



DOMESTIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE

State of Arizona

2006 Annual Report

Submitted by:
Representative Peter Hershberger
Senator Karen Johnson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	3
<i>Historical Background</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Legislative Response</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Membership</i>	<i>6</i>
Domestic Relations Committee 2006	8
<i>Summary</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Membership</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Work, Findings and Recommendations</i>	<i>9</i>
Tasks and Objectives	11
Court Procedures	11
Education/Prevention.....	11
Substantive Law	11
Integrated Family Court.....	12
Credit Issues.....	12
Recommendations for Legislative Action.....	12
Other Issues Before the Committee	13
<i>Future Actions</i>	<i>14</i>

TABLE OF CONTENTS, continued

Appendix A

Domestic Relations Committee i
***Purpose* i**
***Membership* ii**
***List of Members* iv**

Appendix B

**Integrated Family Court Pilot Program First Quarter Progress
Report – October 31, 2006**

DOMESTIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE 2006 ANNUAL REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As required by Arizona law (A.R.S. § 25-323.02), the Domestic Relations Committee, jointly chaired by Senator Karen Johnson and Representative Peter Hershberger, submits to the Governor, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court this report.

The Committee was conceived as a forum to broadly explore, identify problems in and develop reforms for the state's domestic relations statutes. Focusing on these goals, the Committee, with the assistance of its various workgroups, again realized success with the passage of legislative proposals that originated from the Committee.

The work of the Committee's workgroups produced legislative recommendations for 2007 that tie into its overarching mission to develop reform for the state's domestic relations statutes. Some initiatives provide easier access to the family court system while others impact Arizona's families currently involved in that system as well as those who will be involved in the future.

The Committee actively continued the work of its predecessor, the Domestic Relations Reform Study Subcommittee (DR Subcommittee) throughout 2006, to explore concepts for improving the domestic relations system and Arizona's domestic relations statutes. The group set an active schedule holding seven meetings in 2006. Senator Karen Johnson and Representative Peter Hershberger, Committee co-chairs, led the group through the study and discussion of new initiatives, issues carried over from the previous year and the mandate set forth in Laws 2002, Chapter 332.

Three standing workgroups continued to develop ideas and evaluate recommendations for future change through the Legislatures and the courts. One of the two ad-hoc workgroups, Integrated Family Court, reconvened

and continued to work supporting the implementation of this pilot program for Coconino County by the creation of two sub-committees, which include a Services sub-committee and an Operations Sub-committee. The Credit Issues Workgroup began studying and making recommendations regarding financial issues that arise in the family law context. The Court Procedures Workgroup, in collaboration with the Domestic Violence Rules Committee, identified problems created by conflicting language and contradicting orders of the court where Orders of Protection apply.

The groups continued to focus on specific issues developed through strategic planning and from information gleaned from research, Committee members, workgroup members, invited speakers and members of the public.

DOMESTIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE

2006 ANNUAL REPORT

INTRODUCTION

Historical Background

Session law establishing the original Child Support Enforcement and Domestic Relations Reform Committee grew from the work of a legislative advisory committee.

In June 1993, Senator John Greene, President of the Senate, and Representative Mark Killian, Speaker of the House of Representatives, appointed a Joint Select Committee on Child Support Enforcement, co-chaired by Senator Matt Salmon and Representative Pat Blake Wilder, with the goal of creating an effective child support system for Arizona families and children. To assist in this effort, in July 1993, the Select Committee appointed a Technical Advisory Committee co-chaired by David Byers, Administrative Director of the Courts, and Bonnie Tucker, Deputy Director of the Arizona Department of Economic Security.

The Technical Advisory Committee brought together major stakeholders in the statewide child support arena. Membership represented a cross section of program administrators, parents, judicial officers and attorneys, creating a forum for meaningful debate on the issues facing Arizona's child support enforcement system.

The Technical Advisory Committee identified various problems within the system and recommended solutions for corrective action, including identification of the agency or entity responsible for initiating implementation. The Committee developed 57 recommendations, of which 28 required legislative action. At the conclusion of its mission, the Committee submitted a report of its recommendations dated November 1, 1993.

In the course of deliberations, there was consensus that integrated planning and communication among all of the child support and domestic relations

stakeholders is vital to ensure continued improvement in the system. Thus, the first recommendation made in the Committee's report was that a child support coordinating council be formed to provide a mechanism for ongoing communication and integrated planning among stakeholders to ensure consistency in child support policies.

The Technical Advisory Committee also identified a problem concerning the difficulty in understanding laws and procedures due to the lack of integration of the statutes relating to domestic relations issues. To address this problem, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended that a domestic relations reform study committee be established to consolidate, revise and modernize Arizona's domestic relations statutes.

Legislative Response

During the forty-first session, the Legislature created each of the two subcommittees proposed in the recommendations of the Technical Advisory Committee. By Laws 1994, Chapter 374, Section 24, both the Child Support Coordinating Council Subcommittee ("Council") and the Domestic Relations Reform Study Subcommittee ("DR Subcommittee") were established within a single overarching legislative committee called the Child Support Enforcement and Domestic Relations Reform Committee.

The Child Support Enforcement and Domestic Relations Reform Committee consisted of the four co-chairs from the two subordinate subcommittees. This overarching committee was established to coordinate the work of the subcommittees, but was specifically directed not to make substantive changes to the work, findings or recommendations of the two subcommittees. Any conflicts between the findings or recommendations of the subcommittees were to be referred back to the subcommittees for resolution.

Each of the subcommittees was co-chaired by a member of the Senate and a member of the House of Representatives. The enabling legislation identified the composition of each subcommittee's membership and prescribed the tasks to be undertaken. Reports were to be submitted by the subcommittees quarterly to the Child Support Enforcement and Domestic Relations Reform Committee. The overarching committee was responsible to report annually on the work, findings and recommendations of the subcommittees to the

Governor, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court.

The original legislation creating the overarching committee and its subcommittees was effective July 17, 1994. That same enabling law appropriated funds to the Arizona Supreme Court for costs associated with staffing the subcommittees. In July 1994, the Arizona Supreme Court designated the Domestic Relations Division of the Administrative Office of the Courts (“AOC”) to provide that staff support.

The legislation that originally established the overarching committee and its two subcommittees was scheduled for repeal from and after December 31, 1997. Provisions of law enacted in 1997 (Laws 1997, Chapters 45, 176 and 250) extended this date so that each of the subcommittees continued to serve the public until December 31, 2000. New legislation (Laws 2000, Chapter 312) repealed Laws 1994, Chapter 374, Section 24 and added A.R.S. § 25-320.01 to statute. This statute, effective as of July 18, 2000, created the committee and subcommittees by statute, rather than session law, and extended the life of the committee and the two subcommittees until July 1, 2007. The statute further specified that the Domestic Relations Reform Study Subcommittee was to meet jointly with the Child Support Coordinating Council Subcommittee at least twice each year.

Legislation passed in 2002 (Laws 2002, Chapter 332) eliminated the Child Support Enforcement and Domestic Relations Reform Committee, the Child Support Coordinating Council Subcommittee and Domestic Relations Reform Study Subcommittee. The new law created a new structure and two independent committees, the Child Support Committee and the Domestic Relations Committee (“Committee”), with simplified purposes, appointments and reporting requirements and provides that the two committees will expire on January 1, 2008. The Court Services Division, Court Programs Unit, AOC, is responsible for staffing the committees created by this new legislation.

The new statute, A.R.S. § 25-323.01, effective August 22, 2002, directed the Committee to prepare a statewide plan for an integrated family court with comprehensive subject matter jurisdiction over all matters involving the family and submit this plan to the Governor, the President of the Senate, the

Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court on or before December 31, 2002.

The law further requires the Committee to prepare an annual report regarding the Committee's recommended changes to the domestic relations statutes, rules and procedures and other related issues designed to lead to a reform of the state's domestic relations statutes. The Governor, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court are to receive copies of the report.

This report reflects the Domestic Relations Committee's work, findings and recommendations for the year 2006.

Membership

The session law originally enacted in 1994 outlined the membership of each subcommittee by position or category and directed how chairpersons would be appointed. In 1995, the Legislature amended this law. Chapter 44 of the Laws of 1995 altered the numbers of subcommittee members and attempted to balance political party representation of legislative members. The 1995 law also directly affected the composition of the DR Subcommittee.

Under the original law, the only legislative members of the DR Subcommittee were the two subcommittee co-chairs, one appointed from each legislative chamber. As amended, session law provided there shall be *two* members of the Senate from different political parties and *two* members of the House of Representatives, also from different political parties. As a result, two additional members, both of the minority party, were added in 1995. Co-chairperson positions were unaffected.

In 1997, the Legislature also added additional requirements of membership. An amendment (Laws 1997, Chapter 173) to the original enabling law (Laws 1994, chapter 374, section 24) provided that members of each subcommittee shall serve two-year terms at the pleasure of the official or officials who appointed them. Additionally, the law specified that the appointments shall be made at the start of each even fiscal year and that members may be re-appointed.

The new law enacted in 2002 that created the Domestic Relations Committee further altered its membership composition and the method by which members are appointed. Three new positions were added that were not on the DR Subcommittee and include a: 1) law enforcement representative, 2) children's advocacy representative, and 3) representative from the family law section of the State Bar of Arizona. Also, a second active or retired judge or commissioner from the domestic relations department of the Superior Court was added and specified that one of the two should be from an urban county and one from a rural county. The statute eliminated a two-year term limit; members now serve at the pleasure of the appointing official, at least through the termination of the committees on January 1, 2008. Appointments are now made by the Governor, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

DOMESTIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE

2006

Summary

In 2006, the importance of the Domestic Relations Committee as a recognized forum for cooperative decision making in the area of domestic relations was reaffirmed. Under the leadership of Rep. Peter Hershberger and Senator Karen Johnson, the Committee and its workgroups developed ideas intended to continue the mandate to reform the state's domestic relations system. In addition, several workgroups continued to study and suggest recommendations for the revision of domestic relations laws throughout the year.

The Committee continued its endeavor to analyze current laws and procedures and propose legislation to improve them. In 2006, the Committee provided input upon request of the Arizona Supreme Court's committee charged with development of specific rules for family law cases.

Through the activities of the various workgroups, recommendations to improve Arizona's family law statutes will be proposed for 2007 legislation. The Committee will finalize the proposals in January 2007 and upon passage will be introduced for legislation by Committee co-chairs.

Membership

The session law originally establishing Domestic Relations Reform Study Subcommittee (Laws 1994, Chapter 374, Section 24) prescribed the membership composition of the DR Subcommittee by title or category and directed how and by whom each would be appointed. The new law enacted in 2002 that eliminated the DR Subcommittee and created the Committee altered the membership composition and expanded the individuals making appointments. Three new positions were added including representatives from a law enforcement agency, a child advocacy agency and the family law section of the State Bar of Arizona. A second active or retired judge or commissioner from the domestic relations department of the superior court was added and the law specified that one of the two judges or commissioners should be from an urban county and one from a rural county. The statute eliminated a two-year term limit; members now serve at the pleasure of the

appointing official, at least through the termination of the committees on January 1, 2008. Appointments are now made by the Governor, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Several long-standing members resigned in 2006 due to job changes, relocation and a variety of other reasons.

Members leaving the Committee included:

- Senator Gabrielle Giffords
- Judy Walruff, Representative of a Children's Advocacy Agency
- Wanda Weber, Domestic Relations Educator
- Deborra Woods-Schmitt, Joint Custody Parent
- Dale Wiebusch, Representative of Statewide Domestic Violence Coalition

New members joining the Committee included:

- Senator Paula Aboud
- Barbara Fennell, Domestic Relations Educator
- Donnalee Sarda, Representative of a Children's Advocacy Agency

Work, Findings and Recommendations

The Committee is specifically charged in its enabling legislation (Laws 2002, Chapter 332) to recommend changes to the domestic relations statutes, rules and procedures and other related issues designed to lead to a reform of the state's domestic relations statutes. Following the pattern set in the past several years, the Committee pursued an aggressive schedule meeting seven times in 2006. Comment from the public was encouraged to assist the Committee's efforts to continually improve Arizona's domestic relations system. Existing workgroups continued to meet and develop recommendations intended to benefit the citizens of Arizona.

As required by A.R.S. § 25-323.02, the Committee developed an integrated family court plan in 2002. Although the intent was to introduce legislation to implement the plan statewide, budget cuts made the occurrence of that very unlikely. The Committee instead worked jointly with the Arizona Supreme

Court to develop three Integrated Family Court pilot projects in Maricopa, Coconino and Pinal Counties. The projects were formulated to adhere to the adopted Integrated Family Court plan to the extent possible, recognizing that some administrative and financial variances and obstacles would occur. In December, 2004, the three pilot counties submitted reports to the Arizona Supreme Court. Some progress and successes were realized, but funding remained a barrier to full implementation of such a plan.

In 2005, reinforced by support by the courts in Pinal and Coconino Counties, the Committee voted to seek legislation in the 2006 session authorizing two pilot projects in those counties that would run for two years each. The proposal would carry an appropriation request and authorize the courts to follow the original integrated family court plan to the extent possible.

In 2006, Governor Napolitano signed SB 1267, Integrated Family Court pilot program into law as Chapter 364 E, to be effective July 1, 2006. Chief Justice McGregor signed an Administrative Order No. 2006-68, selecting the Superior Court in Coconino County as the court in which the Integrated Family Court pilot program will be conducted. The Coconino County's Integrated Family Court Committee reconvened in August and began building sub-committees which continue to meet regularly. An Interim Family Court Coordinator has been selected, as well as recruitment for a new Integrated Family Court Judge. Elaine Fridlund-Horne will serve as the Integrated Family Court Judge commencing December 2006. January 2007 is the target date for the Integrated Family Court to begin.

The Committee's standing workgroups, Court Procedures, Substantive Law and Education/Prevention continued to forge ahead with their respective projects. In 2005, the Substantive Law workgroup focused on parenting time and custody issues but did not recommend legislation for the 2006 session. This year however, several proposals for legislation have been recommended. The Court Procedures workgroup spent the year discussing issues surrounding complaints against psychologists who perform custody evaluations for the courts. The Education/Prevention workgroup began studying effective methods to educate the public about making choices about various aspects of marriage.

TASKS AND OBJECTIVES

Listed below is a description of the major activities by Committee workgroups.

Court Procedures

In past years, this workgroup had been responsible for recommending much of the legislation proposed by the Committee. The group continued to explore ideas for reform to domestic relations procedures in the courts.

This workgroup's focus in 2006 was to collaborate with the standing workgroups. This resulted in several proposals, as reflected in the following section below titled "Recommendations for Legislative Action" for additional details about potential legislative proposals for 2007.

Education/Prevention

The Education/Prevention workgroup continued to shape policies and procedures to develop and offer new education and prevention ideas and improve methods currently in use within the domestic relations system.

Arizona's divorce rate and out-of-wedlock birth rate is among the highest in the country. This group focused on methods and procedures by which to better prepare people for marriage prior to making that commitment. The group assisted in the formation of proposed legislation that would potentially require the person desiring to marry, to participate in an authorized marriage education program prior to applying for a marriage license. The group continues to explore different venues to address marriage education beyond the confines of traditional lawmaking.

Substantive Law

The Substantive Law Workgroup focused primarily on reviewing domestic relations related statutes to determine areas that need further analysis and revision. The group worked on revising and clarifying a number of existing statutes such as the definition of community property, spousal management and control issues, post-divorce collection of debts, attorneys' fees, division of property, and contempt remedies. The group also considered recommending new legislation regarding the creation of a statewide registry

for premarital and postmarital agreements and a marital education program for those contemplating marriage.

Integrated Family Court

In 2006, the Legislature approved the request for appropriations in the amount of \$850,000 from the General Fund in Fiscal Year 2006-2007 to the Administrative Office of the Courts to implement the Integrated Family Court (IFC) pilot project. The pilot project requires the Supreme Court to implement a two-year Integrated Family Court pilot project in one county with a population of less than five hundred thousand persons. Chief Justice McGregor signed an Administrative Order No. 2006-68, selecting the Superior Court in Coconino County as the court in which the Integrated Family Court pilot program will be conducted. The IFC workgroup continues to work closely with the Coconino County's IFC Coordinator and newly appointed IFC Judge, as the project is scheduled to commence January 2007. The workgroup will continue on an as-needed basis throughout the life of the pilot project. The success of this important project may result in statewide implementation. (See Appendix B for ***Integrated Family Court Pilot Program First Quarter Progress Report – October 31, 2006.***)

Credit Issues

This workgroup was formed to address concerns that were raised during the "Call to the Public" by parents who had experienced problems with post-divorce credit and financial problems that resulted from conflicts between divorce law and credit laws and practices. Focusing on the problematic areas, the group worked on proposals that deal with credit issues, creation of a statewide registry for pre-nuptial and post-nuptial agreements, and creation of a marital education video.

The Credit Issues workgroup will submit many legislative proposals for the 2007 session as reflected in the following section below titled "Recommendations for Legislative Action."

Recommendations for Legislative Action

Potential legislative proposals for the 2007 session include the following:

- Require creditors to obtain the signatures of both spouses on a credit application if the creditor wants to attempt to collect from both after a divorce. Currently, creditors may collect from both even though one spouse may have been unaware that the other had requested credit and the court had assigned repayment to just one spouse.
- Require the Secretary of State to create a statewide registry for pre-nuptial and post-nuptial agreements. Arizona law provides for the recording of these agreements with County Recorders but a centralized registry for such does not exist. Registry of these agreements with the Secretary of State would serve as notice to creditors as to the agreement.
- Specify both spouses shall have the same right to manage community property irrespective of which spouse holds title or is named as owner of the property, unless prohibited by statute or unless a spouse executes a notarized, written waiver of their right to manage community property.
- Require the court to make specific findings concerning the portions of any award of fees and expenses which are based upon consideration of financial resources and which are based upon consideration of reasonableness of positions, as it pertains to attorneys' fees.
- Require the court to consider a homestead as a resource from which an obligor can pay child support, or an amount in the nature of support in a contempt proceeding.

Other Issues Before the Committee

Dr. Bill Fabricius, a professor from Arizona State University, provided a presentation of his research focusing on physical health outcomes for children of divorce. Dr. Fabricius found that more parenting time spent with a child benefits children even in high-conflict families to a certain point. He also found that the father-child relationship improves at all levels of increasing time with father, however; there is either improvement or no change in mother-child relationship and divorce distress. Dr. Fabricius is continuing his groundbreaking research in matters concerning the family and

divorce and has agreed to share his future findings with the Committee in 2007.

As in past years, many issues and ideas came before the Committee that never reached the level of proposed legislation but ultimately each issue leads to an important and thorough evaluation of various components within the domestic relations system. Some issues take more than one year to finalize while others lead to ideas that merit further investigation.

Future Actions

Based on the recommendations of the workgroups, the Committee will continue to develop proposals for future legislative action and to pursue a strategy for accomplishing the long-term goal to improve and reform the domestic relations system. Workgroups will continue to explore issues currently under discussion, new issues that arise, and endeavor to increase public awareness of domestic relations issues.

Once again, the intended purpose of maintaining and continuing a statewide Committee comprised of stakeholders from various backgrounds in the domestic relations arena was shown to be a wise and successful endeavor. Significant gains in domestic relations law have been realized through the efforts of this Committee by utilizing current, empirical, data-driven research, practical experience, and testimony from Arizona's citizens. Arizona is held up nationally as visionary and progressive in domestic relations law, due in part to this Committee's collaborative efforts.

Each year, a number of proposals are introduced to the Legislature with the intent of altering procedures and standards in domestic relations cases without presentation to the Domestic Relations Committee first. The Committee stands prepared to serve as a clearinghouse for new ideas and proposals and provide input to the Legislature, in order that system changes be developed in a coherent manner in the best interests of our State's families and children.

APPENDIX A
TO
DOMESTIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE
2006 ANNUAL REPORT

DOMESTIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE

PURPOSE

Pursuant to A.R.S. § 25-323.02, the Domestic Relations Committee was formed to:

Prepare a statewide plan for an integrated family court with comprehensive subject matter jurisdiction over all matters involving the family and submit this plan to the Governor, the President of the Senate, Speaker of the House and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court on or before December 31, 2002.

Prepare an annual written report regarding recommended changes to the domestic relations statutes, rules and procedures and other related issues designed to lead a reform of the state's domestic relations statutes. The Committee shall submit this report to the Governor, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives and Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court on or before December 31 of each year and provide a copy of the report to the Secretary of State and the Director of the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records.

DOMESTIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE

MEMBERSHIP

Membership consists of the following members who have knowledge of or experience in domestic relations and related issues:

- Two noncustodial parents who are knowledgeable in domestic relations issues and who are not judges or commissioners. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall each appoint one of these members.
- Two custodial parents who are knowledgeable in domestic relations issues and who are not judges or commissioners. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall each appoint one of these members.
- Two parents who have joint custody who are knowledgeable in domestic relations issues and who are not judges or commissioners. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall each appoint one of these members.
- Two parents who are knowledgeable in domestic relations issues, who are not judges or commissioners and who are appointed by the Governor.
- Two active or retired judges or commissioners or both from the domestic relations department of the Superior Court who are appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. One of these members shall be from an urban county and one member shall be from a rural county.
- One domestic relations attorney who is appointed by the Governor.
- One Clerk of the Superior Court who is appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.
- A professional domestic relations mediator who is appointed by the President of the Senate.
- A psychologist experienced in performing child custody evaluations who is appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

- A domestic relations educator who is experienced in matters relating to parenting or divorce classes and who is appointed by the Governor.
- A representative of a statewide domestic violence coalition who is appointed by the President of the Senate.
- A representative of a conciliation court who is appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.
- A marriage and family therapist who is knowledgeable in domestic relations issues and who is appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.
- A representative from a faith-based organization who is knowledgeable in domestic relations issues and who is appointed by the Governor.
- An administrative officer of the Supreme Court who is appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.
- A member of a law enforcement agency in this state who is appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.
- A member of an agency that advocates for children who is appointed by the President of the Senate.
- One member of the family law section of the State Bar of Arizona who is appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.
- Four members of the Senate who are members of different political parties. The President of the Senate shall appoint these members and shall designate one of them as the co-chairperson.
- Four members of the House of Representatives who are members of different political parties. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint these members and designate one of them as the co-chairperson.

DOMESTIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE

LIST OF MEMBERS

Co-Chair: Senator Karen Johnson

Co-Chair: Representative Peter Hershberger

Honorable Karen Adam
Domestic Relations Judge
(Urban)

Lucille Antone-Morago
Parent

David K. Byers
Administrative Office of the
Courts

Honorable Tim Bee
State Senator

Honorable Andy Biggs
State Representative

Jodi Brown
Domestic Relations Mediator

Honorable David Bradley
State Representative

Sidney Buckman
Conciliation Court
Representative

Honorable Bill Brotherton
State Senator

Daniel Cartagena
Parent

William Fabricius
Parent

Honorable Beverly Frame
Clerk of Superior Court

Honorable Paula Aboud
State Senator

Linda Leatherman
Faith-Based Organization
Representative

Ella Maley
Parent

**Honorable Debbie McCune-
Davis**
State Representative

George Salaz
Parent

Ellen Seaborne
Domestic Relations Attorney

Russell Smoldon
Parent

Donnalee Sarda
Children's Advocacy Agency
Representative

Barbara Fennell
Domestic Relations Educator

David Weinstock
Marriage & Family Therapist
Representative

Honorable Thomas Wing
Domestic Relations Judge
(Rural)

Steve Wolfson
State Bar, Family Law Section
Representative

Brian Yee
Psychologist, Child Custody
Evaluator

APPENDIX B
TO
DOMESTIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE
2006 ANNUAL REPORT

Integrated Family Court Pilot Program
First Quarter Progress Report
October 31, 2006

Timeline

6/21/06 Governor Napolitano signs SB 1267, Integrated Family Court pilot program, into law as Chapter 364 E, to become effective July 1, 2006.

8/22/06 The Integrated Family Court Committee meets in Coconino County Superior Court. Sub-committees are formed and meet regularly.

9/6/06 Chief Justice McGregor signs Administrative Order No. 2006-68, selecting the Superior Court in Coconino County as the court in which the Integrated Family Court pilot will be conducted.

10/3/06 Coconino County Board of Supervisors approves acceptance of the Integrated Family Court Pilot Program award and the signed funding agreement is submitted.

10/24/06 The new Judge Pro Tem is chosen by a panel of 6 judges and 5 community members. Elaine Fridlund-Horne will be appointed by the Presiding Judge, Honorable Fred Newton, as the new Integrated Family Court Judge.

January, 2007 is the target date for the new Integrated Family Court to begin.

Accomplishments

All six points in the Phase I Plan have been or are being accomplished:

- **Reconvene IFC Committee**
This meeting took place on August 22, 2006. Participants included the Presiding Judge, Juvenile Court Judge, Court Administrator, Justice Court Administrator, Juvenile Court Director, Clerk of Superior Court, County Attorney, Public Defender, Court Caseflow Manager, Alternative Dispute Resolution Program Director, Guidance Center Director, and members of the Northern Arizona Bar Association. New sub-committees were formed at this meeting. These included a Services Sub-committee and an Operations Sub-committee. Both committees continue to meet regularly.
- **Hire Interim Family Court Coordinator**
AdiShakti Khalsa has served as the Interim Family Court Coordinator since July 24, 2006. The recruitment for the permanent Coordinator position will close November 13, 2006.
- **Recruit Integrated Family Court Judge**
The recruitment, screening, and interview process has been completed. Judge Elaine Fridlund-Horne will serve as the new Integrated Family Court Judge beginning December 1, 2006.

- **Review Integrated Family Court Pilot Program Progress Report**
 This report, dated December 1, 2004, was submitted by Coconino County Superior Court, outlining plans for the IFC, once funding became available. The new IFC Final Plan, soon to be submitted, will incorporate many of these original plans.

- **Determine Additional Positions Needed for IFC**
 These positions have been determined, and include: a full-time Judicial Assistant, a full-time Court Clerk, and a half-time Bailiff. The court clerk has been hired, and is presently being trained. The recruitment for the judicial assistant closes November 2. The recruitment for the bailiff closes November 13.

- **Create a Comprehensive Structure for Integrated Family Court**
 Areas being addressed include: Facility, Staff, Budget, Case Management/Logistics, Programs/Services, Technology, and Training.

 The location of the IFC will be in the Main Courthouse at 200 N. San Francisco Street. A large conference room with two adjoining rooms will be converted into the new courtroom, judge's chambers, and offices. The renovation is planned to be complete by February, 2007. An architect is presently working on layout design and soundproofing recommendations. A temporary courtroom and offices will be set up until the new courtroom is complete.

 The Request for Proposals for the IFC Pilot Program Evaluation has been nationally distributed. The proposals are due November 14. The Review Committee will choose the top-rated firm on November 17. An interview with the top-rated firm is tentatively scheduled for November 21.

 Drafts of the IFC Goals, Caseload, and Proposed Services are attached. These and other aspects of the comprehensive structure of the Integrated Family Court are being finalized, and will be presented in detail in the Final Plan. The Final Plan will be submitted before December 31, 2006.

- **Target Start Date for Integrated Family Court– Three to four months after funding becomes available**
 The initial disbursement of \$98,821 was received on October 30, 2006. Integrated Family Court is scheduled to begin in January, 2007. (Some services may even be in place before January).

Prepared by Committee Staff:

Court Services Division - Court Programs Unit
Administrative Office of the Courts
Arizona Supreme Court
1501 West Washington, Suite 410
Phoenix, Arizona 85007