



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
Strategic Plan Committee Meeting
03/22/2018
Meeting Minutes **DRAFT****

Call to Order: Meeting to order at 10:06am.

Roll Call:

Via Phone: Judge Egan Walker, Dr. Lisa Morris Hibbler, Frank Cervantes, Eve Hanan, Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Captain Shawn Anderssn, Joey Orduna Hastings, Lorna Shepard – OnStrategy, Leslie Bittleston, Sarah Bellows, Katie Brubaker

Absent: Judge William Voy, Carlos McDade, John Lambrose, Kelly Wooldridge

Quorum: Committee only has 7 established voting members - Established enough members present to vote – only need four. The group has a quorum.

Note: Ms. Orduna Hastings ON RECORD must leave at 11:00 – all voting must be prior.

Topics of Strategic Plan Outline:

- **Working Session Objective/Process:** Ms. Shepard will look for input from those on call/attendees/public/non-voting members. Co-chairs make recommendations on what we can vote on (Hibler/Cervantes). Will share with full JJOC at next meeting.
 - ◆ Need to schedule 2 half-day meetings for follow-up (with all co-chairs). Will wait until last 5 minutes of meeting to see if Judge Voy arrives and has input.
 - ◆ Questions: None

- **Definition of Evidence-Based Practices, Lorna Shepard, OnStrategy**

Ms. Shepard provided the group with several definitions of Evidence-Based Practices from other states. Not stand alone-multiple definitions, we want to land on OUR definition today; the definition that is specific to State of NV, including definition of “what is a promising practice”. In this transition may not be evidence based but could

have good potential – don't want to exclude any program or service that could meet this requirement. We can take portions of other state's information and create Nevada's definition.

1. What is an evidence-based program? (handout page 8)

Initial observations from the members.

Captain Andersen: State of Florida definition made the most sense – Definition is solid, practices laid out – bullet points of 5 basic principles (DJJ reference) of effective intervention; includes marketing as does our definition so the broader based population understands where we are going. This is a tremendous benefit.

Ms. Hanan: also likes Florida because of intervention wording, “Including but not limited to” for hard to fit intervention categories/random assignments/control group. The more flexible the wording the better. “Causal relationships” - Looking at recidivism, Causal Relationships can isolate variables that you can't get from a mapped-out program. More flexible. Need to have a conversation about promising practices and where that leads for pilot program. Where is the room for Nevada to innovate if the promising practices have to include only interventions that have been evaluated and found to reduce the likelihood of recidivism? Like to hear from others - How do promising practices fit into our definition? How broad should that definition be? Should it be broader than Florida? Does the statute allow for that? Need to look back at statute and see how promising practices fits into our mandate.

Mr. Cervantes: Good observations. Agree w/ Washington state-definition of promising practices if too rigid you might exclude good options for kids yet evaluated. Dr. Hibbler and I talked about evidence-based programming is rigorous/scientific inquiry require randomized studies. Pretty strict. Need a lot of flexibility in Promising Practices. Used example of Pueblo Project - Not designed to immediately reduce recidivism it was meant to provide linkage between family/younger sibs. Down the line may reduce recidivism but may be hard to show through scientific evaluation how occurred.

Dr. Hibbler: Like Washington State-all 3 definitions. Talked about all having all three (evidence based/research based/promising practices). Everything has to start from a promising practice; nothing is EB until it has been evaluated, tested and replicated...how do you replicate? How does it just start out as a state's practice?

Ms. Orduna Hastings: Just returned from JJC. Scoured National Council Juvenile Family Court Justices for past statements for definition of EB and what constitutes EB = March 2014 Council adopted policy statement: “Evidence of

Effectiveness” based on CDC prevention continuum of effectiveness. They use a matrix to help navigate. Allows promising practices to grow into acknowledged practices best defined by agencies. Recommended using matrix as a tool to work through practices to get to EB outcome. Can get that matrix out to everyone – Sarah will help distribute. Good tool to navigate.

Judge Walker: Pre-legislative meetings as then JJC – contemplated language of bill that Evidence Based practices would include those programs that were EB/RB/PP. Talked @ helping smaller jurisdictions that have small home-baked programs build up promising programs, so they could be Evidence/Research based. All need to be aware: OJJDP good definitions of EB but taking different direction under new administration. Karen Harp – new Director OJJDP, good varied background. Taking clear Trump administration policy line: “Children will be held accountable, victim’s rights will be elevated, offending children will be programmed”. Hard right turn. Recommend moving from OJJDP definitions as giant changes are coming.

At the CJJ Conference, Karen Harp, new Administrator of OJJDP, made statement “I think brain science has gone too far.....all studies have caveats stating science not well developed, so I just don’t buy it”.

Discussion on how to achieve evidence based from programs and services already being used.

- The group distinguished that there is a definite difference between a promising practice and an evidence-based program, example: Juvenile Sex Offender Programs.
- There was consensus that some programs that are needed are not yet available. This means that some programs will need to start from the ground and as it is implemented, data needs to be collected to verify if it is promising, and from promising to evidence based.
- The group agreed that a matrix would be beneficial to help distinguish programs through the process of promising to evidence based. Matrix categories:
 - TOP: Program type/well-supported/supported/promising direction/emerging/undetermined/unsupported and harmful/
 - LEFT SIDE: effect/internal validity/type of evidence research design/independent replication/implementation guidance/extended and ecological validity. Matrix maybe tailor to our needs.
 - The group discussed harmful practices and at the point something is “harmful”– are there harmful things that need to be flushed out/identified. That is the ruling out piece of matrix.
- Once a matrix is established and approved; then existing programs can be flushed

through the matrix to see if they are on track to becoming evidence based.

- The group discussed the legislation: by 2022, 100% of State money going into Evidence Based. Not necessarily 100% but the anticipation “continue to develop data”. The following questions arose:
 - Cannot use state funds for programs that can’t move beyond Promising Practices?
 - Can state funding be used to prove PP is a model program?
 - Statute for over 4yrs counties have had the right to decide movement from promising/model and decide funding sources. It will be up to counties to decide whether to continue a program w/ no evidence and continue taking state funds to support or if they take alternative avenues.

Planning Sessions for Entire Strategic Plan – OnStrategy

- Will schedule 90 minutes sessions and half day session in April/May
- Will work on EB Matrix as discussed today
- Will create an agenda of topics for upcoming sessions, so all areas of the Plan are addressed

New Business None

Next Steps:

- Possible approval of draft Matrix.
- Schedule and topic outline (Lorna will get w/ Mr. Munoz)
- Next meeting will be held via teleconference on Thursday, April 5th at 10:00am.
(Possible time shift to accommodate 3 co-chairs will be announced: 7am//5am)

Public Comment: none

Adjourned: by Co-Chair Judge Walker at 11:19am, moved by committee members.