



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
Risk Assessment Committee Meeting
August 28th, 2018**

Meeting Minutes

Roll Call: Judge Egan Walker- present; Darin Imlay- present; Jo Lee Wickes- present; Ross Armstrong- present; Paula Smith- present; Pauline Salla-Smith- present; Scott Shick- present; Dr. Gina Vincent- present; Kelly Clement- present; Sherri Wright- present; Dean Snyder- present; Dan Baldini- present; John Lum- present; Josef York- present; Stephanie Lee- present; Ann Polakowski- present; Heather Plager- present; Joseph Hass- present; John Munoz- present; Leslie Bittleston- present; Katie Brubaker- present; Lynette Gust- present; Heather Plager- present

Public Comment:

None

Meeting Minutes:

Dr. Gina Vincent: This came off the idea of doing this presentation to you all came up because we were working on policy and there were questions from individuals in that group about how the YLS informs other types of decisions and that it's sort of a mystery to many people still how the YLS looks, how it operates, how all of this works. And so, there was a sentiment that it would be helpful to present to this group and hopefully others, DCFS staff were invited. I didn't catch how many of them were actually here.

Katie Brubaker: Quite a Few.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay, perfect. So, it's particularly important for staff to be hearing too about what the YLS looks like, what it can do for you, and, you know, how it's-how it's going to work in your system and help you in your practice. So, when we're shaping policies and getting staff input into that, in particular, they'll be-they'll be more informed. And, the same with probation. Should I wait 'till?

Katie Brubaker: I think you can go ahead.

Dr. Gina Vincent: All right. So, I'm just giving you an overview of the YLS and what components of the YLS I figure are going to be particularly important and relevant to policy. So, I'll try and point those out as we go. I also would like people to stop me if you have questions. But, I will put natural breaks it because I know a lot of people are on the phone. So, I'll put natural breaks in for that, too. So, first of all, the YLS/CMI, the users of it, the people who are completing it is basically defined as professionals and that often includes probation officers, youth workers, parole officers, psychologists can do it. Of course, social workers. So, anyone who is trained and meets the qualifications really can be a person who completes the YLS. Okay? Recommended training is that they suggest that the YLS not be completed by individuals who don't have experience with the juvenile justice population. So, you want to have that experience with juvenile justice involved youth; you want to have experience with interviewing them and their families. And then, so in addition to that-those are kind of the qualifications, that you got some kind of professional role and that you have experience with justice involved youth and with interviewing. And then there is two-day workshop on the YLS, how it is completed, how you rate items. And then that workshop is accompanied with practice cases. In addition to that two-day workshop, we're also going to have every user of the YLS complete three additional practice cases where we're going to give them feedback. The purpose of that is that you all can get a sense of who is adept at scoring and who's going to need a little more support. It will help us give you recommendations around who your potential master trainers will be if that's the term that we want to use. Master trainers, but those individuals who are going to go on and make sure that training is sustaining within your state. We have found through our research that it requires about three practice cases after training for people to get good, feel confident at doing the YLS.

Commissioner Scott Shick: There is no degree requirement?

Dr. Gina Vincent: No.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Thank you.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Nope. It was created, it was the first risk assessment tool created specifically for probation officers to complete. Because prior to this, it was always psychologists completing tools. People with degrees. This was the first one, was created primarily for probation officers to do. Do most of your probation officers in the state have degrees?

Commissioner Scott Shick : I would say majority of them do.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah?

Commissioner Scott Shick: In my department they all do.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Bachelors? Masters?

Commissioner Scott Shick: Bachelors level some and some Masters.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. Excellent.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: This is Pauline. I think it varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. That great. All right, great. Okay, it's also recommended there be a system of checks and balances, of course. As with any implementation of an assessment that requires ratings. It's not like this is a tool where you're asking the youth verbatim the questions on the tool and they say yes or no. It's not that kind of assessment. It's an assessment where professionals are trained to make judgments about rating of items. So, there's got to be a system of checks and balances or supervisors that are checking. We also highly recommend, and this would be part of the policy that there's ongoing booster training. Oh, thank you. I probably won't need that, but Kelly might want-

Kelly Clement: No, I can wait.

Dr. Gina Vincent: No. Okay, all right. Thanks Ross. Okay. What's the definition of risk of reoffending? So, this is also important I think as you're crafting policy and how risk for reoffending fits into that policy. It's important to know what this means. So, low-risk, essentially means, and I'm sure that you guys have heard these terms before, but there still is always confusion about what risk actually means. So, low-risk means this youth doesn't have a lot of risk factors that increase the likelihood that they're going to reoffend. Okay. They don't need a lot of attention. They don't need a lot of special intervention or supervision. And, they probably don't, some-in some cases they don't even need a case management plan. In fact, some states have decided that the low-risk kids are not going to have a case plan. They might have a service here and there, they're going to have some very distant supervision three-month check-ins. There has been a lot of innovative work done around different states for how low-risk kids are handled. Low-risk by definition means we don't need to be terribly concerned that this youth is going to go out and just do something bad again. Now, there's always going to be those cases where that does happen and that is because life happens. And, people get put into circumstance that we can't predict. Moderate, then I'm going to go to high-risk youth. High-risk means there's a lot of risk factors present. This youth has a lot of things working against them that may increase the likelihood they are going to reoffend. If, and it's very important that we get this, high-risk means if we do nothing, if those of us who have the ability to intervene with this youth, instead do nothing, this youth has a very high likelihood of offending again in the future. So, we want to put together the best case management plan, case plan that we can. The best system of intervention that we can. Because these are the youth that we're trying to prevent from

getting in to further trouble. High-risk does not mean that we need to send them to a correction facility in order to manage their risk. Okay? It-a lot of high-risk youth can be managed safely in the community. And then moderate risk youth falls somewhere in the middle. So, this is just a bar chart of some YLS-a YLS study that kind of shows this visually that where they followed this youth up who are on probation and they followed them up for about a year. And this shows the reoffending rates by race level of the youth. So, and you can see, females, the girls are still less likely to reoffend, however, if they're a high-risk they're more likely than other girls are to reoffend. What this demonstrates is several things. First of all, high-risk youth we need to be concerned about. About 60, 50, 60-50% of high-risk youth are likely to reoffend. This has been shown over multiple studies. Okay. This is if we do nothing. They're likely to reoffend. However, as you notice, it's never the case that all high-risk youth reoffend. It-another reason that we don't want to write policy about locking them up and throwing away the key, not that anybody here is suggesting that, but I think that it's important to keep mind what high-risk means. It means they have a threat to public safety that is a greater threat than their peers and we need to put a good management in place so that that doesn't happen. Okay. Some will need placement, some will not.

Dr. Joseph Haas: is there a time period when you're talking about the high and medium and the low-risk, the recidivism time period that you're talking about? That these statistics are from?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah. Great question. So the YLS has been-YLS studies have ranged from six months follow up to, I think, five years. Actually, seven years, follow-ups. So, this holds, regardless of whether we're looking at it over six months or, I think seven years is that longest study. For the high-risk youth are just more likely to reoffend than any of the other youth. The percentages may shift over time of actual people who reoffend, but they're always more likely to reoffend than the other youth. Of course, we know in practice we want to regularly reassess their risk. Right? The research studies have-are generally based on the initial YLS assessment and seeing for how long that still predicts something. Okay. The study that I'm showing you here is-had a one year follow up. Okay. All right. So that's some concepts to keep in mind. Risk is synonymous with risk-risk for reoffending is synonymous with risk of public safety. Any policy where risk to public safety is relevant for a particular decision that you're making, the YLS becomes relevant for use in that decision. So, like your legislation obviously says a lot of things about risk to public safety needs to be considered for DCFS placement-for placement at a correctional facility. Risk of public safety should be considered, in I think the release decision, I've mentioned. And there are multiple decisions where that comes up in your policy, so obviously, the YLS is relevant to all of those pieces. So, what does it look like? I think you all were sent the scoring form, which is the layout. And I have it here too just to show you what it looks like. Can you hand me my packet? Never-never mind. I have it right here. I do-that's it, yes. I do want to point out that the scoring form, Katie and I and Kelly discovered today that she got from Multi Health Systems this has arrows in it, so, just keep that in mind the purpose, it's just-it's not for you guys to go off and start filling it out, it's just to show you what this looks like. So there are forty-two items. Those are risk factors that are rated. Okay. I'm going to explain to you how that's done in a minute. So those are the risk factors. Those are summed to create eight domains. One of these domains is static risk. And that is a domain that refers to prior and current offenses or

dispositions. So that static is something that we can't change it's the juvenile's history. The other seven domains were crafted to all be dynamic. We call these criminogenic areas or need areas. We have to be careful about the language that we use on policy so that-because need is a word that's used in many different ways. It's very ambiguous and I think one thing to be careful about on policy is when you're referring to criminogenic needs versus when you're referring to other needs. Criminogenic needs are areas that we know are related to whether someone is going to recidivate or not and they become our targets of treatment because in theory, these are the issues that we can do something about. They're dynamic. Okay. The YLS-so as you can see the domain-I'll cover the domains in a minute. The YLS scores each of these, it also gives a total overall risk form for recidivism. Then it has a sheet that's all about additional considerations. It's part three of the YLS. These are what are considered to be responsivity factors. These are issues that are not risk factors. The science research tells us they don't elevate the likelihood that somebody's going to offend. But what they do is they may be a barrier to some of the interventions that we want to put in to place. So for example, learning disability. It's not a risk factor. Most youth who have learning disabilities do not go out and commit delinquent acts. Okay. However, a learning disability is something to take in to account if you want to put this youth in cognitive behavioral therapy for example. Transportation issue might be something else. If you're ex-you guys have a really big state and this town is really spread out. So, it's very spread out and so in other words I got to recommend they go to a service that's two miles away. I mean, sorry, two hours away hopefully. Let's-so, issues like that are a factor here. There is also a piece at the bottom of the YLS form that is the override decision. My understanding is at least the DCFS mental health counselors all have a risk assessment form that they fill out now that's score based. It's very similar to the way the YLS is set up in some respects. But there's not an override decision. This override decision is going to be different to them. I don't think it's going to be different to all the probation officers. Especially those that are already using the YLS or something similar. But, this override option is something that requires a lot of training. It requires good supervision and you know, we'll spend a fair of time-amount of time on it in training. It is also very important because the issue is that for some small percentage of cases the total score generated by the YLS is not going to be an accurate reflection of how much of a risk that youth is. And so sometimes you need to incorporate professional judgment from your staff who have actually done the assessment. To give you an example, you have a youth who's scoring low-risk, they don't have a lot of risk factors, yet they've been bullied a lot in school, so we know that this is a bad recipe for disaster sometimes. They've been bullied a lot at school and they're telling you that they're feeling homicidal against a certain individual. Most probation officers are not going to say, "Oh, well you're low-risk on the YLS so we're not worried you. See you later." Going to say we might need to be a little concerned about this kid, they're actually making specific threats about what they're going to do to people in the school. Even though they're a low-risk I think we need to override this dec-we need to override what the risk level is 'cause right now they're high-risk in some situations. Does that make sense? That's why this is built in. It's built in to incorporate professional judgment of your staff.

Dr. Joseph Haas: Can we read this last section right here.

Dr. Gina Vincent: We know this is important, research tells us this is important, however, we-it's going to be very important in your policy to minimize the amount of times that this happens because the override should be minimal. Okay. Question?

Dr. Joseph Haas: Find out what the SAVRY is-well like in your training the case, I'm concerned with, say a kid with no risk factors, honor student breaks up with a girlfriend, Facebook stuff and he tries to kill a rival. And those were-so that I think when you train out, do you deal like the single episode like heinous cut or over the top. You know, murder also as well as risk of recidivism as well-

Dr. Gina Vincent: Right.

Dr. Joseph Haas: And so, that-I'm just-sounds like something you deal with those pretty credibly in trained PO's on how to talk about them and that kind of-

Dr. Gina Vincent: How to think about them? However, if we were doing a SAVRY training we would spend a bit more time on it. You must be Dr. Haas.

Dr. Joseph Haas: I'm Joe, yeah.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah it is. It's a good thing. The approach the YLS takes is slightly different than the SAVRY. The SAVRY does this better. It's actually part of the whole tool. But we do need to talk to them about idiosyncratic factors that might affect their decision. But, I would suggest that they try to do some of this in consultation with psychologists or mental health counselors, especially when they're really concerned.

Dr. Joseph Haas: You bet.

Dr. Gina Vincent: And a lot of those real responsivity factors, mental health is a hu-mental health issues is a huge responsivity factor. For some kids it may be a risk factor also; for others it's not. That's an area where we want to really promote collaboration between probation and psychologists or clinicians or whoever there is to go to. Be the supportive one, okay. All right. Purpose of the YLS-it's-I'll get in to how this work in a bit. So the instruments designed to assist the professional in synthesizing and collecting information about youths risk need and responsivity factors. And it's used to link that to later case planning. Okay. It is not designed to dictate decisions. I am going to say as our-as a person who does research and who has created a lot risk tools, not this one, that we would never recommend that you take a tool as gospel, or a score on a tool as gospel and use that to decide, okay, this kid scored a 42, he's going to detention, this youth scored a 41, he's staying home. That would be a very inappropriate use of the tool. The tools have cutoffs. They all have standard error. They all have this band of error in them. We know from a-decade's research that the tools help improve decisions greatly. Much better than when there's no tool in place. But, it-a policy where a score dictates now what's going to happen next is not a good policy. It's a combination of what's the score on the YLS say and what does other information about this youth say. Okay. Does that make sense to folks?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: So, this is Pauline. It seems that the-the YLS does capture all the places the other information too in the areas that aren't within the domains like the additional information.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Can help drive either an override or justification to that-

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yup.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: So when you say additional information, what does that mean?

Dr. Gina Vincent: So, a very important part was-we're going-we'll get to in a minute is that high-risk youth there's a tendency to be looking at the high-and this make sense too that you look at high-risk youth as the ones that you might be considering for placement. Okay? In a facility. What make-so you could say, okay a youth who scores 30 on the YLS is going to a placement no matter what. Even-even after the, you know, override decision has been made that they're still high-risk. You could have some kind of policy that if they're over 30, they've been decided to be high-risk, they're going to placement. That would be inappropriate use of an instrument like this because the quest-the next question is are the needs that the youth is showing in YLS something that we can manage in our community through program interventions and if they're not, then we want to be considering placement. And I think your legislation actually states as much. It states something like that. That if the needs can't be addressed in the community and they're-and they're a risk to public safety, that's when we want to consider a placement. So that's one of those factors that will come in to play. Does that help?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Yes. And so that's with the-yeah, I think I was just because I heard placement but if we're-if we're talking about a supervision level that doesn't include placement then-

Dr. Gina Vincent: Supervision level-supervision level is-is somewhat separate. Supervision level is a little more okay. It is certainly more okay to say if they're high-risk they're high supervision level. If they're moderate risk, they're a moderate supervision level. Supervision level is an area where you're more apt to just dictate decisions based on the score of the tools. Certainly, and totally agree. There's going to be nuances there, too though. Because occasionally you may have low-risk youth who you're particularly concerned about their safety in their home and so they might be getting a little more supervision or checking in or something than youth who-than another low-risk youth. So, there's still-there's still a little bit of judgment that comes in to play. Which would be in a smaller end of our cases. Does that make se-would you agree with that?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: That totally make sense.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. All right. And another issue is severity of offense. As you guys know, all right, expect most of you will know, you can have people, Dr. Haas pointed it out, you can have people who who have committed serious offenses who are not high-risk to keep doing that. They're not high-risk for recidivism. Murder is a classic example and probably if the youth scores low-risk on the YLS, you're not going to use that to argue that they should just be, you know, I don't know, put on a bracelet. Or, maybe you will, but I'm fine with that. But, you-your constituents might not like that so. Okay. We're on-some people will react. So-okay the only thing to point out about this is so there's goals that the YLS has. The one goal is to give you an accurate measure of the kids-of youths at risk so that you can use that in case planning. It's not a reliable and valid way. So, I'm not neither going to be considering when putting together policies that there's other tools in place now that overlap with the YLS that aren't reliable or valid or we don't know if they're reliable or valid. If they are reliable the YLS might want to consider replacing them with the YLS. There's no reason to do more than one tool and if you have valid tool there's no reason to do an invalid one. Or, I shouldn't say invalid. There's no reason to do a tool reading you don't know about its validity. Okay. The YLS scoring is based on normative data. This tool has been studied in many, many, many jurisdictions in many countries that has gone in to the norm sample and that's what tells us if a youth score is a 40, they're very high-risk. And if a youth score is a 10 they're a low-risk. That's where it tells us what those cutoffs are. Something to consider in policymaking is that this YLS has been normed in two different ways. So, there are-there are risk levels they used for kids in the community and there are risk levels they use for that same youth if you were considering putting them in a correctional facility. So, there are two different sets of norms. Two different sets of the way used of cutoff scores used to decide what that risk level is. That's how they know they'll need to be addressed in policy for DCFS is when to use which. Okay. That's just a note. It's-for probation you guys are always using community norms; it's not really a question or an issue. Timing of assessments. So, there's typically three types of assessments you guys are talking about. There's the initial one, which we'll call a predisposition assessment. It's the first one that's done on the youth. There's a community reassessment. So, for youth who are on probation, you know, they'll be reassess-reassessing risk. And then there was reassessment for youth to go to facilities. Okay. People always talk about we have to do the YLS every six months or the YLS has to be done every six months. That's not necessarily true. The YLS should-you-you want to think about what's the most-what's the best most feasible policy as to whether reassessments will be done and put that policy in place. We know that it's probably not a good idea to wait more than six months. All right. More than six months we're dealing with adolescents. It's stale at that point. We can't rely on it. Kids change too quickly to consider more than six months to be a reasonable time frame. But there may be situations where you want to apply your reassessment policy of every three months. And in facilities sometimes that becomes relevant and a way to go about that. Right? So, this is merely to say the reassessment policy is something to be thought through. But what makes sense are the types of decisions that you all need to make and what makes sense in terms of youth development and the way reassessments are done in facilities and in community are different. So, it's going to be very important for us to train your staff separately. Otherwise, it gets very confusing. All right. How are we doing on time?

Katie Brubaker: 12:30 PM.

Dr. Gina Vincent: And we have until 12:30pm?

Katie Brubaker: We've got until a little after 1:00 to get through this and then move on to that policy please.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. Okay. All right. Good. So, admin-how is it administered? Let me cover how is it administered. I showed you the YLS scoring form. This operates like any assessment that you would do with individuals who are in a population where you may need to do some digging to get the information. Okay. It requires gathering information from multiple sources. So, I'm sure the probation officers are already used to doing this for predispositions reports. They're used to talking to youth, you talk to a primary caretaker, and you get as much collateral information as you can. Maybe some are already used to getting school records. Psychological evaluations, anything that's already been done on that youth obviously should be made available. All of that information is utilized to rate the YLS. Okay. It's important to have a policy in place about how the YLS is going to be introduced to the youth and the parent, especially in the community. So, you know, you probably want to standardize this so that everyone is introducing it to them in the same way. There's a couple of reasons for that. One is it's going to help you get more reliable information. The other is it's often important to let the person you're interviewing know why you're doing this. I'm not necessarily suggesting you say, "I'm going to complete a YLS with you right now. It's a risk assessment because I want to figure out how risky you are." Whether or not-yeah. I want to figure out if I need to send you away. That's not going to be the best way to do this. So, we have some recommended script that you can use that would go in to a policy because it's not part of the YLS. It's part of your policy for how it's introduced, and you explain to them, you know, that we are gathering information about you because we want to help make the best decisions about your case management. Or use some other term for that. We're going-I'm going to ask you about A, B, and C. And I'm gathering this information to help figure out your needs and help plan your services. Or help plan what's going to be the best direction for you because there's also this idea, I mean I don't want to go off on a tangent, but there's this idea of getting their buy-in to giving you information. Motivational interviewing is one approach many people use so you're going to be more successful with getting that information when they know that you're using this to try and help them, help make decisions about them. And then it's also very important, I think, to disclose to them, that especially because many of these, these may be done pre-adjudication. It's going to be very important to disclose to them how this information will be shared. And I think your attorneys are probably going to be interested in how that may be put together if they're involved in this process. So, how is this information going to be shared? Who's going to see it? Making sure they know it's not confidential, unless it is confidential. So one thing to consider, and I don't remember, I think we all talked about this, if any-if any probation office does need to implement a pre-judication in order to get it done predisposition.

Commissioner Scott Shick: That's generally done.

Dr. Gina Vincent: That's generally done. Some states have actually implemented legislation so that that information, any information garnered from an assessment, whether it's a psychological evaluation or a probation evaluation, is protected information until after

adjudication. So some-some states, Pennsylvania and Illinois are examples where they put that in place so that that information isn't shared prior to adjudication. Prior to the adjudication hearing, which is the part that's of most concern. Other states have just had agreements. The probation officer has an agreement with their judge that this information I is going to be protected until after the adjudication hearing. There's many different ways states have done this. I'm noticing some concerns.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Now, I'm just thinking as to where it's most applicable, yeah.

Dr. Gina Vincent: If you're doing that-if you're doing this assessment post adjudication predisposition its much less of a concern.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Yeah.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah. Right. It's just for those case where its pre-adjudication. So something to think about that will work-would like to-were interested in working with pi- with the pilot counties around where you're going to implement it and what kinds of protection to put in place, if any. Okay. The YLS comes with an interview form. Which I believe we also handed out. It's semi-structured. Did we hand out the interview form?

Katie Brubaker: The profile report and the comparative report.

Dr. Gina Vincent: No. We didn't. That's fine. It's not that-it's not that important for people to see. It comes with an interview form. It's semi-structured so your staff gets trained on how to complete the interview. But they-it doesn't have to be used. It's there as a guide to get good, accurate responding. It's often preferred that you customize that interview a little bit for you. So you're going have a different interview when you do a reassessment than you're going to have when you do an initial assessment. That will be-that's part of the tool prep. You may not want to do that. So that's really up to the individual county and DCFS. Okay. We've already gone through the way that the tool is laid out. There's the criminogenic need areas. It covers all of the primary issues that I think you-this group would expect to see. Family, education, employment, peer relations, negative peer relations, substance abuse, leisure recreation and what that's referring to is the youth not making good use of their free time. So they've got a lot of idle time where there spending getting in more delinquent activity. Personality behavior and attitudes orientation. I think one of the big benefits to having a tool like the YLS or like the SAVRY is that it measures these last two areas. The multiple assessment tools that are home grown and are implemented by agencies don't hit these two areas at all. Or if they do it's not adequate.

Commissioner Scott Shick: It's personality, behavior, and attitudes orientation.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes. These are the two areas that are most strongly related to whether someone is going to recidivate. If they're high in these areas they have got to be targets of attention. Tar-for the case plan. It's going to be something that we will spend a lot of time training your staff when it comes to there's an art to case planning and deciding which need areas should be addressed in a case plan. That is-that comes with training, it comes with

policy. It doesn't come with computer generated scores very well. So sometimes these need to be prioritized over others because these ones are high, and a lot of them are high, but, because these are high and other ones we're most concerned about all the time they need to be prioritized first. So there's some prioritization of what ends up in a case plan that requires a bit of judgment from your probation officers and your DCFS workers, parole. And in combination with the scores you get from YLS. Okay. How the items are rated? There's a manual that comes with the YLS. The manual should-have information about every-how every one of the risk factors is rated. And I'm just showing you a screenshot from the manual. The information in the manual is somewhat sparse. Sometimes states opt to have a guide that accompanies this because you have all kinds of issues that come up that are not addressed in the manual and so you'll want to track those. You're going to get all kinds of stupid questions. Excuse my language. Of the most esoteric kind of situation has just kind of come up and they don't know how to rate the YLS and whoever is in charge of this will be saying things to people a lot like, "Okay, use your judgment. It doesn't make sense to have a policy about this one kid when it's not ever going to come up again." There's going to be a lot of questions about how do we do this. So having a rating guide upfront that accompanies this is going to be helpful. We talked about having a small workgroup, Ross, me, and, I think Pauline for the language. The YLS language.

Katie Brubaker: Ms. Wickes.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Ms. Wickes? Okay. For the YLS language, which is something that is on the agenda. Okay. Does the score sheet, you will then get after the score sheet is filled out, and, people need to put comments into the score sheet it's going to be very important training and policy actually to make sure they put comments in when they've scored kids in certain respector areas because that becomes the narrative printout that you get and you'll want a bit of a narrative printout most likely because that gives you more information about your youth. Okay. I think I handed this out. So the profile report. If everyone has a profile report? This is printed out from Multi Health Systems. It's printed off from the software. I think they're trying to set up caseloads.

Katie Brubaker: CaseloadPro. They're a few weeks out from it being actually in Caseload Pro fully.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Oh. Okay. All right. It will print out, if you look at page-this is what's on page four of the profile report. The YLS how they subscale scores, of these-two of these need a domain and then it gives you this nice chart that shows you whether the youth is moderate, low, or high in each of these areas. These become your treatment targets and again, as I mentioned, if you've got youth who are, in this particular example, this youth scores the same on leisure recreation as on personality behavior as on attitudes orientation. They're the same on all of those. They're high on education employment, so we're pretty sure education employment is going to end up in their case plan. But, it's not generally feasible to have four need areas that we are dealing with at once in one case plan. And there's some prioritization that needs to be done, that's done by the probation officers not by their computers because this requires a bit of judgment. So, personality behavior, attitudes orientation I would suggest be what ends up in the case plan for this time, not leisure recreation. Generally you

can only put so many services in place at once. Change doesn't happen overnight. It's a process and so we really want to target and focus that main need areas that we're worried about in a case file.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Three is plenty is what you're saying?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Three is enough. Three is sufficient and some case if they're a moderate risk youth, you might just want to start with two. There's a lot of things that factor in to the case planning. Where I'm going with this is that the case plan is a science, it's a very heavy training issue, and the policy is going to dictate how some of this goes as well. The computer is not going to spit out a case plan for you that's going to be particularly useful. It can, and Multi Health Systems can produce a case plan at a nominated case plan. They've done that in part because there's pressure by the users to do it. But even when you hear some of them present, they will say that they recognize that your users need to have the ability to select what need areas are going to go in to it instead of just taking the computer as gospel. Does that make sense? It's not, it is there to help guide your case plan, but we are never getting away completely from judgment if we want to do good practice. Though, Kelly can tell you in his state, probation officers were happy to hear that. because it meant their judgment mattered and this still structures it so that you're reducing bias, you're improving decisions. So, you're getting all of those benefits that you get from a structural tool that's been validated, but you still have some professionalism that comes into play. Now is his staff like that? Depending on the way your way or your probation office is used to running. Some of them may not like that because they don't want the responsibility. They'd rather a score drive that decision.

Commissioner Scott Shick: You said reduces bias and what was the second thing you said?

Dr. Gina Vincent: A tool that eliminates or reduces bias and improves the decision making. So, it-it improves it, it standardizes it, and it makes it more accurate. So do you guys have a sense now of how your staff, and we have staff on the phone, actually, I hope. I hope they are-didn't log off. So we have staff on the phone. I'm just curious if people have an opinion about would they rather have a completely score driven decision-making process throughout or would they rather have it be a combination? How?

Dr. Joseph Haas: Supporter of locking it, how tight, how these works. How much wiggle room in the score against the-

Dr. Gina Vincent: Well, so you wouldn't be changing the score.

Dr. Joseph Haas: No, I mean just disposition based on the score.

Dr. Gina Vincent: We're talking about case planning more now. So, disposition-

Dr. Joseph Haas: Okay.

Dr. Gina Vincent: So, I would also suggest at this position is it necessarily determined by a score. It's driven-if they're a low-risk-its driven by the principles of resting responsivity. If they're low-risk, we want to have as little to do with them as possible. So, hopefully the disposition is going to be something informal or dismissed, or whatever. If you consider dismissed a disposition. If they're high-risk than you're thinking they need intensive supervision, on probation, or we're considering potentially a placement. Often high-risk kids can be managed in the community. So, with-when it comes to risk level, I think the idea is we're training people, how does that affect a decision. And the policy will also probably discuss how that would affect the decision. Does that make sense?

Dr. Joseph Haas: Yeah.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: It's Pauline. I think that having a combination of both is critical because I do think that it will vary-you have to take into consideration your community also in that and the specialty of services that you have.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Because even if they're a high-risk that you have the ability to get them the services in the community you wouldn't just put them in a placement before you tried keeping them in the community and treating them with that service.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: So I do think that a combination of both is important, but I also think that if we are going to be overriding with professional judgment, that that's clearly identified on the YLS also so we do stay true to the fidelity of the tool, that we're just not overriding because you know that we tried you know we're frustrated with the family or whatever that stay true to it.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes. I-your points are very well taken. So, override should be done minimally. And when we're talking about overrides, people define overrides differently. We're talking about overrides on the YLS. It's simply are you overriding the risk level because you think this youth is actually higher or lower risk than what it's saying. There's also decision overrides which is, this youth is low-risk so typically we would recommend a formal processing, but you might consider it an override if you're recommending something greater than that. That's a different kind of override and I tend not to talk about those as overrides. That's part of your decision-making process. So, the decision-making process involves training.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Discretion.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Discretion is a good way to say it. Policy-that, I mean, the policy could be low-risk kids should very rarely be on probation supervision. They should, very rarely, if ever end up in a facility. You should be considering informal. I mean that policy can say, here's what should happen in most satiations. That's one way to practice. Yes.

Dr. Joseph Haas: Standard, it's all between whether you override whether to address one of which issue to address or not and then in our state they kind of tie with this disposition because I mean it-

Dr. Gian Vincent: I gotcha.

Dr. Joseph Haas: for discretion because you-where we come up sometimes in example it's not on here it's need based like a child was recommended to be in therapy. But-and they-they didn't make one of their goals and they didn't go to therapy and they could they-be then be held on probation because they didn't complete their therapy and it turns out they probably didn't need it because they're doing fine. That's not logical.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes.

Dr. Joseph Haas: I can see that with any of these as well.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Exactly.

Dr. Joseph Haas: I think if you were going to locking it in, knowing our state county it would probably be better to have some experience with the tools for a while to see how it behaves in the jurisdiction and what it-you know, where it's going. Pauline with the rules is absolutely right. If you don't have the services you don't want to, or the child's family doesn't come along and they're doing fine, you know, do you still-

Dr. Gina Vincent: That's exactly the case. You're going to have variability across your jurisdictions in Nevada. So, having any kind of blanket policy that high-risk kids go to DCFS facility doesn't make any sense because some communities are going to be able to manage that youth in their county.

Dr. Joseph Haas: Right.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Community supervision, right? So, this whole problem, like any blanket policies are score driven, I think. Yeah? Okay. But this is a-this is a piece that's going to be-if you think-if you guys think this is true, this may be something that we want to explain to judges, get buy-in from judges so that they understand how this typically works. And certainly, staff will get this type of training. But you may have other stakeholder groups, Ross if you can think of anybody would be beneficial to kind of educate about this.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Yeah, I think all the different stakeholders.

Dr. Gina Vincent: All six.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: To understand how the JJ side of things is making those decisions and recommendations. I think is key.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Oh, okay. I agree. All right. Good.

Dr. Joseph Haas: Where did we switch disposition then so on our case planning your recommendation should certainly have it locked in stone. Also, you don't want your institution filled kids who are all moderate and, like, you know high. If like 80% of your kids were moderate, then something's not-

Dr. Gina Vincent: Somethings wrong.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Yeah, no I think, you know the bill has passed sets that two prong approaches for the judge to be thinking about at risk decision says you know, the judge is only supposed to commit the kid if they are a high-risk to it-to the community, right? And that the needs cannot be met at-in the community

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: And, so I think for that disposition, it's going to be important if you're a probation department arguing for commitment to DCFS that in your report to the judge you're talking about the ultimate score, right? And, okay this kid really scored a medium but we overrode to a high because of all this and then to also have that discussion with the judge, hey, this kid really scored high in needs of, you know, substance abuse, and education and we've tried everything in the community for substance abuse and education and so, because we have not been able to do it in the community on those two things that scored high on the YLS, commitment is appropriate. Right?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Right.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: And then DCFS can take the information saying, we know this kid is a high-risk that's coming to us, they score really high on substance abuse and education, let's put them our best facility to address education and substance abuse.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah. It'll be more standardized I'm sure. Sorry, hello?

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: I'm so sorry. This is Egan on the phone. I just wanted to ask on behalf of the Luddite judges everywhere if you have any suggestions on how best-when and how best to train the judges?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Hi Judge Walker, it was to meet you in Denver by the way. So, I think we were just talking about that earlier. I don't know if Katie and Ross have any thoughts. I think- I personally I think doing these orientations trainings, that's what we call them, it's to your stakeholders is better to do sooner than later.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Well the judges are going to be the hard sell in all of this.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: And I suspect they all are everywhere. And I was just curious if you've seen more successful way of training it out and less successful ways of training it out because it's all fine and all to have this front end of the system training and using good fidelity and following consistent policies, but if the judges aren't trained and it's to some degree for naught.

Dr. Gina Vincent: I completely agree with you and we have learned the hard way that we didn't-we've learned hard ways working with some states where the states didn't bring the judges in until way late into the process and then no change occurred whatsoever. So-I-so-you-I-what I've learned is that I highly recommend that judges be trained first before you start working on the probation policy. If you can. That orientation occurs with judges. 'Cause this it's more than a training. Right? It's about getting their input. It's about having a back and forth exchange about what they see is important.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: This is Ross, I think too if you get that judicial input on the front end, then also when you go to train defense attorneys and DA's then you can say, look your judge wants to see the X,Y and Z. They're all talking the same language and the court reports that in oral arguments about what's happened with the kid or you know, is there-if the two sides are coming together and are agreeing on a disposition for a kid, how do you put that in these YLS and AB72 terms so that the judge is comfortable with that agreement.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: So, I think there's good wisdom in starting with judicial feedback.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Judge Walker, this is Scott. Is it possible that we could get Dr. Vincent and Mr. Clement to the-when the judges meet? Don't you guys meet annually or semi-annually in a group, a small conference or something like that?

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Well, yes, it's possible but-so the District Judges Association meets annually and then the family division judges meet at a family law conference annually. I'm actually thinking that what I'm going to do is ask for a 80KT from the Supreme Court requiring that every district judge who handles juvenile delinquency cases have a training.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Excellent.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Not to add to your list.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I'm glad you said that.

Dr. Gina Vincent: That's excellent.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Come on. You really-for me this is been where one of the main areas where I think the rubber's going to hit the road about all of this.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: If the judges don't buy-in to and agree with the system of evaluation of risk needs and responsivity it's just not going to work.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yup. Absolutely.

Katie Brubaker: And, correct me if I'm wrong Judge Walker, this is Katie. This is why-a part of the reason we were going to include Dr. Vincent and Mr. Clement as part of our roadshow as well.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: That's correct.

Unknown Speaker: We need that articulation out there.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Yeah, they need to be the prophets in the wasteland- oh sorry I didn't mean that. In the perfect Nevada.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: This is Pauline. Judge Walker and court masters to do them can we be included in the 80KT?

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Yeah, so there's-as you all may know or you may not know there are required classes that every judicial offer, not just the district judge, but every judicial officer has to take before they preside over certain case types. And so for district judge to be court masters they have to take a basic family law course aptitude. An ethics course for-and the district judges have to take a course. And I would just add it to that list received by the 80KT to add it to that list of required courses.

Dr. Gina Vincent: That's perfect.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: And this is-this is Pauline again. One of the things that we did is we had a meeting with our judge, our district court judge, our court master, our alternative public defender, and the district attorney's office to help create the policy and be educated about the YLS, which made rolling out so much more seamless and everybody was on the same page.

Dr. Gina Vincent: That's great.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: I think that's really important.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah. I have absolutely experienced watching it make or break the implementation of best practice is the timing, so I'm glad you raised that Judge Walker.

Katie Brubaker: This is Katie, again. And I think that's kind of where we're at is getting all of these people together in a room to go over this. So, where we've been at in terms of

corrections policy there's been a lot of discussion that's happened that's needed to happen regarding all the discussions we've had today. And we realized that we also need to have buy-in upfront from these judges, before we move into that probation policy.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah. Yup. Well, I totally agree with Katie. There's certainly some pieces of a probation policy they can work on that's not affected by judge buy-in. But I think we'll be able to cover more if they would have judge buy-in there first. Like supervision level. I don't think-I have worked with some counties where judges dictate the supervision level in the community as well. Does that happen here?

Commissioner Scott Shick: I think its case by case.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Our jurisdiction, not in my jurisdiction.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah.

Commissioner Scott Shick: We recommend it.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. Did you ever see one here?

Commissioner Scott Shick: I had never.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Rarely. Okay.

Kelly Clement: So, I'm wondering because I think, this is Kelly, Judge Walker. That's just fantastic. What I loved hearing is trying to make it a required, because as we all know you can offer it and we can do the roadshow and if it's something not required we're going to miss some people. And a lot of times the people you miss are the ones you really need there in many cases. So, if it's a required training I think that's going to be awesome. What kind of time frame do you think we might be looking at as we try to go forward with this before something like that could actually be arranged? I'm not sure, you actually said you would go through some entity to make it required training?

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: That and honestly, this is Egan talking again, that honestly will take a while. It will start with an ADKT, but it's going to require a legislative change. We're already late for this legislative session. I know-I'm a little embarrassed that I didn't really think of how prescriptive we would need the requirements to be. But I think we can do it in a month-in a number of stages so we're going to have to start with the roadshow at the beginning.

Kelly Clement: Yup.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: But the ultimate goal to my mind, if not this legislative session, next legislative session, would be to have the Supreme Court by way of ADKT requiring it and have it codified in the NRS.

Dr. Gina Vincent: That's good.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: And that will take a while.

Kelly Clement: So, in the meantime, we can do it this other way and hopefully judges will invite other judges or, you know, kind of put pressure on other judges to get it-to get on board.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Or as-can Judge Walker put pressure on other judges to get on board.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: What Judge Walker will do is call the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and say hey, would you call Judge X, Y and Z.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Exactly.

Kelly Clement: There you go.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Supreme Court Justice reform efforts and as how its blended it began with that five years blended in to our new-our current commission advisory board commission and I think they would be really invested in seeing some-you know, the shape of that- you know for judges in the district.

Dr. Gina Vincent: That's terrific. And there as far as-oh sorry, go ahead.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: This is Pauline, again. I just want to share what my experience has been with doing roadshows with all the judges is just to keep in mind that including the Chief of Directors in that meeting will be helpful because it-you know, they understand the-their judges and their schedules and most of the people, at least that I, most of the chiefs and directors been talking to their judges, so just to include them in the roadshow with the meeting with them because I think that will remove some barriers also.

Dr. Gina Vincent: I like that idea a lot. What do others think about the idea. Yeah.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Yeah. Juvenile court and probation department and this kind of-you got both ends there.

Dr. Gina Vincent: That's good.

Commissioner Scott Shick: And our public defenders, you know, they'll-they're going to defend people to the death sometimes it looks like.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Right. Right.

Commissioner Scott Shick: We just have to—they they may use this against some of our recommendations based on risk factors and things like that. Once they begin to understand it, you know they can turn-turn it around and, well this kid doesn't, you know, or shouldn't go to a place where, I mean, just based on this and that.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes.

Commissioner Scott Shick: So it could be, I mean, once they get wise to it, it's going to be, you know.

Kelly Clement: So, one thing I've noticed is it can go both ways because we've also—I've worked where the public defenders were a hard sell at first.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah.

Kelly Clement: But when they found out is that our recommendations were actually coming from this research and could be trusted more and they were seeing that we were actually referring fewer kids to come in to custody, so then all the sudden they thought, well this tool's not so bad. Well, because y'all not just identifying the needs but y'all are actually saying that there's no reason this can't be met in the community, which was what they were looking for in the first place.

Dr. Gina Vincent: It can go both ways actually.

Commissioner Scott Shick: it's good news.

Dr. Gina Vincent: And you know we've talked today and public defenders what they tell me is even if they bought into the idea I think in general we're both going to be better for the kids on average, they've slowed down their defense. They send their individual client so they're going to defend whatever the best deal for this youth. That they think that you've won.

Commissioner Scott Shick: It's in the youth's best interest. And a lot of our stakeholder's think that way.

Dr. Gina Vincent: That's good.

Commissioner Scott Shick: They understand we're not in an punitive sense, we're all in what's in the best interest of the child. And this approach, this multi-domain approach is going to even-bring more clarity to that I believe.

Dr. Gina Vincent: I think so. Absolutely. Hopefully, we'll give the decision some credibility. Just a little more credibility. Dr. Haas?

Dr. Joseph Haas: Hi, this is Joe. I'm just wondering if it sounds like the tool is probably the best at saying who not to heavily probate or send than it is to say who to send. Because, and

I think if that's accurate that might be-alleviate a lot of these concerns because in your moderate it-it identifies moderate folks who are 60% like, or 40% of whom are likely to reoffend, right? And then 50% of your high-risk. It's basically helps to identify you group but the decision is still a coin flip or close to in terms of whether they're going to reoffend again if that's your reason for sending. But it would also argue that you wouldn't want to send somebody who was less than that especially low moderate and that pretty well drives our practices, at least to Washoe County, at least in the state, it's not a given if you're high or moderate risk that you're going. I mean when we've looked at our-we've served 50% of our high-risk offenders in the community and you know 85% of our kids don't do another gross or another felony. So, I think if you-I just want to make sure I'm hearing this right to spread the word because it-it shouldn't be the case based on those stats that you've been saying, high-risk, go.

Dr. Gina Vincent: That's right.

Dr. Joseph Haas: Unless you're-you still have to do advanced math around what happens if they do this offense again and this data also doesn't take into account whether they did dangerous offenses again. That's-

Dr. Gina Vincent: That's right. It's not. It's just any offense.

Dr. Joseph Haas: any. Could be probation violations. It could be other things, so-

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes.

Dr. Joseph Haas: make sure I'm talking that right in terms of-cause I, you know, I think it's great for risk assessments, but you don't want to overstate big decisions made on those-that math.

Dr. Gina Vincent: I think that I-think that there's two selling points where I totally agree with you that these-we are quite confident that it was low-risk youth we should be doing as little as possible. So, I totally agree that, you know, the stronger guidelines would be for low-risk youth, what we're going to do with them.

Dr. Joseph Haas: Right.

Dr. Gina Vincent: For the moderate to high, it's a combination of that risk level and their needs that are going to have to help inform us, which is how the policy is written, about where to go. So, I wouldn't say it's a coin toss.

Dr. Joseph Haas: Well, yeah.

Dr. Gina Vincent: I would say that it's-you got to look at the confluence of risk factors. And, what's going on to make that decision. Because the goal is to prevent it from happening, right. So, we want to prevent it from happening and we're going to put the best plan in place that's going to do that.

Dr. Joseph Haas: True.

Dr. Gina Vincent: And that's part of the reason that not all of them affect-

Dr. Joseph Haas: But you still have to do a sell either way if you're a probation officer to get your high-risk. It doesn't look good that far.

Dr. Gina Vincent: It sounds that way. Yes, I agree. I totally agree.

Dr. Joseph Haas: Cool.

Dr. Gina Vincent: I think I totally agree. Okay, should we-

Katie Brubaker: About another 10 minutes.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay, so I am almost done. There's just two things I re-wanted to show-

Commissioner Scott Shick: Can I ask Pauline a question real quick based on what we just-you've been using the YSL for how long?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: We've been using it since April of 2017. A little over a year.

Commissioner Scott Shick: What have you found as far as results of what we were just discussing?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: What have I found with what?

Commissioner Scott Shick: Just the outcome of the use of the YLS in, you know, addressing, you know, the high-risk, the kids that are coming out high-risk. I forget my question actually.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: A couple-there's a couple things we have found out from it is that, one, kids that the prior assessment tool we were using were-was really escalating kids into a deeper level of supervision than what they needed. And, which is of course, not good. So, once we started the YLS, our kids that we diverted either in to the informal-into our informal programs or did a referral to, you know, counseling and then offered to pay for the service and that really was the extent of it. Increased by 34% and the number of kids we're placing on probation has decreased drastically, too. I'm actually just running my numbers on that.

Commissioner Scott Shick: That's cool.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: One of the things that has really come to light with our YLS is that our alternative public defender, because we spend a lot of time educating her and she was part of the process, really believes in our process now and knows that we're-if we're

recommending a youth to be placed on probation that there's all the documentation as to why we're doing that. That the kids that we're escalating need to be escalated and the other kids we're treating need-if they need-have high need then we help them get those services, but our court hearings have really lost a lot of the contentiousness that had before.

Commissioner Scott Shick: That's great.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Which makes it nicer for our kids and for our families and for all of us. So I do think that through this whole process what we've figured out is what we were using was not working, that we still have discretion if we need to-if we need to do an override we still have that discretion but we need to have backup for that and that our system is much more effective when we're all on the same page. Not that we're always going to agree, but that there's trust from the court and from our public defender and our district attorney that our recommendation has support to back it up.

Dr. Gina Vincent: That's a rave review.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Thank you.

Gina Vincent: Yeah, I'm in. I was just add part of that what I'm hearing is that you've spent some time getting buy-in and it's established which is really crucial and actually looking at your data, to do what we continuous quality improvement, you're looking at your data to see if things are working, which is also terrific. So, I will say, we have done research before and after implementation of these tools where people following a good process of putting policies in place and all of that stuff and there's always a increase in the number of people youth who are handled informally and in decrease in the number who go on probation and that's after all the researchy research nerds statistical controls to make sure that-to makes sure that you're not just preparing different types of kids. Yeah.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Can I add one more thing to that?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: It wasn't only just that-that we were channeling more kids informally it's that we were-we were connecting them with-with the actual service that they needed.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes, that's terrific.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Just because of the domains and especially our personality and orientation, that we were giving them the services that they needed so they could be in and out with us. If they just-if they work with us because we were paying for that service that's all they were from with us but they were getting their needs met and I think is huge.

Dr. Gina Vincent: That's huge.

Commissioner Scott Shick: That was domain drive, is what you're saying?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Yes.

Dr. Gina Vincent: That's huge. Yeah. I just want to show two quick things because we were asked about this and then we're-I know we need to wrap up so, the profile report that was handed out to everybody, I think it's important to see and especially for DCFS staff to see. This is what will be produced by the YLS software as the initial assessment. So, like I said, it shows the need areas for the chosen overall risk for, but then the last-the last three pages give a little description about why the youth scored the way that they did within each need area. And that's because the comments are input by the officer that completed the YLS. So it prints out here. That's as much narrative description as DCFS staff will get. If the idea is to send the probation YLS to DCFS. It's not a lot of information unless the probation staff are very good about including comments, because this narrative description is going to be key. So that's something to keep in mind when DCFS is using this their plan their case planning. The other report that we handed out is lovely. It's the comparative report and that is-shows just another printout that you guys can get on all of each of your individual youth. Which will show you over time out the youth risk changed. That's the purpose of this report. So these are comparing reassessments of the youth. And I'll show how the risk level measures up between time one and the first reassessment that's done. It will show you that within each of the need area domains as well if you look at page four. So this is just to show you what kind of information you'll get. Any idea of what that is? Is this us?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: I think someone put us on hold so we're hearing music.

BREAK

Commissioner Paula Smith: I have a question. Do you guys work with any other Native American tribes?

Dr. Gina Vincent: No. No, in fact we are excited to be able to do that and now-

Commissioner Paula Smith: For what the terms are?

Gina Vincent: Is there a particular region or county?

Commissioner Paula Smith: I'm tribal. So it might be because we have 27 reservation under the state care. And my judge travels like the western region of the United States.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Wow so that'd be awesome. We haven't done any research or work with tribes around risk assessment and that sort of thing and think-I think that there may end up being some cultural differences. Obviously, they're going to end up being some cultural difference but yeah that's the area where you generally find the most. The most cultural difference-

Commissioner Paula Smith: The family dynamics a lot of them grew up around their grandparents-

Katie Brubaker: So, I guess what's going to need to happen is I'll need a Co-Chair to make a recommendation about what we should do. If we should be ending this meeting, is that I don't know unless everyone wants to get near this speaker and shout.

Dr. Gina Vincent: I'm not a Co-Chair but can I suggest that we hit at least two issues before we end the meeting if people can hear it. Like one is the-the one to start with probation. The things that we discussed being the most important. There's like-just the-hit the highlights.

Katie Brubaker: So, if there is any kind of additional discussion that needs could we potentially do this by email? Does anyone know if that's a violation of Open Meeting Law?

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: This is Jo Lee and I'm not an expert on Open Meeting Law but I'm pretty positive that you cannot mix the speaking by email. That we have possible action items, it has to be done in complete security. So this point my suggestion is that we move on number seven the possible action-

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay, that's good. Okay. So, this is-this is Gina-sorry about that. The last point I wanted to make in the presentation is simply that the YLS helps make-it helps guide decisions about supervision level. Helps guide decision about disposition, helps guide decisions about case planning. So, it is integral to all of those policies that are put together and also can drive decisions about release planning. However, it's all done through policy and training. It's not like the tool itself will bate-it doesn't matter at this point. It's not like the tool itself is going to tell you what to do. So that's why we always come back to policy, being so important to do first. So, any-any-it's going to-you know the YLS drives how a lot of those other decisions are made. Okay? That's it.

Katie Brubaker: I think we're okay to move forward now.

Commissioner Darin Imlay: Okay. Moving on to agenda item number five the update of the YLS implementation work plan, Katie.

Katie Brubaker: So, I think we covered a lot of the specifics related into the work plan. We are essentially on time with everything. Some of the discussion that we do need to have would fall under agenda item number seven for possible action and assigning tasks, specifying agenda items for the next meeting and confirming next meeting date and time. And so, I would suggest that we wait there so that we can take action at that point.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Some of the jurisdictions who don't have YLS yet are a bit concerned that the rollout or implementation is July of 2019. Are we going to discuss-I mean I guess is that-first is that set in stone because we have a lot of jurisdiction on the phone listening in and, and if it is set in stone I think we need to steer their concerns with that?

Katie Brubaker: Absolutely. So, rolling it out to everyone who is not a pilot county is not set in stone. If we do other things faster on that work plan the concern would be adding additional pilot counties at this time is going to make it more difficult to implement any kind of tweaks that we need to do to policy and training. Dr. Vincent and Mr. Clement will be working with each county to get specifics in place related to the YLS, so it's going to be—they're honestly pretty stretched through their contracts right now anyway. So, if we get past the policy sooner, that means we can start training sooner that means we can start implementation sooner. So, on one hand it's not set in stone; on the other hand, we want to make sure that we're implementing it the correct way.

Dr. Gina Vincent: So, I can just add, this is Gina. So, I mean there's been a lot of work around implementation, best practices, implementation in science and so on and it is standard, I shouldn't say standard practice, but it is strongly recommended practice that there be pilot counties whenever you're rolling out something new. I don't think this is probably not surprising to anybody. Those pilot counties, they're piloting not just the YLS, they're also piloting the policies that are put in to place. They're piloting the training and the process. They're piloting a lot of components of this. And it's going to be both amazing and the YLS let's not forget. It's an amazing screening tool and in order for that pilot to effectuate better practice in the next roll out-to the next rollout sites, there needs to be some time for those for the testing to occur and for them to actually see outcomes. So, three months is simply not enough adequate amount of time for that pilot phase to occur to actually get to the point where its revising policies and practices and then being rolled out to the next sites.

Commissioner Scott Shick: What are the pilot counties again and what's the rollout implementation plan with those?

Katie Brubaker: So, our pilot counties are Washoe, Carson, Douglas, and then state facilities.

Gina Vincent: I thought Carson City was-

Katie Brubaker: Yeah, Carson. Carson City. And Humboldt.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Carson's been using the YLS, correct?

Gina Vincent: Yes. Humboldt and Carson both have been using it, but they would be a part of the pilot because this is going to potentially be changing their policies and procedures a bit.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Who else did you say is in it? Carson and who?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Humboldt.

Kelly Clement: And Douglas.

Gina Vincent: Douglas isn't using it now.

Kelly Clement: But they were in the pilot.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah. Ha-the people that the counties that are using the YLS now that I know of, this is Gina, are Humboldt and Carson. I don't know of any other counties using it.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Churchill had a thing using it longer than anybody.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Churchill. Okay. I don't know how far away Churchill is.

Kelly Clement: Washoe and Douglas are the only counties part of the pilot program that is-

Dr. Gina Vincent: They're not using it.

Kelly Clement: Use a new rollout for them, right?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes, but that-I mean the-the rollout, remember we're not just-it's not just rolling out the YLS, it's the new policies and procedures. Right. And the case plan, which I think that there may be a goal of trying to get everybody utilizing the same base plan which is going to be a very big discussion. It generally is.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: A case plan? This is Pauline, again. A case plan that is different that is-that is different than the YLS case plan?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah. Yes. Because you mean different from the one that's spit out by Multi Health-by the software?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Well we don't-we don't use software. We have the hard triplicate. I mean our case management plan is included with our score sheet. It'll be different than that?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. So, you're using the paper and pencil version?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Yes.

Dr. Gina Vincent: I mean that the resulting case plan is likely to be very similar to that, but maybe more structured. It's got-it's going to be-that's going to be-that's something that I would suggest the probation workgroup work on together is what the case plan should look like. Usually, it needs to be something a little more involved than what the YLS has on it.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Okay. Kate, we only have 25 minutes left. Do we need to move on to item number seven and for possible action do that and then go back to six for the remainder of the time, or?

Katie Brubaker: We can do that.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Okay.

Katie Brubaker: So, this is Katie. One of the things that I would like to propose is getting together, like a half day workgroup to work on this probation policy and it would be through this risk assessment committee. And the idea would be to have everybody in the same room to work through as much as we can in an effort to hear everyone's feedback and have everyone on the same page and also to expedite our policy writing. If everyone is okay with that.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I think it would be important to have representation from the jurisdictions that are using the YLS at that meeting.

Katie Brubaker: Absolutely.

Commissioner Scott Shick: That would be Churchill and Humboldt and Carson City.

Katie Brubaker: And my thought process is to invite a good representation from each county because although they're not a pilot site, they should still be engaged and involved in the process and have some say about what it's going to look like.

Commissioner Scott Shick: So we would invite all the jurisdiction chiefs or directors to the meeting.

Katie Brubaker: That is my thought process.

Dr. Gina Vincent: A chief or designee, yes. And we would also recommend that each county have a probation officer who can be involved. Because the front-the people who are the end users are incredibly important to the way the policy put together.

Commissioner Scott Shick: So, probation officer and an administrator from each jurisdiction.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah. And we had discussed some others; I'm looking through my notes. We discussed other people. We're there both-were there other people-

Commissioner Scott Shick: This is Scott and we're talking about a representative from each jurisdiction, the chief or a designee and a probation officer to meet with Katie and respect-and a sub com-just to discu-you know to formulate the probation policy on behalf of the subcommittee. And I-that would include all the jurisdictions. Lynette, are you there?

Lynette Gust: I am.

Commissioner Scott Shick: What's you're feeling about that?

Lynette Gust: I'm okay with that.

Commissioner Scott Shick: She can serve two purposes. She does both.

Dr. Gina Vincent: And I don't know; Lynette is out of which county?

Leslie Bittleston: White Pine.

Commissioner Scott Shick: A little out there.

Heather Plager: This is Heather with Elko and I would agree with that also. I think that would be important.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Yeah, I agree with you. Okay. Thank you, ladies.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: This is Jo Lee Wickes and I'm wondering, because I keep on getting times on what the rollout will end up doing, not a correction assessment of-the reassessment, but an actual assessment that by chance is going to have to be used prior to a dispositional hearing. And perhaps if they had-f they had somebody in the state who's here on per their division and they commit a delinquent defense they're going to be in the same position as a parole-as probation department, excuse me. But think it would be important to have some parole representation at this meeting because in my mind the probation "procedures" the minimum standard that will be set by the state could apply to parole depending on circumstances and I think they ought to have a chance to be at the table.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Good point.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: And this is Pauline. I thought that the DCFS policy was really guiding parole of whether community based or correctional facility based. But their DCFS policy is going to guide parole and correction facility.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: I could be wrong, but I thought correctional was really kind of a separate animal and maybe their policy will, but I would hope that some of that would be to assist them if it's going to be used in court for the same purpose.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Munoz, you on the phone?

Sharon Anderson: He had to step out for a second. I believe with-I don't know who the lady was, I think-and this is Sharon Anderson, with DCFS. I believe what you're saying though is correct. We would need to go through various processes and with probation department if we are looked in to go on to the court process with the youth also looking towards the multi-disposition would be. So that would be a time that we would have to do this by YLS again.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: So, Katie when would you like to have that date for the next one-the next-next meeting with our group?

Katie Brubaker: I was going to suggest that I would send out a Doodle Poll so that everyone can check their calendars and I will get that out first thing tomorrow morning.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Okay. And those will be primarily probation officers, the director of each probation department, as well as potentially representatives from parole, correct?

Katie Brubaker: Correct.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: And subcommittee members?

Katie Brubaker: Correct.

Dr. Gina Vincent: This is Gina Vincent. Does it make sense to have any judges involved at this stage or wait until after the orientation training has been done? So Judge Walker is on the subcommittee so he'll be involved, right? So is that sufficient? That's probably sufficient.

Katie Brubaker: Judge Voy is our part of our advisory committee so I will reach out to him as well. He's in Clark County.

Gina Vincent: Great. The one thing I would suggest, this is Gina again, is that the goal, I think is to try and start getting some policy decisions made with this group. Some decisions for the draft polity. The bigger the group gets, the harder that's going to be. I think everybody knows that so I would-I suggest to get anything done in a 10 person group is ideal, I don't even know if that's possible, but-

Katie Brubaker: I think we will do our very best. And I know that we need to have people at the table with us.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes. Right. Yeah.

Commissioner Scott Shick: The jurisdictions are pretty compatible. So the chiefs-and so I think we'll find a common denominator there and we understand what we're reaching for here so I think we can accomplish-we can get it done. We will get it done.

Katie Brubaker: And just that everyone knows that the policy template that's attached is the corrections policy template that we've been working at DCFS and it might not look like a lot of work has been done, but there has been a lot of discussion that's needed to happen in terms of what we are going to do, what we think about the process, and then, we actually had a brief overview training of the YLS for mental health counselors this morning and so our goal is to do part of the policy and then kind of roll out that piece and see what it looks like. So that's kind of the phase that we're at right now with our corrections policy. Those mental health counselors are going to be testing out the YLS on a couple of kids coming into the system and then we're going to meet in about a month and talk about what that process was like, what kind of overlap there is from the YLS and what is currently being used, so as Dr. Vincent explained earlier if-there's things that we can eliminate so that they're not doing the same work twice. we can do that because our goal is not to stack more work on our individuals on the front lines doing all this work, but you know, to make sure that we're

covering everything that we need to in getting the information we need to make these decisions in these case plans.

Commissioner Scott Shick: So you'll get us that Doodle poll and we can make a determination taking in to consideration, I mean we'd love to see everybody in the room, of course it's hard but mid-week might be better for travel time for some of the rural jurisdictions so might want-you know, see what we come up with.

Katie Brubaker: I will select the time that has the majority of people available and also meets quorum.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Excuse me. Could maybe Scott or someone let Katie know when the meeting was scheduled because that might help increase the pending if we could coordinate or not at least conflict with that meeting.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Yeah, Paul-we have determined for our next meeting, I-I'll get that to Katie. Or, Pauline can you shoot that to Katie?

Commissioner Pauline Sala-Smith: We actually didn't determine the next meeting today because of her-in on the probation of the year tenure. I think the risk and needs assessment topic is so important that you're going to get people there.

Katie Brubaker: Well, watch for my Doodle poll tomorrow.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I just have one more point on the training of the pilot groups. We recommended that one person come from the jurisdictions even to receive the training to get peoples to begin the saturation process, you know the training, you know from jurisdictions that weren't selected as pilot, I don't know if that interrupts your plan or your way of thinking, Dr. Vincent, but that you know they could come and participate in it, become, I guess are we going to become trainers in that training? Master trainers or is that different piece?

Dr. Gina Vincent: This is sort of in the work plan that we haven't spent a lot of time talking about it yet. There's many differ ways that you can do that. I think it's up for a discussion. I think-I think generally the pilot sites become your master trainers. Not everybody on the site but they have master trainers and we will recommend who makes sense of the master training, there's a lot of other factors that go in but it may make sense when the training comes to invite some folks from different jurisdictions just to sit in.

Commissioner Scott Shick: That would be great if you are open to that.

Dr. Gina Vincent: I mean if there's a clear purpose for why they're sitting in there.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Just to learn.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Oh, that. Then yes. I mean if their purpose was for them to become master trainers eventually we've found that doesn't work.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I just had that discussion I think people are anxious to get in to it and if this is an opportunity for them to be there and they can bet there than I would like to open that door.

Katie Brubaker: I think part of our work plan also suggested that we're going to be doing some focus groups. And so I think that might be a great time to also address some of that.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes the idea for getting the staff buy-in was to do focus groups initially with them and to give them a bit of an overview like this orientation training we do with judges during the same time. If the roadshow can involve the staff as well we could knock it all out at the same time. I think that would be ideal.

Katie Brubaker: It's all a possibility. It's in the works and I would also default to our JJOC Co-Chair, Judge Walker if you're still on the line. I think we lost Judge Walker. So know that there's lots of planning behind the scenes that I am working on the roadshow as well with Judge Walker and Ms. Orduna Hastings. And Dr. Vincent and Mr. Clement intend to be a part of our roadshow as well so that we can gain some buy-in from that as well.

Darin Imlay: Okay. Was there any other-are there any specific agenda items that we need to put on the calendar for the agenda for next time, or have those already been covered?

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: We can put them in. I think they've been covered unless Katie has something else she's got something else keeping us on track with.

Katie Brubaker: I do not.

Darin Imlay: Okay. Do we need to go back to agenda item number six? We only have two more minutes. YLS corrections policy drafts?

Katie Brubaker: I don't think that we need to go back to that. I briefly covered it and kind of said that the work that we had done on the corrections policy led to some training for our mental health counselors to pilot that part of the corrections policy that we just got through. So, we'll be meeting again in about a month to revisit what that was like.

Darin Imlay: And any additional public comment or discussion? Not hearing any. Your motion to adjourn.

Commissioner Scott Shick: So moved.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: So moved.

Darin Imlay: Meeting adjourned. Thank you very much.

Katie Brubaker: Thank you.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Thank you.

Committee Report and Other Notes: