

Juvenile Justice Data Collection in Nevada

Submitted by

**Standardized Data Collection for Juvenile Justice Subcommittee,
a Subcommittee of the Nevada Supreme Court Commission on
Statewide Juvenile Justice Reform**

April 2014

<p>EXHIBIT E-4 - CHILDWELFARE Document consists of 24 pages. Entire exhibit provided. Meeting Date: 06-20-14</p>
--

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
TABLE 1 - FEDERAL AND STATE REQUIREMENTS	2
BACKGROUND/HISTORY DATA COLLECTION	2
PURPOSE OF THE REPORT	4
UNIFORM DICTIONARY WITH JUVENILE JUSTICE DEFINITIONS	5
ADDITIONAL DISCUSSIONS TERMS INCLUDED IN DATA DICTIONARY	6
MINOR IN POSSESSION, CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOL	6
RECIDIVISM	7
VIOLATIONS OF PROBATION OR PAROLE	9
CREATE A UNIFORM METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION FOR ALL JUVENILE JUSTICE DATA	10
TABLE 2 - METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION	10
TABLE 3 - NAC/NRS CHARGES CAPTURED	12
TABLE 4 - USJR CASE TYPES CAPTURED	13
TABLE 5 - NAC/NRS JUVENILE DISPOSITIONS	14
TABLE 6 - USJR DISPOSITIONS	14
CREATE A UNIFORM METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION FOR JUVENILE PROBATION DEPT.	16
COLLECTION OF DATA ON ALL DELINQUENT CHARGES	18
DIRECT FILE AND DISCRETIONARY CERTIFICATION REPORTING	19
RECOMMENDATIONS	19
CONCLUSION	21
APPENDIX	22

Introduction

On February 15, 2011, the Nevada Supreme Court issued an order, under Administrative Docket (ADKT) 455, establishing the Commission on Statewide Juvenile Justice Reform (Commission). The Commission held its first meeting on June 9, 2011, at which time members discussed various topics including the need for centralized data collection for the Nevada Juvenile Justice System. Justices Hardesty and Saitta sent a letter to Commission members on July 12, 2011, asking them to provide the following information regarding their juvenile justice data collection systems:

- What data does the department/organization collect?
- Who is responsible for collecting and/or compiling the data?
- What specific and/or unique technological resources are used for data collection (e.g. software and hardware used)?
- What is the budgetary impact of data collection?
- How often is the data collected and analyzed?
- Who has access to the data that is collected?
- Is the information shared with others and, if so, who?

Staff from the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) collected and compiled responses from Commission members. The information was included in the September 27, 2011, meeting materials for further discussion. The Commission members concluded a subcommittee should be appointed to study juvenile justice data collection, including the review of statutes, rules, definitions, and the costs associated with establishing a unified data collection system. Carson City Chief Juvenile Probation Officer John Simms, now retired, was appointed chair of the Standardized Data Collection for Juvenile Justice Subcommittee (Subcommittee).

The Subcommittee developed the following mission/objective statement:

To study all aspects of data collection and dissemination for the juvenile justice system, including, but not limited to:

- a) Federal and State statutes and regulations and the Uniform System for Judicial Records;
- b) Identification of data needed or necessary to achieve the objectives of the juvenile justice system;
- c) Examination of fiscal costs and technology limitations for data collection; and
- d) A review of benefits derived and plans needed to implement a sharing of data among the various stakeholders.

Currently, juvenile justice data is collected by various branches for various purposes. Table 1 outlines both Federal and State requirements for data collection.

Table 1. Federal and State Requirements for Juvenile Justice Data Collection		
Requirement Federal/State	Organization/Department Data Reported to	Department responsible for data collection and reporting
Federal	Office of Juvenile Justice Dependency and Delinquency (OJJDP)	Juvenile Probation Departments
Federal	Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act	Juvenile Probation Departments
Federal and State	Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) and NRS 62H.230 (aka SB 232)	Juvenile Probation Departments
State	Nevada Revised Statutes Chapter 62H	Juvenile Probation Departments
State	Nevada Administrative Codes Chapter 62H	Juvenile Probation Departments
State	Nevada Administrative Codes Chapter 62H	Youth Correctional Services
State/Judiciary	Uniform System for Judicial Records	Nevada District Courts

Background/History Data Collection

The [Juvenile Justice Programs Office \(JJPO\)](#) falls under the direction of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS). The purpose of JJPO is to ensure compliance with the mandates and administrative requirements pursuant to the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP), as well as State of Nevada statutes and regulations. JJPO’s objectives are:

- To provide for a comprehensive system of compliance monitoring and related data collection.
- To maintain a financial mechanism to state agencies and general units of local government and private non-profit organizations using Federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) funds.
- To provide staff support services to the Department of Human Resources and the ten judicial districts to improve the juvenile justice system in Nevada.
- To maintain comprehensive juvenile justice planning, technical assistance, program development, and training capability.
- To provide technical assistance to the Nevada Juvenile Justice Commission.

During the 1997 Legislative Session, DCFS and the JJPO Office were given the task of establishing a standardized system for the reporting, collection, analysis, maintenance, and retrieval of information concerning juvenile justice in the State. The reporting requirements were codified under [Nevada](#)

[Revised Statute \(NRS\) 62H.200 to 62H.320](#), inclusive. JJPO worked with various stakeholders to develop the standardized system for reporting data, which is currently outlined in [Nevada Administrative Code \(NAC\) Chapter 62H](#). NAC includes specific codes for data reporting, many of which correspond to specific Nevada statutes. Data reported to the Division¹ includes delinquent acts against person, property, public peace and law and order, controlled substances, as well as status and traffic offenses. [NAC 62H.540](#) requires the Division to publish reports of the compiled data once in each calendar year, and once in each fiscal year. Each juvenile court and local juvenile probation department is also required to provide quarterly reports for each fiscal year, with information for each child referred to the court or department whose case is closed or wardship terminated during the quarter.

Nevada's Youth Correctional Services (YCS) report data to the Division separately from the juvenile courts and juvenile probation departments under [NAC 62H.300 to NAC 62H.450](#), inclusive. The data reported by YCS is specific to the facilities and programs provided by YCS. Data is reported by YCS to the Division via the [Unified Nevada Information Technology for Youth System \(UNITY\)](#). Additionally, regional facilities for the detention of children, as outlined in [NRS 62A.280](#), are required to report certain data that is specific to the facilities and programs to JJPO.

Data reported to the Division by the juvenile courts, juvenile probation departments, regional facilities, and YCS is more specific than the data reported to the [Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention \(OJJDP\)](#). The Division is able to extrapolate data reported from the NAC reports to create specific reports for OJJDP.

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (Federal Government)

Juvenile Probation Departments (Departments) are required to report data to JJPO pursuant to the Federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA) on certain delinquent and status offenses. This data may also include performance measures, which are required for Federal grant funding. The data JJPO collects from each Department is compiled and forwarded to OJJDP. The definitions provided by OJJDP incorporate selected terms used in FBI arrest statistics, the Juvenile Court Statistics Report Series, and the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement.

Disproportionate Minority Contact Reporting

The Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) report is an annual report that must be provided to the Federal Government. Each county in Nevada submits their DMC data to JJPO and the Office disseminates the information to the Federal Government. The data definitions for DMC reporting are the accepted definitions by OJJDP.

In addition, [NRS 62H.230](#) requires each Department to analyze information submitted to the standardized system during the previous year pursuant to [NRS 62H.210](#), to determine whether children who are racial or ethnic minorities, and children from economically disadvantaged homes are receiving

¹ [NAC 62H.040](#) defines "Division" as the Division of Child and Family Services of the Department of Health and Human Services.

disparate treatment in the system of juvenile justice in comparison to the general juvenile population. JJPO is required to compile a report² of the results annually.

Juvenile Sex Offender (JSO) Data Reporting

Departments are required to collect data regarding juvenile sex offenders (JSO) pursuant to [NRS 62H.220](#) and [NRS 62H.300](#). Currently, Departments report JSO data separately to JJPO as these youth are tracked throughout the duration of their JSO specific programming, and the data collected goes beyond the aggregate data currently collected pursuant to [NAC Chapter 62H](#).

Uniform System for Judicial Records³

On June 15, 1999, the Nevada Supreme Court issued an order, under ADKT 295, adopting the Uniform System for Judicial Records Court Statistics Project (USJR). The goal of implementing USJR is to ensure statistics are available to accurately measure the caseload of the courts, with implementation goals to eventually measure the workload of the courts. The Research & Statistics Unit is part of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) for the Supreme Court of Nevada. USJR facilitates the collection and compilation of consistent information and data concerning the filing and resolution of cases. This information is used to enhance the administration of Nevada courts, and statistics collected are used as an analysis and planning resource for the Nevada Judicial Branch.

USJR's "Phase II" of the collection of family and juvenile statistics began in July 2011. [Chapter 4](#) of the USJR data dictionary outlines the collection of data for juveniles and includes juvenile case category, case subcategory, and case type definitions. USJR collects data from the Nevada's district courts (or their designated court) regarding their juvenile caseloads.

Currently, USJR collects total caseload data measures from the trial courts about pending cases, new filings, charges, cases reopened, cases reactivated, and dispositions of cases by case type. USJR does not collect data regarding specific cases within the trial court system. Data compiled by USJR is published in the Nevada Supreme Court's *Annual Reports of the Nevada Judiciary*.⁴

Purpose of This Report

The collection and dissemination of juvenile justice data is vital to the proper and efficient function of the juvenile justice system. For example, data can identify crime trends, provide snapshots of the juvenile population in detention, and measure the effectiveness of programs and interventions. Data is used to develop budgets and may be used to determine where money is allocated and where resources

² The report is commonly referred to as the SB 232 report to the Governor. Senate Bill 232 was introduced during the 71st Legislative Session in 2001, and included the language that is now a part of [NRS 62H.230](#).

³ USJR's data dictionary can be found at <http://www.nevadajudiciary.us/index.php/viewdocumentsandforms/AOC-Files/Research--and--Statistics-Unit/Documents-and-Forms/>

⁴ The Annual Reports of the Nevada Judiciary can be found at <http://www.nevadajudiciary.us/index.php/viewdocumentsandforms/AOC-Files/Research--and--Statistics-Unit/2012-Annual-Report-of-the-Nevada-Judiciary/>.

are directed. Providing reliable and readily available data allows juvenile justice practitioners the ability to identify where they should focus their attention and resources. Additionally, the collection and dissemination of data should be a simple process, based on all the technology available today, but that is not always the case due to the complexity of what data elements need to be collected, how data is measured, and the costs to implement standardized data collection systems.

The Standardized Data Collection for Juvenile Justice Subcommittee (Subcommittee) held its first meeting on December 14, 2011, and determined it would approach the standardization of data collection in two phases. Phase I would be an analysis of data collection for delinquency and status offenses, and Phase II would include an analysis of data collection for performance and outcome measures. This report is for Phase I of the Standardization of Data Collection for Juvenile Justice and will provide an overview of the Subcommittee's discussions and conclusions regarding the various topics. The report will identify the steps the Subcommittee has taken to:

1. Develop a standardized data dictionary.
2. Develop a uniform method of data collection.
3. Develop uniform worksheets for data collection.

Uniform Dictionary with Juvenile Justice Definitions

Discussion

During the first meeting, the Subcommittee identified the need for a Uniform Data Dictionary (Dictionary) that would include juvenile data definitions from the [OJJDP](#), [NAC Chapter 62H](#), applicable [NRS](#), [USJR](#), and the DMC report. Currently, Departments have to go to various areas to find the definition that should be used when reporting their data.

The Subcommittee broke the definitions into sections and discussed each definition asking the following questions:

- Why are we collecting this data?
- Is the data being collected useful/helpful?
- Which definition should apply i.e., OJJDP, NAC, NRS, USJR, DMC to the data collected?
- Is there anything we are not capturing that we should be?
- Is there anything that we are capturing that we do not need to be?

Conclusion

While developing the Dictionary the Subcommittee found many of the definitions provided by OJJDP were broad; whereas the definitions provided under NAC and NRS are more specific. For clarification, an asterisk (*) was added by the source and *Preferred Definition** was noted for those definitions that are similar under OJJDP and NAC/NRS, and are reported pursuant to [NAC 62H.200 to 62H.320](#). Data that is required to be reported to the Division pursuant to the DMC report shall use the definitions provided by

the DMC report, unless otherwise noted. Data that is required to be reported by the courts to USJR shall use definitions provided by USJR, unless otherwise noted.

The Subcommittee concluded the Dictionary will assist the Departments in reporting data to JJPO and can be used as a reference for legislators, courts, and other stakeholders when interpreting the data JJPO is collecting and reporting. It can also assist USJR in identifying areas where a different definition may be used by USJR in data reporting when creating the *Annual Reports of the Nevada Judiciary*. Footnotes were added to the Dictionary where information collected may differ and for clarification of certain definitions and/or reporting elements.

The Data Dictionary is a living document, can be edited as warranted, and will provide for an improved collection and flow of data.

Additional Discussions Regarding Terms Included in the Data Dictionary

Minor in Possession, Consumption of Alcohol, and False Representation by Minor to Obtain Alcohol

Discussion

Currently, [NAC 62H.200](#), Most Serious Status Offense, includes reporting data pursuant to [NRS 202.020](#) (Purchase, consumption, or possession of an alcoholic beverage by a minor), and [NRS 202.040](#) (False representation by a minor to obtain intoxicating liquor). Under Nevada law the minor could be charged with a misdemeanor, which would be considered a delinquent offense but OJJDP currently considers all minor in consumption and possession charges as status offenses. The Subcommittee discussed this issue in length, including whether the two charges should be considered a status or delinquent offense.

Conclusion

There are other states that consider a minor in consumption or possession of alcohol and false representation by a minor to obtain alcohol delinquency offenses. OJJDP is currently reviewing whether or not they should change the federal classification from a status offense to a delinquent offense. As of the time of this report, OJJDP has not made a final ruling on this subject.

In the meantime, the Subcommittee recommends Departments continue to report alcohol related offenses for minors pursuant to [NRS 202.020](#) and [202.040](#) under status offenses. A footnote has been added to the Dictionary stating:

[NAC 62H.200](#) includes the list of status offenses as outlined in [NRS 62B.320](#) and [NRS 62B.330](#). Additionally, minor in possession, consumption ([NRS 202.020](#)), and false representation by a minor to obtain intoxicating liquor ([NRS 202.040](#)) are both included in [NAC 62H.200](#) and are reported to the JJPO as status offenses, although they are considered a delinquent offense in Nevada. OJJDP currently considers minor in possession and consumption a status offense so a footnote will need to be added when

reporting this data to clarify [NRS 202.020](#) and [202.040](#) are considered delinquent offenses in Nevada but for purposes of reporting the data to OJJDP the offenses will be reported as a status offense.

JJPO will continue to monitor this subject and will notify the Subcommittee and Commission of any final ruling from OJJDP on this matter.

Recidivism⁵

Discussion

During the discussions it was noted that the juvenile justice system has discussed and debated how recidivism should be defined and measured longitudinally for years but has never come to a conclusion. One of the reoccurring obstacles is the length of time recidivism can be measured for youth under the juvenile justice jurisdiction.⁶ There was a concern, based on the proposed definition, that the method of measurement would only track a juvenile for three years or until they were no longer under the jurisdiction of the juvenile system, whichever is sooner.⁷ The concern is the recidivism rates would be skewed based on this measurement because not all youth are being tracked for the same amount of time. For example, if a child commits their first offense and is adjudicated at the age of 17 and they reoffend and are re-adjudicated at age 19, they are no longer under the jurisdiction of the juvenile system; hence, the re-adjudication would not be counted as recidivism. If a kid commits their first offense and is adjudicated when they are 14 and they reoffend and are re-adjudicated at age 16 then this would be counted as recidivism. Therefore, if you have a district that has a large population of older youth adjudicated, and a district that has a large population of younger youth adjudicated, the recidivism rate might seem higher in the district with the larger population of younger youth.

The full Commission on Statewide Juvenile Justice Reform also discussed this issue at its meeting on February 2, 2013, and many of the same concerns that were addressed by the Subcommittee were raised at this meeting.

There was a concern that by using the timeline in the definition, and not tracking youth into the adult system, a dangerous precedent might be set by saying because a youth has turned 18, and has not recidivated the system has succeeded. It was suggested that the Commission look into this further to make sure the data that is being collected is real data in terms of whether or not the juvenile justice programs were successful and where real changes could be made.

There was a discussion that no matter how recidivism is measured there is always a potential for there to be holes in the data. For example, once a youth turns 18 they may move out of state or live in a different jurisdiction; therefore it might be difficult to track all youth once they turn 18 or are out of the

⁵ The Subcommittee is still discussing how violations of probation would be counted.

⁶ The juvenile court has jurisdiction over a child who is less than 18 years of age and a person who is less than 21 years of age and subject to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court for an unlawful act that was committed before the person reached 18 years of age. See [NRS 62B.300 to 62B.410](#), inclusive.

⁷ Based on additional discussions the Subcommittee removed the language "or until they were no longer under the jurisdiction of the juvenile system, whichever is sooner." The definition now reads, "Recidivism shall be measured by year subsequent to initial finding of delinquency for a time period of three years."

jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system. The Departments and courts would have to run FBI checks on all juveniles to try and track them past the age of 18, and even then all the information may not be able to be collected.

Conclusion

As mentioned earlier, the debate regarding how to measure recidivism for juveniles has gone on for many years. At the current time, it would not be feasible to track every youth beyond the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system. In order to do this, each Department would need to get permission from the FBI to run every youth through the [National Crime Information Center \(NCIC\)](#). This would require NCIC to have a full-time person to run the reports for Nevada, which would be cost prohibitive at this time.

The Subcommittee would recommend adding the following uniform definition for recidivism to the Data Dictionary as a starting point:

The adjudication of delinquency or conviction for any act designated a crime under Nevada Revised Statutes, other than a traffic offense except as specified in [NRS Chapter 484A.710](#), with which a child or an adult may be charged when the individual has been previously adjudicated delinquent.

For purposes of measurement, recidivism will be measured when an individual is re-adjudicated delinquent by a juvenile court or convicted by an adult court.

Recidivism shall be measured by year subsequent to initial finding of delinquency for a time period of three years.

The definition was developed based on information from the [Council of Juvenile Justice Administrators white paper, *Defining and Measuring Recidivism*](#), which outlined how recidivism should be defined and measured, as well as feedback from members of the Subcommittee.

Ms. Salla noted the data JJPO currently receives regarding recidivism is flawed because there is no common definition being used among the Departments. The concerns raised regarding possibly flawed data are legitimate concerns and have been noted. A majority of the members agreed the definition, as proposed, is a starting point, and once a baseline has been established JJPO could expand the definition as resources become available.

The Subcommittee recommended adding a footnote to the Dictionary that would state:

The definition for recidivism, as listed in the dictionary, is specific to those youth that have been adjudicated and have been re-adjudicated delinquent. The definition for recidivism does not capture those juveniles who recidivate after they have left the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system. It may be difficult for some jurisdictions to track juveniles past the age of 18, or once they leave their jurisdiction. Recidivism collected by the Division under performance measures is an overall system measure of recidivism, evaluating and measuring program outcomes on an

individualized basis. This level of measurement is required by the Federal Government for some of its grant funding and is meant to measure programs performance and may be different than the data collected under recidivism in the Data Dictionary.

The proposed definition for recidivism would allow for a statewide measurement for recidivism so all entities could begin reporting using the same definition. The Subcommittee recognizes this might not be the best number for internal CQI because it is not measuring recidivism beyond the jurisdiction of juvenile justice, but it will provide a baseline for the data. There is nothing in the definition that prevents Departments⁸ from tracking recidivism beyond the three years, or when a child leaves the juvenile justice jurisdiction.

The Subcommittee will continue to explore methods that could be utilized to collect recidivism beyond the age of 18.

Violations of Probation (VOP)

Discussion

The Subcommittee discussed the inclusion of collecting data for violations of probation (VOP). Currently, NAC Chapter 62H only includes data collection when holding the child for proceedings in a juvenile court in another judicial district; issuance of a bench warrant for the arrest of the child for a violation of any condition of probation; and violation of parole. There was a concern that this should be captured separately so that it is not reported twice.

Conclusion

The Subcommittee recommends establishing subcategories to capture violations of probation (VOPs) for jurisdictional reporting, making sure it is not imbedded in another category and that the same charges are not reported twice. VOPs could be added as subcategories under Administrative Charges to capture:

- Arrest of the child for violation of any condition of probation or parole.
- Violation of any condition of probation or parole that does not result in the arrest of the child and results in formal handling.
- Violation of any condition of probation or parole that results in informal handling.
- Violation of any condition of probation or parole that results in a technical violation.

⁸ Clark County Juvenile Justice Services is currently working on its own study of recidivism and will continue to track certain youth for three years beyond the juvenile justice jurisdiction, which they are able to do because of their robust data collection system. Other Departments do not have the same access and/or robust data collection systems.

Create a Uniform Method of Data Collection for All Juvenile Justice Data

Discussion

The Subcommittee reviewed the method of collection Departments currently use to collect and report data, as well as a review of the current Federal and State requirements for data collection. The Subcommittee discussed how Departments and YCS report their data to JJPO, and how the courts report their data via USJR. Table 2 illustrates the various methods used to report data.

Agency			
First Judicial District	JCATS	Access ⁹	Excel
Second Judicial District	JCATS ¹⁰		
Third Judicial District	AS400 ¹¹	Courtview	Excel/Word
Fourth Judicial District	AS400 ¹²	Excel	
Fifth Judicial District¹³	Own manual tracking		
Sixth Judicial District	AS400 ¹⁴	Access/Excel	Juvenile Justice Data Input
Seventh Judicial District	JJ Data Entry Format	Notepad	Access/Excel
Eighth Judicial District	FamilyTRACS ¹⁵	29 Crystal Enterprise Reports	
Ninth Judicial District	JCMS ¹⁶	UCS Excel CMS/Access data base designed for facility	NHIPPS (SAPTA internet based program)
Tenth Judicial District	JCATS ¹⁷	Software program provided by the State (Juvenile Justice input form-version 2.0) ¹⁸	

⁹ This is the data retrieval program to pull additional data from JCATS.

¹⁰ Owned and supported by Cayen Systems Inc.

¹¹ The District Court makes the final decisions regarding data collection and the financial responsibility.

¹² The Department’s diversion program data is entered into an Excel spreadsheet and manual calculations are used to develop reports.

¹³ Information is for Mineral County. Being a small local agency, our data collection resources are limited to State demographic reports, Mineral County school demographics, and their own manual tracking of delinquent and status offenses.

¹⁴ The Seventh Judicial District utilizes a number of programs including, but not limited to an Access program developed and implemented by William Jones, Assistant Chief of Detention. They are currently in the process of connecting with Brazo Technology which will give them the ability to link with other law enforcement agencies regarding citations, reports, and other statistical information.

¹⁵ FamilyTRACS has 50 high-level reports (daily, monthly, and quarterly)

¹⁶ JCMS is a data base the district created.

¹⁷ Used for annual DMC report.

¹⁸ Software program to submit statistics for State reporting has been inoperable for 2 years. The State is aware of the problem and has made multiple attempts to supply software that is compatible with their computer system.

Division of Child and Family Services¹⁹	Access/Excel	Federal Grants Management System	Juvenile Crime Database through Information Management System
China Spring and Aurora Pines Regional Youth Camp	Access Database designed for the facility	NHIPPS (SAPTA Internet based program)	MAYSI-2 Computer Program
Youth Correctional Services	Unified Nevada Information Technology for Youth (UNITY) ²⁰		

Table 2 illustrates the method of data collection varies depending on the type of software, or lack thereof, each jurisdiction has available. JJPO has created an Access Database that most Departments are using to report their juvenile justice data to JJPO. The State’s current data base for collection of Juvenile Justice data is antiquated, and there are sections of the system that are corrupt, and cannot be fixed. Below are the steps JJPO must go through to create data reports:

STEP 1 – DATA IS REPORTED BY JUVENILE JUSTICE DEPARTMENTS (DEPARTMENTS) TO THE JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS OFFICE (JJPO)

STEP 2 – JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS OFFICE INPUTS DATA COLLECTED FROM DEPARTMENTS

STEP 3 – DATA JJPO ENTERED IS FORWARDED TO THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE (NJJNC), RESEARCH DIVISION OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURT JUDGES

STEP 4 – NJJNC BREAKS DOWN THE CORRUPT CODES IN THE STATE’S DATA COLLECTION SYSTEM

STEP 5 – NJJNC RUNS DATA REPORTS ONCE THE CODES ARE BROKEN

STEP 6 – REPORT IS THEN FORWARDED BACK TO JJPO FROM NJJNC

STEP 7 – JJPO SUBMITS REPORT TO THE FEDS FOR GRANT FUNDING. REPORTS ARE ALSO PROVIDED TO THE NEVADA LEGISLATURE.

Nevada courts use specific worksheets developed by the AOC’s Research and Statistics Department for purposes of data collection pursuant to USJR.

Table 3 and Table 4 illustrate the difference in data collected by the Departments pursuant to NRS and NAC, and data collected by the courts pursuant to USJR.

¹⁹ DCFS is working on systematic changes to their data system.

²⁰ YCS reports data to the Division utilizing the Unified Nevada Information Technology for Youth (UNITY), which is Nevada’s Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS). The system has been operational since 2003.

Table 3. NAC/NRS Charges Captured
Crimes Against Person
Manslaughter/Voluntary Manslaughter
Involuntary Manslaughter
Sexual Assault
Sexual Seduction, Incest
Pandering/Prostitution/Solicitation
Lewdness/Exposure
Robbery
Battery with a Deadly Weapon, Intent to Commit Crime/Mayhem/Assault with Deadly Weapon
Battery/Assault (no deadly weapon)
Kidnapping/Imprisonment
Abuse/Neglect/Harassment/Stalking
Discharging Firearm/Aiming Firearm/Possession
Crimes Against Property
Larceny
Burglary/ Home Invasion/Burglary with Explosives/Possession of Instrument for Burglarious Intent
Trespassing
Vehicle Theft/Receiving Stolen Vehicle/Tampering with Vehicle
Arson/Explosives/Bomb Threats
Malicious Mischief
Theft, Possession Stolen Property
Fraud/ Forgery
Public Order
Sale/Furnish Alcohol to Minor
Disturbing the Peace
Possession/Manufacture Dangerous Weapon
Aid Escape
Contempt, Disobedience with Court Order, Perjury
Juvenile Traffic
Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol/Drugs
Failure to Stop at Scene of Accident
Other Traffic
Juvenile Delinquency Drugs
Trafficking Schedule I/Possession of Drugs/Possession to Distribute/Maintain a Place to Sale/Use Drugs ²¹
Cocaine
Methamphetamines
Lysergic Acid Diethylamide

²¹ These are each reported separately.

Heroin
Trafficking Marijuana
Status Offense
Desert, Abandon, Runaway
Habitual Truancy
Violation of Ordinance
Minor in Possession of Alcohol/Minor Loitering where Alcohol Sold
Gaming
Curfew
Tobacco
Administrative Charges
Hold child for court proceeding in a Juvenile Court in another Judicial District
Issuance of a bench warrant for the arrest of the child for a violation of any condition of probation
Violation of a condition of parole after institutionalization in a regional facility for children or violation of a condition of probation which does not constitute a crime
Violation of a condition of parole set by the Youth Parole Bureau of the Division which does not constitute a crime
NAC/NRS Data Captured from Youth Correctional Services
Date of Placement in and Release from Facility
Placement
Education Received
Vocational Training Received
Services for Mental Health Received
Services for Special Needs Received
Education or Counseling for Prevention of Drug and Alcohol Abuse Received
Training in Social Skills Received
Medical education or services received
Training on understanding position of victim of crime
Activities
Date of Placement on and termination of parole
Other Services Received or Activities Required
Level of Intensity of Services Received
Nature of Discharge

Table 4. USJR Case Types Captured
Person
Property
Drug
Public Order
Other Delinquency
Total Delinquency Petition
Status Petition

Miscellaneous Petition

The Subcommittee also found data collection for dispositions varied between what JJPO is required to capture and what USJR is required to capture. Tables 5 and 6 illustrate the differences.

Table 5. NAC/NRS Juvenile Dispositions
Referral Dispositions
Transferred for trial as an adult upon certification by the juvenile court
Proceeding filed directly in district court with no juvenile proceeding
Prosecution Deferred for the child to satisfy a condition set by the court
Released from detention and from further court proceedings and transferred to the jurisdiction of a public or private institution or agency
Unconditionally released or referred to receive services on a voluntary basis
Imposition of a fine, costs, restitution or a requirement to forfeit the tools of the crime, but no requirement for supervision
Assigned to the local juvenile probation department for probation
Placement in a regional facility for children or a facility for the detention of children that is administered or financed by the county, that has locked or continually monitored exits and that monitors and restricts the daily movements of the children placed in the facility. (Non-Secure Facility)
Placement in a regional facility for children or a facility for the detention of children that is administered or financed by the county, that does not have locked or continually monitored exits and that monitors the daily movements of the children placed in the facility on a random basis only. (Secure Facility)
Assigned to group or foster home or other residential placement
Assigned to custody of Division
Single sanction, the satisfaction of which releases the child from all further involvement in the system of juvenile justice in Nevada
Petition Dispositions
Adjudicated Delinquent-Child adjudicated delinquent and made a ward of the court.
Acquitted and Dismissed with Prejudice-Child found not guilty and the petition dismissed with prejudice
Adjudication deferred until child has satisfied a condition imposed by the court
Child adjudicated delinquent and committed to the Division for correctional care
Petition Dismissed-Plea Bargain –Petition was dismissed because the child accepted a plea bargain on another petition
Petition Dismissed after the child satisfied a condition of the court

Table 6. USJR Dispositions
Other Manner of Disposition
Dismissal/Non-Adjudicated
Adjudicated by Default
Adjudicated by Plea/Admission/Stipulation

Disposed by Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)
Waiver/Certify/Transfer to Adult Court
Transferred to Another Juvenile Court (before/during trial)
Grand Total Juvenile Dispositions
USJR Manner of Disposition Traffic
Other Manner of Disposition
Bail Forfeitures
Nolle Prosequi (before trial)
Dismissed (after diversion)
Dismissed (before trial)
Guilty/Admit Plea with Sentence (before trial)
Transferred to Another Juvenile Court (before/during trial)
USJR Juvenile Related Proceedings and Additional Juvenile Related Caseload Statistics
Total Number of Filings Event
Informal Hearings (Involving a Judicial Officer)
Detention Hearings
Extradition Hearings
Protective Custody Hearings
Remanded Cases
Bench (non-jury) Trials

Conclusion

After analyzing the method of data collection for the Departments, YCS, regional camps, and the courts (through USJR) the Subcommittee concluded it would not be cost effective or feasible to combine the method of data collection for the Departments, YCS, regional camps, and the courts. While the purpose of data collection between the Departments, YCS, regional camps, and USJR may be similar, each entity is measuring different variables. The data Departments, YCS, and regional camps report to JJPO measures their workload and offender behavior while the data being reported by the courts through USJR measures the court's case and workload only. The data elements the Departments, YCS, and regional camps are required to report to JJPO are more specific than data reported by the courts through USJR. Departments are required to track and report data on each individual youth, whereas USJR data is aggregate. In addition, the Departments capture data that is needed to report crime statistics pursuant to OJJDP and to qualify for Federal grant funding.

Data collected by the Departments pursuant to NRS and NAC is much more detailed than what is required under USJR. For example, data under USJR is reported for person, property, drug, public order, other delinquency, total delinquency petition, status petition and miscellaneous petition. The data is not broken out into further categories as it is under NAC. Data reported by Departments pursuant to NAC is categorized by person, property, public peace, juvenile traffic, juvenile delinquency drugs, administrative charges, status offenses and then further broken out into categories such as robbery, larceny, theft, driving under the influence, runaway, curfew, etc.

Reasons cannot combine method of collection:

- Departments need to collect individual data while courts collect aggregate data;
- Measuring different work/caseloads:
 - Courts are reporting general caseload and workload measures
 - Departments are reporting specific workload and offender data and behavior
 - Regional Camps report data specific to placement and programming
 - YCS reports data specific to placement and programming; and
- Courts report data via USJR while Departments report data pursuant to NAC via JJPO

Although some data elements may appear similar, each entity is collecting data and measuring different variables for different purposes and audiences. Additionally, data reported by the Departments to JJPO is a function of the executive branch while data collected by the courts, and reported to USJR, is a function of the judicial branch; therefore it would be difficult for USJR to oversee the data collection for the Departments and vice versa.

Create Uniform Method of Data Collection for Juvenile Probation Departments

Discussion

The Subcommittee discussed the feasibility of creating a uniform method of data collection for the Departments to use for reporting data to JJPO²² pursuant to State and Federal requirements. During the initial discussions the Subcommittee found jurisdictions use different case management systems. The Eighth and Second Judicial Districts have invested a substantial amount of money in robust data collection systems, while many of the rural courts have to rely on older case management systems that may not allow for proper and/or efficient data collection. JJPO receives data in various formats from the rural jurisdictions, which is then transmitted to JJPO via e-mail, fax, or regular mail. JJPO has to then manually enter the data that is collected from the Departments because their current software, and some of the rural Departments software, are not compatible and do not allow JJPO to automatically upload the data into their system.

There are ten judicial districts each reporting data to JJPO using a different method, which increases the potential for error in the data that is collected and reported. The Subcommittee understands that the State and counties are under tight budget constraints and asking for money to update their case management systems for data collection is not appropriate at this time. The Subcommittee discussed the possibility of creating uniform Excel spreadsheets where data would be collected and reported consistently to JJPO. Hans Jessup, supervisor AOC Research and Statistics Division, suggested developing worksheets similar to what USJR is using to collect data for the courts. This process is cost effective and

²² Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) 57 created a Legislative Commission Subcommittee, during the interim between 1997 and 1999 legislative sessions, to study the system of juvenile justice, including assessing the current level of compatibility between data processing systems within the State and local governments, relating to the tracking of juveniles. The workgroup also assessed the feasibility of developing an integrated data system to track juveniles across all State and local government agencies. Interim Study Report to the 1999 Legislature can be found at <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Publications/InterimReports/1999/Bulletin99-11.pdf>.

would not require each Department to update their case management systems. It would require JJPO to update their data collection system.

Concerns Raised

Mr. Jessup raised the concern that the current reporting hierarchy used by [NAC Chapter 62H](#)²³ is only capturing the most serious offense filed and adjudicated delinquent. The concern is that if a juvenile is charged with multiple offenses, the Departments would only be reporting the most serious offense which could skew the data results. For example, a juvenile is charged with theft (which NAC would consider the most serious offense) and trafficking marijuana. Under the current hierarchy the case would be reported and counted as a child petition under the theft case type and would show a charge for theft and a charge for trafficking marijuana.²⁴ If the case is then adjudicated delinquent the case would be counted out as adjudication for the theft. If in the same example, the theft charge was dismissed, and the juvenile was adjudicated delinquent of trafficking of marijuana, then the data would reflect the dismissal of the theft charge because it is the disposition of the “most serious offense” and the delinquent determination of the trafficking of marijuana adjudication would be lost. A proposed solution would follow the USJR reporting, which would capture the case filing as a theft case but report a second hierarchy of disposition, thereby allowing the delinquent determination but as a theft case. Mr. Jessup expressed the importance of reporting case filings and dispositions in the same case in order to avoid an imbalance of cases filed and adjudicated (i.e., Departments report 10 theft petitions filed and no theft adjudications, or report no marijuana trafficking petitions filed but 10 marijuana trafficking adjudications).

Conclusion

Ms. Salla and Mr. McBride met with Mr. Jessup at the Regional Justice Center on November 20, 2013, to view USJR’s current data collection system and determine whether or not a similar system would work for the Departments for the collection and reporting of data to JJPO. Ms. Jessup provided a hand-on demonstration of how the hierarchy for USJR is designed and how the courts report data using the USJR worksheets.

Ms. Salla and Mr. McBride provided the Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators (NAJJA) an overview of what they had learned when they met with Mr. Jessup. During their meeting on January 14, 2014, members of NAJJA discussed the proposed worksheets, which would count felony in and felony out. The proposed worksheets follow the hierarchy outlined in NAC Chapter 62H. The worksheets were designed to collect aggregate data only, and would not track individual youth like their current system does. The members of NAJJA concluded the proposed worksheets would not collect the type of data the Departments and JJPO need to collect as a State. There were concerns that the data being reported would not be accurate if the Departments were only reporting felony in and felony out. For example, if the Departments are only reporting based on felony in and felony out and a charge was dismissed or

²³ See [NAC 62H.150](#) for an outline of how the most serious delinquent act should be reported to the Division and [62H.200](#) for an outline of how most serious status offenses should be reported to the Division.

²⁴ The case is measured by the most serious offense based upon NAC but would still break out the number of charges that are occurring on a case.

pled down, then the data reported would not be accurate and it could appear that they are following the felony when the charge is really a gross misdemeanor.

Mr. Shick and Ms. Salla both noted they regret that the method USJR uses to collect data will not work for the Departments, and they appreciate all the work Mr. Jessup put into creating the worksheets.

The Subcommittee members agreed the proposed worksheets, similar to those used by USJR, would not work for the data the Departments and JJPO need to collect and report at this time. The Departments and JJPO will continue to research data bases other states are using to see if there is something that could be implemented in Nevada that would reduce the number of steps JJPO must take to create a report. In the interim, Ms. Salla and JJPO will continue to work with the Departments to collect accurate and concise data with the goal of implementing a unified data collection system.

Additionally, the Subcommittee had a general discussion about the hierarchy as outlined in NAC Chapter 62H²⁵. The Subcommittee recommends the review of the hierarchy, and asks the Commission for guidance in how this should be approached.

Collection of Data on All Delinquent Charges

Discussion

There have been discussions as to whether or not [NAC Chapter 62H](#) was capturing every possible delinquent offense. When NAC data codes were created, under [NAC Chapter 62H](#), the committee identified the most frequently charged delinquency offenses, therefore the Subcommittee acknowledges the Dictionary may not include every criminal offense that may be charged pursuant to statute.

Subsequently, if NAC were to list every possible delinquency offense the number of data fields that would need to be included would increase substantially, which could make the reporting of data more difficult because the Departments would have to go through multiple pages to report data and many of the delinquency charges would never be or infrequently be reported on.

Conclusion

The Subcommittee acknowledges there may be some delinquent charges that are not captured pursuant to [NAC Chapter 62H](#). The Subcommittee recommends including an “other” subcategory in each category, which will allow the Departments to report delinquency offenses that may not otherwise be listed. For example, under the category crimes against person you could be charged pursuant to [NRS 200.390](#), administration of poison. This delinquency charge is not currently included in [NAC Chapter 62H](#), so it would be reported as “other.”

²⁵ The Subcommittee did review all charges listed in NAC Chapter 62H and included a list of recommendations at the end of this report.

JJPO will monitor each Departments reporting of “other” and will contact Departments if there appears to be an increase of reporting in the “other” category to find out if the data reported includes a specific delinquency charge that should be added to NAC. A footnote will be added to the Dictionary encouraging Departments to contact JJPO if they notice their Department is consistently reporting on a particular delinquency offense that is not included in [NAC Chapter 62H](#).

Additionally, based on the concerns raised regarding NAC’s hierarchy, Ms. Salla has reached out to the Federal Government to clarify what data is required pursuant to federal funding and statutes.

Direct File, Automatic, and Discretionary Certification Reporting

Discussion

Currently, data collection for youth who are transferred to the adult court and youth who are direct filed are outlined in [NAC 62H.240](#), disposition of referral. The Subcommittee acknowledges there may be instances in which the district attorney’s office direct files on a juvenile, and the Departments, especially in the larger jurisdictions (Washoe and Clark County), may not be aware of the direct file. Direct file data is not required to be reported to JJPO.

Conclusion

The Subcommittee will continue to explore ways to collect data on juveniles that are direct filed pursuant to [NRS 62B.335](#), and recommends developing a method of data reporting in which data from the district attorney’s office in the larger jurisdictions could be reported to JJPO. Additionally, [Assembly Bill 202](#) was adopted during the 2013 Legislative Session, and creates a task force to study certain issues pertaining to juvenile justice, including the study of the laws in Nevada and other states pertaining to certification of juveniles as adults and offenses excluded from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. The Subcommittee will monitor the work of the task force to see if any recommendations come out regarding data collection for direct file cases.

Recommendations

The Subcommittee has developed a list of recommendations for the Commission on Statewide Juvenile Justice Reform’s consideration.

1. Approve the Uniform Data Dictionary²⁶ and allow the Juvenile Justice Programs Office (JJPO) to maintain the Dictionary.
2. Research other states²⁷ to find out how they are collecting juvenile justice data, including the type of data base they are using, whether a similar system would work for the Departments and

²⁶ The Data Dictionary was unanimously approved by the Commission on Statewide Juvenile Justice Reform at its meeting on March 21, 2014.

²⁷ The Juvenile Justice Programs Office has been in contact with Arizona’s Juvenile Services regarding their data system. The Subcommittee will designate a team to do a site visit in Arizona to see if their data system for juvenile justice could be implemented in Nevada.

JJPO, and the costs associated with the implementation of a statewide data collection system, including any necessary training.

3. A complete revision of NAC Chapter 62H including:
 - a. Review current hierarchy (e.g., data is reported on most serious delinquent offense).
 - b. Add Middle Eastern Decent to [NAC 62H.130](#).
 - c. Add an “other” subcategory to each category to ensure all data is reported even if it is not listed as one of the preceding subcategories.
 - d. Add “dismissal” as a subcategory to NAC for disposition of referral and petition.
 - e. Delete “with prejudice” from NAC 62H.250, disposition of petition, child found not guilty and the petition dismissed. Subcommittee concluded it does not matter if it was with or without prejudice.
 - f. Add “abeyance of delinquency” in parenthesis after petition was dismissed after the child satisfied a condition of the court in NAC 62H.250 disposition of petition. Some courts refer to this as abeyance of delinquency.
 - g. Change [NAC 62H.550](#) to require monthly data reporting instead of quarterly data reporting, with monthly reporting occurring by mutual agreement until NAC can be updated.
 - h. Update NAC where it references driving under the influence (TRAFFIC OFFENSES). The statute numbers have changed.
 - i. Add [NRS 205.300](#) “Embezzlement” to [NAC 62H.170](#). NAC does not currently require data to be reported on embezzlement charges but OJJDP does.
 - j. Add [NRS 62A.180](#) “Juvenile Courts” definition and [NRS 62A.190](#) “Local Facility” definition to NAC Definitions.
 - k. Add [NRS 200.485](#) under crimes against person as a new reporting code under NAC. [NRS 200.485](#) deals with battery/assault domestic violence [NRS 33.018](#).
 - l. Add [NRS 202.265](#) to NAC to track possession of dangerous weapon on property or in vehicle of school or child care facility. Would also need to add to worksheet for data collection.
 - m. Add [NRS 62B.335](#) as reference to [NAC 62H.240](#).
 - n. Add Marijuana offenses to NAC 62H.180, which would include NRS 453.096, 453.322, and 453.339.
 - o. Remove Substitution of a Substance from [NAC 62H.180](#). There is no statute to refer it to. If something like this is charged it would have to be charged under one of the other statutes listed under NAC controlled substance codes.
 - p. Remove code 35 for [NRS 62B.330](#) under crimes against property. [NRS 62B.330](#) is CHINS and is reported under [NAC 62H.200](#).
 - q. Remove NRS 202.810 referenced in NAC Unlawful possession of explosives in state building from [NAC 62H.170](#). NRS 202.810 has been deleted.
 - r. Establish Violation of Probation categories for jurisdictional reporting, making sure it is not imbedded in another category and that the same charges are not reported twice. VOPs could be added as subcategories under Administrative Charges to capture:
 - i. Arrest of the child for violation of any condition of probation.
 - ii. Violation of any condition of probation that does not result in the arrest of the child and results in formal handling.
 - iii. Violation of any condition of probation that results in informal handling.

- iv. Violation of any condition of probation that results in a technical violation.
4. Accept the definition for recidivism included in the Data Dictionary, recognizing this is a baseline definition and jurisdictions may collect recidivism data beyond the scope of this definition.
5. Develop a method of data reporting in which direct file data from the district attorney office could be reported to JJPO, particularly in the larger jurisdictions (Washoe and Clark County).
6. Change definition for “Juvenile Arrest” under the DMC report to read “Youth are considered to be arrested when they are apprehended, taken into custody, and processed by a law enforcement agency.” The current definition requires Departments report “juvenile arrest” when a juvenile is apprehended, stopped, or otherwise contacted by law enforcement. If a citation is not issued or the youth is not arrested the Departments would have no way of knowing if a youth was stopped or otherwise contacted by law enforcement.

Conclusion – Report

The Subcommittee acknowledges the collection of juvenile justice data is an evolving process. While the Subcommittee had hoped to recommend the adoption of worksheets, similar to those used by USJR, the members realize the collection of data is not always a one-size-fits-all process. The development of the Uniform Data Dictionary provides a first step towards a comprehensive unified data collection system for all Departments and JJPO. The implementation of a working data collection system for JJPO would require State funding, which would be an investment in Nevada’s youth. This improved data collection system would provide all Stakeholders a better picture of youth that come into contact with the Nevada Juvenile Justice System, at all levels, and would assist Stakeholders in determining where resources could best be utilized for the benefit of our youth.

APPENDIX

Standardized Data Collection for Juvenile Justice Subcommittee A Subcommittee of the Commission on Statewide Juvenile Justice Reform

Membership List

Scott Shick, Chair, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Douglas County Juvenile Probation
Hon. William Voy, District Court Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County
Alan Bates, Information Systems Manager, Ninth Judicial District Court
Frank Cervantes, Director, Washoe County Juvenile Services
Mike Doan, IT Manager, Eighth Judicial District Court
Craig Franden, Court IT and Infrastructure Manager, Second Judicial District Court
Wendy Garrison, Director, China Spring and Aurora Pines Youth Camps
Lynette Gust, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, White Pine County Juvenile Probation
DeVere Karlson, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Churchill County Juvenile Probation
Jack Martin, Director, Clark County Department of Juvenile Justice Services
Steve McBride, Deputy Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services-Juvenile Division
Tom Metscher, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Esmeralda/Nye County Juvenile Probation
Michael Pedersen, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Elko County Juvenile Probation
Pauline Salla, Juvenile Justice Specialist, Juvenile Justice Programs Office (JJPO)
Ed Sampson, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Humboldt/Lander/Pershing County Juvenile Probation
Roger Sayre, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Lyon County Juvenile Probation
Curtis Schlepp, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Mineral County Juvenile Probation

John Simms, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer (retired), Carson City Juvenile Probation was the Chair of the Subcommittee from November 2010, until his retirement in June of 2013. Scott Shick, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Douglas County Juvenile Probation was appointed chair of the Subcommittee in June of 2013.

Fritz Reese, Director (retired), Clark County Department of Juvenile Justice Services, served on the Subcommittee from November 2010, until his retirement in September 2012.

Carey Stewart, Director (retired), Washoe County Juvenile Services (retired), served on the Subcommittee from November 2010, until his retirement in June 2013.

Administrative Office of the Courts-Support Staff

Stephanie Heying, Court Services Analyst
Hans Jessup, Court Research Analyst
John McCormick, Assistant Court Administrator