



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
October 22nd, 2018**

Meeting Minutes

Roll Call: Darin Imlay- present; Jack Marin- present; Ross Armstrong- present; Pauline Salla-Smith- present; Scott Shick- present; Dr. Joseph Haas- present; Dr. Gina Vincent- present; Kelly Clement- present; Frank Cervantes- present; Leslie Bittleston- present; Ali Bannister- present; John Munoz- present; Katie Brubaker- present

Public Comment: None

Meeting Minutes:

Commissioner Darin Imlay called the meeting to order on Monday, October 22, 2018 at 9:00 AM.

Dr. Gina Vincent and Mr. Kelly Clement from NYSAP lead the group on this Agenda item.

Dr. Gina Vincent: The latest iteration of the probation policy reflects all of the edits and suggestions that the group agreed to in the last meeting. She said they had a "healthy" discussion about the timing of initial administration and the decision was that in this standard policy the YLS should just be conducted predisposition as is laid out in the legislation, and that if the YLS was conducted more than 90 days before the disposition it would need to be updated prior to the disposition. There will be different methods to complete the YLS predisposition and NYSAP has been working with local probation officers in the pilot counties to help them decide how they will do this. Dr. Vincent said that when reviewing the material, the group had to decide: A) is this something that belongs in the state policy? Is this something where the state wants to prescribe a minimum standard? Or B) this

section doesn't really belong in the state policy, we're just going to leave it up to the local probation offices to make decisions about how they're going to manage this? She stated she would briefly review what the current practice is and what is best practice or what research shows and why things are worded the way they are on the template. The first item Dr. Vincent addressed was that of reassessments. She reminded the group that one of the advantages to using a risk/need assessment tool is that it allows them to measure changes and risk. Adolescents' risk changes over time for most of them. And as it changes, there should be a measure of what their criminogenic need areas are that are going to be priorities for case planning. Conducting reassessments is very important because it allows them to continually update the way that they're managing the case. It allows them to make sure that the youth is just getting what they need, and it also allows them to know when the youth may no longer need their involvement. Reassessments can probably inform whether the case should be closed or whether they want to go back to the court and ask for the case to be terminated early, if that's an option. There is no golden standard about how often reassessments should be conducted, but the general recommendation is that you look to do reassessments in the community every six months or every 180 days. This policy is written for reassessment with the YLS no later than 180 days from disposition, and no later than every 180 days thereafter until probation is concluded. Dr. Vincent asked the group if they thought it was important for the reassessment policy for that minimum standard to include the reassessment policy? Should this say something about how probation offices should be reassessing youth?

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: He did not think it should be in the state policy; they should leave it at the local discretion. They could have a reassessment policy that would generate every 180 days, but the ones in-between could be left up to the independent jurisdictions. Chair Martin, Mr. Cervantes, and Ms. Salla-Smith all agreed 100%.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Nevada law requires you to be reassessed no later than 180 days, at the minimum. You can do reassessments before that, but the law requires the 180 days.

Ali Bannister: Would it be appropriate to use the short YLS reassessment form or did they have to use the entire YLS?

Dr. Gina Vincent: There is no reassessment version of the YLS; she's never seen or heard of it.

Ali Banister: It's a case management form provided by multi-health systems. They use it to reassess level of supervision.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: In Humboldt County they use the YLS score sheet with updated information and how those domains have changed. She would love to have a short reassessment form instead.

Kelly Clement: There's a distinction between reassessment on the YLS and a shorter reassessment that has to do with how your case management is going to change. The

reassessments on the YLS typically are just you go back for a lot of the YLS items and see which ones should still be checked. The short form is a way of tracking differences between the first assessment and the second one.

Dr. Gina Vincent: The topic of life changing events and reassessments. What should be the language in the policy about major life changing events and reassessments? The language now says if there's been a major life changing event that may have an impact on somebody's risk level, that a reassessment be done. It also includes some examples of major life changing events.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Nevada law does say "significant life changing event" but does not define that. Dr. Vincent said the first section should be changed; instead of saying the following exceptions may apply, it should say exceptions may apply with no specific examples and any reassessments done earlier will be left up to the individual probation office's discretion.

Dr. Gina Vincent: YLS reassessments for formal probation violations and/or new charges. There was a discussion about the basis for dispositions and it was decided that if a youth is brought back to court for a major probation violation and a possible DCFS involvement, there should be a recent YLS that is consulted. If new charges are accrued, a reassessment should be conducted if the last one is more than three months old. Dr. Vincent asked about the language surrounding the YLS and cases being closed. Some states require there be a YLS conducted within three months of a case closing and her recommendation is that that language be part of the minimum standard probation policy for Nevada. It has to do a lot with data gathering, looking at outcomes, and looking at programming and evaluating it across the state. What was the group's view on that? The group's views included concerns about drowning in paperwork, funding for the exit assessments, and juvenile justice administrators who would not support the effort just for data collection purposes. The general opinion was that this did not need to be included in the policy at this time. Dr. Vincent asked about supervisory oversight and quality assurance. Should YLS reassessments be reviewed by a supervisor to make sure they are complete, they are putting the comments in and they're doing everything that they're supposed to be doing? If it's one of those off 180-day mark kind of reassessments and there's some discretion involved, should the supervisor help decide whether a reassessment is warranted, A, and B, reviews the reassessment to make sure that they're complete?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: It's part of the fidelity of the YLS to have reassessments reviewed and signed off on. She and others thought there should be language stating all reassessments should be reviewed and approved by the designated supervisor as stipulated in the local probation policy.

Commissioner Scott Shick made a motion to approve the changes in the timing of administration section as per discussion. Commissioner Salla-Smith seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried and was approved unanimously.

Commissioner Gina Vincent: The subject of YLS scoring and the norms. The software is going to allow them to use two different norms. There are norms for the community when you're conducting the YLS in the community, and there are norms for the correctional settings. The norms basically tell you relative to their peers, is the risk level low, moderate, high or very high risk. The risk levels are always relative to peers, and you want to be comparing youth to other kids in the community when you're doing any assessments on probation. And you probably want to be comparing youth to other youth in correctional facilities when you're doing any assessments and corrections. The proposed language is saying that for all probation department assessments, whether it's predisposition or reassessment, you would be using the community norms since your question is always what's this youth's risk in the community.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Where were those norms established and are they are part of the YLS process?

Dr. Gina Vincent: The creators of the YLS have generated the norms and it's computed automatically in their software.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Should they be using the community norms or the correctional norms?

Dr. Gina Vincent: The bottom line is, can the youth safely stay in the community or may they need some kind of secure placement, or may they need some staff secure placement? Even when they're doing reassessments of youth within secure correctional facilities, you're still asking the question when can this youth be safely managed in the community? If that's the philosophy, then the community norms are the ones you would always use unless you have a question as to which level of security does the youth need within a facility.

Commissioner Scott Shick: A question about Nevada's youth camps, where the average stay is about six months. It's important for the camps to understand the YLS and what it means and what it focuses on, but you don't want the camp to give the YLS if it's due. Isn't that up to the probation department, the placing agent?

Dr. Gina Vincent: Who would they want to be responsible for the YLS being conducted when youth are in the camps and is that something that belongs in the policy?

Commissioner Scott Shick: The probation officer should be that person. They could glean information from the camp in respect to whatever is going on and keep everything centralized. Ms. Banister and Ms. Salla-Smith agreed.

Linda Lawlor: Their PO's are required to be informed in how their kids are doing at whatever placement they're at. In part of their case planning they do an update that they call reassessment on the YLS. In Carson, that's part of their duties as far as their case planning. So it's essential for them to know how the kid's doing in the placement and then coming home so they know what to do when the kid comes home. So, it's part of that transition plan back into the community.

Commissioner Scott Shick: In the camps, they use a team approach and although the probation officer might be the one physically scoring the assessment, they're actually gathering all of the information to score from numerous individuals. The evaluation is done pre-placement and then post-placement by the probation department in total cooperation with the camp case management staff.

Dr. Gina Vincent: This would maintain the fidelity of the YLS better if probation is considered the YLS experts. They are the ones who are taught how to do the assessment and they do the reassessment for kids who are in the camp. They are the group that is trained to do this.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: they currently have PO's assigned specifically to China Spring or Aurora Pines, but what about places that don't? Could the reassessment be conducted over the phone?

Ali Bannister: It was reasonable to conduct the assessment over the phone.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Section 16 of AB472 that talks about the case plan puts all the responsibility on the Probation Department and since the law puts all that emphasis on the Department being responsible for that case plan, it makes sense for the Department to execute the YLS.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Their suggestion was that a reassessment be conducted prior to youth being moved out of the facility and that reassessment is going to be used for their re-entry plan or their case plan, what they're going to do when they enter the community. It's not officially a re-entry plan in this case. And then she asked if Probation is going to be responsible for the YLS, whether it's used in the camp or in the community, does the policy need to have some language in it around how soon or what time youth are going to be reassessed before they leave a camp? Dr. Vincent said generally what facilities do is that there's some kind of team meeting. The probation officer is part of that team and the probation officer gets information during that meeting or from phone calls about the youth's progress within the facility. So, they're talking to staff within the facility as well as talking to the youth. This can be done over the phone.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: You have the ability with the YLS to utilize phone calls to get the information needed to do a revised or an updated YLS for their transition home.

Kelly Clement: Another benefit of relying on the probation staff is that they probably have a much better understanding of the resources available in the community that they're returning to. They are already working with the facility staff, anyway, so if they're completing the YLS and seeing the needs, then they'll be that perfect person to put that into play with the actual discharge planning.

Dr. Gina Vincent: There's nothing specific in the language that says anything about Probation being responsible for reassessments while youth are in camps.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: They could craft something along the lines of “probation departments will be responsible for conducting reassessment prior to getting level of their change.”

Dr. Gina Vincent: This could go under the Assessment section and they could say something like “Probation departments will be responsible for conducting a reassessment on non DCFS youth prior to any level of care change.” Dr. Vincent said this might be something to tackle in the future, whether any extra language needs to be in the policy that relates to case planning when youth are in the camps.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Section 16 of AB472 talks about the case planning, and it’s pretty prescriptive on what has to happen. Section 16 is on the Probation Departments, and there’s a subsection about what needs to happen for the youth that are in a county camp.

Dr. Gina Vincent: In order to make things seamless for youth and their families and to do the best kind of treatment planning possible that’s going to address their needs, there should be one single case plan that is going from probation into the placement facility, whatever that may be, and then following the youth back into the community. The case plan should be seamless.

Leslie Bittleston: The camps (China Springs, Spring Mountain) that are not on CaseloadPRO. How will that CaseloadPRO information roll over into the YLS? Those group members who were familiar with camp operations said that the camps did an exceptional job of data gathering and documentation. They might use different terminology, but they are measuring the same things as the YLS.

Commissioner Scott Shick: The camps’ documentation could be rolled into the YLS very easily with a well-trained probation officer.

Dr. Joseph Haas: The case plan when kids go into China Springs continues in the probation file and would presumably be based on input from China Springs. China Springs already does a really good discharge policy that was implemented and formed changes to that case plan.

Commissioner Scott Shick: That’s something definitely for the pilot counties to think about in their interaction with China Springs but it doesn’t impact the entire state.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Moving along to Training and Staff Qualifications. She said one way to handle this would be to just say “every Probation Department will conduct booster training in a manner left up to their own local policy.” She asked if training and staff qualifications belong in the minimum standards?

Commissioner Scott Shick: Absolutely yes. It gives reasonable recommendations for what do they need to train, who needs to be trained, how they need to be trained in respect to the fidelity of the YLS. The qualifications for master trainers should be comprehensive and stated. And could Dr. Vincent give them some more information on master trainers?

Dr. Gina Vincent: The plan is initially they are going to be training everybody. After initial training, anyone who is going to be administering the YLS completes an additional three practice cases, which are scored by NYSAP. Based on those scores, NYSAP recommends potential master trainers. It is helpful if the new master trainers do a training alongside NYSAP at some point because then they're getting an additional level of training. It's an opportunity for NYSAP to observe them and help give them extra feedback. All training materials will be made available to the individual probation offices as well as DCFS and that will be what their master trainers are able to use. That means that master trainers can train new master trainers. Having your own local master trainers is very important to maintain the fidelity of the YLS and to save money. If you are having your own staff train new staff when they come in, they will not need to return to NYSAP for initial training.

Commissioner Jack Martin: Clark County, they are not a pilot county, so who is going to train his 300 staff members? Doesn't Clark County need their own master trainers? Won't they be behind if they don't start training master trainers during Phase 1? Dr. Vincent suggested that Chair Martin select a handful of potential master trainers and send them to the Phase 1 training. Room will be made for them and it will not be a problem.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Do they wanted to include language specifying a minimum of two master trainers for each probation department or did they want to give a percentage, or did they not want a number at all? After a brief discussion, it was decided that the language should be "the probation department will have master trainer(s)" – putting the "s" in parenthesis an S. The discussion moved on to Booster Training. Dr. Vincent stated booster training is considered best practice in maintaining fidelity to any kind of assessment tool. The general recommendation is that you try to have booster training (managed by the master trainers) for your staff every six months. This policy is written for doing a booster training specifically on the YLS scoring twice a year. Booster training can be done in multiple different ways and takes far less time than initial training. The booster training should involve practice on YLS scoring and on how to generate a case plan from the YLS. What many offices do is they have everyone score one practice case. Each probation officer rate its and develops a case plan. There is a whole group staff meeting afterwards, examining answers and best practices and having robust discussion.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: I understood the intent of the booster trainings but was concerned that it might be overload. There are already several new trainings that have been placed on Detention Centers and Probation Departments in addition to already state mandated trainings.

Commissioner Scott Shick: He didn't think necessary if you have your master trainings to have somebody come in and retrain every six months.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Did the group want anything stated about booster training in the state policy? Again, a kind of minimum standard?

Commissioner Scott Shick: It was important to have a minimum standard regarding booster training as it relates to the fidelity. They're talking about their existing master trainers just

doing a quick review with the staff that initiate the YLS on a weekly basis every six months, and that's to the discretion of the jurisdiction.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: A better way to phrase this piece of the policy would be that "booster training should be offered twice a year" without a mandate. If staff members were doing excellent jobs, then they wouldn't need the booster training.

Dr. Gina Vincent: That's not necessarily so. There is a phenomena known as rater drift where skills start to drift over time. Even clinicians need booster training around some assessment tools. That's why booster training is a recommended part of policy.

Commissioner Jack Martin: Is there is online training that they could use for booster training that somebody could take at their own speed that allows them to work on some of their maybe deficiencies? Would that exist or is this in-person only?

Dr. Gina Vincent: There is no online booster training from NYSAP at this time.

Commissioner Jack Martin: Would it be possible that they could record a booster training?

Dr. Gina Vincent: NYSAP could support booster training in supplying practice case vignettes.

Dr. Joseph Haas: There is always the risk of drift and booster training is required to combat that drift. If you mandate the training, then the question comes up which training meets the criteria for state law? But they could classify it so that each jurisdiction can comply with the law and then do meaningful booster training.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Dr. Haas's points were very well taken. She sees booster training as a part of quality assurance, but it's like a special part of quality assurance. And the general best practice recommendation is that you have booster training for your staff at least once a year regardless of how you want to implement that. There's many ways of implementing it so that it's not a heavy lift. It could even be something that's offered state-wide one time a year so that it's not up to the individual probation departments to put it together.

Unknown Speaker: If everyone would be okay with once a year if it was a technology kind of platform? She reminded them they do have the resource center that could host the actual training or booster training, and then it would just require some coordination for the master trainers to receive those sample vignettes and score the people who are doing those trainings. This would be a happy medium where people are still getting the training once a year. If it's offered on a webinar people can access those, January through March, on their own time so long as they do it once a year. The coordination piece would be something to work on, but at least it would give everyone an option at their convenience to do it.

Dr. Joseph Haas: It would be important for each person to submit a sample YLS report through a vignette that would be reviewed by the master trainer, because in the end, even with the training, you're still going to have to review the vignettes individually. If that was a webinar-based training that would be a good thing. The main activity is doing a vignette,

making sure that people are still accurate with respect to the vignette and giving individual feedback and remediation to folks who are struggling with the vignette.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: In looking at the paragraph under booster training it sounded like folks were ready to replace “twice” with “once” and get rid of that parenthetical after the word year. The rest of the language makes sense because it says you’ve got to be demonstrating the “acceptable level of competence” but there’s flexibility in there about exactly how the training is conducted and that type of thing. Dr. Vincent thought they should say “should be offered once a year using what’s outlined in the local Probation Policy.”

Commissioner Jack Martin made a motion to approve the changes in the Training and Staff Qualifications and Booster Training sections as per discussion. Commissioner Scott Shick seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried and was approved unanimously.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Moving on to how the YLS is used in recommendations and decisions. She said she cut down all of the language to give sort of a minimum standard if the group wants it to be in the state policy. Dr. Vincent started with Predisposition Recommendations. She said there are a couple of decisions to make, including what type of information is going to be conveyed to the court from the YLS and how that information is going to be conveyed. What’s the minimum standard type of information that should be conveyed? In her opinion, the minimum amount of information should be shared with the court. And where to use primary or priority criminogenic need areas? They contribute to the risk for recidivism, along with a narrative description of what those look like for that particular youth. This is the probation officer specifying to the court the priorities for this youth. NYSAP recommends that the probation officers, based on the information they’re getting from the YLS, are prioritizing those need areas for the court rather than sharing with the court the simple graphs that get spit out from the YLS. They are in the best position to prioritize those for the court rather than giving the court a graph. NYSAP recommends the probation officers prioritize areas that need to be addressed for the court rather than share a risk assessment scoresheet with someone who hasn’t been necessarily trained how to complete that assessment or interpret it.

Dr. Joseph Haas: They could put this in the same arena with the answers to the personality inventory which they do not share. Mr. Cervantes said the public defenders would request the information and that when Dr. Vincent met with the public defenders she could explained that it’s not as if the raw data is going to be biased towards one side of the courtroom or the other.

Unknown Speaker: DCFS is creating some informational webinars about this reform, including information about the YLS. There will be two separate webinars – one for judges and one for attorneys, so this would be an avenue to convey that information.

Commissioner Scott Shick: There were legal reasons to protect the YLS scoresheet because those who aren’t trained to interpret the YLS might misinterpret and it would lead to incrimination or a bad portrayal for a kid. There was a discussion about the legalities of

keeping YLS information from public defenders and the prevailing view was that public defenders should have access to all the information that probation does.

Dr. Gina Vincent: There's no reason public defenders shouldn't be allowed access to everything; it's about their client. This language is dictating just the information that should be shared with the court and that includes prosecutors.

Commissioner Scott Shick: They should leave this decision up to the court's discretion regarding the YLS questions and answers. If the public defender feels so strongly that he or she needs to have that information, let them put that before the court. The information shouldn't be allowed right off the bat. It's confidential mental health information and the probation officers that are trained in the process are going to be well equipped to present that information. And if there's a contest, then let the judge decide.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: Washoe County's reports include all of the questions that are part of the assessment and how they were answered, and that's given to all parties.

Dr. Gina Vincent: It's important when they're talking to judges and attorneys that they be aware of where their role is particularly important in the checks and balances. It's important that the public defender asks the questions about how the YLS was conducted and that it was conducted in a valid manner, not necessarily nitpicking the items.

Linda Lawlor: They've been attaching the YLS to their reports for quite some time and they've never been questioned by the attorneys or the judge about how they're asking the questions or about the questions and outcomes themselves.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: They also attach the scoresheet for the YLS with their dispositions. If they don't have a YLS completed, it's continued before a court decision is made.

Dr. Gina Vincent: It would be hard to change current practice if people are already attaching the YLS scoresheets to their reports. The important part is that probation is giving the very specific information about what are the priority criminogenic need areas to the judge because probation should be selecting and presenting those. Rather than just saying to the judge the needs are high here and medium here, it should involve a level of interpretation for Probation to say the priority need areas that we think we need to target for this youth are A, B and C and we are recommending A, B and C to address those. Dr. Vincent went on to say the way that information is shared with the court is critically important, so whatever decisions the group makes going forward with the policy template are significant.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Once people start using the YLS it's really hard to argue the recommendations unless you're just arguing to get people off and not the help they need. It captures risk and needs. It doesn't just allow probation to escalate kids in the system if that information is not there. They are reforming the justice system to make sure they're rehabilitating kids, so it captures that information to make sure they get the services they need. When you get to court and your post plea and your predisposition, it captures what they

need. She reminded the group that this is the first go-round for the policy and if necessary, it can be revised.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith made a motion to accept the information in the How the YLS Is Used in Recommendations and Decisions sections as per discussion. Mr. Shick seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried and was approved unanimously.

Dr. Gina Vincent: The decisions about how the YLS is going to be used are fairly important and they did not have enough time to cover everything in the time remaining for the meeting. After a brief confab, it was decided that another meeting would be scheduled for Monday, November 5th 9:00 to 12:00. The discussion moved on to Probation Supervision Level. Nevada law already states that the YLS will drive the supervision levels on probation. Dr. Vincent said they could approve a less prescriptive state probation policy that simply says that the YLS risk level will be used to assign the supervision level while you draw on probation. Probation policies will follow best practices as suggested by the risk/need responsivity framework, which means lower-risk youths shall receive very few contacts and high-risk youths shall receive more. Supervision should not be simply about surveillance. It will instead be a quality or an evidence-based contact, which means that probation is actually working on the criminogenic need areas with that in mind.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: The case management piece of the YLS, especially with the timeframes utilized, helps you make a qualitative versus just the compliance check-in.

Dr. Gina Vincent: They could change the language to “qualitative contact” or “quality contact” as opposed to just surveillance. It wouldn’t be a mandate, it’s would just say probation departments should consider instituting policies related to that.

Dr. Joseph Haas: If they used “evidence-based” then it would be incumbent on the probation department to show that it’s evidence-based in some way and that the contacts are designed with a purpose.

Dr. Gina Vincent: It would be okay to just say “related to quality contacts” so supervision is not simply about surveillance. The last sentence could be supervision levels will be adjusted either up or down based on the progress of the case and a YLS reassessment following supervisor’s approval.

Dr. Gina Vincent: A more prescriptive state probation policy would actually specify the number of face-to-face contacts and other types of contacts based on the youth’s risk level. Did the group like that option? The group did not like that option and a motion for the less prescriptive version was made.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith made a motion to approve the less prescriptive version of Probation Supervision Level information section as per discussion. Commissioner Ross Armstrong seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried and was approved unanimously.

Dr. Gina Vincent: If the group thought it would be beneficial to add something about what's too much supervision?

Kelly Clement: Perhaps they could attach some research on what evidence-based probation contacts are and what is considered best practice.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Contacts are not always about accountability, but they're strength-based contacts. He thought they should never minimize that kind of contact even with the low-risk child that's responding favorably.

Dr. Gina Vincent: The case plan portion of the YLS is good in some ways. It serves certain functions when it comes to risk/need in particular. It's a good basis, but not really necessarily specific. Any case plan they adopt should really follow the risk/need responsivity framework and the criminogenic needs that are in the case plan need to be driven by the YLS. The only downside of the YLS is that it doesn't have sections for overall broad goals and activities and protective strengths.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: There are some things that are definitely not part of the YLS case plan that are necessary to assess appropriate case management. The law is very prescriptive about the case plan, and there's certain things that have to be in it if they're going to DCFS or they're going to a county camp.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Suggestion would be not to lose anything that the YLS case plan has. Like the essential elements of the YLS case plan are essential, but then it's minimalistic in that most agencies end up customizing it slightly. But you don't want to lose the whole R&R nature of it. She asked if the idea is to go into CaseloadPRO so that everybody is using the same format?

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: No, everyone was not. She thought they would have to have a template and then they would have to get a cost from CaseloadPRO on how much that would cost. There's no template yet.

Dr. Gina Vincent: Many states are using a single case plan that goes from probation to DCFS to Parole. So, it's the same format that's just updated by each agency or group that's getting involved with this youth and the family. Has there been discussion about this? Has it already been decided? Is this something the group needs to decide and make a recommendation to the Commission about, if it hasn't been decided or discussed? A single case plan is ideal because if Probation has the youth first and then they get to DCFS following some major probation violation or a new offense and DCFS is doing something completely different, maybe even having the youth do some of the same things Probation had him do, then they're wasting time and not making great progress.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Using NAJA to come up with a recommendation feeding off the YLS case plan might be the solution. He recommended that they move forward with that to the next NAJA meeting and table the discussion for now.

Commissioner Daren Imlay: This was an excellent suggestion and the case plan format discussion was tabled.

The next step is the meeting scheduled for Monday, November 5th 9:00 to 12:00.

Committee Report and Other Notes:

Commissioner Scott Shick made a motion to approve the changes in the timing of administration section as per discussion. Commissioner Pauline Sala-Smith seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried and was approved unanimously.

Commissioner Jack Martin made a motion to approve the changes in the Training and Staff Qualifications and Booster Training sections as per discussion. Commissioner Scott Shick seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried and was approved unanimously.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith made a motion to accept the information in the How the YLS Is Used in Recommendations and Decisions sections as per discussion. Commissioner Scott Shick seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried and was approved unanimously.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith made a motion to approve the less prescriptive version of Probation Supervision Level information section as per discussion. Commissioner Ross Armstrong seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried and was approved unanimously.

Commissioner Scott Shick made a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Jack Martin seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried and was approved unanimously.