BRIAN SANDOVAL
Governor

RICHARD WHITLEY, MS
Director

ROSS E. ARMSTRONG
Administrator

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

PUBLIC NOTICE

MEETING OF THE NEVADA STATE JUVENILE JUSTICE OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

STRATEGIC PLAN COMMITTEE MEETING

AGENDA

DATE: Thursday, July 12, 2018

TIME: 10:00am

LOCATION: Teleconference

TELECONFERENCE LINE: 1-888-557-8511
ACCESS CODE: 4395904

CONFERENCE WEB LINK: **https://join.me/onstrategy6**

- *Items may be taken out of order, may be combined for consideration by the public body, and/or may be pulled or removed from the agenda at any time to accomplish business in the most efficient manner.*
- *"For Information" items are informal in nature and may include discussion and ideas*
- *"For Possible Action" items may be voted on or approved by members of the commission.*

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order –** Frank Cervantes, Dr. Lisa Morris Hibbler, Judge William Voy

2. **Welcome and Introductions (Roll Call) –** DCFS Staff

3. **Public Comment and Discussion** *(Action may not be taken on any matter brought up under this Agenda item until scheduled on an Agenda for a later meeting)*

4. **For Possible Action:** Review and Approval of Outstanding Minutes – Frank Cervantes, Dr. Lisa Morris Hibbler, Judge William Voy
    - Review and approve meeting minutes from 01/11/2018
    - Review and approve meeting minutes from 02/06/2018
    - Review and approve meeting minutes from 03/22/2018
    - Review and approve meeting minutes from 04/05/2018
    - Review and approve meeting minutes from 04/19/2018
    - Review and approve meeting minutes from 05/03/2018
    - Review and approve meeting minutes from 05/17/2018
    - Review and approve meeting minutes from 05/31/2018

5. **For Possible Action:** Discuss and Decide Upon Next Steps – Frank Cervantes, Dr. Lisa Morris Hibbler, Judge William Voy
    - Assign Tasks to Committee Members (if needed)
    - Specify Agenda Items for the Next Meeting
    - Confirm Next Meeting Date/Time
        i. Discuss and vote on frequency of Strategic Plan Meetings

6. **Public Comment and Discussion** *(Action may not be taken on any matter brought up under this Agenda item until scheduled on an Agenda for a later meeting)*

7. **Adjourn**

CHAIRPERSON MAY CALL FOR A BREAK AT THEIR DISCRETION

We are pleased to provide special accommodation assistance to persons with disabilities who wish to attend. Notify Katie Brubaker in writing at the Division of Child and Family Services, 4126 Technology Way, 3rd Floor, Carson City, NV 89706, or by calling (775) 684-7965 no later than three (3) business days prior to the meeting date. Supporting materials may be obtained at the above address or by contacting Katie Brubaker at (775) 684-7965.

This notice and Agenda has been sent to be posted at the following locations, in accordance with NRS Chapter 241:

State of Nevada- Division and Child Family Services
Website- http://dcfs.nv.gov/Programs/JJ_OC/2018_Agendas_and_Minutes/

State of Nevada- Nevada Public Notices
Website- www.nv.gov

1. Leslie Bittleston, Division of Child and Family Services, 4126 Technology Way, 3rd Floor, Carson City, NV 89706
2. Nevada Youth Parole Bureau, 751 Ryland Street, Reno, NV 89502
3. Grant Sawyer Building, 555 Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, NV 89101
4. Elko Juvenile Court, 665 W. Silver Street, Elko, NV 89801

THIS NOTICE AND AGENDA HAS BEEN SENT TO THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS:

5. Clark County District Attorney, 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, NV 89101
6. Division of Child and Family Services, 475 W. Haskell St. #7, Winnemucca, NV 89445

Notices are also sent to all Juvenile Probation Departments, Youth Camps, and Youth Correctional Centers
POSTED: July 5, 2018

BRIAN SANDOVAL
Governor

RICHARD WHITLEY, MS
Director

KELLY WOOLDRIDGE
Administrator

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.

BRIAN SANDOVAL
Governor

RICHARD WHITLEY, MS
Director

KELLY WOOLDRIDGE
Administrator

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
February 6, 2018

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Welcome and Introductions. Judge William Voy called the meeting to order at 1:30 PM.

Roll Call: Judge William Voy – present, Dr. Lisa Morris Hibbler - not present, Frank Cervantes – not present, Eve Hanan – present, Assemblyman James Ohrenschall – present, Captain Shawn Anderson – present, John Lambros – not present,

Others: Leslie Bittleston, Kelly Wooldridge

Public Comment and Discussion
None.

Update/Review of Strategic Plan Requirements

- **Alexis Tucey – Director's Office**

Ms. Tucey was not in attendance. Ms. Bittleston stated that there are some facilitators on the line that will be joining the meeting.

Ms. Wooldridge stated that in the beginning we talked about getting some help with facilitating and writing the strategic plan. She introduced Erica Olsen and Lorna Shepard from OnStrategy. Ms. Olsen and Ms. Shepard discussed their services and their role to the group. Ms. Shepard noted that the deadline for the Plan is July 1, 2018.

Ms. Shepard noted that DCFS staff sent a power point to the members of this committee titled JJOC Strategic Planning Kickoff. She reviewed process, approach, logistics, how to meet, who should be at the planning table, assumptions, and questions they need to answer if there is time.

- She reviewed the names of the members of this Committee and their advisors
- She and Ms. Olsen are co-leading this project. They will both be up-to-date on everything, but possibly not attending the same meetings. They will also have a project manager, Tim Robb.
- She asked who else should be on the planning team. Who are the stakeholders? Judge Voy said there has been conversation about concentrating just on the mandated areas

from the statute, so we can get through this by the deadline. Get that done and then look at other topic areas. Some of the mandated areas are technical. He suggested that youth could possibly be involved in some areas, but not sure about technical areas. Leslie Bittleston stated that we only have four youth members at this time. There is a youth subcommittee meeting on February 9, 2018. She can query the youth about joining this subcommittee. Ms. Shepard suggested bringing youth in for specific topics. Assemblyman Ohrenschall would like to hear from youth from Caliente or Elko about what they thought worked for them and what did not work for them. Ms. Wooldridge said we can make that happen whether they are on the youth committee or not.

- They are breaking things up into four phases:
  1. Establishing the Strategic Framework. Ms. Shepard listed what they want to work through in February.
  2. Design Strategy. There was discussion about the approach of meetings to nail priorities and make decisions. Assemblyman Ohrenschall suggested meeting following full JJOC meetings via video conferencing, north and south. Ms. Shepard asked Judge Voy what he thinks about doing a half-day session to get everything done. He thinks we should do that early on. OnStrategy will come back with a recommendation of the options. A doodle poll will be sent for the first half- day session between February 26, 2018 and the week of March 12, 2018. They will also schedule the one-on-one interviews.
  3. Build the Plan & Roadmap.
  4. Manage Performance. TBD.

After knowing the process, when do we plug in other stakeholders? Ms. Wooldridge stated that not all the county chiefs and directors of probation are on this committee, but she thinks a lot of them that are not on this commission would have a lot of input. We might want to consider them.

Ms. Shepard reviewed some of the planning assumptions. She asked if the plan is to be approved or submitted by July 1, 2018? Judge Voy stated that he thinks the strategic plan needs to be approved by the JJOC by July 1, 2018 when submitted. Ms. Wooldridge read that portion of AB472. Ms. Shepard stated that we need to have our eyes on a final approval date before July 1, 2018, perhaps at the June meeting. Dates will be coordinated.

Ms. Shepard asked how decisions are made with this subcommittee. Is it unanimous? Judge Voy said if we hold out for that, then we will never get this done. Would it be a super majority then, or who would decide? Ms. Wooldridge suggested talking about this at the full JJOC meeting. Part of the issue is that bylaws have not been written for the JJOC yet.

Any other assumptions? Judge Voy stated we need to have the full Commission vote on what they want it to look like and then we need to implement the strategy to make it happen. Ms. Shepard stated she thinks we will have to come back to the full Commission in intervals – like sometime in phase 2. She is hearing that we need to come to the full Commission with roadmap milestones, not just the finished plan. Judge Voy agreed.

Regarding content – the four core principles are not necessarily the framework for this strategic plan – youth validator risk and needs assessment, implement programs and services proven to

reduce recidivism, collaborate across system ? needs, tailor supervision/services ? developmental needs. Ms. Shepard's understanding is that these are not our only strategic priorities. Judge Voy said it was included but not limited to that language. This bill was thrown together quickly. The subcommittee is working on requests for modifications to this statute. Ms. Shepard said we will have to decide if there are additional principles or are there strategic priorities that are at higher level under which these core principles fall? Are there other strategic priorities? They will define that.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall said there is a program in Las Vegas, The Harbor, that tries to keep youth from getting into the courtroom and being adjudicated a delinquent child. He believes it would be great as part of our strategic plan to see if we are succeeding keeping youth from being in the delinquency system. He would like to see that as part of the plan.

Ms. Shepard asked if there are other decisions that have been made by this group regarding the plan strategy.

Judge Voy thought this group had some guidance from the last full commission meeting but no guidance on the nuts and bolts. Ms. Bittleston said the last committee meeting of this group talked a lot about evidence-based practices. No total decisions have been made. Ms. Shepard said they will hear a lot of opinions in the interviews and then they will figure out what decisions need to be made.

- **Discuss outline and/or assignments**

Overview and Review of Evidence Based Standards

Next Steps
OnStrategy will discuss issues in their one to one interviews and represent that from the data research that they have.
Assemblyman Ohrenschall suggested OnStrategy look at the minutes from the hearing on the bill. A lot of what the First Lady and a lot of stakeholders said is on the record of the testimony on the bill.
At the full commission meeting on Friday, we are going to talk about how stakeholders want to be involved in the whole thing.
OnStrategy will start to schedule the one to one interviews.

- **Set Date and Time for Next Meeting**
  Ms. Shepard will do a doodle poll to get the date of the first half day session. That will be late February or early March.

Public Comment and Discussion
None.
Adjourn. Judge Voy adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:25 PM.

BRIAN SANDOVAL
Governor

RICHARD WHITLEY, MS
Director

KELLY WOOLDRIDGE
Administrator

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

Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission
Strategic Plan Committee Meeting
03/22/2018
Meeting Minutes DRAFT

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

Roll Call:
Via Phone: Judge Egan Walker, Dr. Lisa Morris Hibbler, Frank Cervantes, Eve Hanan, Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Captain Shawn Anderssn, Joey Orduna Hastings, Lorna Shepard – OnStrategy, Leslie Bittleston, Sarah Bellows, Katie Brubaker
Absent: Judge William Voy, Carlos McDade, John Lambrose, Kelly Wooldridge

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

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

Topics of Strategic Plan Outline:

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

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

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

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

Initial observations from the members.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Planning Sessions for Entire Strategic Plan – OnStrategy

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

New Business None

Next Steps:

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

Public Comment: none

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

BRIAN SANDOVAL
Governor

RICHARD WHITLEY, MS
Director

KELLY WOOLDRIDGE
Interim Administrator

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 04/05/18

Meeting Minutes DRAFT

Call to Order: Sarah Bellows called the meeting to order at 10am.

Roll Call:

Via Phone: Judge Egan Walker, Lorna Shepard – On Strategy, Nina Salomon and Shanelle Johnson from CSG, Frank Cervantes, Dr. Lisa Morris Hibbler

Absent: Judge William O. Voy, Eve Hanan, Captain Shawn Andersen, John Lambrose, Assemblyman James Ohrenschall

Staff Present: Sarah Bellows, Leslie Bittleston, Katie Brubaker, John Munoz

Public Comment: None

This meeting will be discussion only; there was not a quorum.

Evidence Based Practice Definitions Matrix – Lorna Shepard from OnStrategy

Ms. Shepard presented the slides from her presentation and focused on the Evidence Based Practice Matrix starting on slide four. Ms. Shepard informed the committee that they had previously discussed the concept of Evidence Based Practice Definitions, and how they should handle them. Lorna summarized some of the key decisions. The first thing that was decided at the last meeting two weeks ago was that the Evidence Based Practice should include Promising Practices. Lorna continued to go over each slide of the Evidence Based Practice Definitions Matrix.

What constitutes as a definition for Evidence Based Practice and accessing resources to help with research on how to determine this was discussed by various members in attendance.

It was recommended to change the heading from 'Promising Program' to 'Evolving Practice'. It was recommended that Ms. Shepard send out a modified, slightly updated, matrix that shows a spectrum of Evidence Based Programs to send out to the rest of the counties; all feedback should be in by the 13th for it to be included in the agenda and be presented at the next session. The subcommittee did not have a quorum to vote, and it was decided that a vote will be taken to accept the matrix at the April 19th session.

Discussion of Cross-Systems and Provider/Probation Collaboration Principles - Lorna Shepard from OnStrategy

Ms. Shepard moved on to slide 8, and briefly went over the list of Principles. Whether or not to include the list of Principles along with the Matrix was discussed by various members in attendance.

It was decided to finalize and iron out the Matrix first before adding the Principles. There will be a placeholder for the Principles if the committee decides to include it later.

Ms. Shepard moved on to slide 10, and briefly went over why including guidelines or principles of collaboration may or may not be needed or required in the plan. Defining and/or articulating a process for Collaboration, or if having the JJOC in place already satisfactorily meets this expectation was briefly discussed by various members in attendance. It was decided to include a definition of the JJOC to meet this expectation.

Next Steps

- Next meeting will be: Thursday, April 19, 2018
    - Will be held in Las Vegas, Charleston Campus, Building 7 from 12:30-4:30pm
    - Half-day meeting

Ms. Shepard informed that not everyone has to physically be in Vegas; Committee members can also teleconference in. In addition to finalizing the Matrix at the next meeting, Lorna will publish a list of strategies sharing what the State's recommended principles, policies, and criteria are, and the committee members' job will be to identify what the rollout expectations from the counties are, and to go over 3 or 4 of the list of the nine strategies the Counties need to rollout and execute.

- Nine Strategies:
    1. Violation of Youth Parole
    2. Placement of Youth Committed to DCFS - Admission Determination Procedures
    3. Family Engagement
    4. Court Findings Prior to Commitment

5. Individual Case Plan - Case Planning for Re-Entry
6. Out-of-State Placement
7. Release of Information/Information-Sharing
8. System Information Requirement
9. Length of Stay

Ms. Shepard informed that she will acquire the complete list from Ms. Brubaker and send it out to the committee members.

Public Comment: None.

Adjourned: at 11:30 am.

BRIAN SANDOVAL
Governor

RICHARD WHITLEY, MS
Director

KELLY WOOLDRIDGE
Administrator

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
and the
Strategic Plan Committee Meeting
04/19/18
Meeting Minutes
DRAFT

Call to Order: Co-chair Commissioner Cervantes 12:32pm

Roll Call: Co-Chair Frank Cervantes, Co-Chair Judge William Voy, Eve Hanan, Brigid Duffy, Judge Egan Walker, Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Pauline Salla-Smith, Joey Orduna Hastings, Scott Shick, John Munoz, Kelly Wooldridge, Katie Brubaker, Sarah Bellows, Lorna Shepard and Erica Olsen- OnStrategy, Nina Soloman- CSG, Dr. Joe Haas- Washoe County.

Noted: Plenty members for the quorum.

Public Comment: None

Ms. Shepard: In June we will go to the Commission with a draft plan. Big themes to go over today.
-Decide definition of Evidence-Based Practices.
-Choose a matrix option.
-Agreement to goals.
-Identify initiatives, timing, roadmap roles.
-Get clarity on responsibilities for JJOC for implementation oversight.
-Clarify the counites roles and responsibilities and the recommended timing with things in plan and AB472.

Working Draft of the Plan

Identify the purpose of the JJOC and its Strategic Plan. Establish procedures for measuring outcomes. Selecting a Risk Assessment Tool. Develop a Mental Health Screening tool, Contract with a vendor for training and support.

Develop the Strategic Plan

Establish policies and procedures for the Division, and each department of the Juvenile Justice System for the use Evidence-Based Practices. (Asks Commissioners) Think of what the plan does not cover so far, to add to it.

Commissioner Cervantes: Simplify the plan is my advice. Try to remove some complexity and stick with what we know and can achieve.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Explains, the JJOC establishes policies.
Concerns in the plan:

- Supervision
- Family Engagement
- Case Planning
- Matrix for Parole
- Getting to what our definitions are for Evidence-Based what it will look like in the next 5 years. Bill sates four years to get to 100% for state funding.
-

Commissioner Cervantes: (Asks Commissioners) Is there a requirement for Evidence-Based to extend to collaterals? It must use State funding

Commissioner Judge Voy: Is Medicaid included as State funding?

Commissioner Wooldridge: A JJOC kid should.

Commissioner Judge Voy: It comes down to answering, are we serving the best possible services to our kids. We need the best services to be presented on the Evidence-Based Practices Matrix.

Commissioner Judge Walker: Recommends doing a layout from current level of practicality to aspirational. Issue is dollars to establish and maintain fidelity. Medicaid does not have to pay for that. Funding through the center means giving an offer to kids. Medicare might stop serving Juvenile Justice kids. It will not work to get providers to change to Evidence-Based.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Bigger picture, if we do it now and have less kids committed, less kids getting costly residential, the goal would be to re-invest that funding down to lower services.

Commissioner Judge Voy: I want to see something about fixing our Medicaid reimbursement rate for out of home placements. Part of the plan should include getting that fixed. Explains this would give a push towards changing it possibly in Legislation.

Commissioners: Agree

Commissioner Wooldridge: We have put effort to look at that current system.

Ms. Shepard: There are a lot of funding things that need to be looked at in different aspects of the plan. Passes out two documents dated for April 5 and April 16.

Regarding April 5th

CVC Draft: Includes idea of Evidence-based practices, and to consider the State to fund.

Regarding April 16th

Revision-
Commissioner Cervantes: Explains, we want Evidence-based programs to funnel money back down to the system by good programming. Asks, so what qualifies as reimbursement funding through the state? It originally said promising practice, we modified to say evolving practices. We need an Evidence-based model to look at treatments. We need to find what we want to include for the funding part of the matrix.

Dr. Haas: When you do a meta-analysis program the package needs to be cognitive. And family programming needs to be consistent to research. Goal is to move more programming into the matrix. Build it, and people will come. Include elements supported by the research.

Commissioner Judge Walker: Has NAJJA approved this?

Commissioner Cervantes: A drafted version, but I do not see it as being an issue.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Talking about the section of Internal Validity being the one with Anecdotal Evidence Sound Theory but no research? (Asking Dr. Haas)

Dr. Haas: We don't want to discourage homegrown programs. As we develop practices there should be less and less anecdotal programs. Instead there should be Evidence-based programs suggested for providers to use.

Nina Soloman: Under this category you would be able to fund everything. If you keep this in place everything will have to eventually meet the Evidence-based criteria. You are creating a system where almost every program is going to be qualified as Evidence-based for receiving the funding.

Commissioner Cervantes: you have to have access to those programs and they have to be accessible to all jurisdictions of the state. There needs to be a menu of programs.

Dr. Haas: That could make sense. Some of the counties the amount you give them might not be enough to establish or run an Evidence-based practice. Once support is there, there would be no excuse of why you would not be able to just choose a practice.

Nina Soloman: I like the word practice over program. The word "program" makes it more limited in how you are thinking of it. Legislation does include a type of waiver or application for counties with smaller populations to apply for it.

Commissioner Judge Walker: An anecdotal practice can still sometimes fit within Evidence Informed practice. I support Kelly's criticism we are trying to move from guessing.

Commissioner Duffy: If not Evidence-based, gives example, if I send 10 kids to a program that is not Evidence-based, but it worked would that be a natural addition we could add? A program showing a good performance outcome, or lack of recidivism. Not naturally Evidence-based but for NV and certain communities or jurisdictions it works. Can we word that in the plan somehow?

CSG Staff: Explain they had the same question.

Dr.Haas: Does that fit into what we have now? Locally developed programming with pre-opposed outcome measures. That is exactly what was just described.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Gives example of a child wearing a sign that says, "I stole from this store." And having to walk around like that. It is not Evidence-based but it certainly works for certain communities.

Ms. Shepard: That way if it is not clearly Evidence-based you will at least know it is delivering results that we require.

Dr. Haas: If we know effective JJ programming has a 70% success rate and someone came into the state with a program that had good face value and was evidence informed and did not violate norms of what we should not do, it would be on that program to achieve some consistency of a success rate consistent with what good programming does. Ideally these will go away as we go along.

Commissioner Judge Walker: I hear a consensus that people like what Commissioner Cervantes and NAJJA put together. Also, a consensus to strike anecdotal evidence out there with no research because it is surplusage. It is captured in other matrices.

Nina Soloman: Clarifies, it should be, "Pre-imposed outcome measures *and results?"*

Commissioner Cervantes: Yes, explains that it is a test. It is measuring an outcome, did someone gain something or not.

Ms. Shepard: One side, it delivers positive results, as defined by the JJOC. The other side is, if someone comes to you from the county with a recommendation of a program and they are confident that it is common expert knowledge that it is successful, but they do not have the experience that we as commissioners have, how do we validate?

Commissioner Judge Walker: I would ask to show where using our Clearing House Model is demonstrated in the scientific literature, or known as the Evidence-based literature, to validate the program they are presenting. If not, there is a problem with the outset of the model. Or can it be anchored to something we know is a Evidence-based practice.

Ms. Shepard: Clarifies, basically asking how it mirrors an Evidence-based practice or program.

Commissioner Judge Walker: On the scale, you can start on the right, but you need to move to the left in order for us to give the funding.

Commissioner Shick: Our Wilderness program in Douglas County uses Cognitive Behavioral Therapy and motivational interviewing. We incorporate good practice and look at the numbers and understand it reduces recidivism. JJ programs in the state are so busy they try to latch on practices. We do not have time to do research on programs or practices. Hybrid programs operating with great practices eliminate pieces of those that may not be working or have validity and improve them to the left of the scale.

Commissioner Cervantes: Agrees, we need to include programs with elements of Research- based programs.

Dr. Haas: A concern, current funding being allocated might not be affected. A task for year one at the center would be to re-evaluate where funding is going. Less of a problem when new money is requested. Our current programs.

Ms. Shepard: It is in the bill, that there will be an inventory. I think that is underway.

Mr. Munoz: As long as we have inventory to look at we are getting there. I don't think all the counties are able to apply all these because of the existing resources that they currently have in their community.

Commissioner Shick: Agrees, asks, how can we assist jurisdictions with less resources to meet the mark to find programs where kids get behavior change and reduction in recidivism.

Commissioner Judge Walker: I want to reiterate, as co-chairs of the JJOC we committed to be the Governor's office, Executive brank, an Legislative branch to speak about how AB472 was created and that it created a push-down dynamic of funding but to have these programs we need money. I, and others here committed to argue for colleagues in Rural areas too, if a kid fails in a Rural area, that is failure to us all.

Commissioner Shick: Each place has its own dynamic.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Gives example, Female population has risen at Caliente (Facility). In the rural areas there is no programming for girls. This is a perfect example of where we could use this legislation to force the state to come up with money to provide programs to local populations to keep girls out of Caliente. By having this law in place and codified to force Legislative branch and Governors office to sign off on providing additional resources to wilderness counties that do not have funding.

Commissioner Duffy: In a previous meeting, I was just talking about how I don't understand some areas we refer kids off to. Or that some places won't always accept a kid. I don't want us to forget that this part is where AB 472 came from and ultimately whatever comes out of the Strategic Plan around Evidence-based programs. I am going to want something that has that check and balance which will come from the Performance Measure committee. I think that is why this was put in here, people are making money off our kids and there are no good outcomes.

Ms. Shepard: This matrix is almost tailored to the current state. We are not cutting off counties doing what they can to get the funds they have. And they cannot make giant shifts that are expensive or complex to change, yet. Question I have, in five years, where would we like Nevada's practices to be? A majority in Evidence-based, majority in Research-based and Evidence-based. We built a matrix for our current situation, but we want to see a result that is different.

Commissioner Cervantes: We never had a matrix that excludes funding. The state is not going to pay for Scared Straight, or prison tours, or boot camps, those all fall in this. Part of this process is show the programs that will be eliminated from funding because they are excluded. There is no evidence, or they are not evidence informed.

Commissioner Judge Voy: I suggest, the majority of what we do with kids in Juvenile Justice is not Evidence-based, in order to be so, you have to have real outcome and recidivism studies validated. Most jurisdictions are in the same boat. We have never really done the recidivism studies on these kids. It is really not Evidence-based.

Commissioner Hanan: Asks for Clarification, we talked about Evidence-based practices, not that the programs themselves have had to be tested, just that the practices underlying the statute.

Commissioner Judge Voy: The practice and the program.

Commissioner Hanan: The statute talks about practices. If a local program that adopts practices that are Evidence-based and uses them, there might be validation issues there, right? You can have programs that have these Evidence based practices employed within them. Why are we moving to the term program rather than practices?

Commissioner Judge Voy: It is both.

Commissioner Hanan: It is not what the statute requires, and it might be more stringent. The question might be to get to the idea of why we are sending our kids to this particular program if we don't know because it is a new program. Well what techniques are they employing? If they are employing techniques that have been tested else where and it is validated for use with Juveniles. Explains the process of turning a regular program into an

Evidence-based program, by gathering data and doing research, and adding parts compliable to Evidence-based practices. Take pieces of other practices and put them together for new programming and practices.

Commissioner Cervantes: Explains the *practice* of probation. Use of Motivational Interviewing, programming, case work, family engagement, so your *practice* encompasses all of these things. Inside the practice is Evidence-based programming. Going at kids with what we know works. The practice is larger in scope and it is consolidating programs and engagement.

Commissioner Judge Walker: Sometimes it is a continuum of care. Gives example- practices could be administrating the MAYSI or YLS, measuring tools to guide programming. A system of care. I agree with Commissioner Hanan, who is basically asking what our Mission Statement is that in five years the JJOC will say the continuum of care for the state of NV was using Evidence-based interventions. We need to choose a term that is not just *practice* or *program* but *interventions.*

Commissioner Cervantes: Continuum of care is sometimes referred to as a continuum of program evaluation, that is what this goal was.

Ms. Shepard: I am hearing that we agree, they need to be referred to as *practices* not *programs.* We are saying let's walk away from anecdotal and be more about delivering positive results. Especially those required by the JJOC.

Mr. Munoz: Practices we are using need to support for positive outcomes. We need to make changes if that's not in our data we are collecting. Human behavior still just is what it is. If data shows positive impact, we need to stay with that, what is working.

Commissioner Judge Voy: *Practices* include programming. So, *practices* are the bigger part.

Commissioner Cervantes: Practices is the policy, programs are the procedure.

Commissioner Hanan: Gives example, Motivational Interviewing is a practice that a program can involve. The pieces of program have to be Evidence-based.

Commissioner Judge Walker: Practice can be an internal art. We could make clear they are not terms of art, but terms of description meant to be broad.

Ms. Shepard: Agrees with term practice but defining that it is not an art.

Commissioner Judge Walker: Practice if we have to define it is, that which is done produces evidence to measure, related to any step in the life of a child whether we are measuring what their needs are, their mental health needs are, YLS needs are, entry into commitment needs are, exit needs are and so on.

Ms. Shepard: We want to find the expectation of where we want to be in five years. We have five years to phase in. The question today is where can we be in five years?

Commissioner Judge Walker: Our goal should be: Describe to the Governor, Legislature, and all stake holders where money is being spent, what money is being spent and how money is demonstrating ethically to the children.

Dr. Haas: Currently, we are using tools to identify needs and risks for kids to apply against recidivism both that leads to commitment and up comers recidivating recyclers. At the county level you can identify needs of kids recidivating and being committed. As the center progresses it will develop Evidence-based practices to target kids and restrict funding to programs that target those kids. Would be the five-year goal.

Commissioner Wooldridge: We somehow need to fit in the Q/A.

Dr. Haas: Mentions there is a universal outcome measure.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Yes, CPC does both institutional and outpatient. That is one of my goals to get it onto the Strategic Plan.

Unknown Commissioner: In five years what is different?

Commissioner Judge Walker: In five years we know what is working to reduce recidivism and we know what is not. Even if we don't reduce recidivism, we at least can answer what we are spending our money on and why. Explains, the state is in charge, to require the counties to report data. Everyone now is really accountable by the state.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Clarifies, not the state but the JJOC. It is in the law. The JJOC is responsible for all of this.

Commissioner Judge Walker: In the end it is the strength of the JJOC that we have all three branches of government on the JJOC.

Mr. Munoz: I would like to see a timeline from when a youth enters to the time that they exit. And the stages that the contact is made. And where AB 472 and all the other changes we are implementing to see progress.

Commissioner Cervantes: We need the data.

Ms. Shepard: What are the responsibilities of the JJOC? Especially the implementation oversight? We know what the JJOC is supposed to do until July 1 right? What is the JJOC's role in oversight?

Commissioner Olsen: Asks, is it the role and responsibility of the counties to report back on the non-data specific items that are in the strategic plan? And in the context of implementation and oversight?

Commissioner Wooldridge: I don't think it is the responsibility of the counties to report back. What we will have is access to certain reports. It is almost a little bit of both.

Commissioner Olsen: How do we set this up so that it is executable at the county level. Implemented by what date?

Commissioner Wooldridge: July 1, across all counties. With Caseload Pro we only had so much funding made available. It is going out in phases. Phase one is data conversion. Phase two is looking at what data is in Caseload Pro. What data does the state have access to for individual counties? Which is part of phase two.

Erica Olson: Asks how far the plan needs to go. Asks about how deadlines will work.
Commissioner Wooldridge: Recommends that both the counties, State, and JJOC need to have deadlines.

Dr. Haas: For Caseload Pro the deadline needs to be to not go live until Caseload Pro is equivalent to our current system.

Commissioner Judge Walker: We need to include Ohrenschall in conversation for a bill draft, for the current legislation. One of the items included could be to tighten up. The JJOC is the bigger part, the state is the actor. It will be your staff that are gathering it. The JJOC make the decisions.

Ms. Shepard: We need to have goals and initiatives written out, so we know what is being done by the JJOC, DCFS and what is expected to be done and by when, by the counties. All of these need to have the expected to be done, date. The idea is to break them out into goals to be read easier and everyone knows what needs to be done. Mentions goals that are framework to the plan:

1) Use a validated Risk and Needs Assessment tool.
2) Implementing programs and services proven to reduce recidivism.
3) Collaborate cross systems to address kid's needs.
4) Taylor supervision services to youth developmental needs.

By the end of five years we hope to have made progress on them.

Commissioner Wooldridge: We have not developed a Mission Statement yet. These four goals come directly from CSG and what they have done nationally. We need to break the goals down to very specific strategies now. What strategies do we need to meet this goal and by when?

Erica Olsen: Recommends using the word *strategy* for an approach to solve something and an *initiative* as a thing a project-based thing that will have a start and end point.

Ms. Shepard: Explains goals of each year, year one will be when benchmarks are identified. Year two is when targets will be identified.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Mentions the Adjudication issue. Screener and the full assessment we plan on implementing the screener on every kid. The law says any kid that is adjudicated has to have the full assessment. Explains, we do not want to do a full evaluation if it is not needed for a kid.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Clarifies, the law says only both screenings before.

Commissioner Judge Walker: Explains the idea of having Mental Health Screening done within the school district to every kid, not just juvenile delinquents in the system. This went to legislation before.

Commissioner Salla-Smith: Asks for clarification, the discussion of the YLS and MAYSI and to address the language is part of the Risk and Needs Sub Committee.

Commissioner Judge Walker: The challenge we have is if we do not get it on Ohrenschall's watch now, it won't happen.

Commissioner Cervantes: Explains a possible issue, isn't this how we standardize information? If everyone gets the same assessment at the same time? We divert kids, I am wondering if it confuses the data points system to say

this kid got the YLS. They were adjudicated but didn't do it. From a data collection process will that be messed up.

Commissioner Duffy: That was my question as well, "Does it throw off what we are trying to show?"

Commissioner Wooldridge: The whole idea is that you develop your case plan based off of that Risk Assessment.

Commissioner Judge Voy: However, if you run the screener with no red flags and you only put them on probation because they won't pay restitution then why are we going to the next level in the first place?

Ms. Shepard: Talking about specifics in the plan: Let's go back to the idea that we have to get the big initiative for these goals laid out. Let's think about these in terms of years instead. Year zero is the year we are in now, year one is next year, year two is the following and so on.

Erica Olsen: Talking about specifics in the plan: In the boxes we would fill in, set up, ready for roll out, phase in, and compliance reporting (example). The intention is to put milestones on paper related to these initiatives and do we need anymore more on this. Can we agree on the initiatives and we can come back with suggested time frames?

Commissioners Agree.

Ms. Shepard: We started with few initiatives and some are questions on what the initiatives would be. To determine when the tool is used. It is clear who is supposed to use it but not clear when.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Can we just skip this goal and let the other committee do it? I don't want us doing work that could be undone by the committee dealing with it directly.

Erica Olsen: Goal four needs work.

Commissioner Wooldridge: This goal is about the development of policies and procedures for the counties, camps and institutions, and Parole. And exactly what policies and procedures the JJOC will develop. By law there is some that we have to have. A few to focus on:

- Family engagement
- Developing a case plan, the law is pretty specific on what to put on that.

It is pretty easy to do initiatives around those, there are national standards on how they should be.

Erica Olsen: Should this plan include the development policies but then the training and implementation and expected, on board compliance of the counties. It is about the development implementation and the measurement of effectiveness.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Agrees and explains Commissioner Duffy's committee will assist in that.
Concerning Family engagement, I have a list of what the national standard are for family engagement. If we look at places like Utah or Florida, or Pennsylvania they have a whole family engagement handbook. One of our initiatives should be to come to an agreement on which of those national standards we want Nevada to Practice. Maybe a handbook on them, or what ever we want to call it, and then counties and state facilities implement them.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Clarifies, so you are suggesting that we look at the handbooks?

Commissioner Wooldridge: Yes, at least the initiatives. We have to at least meet the law in AB 472.

Ms. Shepard: (Reads from law)

> "DCFS in each department of Juvenile Services shall develop and implement a Family Engagement Plan. It will include strategies for increasing family contact with the child, engaging family members in the case plan, involving them in the child's treatment, and solicit feedback from family members."

One of our initiatives needs to be develop a standard handbook of family engagement.

Erica Olsen: Is there one you see as a model?

Commissioner Wooldridge: I would do Utah or New Jersey are really good.

Erica Olsen: Is it the expectation that we identify those as part of this plan or in the plan we will have an initiative to identify which.

Commissioner Cervantes: In the plan

Commissioner Wooldridge: Mentions we have to have an agreement if we want it just to be a policy from the commission, and find how we will monitor it, see if everyone is following it, what is the standard to use it.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Come up with a target date. I like the idea of a handbook that states the type of engagement to have with the kids on probation, stating this is the type of engagement to have with kids in the institutions, or an RTC, and break it down in detail for each engagement specifically on family members.

Ms. Shepard: The point of the plan is to say we need a handbook by this date, we expect compliance on reporting on performance, by this year.

Commissioner Cervantes: Asking Nina Soloman, when you roll these projects out in other states, what did this phase look like for you?

Nina Soloman: There is obviously different things they are working on. The Evidence Based Practice piece is separate. These to me sound more like policies that are developed at the state level. I am not sure of the benefit of including this into the plan other than having this committee stretch thin in a short period of time.

Commissioner Hanan: I guess the alternative is to identify when the family engagement plan policies should be in place and also the responsible party, who is responsible for selecting and developing that policy. Who does that go to if not us? And maybe it does go somewhere else, part of it is how much do we want it to ourselves? Cause you have a good idea about it and you want to implement it. Who would be the responsible party for it?

Commissioner Wooldridge: The law says the counties and the state and camps need to have a family engagement plan. I think this should be in the strategic plan. The law has some standards but there are also national standards that are not in the law.

Commissioner Cervantes: Agrees, I think we should do what the law specifically says to do.

Erica Olsen: Mentions, we must identify who will be responsible for each piece.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Come up with a family engagement plan. Then the Strategic Plan will say by whatever date we will have a committee in place to create the plan, and then to be adopted by the full commission by another date. Then implement and report back.

Ms. Shepard: To summarize, is it more about in places where there is a policy, or a handbook development?

Commissioner Wooldridge: Both

Ms. Shepard: Policies and the handbook are the sub-committee's responsibility, essentially the JJOC. The plans are the counties responsibilities.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Mentions they are separated.

Commissioner Cervantes: There are some things that the counties are independent on.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Recommends, by July 1 we identify a sub-committee to create a policy and handbook on the family engagement plan and that sub-committee will write a report back on X date to the full board and then another date from the full board to adopt it and another date for all the institutions and everyone else to implement it. Another date for them to report back and implement it.

Erica Olsen: Recommends making a timeline at another time.

Mr. Munoz: Wants to be sure there is someone from the state while the counties and JJOC are writing policies for that.

Erica Olsen: Lets agree we don't have to solve how it gets done we just need to sequence out how it might get done and timelines.

Ms. Shepard: Regarding other policies, there was a policy about when you commit a child to the state. When does a child go to a local facility verse state facility and what are the policies behind it.

Commissioner Judge Voy: We currently have policies on when a kid is eligible for a facility and when they aren't.

Dr. Haas: The current assumption is that kids are randomly being committed for lower level offenses. Assuming if we say we are bringing evidence-based practices we will have less commitment. We already have the data.

Commissioner Wooldridge: What the law says on this is that before the Juvenile Court commits, that other alternatives have been looked at, the child poses a safety risk to the public, the risk assessment has been conducted and the court considered the risk assessment.

Commissioner Cervantes: That is the policy.

Commissioner Duffy: If everyone is buying in, and on board with the Risk Assessment tool, we don't even need to think about what is happening right now, the future will weed all that out.

Commissioner Wooldridge: We need to get to the Evidence Based practices.

Ms. Shepard: How will this commission enforce compliance and is it based on state funding.

Commissioner Cervantes: Yes. Based on reported measurements we will have to send in.

Ms. Shepard: I am not sure if this is a valid question, should one of the things the county reports be how many programs they are executing that are actually evidence based?

Commissioner Wooldridge: No

Commissioner Cervantes: No, the only thing that the counties would be responsible for reporting is what is directly funded by those state dollars.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Brings the question, who is going to decide of where on the matrix something lies. We need funding for phase two and three. The original plan was to get private funding.

Ms. Shepard: There should be an initiative or something in the plan of how we are going to address that after June 30th there is no funding.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Suggests two initiatives, one for funding and one if we cannot find funding we develop a sub-committee to take over that role.

Ms. Shepard: Make that one whole initiative, to fund the resource center. Who is responsible for identifying what programs are being used and what is the role of the JJOC. Is it the JJOC's role to define or identify fundable programs.

Commissioner Wooldridge: We need to set up a mechanism for how they do that. Who decides if something falls into the matrix? (Asks Nina Soloman for suggestions on topic)

Nina Soloman: And you are also talking about if the Resource Center is not up and running?

Commissioner Cervantes: Correct.

Commissioner Wooldridge: So maybe to that sub-committee? If it is specific to the Resource Center I guess it would be that sub-committee of experts to do the work and then present it to the JJOC.

Nina Soloman: Is it up to DCFS because the funding comes from there?

Dr. Haas: I think a grant review sub-committee established.

Commissioner Cervantes: Agrees, and explains, the funding source is from DCFS not the JJOC.

Erica Olsen: The next part is oversight. DCFS is doing it but there has to be some sort of JJOC oversight to make sure that it is happening.

Commissioner Cervantes: The JJOC cannot secure funding.

Ms. Shepard: To whom does the county report practice or program to, DCFS or JJOC?

Commissioner Cervantes: To be clear, we do not report all our practices.

Ms. Shepard: There needs to be a database.

Commissioner Wooldridge: We would like the Resource center to be the database. If they don't have that it will have to fall back to DCFS.

Commissioner Cervantes: What is the statute on, if you don't have this we are pulling funds.

Nina Soloman: For Juvenile services to submit a corrective action plan within 60 days of receiving the notice. And if they don't submit or adhere to a corrective action plan the DCFS can withhold the money.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Are there any initiatives on expanding practices.

Commissioner Cervantes: Data collection will help with that. Most counties and jurisdictions already use it or will want to adopt, Evidence-based practices.

Commissioner Wooldridge: The initiative is, that the JJOC has a plan to help the counties get there.
(switching topics) We were discussing adding a fifth goal, to develop financial resources. The advisory committee would be a huge part of.

Ms. Shepard: One question was, are the counties to perform Q/A for service providers ultimately that they work with and what corrective action should they take.

Dr. Haas: Some service providers have state funding.

Commissioner Cervantes: If you only have one service provider providing a service do you eliminate it or change the funding source? If available, you would change the provider. The corrective action would be, if you cannot meet these standards we are not utilizing you as a resource anymore.

Ms. Shepard: The corrective action is the discretion of the county and their choices include, replacing the service, changing the service provider.

Commissioner Cervantes: (Asking Commissioner Wooldridge) When the options are programs that do not meet this design or no program, then what?

Commissioner Wooldridge: The law says, counties with a population under a 100,000 do not have to comply with that.

Erica Olsen: Evidence-based is a numbers game but you can have therapy, that is not Evidence-based but still helping the kid tremendously.

Commissioners: Agree

Dr.Haas: There are a couple of metrics here, the grid, outcome measures, and correctional program tool. Some studies show that Evidence-based practices when they are in a study compared to what other practitioners use, most practitioners performed just as good or better than the Evidence-based ones.

Commissioner Wooldridge: The long-term goal is to have that CPC tool to be used on community providers and help them grow their programs.

Dr.Haas: Does that include using cognitive based interventions?

Commissioner Wooldridge: Yes

Commissioner Cervantes: The question is, if we have a program that does not meet the standards for whatever reason, would we choose not to use that program and discontinue it?

Commissioner Judge Voy: We need a separate category for "Better than nothing treatment" which would be treatments or resources that fall outside of Evidence-based.

Erica Olsen: We currently have three initiatives under goal three. Caseload Pro implementation utilization, the Q/A review, not only from the state but all the way out to community providers and then performance reporting, establishing what they are and getting those metrics reported on across the state.

Ms. Shepard: Caseload Pro is sort of the pivotal tool for gathering data.

Commissioners: Agree

Commissioner Wooldridge: There needs to be data sharing contracts between the counties. Washoe county has a lot of concerns of who can see their data. We need MOU's and be really specific that it is kids transferring over to parole.

Commissioner Judge Voy: You are going to roll out the state Caseload Pro? When I send a kid out I want to be able to hit a button and the info on the kid at the new facility or where ever.

Commissioner Wooldridge: After July 1 the system will be used like that, yes. Not every county is on board with having the state have access to info on every kid.

Commissioner Cervantes: Explains, the will be the most helpful to see everything happening, what is working and what isn't.

Next Steps:
A 90-minute meeting is set for Thursday 5/3 from 10:00am – 11:30am
Another 4-hour working session/public meeting will be hosted in Las Vegas on 5/17- Time TBD, Location is 6171 W. Charleston Blvd., **Building 8**, Las Vegas, NV 89146

Public Comment: None at this time

Adjourned: by Co-Chair Frank Cervantes at 4:33pm, moved by Judge William Voy, seconded and approved by committee

BRIAN SANDOVAL
Governor

RICHARD WHITLEY, MS
Director

KELLY WOOLDRIDGE
Administrator

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
May 3, 2018
Meeting Minutes

Call to Order: 10am

Roll Call: Judge Egan Walker, Frank Cervantes, Captain Shawn Anderson, Katie Brubaker, Dr. Joe Haas, Shanelle Johnson, Lorna Shepard.
Public Comment: None

Continued Development of Strategic Plan

Ms. Shepard: Starts the meeting with explaining they are going off the April 19th session with refining the plan, to understand what is and is not funded. In conclusion the recommendation is to include and represent items appropriately in the plan. On page 2 of the slides, the discussion topic stems from asking the question whether sustainable funding should be a separate goal and plan. What is recommended is the plan does not separate sustainable funding as a goal. There is the initiative for Evidence Based Practice Resource center that includes an evaluation of Evidence Based practices and maintaining a database, of course. Including inventory, training, helping, and coming to identify whether or not their practices are evidence based and if they need to replace them. This is obviously ongoing funding that is needed. We identified whether or not it is a small dollar value, less than a hundred thousand. Between one hundred and three hundred thousand and then greater than three hundred thousand. Not surprisingly, the Evidence Based Practice Resource Center is going to be greater than three hundred thousand. To summarize, in year one and two, which is starting next fiscal year, through the following fiscal year is 415,000 dollars. Ongoing, starting year three, every year it will be 200,000 dollars to maintain and support. It is a budget category, this will be done through a vendor. So that is one unfunded initiative.

Commissioner Judge Walker: No questions. I like when you help us highlight, in the strategic plan, areas that are going to be because that is where we are going to need and want, and the current and incoming governors help.

Ms. Shepard: In transparency, it does look like there will be a funding source but not ongoing we will road map the idea of the end goal to have our programs and services proven to reduce recidivism. There needs to be an initiative of finding ongoing funding. The other is smaller, less than 100,000 dollars, these are included in AB 472. These are things in the bill that have not gotten ongoing funding. This is a round the clock agency collaboration. This is non-Juvenile Justice, so consider child welfare, schools and etc. How to coordinate a cross system collaboration, the ideal state would be a system of care beyond the Juvenile Justice system in collaboration, it is in the bill, this is ongoing, and it is really an issue of staffing and probably as I understand at the DCFS level, and there is not a person here and that needs to be ongoing funding. Those are the two unfunded items that need help in finding funding. There are a few other options for the cross-agency collaboration personnel needed, let's figure out what those are. We recommend these two, simply be the initiative within the goals, and we can create an appendix, or someone to run with and go find the funding, so they don't get lost. That's our recommendation.

Staff member Sarah Bellows: Explains, we did not have a quorum for this meeting.

Commissioner Judge Walker: I would just recommend, we take this recommendation from our strategic planning partners and make it an agenda item for the next meeting. (Talking directly to Staff member Sarah Bellows)

Ms. Shepard: Okay so to recap, the next meeting will be on the Evidence Based Practice matrix. The definition and recommendation. I don't want to underplay, I am not trying to underplay that, that is a small amount, that 415,000 plus 200 [thousand] a year is not a small thing or a small initiative it is very pivotal. As a reminder, our backup to not having ongoing funding for the Evidence Based Resource Center was to find a subcommittee of experts within the state, throughout the state and counties of course that would be able to fill in some of the gaps in terms of what the resource center is meant to do in terms of supporting providers and counties that is an alternative to not finding funding. So, we do have that in the plan. That is all I've got. We are working on our job plan to review at our half day session on May 17th.

Commissioner Cervantes: The performance measures group has contacted part of our Strategic Planning group to look at some things. They are going to present some of their information at our next meeting, which is real helpful cause we can screen some of that out and bring it back to these committees, and without delay. That is our next topic, but coming off topic a little, the one question that keeps coming up about those risk assessments is we are still trying to get clarification as to what point MAYSI, which is the mental health screening tool which is really designed for real time assessment and what is going on for the kid right there, primarily for detention classification and figure out what risks are associated with the kids mental health at that time. I can't tell if it is supposed to be specifically for detention or if there is thought that it will be a part of probation assessment at the pre-dispositional risks and needs assessment time.

Ms. Shepard: Okay, now would that be answered in the policy once the policy is defined. I am going through this document to find what our estimated time is on the policy development on MAYSI.
Commissioners: Agree

Commissioner Cervantes: I only bring it up because that was a question at our last meeting, it was really confusing for some of the folks. It was really represented as Detention specific and has kind of transitioned to joining the Risks and Needs assessment, or the YLS It is going to be really important for the Chief Association to know where that lies.

Dr. Haas: One of the questions is it looks like the statutes has that the evaluation occurs at the camps and at the training centers as oppose to the detention centers and then on the Evidence Based Practices that programs are funded by the state, does that makes sense from the intent of the law.

Staff Member Katie Brubaker: Agrees

Commissioner Cervantes: Closes meeting.

Public Comment: None

Adjourned: By Co-Chair Commissioner Cervantes at 11:01am.

BRIAN SANDOVAL
Governor

RICHARD WHITLEY, MS
Director

ROSS E. ARMSTRONG
Administrator

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
and the
Strategic Plan Committee Meeting
May 17, 2018
Meeting Minutes

Call to Order: 12:33pm

Roll Call: Joey Orduna Hastings, Frank Cervantes, Dr. Lisa Morris Hibbler, Chief Shawn Anderson, Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Judge William Voy, Katie Brubaker, Kelly Wooldridge, Lorna Shepard, John Munoz, Nina Salomon, Shanelle Johnson, Brigid Duffy, Dr. Joe Haas, Sarah Bellows, Sierra Fowzer.

Quorum: Yes

Public Comment: None

Reviewing Draft of Strategic Plan

Ms. Shepard: We want to get further in a draft plan and hopefully make some decisions on a few things in the draft plan. The plan is due by July 1, but we want the draft reviewed by co-chairs of the commission as well as submit a draft to the Governor's office prior to the June 8 meeting, where we will submit the plan for approval. For this meeting we are looking for direction and to make corrections if needed. The Purpose of the Strategic Plan is defined in AB 472.

Explains there are core causes on how to reduce recidivism:

1. Using Evidence Based practices
2. Using Risk and Needs Assessment
3. Case Planning and Family Engagement
4. Performance Measures (Which we are creating/ deciding now)

The vision statement is where we want Nevada's Juvenile Justice system to be in the future. It answers the question about what the Juvenile Justice system will look like in ten or twenty years. This plan is five years, but the vision is a longer term, visions take a long time to achieve. For our mission, we talk about why we exist, and there is a draft in this plan. The goals are those that get us closer to achieving the mission. Our goals have a 5 year or longer outcome. The initiatives are completed and in draft form. We explain how we will accomplish those goals over the five years. The initiatives will have to have clear outcomes. They are not about performance measures they are about whether or not the project is implemented or in place. Explains some actions that will be

accomplished in short term, to be accomplished by the JJOC, the state (DCFS), counties, or service providers, meant to be incremental steps, between one to two years. Our assumptions are that the 18-19 year budget is set but the 19-20 budget and beyond is not. One year is a reasonable time frame to begin implementing Evidence-based practices, one year from July 1st, at the 25% level. The EB Resource Center will be in place July 9th. Caseload Pro, YLS, and MAYSI roll out will continue through year one. Performance measure benchmarks are identified in year one. Targets will be set in year two, fiscal 19-20. Targets will be measured in year three, fiscal year 20-21.

Commissioner Joey Orduna Hastings: Explains, what has been done this far takes some states years to get to and the fact that the committee and commission really rallied to get some decisions made early on needs to be pointed out to the public, so they know the diligence of the commission.

Ms. Shepard: For example, there are a lot of policies we have already created, this is more like a report card to see where we are at. A recommended mission has been drafted. The mission of the JJOC is the governance of the selection policy development implementation enforcement and quality assurance of Evidence Based Practices in Nevada's Juvenile Justice System.

Commissioner Cervantes: Agrees with the mission statement. Questions that might come up, when you talk about long range strategic planning may not need to be a part of the mission. Not just Evidence Based maybe. I want to be sure it accurately defines what the start of this process targeted for. The purpose was to bring in Evidence Based and assessment and do that. Can you write this is a general mission statement and we can bring in other topics? I want to be sure we are not missing something that the commission is charged with.

Commissioner Joey Orduna Hastings: Agrees with Commissioner Cervantes, it seems narrow, maybe add language like "With an eye to Nevada's future" so this can also be a living document. This is a document by the statute we are required to review yearly. Maybe with this language we can encompass things that will need to be reviewed as we change.

Commissioner Cervantes: Example, in the last sentence, maybe say the assurance of Evidence-based practices with adaptability on it fluent to Nevada Juvenile Justice system. Or "evolving", something that leaves room in there.

Ms. Shepard: I think what we are saying is Evidence-based Practices is almost too narrow, it needs to be that next level up term.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Explains maybe adding "Quality of practices". Explains that "evidence based" is so narrow. The mission of the JJOC will act as an oversight for what is current for Juvenile Justice in the state of NV. An oversight includes governance of selection policy development implementation of quality assurance practices of the Juvenile Justice in the state of NV.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: Gives the idea to take out "Evidence Based Practices" out completely.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Agrees and adds to leave the "assurance of the practices in NV Juvenile Justice System."

Commissioner Cervantes: Shorter but more general. That captures the purpose, and some of these can be modified at the full commission if there is not a full agreement. It is broader too.

Ms. Shepard: Asks Commissioner Joey Orduna Hastings, are you worried it is too broad? Explains there is a lot of discussion on what it is the JJOC does, so keep it broad?

Commissioner Joey Orduna Hastings: Agrees with keeping it broad. Explains that part of the matrix when we discussed Evidence Based programming we are also, "Evidence promising" programming. We want to keep an open mind what can be done and included in an Evidence based potential. I agree it does not need to be so narrow that we don't allow for some independence too, because we also stress that we want to empower the counties.

Commissioner Cervantes: Furthermore, to keep it general you can take out Evidence Based practice out and just put "Best Practices" which is a universal term. It is a starting place.

Ms. Shepard: Switches topics to guidance of the vision. The vision is where we going to be, what will it look like in 10-20 years and what does success look like for our future state. The direction from the co-chairs of the commission was this phrase, "We envision that in X years all children in NV with contact in the Juvenile Justice System will leave the system better for it." I recommended we take that guidance. In terms of law enforcement, probation, the courts, the county level. Asks commissioners if the child is "leaving the system better for it" what does that look like? Some that were discussed were, lower recidivism rates and we will be treating the cause of the child's behavior. What else would support or give truth that a kid "le[ft] the system better for it".

Commissioner Judge Voy: Explains chapter 62 in the preamble in our purpose section you are missing the community safety component. In the nature of Juvenile Court, where a judge has to vow for the best interest of the child and community safety at the same time. That adds to our purpose to the Juvenile Justice System.

Commissioner Joey Orduna Hastings: Adds, legislatively to think about tackling the preamble of 62 to make sure it is updated and reflecting what this effort is to do. Some states start with their reform efforts by first looking at the preamble. Agrees, the public safety point is valid.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Emphasizes the importance of looking at the preamble and stated goals in our statutory framework of our purpose.

Ms. Shepard: Suggests the need to address the preamble.

Commissioner Cervantes: Sometimes there is an issue of diluting the public safety side of Juvenile Justice business. Agrees with Commissioner Judge Voy and Commissioner Shepard. If you are doing all these things well you're creating long term public safety. That is the real goal. Counting the long-term factors for a child and especially with concerning public safety. Public safety is the premise of why we are here.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: Explains, recidivism is one thing and juvenile crime is another, they are not the same. Clarifies, are we only talking about addressing juvenile crime after it is committed or preventing juvenile crime?

Commissioner Judge Voy: Explains that is also in the current preamble. In the three stated purposes, the third one is the Juvenile Court is in existence to foster, promote, and create prevention programming in the community. That is our obligation, to foster that early intervention and prevention. Which is why we are working with the schools to combine our efforts.

Commissioner Cervantes: In the system it only captures elements of the Juvenile Justice system, not as a whole. Talks a lot about prevention but in the continuum, all the pieces in the system have to be performing equally well, from prevention to placement or it is not a system. If you are only addressing part of it you cannot affect it as an

entire system. It is a larger system than up front with Evidence Based Practices only at the early stages of the system.

Ms. Shepard: Asks of any other signs of success in the vision with the input of long term safety. We want positive outcomes for children but also public safety.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: How would we measure an increase in public safety?

Ms. Shepard: Agrees that is a good question. Explains, we are trying to say the vision is a long-term direction, but the goals and the way we will accomplish this vision are very measurable. There are a number of performance measures tied to these four goals. Ultimately, if we do these things we will have some performance measures. Regarding reducing recidivism, the general consensus to Juvenile Justice experts is that we are creating a safer place. I don't think the vision has to be measurable.

Dr. Haas: The vision around what kids will look like and the wellbeing indicators on Mental Health and overall health as a portion of that being employability and education.

Ms. Shepard: Asks of any other ways we will know we are achieving at this challenging balance of children coming out of the system and better for it with an understanding that we want to improve public safety.

Mr. Munoz: Education, again, is one of the benchmarks for success that education leads to. Educational attainment, gives example of High School Diploma.

Ms. Shepard: Explains, it is important to know what success for a child means, it is helpful to articulate means of Mental Health and overall health, and education and employability.

Commissioner Wooldridge: It would be a reduction of commitments to the state institutions.

Commissioner Cervantes: Explains, "reduction of commitments" is partially correct. The other one to the purpose of this commission it is appropriate. It is easy to say reduction but if you have a delinquency rate you cannot control certain things in your community. One thing you do have control over is how it looks to who you are committing and at what time.

Commissioner Judge Voy: The reduction of the number of referrals in our system and reduction of number of commitments look at what we experienced the last 24 months. With the continuing reduction of overall referrals but this huge spike of violent crime occurring, smaller portion of kids but severally violent. Agrees with Commissioners that it is more than just reducing overall referrals and recidivism. In the Juvenile Justice system our duty is to keep kids from coming to us in the first place. This will end up being a lot broader.

Ms. Shepard: That is what we are trying to do. A statement at the top is great but we can say things that will help us notice it when we see it, and that is really what the vision is. I want to know form the courts perspective and law enforcement and probations perspective. The question is, how will you know we are doing what the vision says, how will you know when you see it? It is helpful to know from the court side.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Explains sometimes success is a kid not making it in this system and transferring out to the Adult System but then getting placed at a group home and getting Mental Health treatments, that would be success, and be keeping them form committing crimes in the future. Obviously, our main goal is to keep a kid out of our system and the Adult system completely, but it happens.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: It is a decrease in juvenile restraints generally and a decrease in the severity of those crimes and an increase in diversions to non-traditional paths. If arrests are down, and we aren't taking people in to Juvenile Hall as much then we have solved part of the problem.

Ms. Shepard: Asks, if we are using the Risks and Needs Assessments, what potentially is different?

Commissioner Cervantes: Asking Commissioner Dr.Haas, I know you have a thought about using the YLS as outcome indicators throughout the life of a case plan.

Commissioner Dr. Haas: When talking about visions there are broader goals, but in terms of what you are tracking, the YLS and some extent the MAYSI scores, and then the fact that in Caseload Pro you will have a case plan mapping the outcomes as close as possible in Caseload Pro. As we develop Caseload Pro, potentially quantifying some things in there that you could then mend the data without having to identify specific kids. All of the criminogenic risk factors are in the YLS. Furthermore, to the potential of what is offered on the case plan, without having seen Caseload Pro, there could be some automated choices in terms of what kids receive that you could then track the process of what the kid is getting in the program as well as mapping their risk levels and the types and level of probation, or residential programming.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Explains, that is exactly what the YLS will do. It will tell us what their risk level is and there will be a matrix that ties their risk level score to what services work with that risk level score and to what level of supervision.

Ms. Shepard: Explains with all that included the key idea of the outcome would be youth are given the right services to address their cause.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Asks for clarification, would you say that case planning services and supervision ae tied to risk and need level?

Ms. Shepard: What is the outcome of that?

Commissioner Cervantes: You are not applying services or sanctions or needs that don't match the kid's needs. If you are employing high-risk interventions to a low-risk offender, you usually have a bad outcome. And if you are employing low-risk interventions to a high-risk offender you will miss it there. So, you are trying to match the actual service through the evaluation. As you go through strategic plans on anything, and you are looking at the concept here, Juvenile Justice, keeping kids out of the system instead of doing all of these things. One reality is that we have diverted a lot of kids in NV and will continue to. The population now is the deeper end of the system. It is the higher intensity of kids both with Mental Health intensity and Criminogenic factors that put these kids up here, we are not always talking about those kids. We are talking about the low hanging fruit we screen those kids off through a variety of measures, interventions, diversions all of those things. But today in 2018 we are talking about all of our detention centers filling up with some really high performing youth. The system at all points has to be really healthy.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Reads section of current preamble to commissioners. That covers everything we are doing in the system.

Commissioner Joey Orduna Hastings: Suggests, if everyone agrees, we should tie in the preamble with the Strategic Plan as a statement of where we started as NV. Being able to acknowledge the preamble that was written way back and that we are still using it today is a significant step for this commission to stand behind as a commitment.

Commissioner Duffy: Asks, back then was Juvenile Justice and Family Services one in the same? Agrees with Commissioner Joey Orduna Hastings to change wording.

Commissioner Joey Orduna Hastings: Explains it is in the statute.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Reads off from the preamble- When a child is removed from the control of the parent or guardian the Juvenile Court shall secure the child's level of care which is equivalent as nearly as possible to the care that should have been given to that youth by the child's parent or guardian.

Ms. Shepard: Explains AB 472 has direction on methods to achieve the preamble. I think 472 and this plan shows we know some new things on how to do this. We have agreed, somewhere in the plan we include the preamble. We know how to do it; this plan shows how to achieve it. More descriptive than the Vision Statement. We will also revise the Vision Statement, so it includes the concept of public safety, that balance of positive outcomes for youth. They leave the system better for it. Affecting them positively and serving our purpose of public safety.

Definition of Recidivism

Ms. Shepard: The definition was approved by the commission.

Commissioner Cervantes: This came out of some good work, people not on the commission and not in the juvenile Justice community that struggle with this full definition, feeling that it captures too much. After a conversation with NAJJA, I like this because in your own individual data collection research you can always just refine that to meet the needs you are asking us, example if you only want to know of felonies then your data collection will capture that only. This is a comprehensive, true definition of what recidivism is.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Explains process of recidivism and how it relates to probation or how re-commitment relates to the state and placements, or what is being done in the field that contributes or enhances recidivism or not and lastly, did they end up in the Adult System.

Commissioner Cervantes: Asks for clarification, in sub-section A; Re-arrest does that include citations? Like any new law violation.

Commissioners: Yes

Commissioner Judge Voy: We are going to use those points to look at various points of recidivism in our system. Explains the idea of looking at recidivism at different levels, to dig down at various levels to see where we are failing or what is working.

Definition of Evidence Based Practices

Ms. Shepard: We heard from the practitioner that the Evidence Based Practice Resource Center, who is responsible for training and supporting the counties and service providers on how to implement programs and practices that are Evidence Based, and they were confused by the sections above the matrix. The idea of practices versus programs, and I suggest a different way we define our matrix. The matrix implies practices are also acceptable. Clarifies, not recommending changing the matrix, but rather, paragraphs under the heading of the definition have confused our vendor. Suggests, taking paragraphs out with expectation that the matrix still allows for Evidence Based Practices to be used, especially since we are taking about a phased approach of implementing Evidence-based or replacing Non-Evidence Based over time. I think that third column in the middle of Evidence Informed would mean you are doing practices not programs. My recommendation to the Co-Chairs of the Committee and those present that we can take out those proceeding paragraphs.

Commissioner Cervantes: I would like to hear form my co-chair, Judge Voy. I don't have an issue with taking those out. If it is going to be confusing, take it out, the matrix says what it is.

Ms. Shepard: Explains, relying on the fact that the evolution of the paragraph was we started with a matrix that defined Evidence Based practices form the National Council of Juvenile Family Court Judges, this basically said this is the foundation. Also, we added a line "practice" because the bill says programs are not required. Programs are optimal, and we will eventually get there.

Commissioner Cervantes: I agree, the less complicated the better.

Ms. Shepard: Explains, she has not been specific on what the feedback was from the vendor.

Commissioner Joey Orduna- Hastings: Adds that the matrix speaks for itself.

Commissioner Cervantes: Explains, we were using that to give an idea of the standards of what the purpose was.

Ms. Shepard: Okay, we agree to delete the paragraphs on page 14 underneath the heading of Evidence Based Practices. Moving to the next section, goals and road map. This is how we are going to achieve how this all happens. We agreed to four goals, Risk and Needs Assessment, proving programs are Evidence Based programs, system collaboration and tailored services. We have done a good job, generally speaking, of describing what each of these are, and then went into great detail. What is missing is the real description of the outcomes of these goals. Asks commissioners what the successful outcome would be of ensuring risks and needs assessments are completed for every child in the JJ System. Furthermore, what does the successful outcome of ensuring risks and needs assessments are completed for every child in the JJ System, and what specific shifts or changes you all think are required? In the system itself, or any perspective, the courts, service providers, probation, what needs to happen?

Commissioner Cervantes: Asks for clarification, is the goal to have each specific kid assessed in the JJ System?

Commissioner Wooldridge: Only those prior to disposition. Explains, Gina Vincent is looking at it, bringing in a screening tool for other kids that aren't being adjudicated.

Commissioner Cervantes: Clarifies, the section should say, ensure risks and needs assessments are completed for children prior to disposition. And then have the description below it.

Commissioners: Agree

Commissioner Judge Voy: Explains, in Clark County, they are going to run the screener on every kid that hits intake, and then on a pilot base run the full evaluation on the kids that look like they are going to go to the adult system, and the kids detained will get the screener and the YLS before they even get to plea, and most likely the MAYSI.

Ms. Shepard: Clarifies that Clark County is going beyond the legal requirement.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Confirms and explains this is to see what kind of numbers and hits they are getting so when coming into the next legislative session, one of the issues talked about was modifying the language at the next session.

Commissioner Cervantes: Asks for clarification, if this is the UNLV tool. Explains he wants to try that on a few kids.

Commissioners: Explain, no, they are still looking into using that, and that it may not be charged to do so.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Considering the MAYSI, we did that back in detention and it involves taking detention kids into the intake hall, it is a trial basis, and we can cross train too.

Ms. Shepard: Agrees and explains that is great and that is beyond the requirements of the law.

Commissioner Judge Voy: We want a few changes to give us some flexibility on some of these kids coming in and out of custody. They will already have had the screener done, may even have the YLS done but the next step of having the MAYSI done before adjudication.

Ms. Shepard: Tell me why we are expanding the application of the assessment and the risk and needs assessment.

Commissioner Wooldridge and Commissioner Judge Voy: Explains they are just adding the screening. We are screening every kid and then on a pilot basis run the YLS and the MAYSI for the first hundred kids for example.

Commissioner Duffy: Explains a possible situation: A kid comes out with a battery charge and we usually go right to disposition. This will require a screen on each kid prior to court making it to disposition, it will delay that court hearing and cause an additional hearing. If they can do just a screener to see if the data shows it, if they come up low on the initial fast screening why do we then have to do the full screening?

Commissioner Judge Voy: The support may need a change in the statute in the modifications for flexibility. We are going to run a few kids through that. One hundred kids on the screener, out of one hundred only 50% had high whatever scores, but we are running the full MAYSI on all of them. Did the result change after we got the full MAYSI, for example? We can look at when kids are consistently scoring zero and look at the screener.

Ms. Shepard: The question is if we are doing this well what is the results to drive our Risk and Needs Assessments?

Commissioner Judge Voy: To drive our dispositional orders.

Ms. Shepard: Better? More effective disposition orders?

Commissioner Cervantes: More informed.

Commissioner Judge Voy: And more tailored to the kid's individual needs. Or lack of needs and drive the disposition orders.

Commissioner Duffy: And take out some subjective factors.

Ms. Shepard: That is what I assumed was the intention of this. Some of the judges I have talked to have explained, some judges can be a bit subjective.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Clarifies, we are not removing the fact from time to time. There may be some cases where there is subjectivity to it, those cases will come up when we will need to score up the numbers form the YLS and MAYSI.

Commissioner Duffy: One thing to point out, eventually Judge Voy will not be with us anymore, Hearing Masters change, everyone else will change out. For example, a lot of your decisions are made off your experience, right? This may guide new Hearing Masters to decisions to keep stability, instead of someone coming in and turning everything upside down.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Agrees.

Ms. Shepard: Asks, does the ability to do this also help us get closer to doing what is right for the children? It is not just about more and more tailored dispositions, but doing what is right for a kid, but also acknowledging public safety.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Those suggestive scores are going to be deciding if this kid should be out in the community or not, for example. This will guide you in both directions and tell us more or less if a kid should be trusted in the community or not, it goes both ways. That is where we are getting buy in from judges and DA's.

Commissioner Cervantes: It provides a more consistent process. Then you can later measure what you are looking at and see the inconsistencies when you have the data. This is a way to capture all of that.

Ms. Shepard: It is great to have a score, but this does give you a bit of reliability behind you. For example, if you have seen 75 cases like this.

Commissioner Munoz: Explains, the more times that we have these assessments on these kids we are going to get a much better picture of them as well. So we can go through and see what is working, what is not working, and what their needs are. We are going to get a much clearer picture every time we make contact and have them assessed. If they do get to Parole or our institutions, Probation would have had a number of contacts with them and worked with them before. Those will help us drive case plans in the facilities as well.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Suggests having a small point system using the same evaluation tools.

Ms. Shepard: What is the outcome and impact of these assessments? You can have better case plans, and you know what works for kids.

Mr. Munoz: And we know what has not worked for probation, so we can adjust our case plans to be successful.

Commissioner Cervantes: That was in the vision too for the long run, we will be able to look through a much clearer lens, less myopic, and now because we will have information-based decisions on it. That is the biggest part.

Ms. Shepard: We agree information-based decisions are better than those we had to make that are subjective.

Commissioner Duffy: Explains the "guessing" process does not work. Not knowing the full history on a kid.

Commissioner Cervantes: It consist of a little bit of intuition, it is an Arts and Science field right. So you have really good data. In court you see it all the time, this does not quite match, it only provides a really good general guide. Some expertise and experience will help you get to a good decision. There must be some discretion.

Ms. Shepard: To add to that, I don't think the law says the assessments override. There is no overriding a decision, it basically guides decisions. Explains, we could end up setting dispositions based on risk factors and not based on how violent the crime appears. That is always a possibility, if it looks like a very violent crime or serious crime but the risk factor.

Asks Commissioners- Are there any other outcomes in regard to the Risk and Needs Assessment for any of the continuum of Juvenile Justice? I appreciate that Commissioner Munoz mentioned what it does for Probation when it gets to you, your team, is there anything in terms of services you provide?

Commissioner Wooldridge: It will include a service matrix, so we will include that as part of the policy. In terms of what services for what risk level.

Mr. Munoz: Those are alternatives to placement or confinement. Like GPS or evening reporting, daily reporting centers, group homes and foster care.

Commissioner Shepard: Clarifies, more structured service to risk level matching alternatives.

Commissioner Judge Voy: That is why everyone is so on board with using it, you can better identify the risk and needs, and match them up with what you're going to address.

Mr. Munoz: The whole goal here is to avoid the cookie cutter approach that has every now and then been applied and make it more individualized for each particular unit.

Ms. Shepard: Anything else we need to articulate?

Commissioner Cervantes: You must have those services that match. You have to have the right services.

Commissioners: Agree

Ms. Shepard: (Changing subjects) We talked about outcomes, now this goal there are three initiatives:

1. Risk Assessment Tool
2. Reporting Policy
3. Case Planning Policy

Those were the key initiatives we identified happen within the next five years. There are also some road map definitions, which are helpful if you know what you are achieving and when.
Explains there are five milestones:

1. Buy In, which consists of:
   -Identifying Vendors
   -Funding Sources
   -Stakeholder Engagement
   -Vendors Secured
2. Planning and Policy Development, which is how we identify policies, we do some timeline planning.
3. Training Engagement, is how we roll out the tools.
4. Implementation of Accountability Reporting, everyone at county and state level.
5. Conducting the quality assurance enforcement, measuring our use of fidelity with the tools, that we are reporting correctly, and have correction action.

Those are the milestones, the first road map of the initiative, which is to determine if the Risk and Needs Assessment tool is used. Then an action item that we need to add the Risk an Needs tool to Caseload Pro and it shows the milestones for the next five years.

Commissioner Joey Orduna-Hastings: I am concerned that the counties don't have this on the radar and that is why we took the approach of having to be overly transparent about funding. It will be a hurdle.

Commissioner Judge Voy: I am worried about the rural areas.

Mr. Munoz: We reached out to the rural areas and let them know that this is coming. We talked to them about taking over this. This is also their budget building time. We informed them about it, they are still looking for other alternatives. They will have to build it in, either way it is coming. I understand the concern, it is our concern as well. Trying to be the state and transparent as well and letting them know. I hope that they are planning accordingly.

Ms. Shepard: And it is good to hear the communication and outreach that is happening. I will point out that there are initiatives later about doing more on communicating clear about what are the expectations and where are the tools and resources to help. Another example, is if we are expecting you to change your services to evidence based there is a Resource Center to help you. Flagging the financials here, makes it easier for everyone to see the financial obligation.

Mr. Munoz: Communication has been there, so we will see how it goes.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Asks Commissioner Munoz if they communicated with the Chief, he explained yes, they did. Continues- So you don't know if they have gone to their assistant county manager?

Mr. Munoz: We have communicated with them in various ways. We know they haven't and we told them to plan for the future.

Commissioner Cervantes: Do we have an actual cost?

Mr. Munoz: They were looking at it per that user fee. It is $30 a month per user. Which is the cost we negotiated.

Commissioner Wooldridge: We paid for two years of it, and two years of licensing. The YLS is expensive. It will get cheaper the more people that use it. We spent $438,000. I have a contract under the state with them until April of next year.

Commissioner Cervantes: They contract with each individual county.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Suggests, wouldn't it be cheaper if we had the state do the contract and the counties paid the state for their share? To we can negotiate a rate?

Commissioner Wooldridge: Explains that might be a possibility. Commissioner Munoz explains that is something they have been looking at. Wooldridge continues, we paid for training, two years licensing on assessment usage and other parts.

Mr. Munoz: We are debating and researching which would be more cost effective, or if that is something we are able to do.

Commissioner Cervantes: I want to get the question to NAJJA for an estimation for individual costs. Some places already use it correct? Carson?

Commissioner Wooldridge: There are six counties that use it already.

Ms. Shepard: Asks Commissioners, what is the desired outcome, ultimately around using Evidence Based programs or practices?

Mr. Munoz: Mentions, less placements, arrests, reducing detention, overcrowding.

Ms. Shepard: Explains these have a direct impact on these measures.

Commissioner Cervantes: Improved well-being.

Commissioner Judge Voy: We could mirror the four or five recidivism issues. There are five categories, and the goal would be to lower all these situations and lowering the number of kids going to the adult system.

Ms. Shepard: What is the ultimate outcome of Evidence Based Practices? It is not for the Juvenile Justice system, it is for the outcomes of youth in the system.

Commissioner Cervantes: We are trying to improve competency of youth. Example, if you have anger issues you need coping skills to deal with anger management through an Evidence Based program. Providing opportunities to help kids build competency and skills for kids that had none of that before they entered the Juvenile Justice system.

Ms. Shepard: Mentions no competency and skills potentially is what led them to crime in the first place.

Commissioner Cervantes: Explains, sometimes that could be the reasoning behind it but not always.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Improvements are a measurement. A kid is committed, does programming, and that programming is improving, your outcomes are going to be reflected in lesser number of violations when they go back to the community.

Commissioner Cervantes: Five years from now, what you need to be doing is program evaluation on the Evidence Based program. You must decide where you want to invest, in what programs are working.

Ms. Shepard: What is the outcome for the people giving these services?

Commissioner Munoz: The goal is to hopefully not see the same kids coming through, recidivism.

Commissioner Cervantes: Gives an example, you have a kid that is 12 and recycling through the system. But does not get arrested and put through the adult system. They built competency and coping skills from being in the Juvenile system. Recycling is part of the process. Giving them life skills.

Ms. Shepard: We are giving them life skills.

Commissioner Judge Voy: The child's maturation is a huge factor in succeeding in the system.

Ms. Shepard: The root of reducing recidivism, is held in Evidence-based programs.

Commissioner Cervantes: We are supporting parallel to that maturation process by providing. You can only measure what you can measure.

Ms. Shepard: It is very much about tailoring the right program for the right kid.

Commissioner Cervantes: It is about fidelity. If a program is available for anyone in the state, then you know that you are using a similar technology to give to someone rather than guess at it. That is the design of Evidence -based is to standardize something that has shown the effectiveness of something to work.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: By doing Risk and Needs Assessments correctly are we going to decrease costs in providing services as well?

Commissioner Judge Voy: Well we are hoping to not be adding to recidivism. Gives example, instead of having a kid in five programs and we are not quite sure, we now are only having that kid in one program. Which potentially could reduce costs.

Commissioner Cervantes: And it is a measure.

Commissioner Wooldridge: And you want to re-invest that.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: I am not trying to take money away, I just wanted to know if it will get cheaper for us.

Commissioner Orduna-Hastings: It goes back to what the Governor said. We spent this many millions of dollars on Juvenile Justice, what do we get for it? So, yes, there is an economic advantage to this.

Mr. Munoz: It comes back to reducing detention overcrowding, reducing re-arrest and all these other things that we are doing. We are also reducing operating costs for all these things, that we can then re-funnel to the front-end services. Re-invest.

Commissioner Cervantes: That is true, and that is the Detention Alternatives model. If you go back to the part that I put up. If you try to do one at the expense of the other, you pay for it. The facilities are full now, a lot of beds have been removed and a lot of issues are at the front- end. It is not always a one to one ratio. Societies change, systems change, there are a lot of social impacts that bring families and kids to the system.

Ms. Shepard: This is the noble cause. One of the vision outcomes is there could be more funds for prevention vs detention. Detention helps some kids and is right for some kids, but we should also focus on prevention.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: It allows us to make a full argument once we collect these things. The prevention piece is the best investment in the long run. Detention is way expensive.

Commissioner Cervantes: From a Sociological standpoint, talking about poverty, housing, people do not have the same opportunities. I don't know if Juvenile Justice can go in and correct that. There are long standing issues in their lives sometimes that will not be fixed at the gate. It is a larger system to address. We do prevention, but prevention at that level requires you to look deeply into a community that is way in front of Juvenile Justice. It is ultra-expensive. We want to look at big ticket factors. The right kid, right place type model. Once you get that you will understand the diversity of kids and the needs they have. That is really the end goal, keeping them out of the Adult System.

Staff Member Katie Brubaker: Are we assuming for goal two that we already have those Evidence-based practices or programs? Where do we address the outcomes associated with expenses? Or is that an outcome in five years?

Commissioner Wooldridge: Well one of our goals was to increase Evidence-based practices and programs.

Ms. Shepard: Gives example, say something like, "The majority of our practices are Evidence-based." We can soften it, strengthen it. Some argue we are there others argue we aren't there.

Commissioner Cervantes: Ideally, the more opportunity of those programs we have, than the better. The more opportunities that kids have and exposure to those, I think is probably what we are all after. How you get that, I don't know.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Asks about a number in the actual bill.

Commissioner Orduna-Hastings: 25% to 100% over five years. For state funding.

Commissioner Judge Voy: The question is, overall throughout the entire state of Juvenile Justice Systems is what things are not funded, do we want to start putting some numbers by that?

Ms. Shepard: It is hard to do that when you do not know what your base-line is.

Commissioner Cervantes: You can be vague and say, "The more opportunity that you have…", I just don't know how or where to put a number in that. I don't know if it is a number you're trying to get or an ideal (Speaking to Commissioner Judge Voy.)

Ms. Shepard: Gives example, let's say that we have more Evidence-based practices and programs available, in whatever form. And more resources available what is the stake in the sand? At the county or state level. When does the inventory have to be done Katie [Brubaker]?

Staff Member Katie Brubaker: Before July 1

Commissioner Cervantes: What you want is more accessibility to Evidence-based programming.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: It says filling things with desire. They are out there, you would assume you know what they are. Do we have a role in exposing Evidence-based practices, that are best? Or suggesting.

Commissioner Cervantes: Accessibility is the issue.

Ms. Shepard: What if you were to say, "Put it on the service providers from the county and state." Clarifies: That the more service providers, the more counties, the more the state providers, are defaulting to Evidence-based practices.

Commissioner Orduna-Hastings: Isn't the word incentivizing? There is money if you do it. I am trying to be more strength based in the, "You must do this." Maybe the word is incentivized. An increased use of the Evidence-based programs.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: Who says they are Evidence-based?

Commissioner Wooldridge: The Evidence-based resource center will put them on that Matrix.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: So, someone will make the call that this is good stuff?

Commissioner Orduna-Hastings: Yes, backed by measurements of people participating, cohort groups, empirical evidence, and research.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: So, it is measured by people participating in an approved Evidence-based program.

Ms. Shepard: There are two ways to do it. One is difficult, it is to do a whole bunch of research to prove the program we have is evidence based, it is complicated and expensive. The other is to replace the program in place now, with a proven to be, Evidence-based program.

Commissioner Cervantes: (Gives an example with Commissioner Chief Anderson.) Let me ask this, in law enforcement what is an Evidence-based practice in patrol procedures or tact?

Commissioner Chief Anderson: Hot Spot Policing. You put a lot of cops in a very small area and it reduces your overall crime rate dramatically is an example of an Evidence-based practice. I am just not fully familiar with the Juvenile Justice System. If we are making them do this, we should have a list of things that work. And say that we will not continue to fund things if they are not on the list.

Commissioner Cervantes: That is what we are working on now.

Commissioner Orduna-Hastings: That is an enforcement piece that the JJOC has.

Commissioner Cervantes: (Gives example) If all your cars had to be four-wheel drive, and you did not have access to any of those cars we could not really enforce it on your agency. So, we are developing the programming, finding some availability and access to those programs and then introduce those to our system.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: Agrees, so there is marketing and buy in then?

Commissioner Wooldridge: Explains, it is really expensive to buy Evidence Based programs and be trained in them. Part of the problem is you have to use the train the trainer model, because people move around.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: So, is it unbeknownst to tell that it impacts every piece of the Juvenile Justice System in your county? Or is it segmented thing that just applies to the courts or Probation and Parole?

Commissioner Cervantes: You cannot mandate the counties budgets. The bill allows though, up to a population of 100,000, they can be excluded from some of those things. It is still an issue state wide, at a high level it is difficult to achieve.

Commissioner Judge Voy: We are the most densely urbanized state in the country. 96% of our population was in Las Vegas and Reno and Sparks.

Ms. Shepard: What if we were to say counties facilities and state service providers are incentivized to use more EBP's. And that more EBP's be made available. We aren't even saying that they are using more, but rather, that they have it easier to access them, is really all we are saying.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: They wouldn't even have to do research on them. It would just already be there.

Commissioner Cervantes: I think that culturally it is kind of odd to have a bunch of EBP and not be willing to use them, especially if they are available and there.

Ms. Shepard: That is all we are saying, is we are putting them there for you. You decide not to take the state funds or choose to use your general funds. We are making it more appealing and effective for you. (You as in counties). Sustainable funding will be one of the initiatives, it is funded through most of the fiscal year, right?

Commissioner Orduna-Hastings: At this time, it is not funded at all.

Ms. Shepard: (Switching topics) The third goal was around system collaboration. This was an observation of our systems not being very cross-collaborated. I cannot remember if we made the analysis assessment. Those agencies would be inclusive to DCFS. Meaning, outside of the JJS. Clarifies, well within and outside of the JJS. The system collaboration would include the initiatives of Caseload Pro, the Q/A Review, Performance Reporting, and Cross Agency Collaboration engaging with Child Welfare, Child Mental Health and Community providers. The big parts of this goal are really around centralizing the data and reporting the data. The final initiative here is around sharing that information across agencies. A continuum of care concept. In terms of outcomes, anyone have anything?

Commissioner Judge Voy: We should include NDOC, if we get them on board with Caseload Pro and build into that. They can see what we do in our Juvenile Systems in comparison to our Adult Corrections System. I would like to see a potential outcome in five years with the department of corrections with us. Both will use Caseload Pro, and also data collection will lead to recidivism studies will help as well. If a kid comes through our system and another, like Adult, we are going to have a lot of shared info among us. What a resource that would be for them when they are trying to help this kid.

Ms. Shepard: The Director was on the phone last meeting and he seemed very interested. They will be one of the entities that we will work with.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: Is there access about information for Juvenile's in our program that have aged out? Will Adult facilities have access to a Juvenile's previous arrests and records? After the person has aged out?

Commissioner Judge Voy: After they are 21? That is something we will have to explore.

Ms. Shepard: That might be a legislative question.

Commissioner Cervantes: What do they do with the PSI?

Commissioner Chief Anderson: I believe it ages out.

Commissioner Judge Voy: With the PSI they can get Juvenile Justice information until they are 23 years old. It does age out though, yes.

Mr. Munoz: We get subpoenaed all the time for records.

Commissioner Judge Voy: I get records all the time from PSI reports.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: That is different though, that is a subpoena and you have to make the case because you are taking this information for a reason.

Commissioner Cervantes: The statute allows for the Clerk of the Judge to get that information.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: It does go through a mechanism and it does not hard copies.

Commissioner Cervantes: They are notes recorded of a version that they are getting. You are right, it is not a Psych report.

Mr. Munoz: And it is not consistent. For example, it should be the first question when you make contact with a Juvenile, is are you on probation or parole, and what is your PO's name. This does not always happen.

Commissioner Cervantes: If you term out of everything and then you go to get employed and someone is able to pull up all your records that is a problem.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: It can ruin lives.

Ms. Shepard: What are the outcomes of that process and collaboration? It is a two-part goal, part of it is about centralization and gathering of data. The other is cross agency collaboration.

Commissioner Duffy: My goal is I want to stop hearing people say, "This is your kid." One agency looks at the other agency and says, "This is your kid." Another agency looks at them and says, "Oh no, this is your kid." It is all of our kids. Each agency has their strengths and weaknesses.

Ms. Shepard: That can go both ways. One, how effective can you be, the agencies be, and the other is what about for the kid? For the child are we being effective?

Commissioner Duffy: I see it because I handle both foster care and delinquency. I will get a kid on delinquency that is having problems in a foster home and then call probation and they say no that is DCFS's kid. They may be on probation, but they are a C+ probationer so Probation really doesn't have to do anything, and say things like that is not our problem, it is DCFS's problem. We cannot do that, we have to all work together for success on the kid.

Ms. Shepard: That could actually slow down how effective and meaningfully we help kids.

Commissioners: Agree

Commissioner Orduna-Hastings: There is a Judge that said, "Families do not work in silos but the System does." The system is set up for us and not the families and how do we break that down to where we treat them as a family. So many of these kids are on multiple dockets. How do we make the system work for families and not work for us?

Commissioner Duffy: Agrees, the message that we send kids is unbelievable.

Mr. Munoz: It even comes down to organizations. For example, "That is a State kid that we are holding in our Detention Facility." Next thing, you have PO's or other staff members calling state facilities or state offices saying, "Hey when are you going to get your kid out of here?" We are following court orders too. We need to all get on the same page to work together for a kid. The bottom line is, if we don't help the counties now, we are going to get that kid later.

Commissioner Cervantes: There is natural conflict in Sub-systems, trying to minimize that is the goal. There is a general theme of client center of approach, it is not as efficient, but it is helpful.

Mr. Munoz: At the state level, what we started to do is, we have child welfare, we have JJ, and some cases will cross over, we will need assistance from another division. We started to have meetings where we will come together to assist our sister agencies, I guess the goal would be to do this among counties too.

Ms. Shepard: the outcome of this can be more robust if we want it to be, if we want to make a statement with how this will work.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Remember we had that initiative in there? I think we took it out, about collaborating with other state and county agencies.

Ms. Shepard: Clarifies that it is in there. It is an initiative. It is difficult but if we do it we have effectively implement the initiative of cross agency collaboration. We don't just have Caseload Pro, we are not saying, "Your kid." What is the outcome in five years?

Commissioner Wooldridge: That initiative, or that goal is in every Strategic Plan I have ever worked on.

Commissioners: Agree

Commissioner Cervantes: It is stake holder collaboration, data informed.

Commissioner Wooldridge: We never get there, I have been here 25 years and we have never gotten there. We come close, but we never get there.

Ms. Shepard: The bigger system is broken, it could be individual agencies putting in the work or doing a good job, but the bigger system is broken.

Commissioner Cervantes: In some respects, yes, in some aspects it works.

Commissioner Judge Voy: When do we have Foster Cares set up for Caseload Pro?

Commissioner Wooldridge: The problem with that is that it needs to be CWIZ compliant. We have all the requirements that CWIZ would have to do and meet.

Commissioner Judge Voy: For our systems to collaborate they have to be able to communicate.

Commissioner Duffy: At the Children's Commission meeting, we had a very long conversation about that. Caseload Pro and what steps to take to get it there.

Ms. Shepard: I think we captured it here, the system of care. Children are getting all the resources. They are not stuck in a system that is continuously recycling.

Commissioner Cervantes: We are just creating a system that will work efficiently.

Commissioner Judge Voy: We want court orders to transfer over to the field.

Mr. Munoz: With leadership in place, we can begin demonstrating to our line staff that this is a priority for us. Example is dual custody kids, parole has custody over kids too. But we assigned a specific officer to work with them so there is some consistency and reliability. We should take that same approach in all areas, that we are a team, equal responsibility with what is happening with youth. The youth and families are the ones that suffer.

When our communication is not there. This is huge for us to start over and really make it a priority. People here and on the phone have the authority to make that happen.

Ms. Shepard: Sometimes it helps to know where the gap is. We talked about outcomes in five-ish years. I would like to hear from you, where are the gaps? Once some of these new initiatives get done, we might need to look at where we will need more.

Commissioner Duffy: Let's talk about Clark County School district, that gap has been hugely strong in years of collaboration. The police department. The gaps that are still there and sometimes get better and then go backwards that is DCFS and the county Juvenile Justice System.

Ms. Shepard: To recap, we have work to do, but we are on our way.

Commissioner Orduna-Hastings: It is steps in the right direction even if they are not monumental.

Ms. Shepard: It is a never changing thing. Leadership changes, capacities and resources change, a lot. It is helpful when knowing the shift that is needed. When we get to year 3 and get to implementation mode we will be able to continue to see where we need to be and continue to work toward that.

Mr. Munoz: Just like this whole plan, there needs to be some sustainability. Some processes in place so that when we move on, for the next group of people here, this can still continue to work.

Ms. Shepard: Maybe that needs to be a plan a part of the initiative for the cross-agency collaboration. It has to be about processes and sustainability. How do we identify collaboration that is sustainable? Is what we need to find out. (Switches topics)

Tailored Services

This is around family engagement plans, and case plans. They will be set up to ultimately reduce recidivism. The family engagement is for all youth throughout the system.

Commissioner Judge Voy: We are going to develop a handbook for family engagement.

Commissioner Cervantes: Family engagement is a concept, that in working with families that they are involved with the case plan and decision-making processes.

Commissioner Wooldridge: To keep kids with their families and not in placement is huge, especially for cost savings.

Ms. Shepard: What does the case plan do? Those are about re-entry?

Commissioner Wooldridge: I go back and forth on if we need to keep that in as an initiative, because it is in the bill and it is pretty specific in the bill.

Commissioner Cervantes: I don't know if we want to duplicate too much of that right, if it is in there let's not.

Ms. Shepard: It better be in the plan if it is in the bill is my recommendation.

Commissioner Cervantes: It is referenced in the plan, right?

Commissioner Wooldridge: It must be referenced in the plan because it applies to the Risk and Needs Assessment.

Ms. Shepard: Is it a performance measure? If we don't have it in the plan as an initiative…

Commissioner Cervantes: Aren't they kind of conjoined? The Risk Assessment drives the Case Plan. So, they are kind of one in the same. The Risk and Needs Assessment really develops the Case Plan at that point in the system. It guides it, according to this model.

Commissioner Judge Voy: What it is going to do is give you all the risk factors so that you can concentrate on this element here, and you, as the operator will have to come up with what is going to match that.

Commissioner Cervantes: I may be over stating it but my understanding is that the Risk and Needs Assessment, if everything is true to us and there is an evidence based resource center on these things that go to Caseload Pro my risk and need, when I fill that out, all leads me to that juvenile need sand substance abuse intervention. It pulls out a menu of substance abuse intervention sites.

Ms. Shepard: It is good to understand the process. I think there is a difference between process and other difference is, we are basically saying that from the Risk and Needs Assessment we are going to produce a Case Plans. If it is in the bill but not the plan there is going to be someone that does not understand. It informs the Case Plans from what you are saying.

Commissioner Judge Voy: It is going to give you some of the basic stuff. The level of supervision, identified risks, that can be matched up with programming that we currently have that is tied with that risk, and Caseload Pro will help you guide some of that.

Commissioner Cervantes: The whole purpose of this is to standardize the process.

Commissioner Judge Voy: A kid comes in and you do the assessment before giving them charges and time for the charges. This is helping in identifying the issue and how to help fix it, rather than just locking a kid up. These assessments help you to really find the problem. That follows the kid through the process.

Commissioner Cervantes: Right, that is my point, that Risk and Needs drives the Case Plan.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Agrees, explains it still requires some fidelity.

Commissioner Wooldridge: What we originally talked about was like a handbook and guide for probation and parole officers and facility people on what is required in the law for the Case Plan. That is something DCFS can do.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: Is it in compliance with the tool that might be missing?

Commissioner Wooldridge: It is in compliance with the tool and the law.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: You could use the tool all day long but if you think you are better than the tool then you won't even try and use it for the kid. We need to make sure people are in compliance with the tool. They will need to measure the outcomes.

Commissioner Cervantes: What we don't have is a table menu of all of those services, because there are systems that just grab the services and plug them in. I am fine with just developing a Case Plan.

Ms. Shepard: I think the point is that if you think about it, in terms of a timeline that the Risk and Needs Assessment is done prior to disposition, but the point is that the Case Plan is followed and modified flowing disposition.

Commissioner Cervantes: Are you saying it does not have to be in there?

Ms. Shepard: It is, and let's keep it here.

Commissioner Judge Voy: The results will be done, and they can act as checks and balances in the court room. Stating what the YLS shows is needed.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: Does the kid and assessment change post court? And there will be things done to the child that is out of the supervision and review of the court?

Commissioner Cervantes: Yes

Ms. Shepard: Really what this is about is following the Risk and Needs Assessment once they are in the system.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: Who is responsible that they are actually doing that?

Commissioner Cervantes: The probation officers and the supervisors.

Commissioner Wooldridge: The counties have to report it from the bill, the counties and the state, parole institutions will have to report it to the state. They report to us, legislation, and the Governor. They have three different reports that are due.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: Adherence to the plan is one of those measures they have to report?

Commissioner Cervantes: Yes

Ms. Shepard: If they have a Case Plan, needs to be reported first.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Checks and balances are going to be on Supervisors, managers, directors and Judges to make sure it is in the Case Plan.

Commissioner Cervantes: The intent is that the Case Plan has to be a Case Plan, there must be a written document.

Commissioner Chief Anderson: If there is no oversight, stuff does not get done.

Mr. Munoz: With this Case Plan, it is all based on these factors, and these domains, it hits every aspect of the child's life. That case plan is developed and reviewed, and the child and family have a team meeting every so often, so that we can review it and there are updates on it that are required so everyone knows what progress has been made or what the kid has been doing. Supervisors check the Case Plans, there is Judicial oversight. Judicial reviews are to be sure Case Plans are being followed.

Commissioner Wooldridge: One of the downfalls is that the Q/A part is only for State facilities and county camps, we did not add the Q/A to agencies.

Commissioner Cervantes: It is a big deal; a Case Plan is a signed documented agreement. The Director Chief is responsible for every Case Plan under their watch. This is also a great way to hold PO's accountable. There is no grey area.

Ms. Shepard: One of the questions I would ask, is if there is any sort of measure or compliance around the cases needed. Are case plans for children already being measured? Commissioners answer no, Shepard continues, there has to be a Case Plan on every child in the system correct? I know it is not in the bill but as responsible, respectable people in the system, should we be in the plan saying …

Commissioner Wooldridge: The problem is that, there will not be enough staff to go in and Q/A it. Can we have counties be responsible for that? Because we cannot even do our own Q/A's.

Commissioner Cervantes: It is difficult to do policies that you cannot enforce, we should probably leave that off the table. It does not look like any time in the near future we will be able to do quality assurance enforcement so why would we put that in there?

Commissioner Wooldridge: It is not a lot of money to get trained in the Q/A tool for the counties. What is difficult is monitoring that the counties are doing the Q/A tool and the corrective action plan that goes with it. It is time consuming.

Ms. Shepard: My first step is asking if we have a means, or should we have some process or an initiative to develop a process, like the planning the plan part. On how we are going to monitor that every kid has a Case Plan?

Commissioner Duffy: Should my committee put a performance measure in, that every child has a Case Plan?

Commissioner Judge Voy: It is mandated by statute that every kid is going to have a Case Plan and every kid that enters into the system must have a Case Plan.

Commissioner Wooldridge: We can make a report out of Caseload Pro if there are missing Case Plans.

Commissioner Duffy: Is that a performance measure? Or something we recognize in the Strategic Plan for the JJOC Oversight Commission.

Commissioner Orduna-Hastings: Right, a performance measure.

Commissioner Judge Voy: That is correct, it is an oversight measure. And you can run a report on Caseload Pro and we are all on it.

Commissioner Duffy: Is it going to be where Child Welfare agencies are required by the Feds. Are we going to work on policies that require a timeline?

Commissioner Wooldridge: The bill addresses the timeline too.

Ms. Shepard: Clarifies, What we are going to do is expect that for the Case Plan initiative there will actually be a policy or process on how to measure…

Commissioner Wooldridge: In part of their reporting, maybe it can be when the trans-analysis report that is due, the counties will report to the state their percentage of missing case plans.

Commissioner Duffy: Is there a sub-committee around Case Planning?

Ms. Shepard: Yes, it is part of the action items. So, you are saying it would be a trend that the JJOC would report on? I believe we do have the performance measure tied to family engagement. Performance measures from group homes includes increase in family engagement. We are measuring the impact. The statute does say every kid needs to have a Case Plan. What is nice, is that the YLS will make this happen already. Making it part of the trend, we will report on the percentage of youth that have a Case Plan. The question would be, should we recommend that the commission do a draft state policy on corrective action? What do you do if you're a county and have 50% compliance does the oversight commission need to do something, we need a policy, it is a question that we already know.

Commissioner Judge Voy: If you don't put a penalty in a "You shall do…" then it becomes advisory, it is not compliant.

Commissioner Cervantes: You do not policy yourself out of being able to do anything.

Ms. Shepard: Are we saying that we do need the commission to have a policy on corrective action or a response when the county is not?

Commissioner Duffy: Right, I agree with that. I would like to see some strength in our Statute around holding parents accountable to engage in those Case Plans. We need it stream lined. We need our PO's to practice their initial interviewing to motivate parents to want to parent and not let the county and state to parent their children, there has to be some accountability when they are unable to do it.

Ms. Shepard: Asks for clarification. If a parent does not engage what happens?

Commissioner Judge Voy: There has to be a specific written order detailing exactly what they are supposed to do, you give them the order, and if they fail to comply you will file an initial cause. The problem is that the process to hold a parent in content is so cumbersome. Commissioner Duffy is saying we need something more directly in the Statute to help with this issue and the process.

Commissioner Wooldridge: When we do the trends, part of the data to be collected is Minority Disproportionality, Economic Disproportionality to see if parents are too stressed out, working too many jobs and plainly, cannot get out there.

Commissioner Duffy: But wouldn't the PO identify that? And put services in place for that family?

Ms. Shepard: That is where the Risk and Needs Assessment comes in.

Mr. Munoz: The Risk and Needs Assessment is done with the child. Yes, it takes into considerations from the family in certain circumstances, but it focuses primarily with the youth.

Ms. Shepard: One of the performance measures you require as the county for parole or probation is to put in to Caseload Pro, is the race, their education, economic background, family poverty level, composition of household. Commissioner Munoz: Considering composition of household, research shows that family engagement is key and building stronger ties and bonds is helpful in developing coping skills, parenting skills, and all those are important. Commissioner Duffy is saying that by the time they get to us, they are burned out or nearly burned out.

Commissioner Duffy: What we do now, is hold the kid accountable for not getting counseling, and gets a Probation violation. Well how is a kid supposed to go to counseling if he isn't even able to legally drive himself.

Commissioner Cervantes: Family engagement is a concept, a strategy, not something you can really legislate. It is complex.

Ms. Shepard: In terms of this next section is all about reporting. The intention I show do we measure performance and implement. Things to consider, who is responsible for what, in terms of performing. Considering a plan, so we have performance measures to report against, but we also have a plan we have to report progress on. Then the process and what the data sources are for all of this. It is pretty clear that Caseload Pro, or 62H is the data source for the performance measures. But for the planned performance is what we need to figure out.
What is mandated by the bill, for reporting to DCFS and Caseload Pro is December 31. That is a month before the deadline for Statute, in time for the January 31 deadline.

Commissioner Wooldridge: There are three different reports due to the Governor and legislature. Two of them come from DCFS and one from the JJOC.

Ms. Shepard: Clarifies, so the counties and referral need to report to DCFS in time for the January 31 report to the Governor and Legislature.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Then there is one that the JJOC reports on the progress of the strategic plan, and one more.

Ms. Shepard: The way we put it, the counties and parole report to DCFS by Dec 31. The state has to show some data compliance to the JJOC on June 1. And on July 1 is when the DCFS reports that to the Legislature and the Governor. Do we not need a phase when the JJOC reports to DCFS? Who reports the trends?

Commissioner Wooldridge: DCFS

Ms. Shepard: Then there is reporting the status of the Strategic Plan, are we making progress on that. That is the JJOC. So, the counties need to report to the JJOC for July-May. We will want to show a full fiscal year, so we may want to ask legislature that. That date is all over the bill. The date issue will affect all of this. Trends are for 5-6 months maybe, the following may be a full year, the cycle is messed up. At the same time, we would submit recommendations for changes. We can revise the plan as many times as we would like.
(Switches topics)
The JJOC is responsible for adapting the strategy and communicating forms to the Governor and Legislature. Who specifically? Is it the Commissioners? Co-chairs?

Commissioner Wooldridge: The way I envisioned it is what we would probably do is prepare from the data we have and DCFS Staff would prepare a report to present to the Commission.

Ms. Shepard: Who from the Commission presents it to the Governor?

Commissioner Wooldridge: Probably the Co-Chairs

Commissioner Orduna-Hastings: That is what we did last time right? We co-signed a letter to be submitted to the Governor.

Ms. Shepard: DCFS is responsible for compiling county performance measures and reporting on the overall data trends and department lead strategic initiatives. Who from DCFS?

Commissioner Wooldridge: (Speaking to Commissioner Munoz) What we need for your internal implementation team is a policy. I think this needs to be a policy from the JJOC for when the counties report to DCFS.

Mr. Munoz: That is different.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Well Katie (Brubaker) can work on that too. We need a policy based off of this, I think it needs to come from the JJOC of when and what times we need to report to DCFS based off the bill.

Ms. Shepard: It is in the bill and the plan, what needs to be reported.

Commissioner Wooldridge: What the counties are not clear on now, is even what they should be reporting to DCFS now. In 62H or how to report it.

Mr. Munoz: I thought the Data Committee was going to outline and help create what those data points are, so we can compare easier.

Commissioner Wooldridge: But it is also deadlines for reporting which is in the bill. It must be DCFS's responsibility to communicate that to NAJJA or the county people that this is due. I do think there needs to be some sort of policy even if it is not a JJOC policy, but a DCFS policy on what and how the counties report.

Commissioner Duffy: Is that not required already within the plan?

Commissioner Wooldridge: Yes

Commissioner Duffy: That DCFS writes the policy and JJOC has the oversight of it.

Commissioners: Agree

Ms. Shepard: I am sure that there is an initiative for writing a policy on how and what to report. What the counties and probation report. Is there an ultimate accountability Director? System Director or what is the title of that person form DCFS?

Commissioner Wooldridge: The Deputy Administrator over Juvenile Justice, is the title of that person.

Ms. Shepard: This is a role; the county and Parole are responsible for reporting on performance measures and the Strategic Plan initiatives at the counties. The heads of Parole at each county. For plan structure, for who is reporting on progress against the plan do the county heads of Probation also report on that? Who is going to report on the plan at the county level and DCFS level?

Commissioner Cervantes: At the county level it would be Director of Chiefs of Probation.

Ms. Shepard: Are we still on the Strategic Plan talking about the Deputy Administrator of Juvenile Justice being the person who also reports on DCFS compliance?

Mr. Munoz: Yes

Ms. Shepard: For the JJOC is it still the Co-chairs? Or do we delegate to committees?

Commissioner Orduna-Hastings: Co-chairs.

Ms. Shepard: Can we move to approve the draft plan with the said changes and guidance for submittal to the Co-chairs for next week.

Commissioner Judge Voy: Yes, I make that motion.

Commissioner Wooldridge: Submittal to the Co-chairs and the Full JJOC in June.

Ms. Shepard: You are right, to the Co-chairs and the Full JJOC in June.

Commissioner Cervantes: Can I get a motion for the amended motion.

Commissioner Judge Voy: I motion that.

Dr. Hibbler: Seconds the motion.

Public Comment: None

Adjourned: Commissioner Cervantes adjourned at 4:16pm

BRIAN SANDOVAL
Governor

RICHARD WHITLEY, MS
Director

ROSS E. ARMSTRONG
Interim Administrator

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
and the
Strategic Plan Committee Meeting
May 31, 2018
Meeting Minutes DRAFT

Call to Order: 10:00am

Roll Call: Frank Cervantes, Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, John Munoz, Lorna Shepard, Sierra Fowzer, Sarah Bellows.

Noted: No Quorum

Public Comment: None

Commissioner Munoz: Well since it does not appear that we have a quorum, what I would like to do is probably just open it up to see if there are any questions on the Strategic Plan that Commissioner Shepard put together, which by the way I think is a fantastic plan you put together. I think it speaks volumes to the work that we have done and the direction we are heading. Ms. Shepard is there anything that you would like to add to that. Is there any feedback or questions that you have for the rest of the team?

Ms. Shepard: Thanks, I don't take all the credit it was a team effort. The place where we are in is where we left it on May 17th. The plan is sort of in review mode with the Governor's office, to be honest. We are just waiting on feedback there. I know I do not have any questions of the Committee. You know we are aiming for having a draft for a public document by Monday, if not earlier, for a Commission meeting. So, no I do not have any questions and I think we are in good shape. We sent the draft to Judge Walker the plan was complete, you know everything was done there were no outstanding issues or questions. We got to a lot on May 17th.

Staff Sarah Bellows: For the Record Commissioner Cervantes is on the call now, about five minutes in.

Ms. Shepard: I just wanted to say that I did not want to cancel this meeting. Well there are just two questions regarding the plan. Senator Ohrenschall I think that you were remotely attending part of the May 17th, but you know you have been running fast and furious and Frank I do not know if there is anything you want to talk about the plan, or if there is anything you want to say in view of preparation of the June 8th meeting. I think that the subcommittee report would basically be we have a plan, we are recommending this draft to be approved and

wanted the approval to be the final plan and be formatted for submission to the Commission for submission to Legislation and the Governor's office.

Commissioner Cervantes: The final draft has to be in on what date?

Ms. Shepard: July 1

Commissioner Cervantes: This one on the June 8 meeting is just kind of our prelude to our final draft right?

Ms. Shepard: Right, so at this point I do not believe that there is a Commission meeting scheduled again, so I think we are able to do, pending what feedback we get from the Governor's Office if we get feedback, I think what we are going to be able to do is submit a draft for the 8th meeting for approval. Then we will just basically button it up. You know basically format it better, so that the document can be submitted to the Legislature by the 1st. I have not actually coordinated or discussed with the co-chairs when they want to submit the plan, you know what their deadline is. Do they want to do it on the 30th, or sooner?

Commissioner Cervantes: Okay we can just ask that probably at that meeting. I like your plan, I think if we present this, and then if there are any suggestions or questions from the co-chairs, we could address those between that and the date that they chose for a final draft.

Ms. Shepard: That was my hope, so we could have a bit of wiggle room for any adjustments that need to be made and then we would submit it for review one more time and then we would button it up. Yeah exactly.

Commissioner Cervantes: I like it. Was there anything else at the last meeting in Las Vegas, was there anything else that we needed to modify or change on this before we submit that Ms. Shepard?

Ms. Shepard: I do not think on the plan. Mentions the Parking Lot activity. I do not think it belongs in the plan, but I think it belongs somewhere. I guess I would love to get everyone to help because it is going to land happily in your lap Assemblyman Ohrenschall. How do we tackle those and do not lose track of them? I am going to type them, that is the easy part, but then what, what do we do with those? I mean do we make them part of a public record that is probably fine. I probably should have done that for today. I did not actually think about that, but, I actually think it is better for me to ask, how do you want me to handle that, so we do not lose sight of that?

Commissioner Cervantes: Assemblyman Ohrenschall are you on the line?

Commissioner Assemblyman Ohrenschall: Yes, I am on the line and I would like to help in any way in terms of bill drop requests. You know I am still hoping I will be there, right now it depends on the primary. I am running hard and hoping I will be there next session. If I am I would certainly want to help as much as I can. There may be other homes that can be found for bill drops, but I am certainly committed to try assist in any way I can. This is assuming my candidacy gives me that opportunity. I am working hard.

Ms. Shepard: Yes, we are hoping for the best.

Commissioner Cervantes: I have a question for both Shepard and Ohrenschall. You know there is the Juvenile Justice Commission right, and we are looking for some possible future legislation and some things that have already wandered into this plan. But as you know Assemblyman Ohrenschall there are lots of other groups that are going to be forwarding legislation. For example, I met with the ACLU last week, and they are looking at some of this language around you know kids that are in Lovelock in the Adult System that have been certified or transferred to Adult Jurisdiction. Housing them somewhere other than in state prisons, or Nevada Corrections Commissions. Which is a topic, as you know, that has come up in previous sessions. As there is legislation that is presented outside of ours, I was just wondering how we not know if this Commission intends to absorb all of these other kind of other legislative drafts, or if we are ancillary and we play a control team role. I am kind of trying to throw out that fact, because I know that there will be other initiatives and drafts that

may not be aware that we are already working on additional reforms as we had in the past. Does that make sense Assemblyman Ohrenschall?

Commissioner Assemblyman Ohrenschall: That is true, certainly the current legislature on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice has bill drafts, and other organizations, you know private, can try to look for bill drafts as well. So, there might be other ideas that don't completely mesh with ideas that are coming out of our Commission. Now it is always an issue at the Legislative session. (Explains, he has to get off call at this time).

Ms. Shepard: Commissioner Cervantes, you're a Commissioner can you make a recommendation that there needs to be a subcommittee, you know that would basically identify what the approach, strategy, or response is from the JJOC to that kind of legislation. Kind of open ended right, like when legislation comes in I guess will conflict or effect the JJOC bill or purpose. We need a group of experts say to move to review the bill, and here is what the bill does or does not do to contradict our support, what the JJOC is doing. Be interesting to charge the subcommittee with. It would be interesting to tack the subcommittee with, if you feel that any proposed legislation contradicts our mission, you know, than our job is to basically, make a recommendation what our position is on Legislation and then the co-chairs, I think, have the power to go to the Governor and then the Legislature and say "We are for this, or against this".

Commissioner Cervantes: Yea you know it reminds me a little bit of the Supreme Court history this is already on another Commission, and how do we really fully note that. It never really works out like this it is a messy process. Maybe at the 8th what we do is just bring up the question of purpose. Is there any responsibility of this commission? Does it definitely say that in the Legislation to review any contradictory bill draft, or Legislation? Like you said, I think we propose the question. I do not know if anybody has enough time because it is already time to intensify bills, and I do not know if the Commission is going to be able to find a subcommittee. We have tried that in the past and it's you know our NAJJA folks we do that Ms. Shepard.

Ms. Shepard: Can NAJJA do it?

Commissioner Cervantes: Yes. Each county has their own mechanism to follow legislation. In Washoe County we have a legislative preparer person I work with all the bills that are cumulative to its welfare. Then, in NAJJA we bring back the ones that mostly affecting Juvenile Justice directly and in association we can testify on those bills. So, it is weird, one day I will be testifying on behalf of NAJJA, or I may be testifying on behalf of only Washoe County Juvenile services, or Washoe County. It is really hard to bridge all that, I think, in one commission. I just think that we just ask the question, "Is there an appetite, or should we have a discussion about when Legislation moves forward it may contradict the bill."

Ms. Shepard: I think what we could do is we could add some points to our subcommittee report. One is the Treatment Plan, that is the big one, right? We are hoping that works out timing wise right? The other is we are approaching the deadline, the third point is what the responsibility of the commission is, you know asking the question.

Commissioner Cervantes: I am trying to figure out language for this. So, Judge Voy really wants regionalization. That is part of the long-range strategy. What I am gathering from you folks is that there is a common theme from the Juvenile Justice professionals that we don't do as great as years ago. If you can do appropriately in spite of all those things, right? In the Strategic Plan there is a section that we really need to get some legal help to write it correctly would be that the commission reserves the right to examine other issues around long-term strategic plans for Criminal Justice such as regionalization or Blended Sentencing. Those are all big topics that require intensive resources and legislation, but I just wonder in there is the commission supposed to be part of that? Because we are doing long range strategic planning, or not? It seems to me that it should be. If somebody comes along and develops a regionalization law on the Juvenile Justice Oversite Commission certainly has information on that at the list, right?

Ms. Shepard: Or permission to say we support it, we don't support it. I think that it would be legislated but you know actually weigh in and say we support it, or we don't support it. It does not mean the bill won't get passed if they don't support it.

Commissioner Cervantes: The perfect example would be if somebody comes up and said, "We need to do an Evidence-based program and I am writing a bill", and they do not know about this commission that we go let's not duplicate the wheel this is already, that kind of stuff. I would anticipate Commissioner Munoz I think the next horizon for us is that really, I think we are going to be back at this state correctional care, regionalization stuff is going to be big ticket items in the next couple of sessions I think, because we are back at the population growing for the youthful offender housing status, so I think that is going to be on the table. So, Commissioner Munoz, when I talk to Holly, I said maybe her presentation to the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission is that there be a more formalized study of this in that we just forge on what we had in the Supreme Court subcommittee on all of our previous work around this. She was open to a lot stuff, I do not know what she will do with that, but this commission has all the players, and everybody should be fully informed on if there is outside big-time legislation around this stuff.

Commissioner Munoz: Just to let you know there is a subcommittee hearing on June 11th and my understanding is that the ACLU is going to be presenting a PowerPoint presentation on Blended Sentencing. Also, probably bringing up their tour at Summit View in Nevada that we sent them whether or not they want to, or if they are still considering placing certified kids at Summit View. I think I already shared with you that they had a misunderstanding before about what some of it was, and what our function was. Even after clarifying that I am still not sure, I have not seen any indication that they still want to consider doing that. So, I think that there is still a lot of indication that still needs to be done with some of these providers. Regionalization is still on Judge Voy's platform that he is pushing in our favor. As we discussed before, you know, research shows that regionalization only works when there is not targeted care but smaller community, like the Missouri Model right? Where there is a lot of family engagement, where there is a lot of keeping the kids closer to the community in smaller group home type placements that are secure of eight to sixteen kids, not up to forty-eight or one-hundred- forty that we use in state facilities.

Commissioner Cervantes: Yes, I still think that, we will talk about it later, a deeper examination of some of those systems. They are not talking about the kids that we currently have in Summit View. I still think those are more of the county camp type kids. That really deep end kid that we are talking about around regionalization is a different cohort, so I think that is where a lot of the education has to come because, you are right, the kids at Summit View, right now require a fully structured setting. You cannot do that in a Community-Based kind of group home like the Missouri Model. I have a really good example we will talk later about that. I just think that as we go forward, you know you're going to see a lot of these other presentations. If nothing else, we can always present it back to the Commission on current legislation, pending legislation, what is going on? The Criminal Justice outside of the Commission so you know there is some mechanism to keep the Commission informed.

Commissioner Munoz: Just to circle back to what we were talking about earlier about the commission reviewing bills and that kind stuff is that you know I kind of think we need to keep the scope of what the Commission does focused on what it is. I think as bill drafts come up, and they are discussed at legislative hearings that that is really our opportunity, right? To let the process work. That is really our opportunity for the state and for the counties to intervene then and inform everybody that this is contradicting this, or this would change that. Commissioner Cervantes, as you know, and others on this phone call will know as well, I do not want the JJOC to be used as an agenda platform to push forward some things. There are some things about AB 472 that need to be changed just procedurally.

Commissioner Cervantes: We do not want that to be the lobby of the group, right?

Commissioner Munoz: Correct.

Ms. Shepard: Well we also do not want it to be the heavy handed, sort of overlord of what the county does in terms of outside of its scope. You know beyond Evidenced- based practices and some of the specifics in the bill.

Commissioner Cervantes: Yea I like that. If some of these come up that are fully contradictory, I think those are the discussion points for the commission. Maybe not engage in a bunch of new projects. Is that what you are saying Commissioner Munoz?

Commissioner Munoz: It is.

Ms. Shepard: What happens after July 1st? Do we still have all the Commissioners who will be in a position to say this legislation that we look at as the county or the state is not practice of Juvenile Justice, because it is in our interest to know what is going on legislatively. Will they say, "We think this one contradicts, let me bring it to the co-chairs?" Versus every single bill. So, can we rely on the Commissioners who basically make up, well I assume that Judge Walker would read some of that legislation, or Judge Voy, to say, let's rely on the commissioners to say the bill contradicts our purpose.

Commissioner Munoz: Well I assure you that there are many leaders and directors and pieces involved in the JJOC and as an agency and administrator we all, as Frank stated, we all have our own mechanisms of tracking any legislation that comes through. We will all be very much aware of what is happening. If anybody has concerns about it, I am sure that it will be brought up and discussed.

Commissioner Cervantes: We also use NAJJA as a platform for that. So as individual counties have, they will bring forward, and we have that discussion. That might be the screening tool to just go ahead out of NAJJA who wants to report this to the co-chairs, you know for some information that may be subconscious to language in a bill or goes against. That does not mean that the Commission can do anything about it anyway, right?

Ms. Shepard: No, but I think they can decide how they want to wield their influence. You know without saying that in a public meeting. You know the idea that at least it has been raised to our attention and the commissioners at a commissioner meeting. Maybe they hold them formally after July 1. I do not actually know. It can at least say what we support and do not support, and we will communicate that. It will be a public record and that we will communicate that to the Governor's Office, or we will ask Assemblyman Ohrenschall, or whatever other elective officials are involved to represent the JJOC at legislative sessions.

Commissioner Cervantes: The other thing is that once this is quantified and the Strategic Plan is codified it is part of statute. So, if somebody writes a new bill, you know in researching, they would have to go back and change that statute in order to supersede that. So, part of the process itself, will weed out a lot of probably what we are talking about now.

Ms. Shepard: Ok, so it is not likely to happen that there would be great contradiction without some pretty intensive statute changes already in a big proposed bill.

Commissioner Cervantes: Yeah, I think if you want to go into stuff that we have part of the statute on data reporting, and all of those phases you would have to change AB 472 in order to modify this. So those parts, I do not think, would be under any kind of issue. It is just that outside big picture. Every year there is a ton of growth. Solitary confinement, regionalization, information, it is everything. You will see stuff that comes up and you will go "Wow where did that come from?" You know that nobody really controls, anybody in the Juvenile Justice and so that is what we are doing now is having conversations earlier with some of the folks that are probably drafting.

Ms. Shepard: So, bad example, but, if somebody were to propose a bill next year in June, or February and it said, "We want the State of Nevada never to use Evidence-based practices." We want to use all private homes, unlicensed, I don't know. That would be an example of it is not only requiring a change in statute to 472, but it is completely contradictory to the principles and mission of 472 in the commission. So, we are not talking

about like where there might be a bill that is being proposed that might ask to require statutory changes, and we might request our own changes to AB 472, but they don't generally change the principles of what we are trying to accomplish.

Commissioner Cervantes: Right, so I think we are good. So, we will do the draft on the 8th and then see if we can get this thing wrapped up right?

Ms. Shepard: Yes, we asked ourselves this question, we had this discussion, and this might be a recommendation. I might lean on you two, to sort of jump in and help. I might kick off the question. I am assuming I am talking, but maybe we should have you Commissioner Cervantes present the plan and also the question. I am more than happy to prepare the notes that you have in front of you.

Commissioner Cervantes: I do not mind doing that, just give me a note.

Ms. Shepard: Yes, I will give you a note. So, when we are asked to give the Strategic Plan Committee report what we are reporting. One is submitting a plan for approval the other discuss the question. This is the question, and this is what we think. How does the Commission want to vote? How does the Commission want to discuss it, does it need a vote? Coming from the co-chair of you is a good idea, instead of me.

Commissioner Cervantes: Agrees

Staff Member Sarah Bellows: Let's open for public comment just to make sure. Do we have any public comment on the phone?

Commissioner Munoz: Hey Lorna the whole thing, that I think we need to work on is I know that there was some "Parking Lot" items that we have addressed moving through all these meetings. Where there were a couple that Judge Voy had that he wanted some clarification on, or to be rewritten that may need to be submitted as a VDR moving forward. Do you still have the parking lot list?

Ms. Shepard: I do, that is kind of part of my "Garden" conversation. The one change I can tell you that he asked for regarding the plan, was to use the preamble AB62 and we included that. He included that as sort of the setup for the vision of where we are going in the draft plan. So, we just referenced the bill and said this is the preamble and we feel that the AB472 on this and the vision for the JJOC is building off of this preamble. That is basically how we presented it. The other parking lot, I apologize, I really should have written those up for this meeting and I have just been staring at my wall for some reason. I will type those up for you all and share them. I guess if we need to deal with anything at the commission meeting lets figure that out. What we will do is just basically have on the agenda we will have a strategic plan committee report, and we can add that to the items that we need to talk about.

Commissioner Munoz: That would be great thank you. That's all I have. Thank you everybody I appreciate it.

Adjourned at 10:33am Staff Member Sarah Bellows