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About CSG Justice Center

CSG Justice Center provides practical, nonpartisan advice informed by the best available evidence.

National non-profit, non-partisan membership association of state government officials that engage members of all three branches of state government.

Justice Center provides practical, nonpartisan advice informed by the best available evidence.
About NRCC

- 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 Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice
The Statewide Juvenile Justice Improvement Initiative (SJJII) is designed to help Nevada address the following questions:

How well do our policies, practices, and resources, **align with what the research says works** to reduce recidivism and improve other youth outcomes?

**What recidivism and other outcome data does our state track** for youth under the supervision of the juvenile justice system?

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?
Governor Sandoval established the SJJII Task Force to determine what steps can be taken to strengthen public safety and improve outcomes for youth.
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The analysis focused on three key areas at the state and local levels:

- Management, tracking, and evaluation of juvenile justice system performance and youth outcomes
- Recent system trends in state and local juvenile justice systems
- Service delivery for youth on probation, in facilities, and on parole
The qualitative analysis is based on the four core principles demonstrated by research to improve outcomes for youth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 1</th>
<th>Principle 2</th>
<th>Principle 3</th>
<th>Principle 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base supervision, service, and resource allocation decisions on the results of <strong>validated risk and needs assessments</strong></td>
<td>Adopt and effectively implement <strong>programs and services demonstrated to reduce recidivism</strong> and improve other youth outcomes, and use data to <strong>evaluate the results</strong> and guide system improvements</td>
<td><strong>Employ a coordinated approach</strong> across service systems to address youth’s needs</td>
<td><strong>Tailor system policies, programs, and supervision to reflect the distinct developmental needs of adolescents</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case-level data from multiple state and county sources informs the analysis presented today.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark County Probation Data</td>
<td>Clark County Department of Juvenile Justice Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County Probation Data</td>
<td>Washoe County Department of Juvenile Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Camp Data</td>
<td>China Spring Youth Camp, Spring Mountain Youth Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Probation Data</td>
<td>Division of Child and Family Services, Juvenile Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services, Juvenile Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment and Parole Data</td>
<td>Division of Child and Family Services, Youth Parole Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Data</td>
<td>Division of Child and Family Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More than 50 individual interviews and focus groups with an array of system stakeholders also inform the analysis.

- Law Enforcement
- Juvenile Court Judges
- District Attorneys
- Public Defenders
- Office of the Attorney General
- Washoe County Probation Department
- Clark and Washoe County School Districts
- Juvenile Justice Services, Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS)
- Department of Public Safety – Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Corrections
- Youth Parole Bureau, DCFS
- Youth and Families
- Advocates
- Office of Governor Sandoval
- Washoe County Probation Department
- Rural Probation Departments
- Department of Health and Human Services
- Summit View, Nevada Youth Training Center and Caliente Directors and Staff
Key Notes About the Findings from System Analysis

1. **Based on available data**, which is limited, particularly related to risk, needs, service delivery, recidivism, and other youth outcomes

2. **County data focuses primarily on Clark and Washoe Counties** as they comprise approximately 90% of the juvenile justice population and other individual counties’ numbers are too small for meaningful analysis

3. **Details findings from 2013 – 2015** given that data before 2013 from some jurisdictions were reviewed and deemed incomplete

4. **Targeted at identifying opportunities** to better align system policies, practices, and funding with what research shows works to improve outcomes for youth
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1. **Nevada does not track recidivism rates or other outcomes for youth** in the juvenile justice system, but the limited data that are available show that many of the youth in contact with the system commit multiple offenses over time, leading to deeper system involvement.

2. Nevada has seen a significant drop in the number of youth referred to the juvenile justice system over the last few years, but a greater proportion of Nevada youth are receiving formal supervision, placed in a residential facility, and committed to the state.

3. Despite spending almost $95 million in 2015 on the juvenile justice system, the state and counties provide youth with few research-based programs and services.
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All aspects of the Nevada juvenile justice system have declined.
Nevada has demonstrated a commitment to making improvements to its juvenile justice system

Dispositions in Washoe and Clark Counties, 2015

- Strong focus on **diverting youth** from formal juvenile justice system involvement
- County implementation of **detention reform** and detention risk assessments
- Commitment to **keeping youth in the community** as seen by significant reductions in state commitments
- Established multiple **reform commissions** with demonstrated success in making improvements to the juvenile justice system
Nevada spent almost $95 million for juvenile justice supervision and services in 2015
Nevada is unable to answer key questions about how system resources are being used to improve outcomes for youth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Questions</th>
<th>What Data to Report</th>
<th>Current NV Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whom does the system serve?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What Data to Report</strong></td>
<td><strong>Current NV Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• System profiles by youth demographics and DMC reports</td>
<td>• Data exist at county and state levels and are currently reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How are youth moving through the system?</strong></td>
<td>• Length of stay/average daily populations (LOS/ADP) for detention, placements, probation, commitments, and parole</td>
<td>• Data exist to calculate LOS and ADP at the state and county levels but are not consistently reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Frequencies of youth at each point in the system by demographics, offense, priors, risk/need</td>
<td>• Data exist for most critical system points but are not consistently reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited data on risks/needs</td>
<td>• Limited data on risks/needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How well does the system serve youth?</strong></td>
<td>• Service matching analysis</td>
<td>• No program/service data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Probation and parole outcomes</td>
<td>• Data exist for supervision outcomes and are currently reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recidivism analysis</td>
<td>• Data exist to calculate recidivism, but standard definitions and MOUs are needed to facilitate consistent reporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nevada lacks the data structure and research capacity to analyze system performance and use data to guide policy, practice, and funding improvements.

NV collects data for most key points in the system and requires reporting.

The structure of the data in most counties and at the state level inhibits the meaningful analysis necessary to develop system knowledge and inform decision making and system change.

Data + Structure
Information + Meaning
Knowledge + Recommendation

VALUE
Youth often cycle through Nevada’s juvenile justice system multiple times.

### 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
Many youth on probation in Washoe and Clark counties commit new offenses and receive extended probation sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>New Offense</th>
<th>No New Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many youth who commit new offenses while on probation receive extended probation terms that result in extensive lengths of stay

- **Slightly more than 1 in 5 youth in Washoe County**
  - Average LOS 2013–2015
  - ~17.5 months (535 days)

- **1 in 4 youth in Clark County**
  - Average LOS 2013–2015
  - ~16 months (481 days)
Youth who receive a technical violation while on probation or parole comprise a significant and disproportionate number of commitments.

Technical Violation

- 33% (2015), 28% (2014), 20% (2013)

Sex

- 1% (2015), 1% (2014), 4% (2013)

Public Safety

- 6% (2015), 6% (2014), 4% (2013)

Property

- 16% (2015), 14% (2014), 21% (2013)

Person

- 20% (2015), 20% (2014), 15% (2013)

Other

- 5% (2015), 6% (2014), 5% (2013)

Misdemeanor

- 6% (2015), 7% (2014), 6% (2013)

Drug

- 16% (2015), 15% (2014), 13% (2013)

More than 3 in 4 technical violation commitments in 2013 were for probation violations.

NV committed youth to state-run facilities for technical violations at 4 times the rate of the national average in 2013.

NV 33%  U.S. 8%

Council of State Governments Justice Center | 22
Successful parole completions have increased but more than half of surveyed youth commit a new offense while on parole.

The proportion of successful parole terminations increased from 50% to 63% between 2011 and 2015.

Of youth terminating parole between 2013 and 2015 for whom UNITY survey data was available:

- More than half had a new offense while on parole:
  - 311 (47%) had no new offense
  - 353 (53%) committed a new offense

- More than 1 in 5 were revoked while on parole:
  - 521 (78%) were not revoked
  - 143 (22%) were revoked
States have recently enacted laws to evaluate system performance and outcomes, and to ensure that data guides policy, practice, and funding

**Required** establishment of definition of statewide recidivism and annual reporting of recidivism data to the state

Established performance accountability requirements for service contractors, providers, counties, or other agencies
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The number of youth referred to the juvenile justice system has declined substantially while the types of offenses by youth coming into the system has not changed.

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.

### Clark and Washoe County Referrals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referrals</td>
<td>20,164</td>
<td>16,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Misdemeanor</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While referrals have declined, the proportion of cases that are diverted has also declined and the proportion of cases formally processed has increased.
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.
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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Misd</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misd</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Length of Stay in Detention**

- **Clark County**
  - 2013: 16 days
  - 2015: 18 days
- **Washoe County**
  - 2013: 13 days
  - 2015: 16 days

**Average Length of Stay in Detention by Offense, 2015**

- **Felony**: 23 days
- **Gross Misd**: 18 days
- **Misd**: 21 days
- **Violation**: 20 days
- **Admin**: 20 days
- **Status**: 18 days

**Detention Cost per Day**

- Clark County 2015: $339.06
The proportion of youth adjudicated has increased, with majority placed on probation in the community.

Percent of cases adjudicated between 2013 and 2015

- Washoe: 12% in 2013, 15% in 2015
- Clark: 24% in 2013, 29% in 2015

Average LOS on probation in Washoe and Clark Counties decreased by approximately 2.5 months between 2013 and 2015.

- Washoe: 13 months in 2013, 10.5 months in 2015
- Clark: 2013
- 13 months
- 2015
- -84 days
The proportion and number of youth placed in youth camps from Clark and Washoe counties has increased.

- 336 youth to camps
- 414 youth to camps

Formal Dispositions 2013:
- Camp 8%
- Non-Camp 92%

Formal Dispositions 2015:
- Camp 11%
- Non-Camp 89%

Youth Camp Admissions by Offense and County, 2015:
- Washoe = 51 youth
- Clark = 352 youth

Average Length of Stay, 2015:
- Spring Mountain: 157 days
- China Springs All Youth: 145 days
- China Springs Washoe Youth: 165 days
The number of youth from Washoe County placed in community-based residential facilities has increased significantly.

**2015 Placements**

- Had 5 prior referrals
- 59% placed for a misdemeanor, 23% for a violation, 17% for a felony

**Behavioral Health Needs of Youth Placed, 2015**

- Youth with MH Need: 80%
- Youth with SU Need: 43%
- Out-of-State Placements MH or SU Need: 82%

**Youth in Placement by Location, 2011–2015**

- In-State: 156 days
- Out-of-State: 254 days
The proportion and number of youth placed in DCFS custody has also increased substantially.
While most misdemeanor and status offenses were handled informally, they still accounted for approximately 40 percent of camp and DCFS placements.

**Offense Type by Disposition* Washoe and Clark Counties 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Type</th>
<th>Divert/Informal</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viol</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misd</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fel</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Traffic offenses are included in the status offense category; GM indicates gross misdemeanor.
** As reported by China Springs Camp; includes both state and county funding.

**Residential Cost per Day 2015**

- China Springs Camp: $203.67**
- DCFS Facility: $237.22

**Youth committed for a misdemeanor:**
- Had an average of 10 prior referrals
- Had an average of 3 offenses in their disposition
- 62% had a violation in their disposition
- 54% had a prior felony offense
- 13% were on parole

In Washoe County, 43% of misdemeanor commitments were high risk and 57% were medium risk.
The number of youth on parole has increased while lengths of stay on parole have declined substantially.

**Number of Youth on Parole, 2013–2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Youth on Parole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Youth on Parole Up 9%

**Average LOS on Parole (in days)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average LOS on Parole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>390.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>277.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>224.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average LOS on parole decreased substantially, from nearly 13 months to just over 7 months.

**Youth on Parole by Race/Ethnicity, 2015**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Females appear to receive similar levels of supervision from the justice system compared to males.

The majority of youth are referred for misdemeanor offenses:
- **GIRLS** are referred for STATUS OFFENSES more often than boys (17% compared to 10%).
- **BOYS** are referred more often for VIOLATIONS (13% versus 7%) and FELONY OFFENSES (12% versus 4.5%).

Percent of Youth Referred to the Juvenile Justice System who were Detained, 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Detained</th>
<th>Detained for Felony</th>
<th>Detained for Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys</strong></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girls</strong></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Based-Placements, 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Correctional</th>
<th>% Non-Correctional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys</strong></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girls</strong></td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39% out of state for both boys and girls.

DCFS Commitments, 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Committed</th>
<th>Committed for Viol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys</strong></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girls</strong></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Youth of color are referred and detained at rates higher than their representation in the general population and than white youth.
Youth of color are disposed to probation and committed to a state facility more often, and when committed, often stay longer than white youth.

**AVERAGE LOS IN DCFS FACILITIES BY RACE (IN DAYS), 2013–2015**

Black youth stayed in DCFS facilities for about 10 days longer than other youth.
Youth are processed differently and receive different levels of supervision, depending upon the county in which they are referred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Clark County</th>
<th>Washoe County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Department Administrative Reason</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Department Technical Violation</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Referrals Detained</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Referrals for a Violation Detained</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Cases Diverted</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Cases Disposed to Probation</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Probation Dispositions for a Misdemeanor Offense</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
States have recently enacted laws to ensure that youth are matched with the most appropriate level and type of supervision

**Required the use of validated risk assessments** at disposition to inform supervision decisions and post disposition to guide case planning and lengths of stay

**Established a progressive sanctions model** to limit placements in secure settings

**Limit commitment** to state facilities for felony offenses
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Nevada does not provide direct support for research-based services through statute, funding, or administrative rule.
Transfers of juvenile justice funds between the state and counties lack clear goals and do not have a focus on research-based services.

**FY2016 DCFS Funding to Counties**
- **Community Block Grants**: $2.35 million
- **Youth Camps**: $2.18 million

**FY2016 County Funding to DCFS**
- **Parole**: $2.42 million

- Specified purpose is for “community-based delinquency prevention programs”
- Funding formula based on county’s school enrollment rather than county’s needs or outcomes
- Specified purpose is for “detention of children who have been adjudicated as delinquent”
- Based on previous year budget rather than camps’ needs or outcomes
- Specified purpose is for “an assessment for the activities of the Youth Parole Bureau”
- Based on school enrollment rather than the number of youth on parole by county
Few formal policies or case management tools/best practices are in place to promote the efficient use of resources and effective service matching.

KEY STRATEGIES NOT BEING UTILIZED IN NEVADA

- □ Validated risk assessment tool to prioritize and match services
- □ Standardized case plan mapped to validated assessment tool
- □ Statutory and funding requirements on serving higher-risk youth
- □ Funding incentives to maintain higher-risk youth in the community
- □ Regular, ongoing training for supervision staff, providers, and other stakeholders on research-based supervision/service-matching policies and practices
- □ Formalized service referral and service use policies/processes
- □ Service registries or service matrices
- □ Service provider, delivery, and case plan audits
Current procurement and management processes do not support the adoption and effective implementation of research-based practices

**Procurement**

- Often based on relationships, politics, or informal provider agreements rather than competitive RFPs
- No contractual requirements for providers to use research-based programs or models
- No contractual requirements or incentives related to provider performance and expected youth outcomes

**Provider Management**

- Lack of formal, ongoing assessment of service quality
- Limited capacity to collect and analyze service delivery and outcome data, share data with providers, and use it for improvement and accountability purposes
- Limited capacity to offer technical assistance to address common provider deficiencies and build provider capacity
Probation and parole lack access to sufficient research-based services to address the needs of youth in the community.

Challenges and Barriers to Effective Service Provision

- **Lack of providers** interested and/or able to serve youth in juvenile justice system
- **Services are primarily Medicaid funded**, which provides sustainable funding with administrative/reimbursement rate obstacles
- **Limited collaboration** among state and local juvenile justice, child welfare, and behavioral health agencies to address service gaps and build provider capacity

Services with Limited Availability or Basis in Research

- Prevention of juvenile justice involvement
- Mental health
- Substance use
- Family therapy
- Services for females
- Services in rural communities
Services and programming in correctional facilities do not fully address youth’s needs and are typically not aligned with what the research shows works.

Challenges and Barriers to Effective Service Provision

- **Historical absence of a statewide vision and strategic plan** for aligning corrections and parole policies and practices with what research shows works.

- **Limited collaboration** among facility and parole staff, providers, youth, families, and other stakeholders to effectively case manage, deliver services, and plan for reentry.

- **Limited ability to evaluate** service quality and effectiveness.

Services with Limited Availability or Basis in Research

- Substance use
- Mental health
- Family therapy/family engagement
- Cognitive behavioral programming
- Vocational training/certifications
Other states have enacted laws to support the use of research-based practices and ensure that resources are used efficiently

Authorized funding or provided incentives to implement research-based practices

Established quality standards or requirements related to the use of research-based practices

Supported technical assistance and implementation support on the use of research-based practices
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Key Next Steps

1. Meet with task force and other key stakeholders to review potential policy options to address key findings (October/November)

2. Present policy option recommendations to task force and establish consensus on legislative and appropriation changes (November 29)

3. Work with task force, legislators, governor’s office and legislative counsel bureau to advance legislative reforms (December – March)
Key Next Steps

- **Project Launch**
- **Task Force Meeting #1**
- **Task Force Meeting #2**
- **Task Force Meeting #3**
- **Bill Drafting**
- **Policy Rollout and Bill Introduction**

**Jun 2016**
- **Stakeholder Engagement**
- **Initial Data Analysis**

**Jul**
- **Detailed Data Analysis**

**Aug**
- **Final Data Analysis**

**Sep**
- **Impact Analysis**

**Oct**
- **Data Analysis**

**Nov**
- **Stakeholder Engagement**

**Dec**
- **Policy Option Development**

**Jan**
- **Bill Drafting**

**2017 Session**
- **Engage Policymakers and Media and Keep Stakeholders Involved**
Thank you

To receive newsletters on juvenile justice and other announcements, please visit our website: csgjusticecenter.org/subscribe

Josh Weber, Program Director
Nina Salomon, Senior Policy Analyst
Nancy Arrigona, Research Manager
Rebecca Cohen, PhD, Research Manager

Contact: nsalomon@csg.org

This material was prepared for the State of Nevada. The presentation was developed by members of the Council of State Governments Justice Center staff. Because presentations are not subject to the same rigorous review process as other printed materials, the statements made reflect the views of the authors, and should not be considered the official position of the Justice Center, the members of the Council of State Governments, or the funding agency supporting the work.