JUVENILE JUSTICE OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

FY19 SCORECARD & PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

Reporting Period:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STRATEGIC PLAN OVERVIEW

Below is a summary of the Vision, Four Strategic Goals and System Performance Measures that comprise the strategic direction for the Nevada Juvenile Justice System.

JJOC'S VISION	Nevada's juvenile justice system will continue to protect public safety and all children who have contact with the juvenile justice system will leave the system better for it.			
STRATEGIC GOALS	Evidence-Based Practices & Programs Are Used By Counties, The State, Facilities, and Service Providers	Risk & Needs Assessments and Mental Health Screenings Inform Courts' Decisions	Collaboration Across Systems to Meet Youths' Needs	Family Engagement Plans & Case Plans Are In-Place For Every Child In the Juvenile Justice System

DATA & PERFORMANCE MEASURES

		COUNTIES & STATE:		
Juvenile court referrals Charges Number of cases by disposition Levels of supervision Rate of recidivism Percentage of youth with completed family assessment	Percentage of youth with family participation at first CFT Percentage of youth whose case plan includes family participation Percentage of family surveys completed	List of evidence based practices per juvenile court district Number of youth referred to each evidence based practice per district Rate of recidivism per each evidence based practice per youth GROUP HOMES, RTC, YOUTH CAMPS, AND STATE CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES: CPC Performance Based Standards	Assessed risk level Assessed MAYSI-2 score Disciplinary action taken in placement Educational/vocational training provided in placement Number of cases diverted	Number of cases by disposition Race / ethnicity Family poverty level Sex Age Composition of household Child's educational background Violations of probation charges Services by type provided

TRENDS

Recidivism Rates	Dispro-portionate Minority Trends	Family Poverty Level	Percent of Youth with Case Plans	Decreases In Re-Arrest	Decreases In Re-Adjudication	Decreases In Parole or Probation Violations	Decreases In Re-Commitment	Convictions In The Adult System

HOW TO READ THIS REPORT:

<Instructions here>

Status Key:

On Target. Positive Movement	Behind schedule.		

STRATEGIC PLAN PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

GOAL 1 – ASSESSMENTS & SCREENING:

Initiative 1 - RISK ASSESSMENT TOOL: Determine when the risk and needs assessment tool is used.

Summary of Progress:

Initiative 2 - REPORTING POLICY: Develop policy for reporting requirements from use of tool.

Summary of Progress:

Initiative 3 - CASE PLANNING POLICY: Develop policy for decision-making for case planning for courts regarding the scoring of the tool.

Summary of Progress:

Initiative 1 -

Initiative 2 -

STATEWIDE SCORECARD

JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM TRENDS	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Rate of Recidivism				
Percent of youth who are minorities (disproportionate minorities)				
Percent of families in the juvenile justice system at or below the poverty level				
Percent of youth in the juvenile justice system with case plans				
Percent of youth in the juvenile justice system with case plans				
Percent increase / decrease in re-arrests				
Percent increase / decrease in re-commitment				
Percent increase / decrease in violations of parole or probation				
Percent increase / decrease in re-adjudication				
Number of convictions in the adult system				

COUNTY-BY-COUNTY SYSTEM TRENDS

The following trends reflect overall statewide system trends as reported by individual counties. The County-by-County detail can be found on the subsequent pages.

All Counties' Total

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Nature and number of juvenile court referrals				
Type and number of charges				
Type and number of violations of probation charges				
Number of cases by disposition				
Level types and number of supervision				

Churchill County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Nature and number of juvenile court referrals				
Type and number of charges				
Type and number of violations of probation charges				
Number of cases by disposition				
Level types and number of supervision				

Clark County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Nature and number of juvenile court referrals				
Type and number of charges				
Type and number of violations of probation charges				
Number of cases by disposition				
Level types and number of supervision				

Douglas County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Nature and number of juvenile court referrals				
Type and number of charges				
Type and number of violations of probation charges				
Number of cases by disposition				
Level types and number of supervision				

Elko County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Nature and number of juvenile court referrals				
Type and number of charges				
Type and number of violations of probation charges				

Number of cases by disposition			
Level types and number of supervision			

Esmeralda

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Nature and number of juvenile court referrals				
Type and number of charges				
Type and number of violations of probation charges				
Number of cases by disposition				
Level types and number of supervision				

Eureka County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Nature and number of juvenile court referrals				
Type and number of charges				
Type and number of violations of probation charges				
Number of cases by disposition				
Level types and number of supervision				

Humboldt County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	20FY19 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Nature and number of juvenile court referrals				
Type and number of charges				
Type and number of violations of probation charges				
Number of cases by disposition				
Level types and number of supervision				

Lander County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Nature and number of juvenile court referrals				
Type and number of charges				
Type and number of violations of probation charges				
Number of cases by disposition				
Level types and number of supervision				

Lincoln County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Nature and number of juvenile court referrals				
Type and number of charges				
Type and number of violations of probation charges				
Number of cases by disposition				
Level types and number of supervision				

Lyon County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Nature and number of juvenile court referrals				
Type and number of charges				
Type and number of violations of probation charges				
Number of cases by disposition				
Level types and number of supervision				

Mineral County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Nature and number of juvenile court referrals				
Type and number of charges				
Type and number of violations of probation charges				

Number of cases by disposition			
Level types and number of supervision			

Nye County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Nature and number of juvenile court referrals				
Type and number of charges				
Type and number of violations of probation charges				
Number of cases by disposition				
Level types and number of supervision				

Pershing County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Nature and number of juvenile court referrals				
Type and number of charges				
Type and number of violations of probation charges				
Number of cases by disposition				
Level types and number of supervision				

Storey County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Nature and number of juvenile court referrals				
Type and number of charges				
Type and number of violations of probation charges				
Number of cases by disposition				
Level types and number of supervision				

Washoe County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Nature and number of juvenile court referrals				
Type and number of charges				
Type and number of violations of probation charges				
Number of cases by disposition				
Level types and number of supervision				

White Pine County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Nature and number of juvenile court referrals				
Type and number of charges				
Type and number of violations of probation charges				
Number of cases by disposition				
Level types and number of supervision				

COUNTY-BY-COUNTY TRENDS: YOUTH DISPOSITION INDICATORS

The following trends reflect overall statewide youth disposition indicators as reported by individual counties. The County-by-County detail can be found on the subsequent pages.

All Counties' Total

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Age				
Sex				
Race / ethnicity				
Family poverty level				
Composition of household				
Child's educational background				
Assessed risk level				
Assessed MAYSI-2 score				
Type of residential placement				
Services by type provided				
Type and number of disciplinary action(s) taken in placement				
Type(s) of educational / vocational training provided in placement				
Type / number of violations of probation charges				

Churchill County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Age				
Sex				
Race / ethnicity				
Family poverty level				
Composition of household				
Child's educational background				
Assessed risk level				
Assessed MAYSI-2 score				
Type of residential placement				
Services by type provided				
Type and number of disciplinary action(s) taken in placement				
Type(s) of educational / vocational training provided in placement				
Type / number of violations of probation charges				

Clark County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Age				
Sex				
Race / ethnicity				
Family poverty level				
Composition of household				
Child's educational background				
Assessed risk level				
Assessed MAYSI-2 score				
Type of residential placement				
Services by type provided				
Type and number of disciplinary action(s) taken in placement				

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Type(s) of educational / vocational training provided in placement				
Type / number of violations of probation charges				

Douglas County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Age				
Sex				
Race / ethnicity				
Family poverty level				
Composition of household				
Child's educational background				
Assessed risk level				
Assessed MAYSI-2 score				
Type of residential placement				
Services by type provided				
Type and number of disciplinary action(s) taken in placement				
Type(s) of educational / vocational training provided in placement				
Type / number of violations of probation charges				

Elko County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Age				
Sex				
Race / ethnicity				
Family poverty level				
Composition of household				
Child's educational background				
Assessed risk level				
Assessed MAYSI-2 score				

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Type of residential placement				
Services by type provided				
Type and number of disciplinary action(s) taken in placement				
Type(s) of educational / vocational training provided in placement				
Type / number of violations of probation charges				

Esmeralda County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Age				
Sex				
Race / ethnicity				
Family poverty level				
Composition of household				
Child's educational background				
Assessed risk level				
Assessed MAYSI-2 score				
Type of residential placement				
Services by type provided				
Type and number of disciplinary action(s) taken in placement				
Type(s) of educational / vocational training provided in placement				
Type / number of violations of probation charges				

Eureka County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Age				
Sex				
Race / ethnicity				
Family poverty level				
Composition of household				

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Child's educational background				
Assessed risk level				
Assessed MAYSI-2 score				
Type of residential placement				
Services by type provided				
Type and number of disciplinary action(s) taken in placement				
Type(s) of educational / vocational training provided in placement				
Type / number of violations of probation charges				

Humboldt County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Age				
Sex				
Race / ethnicity				
Family poverty level				
Composition of household				
Child's educational background				
Assessed risk level				
Assessed MAYSI-2 score				
Type of residential placement				
Services by type provided				
Type and number of disciplinary action(s) taken in placement				
Type(s) of educational / vocational training provided in placement				
Type / number of violations of probation charges				

Lander County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Age				
Sex				

Race / ethnicity				
Family poverty level				
Composition of household				
Child's educational background				
Assessed risk level				
Assessed MAYSI-2 score				
Type of residential placement				
Services by type provided				
Type and number of disciplinary action(s) taken in placement				
Type(s) of educational / vocational training provided in placement				
Type / number of violations of probation charges				

Lincoln County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Age				
Sex				
Race / ethnicity				
Family poverty level				
Composition of household				
Child's educational background				
Assessed risk level				
Assessed MAYSI-2 score				
Type of residential placement				
Services by type provided				
Type and number of disciplinary action(s) taken in placement				
Type(s) of educational / vocational training provided in placement				
Type / number of violations of probation charges				

Lyon County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Age				
Sex				
Race / ethnicity				
Family poverty level				
Composition of household				
Child's educational background				
Assessed risk level				
Assessed MAYSI-2 score				
Type of residential placement				
Services by type provided				
Type and number of disciplinary action(s) taken in placement				
Type(s) of educational / vocational training provided in placement				
Type / number of violations of probation charges				

Mineral County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Age				
Sex				
Race / ethnicity				
Family poverty level				
Composition of household				
Child's educational background				
Assessed risk level				
Assessed MAYSI-2 score				
Type of residential placement				
Services by type provided				
Type and number of disciplinary action(s) taken in placement				

	Type(s) of educational / vocational training provided in placement			
Type / number of violations of probation charges				

Nye County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Age				
Sex				
Race / ethnicity				
Family poverty level				
Composition of household				
Child's educational background				
Assessed risk level				
Assessed MAYSI-2 score				
Type of residential placement				
Services by type provided				
Type and number of disciplinary action(s) taken in placement				
Type(s) of educational / vocational training provided in placement				
Type / number of violations of probation charges				

Pershing County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Age				
Sex				
Race / ethnicity				
Family poverty level				
Composition of household				
Child's educational background				
Assessed risk level				
Assessed MAYSI-2 score				

Type of residential placement				
Services by type provided				
Type and number of disciplinary action(s) taken in placement				
Type(s) of educational / vocational training provided in placement				
Type / number of violations of probation charges				

Storey County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Age				
Sex				
Race / ethnicity				
Family poverty level				
Composition of household				
Child's educational background				
Assessed risk level				
Assessed MAYSI-2 score				
Type of residential placement				
Services by type provided				
Type and number of disciplinary action(s) taken in placement				
Type(s) of educational / vocational training provided in placement				
Type / number of violations of probation charges				

Washoe County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Age				
Sex				
Race / ethnicity				
Family poverty level				
Composition of household				

Child's educational background				
Assessed risk level				
Assessed MAYSI-2 score				
Type of residential placement				
Services by type provided				
Type and number of disciplinary action(s) taken in placement				
Type(s) of educational / vocational training provided in placement				
Type / number of violations of probation charges				

White Pine County

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Age				
Sex				
Race / ethnicity				
Family poverty level				
Composition of household				
Child's educational background				
Assessed risk level				
Assessed MAYSI-2 score				
Type of residential placement				
Services by type provided				
Type and number of disciplinary action(s) taken in placement				
Type(s) of educational / vocational training provided in placement				
Type / number of violations of probation charges				

COUNTY-BY-COUNTY PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The following performance measures reflect overall statewide performance as reported by individual counties. The County-by-County detail can be found on the subsequent pages.

All Counties' Total

Case Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
List of evidence-based practices per juvenile Court District					
Number of cases diverted					
Number of felonies diverted					
Number of gross misdemeanors diverted					

Youth and Family Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY19 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
Rate of recidivism					
Percent of youth with completed family assessment					
Percent of youth with family participation at first CFT					
Percent of youth whose case plan includes family participation					
Percent of family surveys completed					

Churchill County

Case Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
List of evidence-based practices per juvenile Court District					
Number of cases diverted					
Number of felonies diverted					
Number of gross misdemeanors diverted					

Youth and Family Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
Rate of recidivism					
Percent of youth with completed family assessment					
Percent of youth with family participation at first CFT					
Percent of youth whose case plan includes family participation					
Percent of family surveys completed					

Clark County

Case Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
List of evidence-based practices per juvenile Court District					
Number of cases diverted					
Number of felonies diverted					
Number of gross misdemeanors diverted					

Youth and Family Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
Rate of recidivism					
Percent of youth with completed family assessment					
Percent of youth with family participation at first CFT					
Percent of youth whose case plan includes family participation					
Percent of family surveys completed					

Douglas County

Case Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
List of evidence-based practices per juvenile Court District					
Number of cases diverted					
Number of felonies diverted					
Number of gross misdemeanors diverted					

Youth and Family Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
Rate of recidivism					
Percent of youth with completed family assessment					
Percent of youth with family participation at first CFT					
Percent of youth whose case plan includes family participation					
Percent of family surveys completed					

Elko County

Case Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
List of evidence-based practices per juvenile Court District					
Number of cases diverted					
Number of felonies diverted					
Number of gross misdemeanors diverted					

Youth and Family Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
Rate of recidivism					
Percent of youth with completed family assessment					
Percent of youth with family participation at first CFT					
Percent of youth whose case plan includes family participation					
Percent of family surveys completed					

Esmerelda County

Case Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
List of evidence-based practices per juvenile Court District					
Number of cases diverted					
Number of felonies diverted					
Number of gross misdemeanors diverted					

Youth and Family Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
Rate of recidivism					
Percent of youth with completed family assessment					
Percent of youth with family participation at first CFT					
Percent of youth whose case plan includes family participation					
Percent of family surveys completed					

Eureka County

Case Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
List of evidence-based practices per juvenile Court District					
Number of cases diverted					
Number of felonies diverted					
Number of gross misdemeanors diverted					

Youth and Family Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
Rate of recidivism					
Percent of youth with completed family assessment					
Percent of youth with family participation at first CFT					
Percent of youth whose case plan includes family participation					
Percent of family surveys completed					

Humboldt County

Case Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
List of evidence-based practices per juvenile Court District					
Number of cases diverted					
Number of felonies diverted					
Number of gross misdemeanors diverted					

Youth and Family Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
Rate of recidivism					
Percent of youth with completed family assessment					
Percent of youth with family participation at first CFT					
Percent of youth whose case plan includes family participation					
Percent of family surveys completed					

Lander County

Case Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
List of evidence-based practices per juvenile Court District					
Number of cases diverted					
Number of felonies diverted					
Number of gross misdemeanors diverted					

Youth and Family Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
Rate of recidivism					
Percent of youth with completed family assessment					
Percent of youth with family participation at first CFT					
Percent of youth whose case plan includes family participation					
Percent of family surveys completed					

Lincoln County

Case Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
List of evidence-based practices per juvenile Court District					
Number of cases diverted					
Number of felonies diverted					
Number of gross misdemeanors diverted					

Youth and Family Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
Rate of recidivism					
Percent of youth with completed family assessment					
Percent of youth with family participation at first CFT					
Percent of youth whose case plan includes family participation					
Percent of family surveys completed					

Lyon County

Case Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
List of evidence-based practices per juvenile Court District					
Number of cases diverted					
Number of felonies diverted					
Number of gross misdemeanors diverted					

Youth and Family Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
Rate of recidivism					
Percent of youth with completed family assessment					
Percent of youth with family participation at first CFT					
Percent of youth whose case plan includes family participation					
Percent of family surveys completed					

Mineral County

Case Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
List of evidence-based practices per juvenile Court District					
Number of cases diverted					
Number of felonies diverted					
Number of gross misdemeanors diverted					

Youth and Family Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
Rate of recidivism					
Percent of youth with completed family assessment					
Percent of youth with family participation at first CFT					
Percent of youth whose case plan includes family participation					
Percent of family surveys completed					

Nye County

Case Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
List of evidence-based practices per juvenile Court District					
Number of cases diverted					
Number of felonies diverted					
Number of gross misdemeanors diverted					

Youth and Family Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
Rate of recidivism					
Percent of youth with completed family assessment					
Percent of youth with family participation at first CFT					
Percent of youth whose case plan includes family participation					
Percent of family surveys completed					

Pershing County

Case Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
List of evidence-based practices per juvenile Court District					
Number of cases diverted					
Number of felonies diverted					
Number of gross misdemeanors diverted					

Youth and Family Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
Rate of recidivism					
Percent of youth with completed family assessment					
Percent of youth with family participation at first CFT					
Percent of youth whose case plan includes family participation					
Percent of family surveys completed					

Storey County

Case Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
List of evidence-based practices per juvenile Court District					
Number of cases diverted					
Number of felonies diverted					
Number of gross misdemeanors diverted					

Youth and Family Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
Rate of recidivism					
Percent of youth with completed family assessment					
Percent of youth with family participation at first CFT					
Percent of youth whose case plan includes family participation					
Percent of family surveys completed					

Washoe County

Case Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
List of evidence-based practices per juvenile Court District					
Number of cases diverted					
Number of felonies diverted					
Number of gross misdemeanors diverted					

Youth and Family Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
Rate of recidivism					
Percent of youth with completed family assessment					
Percent of youth with family participation at first CFT					
Percent of youth whose case plan includes family participation					
Percent of family surveys completed					

White Pine County

Case Indicators	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
List of evidence-based practices per juvenile Court District					
Number of cases diverted					
Number of felonies diverted					
Number of gross misdemeanors diverted					

Youth and Family Indicators	FY19	FY20	FY23	STATUS	
Rate of recidivism					
Percent of youth with completed family assessment					
Percent of youth with family participation at first CFT					
Percent of youth whose case plan includes family participation					
Percent of family surveys completed					

JUVENILE COURT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
Number of youth who have a parent / guardian (including an agency custodian) at hearings					
Number of youth who have legal representation					
Number of dispositions determined within 60 days					
Number of detention hearings within 72 hours (per statute)					
Number of victims / victims' families present at disposition					
Victim / family satisfaction with outcomes of the disposition (via survey results)					

PROBATION AND PAROLE PERFORMANCE MEASURES

	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Percent increase / decrease in overall risk score from the initial YLS to any YLS reassessments				
Percent increase / decrease in the risk score of prior and current offenses				
Percent increase / decrease in the risk score of dispositions, family circumstances				
Percent increase / decrease in the risk score of parenting, education				
Percent increase / decrease in the risk score of Employment, Peer Relations Substance abuse, leisure				
Percent increase / decrease in the risk score of recreation, personality				
Percent increase / decrease in the risk score of behavior, attitudes				
Percent increase / decrease in the risk score of orientation				

STATE CORRECTIONAL FACILTIES, GROUP HOMES, RTC & YOUTH CAMP PERFORMANCE MEASURES

CPC Performance Based Standards	FY19 BENCHMARK	FY20 ACTUAL	FY23 TARGET	STATUS YOY% Change	EXPLANATION
Program Leadership & Development					
PD qualified					
…					
Staff Characteristics					
Education					
….					
Offender Assessment					
Appropriateness					
…					
Treatment Characteristics					
Targets					
…					

JUVENILE JUSTICE OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

SCORECARD & PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

RECOMMENDED WITH STRATEGIC PLAN FY 24 – FY 29

1) Ensure data is being collected or can be collected.

2) Ensure that all counties are collecting the data in the same way.

3) Determine if statewide data is acceptable, or if individual county data should be included.

STATEWIDE SCORECARD

Ensure that all counties and DCFS are capturing data in the same manner. Verify data measures, specifically for Recidivism. Must indicate that recidivism is youth specific and identify the one frequency to compare to. Without data analytics tools, this comparison is burdensome on jurisdictions. Recommend a 12-month lookback. If the Office of Analytics receives youth specific information, they would be able to do this 12-month lookback for re-arrests only, with access to arrest records. The Office does not have access to court data so they would not be able to do a 12-month lookback for re-adjudications. Lastly, DCFS can compare commitments to revocations.

Note: Certifications and convictions would be better suited for courts to provide.

JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM TRENDS	FY24 ACTUAL	FY25 ACTUAL	FY26 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Rate of Recidivism 1) Re arrest (County Measure 1) 1) Re arrest (State Measure 1) 2) Re adjudication (County Measure 2) 2) Adjudication (State Measure 2) 3) Revocation (State Measure 3)				1) Use annual re-arrest data from counties and annual re-arrest data from DCFS 2) Use annual re adjudications from counties and annual adjudication data from DCFS 3) Use state revocations
Percent of youth who are minorities (disproportionate minorities)				This can be calculated based on referrals or arrests
Percent of families in the juvenile justice system at or below the poverty level				Counties and state are required to identify poverty rates. This is most likely done at arrest.
Number of certifications to the adult system				Use annual certification from counties and CLEO data for the state
Number of probation violations				This needs to be defined, specifically by measurements. 1) Violation of Conditions of Parole/Probation which includes failure of placement, failure of drug testing, etc. 2) New charge Use annual data from counties and state
Number of adult convictions				Will come from the Office of Analytics Quarterly based on NDOC admissions under the age of 18.
Percent of youths returning home post placement **And** Percent of youths placed out of home post placement				Define placement, is it just DCFS Commitment?

COUNY SYSTEM TRENDS:

The following trends reflect the overall statewide system trends as reported by individual counties. Individual County detail can be found on the following pages.

All Counties' Total

	FY24 ACTUAL	FY25 ACTUAL	FY26 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Nature and number of juvenile court referrals				Use annual referral data from counties
Type and number of charges				Gather highest level arrests from counties annually
Number of cases by disposition Placed in County Camp Committed to the State Placed on Formal Probation				Use annual data from counties
Number of Out of state placements				Data Book from the Office of Analytics
Number of out of home placements prior to Commitment to DCFS Type?				

COUNTY-BY-COUNTY TRENDS: YOUTH DISPOSITION INDICATORS

The following trends reflect overall statewide youth disposition indicators as reported by individual counties. The County-by-County detail can be found on the subsequent pages. **This is information to be collected by a standardized system pursuant to NRS 62B.210. This is youth specific. This would be better suited with the Office of Analytics if data sharing agreements were established, and all counties provide the data as outlined in NRS 62H.210 to the Office for Analysis. There are two highlighted areas that require clarification on how to gather such information.**

   NRS 62H.210   Information to be collected by standardized system regarding children referred to system of juvenile justice; confidentiality.
   1. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 3, the standardized system established pursuant to NRS 62H.200 must collect, categorize and maintain the following information from the juvenile courts, local juvenile probation departments, the staff of regional facilities for the treatment and rehabilitation of children and the staff of the youth correctional services, as directed by the Department of Health and Human Services, regarding each child referred to the system of juvenile justice in this State:
   (a) Any unique identifying information assigned to the child;
   (b) Basic demographic information regarding the child, including, but not limited to:
      (1) The age, sex and race or other ethnic background of the child;
      (2) The composition of the household in which the child resides; and
      (3) The economic and educational background of the child;
   (c) The charges for which the child is referred, including, without limitation, any charges of violations of probation or parole;
   (d) The dates of any detention of the child;
   (e) The nature of the disposition of each referral of the child;
   (f) The dates any petitions are filed regarding the child, and the charges set forth in those petitions;
   (g) The disposition of any petitions filed regarding the child, including any applicable findings;
   (h) The assessed risks and needs of the child;
   (i) The supervision of the child, including, without limitation, whether the child was placed in a residential facility; and
   (j) Any programs and services provided to the child.
   2. In addition to the information required pursuant to subsection 1 and except as otherwise provided in subsection 3, the Department of Health and Human Services shall require the staff of regional facilities for the treatment and rehabilitation of children and the staff of the youth correctional services to collect and transmit the following information to the standardized system regarding each child committed to or otherwise placed in the custody of the Division of Child and Family Services:
   (a) A record of each placement of the child, including, but not limited to, the location and period of each placement and the programs and services provided to the child during each placement;
   (b) Any disciplinary action taken against the child during the child's placement;
   (c) Any education or vocational training provided to the child during the child's placement and the educational and employment status of the child after release of the child on parole;
   (d) The dates of each release of the child, including any release of the child on parole;
   (e) If the child is released on parole, the period of each release and the services provided to the child during each release; and
   (f) The nature of or reason for each discharge of the child from the custody of the regional facility for the treatment and rehabilitation of children or the Division of Child and Family Services.
   3. The information maintained in the standardized system must not include the name or address of any person.
   (Added to NRS by 2003, 1093; A 2017, 4396)

COUNTY-BY-COUNTY PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The following performance measures reflect overall statewide performance as reported by individual counties. The County-by-County detail can be found on the subsequent pages. **Diversions are an important performance measure, so all diversions should be captured here.**

Should juvenile assessment center data be counted in referrals and diversions? Or is that a separate measure?

All Counties' Total

Case Indicators	FY24 ACTUAL	FY25 ACTUAL	FY26 TARGET	EXPLANATION
List of evidence-based practices per juvenile Court District				Programs and practices used in house.
Number of cases diverted				Use annual report from counties
Number of felonies diverted				
Number of gross misdemeanors diverted				
Number of misdemeanors diverted				
Number of status offenders diverted				

Youth and Family Indicators	FY24 ACTUAL	FY25 ACTUAL	FY26 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Percent of family surveys completed				Determine who will send and gather these for counties and state
Percent of youth survey completed				
Percent of youth with a case plan				Use annual report from counties
Percent of youth with family engagement				

JUVENILE COURT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

These measures are better suited for the courts to provide. Unknown if court data is centralized on separated. If centralized, need a data sharing agreement with centralized court records. If not, need data sharing agreements with each judicial jurisdiction.

Note: The Office of Analytics does not currently have access to or receive data from courts.

	EXPLANATION
Number of youth who have a parent / guardian (including an agency custodian) at hearings	
Number of youth who have legal representation	
Number of dispositions determined within 60 days	
Number of detention hearings within 72 hours (per statute)	

PROBATION AND PAROLE PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Counties do not provide this level of detail for the YLS. DCFS does capture this data, but it is done by hand.

	FY24 ACTUAL	FY25 ACTUAL	FY26 TARGET	EXPLANATION
Percent increase / decrease in overall risk score from the initial YLS to any YLS reassessments				To measure this, need to use numeric scores. This is available with state commitment data. Cannot measure for counties unless they provide an annual report with this information.
Percent increase / decrease in the risk score of prior and current offenses				
Percent increase / decrease in the risk score of dispositions, family circumstances				
Percent increase / decrease in the risk score of parenting, education				
Percent increase / decrease in the risk score of Employment, Peer Relations Substance abuse, leisure				
Percent increase / decrease in the risk score of recreation, personality				
Percent increase / decrease in the risk score of behavior, attitudes				
Percent increase / decrease in the risk score of orientation				

Recommend not to include the information from the Correctional Program Checklist; it is likely the JJOC will review other tools for this.

Copy of Victim Survey

Question Title

1. I was notified by the District Attorney's Office of all hearings and my ability to attend was taken into consideration.

○ Yes

○ No

○ Other (please specify)

[   ]

Question Title

2. I felt heard and supported during the court process.

○ Strongly agree

○ Agree

○ Disagree

○ Strongly disagree

Question Title

3. I attended all court hearings.

○ Yes

○ No

○ Other (please specify)

[   ]

Question Title

4. I felt safe during court hearings.

○ Yes

○ No

Juvenile Services Family Survey

Engagement with Juvenile Services

Question Title

1. I was treated with respect by my child's probation officer.

- ○ Exceeded expectations
- ○ Met expectations
- ○ Below expectations

Question Title

2. My child's probation officer provided information to me that explained the Juvenile Court process.

- ○ Strongly agree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Strongly disagree

Question Title

3. My child's probation officer asked about my child's needs and strengths.

- ○ A great deal
- ○ A lot
- ○ A moderate amount
- ○ A little
- ○ None at all

Question Title

4. I had input into the development of my child's' case plan.

- ○ Strongly agree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Strongly disagree

Question Title

5. My child's probation officer explained the rules and expectations for my child to successfully complete their probation.

- ○ Strongly agree
- ○

○ Disagree

○ Strongly disagree

Question Title

6. I understood how the activities on my child's case plan were to help them successfully complete their probation.

○ Yes

○

○ Other (please specify)

[   ]

Question Title

7. I understood my role to help my child successfully complete their probation.

○ Strongly agree

○ Agree

○ Disagree

○ Strongly disagree

Question Title

8. I could contact my child's probation officer with concerns I had about my child's progress.

○ Yes

○ No

○ Other (please specify)

[   ]

Question Title

9. I believed that my input regarding my child was valued.

○ Strongly agree

○ Agree

○ Disagree

○ Strongly disagree

Question Title

10. My child's probation officer cared about my child's success.

○ Strongly agree

○ Agree

○ Disagree
○ Strongly disagree

Question Title

11. Overall, I saw changed in my child's behavior.

○ Very satisfied
○ Satisfied
○ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
○ Dissatisfied
○ Very dissatisfied

Question Title

12. I was treated respectfully and fairly by the Judge.

○ Strongly agree
○ Agree
○ Disagree
○ Strongly disagree

Question Title

13. I understood the court process during my child's court appearances.

○ Strongly agree
○ Agree
○ Disagree
○ Strongly disagree

Question Title

14. I attended all of my child's court hearings.

○ Yes
○ No
○ Other (please specify)

[   ]

Question Title

15. I feel that my child's attorney explained the court process and my child's options.

○ Strongly agree
○ Agree

○ Disagree
○ Strongly disagree

16. I was provided resources or referrals for family and parenting groups.
○ Strongly agree
○ Agree
○ Disagree
○ Strongly disagree

Question Title
17. I had input on the services my child was participating in.
○ A great deal
○ A lot
○ A moderate amount
○ A little
○ None at all

Question Title
18. I communicated with any additional service providers my child had (counselors, mental health professionals, physicians, etc.)
○ A great deal
○ A lot
○ A moderate amount
○ A little
○ None at all

Question Title
19. I knew my child's scheduled appointments and the names of their providers.
○ Yes
○ No
○ Other (please specify)

20. I was well informed and encouraged to express concerns or ask questions throughout the process
○

○ Agree
○ Disagree
○ Strongly disagree

Question Title

21. Meetings and hearings were scheduled during times that did not create barriers to attend.
○ Strongly agree
○ Agree
○ Disagree
○ Strongly disagree

Question Title

22. My child received resources, such as transportation, to remain engaged.
○ Yes
○ No
○ Other (please specify)

[   ]

Question Title

23. If I had questions, I felt I could ask for help if I didn't understand what was happening.
○ Yes
○ No
○ Other (please specify)