



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
Data and Performance Measurement
Committee Meeting 12/11/17**

Meeting Minutes DRAFT

Call to Order: Co-Chair, Brigid Duffy called the meeting to order at 1:33pm.

Roll Call:

Via Phone: Gianna Verness, Brigid Duffy, Jo Lee Wickes, Rebekah Graham

Absent: Assemblyman James Oscarson, Patrick Schreiber, Judge Thomas Stockard

Staff Present: Leslie Bittleston, Sarah Bellows, Ross Armstrong

Guests Present: Nancy Arrigona with CSG, Rex Reed with ACLU

Public Comment: None

Recidivism Discussion: Definition and Measurements

During the Full Commission meeting on November 30, 2017, Commissioner Salla-Smith advised members that a definition of recidivism already exists within the Supreme Courts Data Dictionary which was published in 2014.

Committee members received a copy of the 2014 Supreme Court Data Dictionary in their meeting materials. The definition of recidivism is on page 35.

The definition is:

“the adjudication of delinquency or conviction for any act designated a crime under Nevada Revised Statutes, other than a traffic offense except as specified in NRS Chapter 484A.710, with which a child or an adult may be charged when the individual has been previously adjudicated delinquent. For purposes of measurement, recidivism will be measured when an individual is re-adjudicated delinquent by a juvenile court or convicted by an adult court. Recidivism shall be measured by year subsequent to initial finding of delinquency for a time period of three years”.

The group discussed if the stated definition is acceptable going forward.

Commissioner Wickes and Co-Chair Duffy discussed various actions that can occur while a youth on supervision that can be considered recidivism, but doesn't get measured such as violations of probation or picking up new offenses. Those citations are currently given to the probation officer in the already-open probation case. The only time agencies are made aware is if a felonious offense occurs. Further, if a youth receives informal consequences from any part of the system, it does not currently count as a re-offense.

Mr. Armstrong suggested that the group determine when they would like to "start the clock" on measuring youth offenders. Does measurement begin at the start of intervention services, at or after release from a facility, or at termination of supervision. If using recidivism as a measure of success, how are youth doing after they are released and back in the community. Does the group want to track things such as action triggers leading to an arrest, conviction, or adjudication? Mr. Armstrong shared that states around the nation are tracking recidivism by what starts it, and what event triggers the finding that the youth did, in fact, re-offend.

- Co-chair Duffy shared that Pennsylvania currently measures recidivism as "within two years of case closure, a subsequent adjudication of delinquency in juvenile court or a conviction in criminal court for a felony or misdemeanor offense." This, along with demographics are tracked annually.
- Co-chair Verness clarified that this committee is measuring recidivism new crimes or delinquent acts, not status offenses or a probation/parole violation.
- Co-chair Duffy clarified that capturing data such as technical violations will represent performance measures, and will be looked at to determine the effectiveness of the juvenile system.

Ms. Arrigona from CSG reiterated the importance of deciding when to start the measurement of recidivism, the beginning or end of supervision, or somewhere in between. The benefit of starting at the end of supervision, any benefit or rehabilitative effect is measurable after youth are out of the system. If you choose this as your end measure, you still want to capture data while they're on supervision. There should be less recidivism while on supervision, especially if officer is providing support and services as needed by the youth. Starting measurement at the beginning of supervision allows for an overview of the youth's journey through the entire system. A benefit of starting measurement at the beginning of supervision is that the officer or person providing services to the youth, can understand more of the needs and services for that youth, and can adjust accordingly during the youth's time in the system. Ideally, state's will track youth's technical violations, but those would not count against recidivism numbers. New offenses and crimes, however, would count. The goal is for officers to know what is going on with the youth throughout the journey in the juvenile system, as well as making services and supervision more effective.

Commissioner Graham shared federal Foster Care research and even personal probation experience in California. During her tenure, any youth that went to residential treatment was surveyed at 17, 19, and 21 years old. Data collected from the services offered in care, outcomes such as employment, education, substance abuse, incarceration, and whether they had children at these ages.

Co-chair Duffy suggested measuring youth at two different times: during the case, and after the case closure. This would require two definitions of recidivism. Maybe the goal is to bring all definitions under one larger umbrella. She believes it will benefit the youth of the state, in the system, to come up with a way of measuring the outcome of services provided.

Ms. Arrigona further explained that the committee, the full commission, and the state should not be focused on keeping numbers low, but rather, focus on data collection being accurate and annual.

- The state of Missouri measures at case closure, and often youth that recidivate a lot, do not have case closure. A youth may be in the system for 3, 4, 5 or more years before the case is closed, which can skew data and make it hard to identify at which point a youth has benefited most from the system. She explained that although Missouri recidivism rates look low, those numbers are somewhat artificial due to the data not being captured until case closure.
- The state of Texas measures youth at arrest and incarceration. Conviction data was not complete at time of definition development, so the measures were better to look at arrest which are usually over-counted, and at incarceration where behaviors are usually undercounted.

The group concluded the discussion of recidivism with a final thought by Co-Chair Duffy. She suggested collecting recidivism data at re-arrest, re-adjudication, and technical violations.

Question: How do we determine if a case is successful? 1) Exists a facility, 2) ends supervision, or 3) does or doesn't enter the adult system.

Identifying Performance Measures from Referral to Case Closure

The group discussed potential performance measures.

Commissioner Graham suggested separating low, medium, and high-risk youth. Ideally, low-risk youth are less likely to reoffend or commit new offenses.

- Ms. Arrigona explained that looking at youth that recidivate by risk level is a great way to collect the data. Performance measures can also be used to identify who is coming into the

system. Data may show the population/demographic changes with focus on risk level and dates associated with those assessments. Ms. Arrigona encourages capturing important system points and system trends, as explanatory measures, such as changes in case closure, supervision level, etc.

Commissioner Wickes identified the following to track the following:

- educational progress (credit count, attendance, graduation, alternative diploma)
- to distinguish between technical probation/parole violations
- to determine if a delinquent event was charged as a probation or technical violation
- to track service providers to identify the provider and measure the benefit that each provides the youth

Co-chair Verness identified the need for measurement of multiple placements and various points within system involvement, specifically including group homes, treatment facilities, county camps, state institutions and correctional facilities.

Commissioner Wickes suggested that Dr. Leone from UNR is available to help guide the committee on any other performance measures they may be missing.

Assign Tasks to Members

Commissioner Wickes will reach out to Dr. Leone to join the next committee meeting.

Co-chair Duffy will forward the committee the information that Commissioner Graham shared with her. She will also type up the Committee Report from this meeting.

Next Steps: Date for next meeting: January 16, 2018 at 1:30pm.

Public Comment: None

Adjourned: by Co-Chair Brigid Duffy at 3:12pm, seconded by Commissioner Wickes and moved by committee members.