
	NELSON-FOSTER, DEVENUS	1	0	0
	PERKINS, SAMUEL	0	1	0
	Total	**3,099**	**2,054**	**1,582**
PUBLIC DEFENDER	THACKERY, DIANNE	0	106	115
	HYMAN, BROOKE	0	93	118
	DEANS, BARBARA	0	91	119
	RAYFORD, JAMES	0	72	120
	COLEMAN-DAVIS,	0	74	33
	HARRIS, JAYNIECE	0	0	90
	RUSSELL, STEPHANIE	0	0	63
	SANSBURY, LAURIE	0	55	0
	MARTIN, CHRISTOPHER	0	0	23

		2013	2014	2015
PUBLIC DEFENDER	ARMSTARD, DONNA	0	0	6
	GOWEN, ROBERT H.	0	4	0
	EDWARDS, ELBERT	0	0	3
	FRAZIER-CAMARA, APRIL	0	0	3
	BYNUM, RANDLE B.	0	1	1
	Total	**0**	**485**	**673**

NOTE: This report is counting distinct complaints. If more than one attorney was assigned to the complaint the assignment will be counted once in each category that fits the criteria but will only be counted one time in the overall total. If the attorney was appointed on multiple complaints all the complaints are being counted. This report is using the date the attorney was assigned.

Year	Total Number of Companion Cases	Total Number of Companions
2015	994	2654
2014	1170	2992
2013	1502	3885
Totals:	**3666**	**9531**

APPENDIX 4

The training report intended for inclusion in Appendix 4 was not received at the time this report was submitted.

APPENDIX 5

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURT JUDGES
est. 1937

Memphis and Shelby County Trauma Audit
Juvenile Court of Memphis and Shelby County
616 Adams Ave.
Memphis, TN 38105
Phone: (901) 405-8518

Monday, February 15, 2016

Travel to Memphis, TN
NCJFCJ Team: Sarah Ray, Lorie Sicafuse, PhD, Carlene Gonzalez, PhD and Kelly Ranasinghe, JD arrive. Monique Marrow, PhD will also be joining us.

Tuesday February 16, 2016

8:45 a.m. – 9:30 a.m. **Trauma Audit Team arrives. Tour of Courthouse.**

9:30 a.m. – 9:45 a.m. **Trauma Audit Team meets with Judge Michael**

9:45 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Trauma Audit Activities: Conference room 285**

- Environmental observations (i.e., courthouse and courtrooms)
- Hearing observations
- Focus groups with stakeholders :

Group I: Bailiffs/Security- **10:00-10:30 am**
Group V: Child Attorneys- **10:40-11:10 am**
Group II: Front Line Staff- **11:20-11:50 am**

12:00 p.m. – 1:15 p.m. **Lunch** (Food Trucks Will be Available on Washington Ave Parking Lot)

1:15 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. **Trauma Audit Activities: Conference room 285**

- Environmental observations
- Hearing observations
- Focus groups with stakeholders

Group III: Juvenile Services Counselors- **1:30-2:00 pm**
Group VI: Juvenile Attorneys- **2:10-2:40 pm**
Group VII: CASA & GALs- **2:50- 3:20 pm**

6:30 p.m. **Dinner with Judge Michael** (Optional)

Wednesday, February 17, 2016

8:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. **Trauma Audit Team arrives at courthouse**

9:00 a.m. – 9:45 a.m. **Detention Facility Tour (2nd Floor Detention Intake)**

9:45 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. **Break**

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURT JUDGES

est. 1937

10:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. **Trauma Audit Activities: Conference room 285**

- Hearing observations
- Focus groups with stakeholders

Group IV: Non-Custodial Attorneys: **10:30-11:00 am**
Group VIII: Probation Officers: **11:10-11:40 am**

12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. **Lunch w/Magistrates: Trauma Training/Focus Group: Conference room 285**

1:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m. **Break** (Food Trucks Will be Available on Washington Ave Parking Lot)

1:30 p.m. - 2:45 p.m. **Trauma Training** (Monique Marrow, PhD): **Conference room 285**

- Basic information about trauma (e.g., definitions, signs of trauma, how can trauma affect parents?)
- How can professionals work with parents using a trauma-informed approach
- How can on-going trauma impact court-related professionals (i.e., secondary trauma)
- How to start implementing changes in practice to use a trauma-informed approach (leads into action planning)

2:45 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. **Break**

3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. **Strategic Planning Session: Conference room 285**

- Identify three SMART Goals: Trauma, Current Goals, 3-5 years from now
- Environment – What environmental changes can be made at this time?
- Policy – What is the process for implementing a new policy (i.e., specific to trauma-informed behavior of court professionals)? How is this new policy rolled out?
- Practice – How can we insure that policy is reflected in daily practice? Scheduling trauma training – and sustaining this training over time (i.e., discussion of developing a trauma curriculum for staff)

Thursday, February 18, 2016

8:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. **Trauma Audit Team arrives at courthouse**

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. **Continue Strategic Planning with Memphis Team:** (Only if needed) **Conference room 285**

10:30 a.m. – 10:45 a.m. **Evaluation: Conference room 285**

11:00 a.m. **Depart for airport**

Trauma Audit

Shoaf, Jina
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2016 3:52 PM
To: Sandra Simkins [ssimkins@camden.rutgers.edu]
Cc: Dyer, Ross; Powell, Bill; Skelton, Pamela

Hi Sandra: I just wanted to give you an update on the trauma audit. The team from the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges were in town last week for three days. During that time, they held numerous meetings with various stakeholders within the court. Hopefully, within 60 days we will have a report from them regarding our trauma training needs. All of the meetings went very well. Following is the e-mail Judge Michael and Pam Skelton received from Sarah Ray, the Site Manager:

From: Sarah Ray [mailto:sray@ncjfcj.org]
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2016 4:03 PM
To: Michael, Dan; Skelton, Pamela
Subject: Thank you!

Hello Judge Michael and Pam,

I just wanted to say thank you so very much for all of your patience and assistance in setting up this site visit, and for all of the hospitality while onsite. This trip to Memphis was by far my most favorite site visit to date. You lead an excellent team and it is so exciting and inspiring to see how invested and eager your team is to move your goals and vision forward. I wish I could bottle this experience and share it with my some of my other courts so they can see how it's done.

I will be typing up your action plans and sending them to you by the end of the week. I will also follow up on some of the more immediate technical assitance requests made by stakeholders. In the meantime, should you need anything, please don't hesitate to call, text or email. I will also be sending out a survey in the next few weeks. I would like some feedback from you and your stakeholders on the overall visit, action planning session, and training. Like most courts, there's always room for improvement on our end as well.

Finally, I HOPE and plan to have draft report ready for your review within the next 60 days or so. Thank you again and I hope to come back again soon!

SARAH RAY
Site Manager

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURT JUDGES

P.O. Box 8970 · Reno, NV · 89507
direct: (209) 406-7365 · main: (775) 784-6012 · fax: (775) 327-5306

www.NCJFCJ.org

Thanks!

Jina C. Shoaf
Assistant County Attorney
Shelby County Attorney's Office
160 N. Main Street, Suite 950
Memphis, Tennessee 38103
901-222-2100 (Office)
901-222-2124 (Direct)
901-222-2105 (Facsimile)
jina.shoaf@shelbycountytn.gov