

Joe Lombardo  
Governor

Richard Whitley, MS  
Director



# DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

DIVISION OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES  
*Helping people. It's who we are and what we do.*



Marla McDade  
Williams, MPA  
Administrator

---

## Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission DATA PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE MEETING June 25, 2024, at 10:00 am

### **Roll Call:**

#### **(Members)**

Brigid Duffy  
Jennifer Fraser  
Pauline Salla  
DeDe Parker  
Katherine Maher

#### **(Staff Members)**

Leslie Bittleston  
Jessica Villalobos  
Cindy Casselman

#### **(Others Present)**

Michael Watson  
Kyra Morgan  
Kelly Figueroa  
Andrea Chandler  
Dominique Carter  
Linda Anderson

#### **(Absent)**

Sharon Anderson  
Katherine Maher  
Addie Rolnick

## TRANSCRIPT

**Leslie Bittleston:** Madam Chair, we do have a quorum. At this point we have four members that I see. If you want to go ahead and get started.

**Brigid Duffy:** Great. I would love to get started. Good morning, everyone. Thank you for accommodating this date. I'm going to be taking some time off FMLA for about six weeks. I wanted to try to be present for one of these meetings and Wednesdays did not work for me, I appreciate this and hopefully we can lay a good groundwork for what we're going to be working on over the next year for this data subcommittee. If we could take roll.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes. Brigid Duffy

**Brigid Duffy:** Here.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Jennifer Fraser.

**Jennifer Fraser:** Here.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Sharon Anderson is excused. Pauline Salla.

**Pauline Sala:** Here.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Katherine Maher. Addie Rolnick. DeDe Parker.

**DeDe Parker:** Here.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Kelly Figueroa. For staff we have Leslie Bittleston, Jessica Villalobos, and Cindy Casselman will be joining. I also see Michael Watson and Kyra Morgan as well. That is everybody, Madam Chair. And we do have a quorum.

**Brigid Duffy:** Great. Agenda item number three is public comment and discussion. Do we have any public that would like to make comment? Hearing none, I'll move on to agenda item number four, which is a review and approval of the minutes from the May 1st meeting. I was not present, but I did review them to kind of get up to speed for what was occurring today. If anybody was present and like to make a motion that they accurately reflect the meeting.

**Pauline Salla:** This is Commissioner Salla. I move to approve the minutes as submitted.

**Brigid Duffy:** Thank you, Commissioner Salla. Any second?

**Jennifer Fraser:** I'll second it. This is Commissioner Fraser.

**Brigid Duffy:** Thank you, Commissioner Fraser. Any comments? Changes, additions? Anybody opposed to approving the minutes? Anybody abstaining? Alright. Motion passes. We are going to move on now to the meeting, which is going to be Agenda items number 5 and 6. We're going to start with the Data Dictionary. I know we have it, we had it sent out after the last meeting and thank you for pulling it up. It

appears from the last meeting that the conversation was, again, around Data Collection and how we are defining the data we are collecting. What I gathered from the last meeting was that there's still some differences among Jurisdiction in how they are reporting data. Again, I'm just trying to get where you all were on May 1st. Going through this agenda with Ms. Bittleston. I have some examples of possible places where the State Jurisdictions, where all the jurisdictions differ, things around referrals, probation, violations. The recommendation at the last meeting was to look at the Data Dictionary and because it is from 2014 and work on some amendments throughout this committee. I'm going to pick up that conversation. Commissioner Parker, I see your hand up.

**DeDe Parker:** Hi. As you guys know, I'm newer to this Committee. I just wanted to double check. Is this Data Dictionary supposed to be the dictionary that you used for the scorecard and Performance Summary? Because when I was trying to compare them, I wasn't seeing some of the definitions in the Data Dictionary that are being asked for in the scorecard and the performance. I just don't know if that was like the original thought behind it.

**Brigid Duffy:** No, there are two separate things. This is Chair Duffy for the record. There are two separate things. While we were creating the performance measures, there was discussion about this Data Dictionary being out there, but we did not update the Data Dictionary to comply with the new performance measures. That might be where some of the confusion is, and maybe Commissioner Salla because I brought her on later in the Data Subcommittee meetings because we needed her voice on this group. Maybe she has a little bit more historical knowledge on where we left off, but they are not the same document, nor did they update the Data Dictionary when the performance measures were created.

**Pauline Salla:** Thank you Commissioner Duffy. I agree. I think we have two separate documents. I look at it a little differently. I think the performance scorecard was created without referring to our Juvenile Justice Dictionary. Because the history behind our Data Dictionary with the Nevada Supreme Court Commission on Juvenile Justice reform is to help all of us in our Jurisdictions report the same way, utilizing the same definition. Somehow the Data Dictionary went to on the back burner when we were creating our scorecards. The whole idea for the Data Dictionary was for us to report using the same definitions. Even though some of our Jurisdictions we call things, we might have them titled as certain things. Diversion is diversion, no matter what you call it. If you're not moving to formal proceedings, there's certain common threads that run through all our Jurisdictions, even if we call it something different. I think that that's where the confusion has been with the scorecard versus the Data Dictionary. And absolutely the Data Dictionary needs to be updated. Our federal definitions are our federal definitions. Those really are, if we're reporting to the federal government, those are the definitions we're supposed to use, even if our State is different than the federal definition, which is where the confusion comes from. I look at it a little differently. I think the scorecard was created without referring to the Data Dictionary and then updating our Data Dictionary. Either way they don't match, and I believe that's where the confusion is coming.

**Brigid Duffy:** This is Commissioner Duffy. The other question I have is, do we know possibly through NAJJA that the Jurisdictions are all still using the Data Dictionary.

**Pauline Salla:** Clearly, we are not. We've had a lot of discussion and that's why our NAJJA Data Committee has really focused on getting back to basics so that we all are reporting on the same things. I think there's also some confusion between State understanding of how the Jurisdictions are reporting. We are getting back to all reporting, identifying specific ways of reporting our Data. It's apples to apples

and oranges to oranges. I think that if we update our Data Dictionary and we take that back to NAJJA, then that'll help with us streamlining our reporting.

**Brigid Duffy:** Okay. This is Commissioner Duffy again for the record. Pauline, you said this Committee update the Data Dictionary, I just want to make sure we're not duplicating work. NAJJA's Data Committee is not intending to do that. They're waiting for the executive Committee. The JJOC to do it and then report back to NAJJA.

**Pauline Salla:** I've had some discussion with our NAJJA members too. The Nevada Supreme Court Commission did the Data Dictionary the first time with the support of NAJJA members. I do think this is an Oversight Commission's task to update this. Of course, NAJJA we'll support however we can. NAJJA has not spoken about taking the Juvenile Justice Dictionary and updating it specifically. We knew it was coming to your Committee, Commissioner Duffy.

**Brigid Duffy:** Right. I just want to make sure the record's clear; I know who's doing what. We have that clarified. Then do you think that we have the right people on this Commission or this Subcommittee, or do we need more to update this Data Dictionary? Because I can say, in my role as a DA, I can read statute in federal law and create what the definitions are. However, it would be helpful to have somebody from the Juvenile Justice Agency of Clark County on them to know how they're defining it now. Do we have all the people that we would need, or do we need to reach out to make sure we have other insight? Because that Data Committee, when you go to the last page of this, that was a lot of people on that Data Dictionary Committee.

**Pauline Salla:** This is Commissioner Salla. Which made it difficult because we had so many on that. At that point I was the specialist for the State, which made it difficult for us to all agree. As I look at our members here, I do think that we have the expertise that we need. If I can always take it back to NAJJA for discussion and then bring it back to this Committee. I think Brigid, with the attorneys and Jennifer, I think we have the right people. We may need to just reach out to our other colleagues and be like, "Hey, this is where we're at. What are your thoughts?" Then us as members bring it back to this Committee. That took us a long time because there was a lot of dilution with the supreme. I mean, there was a lot of members on that. I think if we get stuck, then we can invite who we identify as experts to help us move through that.

**Brigid Duffy:** This is Duffy again. I also think that because everything we do goes to the Full Commission and the Full Commission has more members that ultimately, they can have their say there.

**Pauline Salla:** I agree.

**Brigid Duffy:** The problem that I think, and I want to get to it when we get down to the performance measures is, are we capable of capturing it? We can define Data all we want, but that's been the problem with the performance measures is are we able to capture that Data or each individual system, because the courts have a collection ability, the Juvenile Justice Agencies have a collection ability. Are they running the same ability? It's how we're collecting it and if they're able to collect it. I guess the easy sense is that there are certain items that are required by federal law and there are certain items that are required by State law. And so, there needs to be the systems to be able to collect that Data at the end.

**Pauline Salla:** I agree. I think there's two, maybe even three different issues, right? One is how are we defining the Data? Two is how can we capture that Data? And three, if we can't capture why not and how do we fix that.

**Brigid Duffy:** Right.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah. This is Leslie for the record. There's also a couple of areas that NRS are silent in some of the Data that is currently being collected, for example, Use of Force. There is no NRS requirements around the collection of Use of Force, meaning there's no definition currently in statutes on the use of restraints or anything like that. A second area that the Program's Office collects data in that is the statutes are silent is grants. The Community corrections partnership block grant. There are Data elements out there that the State is responsible for collecting that the statute is silent on. In those cases, I don't know if that's just including in the Data Dictionary would be good, or if statutes are needed. I'm just throwing that out just as an FYI to say that there is Data being collected that there are no statutes.

**Pauline Salla:** I think that's where a lot of the convolution came from, is that the JJOC kept adding Data requests and the infrastructure wasn't there. We all started just reporting how we thought best to report. I'm not sure that it needs to be in statute. There are other ways that we can do it through NAJJA. There's our performance card, but that we all agree on how we're going to report that. And that's been the issue.

**Brigid Duffy:** This is Commissioner Duffy. Is there any thought from members that this is something that we don't need to do? Is everybody's in agreement that we need to move forward with looking at this, which was a lot of work that went into it 10 years ago and just updating it. Anybody feel like it's not the appropriate work for us? Not hearing any, so the next question is, Pauline, help me. How did you even get started? I'm not sitting here saying like, "everybody takes a page and start figuring out how you're going to define it, or we put it all on Leslie's team", which is, that we're supposed to be doing the work. Not them necessarily. They're just our support. How would you get started? Just take the first five pages and go through it? Does anybody have any insight currently of where the difficulties lie that are emergent and we need to really deal with those first?

**Pauline Salla:** This is commissioner Salla. We did break it down with areas of expertise. Right? Then of course, we had this draft and then we just kept working through the sections of it. I think if federal law and some of their definitions, there's been some areas that have changed. I'm talking about federal law, not their recommendations, because that's where we get into blurriness too, is that if the federal government is telling us we must report on this, but they are not providing the structure to report it or it's clearly identified, that becomes a recommendation from it. It doesn't mean it's part of the Federal Act. I think whatever's changed in the Federal Act can be updated easy in this. Then our statutes have changed. I think that if we had sections, if Committee members just took some sections and researched it and brought it back to the group, we broke it down into sections like that and then had a lot of robust discussion in the meetings.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Do you want me to pull it up again Commissioner Duffy or not?

**Brigid Duffy:** Sure. I wanted to refer to some examples of how it's easy in that it talks about where that's federal versus us. Let's find out. Any time it says the OJJDP, that's a federal definition, correct?

**Pauline Salla:** Correct.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes. Correct.

**Brigid Duffy:** Okay. Alright.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Commissioner Salla is correct. Some of the definitions and federal requirements changed a little bit with the reauthorization of the ACT in 2018. Anything that says OJJDP does need to be reviewed and just ensure that it still meets the requirements of the act as I Stated, it was updated in 2018.

**Pauline Salla:** Commissioner Duffy, one of the reasons that we did it in the definition that we did it like CNAC 62H, and we didn't put the definition there is because our hope was that NACs and NRSs were kept up to date with all the changes. If you just click on that, hopefully you get the most updated version of it, right? I mean, that would be our hope so that we wouldn't have to keep updating sections with the NAC and NRS that it would take us right to the most recent version of it or updated.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right. Just looking at page one, I mean, the race has since changed with the addition of the North African and Middle Eastern or North African. Just little tweaks, maybe all that's needed throughout this. I wanted to address what Commissioner Salla said about the updating of the NACs and NRS. It seems that LCB is behind on updating the NACs especially some of the NACs that were done in response to AB 472 don't seem to be updated yet. I don't know why. I don't know if that's a good idea on the go forward to just have CNAC. That may be an area of discussion.

**Brigid Duffy:** Anybody else have any input or thoughts on the Data Dictionary? Thinking that our next meeting will probably be sometime, the next full meeting is August 5th. I believe we figured that out yesterday. Leslie?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes. August 5th.

**Brigid Duffy:** I think our next meeting, you can move forward without me in July if you want to do a meeting in 30 days. Or we can schedule this at the end when I go on to Agenda, item number. We can schedule it at the end of August when I'm back. I can then take a few things. I'll take the first couple pages and see what I can find and dig into it and then see who's interested in maybe taking the next couple. I'm going to skip now into the performance measures because this might help us figure out the priority in the Data Dictionary because as we talked about earlier in this meeting, there's conflicts that Commissioner Parker brought up. Things are there that aren't defined here, or things are defined differently. That might be maybe the best starting place to stop that confusion or get it clarified within the Data Dictionary. Thank you.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Just FYI. This is the original scorecard and performance summary that was created with, what was it? FY18 through FY24 or three Strategic Plan. This is the original. Commissioner Duffy, let me know where you want me to scroll to.

**Brigid Duffy:** Well, go up a little bit. Where are our performance measures on this?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Scroll down.

**Brigid Duffy:** Yeah, it's moving up on my screen.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah, it starts on page five.

**Brigid Duffy:** Okay. Since I missed some of your first meetings to give some historical information. Pursuant to statute on chapter 62B, this Subcommittee was tasked with selecting performance measures for the Juvenile Justice system. When we were set with that task, we were basically told the world is your oyster whatever you want to decide how our system is working or not working. There are certain statutory requirements in 62B that we must look at. Then what we realized was, there were a lot of us that wanted a lot of different information to decide whether the system was working, and the world wasn't our oyster because then we were told, "well, we can't get that data." There's no way to get it.

**Brigid Duffy:** We'd have to pay to upgrade the system. We can't do that. We had to reel back in our sites on what we could obtain. What I want to do now with this, and then of course 2020 hit and then three years of no meetings and here we are now. I want to get back to what the statute requires us to look at. And that's all found within 62B. Currently our Statewide scorecard we're looking at, that's up on the screen in front of you is the rate of recidivism, percentage of youth who are minorities, percentage of families in the justice system below the poverty level. I'm not sure how we measure that.

**Pauline Salla:** Jurisdictions collect that. This is where the issue is. Jurisdictions collect that information for kids who are booked. It's part of what we collect during the booking process. The issue is that most Jurisdictions didn't collect that for our kids on probation or on some level of supervision. Our Enterprise Supervision collects that. We can put that. It tracks that.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, and just to add to Commissioner Salla. The Program's Office website does have the current poverty level by household. The Data can be collected in Enterprise Supervision. There's currently a report to pull that Data. If you don't know where it is, I can point you in the right direction. But I think the problem is, there was no definition on when this Data needs to be collected or at what contact point. As you just heard, Commissioner Salla said they collect it for bookings. That would be kids that are placed in detention. That would only be those facilities with detention. I guess it wouldn't include all the Jurisdictions. It would just be those that have detention facilities. I think that there's some discussion around identifying at what point this needs to be captured. Everybody is capturing the Data, whether you want it at referral, whether you want it at rest, or whether you want it at booking. Because if it's referral and arrest, then all the Jurisdictions need to be informed that is Data they need to ask for, collect and put into their Enterprise Supervision. Then that can be reported to the State. That's part of the problems with these performance measures. There was no parameters and Jurisdictions didn't know if when or how to collect this data early on.

**Brigid Duffy:** That performance measure, I don't know if that's a performance measure, but that Data point or fact I guess is not required by statute. Correct? Is it required by Feds?

**Pauline Salla:** It is now.

**Brigid Duffy:** I don't know where Clark is collecting it.

**Leslie Bittleston:** In Enterprise. Yeah, there's a place specifically in Enterprise Supervision for poverty.

**Brigid Duffy:** But are they collecting it like Humboldt at booking or are they collecting it throughout the probation?

**Leslie Bittleston:** That's the problem. There's no information to tell the Jurisdictions when, how, at what contact point they need to collect it.

**Brigid Duffy:** That's such an easy fix to me though. When we're all done with this and we decide on the scorecard, if there's certain things that we're collecting at one Data point and our system collects it, a meeting with NAJJA and saying, "Alright, hey, we're going to collect socioeconomic status at every point." No matter if they're on supervision or booking. Like if it's a referral and you're working with that family, you collect it. Right? The issue is, if it's a referral and the family moves, I mean there's just certain things that happen with that, but that one is such an easy fix to me that I'm not sure we have to spend a lot of time on that. I think that's communicating with the Jurisdictions and saying like when we're all done, right? Because what happened is, it'd be like, we get a little drop of info here, a little drop of info here and we're all like, what, what are we doing? What do we have to do now? I think once this is complete, then to take it to NAJJA where all the Jurisdictions are involved and say, alright, these are on the scorecard. How can we help you guys collect all this, with this definition, whatever we decide so that we're all have the same information at the same time? I think that one is an easy fix.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yep.

**Brigid Duffy:** We collect it, we just only collect it in booking and its part of 62H. We must.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah. I think in this scorecard it just needs to be defined that it's collected at referral, or it's collected at arrest. Everybody's collecting it at referral or whatever it is that this group decides. I think it just needs to be added to the scorecard. When it is the final product that when it gets sent out to the Jurisdictions, they're like, oh, okay. I need to collect socioeconomic data for every kid that is arrested in my Jurisdiction. That's again, back to the apples to apples.

**Brigid Duffy:** Yeah. Not just arrested, right? I mean, we already collect. For the youth who enter our system.

**Leslie Bittleston:** That's what this scorecard originally was missing was really telling the Jurisdictions at what point they need to collect this Data. As you just heard, Commissioner Salla said they do it at booking. We don't know what Clark does. We don't know what the other counties are doing. That is the level of detail that was missing from the original scorecard.

**Brigid Duffy:** I'm going to skip recidivism. Is that the same issue for percent of youth who are minorities? They don't know when to collect it.

**Leslie Bittleston:** No, this one is a little bit different because federally we are required to collect racial and ethnic disparity at several contact points. We are required to collect it at referral, at arrest, at detention, placement at DCFS, commitment, adjudication, and adult certification. That Data is already provided and has historically been provided to the State. What's missing here is, at what contact point do you want it? Do you want it at the referrals? Do you want it at arrest? Because it's different. Each contact point, the racial and ethnic disparities vary. It's really defining, do you want it at referral? Do you want it or deeper into the system? Because I can tell you that the racial and ethnic disparities increase for African



American youth as you move deeper into the system, what you see at referral is not what you're going to see at DCFS commitment or adult certification. It's really pinpointing at what point do you want that data.

**Pauline Salla:** This is Commissioner Salla. With our DMC report, we report it specifically for each Jurisdiction at every level of contact for our kids up to adult certification. When the State gets all that data because this is a Statewide scorecard. This top one is a Statewide scorecard. If it's a Statewide scorecard, isn't that Data for the State level? Because when you do the full DMC report, it breaks it down by county jurisdiction and then it also does an overall disparate treatment score, right? The relative rate index Statewide --

**Leslie Bittleston:** That's gone. OJJDP eliminated that and removed it from use in 2017 or 18. So it's no longer available.

**Pauline Salla:** Then there's no reason for us to be asking for percent of youth who are minorities for a Statewide scorecard. Because you may move that down to county level where it breaks it down per county and what our overall disparate treatment is at. That includes every point of contact. Because if you're just taking a snapshot of a certain point of contact, you're not creating really a clear picture of disparate treatment. If the relative rate index is gone from the federal DMC report, it doesn't make sense to me why we're asking for that on a Statewide scorecard. That's just my 2 cents. I don't even know how you'd figure that out if they took that part out.

**Leslie Bittleston:** And the States were quite upset about that when it happened because it was a good tool. I guess OJJDP couldn't maintain it or maintain the platform. It's no longer available. I agree. I believe that would be something that would be better suited in individual counties at the county level, at certain contact points. But the State, there's really no way to gauge that.

**Pauline Salla:** Unless you're looking at percent of youth who are minorities in the State correctional and youth parole system because that's a compilation of all the Jurisdictions together for the deepest in kids.

**Leslie Bittleston:** That's possible. This would have to be clarified that we are talking about at DCFS commitments. Because if we in the Program's Office all die tomorrow and this is all we have, we wouldn't know that this means at DCFS commitment. That's why this scorecard needs to be a little more specific so anybody can pick it up and say, oh, that's the Data point that goes there.

**Pauline Salla:** I agree.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah.

**Brigid Duffy:** Thank you all. I am sorry, I don't know enough about the Statewide or the federal reporting requirements to have that type of conversation. I appreciate Pauline and Leslie and your input. What about the percentage of youth in Juvenile Justice with case plans?

**Pauline Salla:** We report that. We report that annually to Leslie. I'm not sure why it's in there twice, but all the Jurisdictions report that.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right.

**Brigid Duffy:** Is there a definition of what a case plan is or is that something that's not in the data book because it didn't exist in 2014.

**Pauline Salla:** It didn't exist through the concept of YLS. I mean since then when we implemented our risk and need instrument and all of us had to be trained with the case plans that matched our service matrix, I think that all the Jurisdictions are in agreement with the definition for case plans. I think maybe our Data Dictionary needs to reflect that addition.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right. And that the case plan, the emphasis on the case plan really came out as part of AB 472. There is a definition of a case plan in 62E. Is it 507? I may be saying that, but there's a long definition of what the elements of an individualized case plan are in 62E, and I don't know why percentage of case plans is on here twice. It must be a typo.

**Brigid Duffy:** You're right. Leslie, it is 62E 507.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Brigid Duffy:** I'm just looking at it now. Okay. Because I haven't seen, and I'm not in court as much as I used to be, but I haven't seen my vision of what a case plan is in Clark County. Like a piece of paper that says, this is the kid, this is what he is going to do, who's responsible to do it and what the timeframes are to get it done. How are other Jurisdictions doing it so that we can then add the case plan definition. Commissioner Parker, I'll call on you before I ask for that general question to be answered.

**DeDe Parker:** Hi, this is Commissioner Parker. I believe in conversations with the county, I wish that DJS was on here. I think what they're considering, and I don't want to speak for them, a case plan is the terms of probation, because I don't believe that there are actual case plans as designed by the YLS that I have seen. Commissioner Fraser, I don't know if you've seen different in court, but I believe at the last meeting what was being reported was like a hundred percent. I think that that definition might not be as clear, but I could be wrong because again, this is my second meeting.

**Pauline Salla:** Go ahead Commissioner Fraser.

**Jennifer Fraser:** I was just going to say I haven't seen a document titled case plan either. It was my thought that they weren't doing them yet, like the YLS and the PDs were ruled out first and they haven't really developed what their finalized case plan is going to look like. Because it's still just the terms and conditions of probation.

**Leslie Bittleston:** This is Leslie Bittleston for the record. I was going to say, quick, there is a case plan screen in Enterprise Supervision. What is required per statute is that youth on Community Supervision have a case plan. The problem is that Enterprise Supervision has not been able to make this case plan work functionally because a case plan is a living document. You need to be able to say, this objective is completed, here's the new one. That functionality is not quite working. Cindy can talk more about this than I can, but there is a case plan screen and an embedded case plan in Enterprise Supervision right now, today.

**Pauline Salla:** Okay. My experience is a little different. Ours is a living document. It's a typical appropriate case plan. We prioritize the top, the highest risk domains of the top three, the highest risk

domains of the YLS. The activities and the interventions that we utilize come from our service matrix that's separated by domains and risk level. We use smart goals. We revisit it. Our kids and families have the ability to give us activities that they think that they'll be able to do that would be helpful. Is it the best platform in Enterprise Supervision? No, but we've been able to figure out how to keep that as a living document and you also can create an updated case plan with your notes and dates on it and stuff. The NAJJA agreed on a Statewide case plan template that did not include probation terms. There's a section on the case plan about court obligations and probation terms, so you can always attach that to the case plan. But when we report on how many percent of kids who have a case plan, it's an actual case plan. I was going to try and pull one up, but I can't redact it fast enough for you guys.

**Cindy Casselman:** This is Cindy Casselman. Yes, there are some functionality issues in Enterprise for the case plans, but you can create them. It just doesn't have the reminders and sometimes some of the areas you can't see what you're typing in there, but you are able to, and everybody has access to that. I'm not sure why Clark County doesn't have those.

**Pauline Salla:** I have just a sample up right now. If anybody wants me to share my screen or if I can, I'd be willing to do that. It looks different when you print it out it comes out as a case plan. But let me just make sure. Alright folks, if you see a name, keep it confidential.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Confidentiality.

**Pauline Salla:** Or I'll find you all, hold on. Do you guys see my screen?

**Brigid Duffy:** Yes.

**Pauline Salla:** Okay. This is how it looks in Enterprise Supervision. We link the assessments, the most current YLS, you can see these are the domains, the top three domains. If you click on them, it goes down. Attitudes, Orientations, Peer Relations, Personality and Behavior. Of course, it shows you the score of the YLS. And then this is where we can update, we can add smart goals here in each domain. Personality and Behavior, right? It has the ability for us to put in our notes. It has the ability for us to work on the reentry plan. You can include responsibility factors and barriers. Is the family engaged, yes, or no? We're tracking family engagement and then if there's any court orders or court obligations, you can put them in here and we just attach the probation terms so it's not just probation terms and when you print it out, so this is her first one and you won't -- oh wait, no, I didn't include the wireless. It prints out in a case plan that we share in court. Come on, dude. Okay. I might not, let me do it right now. But yeah, we had a lot of conversations about probation terms are not a case plan as NAJJA and as the commission. What Enterprise could do case plans, it still needs some work, but it's functional for us.

**Brigid Duffy:** This is Commissioner Duffy. Do you file those with the court? Pauline, did I miss that?

**Pauline Salla:** We do at Dispo.

**Brigid Duffy:** Okay.

**Pauline Salla:** We do it at Dispo just so we're all on the same page.

**Brigid Duffy:** Okay.

**Pauline Salla:** I mean, then the parents have the ability to say like, “Yeah, we're not doing that or which ever.”

**Brigid Duffy:** I think Clark is going to start going in that direction. I am familiar with case plans being used up at the camp at Spring Mountain Youth Camp because I've seen them in the family tracks tab before. Okay. I think it would be helpful then to have a definition of case plan put into the into the Data Dictionary and they can see the statutory section that tells them what to do. Okay. Back to the performance measure scorecard. Ms. Leslie.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes. Oh, share. There we go.

**Brigid Duffy:** Okay. Percent increase, decrease in re-arrest and recommitment. I assume there's probably some need for clarifying there.

**Leslie Bittleston:** First, I think the first thing, rate of recidivism needs to be better defined because you can't just go into a data system and select rate of recidivism, and something spits out. That's not how it works. You need specific measurements. And one of those measurements could be this re-arrest. Another measurement could be recommitment. Those could be measurements of recidivism. That rate of recidivism really doesn't mean anything without a measurement or multiple measurements. Commissioner Parker looks like she has a question or comment.

**DeDe Parker:** Hi, Commissioner Parker for the record. I was looking at, has the recidivism rate definition changed since the 2014 data book? I feel like I've heard people in different meetings, and again, this is just from recollection that it includes violations of probation, but when I'm reading it in the definition of recidivism, it's stating just the re-adjudication.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, it was updated with the FY18 to FY23 Strategic Plan. There is a new definition of recidivism. And again, and I will say this as somebody that collects data, that definition is very big. And it was like shooting for the stars again. I'm wondering if it does need to be reassessed because when you say a rate of recidivism, you also must include a measurement. You have to say because recidivism is youth specific. You must look at one youth, let's say arrested youth. All the youth arrested last year, you're going to have to re-look at those youths and see if they were arrested this year. It's not just pulling out the number of arrests from last year and the number of arrests from this year. That's not what recidivism is. It's looking at a specific youth. And that's why this needs to be better defined and better. Described and I'm sure Commissioner Parker as a court improvement person knows that.

**Pauline Salla:** This is Commissioner Salla. We spent four months on the definition of recidivism with the Data Dictionary. We had different levels because technical violation should not be a part of reporting. That must be separate technical probation parole violations, right? But there were different levels of recidivism defined. Which at that time matched the definition of recidivism when we had a report for our state budgets, including the county camps. All of that meshed and we were all reporting similar stuff because we had budget performance measures too. If at some point recidivism was changed, that didn't get passed down to the jurisdictions, or it didn't get passed down to Humboldt County, because I've been using the recidivism definition in the Data Dictionary. That's part of the issue, right, is that if it got changed and it's not communicated to us that clearly, that's why we're all reporting differently.

**DeDe Parker:** Sorry, Commissioner Parker, one more time. I'm looking at, it's page 35 in the Data Dictionary and I believe that's where it's being defined in recidivism. Is that the only part of the dictionary that has it?

**Pauline Salla:** Let me go to 35.

**DeDe Parker:** I just don't know it the back of my hand. I'm sorry.

**Pauline Salla:** Yeah, let me look really quick.

**DeDe Parker:** Because I'm only seeing, I believe the one and then it goes down to the citation 71. I just feel like from, based upon what you said and what I'm looking at, unless I'm missing it somewhere else, I just feel like there's probably been a lot of changes to that. And so, I think that people, I mean, I get confused and this again, only my third meeting, but when we talk about these things, like I've heard people say in meetings like one definition and that. I think that we just need to have a document that's just very clear in the definitions. Anyone reporting anything can discuss that.

**Pauline Salla:** Yeah. When I'm reporting recidivism, I'm utilizing a re-adjudicated delinquent offense by juvenile court or transfer to the adult system. We separate out any technical violations. Any probation violations. We report that to the State annually too. But I operate under, for the purpose of measurement, a recidivism will be measured when an individual's re-adjudicated, not rearrested, because we all know they can be rearrested and not move forward. That if when we're tracking recidivism, we are talking re-adjudicated or either a transfer to the adult system or they're right over 18, get charged with an adult as a crime, we consider that too for recidivism. But I use that definition. I can't speak to everybody else. And I wasn't even aware that there were new definitions.

**Leslie Bittleston:** This is the definition, I just pulled it up on the screen. This is the JJOC approved definition that was done in the FY18 to FY23 strategic plan. This is how it was changed and when it was changed. This could also be a definition that you've heard Commissioner Parker in the past. However, I agree with Commissioner Salla, this definition is way too broad and does need to be looked at because re-adjudication, that is one measurement and that is a definition of recidivism. And that's okay to have one definition. There's no way to look at this huge definition here and pull up all of this data as one definition of recidivism. It does need to be scaled back.

**DeDe Parker:** This is Commissioner Parker again for the record. And again, sorry, I'm the newbie, but like the rate of recidivism, I think looking at the scorecard, if we define that with the 2014 general Statement from the data book, but then under that I think is where you want to put the re-arrest, the recommitment as another measure of recidivism. I completely agree, anybody reporting recidivism, whenever I report recidivism, I state specifically what that means. Like if I only had the capability of running Clark County, that's in my Statement. I'm specific, whether I'm looking at misdemeanors, felonies. I'm specific, what I'm looking at. I just think that that could probably be a little bit clearer on the scorecard. My 2 cents.

**Brigid Duffy:** Okay. I'm hearing a whole bunch of things. We're going to be coming back and having in depth discussion about on the next meeting. You want to bring up the scorecard again for me, Leslie? Just so I can make sure I get everything out there? Okay. The Statewide scorecard talks about going back to the rate of recidivism and looking at what Ms. Parker just said is, we have the definition of it, but then you

can measure it by the increase of arrest or decrease in a re-arrest or re-commitments or violations. Kind of tightening up this whole, what we're looking for.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right. And in addition, need to look at violations of parole or probation, again, those technical violations. I know from the parole side that any arrest is counted as a parole violation, a technical violation. I'm not sure that that's the intent. I just think that that needs to be a bit cleaner as well. Just the definition of what is a violation because as commissioner so just said a few minutes ago, technicals should not be included.

**Pauline Salla:** Well, technical, we report on technicals. We report to you annually how many probation violations we filed. I mean, that's reported already. A technical violation really doesn't mean its recidivism. I mean, technical violations can range. Not going to school too.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah, I just think that needs to be tightened up a little bit. I think that as part of recidivism, you can do a parole or probation violation, but a technical violation doesn't belong in a recidivism measure. It belongs in a violation of parole or probation. That just needs to be tightened up a little bit. And lastly, really quick, I do want to say that one area that we have not been able to measure, but that has recently changed the bottom one, the number of convictions in the adult system. The Office of Analytics does have access to the Department of Corrections data. They'll be able to provide the Program's Office on the go forward, a quarterly report with all the new under eighteens committed to the Department of Corrections. We will be able to get this information through the corrections data. That's good news and we can get that. Oh, Kyra,

**Kyra Morgan:** Can I chime in? Sorry, Kyra Morgan for the record. I'm new with the Division of Child and Family Services, acting as an epidemiologist, but I came from the Office of Analytics for about eight years. The data sharing that we have for the criminal history repository does not allow them to share line level information. You could give them a list of youth and you could ask them, of those youth, how many had recidivist in some period, but they wouldn't be able to tell you which kids it was. Just wanted to clarify.

**Brigid Duffy:** Thank you. Alright, I'm going to wrap up with some of the things we're going to come back with because I think I covered the bulk of it. I didn't go over the family surveys portion. I'm sorry, I don't have the agenda in front of me.

**Leslie Bittleston:** It's okay. You can move that to the next.

**Brigid Duffy:** I'll kick that one. Just focusing in on some of the, the performance measures that are, were required in statute, I want this committee over the next, couple months getting ready for the next meeting. NRS 62B.610, those are listed out as the performance measure statutorily that we must look at without limitations. One of them is services provided by the agency, which I don't know that it would be helpful to know if we are. Even looking at where children are being referred and whether, if you refer then to 62B.615, the evidence-based practices in providing services. Collect and report data relating to programs offered and services rendered. I'm not sure if agencies are doing that. But we are supposed to be looking at specific services that are provided by the agencies or referred to, I guess, and then somehow measuring their effectiveness and whether they're evidence-based in providing those services. That's why we have for at least Clark, I have Commissioner Parker, who is very knowledgeable about a lot of the services we provide and especially when they're grant funded and through the courts able to help us get that data. But when we refer to other individual counseling programs outside of any court grant funded

programs that we're even measuring anything in the state, does any Pauline or anybody know any different, have we even gotten to looking at services offered per by statute required?

**Pauline Salla:** We offer a lot of services in house, which has been helpful to us. But we're in the process of doing a two-year data analysis of three of our onsite programs right now with our pre and posttests and then our satisfaction surveys from our kids and families. Only because we want to see if what we're doing is effective. But we're just in the process of collecting data for three onsite groups that we do. It is much harder to guarantee that when we're referring them out that they can tell us its evidence informed or evidence-based, but how do we really prove that? We just really focused on internally what we're utilizing and starting to collect data and doing data analysis on that part. I agree it's hard when you're referring out.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah. This is Leslie just to add a little more information. The evidence-based resource center, which is a topic of conversation in this strategic planning committee, is severely underfunded. That is a conversation that the strategic planning committee is having and will continue to have. If the evidence-based resource center was funded appropriately, that center could come in and look at those programs that are being done in the counties and assess them to see if they are evidence-based. The resource center recently created a quality assurance tool to assess programs. The problem is, there no staff in the resource center due to the underfunding to look at that tool and verify that. This does tie into the evidence-based resource center piece that the strategic planning's working on. Additional funding is needed around that for staff to ensure that these programs are meeting criteria. Commissioner Duffy and Commissioner Fraser, I think are both on the strategic planning. Yes. Okay. Just didn't want you to forget that does tie into that piece.

**Brigid Duffy:** Alright. Before I lose everybody for our next agenda or our next agendas meeting, I will come back with, having looked through the Data Dictionary and making some suggestions on where we dive in and start kicking around definitions. And I'll make sure they're laid out on the agenda. We need to tighten up our recidivism definition and what the measures are. There's a request that we look at defining technical violations. I'm not sure that they are specifically defined in the data book, but so everybody's looking at those the same way, versus a substantive violation, which should be easy to do. And then, I want to get into our statutory requirements for performance measures. It would be nice to know from each jurisdiction how they are getting that information currently or how they are reporting it, if at all. And I'll cross reference that with the data book before the next meeting. Anything else anybody wants to talk about at the next meeting, how I need to at least an hour and a half on that agenda.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Jessica, do we have a scheduled meeting at this point for the data or do we need to identify a date?

**Brigid Duffy:** I don't think we do. This is Commissioner Duffy.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Brigid Duffy:** I cannot do Wednesdays. That'll be out. If you want me present, I cannot do Wednesdays. So why don't I give Jessica some dates in August. I can do, because I still have some things, I'll be routinely going to in August that will take me out a week at a time. I will get a couple dates in August to her and then she can send out to the larger group to see if any of those work. I know Fridays are bad, so we'll try to stay away from Fridays and Wednesdays are bad for me, so it probably be looking at a Tuesday or a

Thursday. Because Mondays can be bad for everybody, without knowing what we're walking into on a Monday.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Nobody does.

**Brigid Duffy:** I try to refrain from Mondays. I don't know what agenda item is, but I know I have public comment at the end of every agenda. Is there any public comment? Alright. Well thank you everybody for your time and your input today as I try to bring us back into what our goals are going to be in our next conversation. I know there's a strategic planning meeting this week, I believe.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes.

**Brigid Duffy:** Mike Watson will be attending for me to keep me updated on it. That way we figure out if there's a recommendation maybe from them on whether we need to keep the performance measures in the strategic plan, as we did the last Strategic Plan so that they can report back to this committee whether they want to have us work on that for the Strategic Plan. I will get everything out to you all and work on the agenda for our date in August. Thank you everyone.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Thank you. Bye-Bye.

**Brigid Duffy:** Bye.