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About The Council of State Governments Justice Center

National nonprofit, nonpartisan membership association of state government officials that engages members of all three branches of state government.

Provides practical, nonpartisan advice and evidence-based, consensus-driven strategies to increase public safety and strengthen communities.
About the National Reentry Resource Center

- Authorized by the passage of the Second Chance Act in April 2008
- Launched by The Council of State Governments Justice Center in October 2009
- Administered in partnership with the U.S. Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Assistance and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Recent publications on “what works” to improve outcomes for youth involved with the juvenile justice system
Statewide technical assistance provided by the CSG Justice Center to improve outcomes for youth in the juvenile justice system.
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States’ juvenile incarceration rates have declined dramatically.

PERCENT CHANGE IN STATE JUVENILE INCARCERATION RATES (1997–2013)
Texas case study: reforms contributed to decline in juvenile incarceration rates

REFORM HIGHLIGHTS and AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION IN STATE-RUN SECURE JUVENILE FACILITIES

2007 LEGISLATURE
Prohibited commitment to state-run secure facilities for misdemeanor offenses; age of state jurisdiction reduced from 21 to 19; $60 million in new funding for counties

2009 LEGISLATURE
$45 million for Commitment Reduction Program, with incentive funding for counties and community supervision

2011 LEGISLATURE
Merged former Texas Youth Commission and Texas Juvenile Probation Commission to form Texas Juvenile Justice Department (TJJD)

2013 LEGISLATURE
Mandated TJJD to close one additional state-run secure facility; $25 million designated for community mental health services
Texas case study: CSG Justice Center used more than 1.3 million records to analyze recidivism rates for similar groups of youth

Juvenile Probation and Secure Confinement Data
- 899,101 records
- 452,751 juveniles
- Dispositions and secure releases

Criminal History and Prison Admission Data
- 408,312 records
- 242,541 juveniles
- Arrests and incarcerations

Two Closer-to-Home Study Cohorts
- Pre-reform cohort: 27,131 juveniles
- Post-reform cohort: 31,371 juveniles

“Apples to apples” comparison of youth eligible for incarceration:
- Youth supervised in the community
- Youth released from state-run secure facilities
Texas case study: youth kept closer to home have better outcomes

One-Year Probability of Rearrest

- Released from State-Run Secure Facilities: 41%
- Supervised in the Community: 34%

21% more likely to be rearrested

First Recidivism Offense a Felony

- Released from State-Run Secure Facilities: 49%
- Supervised in the Community: 17%

3x more likely to commit a felony when recidivating
Texas case study: per capita funding for county juvenile probation departments increased significantly after reforms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2005</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures for local juvenile probation departments</td>
<td>$3,555</td>
<td>$7,023</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures adjusted for inflation to 2014 dollars</td>
<td>$4,337</td>
<td>$7,304</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of local juvenile probation department expenditures contributed by county</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Texas case study: rearrest rates for youth on probation were comparable regardless of the intervention and did not improve after reforms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVENTION TYPE</th>
<th>PRE-REFORM STUDY GROUP One-Year Probability of Rearrest</th>
<th>POST-REFORM STUDY GROUP One-Year Probability of Rearrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Incarceration</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill-Based Program</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Program</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance Program</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure County Placement</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Secure County Placement</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Intervention</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CSG Justice Center hosted a 50-state forum focused on improving outcomes for youth in the juvenile justice system

**WHO**
Four-person interbranch teams of government leaders from every state

**WHAT**
Convening to develop statewide plans to improve outcomes for youth under juvenile justice supervision

**WHERE**
Austin, Texas

**WHEN**
November 9–10, 2015

**HOW**
Supported by the MacArthur Foundation and conducted in partnership with Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)

### Nevada State Team

- **Justice Nancy Saitta**, Judge, Nevada Supreme Court
- **First Lady Kathleen Sandoval**, Director of Operations, The Children’s Cabinet
- **John “Jack” Martin**, Director, Clark County Department of Juvenile Justice Services
- **Scott Schick**, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Douglas County
- **Jim Kingera**, Chief, Nevada Youth Parole
OJJDP asked the CSG Justice Center to provide technical assistance to states through the Statewide Juvenile Justice Improvement Initiative (SJJII) to address the following questions:

- How well do our resources, policies, and practices align with what the research says works to reduce recidivism and improve other youth outcomes?
- To what extent are leaders from the three branches of state government working together and in partnership with local governments to improve outcomes for youth under juvenile justice supervision?

What recidivism and other outcome data does our state track for youth under the supervision of the juvenile justice system?
Nevada state leadership requested technical assistance from the CSG Justice Center through the SJJII to improve juvenile justice policies and practices.

I commit to providing legislative staff and resources to participating in this technical assistance opportunity. I agree to help establish and serve on a bipartisan, inter-branch task force; examine and compile data from all juvenile justice service systems and work with all partners to improve policy practices across the juvenile justice continuum.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John Hambrick
Speaker, Nevada State Assembly

I commit the resources and staff to help establish and serve on a bipartisan, interbranch task force, examine and compile data from all juvenile justice systems, and work with each branch to improve policies across the juvenile justice continuum.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Nancy M. Saitta
Justice
Following a national competitive process, Nevada was the only state selected by OJJDP for participation in the SJJII.

18 States → 8 States → Nevada

submitted letters of interest → received site visits → selected to receive intensive technical assistance through the SJJII

**Key Reasons for Selecting Nevada**

- Leadership of Governor Sandoval, First Lady Sandoval, and Supreme Court Justice Saitta
- Strong history of collaboration across branches of government and service systems
- Success of Commission on Statewide Juvenile Justice Reform
Governor Sandoval established the SJJII Task Force to learn more about what steps can be taken to strengthen public safety and improve outcomes for youth.
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The SJJII has three phases designed to identify and advance policies, practices, and funding that will improve outcomes for youth.

- Analyze quantitative data
- Review policy and practice
- Present system-improvement recommendations and adopt new policies
With support from the CSG Justice Center, the task force will play a critical role in the success of the SJJII

**SJJII TASK FORCE RESPONSIBILITIES**

- Oversee SJJII and scope of work
- Provide strategic direction on policy option development
- Reach consensus on policy options

**CSG JUSTICE CENTER RESPONSIBILITIES**

- Identify juvenile justice system priorities
- Pass package of policy options in 2017 legislative session
- Provide dedicated staff to Nevada’s SJJII
- Analyze system data and conduct extensive interviews/focus groups
- Deliver findings, present recommendations, and assist with legislation
Nevada’s juvenile justice system is a shared responsibility for the state and counties.
Juvenile arrests, including for violent offenses, have declined substantially over the last decade.

Juvenile Population* and Juvenile Arrests
CY2006 to CY2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Juvenile Arrests</th>
<th>Juvenile Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>20,963</td>
<td>460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Change in Juvenile Population and Arrests
CY2006–CY2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>CY2006</th>
<th>CY2014</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Population</td>
<td>20,963</td>
<td>11,026</td>
<td>+8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Arrests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevada Juvenile Arrests by Offense Type
CY2006 and CY2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Type</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>2,807</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>-68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>4,783</td>
<td>4,312</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>-71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>4,926</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>-76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6,480</td>
<td>3,401</td>
<td>-48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Arrests</td>
<td>20,963</td>
<td>11,026</td>
<td>-47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arrests for violent and weapons offenses decreased by close to 70%
Detention admissions and county probation dispositions have also declined in recent years.

Detentions for a gross misdemeanor or felony offense declined 18 percent between 2011 and 2015.

Probation dispositions declined 22 percent between 2011 and 2015.
Youth camp populations have experienced less of a decline than other types of system supervision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>China Spring</th>
<th>Spring Mountain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Division of Child & Family Services (DCFS) commitments and the juvenile parole population have declined substantially.

**Commitments to DCFS by State Fiscal Year**

- 2006: 678
- 2008: 506
- 2010: 416
- 2012: 299
- 2014: 309
- 2015: 319

Commitments **decreased by 53 percent** between 2006 and 2015.

**Youth Parole Average End-of-Month Population, FY2009–FY2015**

- 2009: 515
- 2010: 532
- 2011: 497
- 2012: 458
- 2013: 472
- 2014: 351
- 2015: 306

41-percent decline in the average monthly juvenile parole population between 2009 and 2015.
Funding for juvenile justice supervision and services is also a shared state and county responsibility.

State/county funding exchanges are based on overall county school-age youth population rather than actual service use or performance targets.
Nevada spent more than $95 million for juvenile justice supervision and services in 2015.
Costs per day for youth in state custody and youth camps have increased and little is known about the effectiveness of services provided.

- Average costs per day have increased since 2012 due to declines in the average number of youth in state facilities and on parole and a slight increase in expenditures for youth camps.
- Services provided to youth at youth camps, at state facilities, and on parole vary and little is known about their effectiveness.
Limited data are available on youth outcomes, and existing data cannot be used to draw firm conclusions about system performance.

- There is **no standard statewide definition** for juvenile recidivism.
- **Recidivism and other outcome measures are not routinely calculated or reported** for youth on probation or in DCFS custody.
- Outcomes currently reported provide **limited information on system performance**.

### AVAILABLE SYSTEM MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Percent in 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China Spring/Aurora Pines Youth Terminating Successfully</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments that Were the Result of a Probation Violation</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments that Were the Result of a Parole Revocation</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Reoffending While on Parole</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth in School and/or Employed While on Parole</td>
<td>36%/12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth on Parole Terminating Successfully</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Fewer youth are under the supervision of Nevada’s juvenile justice system than at any time in the last decade.

2. Nevada is spending significant resources on youth under system supervision, and is unable to determine whether these resources are being used efficiently for supervision and services that improve outcomes for youth.
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Emerging priority areas for assessment based on the initial data review and stakeholder conversations include:

1. Matching of youth to appropriate supervision and services based on seriousness of offense and risk of reoffending

2. Availability and effectiveness of services for youth on probation, in facilities, and on parole, and use of state and local resources to support these services

3. Tracking and reporting of system performance and youth outcomes, and use of data to guide policy and funding decisions
Assessment findings will be based on detailed case-level data sought from many sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark County Probation Data</td>
<td>Washoe County Department of Juvenile Services</td>
<td>-Signed MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Data Request in Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County Probation Data</td>
<td>Clark County Department of Juvenile Justice Services</td>
<td>-Signed MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Data Pull in Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Camp Data</td>
<td>China Spring Youth Camp, Spring Mountain Youth Camp</td>
<td>-Data Received from China Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Awaiting Data from Spring Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Probation Data</td>
<td>Division of Child and Family Services, Juvenile Justice Services</td>
<td>-Signed MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Data Request in Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment and Parole Data</td>
<td>Division of Child and Family Services, Juvenile Justice Services, Youth Parole Bureau</td>
<td>-Signed MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Data Request Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Corrections/Probation and Parole Data</td>
<td>Department of Corrections (Adult)</td>
<td>-DCFS reviewing existing MOU with DPBH for potential amendment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment findings will also reflect feedback from extensive interviews and focus groups with an array of system stakeholders.

**June 2016 Site Visit**
Carson City/Washoe County

- DCFS/Youth Parole Bureau
- District court judges
- Probation chiefs
- Child welfare/social services/education
- Law enforcement
- District attorneys/public defenders

**July 2016 Site Visit**
Clark and Washoe Counties

- State legislators
- DCFS front-line staff
- Probation chiefs and front-line staff
- District court judges
- Child welfare/social services/education
- District attorneys/public defenders
- Summit View correctional center
Statewide Juvenile Justice Improvement Initiative timeline

- **Project Launch**
- **Task Force Meeting #1**
- **Task Force Meeting #2**
- **Task Force Meeting #3**

**2017 Session**

**Data Analysis**

- Initial Data Analysis
- Detailed Data Analysis
- Final Data Analysis
- Impact Analysis

**Stakeholder Involvement**

- Stakeholder Engagement
- Policy Option Development
- Bill Drafting
- Engage Policymakers and Media and Keep Stakeholders Involved

**Council of State Governments Justice Center | 35**
Thank you

To receive newsletters on juvenile justice and other announcements, please visit our website: csgjusticecenter.org/subscribe
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Nina Salomon, Senior Policy Analyst
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nsalomon@csg.org
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