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CHAIR HORSFORD:
The Subcommittee has a quorum and is in compliance with the open meeting law.

MS. TOWNSEND MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES, WITH THE CORRECTIONS REQUESTED, FOR THE MAY 13, 2008, SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING ON JUVENILE JUSTICE.

MS. LOWRY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

*****

CHAIR HORSFORD:
The Subcommittee will move to Agenda Item III, a discussion concerning truancy and children who are dropouts.

GLORIA P. DOPF (Deputy Superintendent for Instructional, Research and Evaluative Services, Department of Education):
We are not sure what information the Subcommittee wants. If there is information we are unable to provide today, the Department of Education (DOE) will provide it at a later date. Nevada has been a part of the National Center for Education Statistics’ (NCES) computation compact of dropout for many years. The DOE has a methodology to develop a trend line; however, it is a methodology only a handful of states have committed to use. When dropouts are defined specifically to conform to a formula, as in Nevada, the data is reliable but is not the pretty data of other entities which allow changes, variations and redefinitions. Nevada’s rate has been computed in the same manner for many years. Nevada’s dropout rate varies year to year. Right now the dropout rate is reduced, with 5.7 percent of Nevada youngsters identified as dropouts. There are many flaws in focusing on the statistics and computations.
Nevada’s dropout rate, using the agreed upon NCES formula, is a snapshot picture of a given year. It raises issues of variability as to what is considered a dropout versus not a dropout. The formula is simple: the total dropouts plus non-returns in a given year divided by the total enrollment plus non-returns. At issue are the youngsters as they go through the process rather than at a single point in time. This dropout “snapshot” differs from graduation rates, completion rates or leaver rates. There is a lot of variability on a national level when trying to define who the dropouts are.

Nevada has adopted a unique student identifier. The State data system downloads information daily from each of the 17 school districts. This information provides the ability to track each student to see who is in the system or returns to the system. The mobility rate in this State is over 30 percent. Nevada will be looking at defining the graduation rate in two ways: the traditional rate and one based upon student identifiers. A comparison of these two rates will be made next year.

The Legislature required the DOE to do accountability reporting for eighth grades showing the rate of exit and entry. There is a significant transition between eighth and ninth grades. The enrollment in first through eighth grades increases a little each year. There is about a 20 percent increase in enrollment between eighth and ninth grades. We are not sure what factors lead to this increase. There is a decline in enrollment due to dropout and other factors, including moving out-of-state, after the ninth grade.

Nevada’s dropout rate is slightly improved. We are on the bottom of the list partly because we are tracking and defining dropouts precisely and consistently, as are others on the bottom of the list. Nevada has made significant efforts to reduce the dropout rate, but with the transient population and with an exit high school exam, which is rigorous, we are losing students.

There are significant laws on truancy. We want to provide the Subcommittee with information about programs we are looking at to reduce truancy and student attrition.

JUDGE DOHERTY:
Do you have the ability to drill down the percentage rates in terms of race, gender and geographic location?

MS. DOPF:
Annually the State Board of Education provides to the Legislature the State Improvement Plan (SIP). The SIP is a snapshot of information about the state of education: graduation rate, dropout rate, high school proficiency exam and criterion referenced tests provided by subpopulations. The DOE’s website, www.doe.nv.gov, includes the SIP and the Nevada
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Report Card which provides data under the state accountability report by district and individual school. I can provide the Subcommittee with the dropout and graduation rates.

MS. TOWNSEND:
In Nevada, we have about a 60 percent graduation rate. How does that relate to the 4 to 5 percent dropout rate?

MS. DOPF:
The graduation rate now is computed as a leaver rate. The dropout rate is a portion of the graduation rate. The computation for the graduation rate is the number of those who complete all the standard diploma options (standard, adult or advanced diplomas) divided by all of those plus the number who receive an adjusted diploma or a certificate of attendance plus the number who dropped out since the ninth grade. In Nevada, the receipt of a GED, a certificate of attendance (unitary requirements have been completed but the high school proficiency exam has not been passed) and the special education youngsters, who do not earn a standard diploma, are included in the computation of the graduation rate. In other words, it is a computation of completion divided by those who completed, those who should have completed (including dropouts) and those who complete in non-standard ways. Those who do not complete in four years are considered non-completers.

MS. TOWNSEND:
Are you suggesting 95 percent of youth are completing some form of formal educational program?

MS. DOPF:
Yes. There is completion; it is not in the standard four-year period. When looking at ninth through twelfth, it is more than the 4.5 percent dropout rate.

MS. TOWNSEND:
Is it 20 percent?

MS. DOPF:
Yes. There is a loss of youngsters from ninth to twelfth grades; some are dropouts, some leave the system because, for instance, the family moves. The 4.5 percent is for the one year, not a cumulative number. Cumulatively, we are losing approximately 20 percent of the population from ninth grade to twelfth grade. The numbers we are losing cannot be equated to failures of the education system.
CHAIR HORSFORD:
The nexus between dropouts and the juvenile justice and correction systems is the reason the Subcommittee placed this item on the agenda. During the last legislative session, we worked on the dropout issue and alternative pathways to demonstrate proficiency standards in academics for a high school diploma. I would like you to clarify where the Nevada system is; how it tracks versus other states; what we are moving toward with the National Governor’s Association dropout compact; and the timeline for implementation. In the past, there has been year-to-year reporting. Legislation now requires tracking promotion beginning at the sixth grade. There is a timeline for the DOE to begin reporting the four-year cohort graduation rate.

MS. DOPF:
The graduation rate is different from the dropout rate. The compact relative to the National Governors Association, which Nevada is a part of, is for the graduation rate computation. It will help us get to closer proximity between the graduation rate and the dropout rate. Nevada is one of 48 states which have agreed to the computation of graduation rate using the cohort model.

The graduation rate using the cohort model, by definition, requires knowledge of the youngsters in the beginning enrollment and to be able to track those youngsters through a four-year process. The first challenge in Nevada was to build a system to assign unique student identifiers and track those youngsters through the system for four years. During the 2008-09 school year, we will have completed a ninth grade cohort model class with unique student identifiers. We will track those youngsters, on a pilot basis, through the twelfth grade and find out what happens to them. We will also use a traditional graduation computation, which is a completion rate or a leaver rate, and look at the difference between the two methods. Some states have adopted the compact, but do not have unique student identifiers in place.

We will be adding the eighth grade data to the summer/fall DOE’s accountability report. We are building the information base for the sixth grade, but it will not be ready for this fall.

JUDGE VOY:
There is a four percent year-to-year drop out rate.

MS. DOPF:
That is correct for a given year.

JUDGE VOY:
To get the true dropout rate, do I multiply the 4 percent by four?
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MS. DOPF:
That is one way to do it if the dropout rate is consistent year to year.

JUDGE VOY:
How does the drop from the roles number fit in? Do you assume they have left the State?

MS. DOPF:
Within our system, there are specific definitions as to when a youngster is dropped from the roles and how that impacts the dropout data. If we do not know where the child has gone, have had no request for records or any indicator of what has happened to the child, they are tracked to Nevada’s dropout rate, unlike other states which have an “unknown” category not included in the dropout rate.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
The Subcommittee should understand the dropout rate is a continuum we need to evaluate. In the past, the numbers reported show a year to year scenario which does not accurately reflect a youth’s performance or success from middle school to high school. Is there any other distinction about how Nevada’s dropout statistics are reported? The Subcommittee needs to understand the true problem of the students not earning a standard high school diploma. Nevada is second to last in the country in the rate of students who earn a high school diploma in a four-year process. That is not currently how the State law requires the DOE to report. Often people think the number is better. There are reasons our numbers are as poor as they are. There are as many as 40 percent of students, from a four-year perspective, who are not earning a high school diploma.

MS. DOPF:
For purposes of reporting rate, dropout will not be part of the cohort model. It will be a comparison of the completion of students from ninth through twelfth grades. We will be looking at a uniform graduation rate using the cohort model. The graduation and dropout rates currently used for ranking are not uniform. Right now, Nevada has a 67.5 percent graduation rate and a 4.5 percent snapshot dropout rate. There are youngsters who are not completing who could be in the system; the DOE wants to provide support to those youngsters.

MS. TOWNSEND:
When the cohort model is used, will it track those in the ninth grade next fall?

MS. DOPF:
Yes. It will be the group which impacts the graduation rate in four years. The DOE has unique student identifiers in place for the ninth grade class of three years ago.
MS. TOWNSEND:
Are youth enrolled in education programs while in correctional facilities or juvenile detention included in the DOE statistics?

MS. DOPF:
That is correct.

D. MICHAEL FITZGERALD (Federal and Related Program Consultant, Department of Education):
I reviewed the Nevada risk behavior survey and pulled out two groups: youth who say they are absent from school frequently, to look at truancy issues, and youth who plan to drop out prior to graduation. Compared to the general population in this survey, frequent absentees (absent four to five times a month) are twice as likely to drink frequently; five times more likely to report marijuana use; two times more likely to report low grades; three times more likely to report dropout plans; twice as likely to report carrying weapons; one and a half times more likely to report sadness, depression or thoughts of suicide; and one and a half times more likely to report feeling unsafe at school.

The students who said they are likely to dropout are three times more likely to report heavy drinking; five times more likely to report marijuana use; two and a half times more likely to report frequent absences; four times more likely to report carrying weapons; twice as likely to report sadness or depression; three times more likely to report thoughts of suicide; and two and a half times more likely to report feeling unsafe at school.

A reason youth drop out could be employment opportunity. The Wingspread Declaration on A National Strategy for Improving School Connectedness shows a common indicator for students who leave school: they do not feel they belong there. What can we do to make them feel connected and give them the resources to become a part of the school system? Most of what I do is substance abuse and violence prevention. The number one research-based-prevention strategy is teachers connecting to students: welcoming the student by name to the classroom, welcoming the most the student you least want to see. We have a lot of information relating to connectedness between adult and student. President Milton Glick, University of Nevada, Reno, is talking about the University “sticky” campuses: students stick and retain by having them feel they have a place and purpose.

JUDGE VOY:
What is the DOE doing to combat the dropout issue? The court was given truancy court but was eviscerated by not allowing it to use its inherent powers for contempt.
MR. FITZGERALD:
The DOE does not have either financial or staff resources. We have peer mediation/conflict resolution programs. We are looking at peer mentoring, tutorials, adult mentoring, 21st Century programs and what we are doing for safe and drug free schools. The DOE piecemeals things together based upon resources. Whenever I have the opportunity, I talk about the Wingspread Declaration and connectedness with students. The best prevention we have is a program which does not cost money; it is a relationship which takes effort. The DOE does not have prevention funds for dropouts or truancy.

JUDGE DOHERTY:
There are no greater partners for juvenile justice than education. I respect the work the DOE does; it is embarrassingly underfunded. We expect more of the DOE than we expect from almost any entity. Educators are heroes. Your partnership is critical. We need a unified response to challenges. National and local research confirms juvenile justice, on the continuum of children, is the receptor of children with low risk to the community and high risk needs. A disproportional number of those children are ousted from the education system due to drug use, mental health issues, serious emotional disturbances and developmental disability. The number of Individual Education Plan (IEP) children in the juvenile justice system because they faced either the exact or general concept of zero tolerance in the school district arena has been confusing in terms of responding to these children. These children do not finish their education. We have teachers who feel unsafe. We have children who are not “stuck” to the system. The DOE is not losing them; the juvenile justice system is gaining them. We must stop this hemorrhage of children getting out the education system, into the juvenile justice system and then dropping out because we cannot educate them the way we know the DOE can. Recognizing all the financial challenges and recognizing the DOE’s commitment to children, how can we get beyond the current condition?

MS. DOPF:
Things are happening to become preventative rather than reactive. We are looking at tiered interventions and models of support not unique only to special education youngsters; what we can do academically and behaviorally before youth go to crisis level. Under tiered interventions, support is built within the districts and schools to provide assistance. These efforts represent a redistribution of funds. Building service partnerships to provide nontraditional school services are critical linkages. Academic plans, in the ninth grade, for completing education and building a dialogue with the counselor, parent and student will help. The partnerships must be built at the school level with a system to bring in intervention as the youngster needs, not once they fall out of the system.
CHAIR HORSFORD:
Please put those recommendations in writing. The Subcommittee will be talking about the interactions between the DOE, juvenile justice and foster care systems. Ultimately, this needs to happen in individual schools and communities affecting the lives of children. We need the DOE’s input on building the linkages between systems.

MR. POMI:
The Subcommittee has been provided a copy of “The Children’s Cabinet & WCSD-Intervention Dept. Attendance/Dropout Prevention Report, June 4, 2008.” (Exhibit C) This report is a collaboration between The Children’s Cabinet, a nonprofit in Washoe County, and the Washoe County School District. The McGee Center houses the truancy program from the Washoe County School District. Washoe County collaborates and provides space because we think truancy is a paramount issue for the youth we serve. This model started about 1984. Assemblywoman Leslie was the Director of The Children’s Cabinet at that time. In 1985-86 I served as a truancy officer and a probation officer from Washoe County Department of Juvenile Services and worked in the collaborative effort with the school district and social services on site at The Children’s Cabinet. There were about 800 referrals last year from the Washoe County School District. The needs assessments, strategy, progress and results are depicted in the report. We want to increase attendance, decrease dropouts, increase graduation and decrease involvement in the juvenile justice system. We have been successful with the model implemented in Washoe County.

The report shows the gender demographics indicating increased female involvement in the truancy program. Washoe County is looking at intervention strategies for girls to catch them before they fall out of school.

The student ethnic breakout is shown. Washoe County is over-represented in Hispanic male youth. The graduation rate for the Hispanic youth was much lower than reported. Money was provided by the Legislature to the school district and given to The Bridge Center to target Hispanic youth having difficulties in school.

The Student Attendance Review Board (SARB) is not a court hearing; the SARB panel is broken down by the disciplines represented on this Subcommittee: juvenile justice, social services, education and law enforcement. The hearings conducted by SARB have helped increase attendance. The data for 2007-08 was not complete for this presentation. There was a law enforcement process. The number of citations decreased since 2003-04. Washoe County implemented the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI). All the research indicates the engagement piece Mr. Fitzpatrick spoke about is the key variable we all have to look at when we decide what to do with children. We develop relationships and fight to get those children back in school, where juvenile justice youth are not wanted. We have to battle
the stigma that juvenile justice can answer the question and have to hold hands with the school district partners to get the youth engaged in school. It is important not to criminalize a truant. It is more important to look at the systemic factors of the family breakdowns, the system breakdowns and answer the question from the child’s point of view about why they are not attending school. We do still cite some youth because we have gone through a stringent analysis of why they are not attending. We will recycle children and put them on 30-60-or 90 day monitors to monitor their attendance and program participation. We collaborate with the school district and juvenile justice with case management. We do not put them on probation. The number of SARB re-offenders is decreasing. Washoe County has been successful with the intervention strategies.

The goals of the program are to increase enrollment; the targets are 7-18 year olds, focusing on students in kindergarten through fifth grades and the transition grades six and nine. Washoe County loses youth transitioning from seventh to eighth grade and eighth to ninth grades. There is much research about things we can do. Washoe County has implemented some models; for example, Reed High School sends peer mentors to work with at-risk eighth graders to engage them in the school process so they have a senior buddy who is on-site to establish a relationship and get rid of the stigma and fear of attending school. The school district has taken large steps to engage youth to not be afraid of school and not worry about the transition. The guidelines for the program are simple: we do what is best for the student’s education, we help the family become actively involved in the child’s education; we value diversity; and we provide wraparound services to the families by building a strong collaboration between the family, school and community. It is a community responsibility to address truancy. If we do not look at truancy that way, juvenile justice, as the destination of last resort when people get frustrated and do not know what to do with children, will become a boot-strapping military style bootcamp for truancy. That is not the answer. The answer lies within the family and within us as intelligent people to push good programs within our communities.

The alternative educational gaps are outlined in the report. We need more alternatives for 15-18 year olds who are dropping out of school. We need programs for students who have little or no credits. We have a poor system when we re-engage a child to go back to school and the school does not readily accept them and they are so credit deficient the school does not want them to catch up. There are systems in place Playto and Wolf where youth can catch up academically on credits. Youth should be on their home school site where their peers are and where the family lives. We do that in Washoe County with the Transition Program, which uses Title I Part D funds. We track youth out of detention to their home school. We need more technical training and vocational education. Educational opportunities for Hispanic males, pregnant females and youth in foster homes are needed.
Washoe County’s model program has never lost sight of the fact that the School Attendance Advisory Board (SAAB) gave the direction through the Legislature to the SARB which was supposed to be replicated statewide. Washoe County, the school district and all of the collaborative effort has moved this initiative and realizes if we educate our youth, they do not end up in the juvenile justice system.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
Washoe County has the type of model the Subcommittee needs to look at and determine how to show support in a recommendation to the Legislature or by building connections.

JUDGE VOY:
You said there were about 800 referrals. How many students are in the program at any given time?

MR. POMI:
A case manager may have 20-30 cases on the 30-60-and 90-day monitors; there are ten case managers, which means there could be up to 300 students at any given time.

JUDGE VOY:
What is the budget?

MR. POMI:
With the JDAI principles and philosophy, everyone collaborates with in-kind services of staff, physical space, phones and clerical support.

JUDGE VOY:
Who employs the ten case managers?

MR. POMI:
Washoe County School District, Washoe County Juvenile Services and Washoe County Social Services employ the ten case managers.

JUDGE VOY:
Even with the donating, there is resource management and costs somewhere in the system. You are having everyone come together bringing their share to the table.

MR. POMI:
That is correct.
MR. SERANNO:  
I have had 25 years in juvenile justice; the last 18 served in northeastern Nevada. Mr. Pomi has illustrated the use of judicial authority to bring about the desired changes, not by using punitive sanctions, but using their authority to involve programs that work. For example, in northeastern Nevada, court masters hearing truancy cases use the court’s leverage to order Saturday school, after-school and alternative education programs. When working with youth, if a need is identified, the court proceeds further with substance abuse evaluations, mental health evaluations and referrals to community agencies. In Winnemucca, for example, Lawry High School offers alternative education and the receipt of the same diploma. Approximately 15 percent of the graduation class comes from these alternative programs. Some of the issues are complex, but many are simplistic, in restoring hope by identifying substance abuse problems through the use of the courts authority and tutoring issues. By restoring hope, truants will show up for Saturday school.

MR. POMI:  
The Children’s Cabinet receives grant funds to support our initiatives.

MS. LOWRY:  
What statute promulgated SAAB?

MR. POMI:  
There is a Children’s Cabinet report showing who has implemented SAAB. I will get the statutory information to the Subcommittee.

MS. TOWNSEND:  
One of the strategies of JDAI is collaboration. Washoe County has focused on schools and truancy.

MR. POMI:  
That is correct. Washoe County began this effort in advance of the JDAI initiative. As the JDAI mission became clear and we looked at the number of youth placed in the system for truancy, we re-strategized and worked with the school district to develop the current program.

MS. TOWNSEND:  
For youth placed under probation supervision and seen through the juvenile court and the Washoe County Juvenile Justice Services, if they are truant, do they go through this same process?
MR. POMI:
Yes, they do. They are identified and can go through any intervention strategy we have. Because we have the school district on-site at the McGee Center, the collaboration is easier to access. The main coordinating factor is the Children’s Cabinet because they see the youth from detention to probation and track them as they return to their home school. The case management piece is the most powerful because of the relationship developed. Someone is concerned about the youth’s education, wants to make sure the youth attends school and cares about what is done in school. We do mentoring, tutoring and study tables. It is a holistic model. The relationship is between the case manager, the school and the youth.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
The Subcommittee may be asking Mr. Pomi for specific steps used to implement this model in order to replicate it. The Subcommittee will now hear from Jennifer Ouellette with information compiled on behalf of the Southern Nevada Workforce Investment Board (SNWIB).

JENNIFER OUELLETTE (Senior Manager, Applied Analysis):
The Subcommittee has received a copy of “Youth Mapping and Data Analysis.” (Exhibit D) Applied Analysis was hired to perform a mapping and data analysis in southern Nevada to help direct the distribution of funds to youth in need. We looked at a variety of information including data from Clark County Family Services, the Clark County School District, the Department of Juvenile Justice and the U. S. Census Bureau. The SNWIB currently has a request for proposal seeking programs to assist at-risk youth ages 14 to 21 in southern Nevada. These programs will help the youth obtain successful adult outcomes, such as job placement, high school diplomas or equivalents, or post secondary education. The programs will be targeting youth at risk of dropping out of school, pregnant or parenting youth, youth with limited English proficiency or youth involved in the juvenile justice or child welfare systems.

Applied Analysis received information from the Department of Family Services regarding substantiated investigations of child abuse and neglect. We looked at this sector rather than those already in the foster care system because children in the foster care system will have addresses tracked by the foster parent’s address. We wanted information from the point of origination. The analysis indicates there are 3.42 substantiated child abuse/neglect investigations per 1,000 households valley wide; or 0.3 percent of all households in Las Vegas during the calendar year 2007. Applied Analysis used an index similar to the Cost of Living Index: 100 would be the national average; anything above that would be a more expensive place to live; Las Vegas rates 110 which means Las Vegas is 10 percent more expensive to live in than the national average. Applied Analysis assigned a valley-wide average of 100; zip code 89106 scores 369, meaning it is more than 3.5 times more likely to
have a substantiated investigation of child abuse or neglect. The top ten zip codes are shown both graphically and geographically.

The information received from the Department of Juvenile Justice indicates juvenile arrest charges, not including traffic violations. There were 51.3 juvenile arrests per 1,000 households. Five percent of the households in the valley are dealing with the Department of Juvenile Justice. Zip code 89109 is slightly more than 3.5 times the valley average of 100. Many of these zip codes were seen in the child abuse or neglect chart and will continue to be seen in the information to follow. The map indicates the zip codes with more than twice the valley wide average.

Poverty information was received from the U. S. Census Bureau. The Applied Analysis study wanted to look at households with children living in poverty. There are 58.3 households with children living in poverty per 1,000 households valley wide, almost 6 percent of all households in Las Vegas. Households in zip code 89101 are more than 3.5 times likely to be living in poverty. The graph and map depict this information. The Census Bureau does not break down ages 14 to 21, so Applied Analysis used ages 15 to 20. Almost one-third of households in Las Vegas have children of that age. Households with more than the valley wide average are shown. Zip code 89101 is again number one at more than 1.5 times more likely to have children ages 15 to 20 living in the household.

Applied Analysis used the Clark County Accountability Report which is available at nevadareportcard.com that you were speaking of this morning. The lowest daily attendance rates for eight of the Clark County High Schools, removing behavioral programs and magnet schools, are shown. Chaparral and Mojave High Schools indicate 87 percent aggregate days present as of the first 100 days of instruction. There are several schools with a ninety percent attendance rate that are not indicated. The graduation rates were described by Ms. Dopf earlier today. The analysis shows the ten lowest graduation rates in Clark County. The habitual truancy schools listed have identified the problem and are making efforts to reconcile the problem. They have hired truancy officers and are keeping better records of what is happening in the school. Generally, children who are habitual truants will be high school dropouts. The NRS 392 identifies a habitual truant as any child declared a truant three or more times in one school year. Fifteen percent of Canyon Springs High School students fail their proficiency exam. Those students who do not pass the proficiency exam may become discouraged and drop out. The ninth grade credit deficiencies report the number of students whose deficiencies prevent them from progressing to the next grade. Students within this 27 percent will not be 10th graders next year; when we look at the 10th grade deficiencies, the numbers trend downward but are still in the 20 percent range. The 11th grade deficiencies become much lower not because we are doing things better, but because we have already lost those children. If we are going to make a difference, it ideally should
start in 9th or 10th grades, perhaps even 8th grade. We have not yet worked on that piece of the analysis.

The index and variables we have just looked at for the Clark County School District were used to see which high schools are most in need of support and are indicated both graphically and geographically.

Many of these regions contain overlapping variables. A zip code which scored high in a characteristic such as poverty levels also scored high with child abuse or juvenile delinquency as well as poor school performance. They all overlapped. Applied Analysis aggregated all of the data variables and depicted the top ten zip codes scoring above the valley wide average of 100 for all variables considered. These areas represent southern Nevada youth most at risk and the greatest opportunities for investment. These are the areas where we can make a difference. The information was also ranked by zip codes and placed into tiers. Tier 1 demonstrates the highest level of need, with Tier 5 having the lowest level of need. This information is also depicted geographically. Schools located in Tier 3, for instance, may be pulling in students from Tier 1 or Tier 2.

JUDGE DOHERTY:
Does Applied Analysis have the capacity to break out some of these percentages by race and gender?

MS. OUELETTE:
Yes. The information is publicly available in the Accountability Report which tracks that information. Applied Analysis was not asked to provide that information. The SNWIB was not as interested in ethnicities as in areas in which it could make a difference.

MS. TOWNSEND:
We in southern Nevada are finding uses for this data and analysis. We may want to find ways to do this statewide.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
Applied Analysis has done work on youth homelessness and is helping with Gard Jamison’s group on the Child Providers Consortium. The Subcommittee will now hear Item VI of the agenda. Mr. Henry has some oversight for the Spring Mountain Youth Camp as well as some other facilities working with youth who re-enter the traditional school system.
ROBERT HENRY (Director of Adult Education, Education Services Division, Clark County School District):

Over the past few years, I supervised the leadership in public education programs. As a result, I have developed an understanding of some of the issues facing our youth once they are released. There are social, emotional, behavioral and career issues as the youth re-integrate after release. Assisting youth to resolve issues becomes the responsibility of all stakeholders. Often our education system is asked to provide significant support for transitioning youth as the amount of time students spend in educational pursuits is greater than other areas. Many parameters beyond the control of the education systems make it difficult to meet the needs of this population. A youth assigned to the Spring Mountain Youth Camp is usually there for six months. During that time, their living arrangements are controlled by responsible adults, their days are structured with high behavior expectations. Students are required to attend school on a regular basis. While in school, they are taught in classes of a manageable size. Research studies suggest staff-to-student ratios of 1 to 18. We achieve that class size guideline. In this environment, students are able to receive the direct and immediate attention of the teacher. That attention is provided in such a way that our students recognize the teacher’s interest in assisting the student to understand the course content. It speaks to the issue of the relationship between students and staff. In exit interviews, students have shared the importance of the teaching staff to their overall educational improvements. This begins to demonstrate the importance of quality relationships in the lives of youth. Previous quality relationships with adults did not exist, especially in education environments. Students have verbalized the importance of doing their best so they would not disappoint a favorite teacher. For many, this has been the first instance of a positive educational experience. A majority of exiting students are released to return to a neighborhood high school campus where they are expected to register, attend classes, complete homework, comply with school rules, be on time, manage their anger and address conflict in a positive manner, all after returning to a community setting where virtually nothing else has changed. Often these expectations are beyond that which a number of our youth can meet. Some will choose not to return to school. Some who have support systems to get them to school will fall into some of the same problematic behaviors existing before their institutionalization. The Clark County School District Administration for the school program at Spring Mountain Youth Camp, in June 2007, chose to use the majority of their 2007-08 school year categorical funds for a transition specialist. This licensed employee prepared at the graduate level as a school counselor and assists in readying a student for his return to the education community on a comprehensive school campus. The specialist spends time prior to release to identify goals, plan integration strategies, identify barriers, discuss possible solutions to minimize the negative effects of those barriers and practice using the strategies in a social setting prior to release. The specialist working with the student will facilitate his reentry into the public school environment by accompanying the parent or guardian and student to school and assisting in school registration if requested. If it is not requested, there
is a follow-up done to assure us the student is registered and attending. If the student has not completed registration, the specialist assists the student and parents accomplish registration. Once registered, the student is expected to follow the provided class schedule. As is often the case, students experience difficulty during the school day. For those who have actually returned to school, often their interest begins to wane quickly. They become truant.

A student is released from the Summit View Correctional Facility after a year to eighteen months during which they are expected to attend school on a regular basis. In school, they have the opportunity to earn credit toward high school graduation. Opportunities exist for students to address their credit-deficient status as most are behind their school peers. At release, students do not have the benefit of the transition specialist. It becomes their responsibility and that of the parents to assure they get to their comprehensive school to complete their registration process. While the school administration at Summit View would welcome having a transition person, it is not provided the same level of categorical funds. The funds available need to be used for general school operation.

Youth assigned to the Clark County Juvenile Detention Center are generally there for a short period of time. During their stay they continue to be enrolled in their comprehensive school as a full-time student. For those detained who are not presently enrolled in school, the education staff at detention will enroll them in school at the detention center and provide educational services. Those services attempt to keep the youth current so at release they will be able to re-integrate with minimal difficulty. At release the expectation is they will return to school to continue their education. However, the reality is the longer they are out the greater the difficulty in returning. Often the staff and students change their perception of the student and begin to interact with them differently.

The provision of support services to aid students in re-integrating to a comprehensive school environment is a necessary service if we expect our students to be successful after institutionalization. Support services come at some expense. We, as educators, recognize the value of such service. When resources are available, we are willing to provide for our students in the best way possible. As resources become tighter and budgets impacted, the services identified as non-essential are first to be considered for reduction or elimination. In our present economic climate, the enhancement of transition services to our youth exiting institutional programs will not be possible.

How can we assist our students make a successful re-integration into the community? Within the Department of Adult Education of the Clark County School District, we are looking to expand programming options to re-engage 17-to 19-year old youth who have left school without earning a high school diploma. Utilizing adult education, those students who are age-wise eligible for adult education services can continue their education in a less traditional
manner. Adult education programs are offered at various times during the day at many locations across our valley. Some students look to engage in educational programs in neighborhoods other than their own as they recognize their individual limitations and abilities. They choose to change their environment and increase the likelihood of success. Also, within the Department of Adult Education, there is the Desert Rose Adult High School. This school has all of the benefits of adult education at a location with some semblance of a traditional school. For the 2008-09 school year, we will be able to offer career and technical education programs together with traditional course offerings for returning youth. The development of sellable job skills is important to many youth. The integration of academics with the development of vocational instruction enhances the engagement of students into the teaching and learning process. Adult educators expect students to attend school regularly. However, if a student is unable, for whatever reason, a student simply picks up from wherever he/she left off before the absence. Many students respond favorably to this level of freedom, as they are being recognized and treated as an adult. Such arrangements do not place teachers and staff in a position of continuous attendance monitoring. A similar situation on a comprehensive school campus would often have a different outcome. Our students react negatively to such monitoring and allow themselves to escalate a school monitoring contact into something resulting in further disciplinary action. To fund the increased services at Desert Rose, we will be accessing Distributive School Account (DSA) funds previously not eligible for re-engaged 17-19 year olds. In the past, the students returning to school through adult education were not considered full-time students and thereby ineligible for DSA support. Next year, our re-engaged students will be full-time students in a school program through Desert Rose High School, dropping “Adult” from the name of the school. Their school will not be a traditional school schedule. Students will be able to arrange their schedule between 7 a.m. and 8:30 p.m., allowing them to access programs at convenient times to their schedules. Not to leave our students integrating into school after institutionalization without appropriate levels of support, plans have been discussed and are currently being implemented to allow released students to enter adult education as an option to enrolling in a comprehensive school in their neighborhood.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
Nevada Partners, of which I am president of the Board, is a partner in many initiatives on which we work with you. It is an effective way to re-engage young people we are losing who are entitled to a public education until they are 21 years of age and who can, based upon the right environment, earn either a standard or adjusted diploma through adult education. This is very important based upon the benefit an individual receives by having a high school diploma or GED; not to mention the social implications and the fact 80 percent of those incarcerated are dropouts. There is clearly a nexus. The direction Desert Rose High School is moving will help facilitate more credit-deficient students obtain their education credential. What is the funding level received for your programming? How will what you are doing now
be able to capture some of the funds which would otherwise be lost if these youth are not in school?

MR. HENRY:
The 17-19-year old population re-engagement will have DSA funding. The Clark County School District has made a commitment for this first year to support the combined Desert Rose and former ATTC program, which is where we get our career and technical education component. The Education Services Division has taken the supervision of that program. We will continue the commitment to the concurrently enrolled high school students who chose to attend ATTC for a two year career/technical education program. Desert Rose will have concurrently enrolled students from comprehensive high schools as well as our adult education students and the re-engaged 17-19-year-old students. The level of financial commitment for next year will, hopefully, remain the same. The additional 4.5 percent budget cut may have some impact on both the Desert Rose Adult High School and the Desert Rose High School. If the 10-14 percent budget reduction impacts the 2009-10 school year, there will be a significant impact on the types of support services we provide.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
Adult education receives $621 per student based upon the State grant.

MR. HENRY:
The funding for adult education receives a set amount. Within the Division, we take the adult education projected enrollment and divide that set amount between three different programs: adult education, Desert Rose High School and the community ESL program. When that amount is divided by the number of students, it is approximately $570 per student as opposed to the more than $5,000 per student under DSA.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
Based upon the number of students aged 17-19 who are accessing adult education, rather than them being re-engaged in a high school setting, this will allow funds to follow the student and support that student accordingly.

MR. HENRY:
That is correct. The DSA funds are based upon enrollment on the third Friday in September.Traditionally, in adult education, after count day we see an increase in the number of students, which negatively impacts us. The funds do not follow the student directly, which has been an annual issue. It would be great for adult education if we could look at multiple count days rather than just the third Friday in September.
CHAIR HORSFORD:
The Superintendent mentioned the same thing. If there is a recommendation or language you could provide to the Subcommittee, perhaps we could support that idea in our recommendations to the Commission.

JUDGE VOY:
Is a high school diploma offered at Summit View? Many of the youth at Spring Mountain or Elko have built up credits in institutional settings and are then sent to Summit View.

MR. HENRY:
Summit View’s educational program does not award a diploma. They do graduate with a Clark County School District diploma awarded through The Academy for Individualized Study, not a diploma from Summit View. I have a meeting Monday with the new principal at Summit View and will make sure he understands the procedure.

MR. SERRANO:
There is no Summit View school. There is a Clark County School District school on the Summit View site. Students earn the credits they would earn at any Clark County school and can earn a diploma if they accumulate enough credits.

MR. HENRY:
That is correct. The program is identified as the Summit View Junior-Senior High School, but it does not grant a diploma; the Clark County School District grants the diploma.

MS. TOWNSEND:
Based upon the information you have provided, you believe transition counselors would be important to facilitate reentry within the juvenile justice system and for young adults who may end up in the adult correction system. As this Subcommittee formulates its recommendations, understanding resources will be an issue, is there a way to quantify the cost-benefit of having transition counselors or other recommendations you would make for ways we can use existing resources to facilitate transition planning and implementation?

MR. HENRY:
I do not have figures in terms of a cost-benefit analysis. In a partnership between the Clark County School District and youth corrections, if each high school had an identified contact person who would assist/facilitate in the transition institutions, as they release students, they would be released to a particular person. Through communications with that particular person, the school would be expecting the youth and would facilitate reentry. We know many of our students, upon release, are pointed in the direction of the school. They have not had successful experiences in the past; why would they put themselves in a situation to re-enter
the same type of environment? If there is a way to facilitate the transition, we will re-engage more students. Using an identified person definitely has benefits. The issue is who to identify and how to train that person. It would not necessarily cost additional funds, but re-allocation of resources at particular school sites. There are a lot of secondary education people who will not like that statement. School counselors, probably the best person to facilitate the transition, are busy. In the best interest of youth, we need to identify a particular person at a school site and communicate with that person to assist in the transition.

MR. POMI:
I have distributed a letter from the Department of Education referencing Title I, Part D. (Exhibit E) Do you receive Title I, Part D transition funding for youth coming from Spring Mountain to the Clark County School District?

MR. HENRY:
The Spring Mountain Youth Camp does use Title I funds for the transition specialist. That is the only usage I am aware of for Title I funds in transition.

MR. POMI:
Are the Title I, Part D funds at risk?

MR. HENRY:
Yes. The Federal Government is always changing the priorities for Title I funds.

JUDGE VOY:
Routinely youth from Caliente or Elko are not back in the Clark County School District for a month or two due to communications, transcripts and other similar issues. Can we determine why that problem occurs? Youth are back in parole status who violated and have not been in school.

MR. HENRY:
I will work with you to identify specific situations to see where the system is broken. If there are some commonalities, we could develop protocol so students are not placed in jeopardy. A month out of school could have a significant impact on that child’s ability to earn high school credit.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
It is difficult to manage a youth’s transition from Caliente to their original community, particularly when it is outside Clark County. Nevada Partners served youth residing in other states. We serve them well in Nevada institutions; upon release, it is difficult to connect them with their educational institution.
MR. SERRANO:
I will look into the problems and determine what corrective action might be necessary.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
It is not an issue of negligence. We need to determine who is responsible to connect the youth and school. It is probably a lack of resources in the transition with no one entity responsible for the transition.

MR. HENRY:
Comprehensive high schools do need complete records in order to accomplish registration and appropriately schedule students. Adult education has more flexibility because the student usually takes one or two classes at a time. Adult education is competency-based. We are not as focused on the 60-hour seat time for half a Carnegie unit of credit. Adult Education has flexibility to program a student into classes working toward a high school diploma while attempting to collect all official transcripts needed to determine what courses are needed.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
Ultimately, we want a mechanism where all information is available prior to release, including educational and wrap around supports. The breakdown is in the transition. Juveniles are entitled to a public education until they are 21 years old. They need to be in an education system which best fits their needs. Fifteen-year-olds cannot go to adult education.

MR. POMI:
Youth Parole does have an active plan as the youth leaves the institution. Credit recovery is one of the main focuses within the institutions. Washoe County has educational staffing and a transition position for Caliente, Elko and Summit View. The bigger issue is getting the youth placed in the home school. There are many on-site labs at Youth Parole where youth are educated, but they do not get back into their home school. There is a stigma against the child. The educational ramifications are solid coming out of the institutions. The youth come back with a lot of credit recovery and on task to graduate. It is the difficulty of getting them into the formal school process.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
With the advent of Desert Rose High School in Clark County, the issue will be better addressed. Are there similar models in Washoe County or other parts of the State?

MR. POMI:
The Department of Education letter (Exhibit E) indicates there is transition. Youth coming out of camp placement is the same. We need to replicate transition for youth parole and drill it down to the districts across the State. The model is in place in the State. Formalized
language is needed for the school districts to accept the youth back into the schools once they leave institutional care.

MS. TOWNSEND:
Much of our focus has been on youth in correctional placement and their reentry into their community school. The other reality is, many of the youth the juvenile justice system touches are disengaged from school. We need to find ways to re-engage them. Reentry can be a broad term. There are youth in detention; there are others disengaged with school and have stigmas attached to them based upon prior behavior. The whole idea of education and how it re-engages students is important.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
We are learning we need to work on the “whole” of the youth and look at models to do that. We do a good job in the institutions, but upon release there are barriers to reentry without enough alternative options. The young people are not dealing with just the education issues. I would like Mr. Pomi, Ms. Townsend and Mr. Henry to research the best models to serve these youth so the Subcommittee can use the information as a direct recommendation for the short and long term to the Commission.

MR. HENRY:
I welcome that opportunity. The career technical education component at Desert Rose is a significant “hook” which assists in re-engaging our 17 and older students. We are losing youth from the education system long before they reach 17. We need to look at alternatives to traditional middle schools. We need to make available career and technical education in a meaningful way. This population would do well in a formal career and technical education program. They would begin to understand why it is important to learn English, social studies, math and science. They would be less likely to continue inappropriate behavior in the community.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
The Subcommittee will now hear Item VII of the Agenda.

MS. SALLA:
None of the Department of Health and Human Services’ juvenile justice data is maintained by zip code. The data is by county jurisdiction and cannot be separated by zip code. We are in the process of determining if we can retain future information by zip code and, if so, what the expense would be. Does the Subcommittee want to hear a list of the data collected by the Department?
CHAIR HORSFORD:
What data do you have? Do we need to request the data from local entities?

MS. SALLA:
The Nevada Juvenile Justice Data Collection (NJJDC) is the data base at the Community Juvenile Justice Program. We collect the information quarterly from each jurisdiction at the county level. There is a rank order of offenses. The information includes: county code, date of birth, gender, race, composition of household, referral source, type of offense charged with, if detained, when released, disposition referral code, further court proceedings, petition, drug type, committed/attempted/conspired crime, disposition of petition, placement, gang affiliation and economic background. I will get this information to the Subcommittee. Our office has provided this template to each of the judicial districts.

The Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) report was previously provided to the Commission. For this report, Federal definitions are generally used unless noted otherwise in which case the State definition is provided. We do this, for example, because a minor in consumption is considered a delinquent act in Nevada; the Federal Government considers it a status offense. The DMC report is submitted annually from each judicial district.

The Status Offender Report is received monthly from each juvenile detention facility in Nevada and any adult jail or lockup with the potential to hold juveniles if they have held any juveniles. If they are status offenders, the detention centers report the time of detention, court hearing, time of release, most serious charge and who released to. The adult facilities report any juvenile coming into an adult facility, whether they are held securely or non-securely. The adult facility information is reported to the Federal government to make sure we maintain compliance with the Juvenile Justice Act.

Information regarding the population movement from the three State facilities is reported, including average population per day, number of males and race. Graphs for population movement are by race and gender. We have committed youth waiting placement and committed youth waiting placement who have spent over 30 days in detention. Youth parole provides a weekly admissions list used to track youth in detention and to be certain expedited movement occurs.

Juvenile sex offenders who receive funding are tracked. We have interlocal agreements with the counties to provide funding for out-patient treatment. We oversee and collect data on assessment general funds. We provide oversight to the counties to help juveniles or families who cannot afford to have the court-ordered psycho-sexual evaluations by private providers throughout the State.
CHAIR HORSFORD:
There is a lot of data which we need by zip code. Will legislative or administrative direction be needed to get the information by zip code? It is problematic that we can use zip codes for the adult population but not the juveniles.

MR. SERRANO:
We will begin the process immediately to break down the information in the most usable way.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
The request for information by zip code was initially made in order to geographically depict where juveniles reside or where the offense is committed and then compare the information to available services. We know, based on the Applied Analysis information, where the juveniles come from in southern Nevada. I imagine that will also be true in northern Nevada. Something similar was provided by Dr. Austin for the adult incarceration population. Without the zip code, we cannot get to the data we are looking for.

MS. SALLA:
The counties may have the information by zip code. Most of the rural jurisdictions only have one zip code. Washoe, Clark, Carson City and Douglas Counties may have the information. The Department may be able to add an area to its template for the zip code.

MS. TOWNSEND:
Clark County has the information and can produce data by zip code. Do you have information on home zip codes for youth committed to State facilities and released to home communities?

MR. SERRANO:
I believe we have that information. The presentation this morning was enhanced by having the zip code information and is clearly advantageous in terms of planning.

MS. WICKES:
The zip code used is the child’s residence. Is there any interest in including the zip code of the alleged offense?

MS. TOWNSEND:
If we are trying to make this a comparison to Dr. Austin’s adult information, we would need to use the home address rather than the offense address.
JUDGE DOHERTY:
I just returned from a DMC training with the Burns Institute. It was debated whether the data
collection nationwide should be the zip code of residency or zip code location of the crime.
We learned at the training to decide which one to use and go with it. There are a lot of
reasons to use one or the other; the real issue is to target and move. We also learned if we
follow the RAGGO Method (race, age, gender, geography and offense), we will serve
ourselves and our communities.

MR. SERRANO:
That is an excellent point. We will work to see what can be done to access that information.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
Please keep myself and Ms. Risa Lang informed on this issue so we can decide how to
broach this issue. We have only one more Subcommittee meeting before making our initial
recommendations to the Commission at the first meeting in August 2008. The Subcommittee
will continue to meet after the initial recommendations are made.

The Subcommittee will need a spreadsheet from Ms. Salla of the various data elements
collected by the Department.

MS. SALLA:
I will do that.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
The Subcommittee will now have an open discussion on two important topics identified in
the members’ list of issues: linkages between the Department of Education, juvenile justice
and the foster care system and the establishment of an interdisciplinary committee to address
issues related to juveniles (the make-up of such a committee, who the members should be
and the charge of the committee). We did a similar thing in the child welfare
recommendations recently. We took a list of the committees which currently meet on child
welfare issues, including some with law enforcement and county and state agencies, and
recommended restructuring some of those committees into one interdisciplinary committee
with specific charges. This can streamline the process, bring all of the partners to the table
and formalize the creation of a committee to see that the work continues. I want input from
the Subcommittee members about this concept and if you are aware of various committees
currently in existence, let us know about those committees. If there are statutory committees
with a specific charge, we may need to make a policy recommendation to the Legislature.
JUDGE VOY:
There is the standing Governor’s Nevada Commission on Juvenile Justice (NCJJ) which meets quarterly. Perhaps we could re-examine the makeup of the NCJJ and propose changes to include additional entities.

MS. SALLA:
The NJJC is a federally established commission with members appointed by the Governor. The guidelines for the NCJJ are within the Juvenile Justice Act. I will provide the Subcommittee with a list of the members and the NCJJ’s requirements.

MS. TOWNSEND:
I recommend we look at interactions between education, juvenile justice and the child welfare system (not just foster care). There is work already done by the Child Welfare League of America. We should build upon that. They have made recommendations to build systems. One, specifically which would help all of us is information sharing between education, juvenile justice and child welfare systems. A policy change may be required to allow the free exchange of information when it is in the best interest of the child. Another suggestion would be to build upon the system of care and the child and family teams, work done through the Committee on Children’s Behavioral Health (CCBH) which includes representatives from education, juvenile justice and foster care. Those issues are the same as we are seeing in this group. The CCBH may need to be incorporated into one mega-interdisciplinary committee. The CCBH is already an interdisciplinary committee but has a narrow focus. The concept of system of care and child and family teams can help us at the child level.

JUDGE VOY:
The school districts are not here, yet they are one of the key components. We need the various school districts.

MS. TOWNSEND:
The school district is on the CCBH.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
There is a state and local piece to this. Part of the Subcommittee’s charge is to look at the State as a whole and make sure the systems are working together. I do not disagree that the local piece is important and local implementation is critically important, but there is a disconnect at the State level. As a policy, all we can start with is the State structure and from there local implementation is decided by local stakeholders.
MS. TOWNSEND:
We need to determine if there are Department of Education regulations or funding streams which are not being communicated as being inclusive (to include children in the juvenile justice system). These juvenile justice youth are pushed out; they are not welcomed back to school. Re-engagement is difficult. We need to see if there is anything we can do with the Department of Education and their policies and funding formulas which would emphasize its responsibility to re-engage all youth.

MR. POMI:
In the discussion this week with the Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators (a juvenile justice body with involvement at the state and county level) we talked about the implementation and replication of the JDAI in all jurisdictions within Nevada. We have been working toward the goal of establishing that mechanism. If we use our stakeholders, which are representative, and have JDAI in each jurisdiction with social services, welfare agencies, school districts and juvenile justice, it would segue into having a board or a body to discuss funding with the Department of Education because we would have a representative from the educational field within the group. Statewide use of JDAI would give us some impetus about a consistent policy and practice in dealing with juveniles. There is a host site on the JDAI website about statewide replication which the jurisdictions said they would review.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
Is there a need to create a statewide interdisciplinary committee of stakeholders? By raise of hands, it appears everyone agrees with that statement. The next step would be to evaluate the current structure of the Commission on Juvenile Justice to determine if there are ways in which to expand it beyond juvenile justice and determine if there are key stakeholders missing from the current group. Ms. Salla has agreed to provide the Subcommittee with the NCJJ’s structure and membership list. Is that a Legislatively created commission?

MS. SALLA:
No. It is mandated, for formula funding, in the Federal Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002. The commission members are appointed by the Governor.

CHAIR HORSFORD:
Is there a certain structure which must be in place for Nevada to meet the Federal requirement, or can Nevada meet minimum standards and expand upon that? Would we be in compliance? Do we need a legal interpretation?
MS. SALLA: There are minimum requirements identified by the Federal Government: four-year terms for appointed members; Commission is responsible for the oversight of Federal funding and ensuring Nevada maintains compliance with the Juvenile Justice Act.

JUDGE DOHERTY: I am a member of the NCJJ appointed by Governor Guinn and reappointed by Governor Gibbons. The NCJJ serves a critical and useful role within Nevada but, potentially, is not the best body to address all of the things we hope to achieve. The NCJJ is focused on complying with Federal mandates of Federal programs and reporting requirements under the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. We should look at NCJJ’s structure, interface with it, but I would be concerned if we identified that entity as the appropriate entity to fold into.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation is releasing today a nationwide study, 2008 KIDS COUNT Data Book. The report identifies the vulnerability of child populations nationwide. The Subcommittee has received the “Essay” (Exhibit F) which is the introductory research included in this year’s KIDS COUNT publication. This year the essay focuses on juvenile justice. The outline covers many of the areas the Subcommittee has addressed. We could use that research as a source for the beginning of many interdisciplinary issues a commission might address on an ongoing basis. Those issues include research on the development of the juvenile brain through their early 20s; the efficacy of consequences the juvenile justice systems have traditionally imposed; the effectiveness of alternatives to detention; objective risk-assessment instruments; the percentage of mental health children addressed in the juvenile justice system; the nature and extent of children placed in foster care progressing through the delinquency system without the backup support of the foster care system once they are placed in the delinquency arena; prioritization of certain issues within various jurisdictions; and how to reprioritize the effectiveness of work in the juvenile justice system.

MS. TOWNSEND: I also sit on the NJJC and agree with Judge Doherty’s concerns. There are some NJJC requirements regarding lobbying which limits what the NJJC can do in the policy-making arena. We need to be cautious. There are ways the NJJC can help an interdisciplinary committee but the NJJC has limitations in terms of making recommendations and being a strong advocate for those recommendations.

MR. SERRANO: I concur with Judge Doherty and Ms. Townsend regarding the NJJC. Is the Subcommittee familiar with the ongoing work of Washoe and Clark Counties and rural Nevada’s Mental Health Consortium? The long range vision is to have a statewide consortium, multi-
disciplined, to address the needs of the child welfare, juvenile justice and mental health systems. With a few additions, it may be the ideal group to link with since we are looking at a multi-disciplinary approach to these issues.

MS. TOWNSEND:  
I recommend the Subcommittee look at an interdisciplinary committee which may be established by the Legislature to serve in an ongoing way as this Subcommittee has. It may be possible for the consortium to function in that way.

JUDGE VOY:  
If there is going to be a statewide body, it sounds as though the consortium may be the one to look at. If we are going to establish a body through the Legislature, we may want to look at what the consortium is doing, what the Subcommittee would like in a committee and roll the two together. Most of the players in the consortium are the same as are serving on this Commission. We are doing local things with JDAI.

MS. TOWNSEND:  
In other jurisdictions where there has been effective planning and advocacy, interdisciplinary committees have been akin to the Children’s Cabinet. Perhaps something similar on a statewide level would be effective.

MR. POMI:  
I sit on the Mental Health Consortium. A statewide Children’s Cabinet, broad-based to include all disciplines, would be the best process to look at statewide change for youth served in Nevada.

CHAIR HORSFORD:  
Are there Legislators on the Juvenile Justice Commission?

MS. TOWNSEND:  
No.

CHAIR HORSFORD:  
When Legislators are placed on an interdisciplinary committee, the scope and fiscal pieces change. We probably want stakeholders other than Legislators. The consensus is to not duplicate current committees, not to distract the intent of the current committees, but to expand a statewide group of stakeholders with a specific charge of looking at youth in general. Between now and the next meeting, we will make a first draft for your input. If there are other suggestions in the meantime, please forward them to me.
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The Subcommittee has received a lot of information; there are many directions in which we could go. The Subcommittee agrees there is still a lot of work before arriving at any concrete recommendations. We will formulate a recommendation for an interim committee charged with evaluating, in depth and with more support, the issues we have touched upon. I will list the priorities the Subcommittee has identified for your review. The considerations developed during our meetings will also be provided to the Subcommittee and work groups assigned to those topics.

Ms. Lang will contact Subcommittee members to determine the date of our next meeting.

No members of the public have come forth to present testimony.

There being no further business to come before this Subcommittee, the meeting is adjourned at 1:40 p.m.
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