



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 Advisory Committee Meeting 11/7/17**

Meeting Minutes

Roll Call:

In Person: Governor Brian Sandoval, Co-Chair Judge Egan Walker, Co-Chair Joey Hastings, Leslie Bittleston, Brigid Duffy, Darin Imlay, Eve Hanan, Frank Cervantes, Gianna Verness, Jack Martin, Jaqueline Pierrott, John Lambrose, Jo Lee Wickes, Katherine Hickman, Kelly Wooldridge, Paula Smith, Pauline Salla-Smith, Rebekah Graham, Scott Shick, Assemblyman James Oscarson, Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Judge Thomas Stockard

Via Phone: Megan Pekuri (7th Judicial)- filling in for Lynette Gust, Judge Nancy Saitta, Nina Salomon and Shanelle Johnson from CSG Justice Center, NYPB, Dr. Lisa Morris-Hibbler, Patrick Schreiber, Sandra McGurk

Excused: Shawn Andersen, Senator Julia Ratti, Senator Becky Harris, Judge William Voy

Absent: Allen Penaluna, Christian Paz, Elba Gonzalez, Haydyn Williams-Thom

Introduction:

Governor Sandoval would like to thank everybody for their participation and commitment. Welcome to the Inaugural meeting for the Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission. Today's meeting represents nearly two years of hard work from stakeholders across the state. This effort was initiated in July of last year, to transform the Juvenile Justice system within our state. With the formation of a Task Force that will perform a comprehensive review of Nevada's Juvenile Justice System, this commission should be proud. Nevada was the only state in the nation selected by the United States Department of Justice to receive a technical assistance grant that supports the selection of a review process; and through a partnership with the Counsel of State Governments, a task force devoted time and attention to the development of recommendations for improving Juvenile Justice outcomes in Nevada. Governor Sandoval would also like to recognize and thank members from the Counsel of State Governments Justice Center, for the outstanding work and help with the Task Force.

Assembly Bill 472 (AB472), passed by legislation during the most current session, reflects the findings and recommendations endorsed by the Task Force that imposes significant provisions that will enhance our Juvenile Justice System. This Bill was passed unanimously, and shows not only how compelling the issue is, but acknowledges our legislators' recognition of necessary change. This Bill created several reforms, as well as the creation of the new Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission. The membership of this Commission includes representatives from each branch of government, leaders from Juvenile Justice agencies at state and local levels, representatives from law enforcement, non-profits, and youth that have been involved in the system. The youth represent the future of the state, Governor Sandoval encourages members to be bold and share their insights.

AB 472 also established a framework for incorporating evidence-based programming with new tools to reduce recidivism, improving outcomes, and measuring effectiveness as a state. Implementation of this reform must be done quickly. Furthermore, AB 472 establishes a timeline for the development of a Strategic Plan. This reform will be urgent, as the timeline is condensed greatly. AB 472 was introduced and implemented by the Governor's Office, because despite the fact Nevada is spending \$95 million on supervision of justice-involved youth, the state still lacks standardized methods for tracking measurable outcomes, ensuring the best practices and research are being consulted, and ensuring the best tools are being used to reduce recidivism, and multiple encounters with courts and law enforcement.

This Commission will be responsible for implementing the provisions of AB 472. Some of the most pressing items are as follows: the adoption of a validated Risk and Needs Assessment tool and Mental Health Screening tool to guide the disposition, case planning, and service decisions for justice-involved youth. The Commission must also develop a 5-year Strategic Plan establishing policies and procedures for Juvenile Justice agencies including uniform standards for evidence-based programming and strategies for enhancing the effectiveness of Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS). This commission will also conduct Quality Assurance reviews for state and county youth facilities while serving as the Advisory Group for administering critical federal grants and implementing Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act.

Governor Sandoval shared a poem with the Commission, written by Edward Everett Hale, "I am only one, but I am one. I cannot do everything, but I can do something. And what I can do, I ought to do. I will not let what I cannot do interfere with what I can do." The state of Nevada has the opportunity to make historical changes, and Governor Sandoval believes this commission will spark those changes.

Public Comment: None

Overview of Commission Duties and Timelines

Co-Chair Judge Egan Walker, along with Co-Chair Joey Hastings encourage input and discussion in these meetings, so the youth of the state of Nevada benefit from what is implemented. Mr. Walker verified the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) involvement in the commission as a partnership.

Administrator Kelly Wooldridge presented the goals of this commission as follows: the establishment of uniform procedures across agencies and the state to reduce recidivism in Juvenile Justice, selection of a Risk and Needs Assessment Tool, as well as a Mental Health Screening Tool, act as the state Advisory Group for Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act and Title 2 Formula Grants, develop a Strategic Plan on evidence-based programming, uniform collection of data and data analysis, and finally develop Quality Assurance reviews for correctional facilities and county camps.

AB 472 Implementation Plan

Ms. Wooldridge shared information regarding the AB 472 Implementation Plan, section by section. Sections 1-3 are definitions and were not included. Section 4 of the plan describes the creation of the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission (JJOC) that was due 9/1/17. The state was a little behind, but Ms. Wooldridge and DCFS take full responsibility. Section 4 also established the Advisory Committee to the Commission.

Section 5 of the plan describes the duties of this commission. By January 1, 2018, a Risk Assessment tool and Mental Health Screening tool will need to be adopted and uniform statewide. The state will have until July 1, 2018 to bring experts in to lead trainings and begin implementation of the tools.

Section 6 of the plan describes the development of a 5-year strategic plan. The commission will need to establish policies and procedures for evidence-based practices to get uniform standards and data collection with measurable goals, timelines, and responsibilities. This plan will need to be submitted to the Director of LCB for transmission to the Legislature prior to July 1, 2018, and every 5 years thereafter. The DCFS will adopt regulations to implement the provision of the strategic plan that is developed.

Section 7 of the plan describes annual Quality Assurance reviews of each state and regional facility, conducted by the commission. The commission will select a tool to validate Quality Assurance at each facility, which will lead to strategic action planning for program improvement. Section 8 of the plan describes the implementation of a Risk Assessment Tool and Mental Health Screening.

Section 9 of the plan describes the implementation of Evidence Based Programming. The DCFS and each Juvenile Justice department that receives money from the state, except money received from Medicaid, must use the money to develop, promote and coordinate evidence-based programs and practices. This requirement of the Bill is phased in at 25% in fiscal year 2019-2020, 50% in fiscal year 2020-2021, 75% in fiscal year 2021-2022, and 100% thereafter.

Section 10 of the plan describes the development of an Evidence Based Resource Center. The DCFS had a due date of 9/1/17 for the RFP paperwork to be completed. This Resource Center will provide technical assistance to the DCFS, each department of juvenile services and treatment providers to support the implementation and operation of evidence-based programs and practices set forth in the strategic plan, once developed by the commission. The Center will act as a clearinghouse for information and statewide resources on evidence-based programs and practices for children subject to jurisdiction of the juvenile court. Finally, the Resource Center will provide support for the assessment of the implementation of evidence-based standards by state and local agencies.

Section 11 of the plan describes Annual Compliance Reports due on or before July 1, 2019, and on or before July 1 of every year thereafter.

Section 12 of the plan describes the Family Engagement plan. DCFS and each department of juvenile services shall develop and implement a family engagement plan to enhance family engagement in the juvenile justice system. DCFS will engage family members in the case plan of a child and in planning meetings for the release of the child from juvenile court jurisdiction. Sections 13 and 14 were language cleanup- removing detention from facilities and including treatment and rehabilitation facilities.

Section 14.5 of the plan describes Court Findings Prior to Commitment. Before the juvenile court commits a delinquent child to the custody of a state facility, the court must find that appropriate alternatives were looked at to meet the needs of the child, that the child poses a public safety risk based on the child's risk of reoffending as determined by a Risk Assessment. DCFS has developed implementation guides to educate the judiciary and other legal stakeholders for necessary changes to dispositional order related to commitment to DCFS.

Section 15 of the plan describes the use of Risk Assessment and Screening tool, as discussed prior.

Section 16 of the plan describes Individualized Case Planning and looking for evidence-based case management programming across the state.

Section 17 of the plan describes the Placement of a Child. DCFS should consider the results of the Risk Assessment and Mental Health Screening prior to making decisions on placement of the child(ren). DCFS will develop a length of stay matrix and individualized case plans for children in facilities.

Section 18 of the plan describes the Out of State Placement of Children. Prior to committing a child to public or private institution or agency in another state, the juvenile court must find that no public or private institution or agency in this State met the needs of the child, or that such institution has already attempted to meet such needs and proved unsuccessful. Finally, the court must find that efforts have been made to consult with public or private institutions and agencies within the State.

Section 20 of the plan describes the Frequency of Screening. Each child that is adjudicated delinquent and committed to a regional facility by the juvenile courts for the treatment and rehabilitation of children must be screened to determine whether the child is in need of mental

health services or is an abuser of alcohol or drugs once every 6 months or when significant changes to the child's case plan occurs.

Section 21 of the plan describes Screening at each regional facility for the treatment or rehabilitation of children.

Section 21.5 of the plan describes Commitment. The language was changed to permit the commitment of a delinquent child to the custody of the DCFS for placement in a correctional or institutional facility if the child needs placement in a facility or in need of residential psychiatric services.

Section 22 of the plan describes Annual reporting, due January 31, 2019. On or before January 1 of each year, the DCFS will submit a report that will analyze information submitted to the Division to determine Juvenile Justice system trends. These reports will go to the Governor and to the Director of the LCB.

Section 23 of the plan describes the Release of Information. Amendments were made to allow for the release of confidential information to the Chief Parole and Probation Officer, Director of the Department of Corrections, the director, chief or sheriff of a state or local law enforcement agency, the director of a state or local or regional facility for treatment and rehabilitation of children, and the director of an agency which provides mental health services.

Section 24 of the plan describes Regulations, permitting DCFS to adopt regulations as necessary to implement the performance measures and evidence-based standards developed by the Commission. These regulations also permit DCFS to withhold state money from a juvenile court or department that does not comply with adopted regulations.

Section 25 of the plan describes System Information Requirements by adding staff and regional facility for the treatment and rehabilitation of children. Amendments will add data elements related to educational background, charges of violation of probation or parole, assessed risks and needs of the child, supervision of the child including placement in a residential facility, any programs or services provided to the child, any disciplinary action taken against a child during placement, and any training provided to the child during placement.

Section 26 of the plan describes changes to Youth Parole, specifically establishing a sliding scale based on the severity of the violation to determine the appropriate response to the child. This section also requires that a response to a child's violation of the terms and conditions of his or her parole timely take into consideration that: the risk of the child to reoffend as determined by the risk and needs assessment, the previous history of violations, the severity of current violation, the child's case plan, and the previous responses to violations by the child.

Section 27 of the plan describes County's Requirement to carry out NRS 63.700 and 63.780, along with section 26 of the Bill.

Section 28 of the plan describes Petition by Court to Revoke Parole. The juvenile court will consider policies and procedures adopted by the Youth Parole Bureau in determining whether to suspend, modify or revoke parole of a child, considering the adherence of the Youth Parole Bureau to such policies and procedures.

Section 29 of the plan describes Youth Parole Recommendations to Revoke. The Chief of Youth

Parole may recommend to the juvenile court that a child's parole be revoked and that the child be committed to a facility only if the Chief or his/her designee has determined that the child poses a risk to public safety, and the policies and procedures adopted by the Youth Parole Bureau recommend revocation, or the other responses set forth in such policies and procedures would not be appropriate for the child.

Section 33 of the plan describes the repeal of NRS 62H.230, effective July 1, 2018.

Review of CSG Presentation

Deputy Armstrong shared the Second Presentation to Task Force: Key Findings from System Analysis. Data was gathered from the state's juvenile justice facilities, and focus groups were hosted with the Task Force that was appointed. This information is helpful in laying a foundation for what the system should look like, and what it currently looks like based off data that was submitted.

Slide 15 shows a series of four different graphs. Since 2008, general juvenile justice involvement for youth has declined nationwide. There has been a slight increase in commitments over the last couple years, however, it is still lower than previous numbers.

Slide 16 shows percentages of the entire youth in the system, for the state. 70% of youth coming into the system are being diverted or having their cases closed. A very small amount of the population, 26%, are adjudicated.

Slide 20 demonstrates youth cycling through the Nevada juvenile justice system multiple times. Mr. Armstrong would like the Commission to focus on the Risk and Needs Assessment and getting the right services to youth at the right time.

Slide 22 shows DCFS commitments by offense type. This slide was controversial with the Task Force because of the high number of technical violations. As this commission goes forward, it must figure out how to collect data to show true story of violations.

Slide 23 shows about half of youth committing a new offense while on Parole, with only about 22% revoked. The Commission has high hopes that data will be collected in a way to reflect revocations based off parole violations or a new offense.

Slide 33 shows a slight increase in youth in DCFS custody, however, the length of stay is down 13% since 2013.

Slide 34 shows different offense types by disposition in Washoe and Clark Counties. The state of Nevada is progressing healthily: most youth are receiving diversion or misdemeanor offenses, with a larger group of felony offenses (38%) that are committed.

Slide 35 shows disproportionate minority contact and the substantial decrease of length of stay, from nearly 13 months to slightly more than 7 months.

Scott Shick would like to extend his gratitude for getting information aligned on what we are doing well as a state, and what needs to be improved. Mr. Shick commends the CSG for their hard work and organization in pushing this Bill forward.

Brigid Duffy disagrees with a slide provided by the CSG, due to presentation of the statistics. Ms. Duffy encourages the Commission to gather data in a way that reflects the true story, especially when youth are committed for technical violations of parole or probation.

Co-Chair Walker acknowledges these issues and encourages the Commission to dive deeper into the statistics. There needs to be a discussion since Nevada is portrayed differently due to these technical violations.

Jack Martin would like this Commission to track data based off new response grids, so numbers are reflected more accurately.

Duties of Federal State Advisory Group

Mr. Armstrong shared that the former commission will be disbanding, and new members have been assigned to the Governor's Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission to take over the duties as the State Advisory Group. This is a federal regulation that the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) will follow in order to receive Grant funding, as well as helping execute the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act. The DCFS Program's Office helped staff this and will make sure the grants are done. Eventually this Commission will need a body to work on and review sub grant applications. DCFS staff also work on compliance via Sight and Sound Separation, Jail Removal, Status Offenses, and a plan to decrease Disproportionate Minority Contact.

Ms. Wooldridge shared that DCFS receives federal funding for the Commission that has been disbanded. That funding is switching over to the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission, so there will be a budget for travel and administrative support.

Report on Work Completed by DCFS

Ms. Wooldridge's report describes the DCFS Implementation Team's task to start writing policies and procedures for Youth Parole and correctional institutions statewide. This report will be ready at one of the next full Commission meetings. The RFP for the Evidence-Based Resource Center did go out and DCFS is following state purchasing guidelines. This RFP closed November 2nd. Within the next couple weeks, a team will be put together to select a Vendor for this process.

Caseload Pro is a system has been chosen to be used to collect data, in hopes of minimizing inadequacies. This contract has been completed and will be available throughout the state. Some departments are already being moved into Caseload Pro.

Mr. Martin furthered explained what Caseload Pro is. This program was selected to reinvest in tools used to collect data and case management information. This is a program that is all internet

based and all inclusive, allowing for contacts with other providers and agencies. The program runs on Service as a Software (SAS) meaning that the state will only be charged for what services are used, without a minimum or maximum allotment set. The program will give a more accurate overview of what is happening with the youth in the state's system.

Mr. Shick uses Caseload Pro regularly as of right now. He describes the system as a viable system that allows for the aggregation of data in a way that hasn't been done in the past.

Ms. Wooldridge reiterated that Caseload Pro is beneficial because it has the ability to follow youth throughout their journey in the system, giving a more valid depiction of our juvenile justice system.

With the assistance of CSG, Implementation Guides have been developed for the Commission. These are available for courts, attorneys, and county probation offices as well. Ms. Wooldridge and DCFS' new Administrator, Mr. John Munoz, will be dispersing these Guides during facility visits in the near future.

With the assistance of the CSG, the DCFS has had communication with multiple agencies across the nation to discuss, learn about and select a uniform, statewide, Risk and Needs Assessment tool and Mental Health Screening tool. There will be further clarification after discussion with the state purchasing department, whether there is a need for a RFP or if the Commission's selection of statewide tools will be valid.

The first company DCFS met with for the Risk and Needs Assessment tool was the National Youth Screening and Assessment Partners, Gina Vincent. This company provides technical assistance and is a research group that is dedicated to helping Juvenile Justice programs identify youth's needs for assessment and risk management. They will present up to four tools to the Commission and will establish stakeholder and staff buy-in, develop policy and procedure around the use of the tool, will pick a training and pilot, once the tool is selected. There will be ongoing monitoring and implementation throughout the state, following the pilot sites. This group is considered experts in the YLS tool, which there has been past discussions about.

The second company is UC Corrections systems, specifically the Ohio Youth Assessment System (OYAS). This system helps determine diversion options for youth, considered for front end decisions, back end releases, overall risk of youth reoffending, criminogenic needs, responsivity factors and case management strategies. There are also assessments available for re-entry and residential. It is automated so if the Commission selects this system, it will need to verify the ability to work with Caseload Pro.

The next company is Noble Software with the Positive Achievement Change Tool

(PACT). This tool is a combination of Risk and Needs Assessment and Mental Health Screening tool. It is currently used in Washington, Florida and Texas, and has a residential portion and Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACES) as well.

The final company was recommended by Mr. Martin, called Multi Health Systems Inc. This company uses YLS and has given us a proposal of 5 to 10 years of unlimited statewide access and training.

The subcommittee will oversee the selection of this tool, and should expect to have some deep end conversations about each company's proposal. The Risk and Needs Assessment tool and Mental Health Screening tool will need to be selected by January 1, 2018 and implemented statewide by July 1, 2018. Ms. Wooldridge will reach out to each county and/or judicial district to verify the tools they are using currently. The Risk Assessment Subcommittee will, after selection of a tool and service provider, report back to the entire Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission on their selection.

Ms. Pauline Salla-Smith shared that detention centers have the MAYSI Assessment identified in their statute. She shared that this is how herself and staff identify youth with potential suicidal ideation or substance abuse issues. She voiced appreciation to Ms. Wooldridge for her efforts to reach out to counties individually to ensure a smooth transition from past to present.

Assemblyman James Oscarson wants to ensure rural participation as this process moves forward. These changes will impact them significantly, including operation and potentially their budgets.

Quality Assurance tool selection has been narrowed down to three companies. The first offered through Vanderbilt, called Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP) comes from an evidence-based information support center and measures impact of programs on reducing recidivism, looks at service type, dosage, quality and risk level. Via this information, the program develops strategic plan of results, as well as special considerations for residential facilities.

The second program option is through UC Corrections, with a program checklist that includes training on the tool, data analysis, reports on strengths and needs of the tool. It looks at quality not quantity, and is currently being used by the Nevada Department of Corrections.

The final program is Noble Software, that works with YLS software, Ohio Assessment tool and Caseload Pro. This company will develop policies and protocols about how to use quality assurance tools. There will also be action planning and strategic planning and based off the tools usage.

Ms. Wooldridge has a couple other meetings with various Quality Assurance programs and companies to ensure the state is selecting the most beneficial option.

Overview of Commission Structure/Subcommittee Development

Co-Chair Egan Walker described the role of Advisory members and the role of Commission members, stating that the Commission is tasked with making beneficial and positively impactful changes for the youth in the Juvenile Justice system in this state. The Advisory Committee members are there to guide, advise, and support the implementation of changes as they are made. Through conversation with other commissioners, Mr. Walker acknowledged that, in his opinion, the Commission is lacking the role of state educational support, rural law enforcement, youth advocacy mentors, as well as a mental health community representative who works with children.

Mr. Martin recommends adding diversity by including more minority groups on the Commission, either individuals or groups such as NAACP or the Latin Chamber of Commerce, etc. Mr. Martin has been doing extensive work with Dr. Lisa Morris Hibbler in regard to the School to Prison pipeline. He recommends including school district officials, as well as more minority representation.

After consideration and conversation, the Co-Chairs of this committee, Mr. Walker and Ms. Hastings, along with guidance from Ms. Wooldridge and creating inclusive Subcommittees, have suggested the following people take the lead and Co-Chair each subcommittee to ensure everyone has a role: Data Subcommittee, Strategic Plan Subcommittee, Risk Assessment Subcommittee, and a Youth Subcommittee. The proposed Co-Chairs of the Data Subcommittee will be: Ms. Brigid Duffy, Ms. Gianna Verness, and Judge Thomas Stockard. The proposed Co-Chairs of the Strategic Plan Subcommittee will be: Mr. Frank Cervantes, Dr. Lisa Morris-Hibbler, and Judge William Voy. The proposed Co-Chairs of the Risk Assessment Subcommittee will be: Mr. Jack Martin, Ms. Jo Lee Wickes, and Mr. Darin Imlay. The proposed Co-Chairs of the Youth Subcommittee will be: Mr. John Munoz and Justice Nancy Saitta. These are suggestions and proposals that the Commission Co-Chairs believe reflect inclusion via the location of individuals and their experience. The remaining Commission members are asked to select their top two choices for subcommittees and submit those proposals by the end of the week. The Risk Assessment Subcommittee will need to work quickly and immediately at selecting a uniform tool to be used statewide. The selection will need to be made and presented to the Governor's Office by January 1, 2018. Due to Open Meeting Law, each subcommittee cannot exceed 12 people.

Overview of Budget

Ms. Wooldridge shared that most of funding for this commission is in this fiscal year's budget, and does not carry over into the next fiscal year. The adoption and implementation of a statewide validated Risk and Needs Assessment has a budget of \$500,000, with \$450,000 that must be spent on the Risk and Needs Assessment tool for the fiscal year 2018. The breakdown of the funding is as follows: \$300,000 for exploration, development and purchase of a validated tool, \$100,000 for technical assistance to guide, train and develop policy and procedure, \$50,000 in

operating costs, and \$50,000 for the cost of purchasing assessments for fiscal year 2019.

The Caseload Pro budget over two fiscal years is \$745,403. These numbers are based on negotiations with Caseload Pro during session.

For Research and Quality Improvement, the state has \$254,597. In fiscal year 2018 it is \$144,597 for startup funds for Evidence-Based Resource Center. \$50,000 for a contract Quality Assurance Manager with DCFS, \$10,000 for the Quality Assurance training and building tools previously mentioned. Fiscal year 2019 includes \$50,000 for contract Quality Assurance Manager through DCFS. This is a total budget of \$1.5 million over the biennium, with over \$1 million to be used in fiscal year 2018.

New Business:

Nina Salomon from CSG would like to reiterate that the CSG is partnering with the Commission to help support members and subcommittees as needed. She asked Commission members to please reach out with anything that they may be able to assist with.

Next Steps:

Next Full Commission Meetings:

Thursday, November 30, 2017 at 1pm- phone and video conference

North: Undecided, but will be announced- Reno

South: Grant Sawyer Building, Las Vegas

Friday, December 15, 2017 at 9am- in person meeting (Reno) and phone conference as needed.

Friday, December 29, 2017 at 1pm- phone and video conference (tentative depending on the outcome of Friday, December 15 meeting)

Public Comment: none

Adjourned: by Co-Chair Egan Walker at 12:25pm, moved by Commissioner Salla-Smith and seconded by Mr. Martin