



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
DIVISION OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES
4126 TECHNOLOGY WAY, SUITE 300
CARSON CITY, NV 89706
Telephone (775) 684-4400 • Fax (775) 684-4455
dcfs.nv.gov

**Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission
Risk Assessment
Committee Meeting
June 22, 2018**

Meeting Minutes

Roll Call: Scott Shick- present, Tom Metscher - present, John Munoz- present, Gina Vincent- present, Kelly Clement- present, Katie Brubaker- present; Ross Armstrong- present, Jo Lee Wickes- present, Pauline Salla-Smith- present

Public Comment:

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: So, under public comment, I think that Scott had brought up some concerns that other administrators across the state have, about the MAYSI. I heard you mention false positives, and the possibility of kids becoming familiar with the MAYSI, and maybe getting ideas about how to most effectively use it as part of probation case management. I think that that's appropriate under public comment, since the YLS and other issues are listed later in the Agenda. So, Dr. Vincent and Mr. Clement, if you're comfortable weighing in on that, then we can hit the other Agenda items a little bit further down the road.

Gina Vincent: All right. So, the MAYSI. My understanding is that you've all had the MAYSI for a while in your detention facilities, and then, I think, your camps, and your correctional facilities. But, this is something new to probation. So, the MAYSI, there's a few different questions there. First of all, that MAYSI is always going to have false positives, because it's a screening tool. It's a screening tool for mental health. It's a mental health screening tool, and the reason that you would adopt one of those in addition to the YLS is that, the YLS is for risk, which has nothing to do with mental health. Then, the MAYSI basically

complements that because the idea is to help you identify which youth you might need to be concerned about from a mental health perspective. So, they would get potentially a referral to some kind of clinician. The issues that you're raising, Scott, are issues that come up. So, they're not incredibly unfamiliar to us, and there's pieces that our team will work with folks on when developing the policy. So, with the MAYSI, there would be a policy for how it's used, when it should be administered, and what's the next step after people screen-in, so to speak. Generally, when it's implemented in probation, the next step is either, you may find that a youth is a major risk to themselves, or it looks like they could be a risk to themselves right away, and you want an immediate referral of some sort. But generally, it's used to try to identify which youth may need a psychological evaluation. What we find in many states, and it really is going to depend on the way that you all are operating now, and that could even be individual across the counties, but in many states, we see kids getting over-referred to get psychological evaluations. The MAYSI cuts down those referral rates because then you're only referring kids who actually have a valid measure of—whether they have a mental health need. So, I would anticipate, depending on where your current practice is, it's either going to improve identification of youth that have mental health issues, or it's going to decrease the number of the kids that you are sending for an evaluation, which improves costs. So, that's one. The other issue you raised is what we refer to as, “no'ing out”. So, youth could get familiar with MAYSI, they just started answering, no, on everything. We call that, no'ing out. There is a way that will be addressed in the MAYSI training and would also be addressed by our staff who are helping put the policy together. I don't do the MAYSI policy part of my staff work, but Johnathon Clayfield will be working with you all around that. He does have some strategies to help minimize the, no's, the no'ing out. But it is an issue and you don't want to over-MAYSI people. You want to try to just give it to them once. On probation, that's much easier to do than it is in a detention facility. Did I miss any of the questions, Scott?

Commissioner Scott Shick: Thank you very much.

Gina Vincent: Okay.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: You just answered all of my questions. I appreciate that.

Commissioner Scott Shick: And the Chief's and Director's questions from the meeting the other day. So, thank you very much.

Gina Vincent: Oh. Good. Good.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Any other public comment relating to the MAYSI? Any other public comment? Hearing none, we're going to move on to Item No. 4, which is Review and Approval of the Meeting Minutes from May 8th, 2018. They were attached. They are very detailed, which I appreciate, having missed the meeting. Do I have a motion to approve the meetings from the May 8th meeting?

Meeting Minutes:

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: This is Jo Lee Wickes for the record. By my count, we have four of the seven members.

Sierra Fowzer: Correct. You do have quorum.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Wonderful. The next item on the agenda is Public Comment and Discussion. I believe that we have Gina Vincent and Kelly Clement. I think this would be a great time to allow them to address us and answer questions that anyone has.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I asked Gina and Kelly to come onboard, maybe just to further our dialogue about the use of the MAYSI in probation roles and how to use that piece. I also talked to Pauline this morning regarding her concerns about false positives and things like that. And also, this is Scott Shick. I'm sorry. Also, from our Chief's Meeting, administrators, there were concerns about using the MAYSI, and having to use it. The statute clearly says mental health screening tools predisposition for adjudicated children. So, we did vote on the MAYSI and the body did, and we presented it to the Oversight Commission. This is like the best or a little bit more, Gina or Kelly, its importance in strategy when using it for probation kids. At what point in the probation process would you use it? Then maybe speak to our concerns regarding the false positives, and kids getting familiar with the MAYSI with frequent attention. So, having said that, could you potentially give us feedback.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes. So, hi everybody. This is Gina. I can certainly address the MAYSI questions. I wondered if we could take a step back for a second because I'm just a little bit confused, I think. My impression was that these meetings—and I'm not sure that it's every meeting, but my impression was that Kelly and I would be attending all of these meetings, in part to help drive you guys through the YLS implementation process, and that that's going to be a big part of your agenda today as well. The MAYSI is also part of this process, and the MAYSI piece as we're getting started on the actual work plan for the MAYSI implementation is something that we will probably want to talk about when you all would like to do that. But we're also going to be helping guide you through the MAYSI. I also had the impression that this group was going to be sort of the implementation for a bulk of those things. The way that we were introduced, it just gave me the sense that we're here as guests. I don't know if that's going to be kind of the structure from here forward, or if we're going to become part of the group to guide you through that process. Maybe that's a difficult—

Commissioner Scott Shick: That's a good question.

Dr. Gina Vincent: question. My understanding was that we would be at every one of these meetings for a while, to be helping guide you guys through a process. But if you don't want that to be done in these meetings, then we could do it—certainly do it through a different meeting.

Commissioner Scott Shick: What are thoughts on that?

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: This is Jo Lee Wickes. Ross, could you give all of us some guidance from the state's perspective, and bring some clarity to Ms. Vincent's introduction?

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Sure. For the record, this is Ross. My understanding is that my staff is serving as our TA and contractor to help us implement this part of the YLS that is required by statute. They are not technically members of the Commission, right? So, in that sense, they would be considered guests for purposes of the Open Meeting Law. We should probably adjust how we do roll call to make some things more clear on who are members of the Commission, and who are staffing and assisting of this particular committee. That is my understanding, that today we were really going to be talking a look at what the implementation plan is. My understanding is that, this committee is now that the tool has been selected, tasked with helping to guide that implementation through the next several months. That would be something this committee, I think, should discuss and potentially get some feedback from the Co-Chairs of the entire Commission, as to what role this committee has, now that the tools have been selected. It makes sense to me that the same group would help guide that implementation, but there may be some other thoughts out there by the two Co-Chairs, or the Chairs of this Committee.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Anybody else? I just think it's with Gina and Kelly, we didn't put them on the Agenda, and maybe that's part of the problem today. I contacted Gina, did you know about this meeting prior to my contacting you yesterday?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes. We were involved in helping get it set up. No. We were involved in the date selection.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Okay. Thank you. You guys should be a part of—it should be agendized, and you should be part of the conversation as we go forward with this. That's my feeling. I don't know how to accomplish that today.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: I think they're No. 5 and No. 6.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Okay. Very good.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: This is Pauline Salla. I have a question. This is Pauline.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Gina, are you talking about the meeting that NAJJA had? Is that the meeting you're talking about not being a part of?

Commissioner Scott Shick: No.

Dr. Gina Vincent: I don't know what NAJJA is yet.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Okay.

Gina Vincent: Sorry.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: I was just wondering which meetings you were because it sounded like you had some concerns that you guys weren't part of some meeting. So, I'm just trying to figure out-

Dr. Gina Vincent: Oh. No. I was just talking about this meeting, but I think Ross has clarified it for me, very well. So, thank you. We're not going to be members of this group, because this is an official subcommittee of the Commission. That absolutely makes sense. I would imagine that we would be participating in these meetings regularly over the course of the next year, and we're still considered the public. This is all new to us. So, that really helped. That helped clarify it for me, but I think that we've been working with Katie to help put together the agenda a bit, and so I just wanted to get some clarity around that. So, thank you.

Katie Brubaker: This is Katie Brubaker for the record. I can clarify a little bit more on the agenda. Next to the items, I will put your name, Dr. Vincent and Kelly, and who will be presenting what item in the future.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Thank you, kindly. I didn't realize that you're in the loop. Anyways, let's move forward.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Any other public comment relating to the MAYSI? Any other public comment? Hearing none, we're going to move on to Item No. 4, which is Review and Approval of the Meeting Minutes from May 8th, 2018. They were attached. They are very detailed, which I appreciate, having missed the meeting. Do I have a motion to approve the meetings from the May 8th meeting?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: This is Pauline—Commissioner Salla. So moved.

Commissioner Scott Shick: This is Commissioner Shick. I'll second the motion.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: All those in favor? Any opposed? Minutes are approved. Moving on to Item No. 5, which is listed as a possible action item, which is a Discussion and Possible Vote to Approve the YLS/CMI Implementation Work Plan. I'm hoping that there's somebody who can familiarize me, at least, with the implementation work plan.

Katie Brubaker: This is Katie Brubaker. This is where I am going to turn it over to Dr. Gina Vincent and Kelly Clement, as this is the work that they put in. They'll be able to walk us through each objective.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Great. Thank you.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. Hi again, everybody. This work plan is stemming from the conversation that we had last month where we went through a PowerPoint presentation with everyone around the steps of the implementation, good quality implementation of a Risk Needs Assessment Tool. The next step, generally when we're working with agencies

around this is to develop a work plan that's got a somewhat realistic timeline so there can be some planning about who is doing what, and what comes first, versus next, and so on. I'm sure you all are quite familiar with work plans, so I probably don't need to explain that. The work plan follows the steps that we went through with you all in the Power Point presentation last month. I'm not sure what's the best way to go about this with a group this size over the phone. So, I think that step one is probably just to orient everyone to the objectives. Then Kelly and I, and Katie—Katie has been incredibly helpful, have some questions for you all. You may have some suggestions about things that you would like changed. So, maybe we'll just to start with orienting you to the objectives. I should just mention from the out—I think I should just mention from the outset that, there may be some confusion still about training, and when training should occur because we are getting questions about that. And so, I thought maybe I would review a bit of what we talked about last time. First of all, the YLS is a very good Risk Needs Assessment tool. It's been well-validated. You all picked an excellent tool, in our opinion, to be used in your state. That is all that it is. It is a tool that is going to enable you all to quantify an individual's risk for re-offending, and to give you direction as to what is driving that youth re-offending. You'll be able to do so that every county can do that in the same way. You'll be on the same page, and that's a first step in the process. But, the Risk Assessment tool in itself, does not actually change or affect case planning. It's simply a measure that tells you what results are and what the needs are. The part that actually affects case planning and changes, may change the way that you all are working with youth, depending on which county you're in, is the implementation process itself. So, there have been many studies now, which I am happy to share with people, but there have been many studies now documenting when Risk Assessment fails to work. It typically fails to work, or fails to lead to any change, it doesn't have an impact on case planning, it doesn't have an impact on disposition, in situations where the policy for how it's going to be used wasn't established before the training occurred. And in situations where there hasn't been buy-in from the major stakeholders that are so crucial to the process. For those reasons, and it's been documented in several studies now, and people then decide that there's something wrong with the tool. They get rid of the tool. They replace the tool, when the real issue is that the implementation process wasn't thoughtfully carried out from the beginning. So, a mistake that—sorry to use the word, “mistake”, it sounds a bit harsh, but a mistake that many states have used, and then have had to undo, is to train all of their staff how to complete an assessment tool without actually going through the process first of how that information is going to be used, and developing their policy to do that so that their staff are trained on the policy at the same they're being trained on the tool, and that you've got all of your pieces that you need in place, prior to the training actually occurring. In instances where we have seen that not happen, what happens—and Kelly can, I'm sure, attest to this as well, is that, staff get trained on the tool, they don't know how they're supposed to use it, they have actual data indicating that it doesn't affect the way that they handle their youth cases in any way, shape, or form, because they don't know how they're supposed to use the information. Then six months later, they're trained how to use the tool, and at that point, they've already developed some bad habits. Or, at that point, they've already decided that they don't like the tool because it's not doing what it's supposed to do. Judges have decided they don't like the tool because it's not doing anything for them either. So, you have many counties who obviously are incredibly experienced when it comes to Risk Assessments, and they already have—are using the Risk Needs Responsibility

protocol. So, for them, this is unlikely to be an issue. For counties who may not be doing their practices in that way, and certainly for your correctional facilities who this is going to be much newer for, it's going to take a little bit of time to get a policy together and their practices down, which we strongly recommend occur before training. The training is Step Five in an eight-step process. The training, all the training does is tell people how to fill out the YLS. It doesn't tell them how to use it. So, when we're working with places, we try to help them establish their policy first. We help them with establishing the buy-in from the judiciary first, especially when they're implementing a tool pre-disposition. So, when we have trained your staff how to complete the YLS, we are also training them how to use it, and we're also training them in case planning. So, we're hitting the ground running right after the training has been done, and all those other steps are in place. So, the work plan is set up with those agendas in mind. And so, that is just to frame how the work plan looks. I just wanted to know if anybody has any questions or concerns, or wants to think about this differently?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: This is Commissioner Salla. I have a question on that.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Do you think that it's important because we've been using the YLS for about a year, would you recommend that my staff go back through this training? Or will the whole state be trained again by the same trainer, doing it the exact same way?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Are you from Carson?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: No. I'm from Winnemucca. We've been doing it in Humboldt County for over a year.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Oh. You've been doing it in Humboldt? So, yeah. I think Carson is also using the YLS, and probably a few others. So, yeah. My recommendation is that, first of all, the idea was to start with three probation pilot counties, and those counties being trained first. Those counties become your master trainers, well, not everyone in the county obviously, but you'll develop a handful of master trainers from that. They will then help train your other counties. But the pilot testing is really important. Because you all are already using the YLS, it might make sense to just think about whether you should be part of that pilot test, because you're not going to be as much work as places that aren't using it at all. Yes. I would suggest that you do, because with the new legislation and with whatever this group comes up around policy and practice, there may be some changes. Your case plan format may change a bit. I don't know. Since I haven't seen your stuff, I don't know how many changes might arise for you. But, yeah. My suggestion would be; they be retrained because there may be some changes to their practice.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Perfect. Thank you.

Gina Vincent: However, for you, it's more of a booster training. That's some very nice background music. Did someone put us on hold? The music is like when someone puts a hold. Okay. It sounds like it ended. Other questions, thoughts, concerns, about the layout?

Commissioner Scott Shick: This is Scott Shick. It makes really good sense to first [inaudible] policies and practice [inaudible] get that buy-in [inaudible] our staff, and then go ahead and [inaudible] those counties, it makes a lot of sense that we have never done a YLS and they understand it pretty well. And eventually Humboldt and people that are using it, participate in that master training, or however that works out. I don't know people who have experience at it.

Katie Brubaker: Scott, this is Katie Brubaker for the record. I think that is a good idea. We can reach out to those counties who are already using the YLS. Then we can combine forces for that training.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Yeah. I think it was Washoe, and Carson, and Humboldt.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Isn't it true that Clark County is already using the YLS?

Commissioner Scott Shick: I am not sure.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Humboldt would love to be a part of that.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Pauline, isn't it true that Clark County has already purchased the YLS?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: I'm not certain about that. I think they've been looking at it, but I'm not sure that they purchased it and implemented it.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: This is Ross. What my suggestion might be, since we're talking about the work plan, and my understanding is that today hopefully we approve the framework of this work plan, and then have staff, primarily Katie and Gina, work together to plug in all the timeframes. But, since we do have some counties using it, we may add under Objective One, for the folks at NYSAP to maybe just do a quick review of the counties that are using it already, and their policies and procedures. That may give NYSAP a good understanding of how the Nevada system works, and the way we're using it here, and then can recommend potential tweaks during the buy-in, and development of policies and procedures phase.

Commissioner Scott Shick: That's well said.

Tom Metscher: This is Tom in Nye County. Is it also possible for the counties that have already begun, or have implemented the YLS, to share openly their implementation, policies, and the procedures they already have in place? So that maybe some of the counties that don't have it can kind of get a vision of what that policy might look like in the implementation, so we can catch up a little bit quicker when the time comes.

Katie Brubaker: This is Katie Brubaker. I think that's a great idea, especially when we're creating policies around the YLS, to use what's already existing and what has worked or maybe what hasn't worked, so that we can all be on the same page.

Gina Vincent: Yeah. I think one of the—this is Gina. I'm sorry. I think one of the details that was discussed last time, and I think decided, was that there would be one statewide YLS policy that sort of sets the bar and the minimum. Then, each individual county has got their practice written down, which we can call policy or practice. It's essentially the same thing, but there's a statewide that sets the minimum, because now the legislation is saying everyone needs to do a pre-disposition. That may not be the case in every county now. So, there's a statewide that we are going to share with, and work with you all, to establish those policies, those policies and practices around training, minimum training, standards, re-assessment, and many other things that you might want to set forth in the statewide policy. Then other policies can be a modification for what's going to be feasible for them. So, one of the things that we talk about is, some of your counties have intake units and they have a really high volume. In those cases, they may want to implement a screening tool instead of YLS'ing everybody. So, I think we do have the policies from the three counties that were going to be in the pilot. Kelly and I have reviewed them. Kelly, can you remind me which one had the YLS in their policy? I thought it was Carson. Kelly? If he's still there.

Kelly Clement: I'm sorry. I was on mute and I was just talking away. It was Carson City.

Dr. Gina Vincent: It was Carson City. Yeah. Okay.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: This is Commissioner Salla. We have a policy also for our YLS, if someone could look at that and tell us if we're off track, or on track?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. That would be great. I think it would be great if we could gather everyone who uses the YLS, gather their policies to take a look at them. So, we'll add that to Objective One. Okay. So, moving through, why don't we move through the work plan. We won't go through it in great detail, it's just to give you a broad idea about the steps. So, some of these steps will work in tandem in terms of their timeframe. Establishing Buy-In. So, although clearly there's legislation and everyone has decided that the YLS is going to be used, what I was getting from the last meeting is that, some of you felt that it's still going to be important to get buy-in from the judiciary around how the YLS is going to be used. When you're using a tool pre-disposition, in our experience, the judiciary has got to be on board. If they're not onboard, that that—the tool doesn't lead to anything. Again, you don't see practices being implemented. So, they're key. As Scott mentioned, your staff are also key. And we're talking about two different types of staff. We're talking about the three different types, actually. We're talking about probation officers, we're talking about YPCs, and we're talking about whatever staff in the correctional facilities you all thing are going to be administering the YLS.

Commissioner Scot Shick: What are YPCs?

John Munoz: This is John. I think you have YPCs for Youth Pro Counselors?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Oh. YPCs. YPC. I'm sorry.

John Munoz: That's okay, Gina. Thank you.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Thank you. I'm just making stuff up. YPC. So, you've got at least three sets of personnel to potentially get buy-in from. Again, if they don't like the tool, that can be an issue. I mean, they don't have to love the YLS, but if they don't see it as having any credibility, what you'll end up with is a lot of override of the risk level, and them not using it in their decision. They're just going based on their gut, which as you said, you want to adopt a tool so that people can minimize that. So, both of those groups are important. Buy-in is your first one of the ways that we thought we could work with your staff around buy-in is just for the pilot counties and all the correctional facilities and YPCs, is to have some focus groups with them, which could be done over the phone. That's just one suggestion. That is going to be to get a sense of their practices, current practices, and what they think is going to be feasible in terms of implementation, because then they are having some say in the process. Then having presentations with your judges and attorneys. We talked with Katie and John Munoz about this a few weeks ago. They had some suggestions, I think, about how to do those trainings with judges and attorneys, and how to split up staff. I don't know, Katie and John, what's the best way to discuss out of this forum. Do you want to mention the roadshow?

Katie Brubaker: This is Katie. Yeah. So, we had talked about, in several of our JJOC full Commission meetings, about a roadshow. Not just for DCFS staff, but for different stakeholders. What we thought would be best is to have NYSAP come out here and do presentations alongside of us at the roadshow, so that we have everyone's full attention. Now, the specifics of that have not been worked out, but that is our plan moving forward, to hit all of these target groups.

John Munoz: This is John. So, we also talked about splitting up some of the—I didn't think we needed to have the probation officers, parole officers and institution staff in the same training as the judges, DAs, PDs, you know, other court officials. Is everybody okay with that? Or are there other recommendations that this team has? If you do have other suggestions, we'd be more than happy to talk about that.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: This is Jo Lee. I think the meetings are going to be insufferable if you have too many different people or too many different roles in the room at the same time, because the focus is going to be so different. I think it's probably better to divide them.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I agree. Scott Shick. I agree.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: This is Commissioner Salla. One of the things I learned when I was with the state as the specialist is that, if other people are coming into the community, make sure you have the stakeholders already—like the probation chief, their director, or somebody that's tied to that community is so helpful to be a part of that. The buy-ins can occur more easily.

Dr. Gina Vincent: That's great.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Also looked at those roadshow presentations can be videotaped, because staff turnover is going to happen across the board. The ability to even watch a videotape is probably more helpful, even for the short-term, than having nothing at all.

Gina Vincent: Yeah.

Commissioner Scott Shick: And potentially, you could make a standardized training that we could circulate.

Katie Brubaker: This is Katie Brubaker again. That's definitely something that we can look into, and I appreciate everybody's feedback. We have been working with Judge Walker and Jo Lee in terms of the roadshow. And so, we will definitely be looking at splitting up the groups so that we have the right audience without too many people.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. And the goal is to have this piece done as soon as those can be organized, because Kelly and I are ready whenever you guys are. So, I think we are looking at—we're thinking August potentially.

Katie Brubaker: That is correct.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah. Okay. Okay. Great. Are there thoughts about that? Or shall I move on to Objective Three? Okay. We're good. All right. Before I get to Objective Three and Four, I have some questions to ask everybody. Kelly and I are just getting familiar with your process. I guess it's a bit different than some of the other agencies that we've worked with. Where Kelly and I implemented this in Louisiana, I just pretty much just dealt with Kelly, and he had a very small committee that he ran things by. Here, it's not clear to me always what the Commission needs to approve, what this group needs to approve, and what can be done in smaller work groups without having everybody involved. Obviously, some pieces can be done in smaller workgroups without everybody being involved and will get done a little faster. Maybe there is some process that you all took subcommittees—or, sorry, workgroups, and then we bring it back to this group for approval. Then it goes to the Commission. I'm not sure, but whatever way is the most efficient, works for us if it works for you. That's just something to think about as we go through Objectives Three and Four, is how—what is the most efficient way to do this, while also making sure that the right people are involved. So, Objective Three does not take a lot of time, but this is around preparing the YLS for your use. There's a couple of steps there. One is clearly the software integration. You want to have the software ready in your pilot counties, and for DCFS, prior to the training, if at all possible. And we are working with MHS, but I'm not sure what timeframe they're on right now for that to happen. So, that's something, I imagine, Katie, is most directly involved with Dominic at MHS.

Katie Brubaker: Yeah. This is Katie Brubaker for the record. The YLS is going to be in Case Load Pro for us to use. I think that Case Load Pro had started working on it, and then it stopped so that we could get all the data converted from each county and DCFS, before July 1. So, the YLS will be in CaseloadPro and ready to go by the end of July.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. Great. All right. There's another couple pieces to getting the YLS ready, so to speak. I think it would be really helpful to look at what you're doing in Humboldt County and what Carson is doing around this, because you guys may have already come up with practices that we can just use. The YLS language requires a little bit of the adaptations for your state, because there's several items there that are related specifically to juvenile court procedures, and juvenile record. The language in the YLS is not generally complete and refined for liability purposes that it's best to make sure that you've got some kind of guide, so all your probation officers know how they're supposed to read these items. That is something that we can work on very easily with a small group, ideally someone who knows the law really well. So, I think one of the items on the Agenda today is to find out who is willing to do what. We can work on that with a really small group, and if it's allowed, put that together and then submit it to this group for approval. Does that sound like a reasonable process?

Commissioner Scott Shick: Jo Lee?

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: It does. As one of the Co-Chairs, I'm hoping that a lot of work can be done and brought back to this subcommittee so that we can agendize it, have a discussion about it, make any decisions that have to be made to report back to the full Commission. Obviously, we have a difficult time scheduling meetings so that we have a quorum. I do think that a smaller work group that can collaborate more efficiently, quickly, more thoroughly, I guess, would be ideal.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Ross, do you think that is workable?

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Yeah. I don't know that there's any need for the full-blown Commission to approve this implementation plan. I think you could say just this committee does.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Right.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Then present it for information to the entire Commission. That may be the way to go.

Commissioner Scott Shick: That was the original idea. I love the idea of the subcommittee—this is Scott. And with respect to that last piece as far as juvenile record, juvenile court procedures. I believe, Jo Lee, you have that legal mind. Pauline, you're in implementation already, essentially you two can be on that workgroup. Potentially somebody from youth

parole. John himself or—am I calling this out right, Gina? As far as what you're looking for to establish?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah. I think it would be great to have someone who is already using the YLS involved. We definitely would want to have someone who is legally-minded. I'm sure you all are legally-minded, but—whatever that means. If there is someone from the judiciary or an attorney on this group who would be willing to look at it. And a YPC type person, I think would be helpful.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Well, and I'm really as confident as I can be without being 100 percent sure, that part of the reason—among the factors that we were looking at before, we chose the YLS is that, Clark County had already purchased it. And so, I know Jack wasn't able to join us today, and Darin had told us ahead of time that he would not be available today, I think it would be nice if that small workgroup could include Pauline if she's willing. Clark County, if indeed I am correct, that they had already purchased the YLS. I'm not a Risk Assessment expert. Obviously, I'm a lawyer. I can read the law. If a lot of that work can be done beforehand and then I would be happy to review it to make sure that it complies with what I believe the statute-the law requires us to do.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Excellent. Excellent. I would suggest too that, you've got your three pilot counties, I don't know if those are even up for debate, but my understanding is that they have been selected and agreed.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Who are the three?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Douglas, Carson and—I'm going to say Washoe. Yeah. Thank you. I don't want to embarrass myself and say it wrong.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: This is Commissioner Salla. I thought that the pilot counties were going to be those—are they the ones who haven't implemented it yet, that are going to roll it out? Or is it a mixture?

Commissioner Scott Shick: Well, there was no one way or the other. So, it could be a mixture. I think we could just add you to the pilot counties.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: This is Ross. I wasn't involved in the selection of the pilot counties, but my hunch and maybe Gina knows why those three were selected, that there would be one larger county, which would be Washoe. Then the addition of Carson and Douglas made that easier for the trainers, so they could do a visit and just hit a single area. I think potentially with Humboldt already using it, maybe not so much a pilot county, but kind of like a county to review and see how they're doing it and determine if tweaks are needed. Then, rather than disrupt Humboldt twice with changing it, take the tweaks from the way Humboldt was using it, pilot it in those three counties. Then when we have the system we think will work, then go back to Humboldt and say, okay, just make this one change to the way you're doing it now and you should be good to go.

Commissioner Scott Shick: This is Scott. Ross, Carson is already using the YLS, and may need those tweaks as well. So, both of those counties should probably be in that domain that you just talked about, then bring it out.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: So, I wonder—this is Jo Lee. I wonder if the small workgroup, if we can reach out to people and ask them, are you willing to be part of that group? Because, obviously, it makes sense for people from the pilot counties, and maybe Pauline chipping in if she's willing, to figure out—

Dr. Gina Vincent: This is Gina. That sounds perfect to me, and I like the suggestion of Humboldt County being involved at least as an advisor on that small group. So, potentially, one person from each of the pilot counties, and an attorney who is willing to review it for us and not be a part of the group, but at least willing to review it for us, and Katie and us. That's probably enough, if you all are okay with that.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Yes, ma'am.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: This is Jo Lee. I'm happy to review in all honesty, I don't have the time—and really I have no expertise, but I'm certainly willing to look at whatever you come up with just to say—you know, if I think it complies what the law requires.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. That's it. It will be less than one page.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Perfect.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. I understand. Okay. So, Katie, I believe, is our go-to person who will help with organizing the groups moving forward?

Katie Brubaker: Yep. That's correct.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. Terrific. All right. So, moving on to Objective Four. So, that's great. This is something—this piece on the YLS practice, something we could try to have done between August and September. August. We should be able to have it done by August. Okay. Objective Four is about the policies and procedures. This is the most important part, and it is the most time consuming part because it involves—and for you all, as we discussed, it's going to involve a statewide policy that is kind of setting the minimum. The policies for use of a Risk Needs Assessment Tool in probation, look different than the policies for use in corrections. The use of the tool is just very different. Corrections is dealing with things like, release decisions, security level within their placement constellation, whatever they may have. We haven't delved into that too much yet. Probation is looking at supervision level; they're looking at case management decisions. They're very different looking policies.

So, we're talking about too, at the minimum that I suspect it sounds like would be developed by members of this group and bringing in some others, as a statewide policy. Then, asking your counties to make modifications and adaptations based on what can be feasible in their area. So, I would also suggest here and clearly, Kelly and I are going to guide you through this. Kelly and I have many examples of policy templates, and you guys already have

legislation. So, I suspect you're going to be able to get—this will go faster with you than it does with others. Kelly, how much time did we spend on this in Louisiana? I think four months?

Kelly Clement: Yeah. This is the most tedious because you want to try to get buy-in.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah. You want to get it right. It's not just about getting the policy on paper, it's also about the case plan, and what the case plan is going to look like, and whether the case plan aligns with the YLS. This is where I think we're going to need to be introduced to Case Load Pro probably, because my understanding is that they're—I mean, that's going to impact us greatly what our Case Load Pro is doing as well. Yeah. Go ahead.

Kelly Clement: I was just going to say too that, typically I know it's been done in this practice is that, once these policies are developed, that they do remain in kind of a draft form, the changes could be made just as easily to them as they're tested and staff have new ideas of how to improve on them.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes. Excellent. That's a really important point, is that, often the point of a pilot is you start out with a draft policy, and the pilot testing is what guides you as to whether anything should be adjusted in there before you roll it out to the rest of the state. So, in that sense too, there's probably a little less red tape if it's a draft policy, because I imagine there is many levels of needing to get a policy official and approved. So, our questions here are, what's the best way to accomplish this? We have the policies from the pilot counties and from DCFS. We will get one from Humboldt and any other county that is using the YLS currently. I know Katie and us are going to be working on this. In our experience, it's very important to have some—a couple field staff engaged in this part of the process. At least the chief probation officer, but I would say even potentially a field staff because they've got some good ideas about what is going to be feasible, and how their system actually works. Do you all have suggestions of what you would like to see for these policies to be put together?

Commissioner Scott Shick: Well, if we want it—this is Scott. I want to do what works. We need a document responding to the needs of the kids. It is about the kids. So, how does that policy look in respect to getting the YLS to the child and making the best call of that moment, probably the least amount of time as necessary, to get them on their feet and [inaudible] a bold statement when you narrow it down that way. I think our probation officers that I was talking to here, that they would appreciate that and know that some of the decisions they're making are theirs, may validate some of them, [inaudible] in the past and give them validation to that direction. So, that's policy [inaudible] to narrow it down that way to [inaudible].

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: This is Commissioner Salla. I think that one of the things we did when we had a statewide policy for something like [inaudible], is that the statewide policy was really just the umbrella that met the standards. Then each county could really specify that to their organization and community. So, when I think of a statewide policy for the YLS, I look at it like it's the umbrella of how to implement and conduct the YLS appropriately, in terms of validity and liability, but that each county would then have their own policy that met the statewide standards, but really was specific to them.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: This is Jo Lee. I'm looking kind of at the subsections under Objective No. 4. So, I appreciate your big picture view, but then I sometimes get concerned about the fact that I think part of getting buy-in is to recognize that when you have sweeping legislation like this, it creates a level of discomfort. If we drill down too far into telling individual probation departments how to act, I think we're going to get significant resentment and pushback. So, for instance, selecting a risk screening tool to be provided to the probation department, I don't know if there's any funding for a risk screening tool to be provided to the probation department.

Commissioner Scott Shick: That's the YLS.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Information sharing agreement with providers, is fraught with difficulty under Nevada law, and something that's going to be very boggy. Four-point-eight, Reviewing and Approving Probation Department Local Policy, I'm adamantly opposed to being involved in that. Because I think if we develop a statewide policy of minimum standards, I think that we have to respect the Probation Chief and Directors of those agencies to run their agency within their discretion, and as approved by their Juvenile Court Oversight. I frankly think we need to stay out of it.

Dr. Gina Vincent: All of the pieces in here that you have pointed out are things that are in red, that are areas that we wanted to discuss with the group, because we're not sure how things operate.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Okay. I have black and white, so I didn't have the benefit of color distinction.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Every one of the ones you pointed out are the ones—they're all the ones in red, and they all have question marks.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Okay.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Except 4.3, I missed the question mark. My apologies. So, the selection of the screening tool. That was brought up on the last meeting that we all had with you, where some counties mentioned they got a very high volume, and it's going to be very hard for them to implement—to complete the YLS pre-disposition on all of their youth. This is an issue with places like Clark County. That's nearly impossible. You would need a lot of probation officers to do that. And so, 4.1 was simply in there as, having an option or giving guidance for those who want to use a risk screening tool. We weren't sure if that's something that needs approval from anyone if we gave guidance. Or, would you want to have one risk screening tool that's recommended by the state, or what have you, or just leave that up to them to figure out on their own? I wasn't sure whether that should be part of this work plan. We really didn't know if it should be part of this work plan, or just kind of let them all figure that out. I am sure when we get to the point of Clark County, that that's something that they're going to—well, I get the sense that's something they're going to want to implement. They may be asking for some guidance around that, but it doesn't necessarily need to go in the work plan. So, thoughts about taking it out? Do folks think we should take it out?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: This is Commissioner Salla. I think during our last meeting, the discussion was with the jurisdictions that have such a high volume of kids, is that they were talking about that the YLS has a smaller screening tool, which I really can't find. I would love to see that. I looked all over their website, and I can't find that part. But I think that the discussion was around that, versus the complete YLS to do. I just want to say that, Jo Lee, I totally understand what you're saying. We ran into that with the PREA policies also, which is why we just did a statewide one that met the minimum standards, and then the jurisdictions were allowed to tailor that to their community and their agency. And that as long as they met the minimum standards—and with the YLS, it would be really staying true to the fidelity of implementation, that we did stay out of that, because that does create some anxiety. It just creates a whole bunch of stuff that I think as a statewide policy, that there should be—we should meet the minimum standards, and then let the Chief and Directors do what they do best, which is work in their community.

Commissioner Scott Shick: That's good feedback.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: This is Ross. A couple things on the risk screening tool, as opposed to doing the entire assessment, I don't know that that would necessarily be in compliance with the NRS now. I mean, that would be a legal question probably for each jurisdiction's counsel on that. They may—I don't know if they're talking about doing one before they move towards an adjudication disposition. So, if there's one that aligns better then—I know some of them use like the detention screening tool now. So, we could see exactly what that plan is. Then, I would echo Jo Lee and Pauline. I think it's 4.8 on the work plan that would definitely have some heartburn and pushback from the local jurisdictions. However, I think if it were modified so that it's clear, we're not talking about the Commission approving probation department local policies but having NYSAP review so that we create a model state policy for YLS use, local jurisdictions can modify it to their needs, and if there is some review by Gina and their team to make sure the county modifications don't diminish the effectiveness of the tool. Not a Commission review and approval, but of a NYSAP review and feedback, I think would be a better way to handle that.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Yes.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Very nice.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah. Thank you, Ross. That was our intention, was that we would review—for the pilot counties, because the pilot counties are going to be models for some of your other counties. Then, they can share those policies with the counties that are just adopting the YLS to use as a guide.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: This is Jo Lee. So, if we changed 4.8 to, NYSAP would review and provide feedback to probation department regarding local policy.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay.

Commissioner Scott Shick: That's good language.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: With regard to a risk screening tool, I'm only one voice, but I think the law is crystal clear. If a petition gets filed and it's headed toward disposition, the full YLS has to be done, period. There's plenty of cases in Clark, thousands of cases in Washoe, and I'm sure lots of cases in the other counties, where you're not going to a petition, you're not going to court. So, providing some suggestions about risk screening tools would be fine. I'm sure that—well, I'm not sure. I suspect that budgets are not going to support, nor would probation departments be wanting to spend their resources to do a full YLS on kids who are not going to court. I think under Ross' point, it's clear. If a petition gets filed and you're headed toward disposition, a YLS has to be done.

Commissioner Scott Shick: That's the umbrella policy. That's what the statute says.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Okay. I agree with that, Jo Lee. This is Commissioner Salla.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. That, for a place like Clark County, I don't want—I understand if their legislation is written a certain way, that post-petition, pre-disposition, a YLS needs to be done somewhere in that timeframe. It is—some tools, the YLS is not one of them, but some tools, they are a screening tool plus full-assessment combo. That's how they come. The idea of the screening tool is simply, that if a youth is low-risk, there is no need to do the full assessment. So, it only screens youth out who don't need a full assessment because low-risk kids, by definition, don't have a lot of needs and don't need an extensive case plan. So, it's not like—this isn't in here to mean that a risk screening tool is all that they would do, it's simply in there to mean that it might cut down the number of YLSs that they do because they wouldn't have to do them on low-risk youth.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Gina?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Commissioner Salla. Is there another shorter instrument of the YLS? I mean, is there something that—because everyone keeps talking about it, but I can't find it.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah. Yes. There is. There is a YLS screening tool. I have never been able to find it either. I don't know why they don't advertise it on their website. It's impossible to find unless you email someone at Multi Health Systems to get it. So, yes, it exists, but I don't understand why it's not on their website. I talked to Multi Health Systems to see if there was a way they could give you guys a deal if you wanted to use the YLS with a screening tool. So, they're looking into that. But, yes. But it's not free. It does cost money, and there may not—and so, it may be something that you want to leave up to individual counties because they'll have to—it sounds like you're saying that they would need to pay for it. But, yeah. It exists. It's like 10 items.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Well, then here's the second part of my question. If there is—I mean, if it's a YLS assessment screening tool, then it would still—I mean, we accepted

YLS as our risk and need tool for the state, so wouldn't—if Clark County wanted to do that first, wouldn't that still meet the intent of the legislation?

Commissioner Scott Shick: I think you're on to something.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Pauline, could you ask that question one more time?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: I'm just wondering because I understand why Clark County has that concern, and Washoe, because you guys have such a high number. But if there is that YLS screening tool, that ten item screening tool, and it's YLS, and Clark County and Washoe, or whoever wanted to use that as a way to really eliminate those kids right off the bat that are a low risk to offend, wouldn't that still meet the intent of the legislation since it's part of YLS also?

Commissioner Scott Shick: Let's talk about the Risk and Needs Assessment, they don't say, screening tool. That would be my—I mean, my concern.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: But if it's part of the assessment process that identifies for a full YLS, then I would consider that an assessment tool, even though it's a screening.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I see your point. I think when it comes down to it, would that be acceptable to meet the statute?

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: This is Ross. I think—so, it's in 62B.625 is the statute that talks about the assessment. I mean, it's all open to interpretation, right? I think the fact that they use an assessment tool for the risk, and they use a screening tool for the mental health one, a court would find legislative, the intent would be that a screen would not be sufficient for the assessment, because they specifically call them different things. So, that's going way back into my legislative intent class in law school. There's no prohibition on using a screen if they want to do that to reduce the number of full YLSs that they need to do, and divert kids from petition, and adjudication, and disposition. There's nothing that prohibits that, but they would still need to do the YLS for those they want to proceed to adjudication with.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Right. Right. This is Commissioner Salla. I mean, I agree with what you're saying, Ross. I'm just wondering if we can save some of our energy about—like, arguing about the tool versus the full YLS, to make sure that those that we go—that we're going to dispo on, that we're doing a full YLS. I was just wondering if we could eliminate some of that time and energy.

Dr. Gina Vincent: This is Gina. I'll just say, in our world from a Risk Assessment person world, that the screen plus assessment, they'd be still considered a Risk Needs Assessment, the two. Both would, as long as the screen is being used in the right way. However, I know that the legislation can be very detailed. If you all don't think that that's going to meet the requirements, that makes sense. I would just say that, there may be an argument for it down the road if they have a really hard time doing the YLS on everyone who is going to disposition. If anyone wanted our assistance in making an argument, we could help you write that up.

For now, it sounds like potentially we should just take this out of the work plan. Is that where you all are leaning?

Commissioner Scott Shick: I would support that. This is Scott.

Gina Vincent: Okay.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Which number are you suggesting that we take out? Number one?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Four-point-one.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Four-point-one. I have no problem with taking 4.1 out of the work plan. I think if the county—certainly that doesn't prohibit NASAP from—is it NASAP or NYSAP?

Dr. Gina Vincent: It's NYSAP. That's okay.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Okay. NYSAP.

Dr. Gina Vincent: I like NASAP.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Okay. That doesn't prevent NYSAP from answering questions, or even just saying, we have some suggestions if you're interested in a risk screening tool.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yep.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Is there anything else in Section 4? I've been scribbling some notes, and here's what I have so far. That we would delete 4.1, which is the Risk Screening Tool, from the work plan. I am suggesting that we also delete 4.3, which is, Establish Information Sharing Agreement with Providers. I do think the counties are going to have to work on MOUs and some of those other things, but that is a very deep quagmire in my judgement. We have talked about 4.6, Obtaining Approval of Statewide Draft Policy and Procedures from this subcommittee. So, we would amend that and delete the word, Commission. Then, that we would modify 4.8 to state that, NYSAP would review and provide feedback to probation departments on their local policy. Does anybody see anything else under Objective Four that we talked about, or need to talk about?

Commissioner Scott Shick: Could you go back to the information sharing again? Could you speak on that please?

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: My concern about having this as part of the work plan is that, you can spend the next five years trying to come up with what's going to work for different providers across the State of Nevada in different counties, different providers to youth parole. Information sharing is an absolute quagmire. I think that we have to trust the individual jurisdictions to figure out, with the advice of the attorney—the government

attorneys who represent them, how to work through it in their jurisdiction. You literally could spend five years doing this.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: This is Commissioner Salla. I agree.

Dr. Gina Vincent: This is Gina. I'm wondering if I could just give a little bit of explanation as to why Kelly and I have that in there? Maybe this is just something that needs a rewrite.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Okay.

Dr. Gina Vincent: But it may be something that needs to be taken out, because I hear what you're saying. Information sharing agreement might be a little too strong. For case planning, to really follow with responsivity procedures, which is, kids are getting their criminogenic needs addressed. It's important for the service provider to understand how you all are defining that, and to get some information from probation as to what the needs are that this youth is having on the YLS. So, some information—it's important for providers to know what the youth's criminogenic needs are, so that they know that they're addressing them. That's just sort of like sharing case plans, but it doesn't even have to be sharing a case plan. It could just be probation officers ensuring that they're explaining this to the providers. But providers having a role in the implementation process and informing their probation officers about what services they have that address criminogenic needs, is also going to be key. So, does that still sound like information sharing? An information sharing agreement to you? Or could it simply be establishing a process with providers for communication.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: This is Commissioner Salla. We actually had to go through that with our counseling center that we use, and then our forensic psychiatric nurse that we have. We don't really—I mean; I think the information sharing terminology is really broad. We are supposed to do that because we have the frequent team meetings that we share information, and that the parents and the kid is actually at. So, I think that that's more like MOU agreement within the community to the support services that they're utilizing, not just the broad term of, information sharing.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: That is important. I do agree with that. We've all got to be working on the same page.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Gina?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes?

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: I really appreciate your perspective. I think that it's critical. Even within our own county, I see so many different ways that that's done. I guess I'm being selfish. I'm going to be a prosecutor, and to try to have this subcommittee be able to do something that's effective across the board around that issue, and maybe approve or reduce it to writing, is overwhelming.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah. That absolutely makes sense. It may be something that we can work on with local probation departments, just explaining the importance of this. It's also important for the YPCs. Individualize—sorry. Go ahead, Kelly.

Kelly Clement: I was just about to interject, because in Louisiana, this was—obviously, that's a huge issue. I just wanted to point out, I think some of this, what we were referring to and were able to work out is, like you were saying, is mostly about the fact that we're doing this assessment, and that there's certain parts of it that we would need to share the information with, a provider, for instance. Because what we found was happening is, we were doing an evidence-based assessment tool that was guiding our treatment and supervision of the youth, but then we were referring them, to say, a substance abuse clinic or whatever, and they were doing a service plan for the kids that wasn't in agreement with what our evidence-based tool identified. And so, part of this too, I think like you were saying with the service team is that, it's just making sure that whoever we're referring a kid to that we're kind of on the same page, and that they're not going off in a different direction in trying to achieve goals and measure things that we didn't identify as being a need for instance.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: I was just thinking that, I hear that, and we had that issue in the beginning too, but I agree with Jo Lee. I think the importance of working directly with the other providers, or if it includes a statement in the policy of working together, is important. But I do think that the communities that are implementing it know who their stakeholders are, and probably already have information sharing policies in place that—it doesn't need to be run or overseen by this committee, or the full Commission.

Dr. Gina Vincent: This is Gina. That makes sense to me. I think everyone understands the importance of it, and it's something that NYSAP can work on directly with some of your—some of the groups that are involved in the pilot, rather than it being in here. So, we can take that out.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Four-point-three we're taking out, right?

Dr. Gina Vincent: I have one other question about Section Four that I just think that maybe we should revise the language based on something that Jo Lee said about another one. It's 4.10, which is currently written as, Judges Review and Approve Pre-Disposition and Recommendations Template. Would you recommended having some kind of template about how YLS information will be shared at disposition? It's not something the YLS comes with. It's something that each place creates. If you all create one at the statewide level that the other counties can adopt or modify—I understand you don't want to force the other counties to do anything, but they can—they'll have it as a template to use. What this means is simply that, it's helpful for judges to have input as to what that looks like. So, is approval too strong of a word in there? Should we revise that to, provide feedback? Review and Provide Feedback?

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: This is Jo Lee. I think feedback is not only wise, but I think it's probably legally necessary, because under the statute that we're operating under that developed the JJOC, judges are non-voting members. So, that could become problematic.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. All right. All right. Got it.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: This is Commissioner Salla again. We went through that with our judges when we were implementing it. Our template changed about 10 times until we got it to where everybody felt comfortable with it. So, I do think that it's important to have the judges' feedback, but honestly, it's important to have the DAs, the public defenders, probation, just everybody involved. I think that that's few chance times and drafts within the agency, so the jurisdictions can get to where they all feel comfortable with it, because ours changed about 10 times. Now we have it secured in our disposition just how agreed upon.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Would we be able to look at yours? And maybe that would be just one version that could be suggested to other people.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: I'd be more than willing to give you that as a sample and just redact the names. Absolutely.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. That would be terrific. If you all want any other changes to this section, this section also involves developing a quality assurance plan. Quality assurance, in our terms, includes supervisor sign-off when supervisors are going to sign-off, what approvals are needed—or the case plan, or YLS. Initial training. Annual booster training. Then there's quality assurance that has to do with data checking. Since you are developing a statewide policy that will be modified for individual pilot counties, this could be something as simple as, here's some recommendations for quality assurance.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: I think under Section 8, 1B, that we have—that everybody is required to comply with policies and quality assurance protocols set forth by a qualified vendor or other provider. So, I think we have quality assurance protocol that have to be followed.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. So then, this committee is already charged with doing that for the YLS?

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Well, the JJOC is. I think it falls to this subcommittee.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. Sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt you. Okay. So, we leave that in. All right. Is there any other issues people would like changed on Objective Four?

Commissioner Scott Shick: Just for my clarification, we are eliminating 4.3?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yes.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Thank you.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Eliminating, it sounds like.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: We're modifying 4.10?

Commissioner Scott Shick: Yes, Ma'am.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Okay.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Next question is, is there anything in here that you all see that needs to be approved by the Commission? Or is it the case that, say, Katie, and Kelly and I, and some others, can work on the statewide policy and just have it approved by this group? That has to the Commission at some point, or is it just this group? I think Ross said it's just this group, but I'm not sure because it's going to be a draft for the pilot stage anyway.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I believe Ross is correct. Yeah.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: I think that if we work within the subcommittee, if the full Commission doesn't like it, we'll hear about it and we can adjust.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. All right. Excellent. So, this, by the way, is the last big piece. The other things, we can discuss quite quickly, I think, from my perspective. So, this is another area where I think it would be wise—because it can be time-consuming sometimes—it would be wise to try to hit the ball running. Is it possible to put a small workgroup together to work on the state policy which—I mean, I think it would probably start, if it's okay with you all, it would probably start with Kelly and I working with Katie. But I would like to see, if possible, representation from each of the pilot counties at some point, because everyone's input, I think, could be important. And the correctional policy, we'll certainly want to talk to some YPCs and people in those facilities, and John, I would imagine. There's a lot of information. I guess I'm just looking for your opinions as to whether we can pull our group together.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Sure. I would be glad to participate in whatever you need as far as the implementation [inaudible]

Dr. Gina Vincent: Excellent.

Katie Brubaker: This is Katie. Excuse me. I will work behind the scenes to reach out individually to people to get that set up.

Gina Vincent: Okay.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Thank you.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. Thank you, Katie. That's great. Okay. All right. Those pieces, the quality assurance part, you may not feel needs to be done before the YLS training. That's kind of an ongoing thing. We will be working with you all over the course of this year, at least. So, that's kind of an ongoing thing. Many of the other components of Objective Four, we highly recommended be done before the—or be close to done, before the YLS training. At least be in draft form so that it becomes part of the YLS training, otherwise it wouldn't be in the training. Objective Five is Training. There are several different steps to training. The YLS training itself takes two days. We are strongly recommending that we split up probation, and corrections, and the YPCs separately because the way that—like I said, the way that the YLS is going to be used and completed in Corrections, is different. We're thinking—and also, we've got people's numbers. So, we are thinking there's kind of large numbers here. We're thinking that's going to be two workshops. It could be done in one week. Kelly and I can come out and do that in one week. Then there's some practice stuff folks do post-training. They get feedback from us. It's practice follow-up cases, it's making sure people are adept and skilled at completing the YLS. It's just part of the process. We use that information to nominate master trainers for you all or nominate your pool of people who are looking like they're going to be able to do this really well. Then we'll work with each group to help select master trainers, or just recommend master trainers. Obviously, a master trainer would also probably want to agree to that. They wouldn't be told that they're going to be a master trainer. The YLS training is separate from the case plan training. The case plan training would also cover all of the policy steps. The case plan training is about a day-and-a-half, and that also would be separated between your different groups of personnel.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: This is Jo Lee. I have a quick question.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah?

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: When you talk about dividing probation from corrections, I think our parole officers, from my point of view, kind of fall into those categories, right? Because they'll be using—or, they'll be seeing the YLS as kids are in the correctional facilities, but once the kid hits the street, especially if anything happens where a subsequent petition is filed, then they're really—I mean, they're a parole officer, but they're really acting just like our probation officers do in terms of needing to do that assessment and provide that information to the court, for the purpose of disposing of a new set of charges. So, have there been discussions with John, Ross, or whoever, about how that—how they're going to be divided in the training, or what that's going to look like?

Dr. Gina Vincent: We haven't had that discussion. Oh. Go ahead. Sorry.

John Munoz: This is John. Our mental health counselors are going to be doing the YLS from the parole side. The parole officers are going to be working when they do our—what some people call, treatment team meetings, or child and family team meetings once a month with the institutions, when they sit in and participate in those. So, they're going to know what's going on with those kids while they're in the facility, and will be part of the re-entry planning meetings on the way out. So, there will be some continuity with what the understanding is, and what the direction is and what's going to happen; and when the YLS is done again before

they—at that six-month mark while they're in the facility. So, they'll know what their risk level is and everything else, as they transition out. And then again, once they get on parole.

Dr. Gina Vincent: John, were you thinking of the YPCs doing the YLS re-assessments in the community?

John Munoz: Yes. They will be doing it in the community. So, kind of along the same lines of, I think what Jo Lee was asking about is, maybe combining probation and parole to do those, but the mental health counselors will be primarily doing that when they're in the community with the parole officer. So, the way we have it trained out was for the mental health counselors to be doing it. Does that make sense?

Dr. Gina Vincent: It does. I'm just thinking if your YPCs are only going to be doing re-assessments as opposed to initial assessments, we may be able to give them even a shorter training. They certainly, it sounds like, want to be in the case plan training. It sounds like—it makes perfect sense to combine them with probation for that. So, yeah. We can combine these in whatever way you all would like. That makes sense. Okay. Then the case plan training, which I'm also envisioning would be at least two separate trainings, because even if you put groups together, there's a lot of them. The case plan training is fairly intensive. MAYSI trainer training, which we've got in here, with a note that we need to discuss. I don't know if we need to discuss exactly how we would do that now, it could just be a place holder there—when we get closer and see how many master trainers you have, or you all decide how many master trainers you want from these pilot counties, so we can come up with a solution about what's going to be the most feasible way to train them to be trainers for the rest of your places. Supervisor training, that's something that generally comes a bit later, and it's short. It's about a three-hour training. And, orienting of service providers to the YLS is something that we found to be really key. That's also just a half-day training. Any other suggestions about what we should change in there? It sounds like we'll combine the groups a bit differently in the training. None? Okay. All right. So, Objective Five is getting your folks in the pilot—the pilot folks trained. Objective Six is, now they start using the YLS, or using the software, they're doing the case planning, they're testing it out. There will be some decisions to be made around how long they should test it out. I think Kelly has the best advice about that, so I'm going to turn it over to him in just a second. Then, Objective Seven is simply rolling it out to the rest of your counties. Our goal is to work with you all to set up your pilot counties to be part of that process. Part of the rollout process to everyone else. This would all have policies, provision probation policies, but they may want to share a template [inaudible] templates, dispositions, the physician report, case plans and so on, that will help speed that part up. Kelly, do you want to give your suggestion about the pilot test?

Kelly Clement: Sure. Well, what we found that works best is a minimum of six months in the pilot testing, and that's really a minimum. I know what we have done in regions or areas that weren't in the pilot were getting a little antsy wanting to know what's going on, what are y'all getting to do that we're not doing? Some of them didn't care because they didn't really want to get onboard that quickly. Six-months is a lot of time for the staff who are actually completing YLS, and not only completing it, but utilizing the information, and having to follow these new policies that were written, that give input for change. And so, when you do

bring everybody else on board, obviously you want them to feel like they have input and you'll continue with that, because a lot of the kinks are worked out. We just found it was much more successful when we brought on the [inaudible]. A lot of the minor things that we never saw coming, were ironed out so that it kind of rolled out much more smoothly. It also helps with our master trainers to get a lot more experience and be able to go out and train these other areas as well, and feel more comfortable with the planning and using these tools. So, six months, I think works pretty well, but I definitely wouldn't recommend that we try to roll it out too quickly. I've worked with people who were hoping for a two-month pilot, and it just didn't go very well.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Okay. So, I don't know where you all would like to go from here, but maybe we should ask if there are other further changes to the work plan, or anything that you think is missing, anything that should be added? Then, I think as we said Katie and us—we work with Katie to fill in the timeline.

Commissioner Scott Shick: This is Scott. The role of the master trainers—I see how important it is—

Dr. Gina Vincent: Yeah.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Hey Ross? I just have to say, it would be great to have some master trainers at the state-level, master trainers at the jurisdictional-level, rural-level. [inaudible] potentially have to have master trainers to train the persons coming onboard, correct? Internally?

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Yeah. I think having it all the levels is going to be important, especially some master trainers that perhaps specifically know the corrections application, versus the field application. It would also probably be good—it may be an area where we can tie in the Evidence-Based Resource Center so they have a master trainer, or at least they maintain that roster of master trainers, and we go to that center when meeting a training request.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I don't hear that the state is involved in roll out. I mean, Washoe is in, Carson is in, Douglas. Should the state be in that first group? Or some part of it? I'm just thinking out loud right now.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Yeah. I think it would make sense for the Reno Parole Office to be involved in that pilot discussion.

Commissioner Scott Shick: There you go.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: And perhaps one of the correctional facilities. We can get together—Katie and I will get together with Gina after to see if that makes sense.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I think there might be some wisdom in that.

John Munoz: This is John. My understanding in talking with Katie before is that—and with Kelly before, that we were going to be, because we're much smaller—that we were going to have those people from the state participate, because it doesn't really do a lot of good if there were YLSs being done from the north, and when those kids get committed to us, the proper facilities aren't doing anything with it. So, my understanding was, that there would be some staff from each correctional facility, and parole officers that would be participating in those initial—in that initial pilot group, so that when we get the information, we know what to do with it in the facilities. So, that was my understanding. Katie, if I misunderstood that, please jump in.

Katie Brubaker: No. You are correct, John.

John Munoz: Okay. Thanks, Scott for thinking about us. I appreciate you.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: So, before we leave this agenda item, I'm going to attempt to summarize, by way of a motion, that we approve the implementation work plan with the following modifications. I don't see any modifications to Objectives One, Two, or Three. We have decided to delete 4.1, we're deleting 4.3, we're modifying 4.6, that we will obtain the approval of the statewide draft policy and procedures from this subcommittee. We're modifying 4.8 to read that NYSAP will review and provide feedback to probation departments for their local policies. We're modifying 4.10 to provide that NYSAP will review and provide suggestions for pre-disposition recommendation templates, after receiving any template provided by—for instance, Humboldt County or other counties that are utilizing some templates. I see no corrections to Objectives Five or Six, or Seven, other than, we've agreed that a small workgroup will be involved in drafting the policies under Four, and a small workgroup will be involved in Objective No. 5. Does anybody have corrections to what I've outlined?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: I was going to make a motion.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Yeah. That would have [inaudible] That was a good job.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: So, Pauline, if you're making a motion to approve it as modified?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Yes. I move to approve as modified.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: I will second that motion. Any other discussion? All those in favor Anyone opposed? Thank you very much, Dr. Vincent and Kelly, for your guidance and expertise. We literally could not do it without you.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Thank you very much.

Kelly Clement: Thank you.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: So, Item Number 6. Discuss and Decide Upon Next Steps. I think the next step would be to get some input from Dr. Vincent and Kelly as to when they might need further guidance from us, because I don't really see any tasks that need to be assigned to specific committee members, although it's tempting to assign a bunch to the people who couldn't get on the phone. That's cruel and unusual. We won't go there.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I got an email from Jack Martin, and that there was an emergency that he had to respond to that made him not available today.

Dr. Gina Vincent: I think we came up with at least two workgroups to get started right away, and Katie was going to reach out to people. Some of them might be on the committee here.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Right.

Katie Brubaker: No. I think you're right. This is Katie Brubaker for the record. I think all of the tasks that need to be assigned are actually probably going to me. I will reach out to get policies from Humboldt, and I will work behind the scenes to get the smaller workgroups together for these policies. I will work with NYSAP to fill in and modify this work plan that we just voted on.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: So, realistically, do you think we should gather again in like 45 days? Or do we need to do it sooner? Later?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Does this committee need to be involved at all at this point in the roadshow preparation or decision making? Because that's the next big thing on the agenda, and then having the workgroups work together. My guess is, the workgroups won't have something to present to the committee before late August.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: My feeling is that we do not need to be involved.

Gina Vincent: Okay. Okay. I'm still figuring this out.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Right. Ross, what do you think? And, Scott, what do you think?

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: I think that's good and correct. I think this implementation plan; we can fill in all the boxes and have that informational item to the Commission at the July meeting. Then, really, this group would just want an update in 45 days or so. Then at that point, if in the implementation of the plan there are questions raised, that those could be added to the Agenda from this committee's guidance to Gina and Katie.

Commissioner Scott Shick: I agree with Ross.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: So, if we schedule the meeting mid-August, Dr. Vincent and Kelly, do you think that that's a realistic timeframe to get an update?

Gina Vincent: I'm going to ask Katie. This is Gina. Sorry. I'm going to ask Katie real quick. I would think mid to late August.

Katie Brubaker: This is Katie. I would suggest that we move it to late August. That way, we have an opportunity to perhaps share some information on the roadshow, and have a little bit lengthier of a time to get some stuff ready for you guys.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: So, maybe the week of the 27th?

Commissioner Scott Shick: Yeah.

Gina Vincent: Yep.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: We probably don't want to go to the 31st if Monday the 3rd is Labor Day, because that means we're going to have a hard time getting a quorum.

Commissioner Scott Shick: So, the 28th is a Tuesday.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Here's my suggestion, is that, Sierra, reach out to committee members to see how we get maximum participation on Tuesday the 28th, Wednesday the 29th, or Thursday the 30th.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Okay.

Sierra Fowzer: Perfect. I can do that.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: That would be great. Last Agenda Item is No. 7, Public Comment and Discussion. Anyone wishing to make any public comment?

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: This is Ross. It's not really public comment, but I know that Katie and Sierra had worked to put together a little bit more clear template for Agendas on, what's an action item, and what's just for information. So, it looks like the way this Agenda looks. Or do you have any feedback on that piece of it?

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: I love it.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Yeah. It was great. I would just incorporate names, specific names to whoever is involved.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Okay. Thanks.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Thank you for the work on the Agenda. It really does help busy people like me remember how I'm supposed to run a meeting. So, that's awesome. Thank you, for everybody on the phone. I think we can adjourn. I hope everybody has a great weekend.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Thank you for your leadership, Jo Lee. Appreciate it.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: Okay. Thank you everyone.

Sierra Fowzer: Thank you, everybody.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Thanks, everybody.

Public Comment:

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: This is Ross. It's not really public comment, but I know that Katie and Sierra had worked to put together a little bit more clear template for Agendas on, what's an action item, and what's just for information. So, it looks like the way this Agenda looks. Or do you have any feedback on that piece of it?

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: I love it.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Yeah. It was great. I would just incorporate names, specific names to whoever is involved.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Okay. Thanks.

Committee Report and Other Notes:

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes motioned to have the meeting minutes from May 8th approved. Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith moved this motion and Commissioner Scott Shick seconded the motion.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith motioned to approve the implementation work plan with the discussed modifications. Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes seconded this motion and the motion was approved.