



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

**Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission
Strategic Plan Committee Meeting
1/11/18
Meeting Minutes **DRAFT****

Call to Order: Co-Chair, Frank Cervantes called the meeting to order at 10:06am.

Roll Call:

Members Present Via Phone: Co-Chair Frank Cervantes, Co-Chair Judge William Voy, Co-Chair Dr. Lisa Morris Hibbler, Eve Hanan, Senator Julia Ratti, Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Captain Shawn Andersen

Staff Present Via Phone: Leslie Bittleston, Sarah Bellows

Guests Present Via Phone: Shanelle Johnson- CSG; Matthew Vanovich- Juvenile Services

Public Comment: None

Review Minutes from 11/17/17 Meeting

Judge William Voy moved, seconded by Assemblyman James Ohrenschall. The minutes are accepted as written, with no amendments necessary.

Overview of Strategic Plan Requirements

Chief Bittleston gave the committee a brief update regarding this committee's specific duties. One of the first things this committee is tasked with completing is the selection of Evidence Based Standards.

Alexis Tucey from the Director's Office has taken on the task of updating the Strategic Plan as a working document, amended as needed with each committee. This committee will, after choosing an Evidence Based Program Model to follow, also develop policies and procedures for utilization of Evidence Based Programming, select and implement a training model, determine

policies and procedures for reporting requirements and finally, develop and revise (as necessary) the 5-year Strategic Plan.

Overview and Review of Evidence Based Standards

A major focus for this Strategic Plan Committee right now is the selection of Evidence Based Program Models by Vendors. There was an example document shared with the group that shows how various other states define evidence based programs and practices for their juvenile justice system (Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Florida, Utah and Washington).

Co-Chair Cervantes questioned the flexibility of counties within the state having programming that is not particularly Evidence Based but considered “promising.” He asked this using an example that some rural areas may have programs that work well for the youth in their system, but the program has not necessarily been validated as Evidence Based. Mr. Cervantes would like to inquire more information about the potential use of other tools.

Chief Bittleston has the understanding that all programs must go through the evaluation process to become Evidence Based, if they are not already.

Co-Chair Judge Voy clarified that not every program needs to be Evidence-Based immediately. There is a phase in period where counties will have time to either validate the current tool they are using, or switch over to the tools selected by the committees of this Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission.

Chief Bittleston followed up that this phase in approach will last until 2022. If counties are currently using programs that are not validated, Ms. Bittleston suggested that the groups begin the process of validating those programs now, so by the 2022 cutoff, they are still able to use said programs.

Co-Chair, Dr. Hibbler informed the group that the bar is set high for programs to be deemed Evidence Based. This takes substantial and extensive research, so she suggests that programs currently being used that are not validated, get with a partner as soon as possible to take the steps to become Evidence Based.

Co-Chair Cervantes mentioned concern regarding unethical practices in a control group, such as Sex Offender treatment. Another concern brought forward involves parents. If counties within the state are hosting classes for parents, there is no way to track recidivism or the outcome for that population/demographic. This causes concern as the co-chairs of this committee recognizes that current programs may not all be Evidence-Based or can become Evidence-Based.

Co-Chair Judge Voy and Co-Chair Cervantes are in agreeance that it is nearly impossible to run

a social program where all elements are Evidence-Based.

Co-Chair Dr. Hibbler used a term called “promising practice.” This is a term used for programs that have not been scientifically or statistically proven to be successful, but the program is working toward compliance to become Evidence-Based. While some Evidence-Based programs may work in a specific community, may not fit in other counties or areas throughout the state. It is important to reflect what is best for the state, not just individual or larger counties.

Commissioner Hanan verified that specific state funds for specific programs must be evidence-based. However, with diversion methods and other desirable outcomes, Ms. Hanan is concerned that specific funds and general funds may overlap or intervene with one another.

Co-Chair Judge Voy suggested looking at the states of Florida, Nebraska, and Washington’s reforms, and taking what is ideal from those reforms and creating our own for the state of Nevada.

Shanelle Johnson from CSG would be happy to help connect this Committee with contacts in the states mentioned above. Ms. Johnson will share this contact information with Co-Chair Cervantes.

Next Steps

There has been a vendor identified for the Evidence-Based Resource Center, which will be the research component of this Assembly Bill, going to the Board of Examiners some time in February. The vendor will then gather programs that are already Evidence-Based and will add information to a website for reference.

A date and time for the next meeting will be determined.

Public Comment: None

Adjourned: by Co-Chair Frank Cervantes at 11:01am, moved and seconded by the committee members.