



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
DIVISION OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES
4126 TECHNOLOGY WAY, SUITE 300
CARSON CITY, NV 89706
Telephone (775) 684-4400 • Fax (775) 684-4455
dcfs.nv.gov

**Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission
and the
Strategic Plan Committee Meeting
04/19/18
Meeting Minutes
DRAFT**

Call to Order: Co-chair Commissioner Cervantes 12:32pm

Roll Call: Co-Chair Frank Cervantes, Co-Chair Judge William Voy, Eve Hanan, Brigid Duffy, Judge Egan Walker, Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Pauline Salla-Smith, Joey Orduna Hastings, Scott Shick, John Munoz, Kelly Wooldridge, Katie Brubaker, Sarah Bellows, Lorna Shepard and Erica Olsen- OnStrategy, Nina Soloman-CSG, Dr. Joe Haas- Washoe County.

Noted: Plenty members for the quorum.

Public Comment: None

Ms. Shepard: In June we will go to the Commission with a draft plan. Big themes to go over today.

- Decide definition of Evidence-Based Practices.
- Choose a matrix option.
- Agreement to goals.
- Identify initiatives, timing, roadmap roles.
- Get clarity on responsibilities for JJOC for implementation oversight.
- Clarify the counties roles and responsibilities and the recommended timing with things in plan and AB472.

Working Draft of the Plan

Identify the purpose of the JJOC and its Strategic Plan. Establish procedures for measuring outcomes. Selecting a Risk Assessment Tool. Develop a Mental Health Screening tool, Contract with a vendor for training and support.

Develop the Strategic Plan

Establish policies and procedures for the Division, and each department of the Juvenile Justice System for the use Evidence-Based Practices. (Asks Commissioners) Think of what the plan does not cover so far, to add to it.

Commissioner Cervantes: Simplify the plan is my advice. Try to remove some complexity and stick with what we know and can achieve.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Explains, the JJOC establishes policies.

Concerns in the plan:

- Supervision
- Family Engagement
- Case Planning
- Matrix for Parole
- Getting to what our definitions are for Evidence-Based what it will look like in the next 5 years. Bill sates four years to get to 100% for state funding.

Commissioner Cervantes: (Asks Commissioners) Is there a requirement for Evidence-Based to extend to collaterals? It must use State funding

Commissioner Judge Voy: Is Medicaid included as State funding?

Commissioner Wooldridge: A JJOC kid should.

Commissioner Judge Voy: It comes down to answering, are we serving the best possible services to our kids. We need the best services to be presented on the Evidence-Based Practices Matrix.

Commissioner Judge Walker: Recommends doing a layout from current level of practicality to aspirational. Issue is dollars to establish and maintain fidelity. Medicaid does not have to pay for that. Funding through the center means giving an offer to kids. Medicare might stop serving Juvenile Justice kids. It will not work to get providers to change to Evidence-Based.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Bigger picture, if we do it now and have less kids committed, less kids getting costly residential, the goal would be to re-invest that funding down to lower services.

Commissioner Judge Voy: I want to see something about fixing our Medicaid reimbursement rate for out of home placements. Part of the plan should include getting that fixed. Explains this would give a push towards changing it possibly in Legislation.

Commissioners: Agree

Commissioner Wooldridge: We have put effort to look at that current system.

Ms. Shepard: There are a lot of funding things that need to be looked at in different aspects of the plan. Passes out two documents dated for April 5 and April 16.

Regarding April 5th

CVC Draft: Includes idea of Evidence-based practices, and to consider the State to fund.

Regarding April 16th

Revision-

Commissioner Cervantes: Explains, we want Evidence-based programs to funnel money back down to the system by good programming. Asks, so what qualifies as reimbursement funding through the state? It originally said promising practice, we modified to say evolving practices. We need an Evidence-based model to look at treatments. We need to find what we want to include for the funding part of the matrix.

Dr. Haas: When you do a meta-analysis program the package needs to be cognitive. And family programming needs to be consistent to research. Goal is to move more programming into the matrix. Build it, and people will come. Include elements supported by the research.

Commissioner Judge Walker: Has NAJJA approved this?

Commissioner Cervantes: A drafted version, but I do not see it as being an issue.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Talking about the section of Internal Validity being the one with Anecdotal Evidence Sound Theory but no research? (Asking Dr. Haas)

Dr. Haas: We don't want to discourage homegrown programs. As we develop practices there should be less and less anecdotal programs. Instead there should be Evidence-based programs suggested for providers to use.

Nina Soloman: Under this category you would be able to fund everything. If you keep this in place everything will have to eventually meet the Evidence-based criteria. You are creating a system where almost every program is going to be qualified as Evidence-based for receiving the funding.

Commissioner Cervantes: you have to have access to those programs and they have to be accessible to all jurisdictions of the state. There needs to be a menu of programs.

Dr. Haas: That could make sense. Some of the counties the amount you give them might not be enough to establish or run an Evidence-based practice. Once support is there, there would be no excuse of why you would not be able to just choose a practice.

Nina Soloman: I like the word practice over program. The word "program" makes it more limited in how you are thinking of it. Legislation does include a type of waiver or application for counties with smaller populations to apply for it.

Commissioner Judge Walker: An anecdotal practice can still sometimes fit within Evidence Informed practice. I support Kelly's criticism we are trying to move from guessing.

Commissioner Duffy: If not Evidence-based, gives example, if I send 10 kids to a program that is not Evidence-based, but it worked would that be a natural addition we could add? A program showing a good performance outcome, or lack of recidivism. Not naturally Evidence-based but for NV and certain communities or jurisdictions it works. Can we word that in the plan somehow?

CSG Staff: Explain they had the same question.

Dr.Haas: Does that fit into what we have now? Locally developed programming with pre-opposed outcome measures. That is exactly what was just described.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Gives example of a child wearing a sign that says, "I stole from this store." And having to walk around like that. It is not Evidence-based but it certainly works for certain communities.

Ms. Shepard: That way if it is not clearly Evidence-based you will at least know it is delivering results that we require.

Dr. Haas: If we know effective JJ programming has a 70% success rate and someone came into the state with a program that had good face value and was evidence informed and did not violate norms of what we should not do, it would be on that program to achieve some consistency of a success rate consistent with what good programming does. Ideally these will go away as we go along.

Commissioner Judge Walker: I hear a consensus that people like what Commissioner Cervantes and NAJJA put together. Also, a consensus to strike anecdotal evidence out there with no research because it is surplusage. It is captured in other matrices.

Nina Soloman: Clarifies, it should be, “Pre-imposed outcome measures *and results?*”

Commissioner Cervantes: Yes, explains that it is a test. It is measuring an outcome, did someone gain something or not.

Ms. Shepard: One side, it delivers positive results, as defined by the JJOC. The other side is, if someone comes to you from the county with a recommendation of a program and they are confident that it is common expert knowledge that it is successful, but they do not have the experience that we as commissioners have, how do we validate?

Commissioner Judge Walker: I would ask to show where using our Clearing House Model is demonstrated in the scientific literature, or known as the Evidence-based literature, to validate the program they are presenting. If not, there is a problem with the outset of the model. Or can it be anchored to something we know is a Evidence-based practice.

Ms. Shepard: Clarifies, basically asking how it mirrors an Evidence-based practice or program.

Commissioner Judge Walker: On the scale, you can start on the right, but you need to move to the left in order for us to give the funding.

Commissioner Shick: Our Wilderness program in Douglas County uses Cognitive Behavioral Therapy and motivational interviewing. We incorporate good practice and look at the numbers and understand it reduces recidivism. JJ programs in the state are so busy they try to latch on practices. We do not have time to do research on programs or practices. Hybrid programs operating with great practices eliminate pieces of those that may not be working or have validity and improve them to the left of the scale.

Commissioner Cervantes: Agrees, we need to include programs with elements of Research- based programs.

Dr. Haas: A concern, current funding being allocated might not be affected. A task for year one at the center would be to re-evaluate where funding is going. Less of a problem when new money is requested. Our current programs.

Ms. Shepard: It is in the bill, that there will be an inventory. I think that is underway.

Mr. Munoz: As long as we have inventory to look at we are getting there. I don't think all the counties are able to apply all these because of the existing resources that they currently have in their community.

Commissioner Shick: Agrees, asks, how can we assist jurisdictions with less resources to meet the mark to find programs where kids get behavior change and reduction in recidivism.

Commissioner Judge Walker: I want to reiterate, as co-chairs of the JJOC we committed to be the Governor's office, Executive branch, an Legislative branch to speak about how AB472 was created and that it created a push-down dynamic of funding but to have these programs we need money. I, and others here committed to argue for colleagues in Rural areas too, if a kid fails in a Rural area, that is failure to us all.

Commissioner Shick: Each place has its own dynamic.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Gives example, Female population has risen at Caliente (Facility). In the rural areas there is no programming for girls. This is a perfect example of where we could use this legislation to force the state to come up with money to provide programs to local populations to keep girls out of Caliente. By having this law in place and codified to force Legislative branch and Governor's office to sign off on providing additional resources to wilderness counties that do not have funding.

Commissioner Duffy: In a previous meeting, I was just talking about how I don't understand some areas we refer kids off to. Or that some places won't always accept a kid. I don't want us to forget that this part is where AB 472 came from and ultimately whatever comes out of the Strategic Plan around Evidence-based programs. I am going to want something that has that check and balance which will come from the Performance Measure committee. I think that is why this was put in here, people are making money off our kids and there are no good outcomes.

Ms. Shepard: This matrix is almost tailored to the current state. We are not cutting off counties doing what they can to get the funds they have. And they cannot make giant shifts that are expensive or complex to change, yet. Question I have, in five years, where would we like Nevada's practices to be? A majority in Evidence-based, majority in Research-based and Evidence-based. We built a matrix for our current situation, but we want to see a result that is different.

Commissioner Cervantes: We never had a matrix that excludes funding. The state is not going to pay for Scared Straight, or prison tours, or boot camps, those all fall in this. Part of this process is show the programs that will be eliminated from funding because they are excluded. There is no evidence, or they are not evidence informed.

Commissioner Judge Voy: I suggest, the majority of what we do with kids in Juvenile Justice is not Evidence-based, in order to be so, you have to have real outcome and recidivism studies validated. Most jurisdictions are in the same boat. We have never really done the recidivism studies on these kids. It is really not Evidence-based.

Commissioner Hanan: Asks for Clarification, we talked about Evidence-based practices, not that the programs themselves have had to be tested, just that the practices underlying the statute.

Commissioner Judge Voy: The practice and the program.

Commissioner Hanan: The statute talks about practices. If a local program that adopts practices that are Evidence-based and uses them, there might be validation issues there, right? You can have programs that have these Evidence based practices employed within them. Why are we moving to the term program rather than practices?

Commissioner Judge Voy: It is both.

Commissioner Hanan: It is not what the statute requires, and it might be more stringent. The question might be to get to the idea of why we are sending our kids to this particular program if we don't know because it is a new program. Well what techniques are they employing? If they are employing techniques that have been tested elsewhere and it is validated for use with Juveniles. Explains the process of turning a regular program into an

Evidence-based program, by gathering data and doing research, and adding parts compliant to Evidence-based practices. Take pieces of other practices and put them together for new programming and practices.

Commissioner Cervantes: Explains the *practice* of probation. Use of Motivational Interviewing, programming, case work, family engagement, so your *practice* encompasses all of these things. Inside the practice is Evidence-based programming. Going at kids with what we know works. The practice is larger in scope and it is consolidating programs and engagement.

Commissioner Judge Walker: Sometimes it is a continuum of care. Gives example- practices could be administering the MAYSI or YLS, measuring tools to guide programming. A system of care. I agree with Commissioner Hanan, who is basically asking what our Mission Statement is that in five years the JJOC will say the continuum of care for the state of NV was using Evidence-based interventions. We need to choose a term that is not just *practice* or *program* but *interventions*.

Commissioner Cervantes: Continuum of care is sometimes referred to as a continuum of program evaluation, that is what this goal was.

Ms. Shepard: I am hearing that we agree, they need to be referred to as *practices* not *programs*. We are saying let's walk away from anecdotal and be more about delivering positive results. Especially those required by the JJOC.

Mr. Munoz: Practices we are using need to support for positive outcomes. We need to make changes if that's not in our data we are collecting. Human behavior still just is what it is. If data shows positive impact, we need to stay with that, what is working.

Commissioner Judge Voy: *Practices* include programming. So, *practices* are the bigger part.

Commissioner Cervantes: Practices is the policy, programs are the procedure.

Commissioner Hanan: Gives example, Motivational Interviewing is a practice that a program can involve. The pieces of program have to be Evidence-based.

Commissioner Judge Walker: Practice can be an internal art. We could make clear they are not terms of art, but terms of description meant to be broad.

Ms. Shepard: Agrees with term practice but defining that it is not an art.

Commissioner Judge Walker: Practice if we have to define it is, that which is done produces evidence to measure, related to any step in the life of a child whether we are measuring what their needs are, their mental health needs are, YLS needs are, entry into commitment needs are, exit needs are and so on.

Ms. Shepard: We want to find the expectation of where we want to be in five years. We have five years to phase in. The question today is where can we be in five years?

Commissioner Judge Walker: Our goal should be: Describe to the Governor, Legislature, and all stake holders where money is being spent, what money is being spent and how money is demonstrating ethically to the children.

Dr. Haas: Currently, we are using tools to identify needs and risks for kids to apply against recidivism both that leads to commitment and up comers recidivating recyclers. At the county level you can identify needs of kids recidivating and being committed. As the center progresses it will develop Evidence-based practices to target kids and restrict funding to programs that target those kids. Would be the five-year goal.

Commissioner Wooldridge: We somehow need to fit in the Q/A.

Dr. Haas: Mentions there is a universal outcome measure.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Yes, CPC does both institutional and outpatient. That is one of my goals to get it onto the Strategic Plan.

Unknown Commissioner: In five years what is different?

Commissioner Judge Walker: In five years we know what is working to reduce recidivism and we know what is not. Even if we don't reduce recidivism, we at least can answer what we are spending our money on and why. Explains, the state is in charge, to require the counties to report data. Everyone now is really accountable by the state.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Clarifies, not the state but the JJOC. It is in the law. The JJOC is responsible for all of this.

Commissioner Judge Walker: In the end it is the strength of the JJOC that we have all three branches of government on the JJOC.

Mr. Munoz: I would like to see a timeline from when a youth enters to the time that they exit. And the stages that the contact is made. And where AB 472 and all the other changes we are implementing to see progress.

Commissioner Cervantes: We need the data.

Ms. Shepard: What are the responsibilities of the JJOC? Especially the implementation oversight? We know what the JJOC is supposed to do until July 1 right? What is the JJOC's role in oversight?

Commissioner Olsen: Asks, is it the role and responsibility of the counties to report back on the non-data specific items that are in the strategic plan? And in the context of implementation and oversight?

Commissioner Wooldridge: I don't think it is the responsibility of the counties to report back. What we will have is access to certain reports. It is almost a little bit of both.

Commissioner Olsen: How do we set this up so that it is executable at the county level. Implemented by what date?

Commissioner Wooldridge: July 1, across all counties. With Caseload Pro we only had so much funding made available. It is going out in phases. Phase one is data conversion. Phase two is looking at what data is in Caseload Pro. What data does the state have access to for individual counties? Which is part of phase two.

Erica Olson: Asks how far the plan needs to go. Asks about how deadlines will work.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Recommends that both the counties, State, and JJOC need to have deadlines.

Dr. Haas: For Caseload Pro the deadline needs to be to not go live until Caseload Pro is equivalent to our current system.

Commissioner Judge Walker: We need to include Ohrenschall in conversation for a bill draft, for the current legislation. One of the items included could be to tighten up. The JJOC is the bigger part, the state is the actor. It will be your staff that are gathering it. The JJOC make the decisions.

Ms. Shepard: We need to have goals and initiatives written out, so we know what is being done by the JJOC, DCFS and what is expected to be done and by when, by the counties. All of these need to have the expected to be done, date. The idea is to break them out into goals to be read easier and everyone knows what needs to be done.

Mentions goals that are framework to the plan:

- 1) Use a validated Risk and Needs Assessment tool.
- 2) Implementing programs and services proven to reduce recidivism.
- 3) Collaborate cross systems to address kid's needs.
- 4) Taylor supervision services to youth developmental needs.

By the end of five years we hope to have made progress on them.

Commissioner Wooldridge: We have not developed a Mission Statement yet. These four goals come directly from CSG and what they have done nationally. We need to break the goals down to very specific strategies now. What strategies do we need to meet this goal and by when?

Erica Olsen: Recommends using the word *strategy* for an approach to solve something and an *initiative* as a thing a project-based thing that will have a start and end point.

Ms. Shepard: Explains goals of each year, year one will be when benchmarks are identified. Year two is when targets will be identified.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Mentions the Adjudication issue. Screener and the full assessment we plan on implementing the screener on every kid. The law says any kid that is adjudicated has to have the full assessment. Explains, we do not want to do a full evaluation if it is not needed for a kid.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Clarifies, the law says only both screenings before.

Commissioner Judge Walker: Explains the idea of having Mental Health Screening done within the school district to every kid, not just juvenile delinquents in the system. This went to legislation before.

Commissioner Salla-Smith: Asks for clarification, the discussion of the YLS and MAYSI and to address the language is part of the Risk and Needs Sub Committee.

Commissioner Judge Walker: The challenge we have is if we do not get it on Ohrenschall's watch now, it won't happen.

Commissioner Cervantes: Explains a possible issue, isn't this how we standardize information? If everyone gets the same assessment at the same time? We divert kids, I am wondering if it confuses the data points system to say

this kid got the YLS. They were adjudicated but didn't do it. From a data collection process will that be messed up.

Commissioner Duffy: That was my question as well, "Does it throw off what we are trying to show?"

Commissioner Wooldridge: The whole idea is that you develop your case plan based off of that Risk Assessment.

Commissioner Judge Voy: However, if you run the screener with no red flags and you only put them on probation because they won't pay restitution then why are we going to the next level in the first place?

Ms. Shepard: Talking about specifics in the plan: Let's go back to the idea that we have to get the big initiative for these goals laid out. Let's think about these in terms of years instead. Year zero is the year we are in now, year one is next year, year two is the following and so on.

Erica Olsen: Talking about specifics in the plan: In the boxes we would fill in, set up, ready for roll out, phase in, and compliance reporting (example). The intention is to put milestones on paper related to these initiatives and do we need anymore more on this. Can we agree on the initiatives and we can come back with suggested time frames?

Commissioners Agree.

Ms. Shepard: We started with few initiatives and some are questions on what the initiatives would be. To determine when the tool is used. It is clear who is supposed to use it but not clear when.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Can we just skip this goal and let the other committee do it? I don't want us doing work that could be undone by the committee dealing with it directly.

Erica Olsen: Goal four needs work.

Commissioner Wooldridge: This goal is about the development of policies and procedures for the counties, camps and institutions, and Parole. And exactly what policies and procedures the JJOC will develop. By law there is some that we have to have. A few to focus on:

- Family engagement
- Developing a case plan, the law is pretty specific on what to put on that.

It is pretty easy to do initiatives around those, there are national standards on how they should be.

Erica Olsen: Should this plan include the development policies but then the training and implementation and expected, on board compliance of the counties. It is about the development implementation and the measurement of effectiveness.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Agrees and explains Commissioner Duffy's committee will assist in that. Concerning Family engagement, I have a list of what the national standard are for family engagement. If we look at places like Utah or Florida, or Pennsylvania they have a whole family engagement handbook. One of our initiatives should be to come to an agreement on which of those national standards we want Nevada to Practice. Maybe a handbook on them, or whatever we want to call it, and then counties and state facilities implement them.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Clarifies, so you are suggesting that we look at the handbooks?

Commissioner Wooldridge: Yes, at least the initiatives. We have to at least meet the law in AB 472.

Ms. Shepard: (Reads from law)

“DCFS in each department of Juvenile Services shall develop and implement a Family Engagement Plan. It will include strategies for increasing family contact with the child, engaging family members in the case plan, involving them in the child’s treatment, and solicit feedback from family members.”

One of our initiatives needs to be develop a standard handbook of family engagement.

Erica Olsen: Is there one you see as a model?

Commissioner Wooldridge: I would do Utah or New Jersey are really good.

Erica Olsen: Is it the expectation that we identify those as part of this plan or in the plan we will have an initiative to identify which.

Commissioner Cervantes: In the plan

Commissioner Wooldridge: Mentions we have to have an agreement if we want it just to be a policy from the commission, and find how we will monitor it, see if everyone is following it, what is the standard to use it.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Come up with a target date. I like the idea of a handbook that states the type of engagement to have with the kids on probation, stating this is the type of engagement to have with kids in the institutions, or an RTC, and break it down in detail for each engagement specifically on family members.

Ms. Shepard: The point of the plan is to say we need a handbook by this date, we expect compliance on reporting on performance, by this year.

Commissioner Cervantes: Asking Nina Soloman, when you roll these projects out in other states, what did this phase look like for you?

Nina Soloman: There is obviously different things they are working on. The Evidence Based Practice piece is separate. These to me sound more like policies that are developed at the state level. I am not sure of the benefit of including this into the plan other than having this committee stretch thin in a short period of time.

Commissioner Hanan: I guess the alternative is to identify when the family engagement plan policies should be in place and also the responsible party, who is responsible for selecting and developing that policy. Who does that go to if not us? And maybe it does go somewhere else, part of it is how much do we want it to ourselves? Cause you have a good idea about it and you want to implement it. Who would be the responsible party for it?

Commissioner Wooldridge: The law says the counties and the state and camps need to have a family engagement plan. I think this should be in the strategic plan. The law has some standards but there are also national standards that are not in the law.

Commissioner Cervantes: Agrees, I think we should do what the law specifically says to do.

Erica Olsen: Mentions, we must identify who will be responsible for each piece.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Come up with a family engagement plan. Then the Strategic Plan will say by whatever date we will have a committee in place to create the plan, and then to be adopted by the full commission by another date. Then implement and report back.

Ms. Shepard: To summarize, is it more about in places where there is a policy, or a handbook development?

Commissioner Wooldridge: Both

Ms. Shepard: Policies and the handbook are the sub-committee's responsibility, essentially the JJOC. The plans are the counties responsibilities.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Mentions they are separated.

Commissioner Cervantes: There are some things that the counties are independent on.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Recommends, by July 1 we identify a sub-committee to create a policy and handbook on the family engagement plan and that sub-committee will write a report back on X date to the full board and then another date from the full board to adopt it and another date for all the institutions and everyone else to implement it. Another date for them to report back and implement it.

Erica Olsen: Recommends making a timeline at another time.

Mr. Munoz: Wants to be sure there is someone from the state while the counties and JJOC are writing policies for that.

Erica Olsen: Lets agree we don't have to solve how it gets done we just need to sequence out how it might get done and timelines.

Ms. Shepard: Regarding other policies, there was a policy about when you commit a child to the state. When does a child go to a local facility verse state facility and what are the policies behind it.

Commissioner Judge Voy: We currently have policies on when a kid is eligible for a facility and when they aren't.

Dr. Haas: The current assumption is that kids are randomly being committed for lower level offenses. Assuming if we say we are bringing evidence-based practices we will have less commitment. We already have the data.

Commissioner Wooldridge: What the law says on this is that before the Juvenile Court commits, that other alternatives have been looked at, the child poses a safety risk to the public, the risk assessment has been conducted and the court considered the risk assessment.

Commissioner Cervantes: That is the policy.

Commissioner Duffy: If everyone is buying in, and on board with the Risk Assessment tool, we don't even need to think about what is happening right now, the future will weed all that out.

Commissioner Wooldridge: We need to get to the Evidence Based practices.

Ms. Shepard: How will this commission enforce compliance and is it based on state funding.

Commissioner Cervantes: Yes. Based on reported measurements we will have to send in.

Ms. Shepard: I am not sure if this is a valid question, should one of the things the county reports be how many programs they are executing that are actually evidence based?

Commissioner Wooldridge: No

Commissioner Cervantes: No, the only thing that the counties would be responsible for reporting is what is directly funded by those state dollars.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Brings the question, who is going to decide of where on the matrix something lies. We need funding for phase two and three. The original plan was to get private funding.

Ms. Shepard: There should be an initiative or something in the plan of how we are going to address that after June 30th there is no funding.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Suggests two initiatives, one for funding and one if we cannot find funding we develop a sub-committee to take over that role.

Ms. Shepard: Make that one whole initiative, to fund the resource center. Who is responsible for identifying what programs are being used and what is the role of the JJOC. Is it the JJOC's role to define or identify fundable programs.

Commissioner Wooldridge: We need to set up a mechanism for how they do that. Who decides if something falls into the matrix? (Asks Nina Soloman for suggestions on topic)

Nina Soloman: And you are also talking about if the Resource Center is not up and running?

Commissioner Cervantes: Correct.

Commissioner Wooldridge: So maybe to that sub-committee? If it is specific to the Resource Center I guess it would be that sub-committee of experts to do the work and then present it to the JJOC.

Nina Soloman: Is it up to DCFS because the funding comes from there?

Dr. Haas: I think a grant review sub-committee established.

Commissioner Cervantes: Agrees, and explains, the funding source is from DCFS not the JJOC.

Erica Olsen: The next part is oversight. DCFS is doing it but there has to be some sort of JJOC oversight to make sure that it is happening.

Commissioner Cervantes: The JJOC cannot secure funding.

Ms. Shepard: To whom does the county report practice or program to, DCFS or JJOC?

Commissioner Cervantes: To be clear, we do not report all our practices.

Ms. Shepard: There needs to be a database.

Commissioner Wooldridge: We would like the Resource center to be the database. If they don't have that it will have to fall back to DCFS.

Commissioner Cervantes: What is the statute on, if you don't have this we are pulling funds.

Nina Soloman: For Juvenile services to submit a corrective action plan within 60 days of receiving the notice. And if they don't submit or adhere to a corrective action plan the DCFS can withhold the money.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Are there any initiatives on expanding practices.

Commissioner Cervantes: Data collection will help with that. Most counties and jurisdictions already use it or will want to adopt, Evidence-based practices.

Commissioner Wooldridge: The initiative is, that the JJOC has a plan to help the counties get there. (switching topics) We were discussing adding a fifth goal, to develop financial resources. The advisory committee would be a huge part of.

Ms. Shepard: One question was, are the counties to perform Q/A for service providers ultimately that they work with and what corrective action should they take.

Dr. Haas: Some service providers have state funding.

Commissioner Cervantes: If you only have one service provider providing a service do you eliminate it or change the funding source? If available, you would change the provider. The corrective action would be, if you cannot meet these standards we are not utilizing you as a resource anymore.

Ms. Shepard: The corrective action is the discretion of the county and their choices include, replacing the service, changing the service provider.

Commissioner Cervantes: (Asking Commissioner Wooldridge) When the options are programs that do not meet this design or no program, then what?

Commissioner Wooldridge: The law says, counties with a population under a 100,000 do not have to comply with that.

Erica Olsen: Evidence-based is a numbers game but you can have therapy, that is not Evidence-based but still helping the kid tremendously.

Commissioners: Agree

Dr.Haas: There are a couple of metrics here, the grid, outcome measures, and correctional program tool. Some studies show that Evidence-based practices when they are in a study compared to what other practitioners use, most practitioners performed just as good or better than the Evidence-based ones.

Commissioner Wooldridge: The long-term goal is to have that CPC tool to be used on community providers and help them grow their programs.

Dr.Haas: Does that include using cognitive based interventions?

Commissioner Wooldridge: Yes

Commissioner Cervantes: The question is, if we have a program that does not meet the standards for whatever reason, would we choose not to use that program and discontinue it?

Commissioner Judge Voy: We need a separate category for “Better than nothing treatment” which would be treatments or resources that fall outside of Evidence-based.

Erica Olsen: We currently have three initiatives under goal three. Caseload Pro implementation utilization, the Q/A review, not only from the state but all the way out to community providers and then performance reporting, establishing what they are and getting those metrics reported on across the state.

Ms. Shepard: Caseload Pro is sort of the pivotal tool for gathering data.

Commissioners: Agree

Commissioner Wooldridge: There needs to be data sharing contracts between the counties. Washoe county has a lot of concerns of who can see their data. We need MOU’s and be really specific that it is kids transferring over to parole.

Commissioner Judge Voy: You are going to roll out the state Caseload Pro? When I send a kid out I want to be able to hit a button and the info on the kid at the new facility or where ever.

Commissioner Wooldridge: After July 1 the system will be used like that, yes. Not every county is on board with having the state have access to info on every kid.

Commissioner Cervantes: Explains, the will be the most helpful to see everything happening, what is working and what isn’t.

Next Steps:

A 90-minute meeting is set for Thursday 5/3 from 10:00am – 11:30am

Another 4-hour working session/public meeting will be hosted in Las Vegas on 5/17- Time TBD, Location is 6171 W. Charleston Blvd., **Building 8**, Las Vegas, NV 89146

Public Comment: None at this time

Adjourned: by Co-Chair Frank Cervantes at 4:33pm, moved by Judge William Voy, seconded and approved by committee