



JUVENILE JUSTICE OVERSIGHT COMMISSION FY2019-23 **DRAFT** STRATEGIC PLAN

UPDATED JUNE 1, 2018

MESSAGE FROM THE JUVENILE JUSTICE OVERSIGHT COMMISSION CO-CHAIRS

It is our pleasure to present the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission's 5-Year Strategic Plan. This plan is a testament to statewide, cross-system collaboration and a document about which we are all very proud. We have risen to the Governor's challenge of: "One Nevada." In less than a year, dedicated Commissioners, sub-committee members and juvenile justice stakeholders have accomplished a tremendous amount despite the enormity of the initial AB 472 requirements. To a person, those engaged in the process stood behind the bill's intent to make the juvenile justice system more effective and cost-efficient. All of us remain convinced that together, with the right tools, policies and continued collaboration, we will achieve our vision for Nevada's juvenile justice system, that *all children in Nevada who have contact with the juvenile justice system will leave the system better for it.*

At this point, new tools, resources, and data collection definitions are in-place, and policies are being developed to ensure that Nevada's juvenile justice system has the foundation it needs to meaningfully reduce recidivism rates and improve youth outcomes. Importantly, we head in to the first year of our Strategic Plan with continued collaboration and a unified effort among all components of the juvenile justice system. The Commission is dedicated to gaining a deeper understanding about the causes of youth recidivism across Nevada, and to ensuring Nevada implements evidence-based practices proven to reduce recidivism; we believe the successful implementation of this Strategic Plan will achieve the desired outcomes.

The intent of AB 472 and the Commission is to keep all of us who use State funds for Juvenile Justice programming accountable for where and how we use those funds. Funds will now be allocated in ways that tie the receipt of funding to the use of evidence based programming. If we can't prove it works, the citizens of Nevada can't, and shouldn't, pay for it. By identifying what does work, we hope to empower Counties, juvenile justice facilities, and service providers with the resources and support they need so that, ultimately, a majority of the juvenile justice service funds (regardless of source) are used for prevention and treatment such that fewer funds are needed for detention. If Nevada accomplishes this, not only will recidivism rates decline, but funding from all sources will have a measurable and more positive impact on children and families. When we succeed, we will redirect the trajectory of young people in the juvenile justice system so that they can grow to be healthy, productive adults.

There are many people we would like to thank for their efforts and commitment to our shared cause of reducing recidivism and improving the outcomes for youth in Nevada's juvenile justice system: Governor Brian Sandoval, Deputy Chief Shawn Anderson, Luis Beltran, Kierra Bracken, Frank Cervantes, Brigid Duffy, Mayra Rodriguez-Galindo, Rebekah Graham, Eve Hanan, Senator Becky Harris, Dr. Lisa Morris Hibbler, Katherine Hickman, Darin Imlay, John Lambrose, Jack Martin, John Munoz, Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Assemblyman James Oscarson, Jacqueline Pierrott, Senator Julia Ratti, Justice Nancy Saitta, Scott Shick, Patrick Schreiber, Paula Smith, Pauline Salla-Smith, Judge Thomas Stockard, Emmanuel Torres, Kathleen Teipner, Gianna Verness, Ricardo Villalobos, Judge William Voy, Jo Lee Wickes, Kelly Wooldridge.

- Joey Orduna Hastings & Judge Egan Walker, JJOC Co-Chairs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- SECTION ONE BACKGROUND 4**
- PLANNING PROCESS OVERVIEW..... 5
- PURPOSE OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN 6
- NEVADA ASSEMBLY BILL 472 REQUIREMENTS OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN..... 6
- PLANNING DEFINITIONS..... 7
- PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS 7

- SECTION TWO CURRENT STATE 8**
- KEY DATA POINTS FOR NEVADA’S JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM..... 9
- JJOC’S KEY ACCOMPLISHMENTS AS OF MAY 2018..... 10

- SECTION THREE STRATEGIC DIRECTION 12**
- MISSION OF THE JJOC – WHY WE EXIST..... 13
- VISION – NEVADA JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM’S FUTURE STATE 13
- DEFINITION OF RECIDIVISM 13
- DEFINITION OF EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES 14

- SECTION FOUR FIVE-YEAR GOALS & ROADMAP..... 15**
- STRATEGIC GOALS 16
- GOAL 1: ASSESSMENTS & SCREENING 17
- GOAL 2: PROVEN PROGRAMS 19
- GOAL 3: SYSTEM COLLABORATION..... 23
- GOAL 4: TAILORED SERVICES 27

- SECTION FIVE IMPLEMENTATION & GOVERNANCE PROCESS..... 29**
- IMPLEMENTATION MODEL GUIDELINES 30
- PERFORMANCE MEASURES..... 31
- COUNTY ACTION PLAN & REPORTING..... 33

- APPENDIX..... 36**
- JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM STRUCTURE 37
- KEY DATA REGARDING THE NEVADA JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM 38
- CPC PERFORMANCE-BASED STANDARDS PROGRAM CHECKLIST..... 45

SECTION ONE
BACKGROUND

PLANNING PROCESS OVERVIEW

The State of Nevada applied for and received technical assistance through the Justice Center of the Council of State Governments. Receipt of the award triggered a year long process analyzing Nevada's Juvenile System and developing recommendations for change. That process included convening a team of Nevadans from all branches of government and all corners of the state together with national experts. Like most states across the country, Nevada currently has fewer youth in its juvenile justice system than at any point in the last decade, with a majority of those youth now being supervised in the community rather than in correctional or residential treatment facilities. Between 2006 and 2014, the number of youth who were committed to the Nevada Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) for delinquent offenses decreased by 54 percent. However, Nevada still allocates significant resources for youth under supervision. In 2016, approximately \$61 million was spent on supervision and services across Nevada's two largest counties (Clark and Washoe), in addition to approximately \$28 million at the state level. State and county leaders became increasingly frustrated that, in spite of these considerable investments, they did not have the necessary data capacity to track system performance and youth outcomes to determine whether resources were being used effectively. Additionally, while state and local leaders shared common frustrations with the functioning of the juvenile justice system, including its shortage of behavioral health services and evidence-based services more generally, the lack of data made it difficult to objectively pinpoint specific areas of poor performance and establish consensus for how best to improve the system. CSG assessment process found the following:

- Nevada does not regularly or comprehensively track recidivism rates or other outcomes for youth in the juvenile justice system, and the limited data available indicates that youth in the juvenile justice system experience poor outcomes.
- Although Nevada has recently seen a significant drop in the number of youth referred to the juvenile justice system, a greater proportion of those youth who are referred to the system are being petitioned, detained, adjudicated, and formally supervised.
- Despite significant spending on Nevada's juvenile justice system—almost \$90 million in 2015—state and county agencies do not ensure that youth are matched with the most appropriate levels and types of supervision and services based on their risk and needs.

The final recommendations were then included in one of Governor Sandoval's signature bills for the 2017 Legislative Session, Assembly Bill 472. The bill passed both the Nevada Assembly and the Nevada Senate unanimously and was signed into law by Governor Sandoval on June 16, 2017. The bill has several components but most importantly:

- Creates a Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission to develop standardized performance measures and data analysis points including but not limited to youth recidivism;
- Requires statewide implementation of statewide uniform risk assessments that will help guide the judiciary and juvenile justice agencies in serving youth throughout the life of their case;
- Modifies required judicial findings to ensure youth being removed from the community truly pose a risk to public safety and that availability community resources have been explored; and
- Requires a number of juvenile justice agency practice changes including but not limited to, family engagement strategies, comprehensive youth case planning, objective length of stay and facility release decisions, and standardized responses to youth parole violations.
- Requires that over time state funds for juvenile justice agencies be expended on evidence based programs.

This legislation represents a united effort by all three branches of government to better protect public safety and improve outcomes for youth in our juvenile justice system by making the system more cost-efficient and effective.

- Governor Brian Sandoval

The Strategic Plan subcommittee of the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission developed the strategic plan through the process below:

Phase I Establish the Strategic Framework February 2018	Phase 2 Design Strategy March – April 2018	Phase 3 Build the Plan & Roadmap May – June 2018
<p>Formal Kickoff: Begin planning process with subcommittee and Commission</p> <p>Subcommittees Interviews</p> <p>Governance Structure: Determine who has oversight and responsibility for development and revisions to Strategic Plan</p> <p>Plan Template: Develop Template for 5 yr. Strategic Plan</p> <p>Strategic Issues: Clarify the strategic issues + Evidence-Based Practice Model</p> <p>Summarize the “Knowns”: Pull together all of the planning elements that have been developed through the course of the Bill creation and CSG’s work.</p> <p>APPROACH: Subcommittee meetings; interviews; staff team meetings</p>	<p>Roles & Functions: Document individual subcommittees, their functions and goals</p> <p>Long-Term Goals, Strategies & Measures: Develop specific goals for 5-year plan</p> <p>APPROACH</p> <p>1.Virtual, 90 min meetings, 2x per month</p> <p>2.In-person half-day session</p>	<p>Five-Year Roadmap: Build the multi-year milestone roadmap.</p> <p>Performance Measure Scorecard: Establish the performance measures, calculations, data sources and data owners.</p> <p>Annual Workplan: Develop timeline of implementation with benchmarks; individual subcommittee outcomes; completion dates of tasks for the current fiscal year.</p> <p>Complete the Strategic Plan: Complete the full strategic plan and 2-page communication summary for review by JJOC.</p> <p>Strategic Plan Approval: July 1, 2018</p> <p>APPROACH</p> <p>1.Virtual, 90 min meetings, 2x per month</p> <p>2.-Half Day Session</p>
<p>Working Group Participants: Strategic Plan, Data and Performance Measure & Youth Subcommittees; JJOC Chairs</p>	<p>Working Group Participants: Strategic Plan Subcommittee; Data Subcommittee; JJOC</p>	

PURPOSE OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

AB 472: “The Commission shall develop a 5-year strategic plan that establishes policies and procedures for the Division of Child and Family Services and each department of juvenile services relating to the use of evidence-based practices in providing services to children subject to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court....”

NEVADA ASSEMBLY BILL 472 REQUIREMENTS OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

The Commission shall develop a 5-year strategic plan that establishes policies and procedures for the Division of Child and Family Services and each department of juvenile services relating to the use of evidence-based practices in providing services to children subject to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court.

The plan must include:

- Uniform standards that an evidence-based practice or program must follow, including model programs, staffing requirements, and quality assurance protocols;
- Strategies, including measurable goals, timelines and responsible parties to enhance the capacity of the DCFS and each department to:
 - Comply with evidence-based standards developed by Commission; and
 - Partner with treatment providers that offer evidence-based programs for the treatment of children subject to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court;
- A requirement for the collection and reporting of data to the Commission by each department of the juvenile services relating to the programs offered and services rendered by each department; and
- Protocols for improvement and corrective action for:

- A department of juvenile services that does not comply with the reporting requirements established pursuant to paragraph c; and
- A treatment provider that doesn't comply with evidence-based standards established by the Commission.
- DCFS shall adopt regulations to implement the provisions of the strategic plan developed pursuant to subsection 1.
- On or before July 1, 2018, and every 5 years thereafter, the Commission shall submit the strategic plan developed pursuant to subsection 1 to the Director of Legislative Counsel Bureau for transmittal to the next regular session of the Legislature.

PLANNING DEFINITIONS

Vision Statement: A short, concise, vivid statement of Nevada's juvenile justice system's future, answering the question: *what will the juvenile justice look like in 10-20 years?*

Mission Statement: An overarching, timeless expression of the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission's (JJOC) purpose and aspiration, addressing both what the JJOC seeks to accomplish and the manner in which the JJOC seeks to accomplish it; a declaration of an organization's core purpose. A mission statement answers the question, "*why do we exist?*"

Goals: The long-term, continuous strategic focus areas that move the juvenile justice system closer to achieving the Vision Statement. Goals are seen as having a five-year or longer time horizon.

Initiatives: Explain how we will accomplish the Goals over the life of the plan, with clear outcomes associated with the initiatives. Initiatives have a two- to three-year time horizon.

Actions: Explain what will be accomplished in the short-term to achieve the initiatives. Actions in this plan are completed either by the JJOC, the state (Department of Child & Family Services), the Counties or service providers or a combination of any of these entities. Actions are the incremental steps or phases with a time horizon between one to two years.

PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS

- FY2018-19 budget is set; FY2019-2020 and beyond budgets are not.
- 1 Year is a reasonable timeframe for Counties to begin implementing evidence-based practices.
- Evidence Based Program Resource Center will be in-place July 9, 2018.
- Caseload Pro, YLS and MAYSI rollout will continue through Year 1.
- Performance measure benchmarks to be identified in Year 1 (FY2018-19); targets set in Year 2 (FY2019-20); targets to be measured in Year 3 (FY2020-21).

SECTION TWO
CURRENT STATE

AB 472 was introduced and implemented by the Governor's Office, because despite the fact Nevada is spending \$95 million on supervision of justice-involved youth, the state still lacks standardized methods for tracking measurable outcomes, ensuring the best practices and research are being consulted, and ensuring the best tools are being used to reduce recidivism, and multiple encounters with courts and law enforcement.

- Governor Brian Sandoval

KEY DATA POINTS FOR NEVADA'S JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

YOUTH OFTEN CYCLE THROUGH THE NEVADA JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM.

Average number of prior referrals, 2013-2015:

- Diversion - 1 prior referral
- Probation - 6 prior referrals
- Youth camp placement - 8 prior referrals
- DCFS commitment - 11 prior referrals

In 2015, Youth Offenders had an average of 3 Prior Referrals.

THE NUMBER OF YOUTH REFERRED TO NEVADA'S JJS HAS DECLINED, WHILE THE TYPES OF OFFENSES COMMITTED BY YOUTH HAVE NOT CHANGED.

Offense Types for Clark and Washoe County in 2015:

- Misdemeanor – 46%
- Felony – 14%
- Status – 13%
- Administrative – 11%
- Gross Misdemeanor – 8%
- Violation – 7%
- Traffic – 1%

Youth Were Referred for an Average of 2 Offenses.

THE PROPORTION OF CASES THAT ARE DIVERTED HAS DECLINED AND THE PROPORTION OF YOUTH BEING DETAINED HAS INCREASED SLIGHTLY, 2013 - 2015.

The Average Length of Stay in Detention in 2015:

- 18 Days in Clark County up from 16 days in 2013;
- 16 Days in Washoe County up from 13 days in 2013.

Detention Cost per Day in Clark County in 2015: \$339.06

THE PROPORTION AND NUMBER OF YOUTH PLACED IN YOUTH CAMPS FROM CLARK AND WASHOE COUNTIES & THE PROPORTION AND NUMBER OF YOUTH PLACED IN DCFS CUSTODY HAVE INCREASED.

DCFS Commitments by Race / Ethnicity, 2015:

- 41% Black
- 31% Latino
- 24% White
- 4% Other

THE NUMBER OF YOUTH ON PAROLE HAS INCREASED 9%, 2013-2015.

The Average Length of Stay on Parole has decreased 42% in The Same Period.

Youth On Parole by Race / Ethnicity, 2015:

- 35% White
- 34% Black
- 28% Latino
- 3% Other

YOUTH OF COLOR ARE REFERRED AND DETAINED DISPROPORTIONATELY & AT HIGHER RATES THAN WHITE YOUTH

	Clark County			Washoe County		
	Juvenile Population	Referrals	Detention	Juvenile Population	Referrals	Detention
White	40%	23%	19%	46%	49%	44%
Black	10%	35%	41%	2%	11%	15%
Latino	41%	36%	34%	39%	35%	36%

Further detail and data can be found in the Appendix.

JJOC’S KEY ACCOMPLISHMENTS AS OF MAY 2018

To-date (May 2018), JJOC has completed several statutory requirements and foundational programs, policies and projects:

- Juvenile Justice Commissioners from a broad representation of juvenile justice expertise areas were appointed and have been actively engaged in implementation and planning of juvenile justice reform;
- Developed JJOC by-laws;
- A dedicated online presence on the DCFS website representing JJOC content, information and progress updates;
- Developed the Evidence-Based Resource Center website;
- Selected a risk and needs assessment tool, YLS;
- Drafted policies for YLS;
- Selected a mental health screening tool, MAYSI II;
- Integrated YLS, MAYSI II into Caseload Pro and drafted policies;
- Selection of a quality assurance tool, CPC (for facilities);
- Drafted policies, including
 - Violations of Parole and Revocation;
 - Placement of Youth Committed to DCFS / Admission Determination Procedure;
 - Family Engagement Plan;
 - Court Findings Prior to Commitment;

- Individual Case Plan & Discharge Planning / Re-Entry;
- Out-of-State Placement of Children;
- Length of Stay;
- Release of Information / Information Sharing;
- System Information Requirements (Data Collection Activities)
- Reporting requirements (of performance data);
- Quality improvement procedures for reporting;
- Performance measures reporting;
- State compliance for EBP standards and quality assurance process by the State;
- Withholding funding for county non-compliance of evidence-based standards;
- Drafted regulation changes (NAC 62) to NRS 62 (DCFS policy) for public notices and workshops;
- Selection of an Evidence Based Practices Resource Center vendor;
- Developed a training program to enhance evidence-based practices in Nevada;
- Began an inventory of current evidence-based practices throughout the state;
- Defined Recidivism for clarity of measurement;
- Defined evidence-based practices for the State of Nevada's juvenile justice system;
- Confirmed required performance measures / data;
- Established the Youth Committee and conducted 2 tours for the Youth Committee members of JJOC to inform their recommendations;
- Provided Youth Committee a demonstration of Caseload Pro for a deeper understanding of JJS method of measurement;
- The Youth Committee report to the Commission at the April full commission meeting;
- Established an internal DCFS Implementation Team representing parole, programs and facilities.

SECTION THREE

STRATEGIC DIRECTION

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.

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

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	COUNTIES & STATE: 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	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
GROUP HOMES, RTC, YOUTH CAMPS, AND STATE CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES: CPC Performance Based Standards				

TRENDS

Recidivism Rates	Disproportionate 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
------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------	------------------------------	---	----------------------------	---------------------------------

MISSION OF THE JJOC – WHY WE EXIST

The mission of the JJOC is the governance of the selection, policy development, implementation, enforcement, and quality assurance of Nevada’s juvenile justice system.

VISION – NEVADA JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM’S FUTURE STATE

We envision that Nevada’s juvenile justice system will continue to protect public safety and that all children who have contact with the juvenile justice system will leave the system better for it.

Success looks like...

- The rates of recidivism, commitments and referrals decline and diversions increase.
- The system operates effectively and collaboratively so that the services and supervision youth receive correspond to their risk and needs, regardless of risk levels.
- Children leave the juvenile justice system ready for life and employment because their mental health, overall health and educational needs are addressed.
- Fewer children move from the juvenile justice system to the adult correctional system.

The JJOC’s Vision for the future of juvenile justice in Nevada builds off of the declaration in NRS 62:

The Legislature hereby declares that:

1. This title must be liberally construed to the end that:
 - (a) Each child who is subject to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court must receive such care, guidance and control, preferably in the child’s own home, as will be conducive to the child’s welfare and the best interests of this State; and
 - (b) When a child is removed from the control of the parent or guardian of the child, the juvenile court shall secure for the child a level of care which is equivalent as nearly as possible to the care that should have been given to the child by the parent or guardian.
2. One of the purposes of this title is to promote the establishment, supervision and implementation of preventive programs that are designed to prevent a child from becoming subject to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court.

(Added to NRS 2003, 1026)

DEFINITION OF RECIDIVISM

“A CHILD’S TENDENCY TO RELAPSE INTO A PREVIOUS CONDITION OR MODE OF BEHAVIOR AFTER THE INITIAL INTERVENTION OF THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM.”

Recidivism rates in Nevada will be measured at various points of a child’s time in the juvenile justice system.

Recidivism rates will be measured when an individual, within 3 years of initial arrest/citation, adjudication, commitment or placement into an out of home facility, placement under probation or parole supervision or when convicted as an adult is

- a) Re-arrested or
- b) Re-adjudicated or
- c) Re-committed or
- d) In violation of supervision or
- e) Convicted by an adult court.

DEFINITION OF EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES

The approach to reducing recidivism and improving youth outcomes is to use evidence-based practices that comply with the definitions below.

EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES DEFINITION MATRIX

	ELIGIBLE FOR PURPOSES OF STATE FUNDING			EXCLUDED FROM STATE FUNDING	
	Evidence Based Practices	Research Based Practices	Evidence Informed (to qualify, meets 1 of the bullets in each row below)	Ineffective Program	Harmful Program
Effect	Found to be effective		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some evidence of effectiveness Experimental evaluations show that there are contradictory findings Effects are short in duration Programs that include elements of approach known to be effective (e.g. Cognitive behavioral programming, problem solving, skill training, etc.) 	Experimental evaluations failed to show significant differences between the treatment and the control group Or Based on statistical analysis or well-established theory of change, no potential to meet evidence- or research-based effect / criteria	Experimental evaluations show that the control group scored higher on targeted outcomes than did the treatment group Practice constitutes a risk or harm
Internal Validity	True experimental design	Quasi-experimental design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-experimental design, but statistically significant positive effects. True experimental design, but inconsistent inference of causality Delivers positive results, especially related to JJOC-required performance measures, but no research 	True or quasi-experimental design	
Type of Evidence or Research Design	Randomized controlled experimental study	Quasi-experimental design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Locally developed programming with pre/post outcome measures Includes programs or practices with elements of researched based programs. Single group design Program matches the dimensions of a successful meta-analysis practice 1 large, multi-site, randomized / or statistically controlled experimental study 	1 randomized and/or statistically controlled evaluation Or 2 quasi-experiments and 1 randomized controlled evaluation not conducted by an independent investigator	Any design with any results indicating negative effect
Independent Replication	Program replication with evaluation replication.		At least 1 replication without evaluation	At least 1 replication without evaluation	Either replicated or not; with or without evaluation
Implementation Guidance	Comprehensive	Comprehensive	Partial	Partial or comprehensive	Possible applied studies under similar or different settings
Extended Validity	Applied studies: different settings (2+)	Applied studies: similar settings (2+)	Real-world informed. Somewhat evidence informed.	Applied study(s): different or similar settings	Applied study(s): different or similar settings (2+)

SECTION FOUR

FIVE-YEAR GOALS & ROADMAPS

STRATEGIC GOALS

THE KEY GOALS FOR NEVADA TO REDUCE RECIDIVISM AND IMPROVE YOUTH OUTCOMES

Goals are numbered for reference purposes, not to signify any type of prioritization.

GOAL 1 – ASSESSMENTS & SCREENING: Ensure risk and needs assessments and mental health screenings are completed for children prior to disposition.

GOAL 2 – PROVEN PROGRAMS: Implement evidence-based programs, practices and services proven to reduce recidivism.

GOAL 3 – SYSTEM COLLABORATION: Collaborate across systems to address youths' needs.

GOAL 4 – TAILORED SERVICES: Tailor supervision / services to youths' developmental needs.

ROADMAP DEFINITIONS

- **Planning:** identify vendors; funding sources secured; stakeholder engagement and agreement on approach, vendor secured.
- **Policy:** policies define use, policies for reporting, and approval; timeline planning.
- **Rollout:** rolling out tools, policies and other requirements and resources to Counties, the State and service providers.
- **Implementation:** of all users at the County and State levels, including reporting.
- **Quality Assurance:** Measure use fidelity to the tools and reporting correctly; corrective action or recommendations if necessary.

FY2017-18 is "Year 0" where rollout expectations will be established.

GOAL 1: ASSESSMENTS & SCREENING

Ensure risk and needs assessments and mental health screenings are completed for children prior to disposition.

DESCRIPTION

Before committing a child to the custody of a state facility for detention or a public or private institution or agency in another state, the juvenile court will use needs and risk assessments to inform its decisions. These assessments will be used to determine the adjudication or service that addresses youths' needs to prevent recidivism by addressing the root cause of the youth's offense.

OUTCOME

The outcome of this goal will be that the juvenile justice system will deliver individualized services informed by objective assessments and screenings. Furthermore, courts will take a consistent and replicable approach to dispositions as a result of assessments and screenings which will ensure the needs of youth are balanced with protecting the public's safety.

STRATEGIC APPROACH

The approach for this goal is to, across the state, consistently use objective data to inform decisions regarding dispositions and to identify services and programs which will most positively impact youth.

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES:

- 1. RISK ASSESSMENT TOOL: Determine when the risk and needs assessment tool is used.**
Policy to guide use and implementation of the tool, including who uses the tool, how often the tool is used, and outlines training requirement of the tool.
- 2. REPORTING POLICY: Develop policy for reporting requirements from use of tool.**
Establishes a process, requirements, and timing for Counties, State and facilities to have data current in the tool for JJOC to report to the Governor and the Legislature annually.
- 3. CASE PLANNING POLICY: Develop policy for decision-making for case planning for courts regarding the scoring of the tool.**
Policy defines specifics of scoring, including frequency of use, definition / break down of level of care (score ranges), risk to reoffend. Also included is a decision-making guide related to level of care, definition of services / case plan recommendations that fall under each level of care.

GOAL 1 FIVE-YEAR ROADMAP

INITIATIVES / ACTIONS	Year 0 (FY2017 18)	Year 1 (FY2018 19)	Year 2 (FY2019 20)	Year 3 (FY2020 21)	YEARS 4 5 (FY2021 23)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
INITIATIVE 1.1 RISK ASSESSMENT TOOL: Determine when the risk and needs assessment tool is used.						
RISK ASSESSMENT TOOL: Add the risk assessment tools in Caseload Pro	Completed	Policy Rollout	Implementation Counties Executing	Quality Assurance		State with NYSAP ¹
Risk assessment tool funding	DCFS pays 100% of risk assessment tool cost	DCFS pays 50% of risk assessment tool cost / Counties pay 50%	Counties pay 100% of risk assessment tool cost			State Counties
INITIATIVE 1.2 REPORTING POLICY: Develop policy for reporting requirements from use of tool.	Planning Policy	Rollout Implementation Counties Executing (partial)	Implementation Counties Executing (remaining) Quality Assurance			State with NYSAP
INITIATIVE 1.3 CASE PLANNING POLICY: Develop policy for decision-making for case planning for courts regarding the scoring of the tool.	Planning Policy	Rollout Implementation Counties Executing (partial)	Implementation Counties Executing (remaining) Quality Assurance			State with NYSAP

¹ National Youth Screening and Assessment Partners

GOAL 2: PROVEN PROGRAMS

Implement evidence-based programs, practices and services proven to reduce recidivism.

DESCRIPTION

Data has proven that evidence-based practices and programs are proven to reduce recidivism and improve the overall outcomes of youth in a juvenile justice system.

OUTCOMES

More programs and practices within the juvenile justice system are evidence-based so that it is clear what works to improve youth outcomes and reduce detention.

STRATEGIC APPROACH

Counties, facilities, the State and service providers are incentivized to use more evidence-based practices.

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

- 1. EBP RESOURCE CENTER: Ensure the sustainability of the evidence-based practices resource “center.”**
The state and counties have a sourcebook that is maintained to bring in new evidence-based practices. Center may be a specific expertise contracted if sustainable funding is secured or via a subcommittee of the JJOC.
- 2. EBP CRITERIA: Establish criteria and process for identifying and evaluating evidence-based programs / practices.**
Practices from Counties submitted to DCFS for evaluation and determination of funding (similar to the grant process). Youth and families will be referred to evidence-based practices. Successful outcomes determined by a decrease in recidivism and a decrease in youth committed to correctional care and a decrease in youth referred out-of-state for treatment.
- 3. EBP INVENTORY: Complete and maintain an inventory of existing evidence-based practices in Nevada.**

The Evidence Based Practices Resource Center or DCFS will maintain a database of current evidence-based practices

AB 472: The database should consider at least the following: Those programs for which the research is deemed adequate will be compiled into an Evidence-Based Sourcebook. The Sourcebook will include information such as: • Practice Name; • Practice Developer; • Target Population; • Criminogenic Need/Risk Factors Addressed; • Number of Sessions/Program Duration; • Setting (i.e., community-based, residential); • Program Area (i.e., Prevention, Probation, Detention, Residential); • Facilitator and Master Trainer qualifications and training requirements; • Cost Information; and • Contact Information.

- 4. EBP PRACTICES: Strengthen evidence-based practices to improve outcomes.**
Strategic approach to achieve this initiative is through progressive funding towards the use of EBPs from 25% to 100% over 5 years.

Develop a plan for the DCFS to help the Counties replace ineffective and harmful programs.

Policy should Identify requirements for Evidence Based Standards in the following areas: County Juvenile Probation Departments, County Detention Centers, County Camps, State Parole, State Facilities, Community Providers for all.

Strategies for expanding/strengthening EBPs:

- *Funding requirements/incentives*
- *Leveraging Medicaid and other state/federal funding streams*
- *Cross-systems collaboration*
- *Provider and probation/state training and resource/tool development*
- *Provider/probation collaboration*
- *EBP Resource Center*

AB 472 – “Protocols for improvement and corrective action for: A department...that does not comply with reporting requirements... A treatment provider that does not comply with the evidence-based standards established by the Commission.”

5. COUNTY ENGAGEMENT: Inform and engage Counties of the intent and desired outcomes and resources outlined in AB 472.

Counties and departments of juvenile services have a clear understand of the expectations and intent of the Governor and AB 472, the timing and phasing-in and their role and available resources to increase evidence-based practices in Nevada.

GOAL 2 FIVE-YEAR ROADMAP

ACTIONS	Year 0 (FY2017 18)	Year 1 (FY2018 19)	Year 2 (FY2019 20)	Year 3 (FY2020 21)	YEARS 4 5 (FY2021 23)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
INITIATIVE 2.1 EBP RESOURCE CENTER: Ensure the sustainability of the evidence-based practices resource “center.”						
RESOURCE CENTER CREATION: Establish the EBP Resource Center.	Planning Policy	Rollout Implementation Counties Executing (use of EBPRC)	Quality Assurance			JJOC
FUNDING: Secure sustainable funding of EBP Resource Center.		Planning	Policy			JJOC
EBP SUBCOMMITTEE: Establish EBP Evaluation subcommittee of JJOC (if sustainable funding for EBPRC is not funded)		Planning	Quality Assurance			JJOC
INITIATIVE 2.2 EBP CRITERIA: Establish criteria and process for identifying and evaluating evidence-based programs / practices.						
EBP DEFINITIONS: Develop EBP Definitions Matrix and process for evaluating practices	Planning Policy	Rollout	Implementation Counties Executing	Quality Assurance		JJOC
EBP EVALUATION: Define the process for evaluating EBPs		Planning Policy	Rollout Implementation Counties Executing	Quality Assurance		JJOC
COUNTIES EBP ASSESSMENT: Assess current practices to determine number of practices or programs that are evidence-based.		Rollout	Quality Assurance			Counties
STATES EBP ASSESSMENT: Assess current practices to determine number of practices or programs that are evidence-based.		Rollout	Quality Assurance			State

INITIATIVE 2.3 EBP INVENTORY: Complete and maintain an inventory of existing evidence-based practices in Nevada.						
INVENTORY: Conduct an inventory of current practices and programs currently underway / in use by state, county and service providers	Planning Implementation Counties Executing	Policy				State
EBP DATABASE: Develop and maintain a database that reflects ongoing changes to state, county and service provider EBP practices and programs.		Rollout Implementation Counties Executing	Quality Assurance			EBP Resource Center or State
AB 472: DCFS and each department of juvenile services shall use the following percentages of money receive from the State as described in subsection 1 to develop, promote and coordinate evidence-based programs and practices			25%	50%	75% (FY21- 22) 100% thereafter	State
INITIATIVE 2.4 EBP PRACTICES: Strengthen or replace evidence-based practices to improve outcomes.						
PROVIDERS POLICY: Conduct an audit and evidence-based practice improvement / replacement program, including corrective action.		Planning Policy	Rollout	Quality Assurance		State & Counties
COUNTY POLICY: Conduct an audit and evidence based-practice improvement / replacement program, including corrective action.		Planning Policy	Rollout	Quality Assurance		State & Counties
INITIATIVE 2.5 COUNTY ENGAGEMENT: Inform and engage Counties of the intent and desired outcomes and resources outlined in AB 472.						
COLLATERAL: Develop support and information collateral for Counties and service providers.		Policy				State
ROADSHOW: Conduct a County “roadshow” to inform County and service provider stakeholders of the intent of AB 472, value of EBPs, JJOC and AB 472’s timing expectations / requirements, and support and resources available.		Rollout Implementation Counties Executing to Providers (partial)	Implementation Counties Executing to Providers (remaining)			State
ONGOING COMMUNICATION: Establish outbound, regular communications for updates and reminders to counties and service providers.		Policy Implementation				State

GOAL 3: SYSTEM COLLABORATION

Collaborate across systems to address youths' needs.

DESCRIPTION

By ensuring that the services and programs youth receive are coordinated across agencies, providers, and organizations, youth will receive a continuum of care that is more effective.

OUTCOMES

Children won't 'cycle' in the juvenile justice system: we will have a meaningful, effective cross-agency approach to treat a youth's needs, implemented in a timely manner.

STRATEGIC APPROACH

Take a 'client-centered' approach that reduces the burden on families to have to coordinate different agencies and entities in the system.

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

1. **CASELOAD PRO:** Complete the implementation of Caseload Pro Phases I & II across all Counties.

The State and Counties will have access to performance outcome reports.

2. **QA REVIEW: Conduct annual quality assurance reviews.**

The State and Counties will have quality assurance reviews and correction action plans for ensuring State facilities and County camps are using evidence-based practices:

- State (DCFS) to perform for State facilities and County camps annually.
- Training to QA tool - efforts to expand/sustain the training over 5 years. (DCFS)
- Community based providers to use CPC.
- Counties to use CPC in detention facilities (not required under statute)
- Policy should include corrective action, including timelines for completion of corrective action plan

3. **PERFORMANCE REPORTING: Counties provide annual Performance Reporting based on approved performance measures.**

Counties will be able to report performance measures required in AB 472 with the ability to develop reports within the Caseload Pro system.

- Establish standard procedures for measuring outcomes for a child subject to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court.
- Every County will have an annual scorecard for the key performance measures related to the juvenile justice system. (Caseload Pro + self-reported data)
- Establish performance targets by County.
- *Information to be collected, analyzed and reported upon: (Sec. 25) **new to AB 472 bolded.***
 - **Unique identifying information assigned to the child;** Basic demographic info, including, but not limited to age, sex, race or ethnic background, composition of the HH, economic **and educational background, charges including any charges of violations of probation or parole**, dates of detention, nature of disposition, dates petitions filed, dispositions of any petitions filed, **assessed risks and needs of the child, supervision of the child (placement), programs and services provided to the child. data collected shall include, but not be limited to, the following: The type of juvenile service, how the service met the goals**

of the comprehensive juvenile services plan, demographic information on the juveniles served, program outcomes, the total number of juveniles served, and the number of juveniles who completed the program or intervention.

- 4. CROSS AGENCY COLLABORATION: Engage children's services providers, including child welfare, children's mental health, community providers, schools, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Nevada Medicaid, and Nevada Department of Corrections.**

Institute a system of care by improving service provision, communication and collaboration with all stakeholders involved in youth services with the aim of reducing out-of-state placement.

GOAL 3 FIVE-YEAR ROADMAP

ACTIONS	Year 0 (FY2017 18)	Year 1 (FY2018 19)	Year 2 (FY2019 20)	Year 3 (FY2020 21)	YEARS 4 5 (FY2021 23)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
INITIATIVE 3.1 CASELOAD PRO: Complete the implementation of Caseload Pro Phases I & II across all Counties.						
PH II PLAN: Develop Phase 2 Plan with Caseload Pro.		Planning Policy Rollout Counties Executing	Quality Assurance			State
DATA SHARING: Develop data sharing agreements between State and Counties.		Planning Policy Rollout Implementation Counties Executing	Quality Assurance			State Counties
INITIATIVE 3.2 QA REVIEW: Conduct annual quality assurance reviews.						
QA TOOL: Conduct training and certification to the QA tool.	Planning	Policy Rollout	Quality Assurance			State
FACILITY TRAINING: Train facility management and staff regarding performance measures in the tool.		Planning Rollout	Quality Assurance			State
PbS: Determine / cross-walk PbS with QA tool for facilities.	Planning	Planning Rollout				State
DETENTION CENTERS & COUNTIES: Expand the use of the tool to detention centers and Counties.		Planning	Rollout	Quality Assurance		State
COMMUNITY PROVIDERS: Expand the use of the tool to community providers		Planning	Rollout	Quality Assurance		State & Counties
INITIATIVE 3.3 PERFORMANCE REPORTING: Counties provide annual Performance Reporting based on approved performance measures.						
PROCEDURE: Develop procedure for reporting by Counties.	Policy	Implementation Counties & State Executing (partial)	Implementation Counties Executing (remaining)			State & JJOC
PERFORMANCE MEASURES: Determine performance measures with definitions.	Planning Policy	Rollout Implementation	Quality Assurance			JJOC & State

REPORTS: Develop reports within Caseload Pro.	Planning	Policy Rollout Implementation	Quality Assurance			State						
REPORTS ACCESS: Determine process for State to gain access to reports		Planning Policy Rollout Implementation	Quality Assurance			State						
POLICY: Determine Policy for JJOS to review and report to Governor and Legislature on required outcome measures by January 31 (County & Parole) and July 1 (DCFS)	Planning	Policy Rollout Implementation Counties Executing (Manually) Quality Assurance	Implementation Counties Executing (via Caseload Pro)									
<p>AB 472: Reporting Schedule:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>County & Parole</u></th> <th><u>DCFS</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>By January 31, 2019</td> <td>By July 1, 2019</td> </tr> <tr> <td>By January 31, 2020</td> <td>By July 1, 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>By January 31, 2021</td> <td>By July 1, 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>By January 31, 2022</td> <td>By July 1, 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>By January 31, 2023</td> <td>By July 1, 2023</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>							<u>County & Parole</u>	<u>DCFS</u>	By January 31, 2019	By July 1, 2019	By January 31, 2020	By July 1, 2020
<u>County & Parole</u>	<u>DCFS</u>											
By January 31, 2019	By July 1, 2019											
By January 31, 2020	By July 1, 2020											
By January 31, 2021	By July 1, 2021											
By January 31, 2022	By July 1, 2022											
By January 31, 2023	By July 1, 2023											
INITIATIVE 3.4 CROSS AGENCY COLLABORATION: Engage children's services providers, including child welfare, children's mental health, community providers, schools, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, and Nevada Medicaid.												
CONTACTS: Determine point of contact for various children services agencies.		Planning	Policy	Rollout Implementation	Quality Assurance	State & Counties						
STAKEHOLDER PROFILES: Determine strengths and needs for each stakeholder agency.		Planning	Policy	Rollout Implementation	Quality Assurance	State & Counties						
MOUS: Develop MOUs for collaboration and cooperation with each agency.		Planning	Policy	Rollout Implementation	Quality Assurance	State						

GOAL 4: TAILORED SERVICES

Tailor Supervision / Services to Youths' Developmental Needs

DESCRIPTION

Family engagement plans and case plans / re-entry plans will result in individualized solutions for youth to sustainably and successfully avoid recidivism. The goal is that every child in the system has a case plan, and where appropriate, a family engagement plan.

OUTCOME

Families are engaged in the process of JJS's efforts to rehabilitate youth in the system and more children in the system are able to stay with their families, in their homes.

STRATEGIC APPROACH

Use risk and needs assessments to identify families' roles in the rehabilitation of youth in the juvenile justice system.

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

- 1. FAMILY ENGAGEMENT PLAN / POLICY / PROCEDURE: The DCFS and each department of juvenile services shall develop and implement a family engagement plan.**

Strategies and models are identified that support family involvement in the juvenile justice system in effective and measurable ways that are rooted within balanced and restorative justice practice.

- Determine or adopt a Family Engagement Handbook. (Policy + Handbook) (Subcommittee)
- Approved Family Engagement Handbook. (JJOC)
- Implementation of Family Engagement Plans across all State institutions & Counties.

- 2. CASE PLANS / RE-ENTRY PLANS: The department of juvenile services shall develop a written individualized case plan for each child placed under the supervision of the juvenile court, under the informal supervision of a probation officer, or committed to a regional facility.**

GOAL 4 FIVE-YEAR ROADMAP

ACTIONS	Year 0 (FY2017 18)	Year 1 (FY2018 19)	Year 2 (FY2019 20)	Year 3 (FY2020 21)	YEARS 4 5 (FY2021 23)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
INITIATIVE 4.1 FAMILY ENGAGEMENT PLAN / POLICY / PROCEDURE: The DCFS and each department of juvenile services shall develop and implement a family engagement plan.						
FAMILY ENGAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE: Identify Family Engagement subcommittee.		Planning				JJOC
FAMILY ENGAGEMENT EBPS: Review & identify evidence-based standards for Family Engagement.		Planning				Subcommittee
FAMILY ENGAGEMENT POLICY: Develop Policy for Family Engagement.		Policy	Rollout	Quality Assurance		Subcommittee & State
FAMILY ENGAGEMENT HANDBOOK: Develop a handbook for State and Counties on Family Engagement.			Implementation Counties Executing			Subcommittee & State
INITIATIVE 4.2 CASE PLANS / RE-ENTRY PLANS: The department of juvenile services shall develop a written individualized case plan for each child placed under the supervision of the juvenile court, under the informal supervision of a probation officer, or committed to a regional facility.						
CASE PLAN SUBCOMMITTEE: Identify the Case Planning subcommittee.		Planning				JJOC
CASE PLAN REQUIREMENTS: Review AB 472 requirements for case planning.		Planning				Subcommittee
CASE PLAN EBPS: Review National standards and evidence-based case planning standards.		Planning				Subcommittee
CASE PLAN TOOLS: Ensure case planning tools are in Caseload Pro	Implementation	Quality Assurance				State
CASE PLAN REPORTS: Ensure case planning is tied to reports on the YLS and MAYSI-2.	Implementation	Quality Assurance				State
CASE PLAN HANDBOOK: Develop a Case Planning Handbook.		Policy Rollout Implementation Counties Executing				Subcommittee & State

SECTION FIVE

**IMPLEMENTATION &
GOVERNANCE PROCESS**

IMPLEMENTATION MODEL GUIDELINES

The model JJOC is using to implement this Strategic Plan is structured to both directly cascade to Counties and DCFS. To accomplish both of those purposes, the guidelines are in red below.

- **People – Roles/Responsibilities:** The strategic plan is intended to provide direction to DCFS, the Counties and facilities:
 - **JJOC:** Responsible for adapting the strategy & communicating performance to the Governor and the Legislature.
 - JJOC Co-Chairs will submit to the Governor and Legislature.
 - **DCFS:** Responsible for compiling county performance measures and reporting on the overall data trends, and department-led strategic initiatives.
 - Deputy Administrator of Juvenile Justice.
 - **County heads of probation:** Responsible for reporting on performance measures and relevant strategic plan initiatives.
 - *Chiefs or directors of probation*
 - **Director of Clark County DJJS:** Responsible for reporting on data related to Clark County camp.
 - **Wendy Garrison:** Responsible for reporting on data related to Douglas County camp.

- **Plan Structure – Who Owns What:** The Strategic Plan cascades from the JJOC directly to DCFS and Counties.
 - **County directors or chiefs of probation:** Actions identified in the roadmaps and performance data detailed below.
 - **DCFS:** Initiatives identified in the roadmaps and data trends.
 - **JJOC:** Performance against the Strategic Plan, Vision and Goals.

- **Process – How data and performance will be collected and presented.**
 - **Performance Data Reporting:**
 - While Caseload Pro is being rolled out: utilize 62.210-230 with DCFS-developed mechanism for consistent reporting across counties.
 - Once rollout of Caseload Pro is complete, DCFS and Counties’ will provide current performance measures in this tool.
 - **Strategic Plan Performance Reporting:**
 - **Counties’ and County Facilities’ performance** – Chiefs or directors of probation
 - **State Facilities’ performance** – Deputy Administrator of Juvenile Justice.
 - **DCFS’s performance** - Deputy Administrator of Juvenile Justice.
 - **Cadence of Accountability:** detailed below:

GOVERNANCE MODEL & REPORTING CALENDAR

	FY2018 19	FY2019 20	FY2020 21	FY2021 22	FY2022 23
PERFORMANCE DATA & TRENDS					
Counties & Parole to DCFS	December 31, 2018	December 31, 2019	December 31, 2020	December 31, 2021	December 31, 2022
DCFS trends to legislature and Governor	By January 31, 2019	By January 31, 2020	By January 31, 2021	By January 31, 2022	By January 31, 2023
DCFS to JJOC on compliance (for July through May)	June 1, 2019	June 1, 2020	June 1, 2021	June 1, 2022	June 1, 2022
DCFS to Governor & Legislature	By July 1, 2019	By July 1, 2020	By July 1, 2021	By July 1, 2022	By July 1, 2023
STATUS OF JJOC STRATEGIC PLAN					
Counties to JJOC (for July – May)	June 1, 2019	June 1, 2020	June 1, 2021	June 1, 2022	June 1, 2022
DCFS to JJOC (for July – May)	June 1, 2019	June 1, 2020	June 1, 2021	June 1, 2022	June 1, 2022
JJOC to Governor & Legislature	By July 1, 2019	By July 1, 2020	By July 1, 2021	By July 1, 2022	By July 1, 2023
Recommendations for Updates / Revisions to Plan	By July 1, 2019	By July 1, 2020	By July 1, 2021	By July 1, 2022	By July 1, 2023
NEVADA LEGISLATIVE SESSIONS	February 2019		February 2021		February 2023

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The following data will be gathered and measured:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rate of recidivism per each evidence based practice per youth 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 |
|--|--|

Type of residential placement

Services by type provided

In addition to monitoring the State’s overall and individual Counties’ rates of recidivism, JJOC will review data to measure trends in:

Recidivism Rates

Decreases in re-arrest

Disproportionate Minorities

Decreases in re-commitment

Family Poverty Level

Decreases in violations of parole or probation

Percent of youth in the juvenile justice system

Convictions in the adult system

with case plans

Decreases in re-adjudication

Performance measures for group homes, RTC, youth camps, and state correctional facilities:

CPC will be the tool for measuring Performance Based Standards (PBS). In the appendix are the CPC PBS standards.

The following outlines the timing for reporting on the above metrics, including identification of benchmarks and targets.

	FY2017 18 Year 0	FY2018 19 Year 1	FY2019 20 Year 2	FY2020 21 Year 3	FY2021 22 Year 4	FY2022 23 Year 5
Measures Identified						
Benchmarks Identified						
Targets Determined						
Counties & State Reporting						

COUNTY ACTION PLAN & REPORTING


INITIATIVES / ACTIONS	Year 0 (FY2017 18)	Year 1 (FY2018 19)	Year 2 (FY2019 20)	Year 3 (FY2020 21)	YEARS 4 5 (FY2021 23)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
INITIATIVE 1.1 RISK ASSESSMENT TOOL: Determine when the risk and needs assessment tool is used.						
RISK ASSESSMENT TOOL: Add the risk assessment tools in Caseload Pro	Completed	Policy Rollout	Implementation Counties Executing	Quality Assurance		State with NYSAP ¹
Risk assessment tool funding	DCFS pays 100% of risk assessment tool cost	DCFS pays 50% of risk assessment tool cost / Counties pay 50%	Counties pay 100% of risk assessment tool cost			State Counties
INITIATIVE 1.2 REPORTING POLICY: Develop policy for reporting requirements from use of tool.	Planning Policy	Rollout Implementation Counties Executing (partial)	Implementation Counties Executing (remaining) Quality Assurance			State with NYSAP
INITIATIVE 1.3 CASE PLANNING POLICY: Develop policy for decision-making for case planning for courts regarding the scoring of the tool.	Planning Policy	Rollout Implementation Counties Executing (partial)	Implementation Counties Executing (remaining) Quality Assurance			State with NYSAP
INITIATIVE 2.2 EBP CRITERIA: Establish criteria and process for identifying and evaluating evidence-based programs / practices.						
EBP DEFINITIONS: Develop EBP Definitions Matrix and process for evaluating practices	Planning Policy	Rollout	Implementation Counties Executing	Quality Assurance		JJOC
EBP EVALUATION: Define the process for evaluating EBPs		Planning Policy	Rollout Implementation Counties Executing	Quality Assurance		JJOC
INITIATIVE 2.3 EBP INVENTORY: Complete and maintain an inventory of existing evidence-based practices in Nevada.						
INVENTORY: Conduct an inventory of current practices and programs currently underway / in use by state, county and service providers	Planning Implementation Counties Executing	Policy				State
EBP DATABASE: Develop and maintain a database that reflects ongoing changes to state,		Rollout Implementation Counties Executing	Quality Assurance			EBP Resource Center or State

county and service provider EBP practices and programs.															
INITIATIVE 2.5 COUNTY ENGAGEMENT: Inform and engage Counties of the intent and desired outcomes and resources outlined in AB 472.															
ROADSHOW: Conduct a County “roadshow” to inform County and service provider stakeholders of the intent of AB 472, value of EBPs, JJOC and AB 472’s timing expectations / requirements, and support and resources available.		Rollout Implementation Counties Executing to Providers (partial)	Implementation Counties Executing to Providers (remaining)			State									
INITIATIVE 3.1 CASELOAD PRO: Complete the implementation of Caseload Pro Phases I & II across all Counties.															
PH II PLAN: Develop Phase 2 Plan with Caseload Pro.		Planning Policy Rollout Counties Executing	Quality Assurance			State									
DATA SHARING: Develop data sharing agreements between State and Counties.		Planning Policy Rollout Implementation Counties Executing	Quality Assurance			State Counties									
INITIATIVE 3.3 PERFORMANCE REPORTING: Counties provide annual Performance Reporting based on approved performance measures.															
PROCEDURE: Develop procedure for reporting by Counties.	Policy	Implementation Counties & State Executing (partial)	Implementation Counties Executing (remaining)			State & JJOC									
POLICY: Determine Policy for JJOS to review and report to Governor and Legislature on required outcome measures by January 31 (County & Parole) and July 1 (DCFS) AB 472: Reporting Schedule:	Planning	Policy Rollout Implementation Counties Executing (Manually) Quality Assurance	Implementation Counties Executing (via Caseload Pro)												
<table border="0"> <tr> <td>County & Parole</td> <td>DCFS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>By January 31, 2019</td> <td>By July 1, 2019</td> </tr> <tr> <td>By January 31, 2020</td> <td>By July 1, 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>By January 31, 2021</td> <td>By July 1, 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>By January 31, 2022</td> <td>By July 1, 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>By January 31, 2023</td> <td>By July 1, 2023</td> </tr> </table>				County & Parole	DCFS	By January 31, 2019	By July 1, 2019	By January 31, 2020	By July 1, 2020	By January 31, 2021	By July 1, 2021	By January 31, 2022	By July 1, 2022	By January 31, 2023	By July 1, 2023
County & Parole	DCFS														
By January 31, 2019	By July 1, 2019														
By January 31, 2020	By July 1, 2020														
By January 31, 2021	By July 1, 2021														
By January 31, 2022	By July 1, 2022														
By January 31, 2023	By July 1, 2023														
INITIATIVE 4.1 FAMILY ENGAGEMENT PLAN / POLICY / PROCEDURE: The DCFS and each department of juvenile services shall develop and implement a family engagement plan.															

FAMILY ENGAGEMENT HANDBOOK: Develop a handbook for State and Counties on Family Engagement.			Implementation Counties Executing			Subcommittee & State
INITIATIVE 4.2 CASE PLANS / RE-ENTRY PLANS: The department of juvenile services shall develop a written individualized case plan for each child placed under the supervision of the juvenile court, under the informal supervision of a probation officer, or committed to a regional facility.						
CASE PLAN HANDBOOK: Develop a Case Planning Handbook.		Policy Rollout Implementation Counties Executing				Subcommittee & State






APPENDIX

JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM STRUCTURE





KEY DATA REGARDING THE NEVADA JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

DCFS and County Juvenile Justice Budgets 2015



C

The number of youth referred to the juvenile justice system has declined substantially while the types of offenses committed by youth coming into the system have not changed




	2013	2015
Clark and Washoe County Referrals	20,164	16,673
Administrative	8%	11%
Felony	13%	14%
Gross Misdemeanor	6%	8%
Misdemeanor	50%	46%
Status	14%	13%
Traffic	2%	1%
Violation	7%	7%

There was no significant change in the type of offenses or average number of prior referrals for youth referred to the system between 2013 and 2015

Youth had an average of **3** prior referrals


Youth were referred for an average of **2** offenses

While referrals have declined, the proportion of cases that are diverted has also declined and the proportion of cases formally processed has increased



Council of State Governments Justice Center | 27

The proportion of youth being detained has increased slightly, and about half of youth with administrative or felony offenses are detained




- The number of youth detained **decreased between 2013 and 2015**, but the proportion of youth detained increased
- More than half of youth referred for **administrative or felony offenses** were detained
- Of youth detained for a felony offense, **less than half (44%)** were for felonies against a person


Council of State Governments Justice Center | 28

The types of offenses for which youth were detained has not changed but lengths of stay have increased

Primary Offense for Youth Detained in Clark and Washoe Counties, 2013 and 2015



Average Length of Stay in Detention by Offense, 2015




Average Length of Stay in Detention

2013		2015	
Clark County	16 days	Clark County	18 days
Washoe County	13 days	Washoe County	16 days

Detention Cost per Day
Clark County 2015

\$339.06

The proportion and number of youth placed in youth camps from Clark and Washoe counties has increased



Average Length of Stay, 2015


Spring Mountain:
157 days

China Spring All Youth:
145 days


China Spring Washoe Youth:
165 days

The proportion and number of youth placed in DCFS custody has also increased substantially


Number of DCFS Commitments, 2013 – 2015




DCFS Commitments by Race/Ethnicity, 2015



DCFS Commitments by Offense, 2015




Average LOS in DCFS Facilities (in days)




Average LOS in state correctional facilities decreased slightly from 9 months to 8 months

The number of youth on parole has increased while lengths of stay on parole have declined substantially


Number of Youth on Parole, 2013–2015



Youth on Parole by Race/Ethnicity, 2015




Average LOS on Parole (in days)



Average LOS on parole decreased substantially, from nearly 13 months to slightly more than 7 months

Youth of color are referred and detained disproportionately and at higher rates than white youth



Black youth stayed in DCFS facilities approximately 10 days longer than other youth.

CPC PERFORMANCE-BASED STANDARDS PROGRAM CHECKLIST

1. Program Leadership and Development

- 1.1 PD qualified
- 1.2 PD experienced
- 1.3 PD selects staff
- 1.4 PD trains staff
- 1.5 PD supervises staff
- 1.6 PD conducts program
- 1.7 Literature review
- 1.8 Pilot
- 1.9 CJ support
- 1.10 Community support
- 1.11 Funding adequate
- 1.12 Funding stable
- 1.13 Age of program
- 1.14 Gender

2. Staff Characteristics

- 2.1 Education
- 2.2 Experience
- 2.3 Skills & values
- 2.4 Meetings

2.5 Annual Evaluation

- 2.6 Clinical supervision
- 2.7 Initial training
- 2.8 Ongoing training
- 2.9 Program input
- 2.10 Staff support
- 2.11 Ethical guidelines

3. Offender Assessment

- 3.1 Appropriateness
- 3.2 Exclusionary criteria
- 3.3 Risk
- 3.4 Need
- 3.5 Domain specific need
- 3.6 Responsivity
- 3.7 Higher risk offenders
- 3.8 Tool validation

4. Treatment Characteristics

- 4.1 Targets
- 4.2 Target density
- 4.3 Case plans

- 4.4 Treatment type
- 4.5 Treatment length
- 4.6 Location monitored
- 4.7 Program manual
- 4.8 Manual followed
- 4.9 Involvement
- 4.10 Groups by risk
- 4.11 Intensity by risk
- 4.12 Treatment and offender
- 4.13 Staff and offender
- 4.14 Staff and programming
- 4.15 Offender input
- 4.16 Reinforcers
- 4.17 Reinforcer application
- 4.18 Ratio
- 4.19 Punishers
- 4.20 Punisher application
- 4.21 Negative effects
- 4.22 Completion criteria
- 4.23 Completion rate
- 4.24 Modeling
- 4.25 Skill training
- 4.26 Graduated practice
- 4.27 Groups monitored
- 4.28 Group size
- 4.29 Family trained
- 4.30 Discharge planning
- 4.31 Aftercare provided
- 4.32 Aftercare quality

5. Quality Assurance

- 5.1 Internal QA
- 5.2 External QA
- 5.3 Participant satisfaction
- 5.4 Offenders reassessment
- 5.5 Recidivism tracked
- 5.6 Program evaluation
- 5.7 Positive finding
- 5.8 Program evaluator