



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
5/29/19
Meeting Minutes

Call to Order: Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes called the Risk Assessment Committee meeting to order at 2:03PM.

Roll Call:

In person: Commissioner Ross Armstrong. Commissioner Paula Smith

Via Phone: Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes, Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith, Commissioner Scott Shick, Commissioner Jack Martin

Public: Katie Brubaker - DCFS, Jonathan Clayfield – NYSAP, Kelly Clement – NYSAP, Dr. Gina Vincent – NYSAP, Andrew Pawling – China Spring Youth Camp, Kathryn Roose – DCFS, Dr. Joe Haas – Washoe County Juvenile Services, Lance Metzger – Washoe County Juvenile Services

Public Comment: None

Meeting Minutes:

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: We'll move onto item number 4 which is the YLS/CMI statewide case plan. And I believe that one of the attachments to our email is the case plan that is provided through YLS and I'm hoping for, I believe that perhaps Mr. Clayfield will have some information for us on that item.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Can I talk about that a little bit since we've been piloting it.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Please.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: So, Humboldt County was one of the jurisdictions that has been piloting the case study with the YLS. Our judges love it, our families love it. We had a couple recommendations of just minor, just a minor change and it really streamlines our process and helps us stay focused so we're not trying to address too many domain and behaviors at the same time so we're not overwhelming our kids and their family. So at least for us in Humboldt we really support this case plan template.

Commissioner Scott Shick: That's the one with the green bars on it Pauline?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Yes.

Commissioner Scott Shick: This is the one that NAJJA, you brought that to us in meetings as well and we kind of worked through it correct?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Yes, this was a combination of, Washoe County really developed an original template just to streamline it. They did a wonderful job with it. Then DCFS reviewed it to make sure it meets our standards and mandatory performance measures we have to report on and then NAJJA reviewed it and then there's pilot counties that have been actually using it so I can only speak for us and from what I've heard from some other people that they really like it. But it wasn't, everybody has that input on it.

Commissioner Scott Shick: It's a great document because it feeds off of the YLS in the risk and needs and the changing risk and needs as a child who's on probation responding to their case plan. It allows for some adjustments to that and stays in the priority areas correct?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Yes. And it actually, I mean at least for us, and Kelly and Gina really taught us this, is just not to focus on so many SMART goals at once, not to overwhelm our kids and I think that this allows us to take plans, the areas with the highest priority and then work through them and as the kids successfully met those objectives then we can add some more if we need to. But it keeps them focused to and we're using

SMART goals at once so we break it down for our kids. And it's just really, it's user-friendly. Our families understand it. It keeps us on track and follow up to make sure we're following up with the kids and the families so that we can mark off when they complete it or if there's some responsivity factors that are keeping them from completing them. It allows us to address those to. And it does have an area where we can include our court requirement for the court obligations from court orders to the track family engagement. Yes or no is the family engaged or not. That's family engagement definition really seems to be like a definition for recidivism. But it does track if the families involved or not.

Katie Brubaker: I did have a couple of recommendations to slightly modify this case plan. So, if you look under, let's take priority one, it says domain level of risk and target date. And then under SMART goals, obviously that's where you write your goals and then the next column says activities / target-date. What I'm proposing is that instead of activities / target-date we leave it activities and then include a drop-down box or a place for a specific target date. Like its own little box. My thought process here is one, each activity related to the SMART goal is going to need a separate date and two, in order to reduce errors of people not remembering to put the dates or put the date for each one that a box will signify that something specific needs to go in there.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I can't speak to that. Pauline you probably better speak to that because you're in practice with the document.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: I think that probably for the larger jurisdictions and the state that might be a welcome addition. We monitor our dates anyway, so I understand where Katie's coming from and I can take that to our pilot team in Washoe to see if we can add that.

Dr. Joe Haas: I think that would be good idea. Katie what your proposing is multiple based under the domain or the goals. I think what the, and I not sure just from hearing folks talk around here unintelligible goals would be sort of a primary thing that would have the date achieved on it.

Commissioner Scott Shick: It's SMART goals under that particular domain and as a result reaching, in order to reach those SMART goals there are activities. And each one of the activities has a target date. Is that how we have to look at this?

Katie Brubaker: Correct.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Yes. And that's how we do it to. Like our SMART goal is measurable. Our SMART goal is really bigger than our activities, right. It's what our activities are going to help the youth reach overall. And so, I can see having different days because we do it to. We just type ours in.

Commissioner Scott Shick: It could be an education goal, it could be, ok good.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: I can take that to the committee in Washoe.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: In looking at a couple from parole one I noticed some errors there. I think it makes sense to put dates for each activity. One, it makes it really clear to the youth and family. Kind of what expectations are. And a road map for probation so that you have some intermediate checks. They can always be amended if situations change. And then I will say the other part of the case plan I did not find all that helpful is the check box for family engagement. Because I think if I'm a supervisor taking a look at the appropriate case plan, I don't know what the yes or no means. I don't know if a place to put in there what the family engagement plan is or what that looks like, um, makes sense, but to me, the check box yes or no didn't tell about what the plan is for that family.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: We had a lot of discussion about that within our committee and I don't know if you heard me say that the definition for family engagement seems to be like the definition for recidivism and people have so many definitions they can use so we took the standard that we have to report on is their family engagement. And if it's yes or no, because my definition of family engagement might be different than yours and the standard doesn't at least when I read it and with Leslie meeting with us on that wasn't direct case plan for family engagement. Because if there's issues in the family it's going to be caught in the family domain that you could address on the actual case plan. But the family engagement question was specifically to meet that standard of is a family engaged or not.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Once you check the box are you going to be able to offer any specific information. So, for instance you know you would expect less family engagement with somebody's who maybe, turned 18 and have their own transportation to get the counseling versus somebody who's 14 and needs a parent to get them there.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: I don't think there's an option to put in language. I think that could be helpful. Like the minimum standard is to check yes or no but I know if I was a parole officer and another parole officer quits or dies or whatever and I've got to pick up those caseloads in terms of it being a helpful case plan just a check box isn't going to tell what's happening with that family. Or what has happened. I don't know if we need to mandate the ability to do that. I certainly would mandate that with parole but I know we're making a statewide case plan but just having an option in the template I think could be a good way to at least provide an option if the local JJ department wants to put some more actual case plan stuff around family engagement.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: But I do think family engagement would overlap into the family domain. And if the family domain isn't a priority, because I think it would capture it with those questions with the YLS.

Commissioner Scott Shick: That was kind of how this was shaped. And as a parole officer or a probation officer and I was to read family engagement and I would say yes. I say to a certain degree the family's involved based

on their capacity and their dynamic and their financial status, whatever that might be and then, we're trained to go through that no matter what and build on it. Build on the strengths of what's existing if no then try to find a way to, whatever the family looks like. Whatever shape the families in and whatever members, uncles, aunts, whatever that might be to begin family engagement. So, I think it's meant to be simple and then the domains would cover it. Most likely you'd have a family domain already to be working on as a result of no family engagement.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: This is just one of those areas where we had a lot of discussion. And we went round and round on it. And just like our state, our YLS policy that we met minimum standards and if the jurisdictions want something different or add more to it they could but we didn't we didn't want to do a case plan. We want to do minimum standards and then leave the discretion up to the agencies to add additional information.

Commissioner Scott Shick: And I support that format. And I think in Caseload Pro or new Caseload Pro, I forget the name of it. Tyler Supervision. As a probation officer I would be entering family involvement in my notes and what not. And then the YLS would also incorporate that. That information is available moving forward to a person that's trained in the use of the system at a state level or at a jurisdictional level. And then we go from there and this meets the requirement. I remember the conversation goes back and forth and a lot of this has been gone through already.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: And we really wanted to make sure that our case plans weren't becoming our case note and our file activity notes. Because we still have those in Tyler supervision, but the PO had to take over. They would access all of that. That our case plan remains our case plans and our notes support that. I totally understand Ross, if you guys, that you know you want more, and I think that as an agency you can add that.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: So the case of this document is to basically be the minimum case plan that all of the jurisdictions will use including DCFS and of course each jurisdiction is welcome to do more and obviously there will be other documents supporting what's happening with a case and with that use in the family.

Commissioner Scott Shick: That's correct. It's a snapshot of what we're working on. And then the specifics, the breakdown are in the notes and in the YLS and the YLS, the rejuvenation of the YLS throughout the process of the case. And no from family can change to a yes as a result of the things that are going on in the case.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Has anyone joined us after the roll call other than Ross?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes, Hi it's Gina.

Kathryn Rose: Kathryn Roose from DCFS.

Andrea Pauling: Andrea Pawling from China Spring.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Anyone else? So is there any further discussion regarding the Statewide minimum case plan for YLS or Doctor Vincent, is there anything you think we should consider.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes. So, I apologize for being late. I am curious if the progress note was discussed already. Was that already discussed?

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: No, the only thing that was discussed was the case plan was separate from the progress note and Tyler supervisor.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay so I don't want to reiterate anything that was already said but I'm just going to add something for your consideration with this family engagement piece. That yes, I totally hear Pauline and Scott and agree the YLS is going to capture the need if there's something going on with the family that suggestive of lack of engagement. However, if you are updating your case plan more often than you are updating your YLS. There is where it becomes important to have some notes about how the family was engaged moving forward because the YLS won't be capturing that at that stage. I know DCFS is going to be updating the case plan more often then, they are going to be updating the YLS. I'm not sure, I can't remember for probation, if that's the case. I think it is though. So that's just something to consider that the family need area and the YLS is not necessarily going to capture all your family engagement stuff if it's changing. And I imagine Katie talked about adding progress notes and I think having progress notes is really important. And having that be a common place that people are capturing how the family was engaged might be another way of making sure that your getting that information.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: Our progress notes are called file activity in supervision. Where we document everything, every contact with our families, every contact with our kids. What happened if there was an issue. That I guess my concern is that if we, if we have our file activity and Tyler supervision, which is really helpful for probation and parole officers to track everything that's been done with that youth because everything shows up on it when you run a file activity report, UA's check in's, visits at school, home visits, family meeting, counseling, whatever. All that can show up on that. So that if we add a progress note with the case plan would we need info?

Katie Brubaker: I guess my line of thinking for a progress note and I do agree with needing one because this is something that we're developing with the family and the family is then going to be getting a copy of. Why wouldn't we put a progress note directly into the case plan. Because we're not going to be giving progress notes or activities to our attorneys or judge's, right? So, we would need something to give to them to show progress.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Isn't that, why is there even a family engagement down below the domains. I guess.

Katie Brubaker: It's a data requirement. It's a performance measure.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Okay. And, ok so it needs to be. Ok, I got it.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: In addition to that and NR62B645 required every department to develop a Strategic Plan on family engagement and so that the measure, to see if, I mean I haven't seen that many departments family engagement plans. I think that will be something for the whole JJOC to request and review to see if we are adequate to the law. But I think that, the check box, that's helpful to make sure everyone's compiling with the law.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Ok, that makes sense.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: This seems duplicative. You can do a file activity; you can just print out that day's file activity if it's a case plan review. It doesn't have to include everything. I think that what we were trying to get away from was having to put information in different areas to meet the standards and in your bigger jurisdictions, I mean that, that would actually increase our work with our kids a lot too and we're small. But if we're having to do it in file activity and a separate progress note on the case plan, I think we're getting away from streamlining our system.

Commissioner Scott Shick: And that would be Washoe's concern I believe. Joe can you speak to that.

Dr. Joe Haas: I think that would be. I think there's the value is there for family engagement. There's no question there. But I think what probably was envisioned was the yes no would be. Is that an area of focus that should be triggered by the YLS as identifying an issue in the family domain. In some cases, there may not be family engagement because say the family is not available if we're referring to just parents or adopted parents. Then I think we should probably look at foster parents or kids that are in the system and then goals should be flushed out there and if it's not a problem then the family engagement would be assumed. I wanted to keep this as simply as possible and make sure there wasn't duplications, if that makes sense.

Dr. Gina Vincent: So, this is Gina. I hear all of the arguments. It makes good sense that your trying to minimize work and streamline and not duplicate and that all makes good sense. Some of the considerations would just be, from my thinking, is everybody as a standard, documenting things in that activity notes that are relevant for families. Are there, is there as much QA around that area of your reporting as there would be on this case plan to make sure that everyone's capturing this information that the state needs to report family engagement. And those are just some considerations. In a case plan you have a little more control and it's a little more standardized. And is that something that you need. That's the question. I think that's the question. I don't know if Pauline what you're talking about if every probation office does that. Follows that strategy or if you guys are just incredibly thorough which I could also see being the case.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: Thanks Gina. I do know that our, I'd have to look really quick but I do think that our YLS Statewide policy talks about putting the information in custody, mine says caseload so I'll have to change it. But I mean I think that that's something that as NAJJA we can have a discussion with the chief and director. Because I guarantee if we say either we have to develop some QA around making sure it's in the activities or you're gunna, we're going to have to put an additional progress note in that people are probably going to choose A to streamline it. So, I mean I think that I can't guarantee everyone's doing it that way. But everyone's been working on the same page and we can have that discussion.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Not that I read the current chronological notes as Washoe County Probation refers to them in every case because I don't. But there are times when we're preparing for trial and we subpoena records or whatever, I've read through those. There are pages and pages and pages long, in some cases. And just in terms of repetition of information and overwhelming the family with too much information I'm concerned about how that would be summarized and an added to updated case plans in a way that allows for meeting the data reporting requirements and makes it meaningful to the family and the kid about where are we. So, in some ways I think it's tempting to have progress notes in this document. On the other hand based on different practices around this state I just think that if we do a statewide plan I really believe in it being minimal and letting the jurisdictions figure out what works for them and if it turns out that they're doing doesn't allow them to report the data they'll have to adjust. I can see in Washoe County that this document which seems pretty straight forward and focuses on a couple priority domains at one time could be overwhelmed with verbiage frankly. Based on what I've seen get documented in Washoe County's probation files.

Dr. Joe Haas: There are a couple of issues here. One is where to document the state requirements and I've not been as thoroughly involved in the case planning but are there clear indicators that have to be reported and can we work backyards to say this is where we're going to put them. In the Caseload Pro or Tyler Technology product.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith or Commissioner Ross Armstrong, could you help answer that questions in terms of the amount of specificity regarding family engagement. Because I don't know the answer.

Dr. Joe Haas: That seems like a separate issue to me, where we would, I think we have to start there. We need to blend our forms. And Frank just joined us, so he'll probably want to weigh in.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: Before that happens though, when we were having these discussions and Commissioner Frank Cervantes was part of those discussions with family engagement so hopefully, he can confirm this. That through Leslie's feedback to us the standard was is there family engagement. We went through definitions of family engagement. How we were going to track it, if there was family engagement. And so, when we looked at the minimum standards we came up with a yes or no. Because, I still hold true to my, if there's issues in the beginning it will be caught in the family domain. I understand what Gina's saying and other areas where we have caught with family engagement is with responsivity factors and the other areas that the YLS captures when we're going through it. So, although family engagement looks real different to me than it does to some other people and if a family's telling me off I consider them still being engaged. Some people wouldn't. But to me that's still engagement, at least their doing that. And so, we went with a yes or no to capture that because we had several different discussions about definitions and jurisdictions are gonna have a hard time agreeing with that and if the minimum standard is the family is engaged or not and that's what we capture on the template.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: Hey Pauline how are you.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: Fired up.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: So, on that form what you're not seeing to is there's a drop down for the family engagement menu there to field stuff out so there's a window underneath that

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: There's not Frank, with the one we've been using. Unless you guys modified that.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: I think we did. That was the plan. We were going to open that and just do a you can just open up a screen and fill in stuff that you wanted to put a narrative in.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: Not the one we're piloting though.

Katie Brubaker: I don't believe that had been added yet because the document is locked for editing and only a particular person is able to do that, and she was out of town. So, I'm not sure that it was updated. But if we can compromise to put those dropdowns for people to have the option to put text in there. I think that would solve a lot of things. Now whether your jurisdiction wants to do that or not is up to you. But I think that we should be providing people the option to do so.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: Yeah, I'm 100%. Lance and I discussed it may not be on your document at this point, but the end result is that you should have a drop down if you want to fill stuff out that.

Kathryn Roose: I agree with the text box because at least it gives the option. It doesn't have to be mandatory but I just from a data perspective and evaluation perspective a yes or no on family engagement provides very little information because NRS is really about having strategies to engage family. So, selecting yes or no that you have family engagement doesn't indicate the efforts on the part of our staff. So, a no maybe we have no engagement but we're attempting to get engagement or it could be we have no engagement and we've given up trying to engage the family so for me from a data perspective that is below minimum requirement to meet NRS in my opinion.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: NRS is, there's two different things. There's the track family engagement and then to have a strategic plan for your agency to develop family engagement correct?

Kathryn Roose: Right.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Does anybody have the statute number?

Kathryn Roose: 62b.645

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: And the alphabet is?

Kathryn Roose: Oh, sorry, B.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: I don't know if there's another statutory requirement but that one is just about having the plan. Every agency has to have a plan. Like, DCFS has a plan for this year there's certain goal that has to be met by each program, each quarter. Like allowing video visits at facilities. Putting electronic visitation requests on the website. And that plan is measurable in an individual case plan. And I'm not sure if there's another statutory requirement but every case plan has a thing about family engagement.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: The family engagement yes or no was for the minimum standards that we have to report. So 62b.645 is the development and implementation of a 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. The plan must include strategy for increasing the families contact with a child subject to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. Engaging family members with a case plan. Which is documented on our case plan. Planning meeting for the release child from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. Involving family member in treatment. Soliciting the feedback of family members relating to improvements to the services rendered to Children subject to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court.

Kathryn Roose: So, there's a behavioral measure and there's an outcome measure. So are we following our strategic plan to engage families and there's also an outcome measure of our families engaged. No?

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: Are you asking for an answer?

Kathryn Roose: Yes.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: I pretty sure that most jurisdictions are working on their family engagement plan and if family are engaged or not is why we did the yes or no.

Kathryn Roose: Ok, well then that makes more sense to me.

Commissioner Scott Shick: And there is a drop down on this family engagement. Frank, is that confirmed? I switched this document over a couple different ways and I'm not seeing it on this one.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: Your just not seeing it yet.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Okay. So, there is.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: There are program modifications, but there will be a window that you can drop down.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Tracking family engagement per client, per case through this case plan also through the YLS, also through progress notes and things like that. And then overall from the plan that we have and the things that we're doing our families becoming more involved on a probation level with kids by nature of what we're providing of programs as a result of the program is doing. That's kind of what we're looking for.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: It's also subject to the YLS, sometimes minimal involvement is better. So, suggesting that you engage and some of the case plans won't really ask for that because the risk and need is going to be lower so. I think it's a really tough one to capture. And to evaluate what exactly is family engagement. Because what Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith said a minute ago is right. If my family is fighting all week they may be engaging. I mean, how are you going to track that.

Katie Brubaker: But I think that's what you say. Family engagement is any kind of engagement not good or bad just whatever that looks like on the staff's part and on the family's part.

Commissioner Scott Shick: And I would go right to my case notes and activities in YLS or in Tyler Supervision and document that based on ya know, Step-father's showed back up in the scene and things are a little chaotic right now, we're working through it. Like I said, if anybody picked that up or wanted to review that case in that particular point and work it with the proper training.

Katie Brubaker: Can we then agree to add those specific date boxes for each activity and then include the drop-down option for family engagement in progress notes, and you just don't have to use them. Maybe a particular county will use their progress notes, but I think DCFS is leaning more towards filling that in, at this point. So, if we can just have the option to do that, I think that would solve this problem.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I just make a motion that we support those two options that Katie just said as changes or, ya, as changes to this case plan that was presented here today.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: But before we ask for a second is there any more discussion. The motion as I understand it is that in the domain, under SMART goals off to the right activities. Target date will be moved away from the line that says activities and we're going to have a separate check box or fill in the date for each activity if there's more than one listed under any of the SMART goals. And that the second part of the motion is that a drop-down box will be added to family engagement so that if jurisdictions want to add additional information in there about family engagement a long list checking calling it yes or no, they can opt in to having information on the case plan. Did I get the motion correct?

Commissioner Scott Shick: I believe so.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Any other discussions? Anyone care to second the motion?

Commissioner Jack Martin: I will, this is Jack Martin.

Lance Metzger: Hi everyone. I just got brought into this one obviously because I'm the one that kind of facilitated this whole case plan in the formatting. But just so I understand the family engagement piece, that will be easy I'll just open a field underneath just like protective factor, strengths and all that right? Is that what everybody's asking for?

Katie Brubaker: Correct.

Lance Metzger: Ok, so we'll have an open field it won't be a drop down. It'll just be an open field you can either type or you don't have to. Pretty simple. So that will be an easy fix. So, we listen to the, each activity having a target date and it's pretty, why we added a SMART goal and then an activity and broke it up. Because of the formatting limitations that we have, just in general because when you do it like we broke it up on the domain where it says risk level and target date, it really makes this whole document rather large and we're trying to continue to keep it concise. Because this is what a family's looking at and we know that sometimes the level of sophistication that our families have are very minimal. So, we wanted to keep it really concise. Is why we just

added the activity/target date and anybody can add anything they want and put a target date next to each one of them to continue to make it concise. As soon as you start formatting a separate box this thing will turn into a six-page document. And that was kind of where we're at, why we put activity/target date. Feel free to add a target date for each activity it's really leaving it open. We have SMART goals and then obviously the overall domain target date we're looking for is the top one. So that could be a whole separate one. That just what we're trying to complete this whole domain and this criminogenic need is complete at that time.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I think that's a great rationale to resolving the state's concern and keeping this document simple and family friendly.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Commissioner Ross Armstrong, Katie, do you think that with that explanation about the technological limitations that you can work with it?

Katie Brubaker: If there's no other way around it or if people, everyone would oblige me to give it a shot and try editing it that would be great. I'd like to for quality assurance purposes have a separate box. But if it's not possible it'll just be up to everyone to do their own quality assurance on that and training around every activity needs to have a date.

Dr. Gina Vincent: May I interject. I would just say I hear what Lance is saying. Lance, you put together a beautiful document. Thank you very much for doing that. And it's nice and concise. Some consideration there, is I do think it's actually cost for families that this is their expected target date. So, it makes it more helpful for them if it's there. And in our experience, if you don't spell these things out and have a field for it you'll have a lot of probation officers not filling it in. The quality assurance just gets difficult. So those are some considerations. And to keep this, you want SMART activity, that means there tying down. There should be a date in there. So, it's either a lot of quality assurance which in my experience we see it doesn't necessarily happen. Depending on the county, depending on a lot of factors or it's having a date field in there to make it really clear for everybody. Those are just some things to think about.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: I'm going to propose an alternate plan. Which is that we vote to approve the document we're looking at that will include an area where jurisdictions can offer to type more information under family engagement if they chose to so they'll just be a blank area there where you can add information there if you want. That for today's purposes we approve this. But we also approve Katie or someone playing with this issue around the document to see if they can develop one where at target date is actually required to be added in. And if there's more than one activity under the goal for one of the domain priorities.

Commissioner Scott Shick: This is Scott, did I misunderstand where you said you could actually put in the existing activities and target dates? Did I misunderstand that Lance or?

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: You can type it in. But I think the concern is that if you are not required to type it in, will it get missed.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Oh, based on the particular goal, oh, ok. Do you have 4 SMART goals. Do you have 4 activities with target dates that speak to your SMART goals. Okay.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Correct. So for instance if, and I'm not going to pretend you know that you're going to do regression treatment therapy and the probation officer knows that you won't be able to start that until June 1st because that's when the next class starts and you are not going to be able to finish it until August 1st under the same domain you have a totally separate activity. You know the question is are the target dates going to be typed in or are they going to be required to be there because something has to be put in. And part of that sounds like it might be an issue about how cumbersome the document gets and what the technology will allow.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: And nobody has ever filled out a case plan in practice. You'll understand just what you said Jo Lee, that you can have them stacked because every time you make a change the dates change. The finish dates change. So what Lance was proposing on this document is that this is a summary and we keep going back to, we can't recreate the whole file in this document and so it has to be a clean version of it at some point or you just have case plan 1 case plan 2. And every time you change it you'll have 9 of these things.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: I think that a lot of this could be that we set reminders and Tyler supervision when things have to be reviewed. It gives us when we open our dashboard and it gives us what are due dates are. I think we could add it to some of our reviews, either the quality assurance, either Silver State Peer Review or Katie the reviews you guys do at the facilities in in I mean I think that there's other ways to implement quality assurance. I mean I think everyone in our Juvenile Justice Fields has really been committed to reforming like with probation department have been really committed to reforming. And I think that if we have discussions about quality assurance to make sure that PO's are putting in that information, setting their reminders in Tyler supervision that we can reach the goal we want to reach. AS someone who's been using the case plan, our family like it. It's short, to-the-point, they understand it. We're not overwhelming families and our kids. We're not overwhelming PO's which happens when our caseloads get big. And so I know we're trying to make sure we get everything we need to report. But I think that there's other ways to go about it then just make a big document for a case plan.

Katie Brubaker: I like Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes suggestion for a motion to include the option of an engagement, family engagement box. So that there is the option for people to fill that in and then the second part of that would be to approve the way it is with that and then give me the ability or someone like our IT department or someone to help see what it would entail to include those check boxes and if that doesn't work then yes it will be a matter of quality assurance and setting alerts in Tyler Supervision and things like that.

Commissioner Scott Shick: That's fair enough.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Obviously if, say IT or someone can come up with a way to help Lance with that issue because I appreciate what he saying, in terms of it being voluminous then we can always schedule another meeting because we love them so much and have some kind of looked at it and people have looked at it to see whether or not we want to amend the document for the new document to be the statewide minimum. But I think for purposes for today it sounds like we have agreements that this could be the statewide minimum for now and we'll work on the issue to whether or not it's feasible to add separate target gate for separate activities.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Yes Ma'am. So, can I make a motion along the lines that Katie just shared with us. In respect to adding the family documentation ability in the family area and evaluate our capacity to revise the form to meet the needs and find a best middle ground for the state and the jurisdictions. So, I make that motion.

Motion: Commissioner Scott Shick: Adding the family documentation ability in the family area and evaluate our capacity to revise the form.

Second: Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes.

Vote: Unanimous

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Katie did you here enough voices to actually tally a vote?

Katie Brubaker: No, I didn't. Can I do a roll call vote.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Perfect

Katie Brubaker: Okay.

Roll Call Vote:

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: I

Commissioner Jack Martin: I

Commissioner Ross Armstrong:

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: I

Commissioner Paula Smith: I

Commissioner Scott Shick: I

Katie Brubaker: Ok it's unanimous.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: That's good news. Moving on to item number 5. Which is a statewide minimum policy for the MAYSI 2 and hoping to have some robust discussion on this. I would like to start out that I had review a document that I believe was from NYSAP, and NAJJA has looked at it. Mr. Martin was kind enough to send it to me. That document, from my point of view because I didn't have time to really talk to anybody about what we should say and what we should avoid in order to kind of move this process along. I typed up something although I have to say that the information provided by Humboldt County for the MAYSI-2 is a lot prettier than mine. And mine also does not clearly state but I believe it needs to state, that this is only for purposes of predisposition mental health screening. This has nothing to do with kids who are coming into secure detention. So, coming from one from with a lot more experience.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: Can I just throw something out there before we dive into this because it could get, we need to just put it on the table.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Ok.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: We've had a lot of discussion with NAJJA and of course agencies are completely supportive of doing the MAYSI with our kids who are in detention. We've been doing that. That's been in statute. So, we're all supportive of that. There's a lot of robust discussion about utilizing the MAYSI with our probation kids and I know that we've been through this because so many meetings but part of me feels like we may have been rushed and we spent so much time on the YLS that when we chose the MAYSI to use with are community-based kids at least for me it doesn't feel like a good decision. We've had discussions with Gina and Kelly and Jonathan too. We did want to have a conversation and we put it on the agenda with our State Advisory Committee too. Just to have a discussion of how we can bring to the full commission possibly changing and not using the MAYSI with our probation kids.

Commissioner Scott Shick: May I ask what in our current revised new policies state statute requires us to have a mental health screening at the probation level. Is that in statue Ross or somebody can speak to that.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: It's in the statute. I think it's 62E.650 but we can pull it up. But the truth is we picked the MAYSI too, very quickly in the beginning of committee's work. I was really interested in hearing all of the concerns that were stated at the last commission meeting or at one of the commission meetings and I think Doctor Haas had weighed in with the fact that mental health screening tools, if they're used too often are going to lose their effectiveness because those kids are going to figure out what the answers are supposed to be. And that that's an inherent problem with screening tools and is not specific to the MAYSI2. It might just be when your repeatedly asking kids these questions, you know the kid comes to court 3 times in 3 months under the statute, they are going to require 3 mental health screenings and that doesn't even include them getting arrested and having to have one at detention. So realistically they could be answering mental health screening things 6 times in 3 months and their going to figure it out. So I don't know if it's an inherent problem is in the statute itself, which

requires mental health screening before disposition once a petition's been filed or if it's particular to the MAYSI-2 and if there's another screening instrument that kids wouldn't figure out for those community based kids.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: What, was the statute with the YLS right? I mean it's a validated risk assessment and a mental health screening. Does it say for probation level kids, does it specifically say MAYSI in the?

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: No, it doesn't say MAYSI in the statute. This Risk Assessment Committee picked MAYSI-2 very quickly in order to comply with the statute but at that time we didn't really have a discussion about the effectiveness of doing mental health screening and happy to do it repeatedly and really what that means on the ground.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: I think that once we started like we implemented the YLS and then we're writing our policies. We get a lot of false positives for the MAYSI in detention too and I think we're going to see that with our probation kids. But, I agree Jo Lee, we had to make a decision. We chose the MAYSI. I just don't think it's the right tool for our probation kids. I think that's why we're having some pushback from Counties and I totally understand it. And so, if we could if we could just take a step back and see what other tool's we have available to us besides the MAYSI maybe because I just don't think it works for our probation kids.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Is it the actual type of tool or is it the fact that we're doing a risk and needs, excuse me, not a risk and needs but a mental health assessment. Is that good practice. When the day is done any kid that makes it's to this position around here most likely is going to have contact with the drug and alcohol counselor. An MFT, a Licensed Clinical Social people that we have under contract in our jurisdiction and some of those things are going to be identified already. Those things are going to be on the table. And the MAYSI is for an acute here and now, walking into detention crisis-oriented type screening to take care of a child specifically with suicidal ideation or thought disorder or anything like that so it doesn't really is, is that good practice.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Because Jonathan is not on, I just wanted to interject. I missed a little bit of the conversation. But I think that there is some missed communication somewhere that I just want to clear up. The purpose of doing the MAYSI or a mental health screen in probation in a community setting, the primary purpose is really to 1, do just what Commissioner Scott Shick said. To identify an acute problem. But 2, is to signal for you whether this is a youth in need of a mental health evaluation. And the point is, not all youth need a mental health evaluation. In fact, it's generally around 30%. Based on MAYSI data. They need a mental health evaluation. That's generally what triggered at the pre-trial stage. Because that's the smaller percentage of kids who have fit that category. So, it's to help guide probation officers around recommendation for who needs an evaluation. So, you're not wasting time and money and getting evaluation for everybody. And you've got a reliable and valid method for doing that. I feel like that piece has been missed and I'm not sure why but that's the primary purpose for using this in a probation setting. I'd also just add that the issue that I and Pauline is raising about you're worried about kids not being honest or having it repeatedly taken and them starting to say no. That's going to occur with any mental health screening. That's not a MAYSI specific issue. Any mental health screen especially that's asked about substance use, that is not MAYSI specific. So, there's a couple of things you could also consider. Which is how often are you doing it. I haven't looked at the policy. It's only necessary at that first step. The first time the youth is introduced to probation. Either at intake or post adjudication.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: But I think the issue is how our statute is written.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: The statute requires it prior to going to disposition so the answer to how often to be done. How many times do we file a petition going to disposition so that's driven by the kid's behavior.

Commissioner Scott Shick: And my point is if the kids are that imbedded in the system going to disposition have already had an evaluation, most likely and it already seems, you go ahead and refer them to the local mental health agency.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah, it's only necessary one time. I mean at that point they've probably already had an evaluation and you guys know what's going on.

Commissioner Scott Shick: It speaks against our training of MAYSI, which is a here and now document. It's like a now time document, this kid's not acting right today. You know, we just got back from a trip and potentially we'd give it to him based on what he's displaying as far as the symptoms are concerned, to me it's, I don't know.

Dr. Gina Vincent: I don't think that makes sense when you are talking about youth on community supervision. So that, I can speak to Jonathan about that. It just doesn't make sense that they've already had a disposition and you guys are supervising them. Because that's something that can be changed from a policy perspective in your SOP's. But what Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes is raising about your statute sounds a little problematic.

Dr. Joe Haas: Gina that mirrors the thinking what you're saying is when we selected the MAYSI. For one we didn't want a second screening in addition to the one that most of us use in detention and my guess is if you craft your policy as kids first begin their probation and they're in the assessment if that experience begins with a detention they're already have a MAYSI that's already triggered a mental health evaluation under our policy. And I don't see a need to duplicate that. We did look at other assessment devices during this time and we came to a similar consensus. The potential to answer everything in the positive or to not, or to be different across them is not specific to the MAYSI. It's hard to have one that non-clinician can administer and some of the ones we looked at were pretty long and cumbersome. And I think if we can, the question that Frank raises is whether we are already doing it enough that to put it in policy is important. I'll defer that to him. But if we do, do it, I think looking at how we addressed that statute to policy around just doing it at the beginning one time triggering a mental health evaluation I don't think it's good to do it reactively. You know if a kid is acting differently doing it again and again you know. That's my thoughts.

Dr. Gina Vincent: I completely agree with Joe. And that speaks with intent. Because for youth who are already being supervised it just doesn't make sense to keep doing it repeatedly with every new clinician.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Well I guess that's going to be a question because the statute and it's actually 62E.506 says beginning on the date selected by the commission for implementation for the youth of a validated risk and validated mental health before the disposition of a case involving a child who's adjudicated the department shall conduct validated risk assessment and validated mental health screening using the tools selected by the commission. So it sounds to me like we're really fighting a bigger issue which is that the state statute, and how long in advance of disposition is before. You know like if it's been done six months ago, when we're now back in court on the second petition is that going to satisfy the statute. We need to go back to the legislature and say look, it's ill advised, it's bad practice and we need to not do it.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: It's says just before, right? Not before each disposition.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Right.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: I think that's a fair, It's going to kind of depend on what the folks in the courtroom are arguing and where each judge lands but it's a fair argument that as long as this has been done previously you don't necessarily need to have one for every single disposition.

Commissioner Jo Le Wickes: Because that same language talks about the validated risk assessment but the statewide policy is that it's done before each disposition.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: I'd like to just highlight what Scott was saying a moment ago. Is this. So, a kid comes into detention. It's a MAYSI and now the detention hearing gets a psychological order. Then subsequently it would go to disposition. The statute reads that you still have to do a mental health evaluation which in this case is a MAYSI even though you already have a psychological evaluation at hand. So, I really think it's a statute.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I just want to know if it's best practice to do a mental health screening prior to a disposition and communication. Where else is that accomplished or where the states do that or jurisdictions I don't know.

Dr. Joe Haas: I think what Jonathan was pushing is how do you do that without there being due process right around somebody doing the, he was really pushing, if I'm understanding. I didn't go to the training but he was pushing the issue of this not having a consequence for a kid in terms of having a full evaluation for the court or having a, in any way their disposition being affected by the results of the MAYSI and then I would ask by the assessment that it triggers when we do a MAYSI we do an assessment for kids who are high in depression and suicide. Our clinicians see the kids who are depressed. If there's suicide we have an evaluator comes in that goes in a file for the probation officer to be aware of, but it doesn't necessarily, it doesn't get introduced into court.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: And generally, the kid's behavior is used, that would corroborate the mental health, would be used to ask for a psychological. And at a probation meeting prior to disposition you run an assessment when a kid goes to the hospital from an office appointment. You don't have any control over that evaluation that they did at the hospital. It's just a referral at that point. It's not at court document.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Well I go back to what Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes said about revising the statute. And that we do diligently do MAYSI when a child enters our Juvenile Detention facilities.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: And I don't think it's a question of MAYSI Scott. I think it's just a question of a Mental Health evaluation as a screening tool.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Right.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: And that's the real discussion. Is it necessary to use an instrument at predisposition?

Commissioner Jo Le Wickes: Well I wonder if, I mean the statute I think the language is clear that at least before disposition you have to have a validated mental health screening tool. And we picked the MAYSI and we can back up at some other point and pick a different one if we can find one that allows a non-clinician to administer it and doesn't and avoids the pitfalls that we have concerns about.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: I think you'll still have pitfalls Jo Lee. I don't think you need it.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Can anybody remember why this was inserted into our statute. As a result of the two, two or three years we did under.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: I had discussions and I won't name any parties. And I was assured that this wouldn't be part of the statute.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Okay. And I guess I don't. I mean if I was a part of that I was ignorant to the outcome.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: It came out of the CSG report.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Yeah, it did.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: I was going to use more colorful language and say it was the CSG nincompoop. I don't know I mean I could very well say oh yeah, MAYSI works for us not really understanding the absolute outcome.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: I don't know how many hours we have in left in this legislative session. 80 hours left? I think that we should see how it goes in practice and then I think that they'll be an opportunity in the interim to discuss with the interim committee on child welfare and juvenile justice the progress of AB472. And where we are at some point during the interim and if there are weeks that need to be made, we in particular with this one. You know I think that that would be the right time. I would want to see some data and look at our, the extend of which JJ use is actually receiving mental health services. Based on those is what they are receiving adequate. That's I mean, taking a look at how it ends up in practice I would read the statute in the meantime as flexible as you could make it so that we're not creating ridiculous practice.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: I wonder if rather than trying to adopt a minimum statewide policy around the use of mental health screening with non-detention or community based kids that we instead go back to the full commission and explain to them that numerous people in this group and NAJJA and across the state have significant concerns about the appropriateness of mental health screening tools outside the detention settings and that we could not really decide on a Statewide minimum policy to effectuate that even though we've chosen a tool because we feel like we need to step back, look at that practice get some data and have further discussions before we can adopt a policy because indeed what we might be doing is moving towards suggesting legislative changes around the use of mental health screening tools with community-based kids.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Right.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: My district interprets it like every kid will have one that we go to court with. So, we can interpret it as loosely as we want to, but our judges are a different story.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I like what Jo Lee just said and I think we should take that back to the oversight commission.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: The good news is by doing it as I've suggested. A, it sounds like the right thing to do but B it's not statutorily required until the commission picks a date to implement it. And if we go to the commission and say don't pick a date to implement it because we think it might be bad practice then it least it gives jurisdictions flexibility until the lawyers and the judge can make a decision and tell the county you are going to do it because I said you are. Or in my county, you did one when he was booked in detention that was a month ago. There's no sign that his mental health has changed significantly and that's before disposition so we're good. We're good to go right I mean.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I agree.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Pauline what do you think about that?

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: I thought there was a date in the statue.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: No, it just says the date picked by the commission and the commission's not going to pick a date. If we go to it and recommend you know that the YLS becomes effect on this date but as to the MAYSI2 with community-based kids we're suggesting that we step back and look further. We can pick two separate dates. It doesn't have to be the same date for both even though it contained in the same subsection of the statute there's different goals different instruments.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: That's an excellent suggestion Jo Lee. I like it.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Do we need a motion Jo Lee, as to what you just said.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: I motion that we suggest to the full JJOC commission that we not adopt a statewide minimum policy for MAYSI2 with community-based kids. But we instead step back study the effectiveness of whether or not it's good practice. Get some data as Ross suggested and continue discussions until we're better informed about what we're doing, why and if it's a good practice.

Motion: Not adopt a statewide minimum policy for MAYSI2 with community-based kids.

By: Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes

Second: Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith

Vote: 1 apposed

Motion approved

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Can we do a roll call vote since we have so many people on the phone and it's hard to hear.

Roll Call Vote:

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: I

Commissioner Jack Martin: Apposed

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: I

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: I

Commissioner Paula Smith: I

Commissioner Scott Shick: I

Katie Brubaker: We five yeses and 1 no.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Hey Jack

Commissioner Jack Martin: Yes sir.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Could you give us your feedback please.

Commissioner Jack Martin: I don't think it's ever a problem. We have 11,000 kids that come through our intake hallway during the course of a year and we're planning on setting it up where if the YLS triggers some level of mental health flags we plan on doubling down after that. Throwing the MAYSI at them and if they flag as self-harm at that point we want to, we'll have either contracted clinicians or some of our employees there. You know, our clinicians to do a larger evaluation and then make recommendations for those guys in the community. So, we believe it's a worthwhile tool. Our mental health folks believe it's a worthwhile tool. We don't believe there's going to be a whole lot of redundancy. If there is, we'll deal with that redundancy as we will write it in policy that if it's done yesterday we're not doing it again or within 60 days or 90 days or whatever it is. We believe we've got a lot of mental health issues down here and we've got a very large mental health hospital that we're

running back here. We call our detention. And if we can flag it and wrap kids in services long before they get to us then that's probably a meaningful conversation to have.

Commissioner Scott Shick: And so, the MAYSI, you are talking about the MAYSI and detention. MAYSI and diversion. Is that correct?

Commissioner Jack Martin: Yes. On the intake hall. We're not going to do everybody. We're going to do folks that flag on the YLS first.

Commissioner Scott Shick: So, I understand your opposition in respect to using a pre-disposition. Are you in opposition to that or, or can you clarify that?

Commissioner Jack Martin: We're going to do it on anybody that comes through our intake hallway that's flagged. If we do the YLS and then they flag that mental health no matter who they are or what their disposition or what it is because we believe we've got a large mental health issue here and if we can wrap them in services maybe we can stop them from returning.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Makes sense.

Commissioner Jack Martin: That's kind of our play.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: Are you using the YLS or are you using the UNLV screening instrument at the intake level.

Commissioner Jack Martin: We use the screening instrument now because we haven't been trained in the YLS. We're still waiting for training.

Commissioner Fran Cervantes: But you're going to switch over to that.

Commissioner Jack Martin: We believe so yeah.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: Can I ask a question on that? For us because we too were using the YLS to give us some flags but then Gina and Kelly said no it doesn't diagnose or give you flags for Mental Health. So, what do you tell the YLS to trigger to trigger it because we were doing that to. But then we had to step back from it.

Dr. Gina Vincent: I was going to say the same thing. The YLS is a risk tool. It does not tell you anything about mental health. The risk tool that you guys have right now Jack may do that. The YLS does not. So, the MAYSI is a screening tool. It's intended to be given it to everybody at a certain point whatever that point is, it's given to everybody. There's not really a mechanism to flag who needs it and who doesn't. It's meant to flag you who need an evaluation and who doesn't. Does that make sense?

Commissioner Jack Martin: That's how we're working the MAYSI. Once the child raises to the level of the MAYSI we'll take that MAYSI and then will be whether they go on to a full blown evaluation or not.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Right. But the YLS won't trigger for you who needs a MAYSI. The idea is everybody just gets a MAYSI as part of the screening process.

Commissioner Jack Martin: That's new information for us. We haven't been trained in the YLS for some reason. We kind of got punked on that one Gina. You might know something about that.

Dr. Gina Vincent: I know a little bit about that yes. We are working that out aren't we Jack.

Commissioner Jack Martin: I would hope with you or someone else who would steal my 50,000. Yeah, we'll figure it out. However, we do it. Whether we keep using the screening tool that we're currently using that would raise a level of awareness for us that a child is experiencing some level of elevated mental health issues. We're going to continue screening at that intake process.

Dr. Gina Vincent, Okay, excellent. I'll just add for the discussion point that it is, there is a lot of data. It is the practice to do MAYSI, to do mental health screening predisposition to tell you who is in need of an evaluation. It's not good practice to keep doing it over and over for community-based kids. But I wouldn't dispute that one part of your statute. That it is the practice to do it once. There are other issues that are a problem. I understand that.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Jack, can I ask a question in respect to what indicators would you need, or symptoms would you need that you would want to give a child, you know, the MAYSI part or any contact with your juvenile justice system. What are you looking for?

Commissioner Jack Martin: I think the biggest issue is that our mental health folks have pointed out and we did a little sample of this. We did about 150 kids on our intake hallway and we saw about a 20% elevation to a full screening. So, in line with Dr Gina's 30% data. But we're looking for predominantly self-harm data stuff. I think there's, I think I have some level of responsibility for a child that comes as sees us to not send them back home, more stressed out and more whatever. And quite honestly, we've seen such great results from the harbor and being able to assess and divert and keep kids away, we might just roll over the Harbor stuff. You know what I mean. And just use some of the assessment tools we're using over there.

Commissioner Scott Shick: The question I have is what are the jurisdictions, what is the state, at what point do we initiate a mental health evaluation. What have we been doing before that would indicate a child needs a mental health assessment? It could be the MAYSI that's we've been using in detention or is the child placed on probation. Basic behaviors and symptoms. Failure to respond. Activity. Whatever that might be that would indicate we would just ask for a psychological evaluation without really using a tool. I mean, what have we been doing across the state. I don't know that we got into that. Maybe we have, I just wasn't aware of it.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: Do you think that this is conversation when we bring it to the pool JJ. That we're out of time.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I mean this is the Risk and Needs sub-committee.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: Yes, but we just voted on taking it to the.

Commissioner Scott Shick: We did. I just didn't hear from Clark County. I thought it might be important to pull them into the conversation.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: Oh no I thought, I had questions to for Jack because I was using the YLS like that too, but I got my hands slapped.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Ok, let's move forward.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Anyone that has this job could probably use the mental health. I'm just going to say, for the record.

Unknown: Agreed, agreed.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Is there anybody in Carson City that would like to make a public comment? Anyone on the phone with public comment? Going back to item number 6 for future possible task. Having just tabled the last big task that I was aware of is developing the statewide policy for MAYSI2 with non-detention kids. Katie is there anything else that we are supposed to be accomplishing on our time-line that you can think of because I can't think of anything.

Katie Brubaker: Not at this time.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: Can I ask a question?

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Please.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: So, with the MAYSI, did we already approve the detention?

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: That's been on the books forever. A long time ago. So, I don't think there's any question about that.

Commissioner Pauline Salla Smith: I forgot. Ok I was just checking.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Does anybody feel the need at this point, I would think that early fall maybe we should, I think we're going to need some guidance from the big , from the full commission about tackling this problem about mental health screening of community-based kid before we can even think about schedule our next meeting.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I agree. I think we should talk to NAJJA about where everybody's at with that. At what point are they looking for a mental health evaluation on a child or screening. What would indicate a child would need a mental health screening. Maybe go to NAJJA with that kind of questions.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: When's the next NAJJA meeting?

Commissioner Scott Shick: It's supposed to be around the 19th of June, I think.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Well it would certainly be important to meet to get input from that group because they're the ones that are really doing it so.

Commissioner Scott Shick: We could do that.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: If we're not going to assign any tasks, which I like the way that sounds, and we don't know when we're going to have our next meeting I vote to adjourn.

Motion: Adjourn
By: Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes
Second: Commissioner Scott Shick
Vote: Unanimous

Meeting adjourned at 3:29 PM.