

Supreme Court of Nevada
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

KATHERINE STOCKS
State Court Administrator



JOHN MCCORMICK
Assistant Court Administrator

Committee To Study Evidence-Based Pretrial Release

Date and Time of Meeting: Tuesday, September 23, 2025, at Noon

Place of Meeting: Remote Access via Zoom (link)

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83740887444?pwd=KdBxa2sGEcK8GbJRGioAQRsHATdNbm.1>

Meeting ID: 837 4088 7444

Meeting Passcode: 550388

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
 - A. Call of Roll
 - B. Determination of Quorum
 - C. Opening Remarks
- II. Review and Approval of Previous Meeting Summary*
 - A. August 4, 2025 (*Tab 1, pages 3-5*)
- III. Discussion Items
 - A. Review Updated Revalidation Scope of Work Options
 1. CGL Scope of Work provided by Caitlin O'Conner (*Tab 2, pages 6-9*)
 2. CJI Scope of Work provided by Jessica Hickman (*Tab 3, pages 10-13*)
 3. UNR Scope of Work provided by Jennifer Lanterman, Ph.D. (*Tab 4, pages 14-16*)
- IV. Future Meetings
 - TBD
- V. Adjournment

TAB 1

[Return to Agenda](#)

Supreme Court of Nevada
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

KATHERINE STOCKS
State Court Administrator



JOHN MCCORMICK
Assistant Court Administrator

Committee to Study Evidence-Based Pretrial Release

August 4, 2025

2:00 pm

Summary prepared by: Almeda Harper

Members Present

Chief Justice Douglas Herndon, Chair
Judge Stephen Bishop
Judge Melisa De La Garza
Evelyn Grosenick
Christopher Hicks
Chief Judge Kevin Higgins
Judge Kalani Hoo
Judge Danielle Johnson

Nancy Lemcke
Garrit Pruyt
Judge Randall Soderquist
Judge Ryan Toone
Judge Matthew Walker
Angelina Wencke
Stephen Wolfson

AOC Staff Present

Jamie Gradick
Almeda Harper

- I. Call to Order
 - Chief Justice Herndon called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.
 - Ms. Harper called roll. A quorum was present.
- II. Approval of Meeting Summary
 - The summary of the May 15, 2025, meeting was unanimously approved.
- III. Review Revalidation Scope of Work Options
 - Chief Justice Herndon opened the discussion to the members.
 - Judge De La Garza emphasized that vendors should gather data from both a justice and a district court, as well as from local law enforcement regarding failures to appear and re-arrests.
 - Judge De La Garza shared that Clark County is working with CJI because grant funds were available from the Clark County Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC). Clark County originally planned to include Las Vegas Justice Court and the District Court in its revalidation; however, the cost was too high, so the decision was made to focus solely on Las Vegas Justice Court.
 - Chief Justice Herndon responded that an individual revalidation based solely on Clark County would not be useful considering any product produced by the Commission will be mandated for use by all courts, rendering Clark's efforts unnecessary.

- Judge De La Garza suggested that Clark County share the information collected so far with the vendors for their study.
 - Chief Justice Herndon expressed skepticism, noting that the vendors will likely prefer to conduct their own studies and gather information independently.
- Ms. Gradick asked the attendees whether the intent was to collect data statewide or to use the same counties from the original assessment - Clark, Ely and Washoe - as recommended by Dr. Austin.
 - The attendees discussed the pros and cons of evaluating the entire state versus the three counties from the original assessment and ultimately decided to use the three original counties.
 - Obtaining information from all courts in the state will provide a more accurate interpretation of whether the tool is working for each court. The rural courts operated very differently from urban courts and have unique challenges that may not be addressed with the current tool.
 - Using the same three counties as the original assessment will ensure consistency.
- Chief Justice Herndon asked if the fee for the Clark SOW was larger than the allotted \$70,000 offered by the CJCC.
 - Judge De La Garza responded that it was not larger, but details are still being discussed.
- Attendees discussed whether district courts should be included in the assessment.
 - Many cases move up to the district court, excluding them may alter the data negatively
 - The tool is being used primarily by the justice courts. It's rare that district courts will be the first court to judge a bail hearing.
- Judge Bishop suggested measuring the level of supervision and resources devoted to pretrial as White Pine County does not have any.
- Judge Johnson shared that Esmeralda County has a high FTA rate regardless of using the tool. She has found that people who commit very serious felonies often score lower than those with traffic citations. Esmeralda County is also limited in resources.
- Judge Bishop asked what is meant by "validate" commenting that, originally, it encompassed two terms, accurately predictive and consistence. He suggested reviewing the factors involved in identifying the predictability.
 - Ms. Wencke commented that it's the difference between internal reliability and validity. Validity is evaluating whether the ten questions predict FTA and reoffence, versus the judges reliably using and sentencing based on the tool.
 - Chief Justice Herndon commented that the revalidation should ensure that the ten questions and related data are predicting what they were intended to predict.
 - Mr. Wolfson asked if the revalidation will address the difference in results between the judges and their sentencing.
 - Justice Herndon responded that a deep dive into the "why is not necessary. The goal is to analyze each question to determine which factors are most predictive of FTA and re-arrest, as outlined in task number five of CJI's scope of work.

- Chief Justice Herndon asked the attendees if the vendors should attend a future meeting to discuss their SOW.
 - A majority of the members agreed
 - All vendors should attend the next meeting, if possible, and prepare an update SOW reflecting gathering data from the three original counties
- Judge Toone asked if there were any funding considerations that would eliminate any of the current vendors.
 - Ms. Gradick offered to review the quotes with the AOC's CFO, Todd Mylar, for more details.

IV. Next Meeting Date

- TBD

V. Adjournment

- There being no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at 2:42 p.m.

TAB 2

[Return to Agenda](#)

Re-validation of the Nevada Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument

Scope of Work

Introduction

In 2016, the Nevada Pretrial Risk Assessment (NPR) instrument was developed as a customized tool designed specifically for Nevada's courts. The instrument was based on a comprehensive analysis of pretrial populations and tailored to Nevada's legal landscape, with validation performed on data from Clark, Washoe, and White Pine counties.

Since implementation, the NPR instrument has undergone modest adaptations, and there are currently two slightly different versions in use, as allowed under the Administrative Docket (ADKT) order. Given that the tool has now been in use for several years the Committee to Study Evidence-Based Pretrial Release is seeking to re-validate the NPR tool to ensure its continued accuracy and fairness.

This Scope of Work outlines the tasks and associated deliverables for the re-validation study. The study will be led by Wendy Ware of CGL Management Group, LLC, and supported by Caitlin O'Connor, who will serve as lead data analyst for this project. The Committee to Study Evidence-Based Pretrial Release has indicated that the re-validation should focus on the three jurisdictions originally used in the development of the Nevada Pretrial Risk Assessment (NPRA): Washoe County, Clark County, and Ely Justice Court.

Research Tasks

Task 1: Review Data Availability and System Capacity (Month 1)

- Meet with court staff, pretrial services, and information system personnel in Washoe County, Clark County, and Ely Justice Court to assess current data availability.
- Determine the format (PDF, paper, electronic databases) and completeness of risk assessment data.
- Evaluate whether data exports (e.g., CSV, Excel) are feasible or whether a sampling effort for a manual data entry process will be required for certain courts.
- Confirm which NPR version(s) are in use by each participating court and assess differences in versions.
- Confirm which NPR version(s) are in use by each participating court and assess differences in versions across the three jurisdictions.

Task 2: Develop Data Collection Strategy (Month 1)

- Define the study cohort, focusing on individuals assessed and released on pretrial status in 2022 or later within Washoe County, Clark County, and Ely Justice Court.
- Collaborate with court IT staff each of the three jurisdictions to extract assessment data, release information, failure to appear (FTA) data, and re-arrest records.
- If full automation is not possible, develop a random sampling strategy for courts using paper forms, ensuring the sample is representative.
- Design secure processes for the transfer of risk assessment forms to CGL for data entry and analysis.

Task 3: Data Entry and Preparation (Months 2–4)

- Receive and digitize assessment data from the three participating jurisdictions.
- Enter all assessment items, outcomes (FTA and re-arrest), and demographic variables into an SPSS database for analysis.
- Conduct thorough data cleaning and verification to ensure data integrity.

Task 4: Inter-Rater Reliability Testing (Month 4)

- Select a sample of 50 recent assessments across the three jurisdictions for re-scoring by a second pretrial staff member.
- Calculate agreement rates for each item and overall risk scores.
- Assess whether results meet acceptable reliability thresholds (90% item-level, 95% overall risk level).

Task 5: Statistical Validation (Months 4–5)

- Conduct bivariate and multivariate analyses to determine which factors are most predictive of FTA, re-arrest, and a combined outcome.
- Additional statistical analysis will be used to assess predictive accuracy of the NPR tool.
- Evaluate whether the current scoring weights remain appropriate or require adjustment.
- Assess whether additional risk factors (e.g., residency status, cell phone availability) should be incorporated based on recent research and Nevada-specific data trends.

Task 6: Presentation of Preliminary Findings (Month 5)

- Present initial findings, recommendations, and proposed adjustments to the Committee to Study Evidence-Based Pretrial Release and other stakeholders, with results specific to Washoe County, Clark County, and Ely Justice Court.
- Attend committee meetings (likely virtual) to provide updates and gather feedback.

Task 7: Draft Final Report (Month 6)

- Prepare a comprehensive report summarizing methodology, findings, reliability results, statistical validation, and recommendations for adjustments to the NPR instrument, with a focus on the three jurisdictions included in this re-validation effort.
- Provide the draft report to the Committee for review and feedback.

- Update the Nevada Pretrial Risk Assessment Tool Manual as needed.

Task 8: Final Report Submission (Month 6)

- Incorporate feedback from the Committee and other stakeholders.
- Submit a finalized report including:
 - Recommended modifications to the NPR tool (if warranted).
 - Updated scoring guidelines.
 - Updated scoring manual.
 - Recommendations for future validation intervals.

Timeline

- Total Duration: 6 months, pending Committee approval of start date.
- Regular status updates will be provided, particularly aligned with Committee meetings.

Costs

- Total Fixed Fee: \$35,000 (all-inclusive of labor, data processing, analysis, and reporting). This is a reduced rate, as similar validation studies typically range closer to \$50,000. The fixed fee remains the same even with the narrowed focus on the three jurisdictions.
- Travel for in-person presentations is not anticipated but can be arranged if requested, with additional costs negotiated separately if needed.
- An in-person training session for staff may also be arranged for an additional fee, based on the scope and scheduling of the session.

TAB 3

[Return to Agenda](#)

Proposed Validation Study Scope and Budget

Crime and Justice Institute

September 2025

The Crime and Justice Institute (CJI) at Community Resources for Justice welcomes the opportunity to partner with the Nevada Courts and the Committee to Study Evidence-Based Pretrial Release to determine the predictive validity of the Nevada Pretrial Risk Assessment (NPRA). CJI proposes conducting a validation study that investigates the NPRA's accuracy using data from the Second Judicial District Court (Washoe County), the Clark County District Court, and the Ely Township Justice Court. A proposed project summary, list of deliverables, timeline for completion, and cost for services, are included below.

Project Summary

The proposed validation study will rely on rigorous statistical analyses to determine if the NPRA accurately and consistently predicts risk of failure to appear and new criminal activity among individuals released during the pretrial period.

The validation will answer the following research questions:

1. Is the NPRA a valid instrument for predicting pretrial failure outcomes on a sample of individuals assessed across the three jurisdictions included as well as within each jurisdiction individually?
2. Do the current NPRA risk levels appropriately distinguish between increasing pretrial failure rates?
3. Does the NPRA predict risk of pretrial failure accurately and consistently for all subgroups (e.g., sex, race, ethnicity)?

The study will include descriptive frequencies for the sample population, correlations, area under the curve-receiver operator characteristics (AUC-ROC) analysis, and bivariate and multivariate logistic regression models to answer the research questions listed above. CJI will run analyses using a combined dataset from all three jurisdictions and will run separate analyses for each location. This approach will allow the Committee to understand the predictive validity of the NPRA on a statewide level and for local populations.

CJI will complete a virtual scoring fidelity exercise with staff to identify opportunities to improve consistency. Scoring fidelity impacts the validity of the NPRA and the fidelity exercise results will inform the quantitative analyses.

Deliverables

CJI will produce four deliverables for the proposed study:

- An executive summary to outline key findings and recommendations
- A brief report with findings from the localized and combined validation analyses, including scoring fidelity results and recommendations
- Appendices that include study methods, analyses, and output
- A virtual presentation of the key findings and recommendations

Timeline

CJI expects the validation study to take approximately nine months, depending on data availability and extraction. In the first two months, CJI will facilitate a kickoff meeting to introduce the study, submit a data request, and finalize the analysis plan. While the data transfers are in progress, CJI will conduct a scoring fidelity activity with staff to examine NPRA scoring consistency. After receiving the data via secure transfer, the CJI team will de-identify, clean, code, and restructure it in preparation for the analyses. CJI will also work with state leadership to create the required outcome variables as needed. The remainder of the time will be spent reviewing findings, preparing deliverables, and presenting the findings and recommendations. The table below shows the anticipated activities and month for completion.

ACTIVITY	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8	M9
Facilitate introductory planning meeting									
Sign data sharing agreements with relevant agencies									
Review and submit comprehensive data requests to all relevant agencies									
Finalize analysis plans based on data availability									
Assist agencies with secure data transfers									
Conduct scoring fidelity activity with staff to inform the validation analyses									
De-identify, clean, code, and restructure data									
Create required outcome variables (as needed)									
Run validation analyses									
Review initial findings with agency leadership									
Draft deliverables									
Submit draft report for feedback									
Finalize deliverables									
Present findings and recommendations									

Validation Study Cost for Services

The total budgeted expenses for this project include estimated costs for staff time required to complete the proposed work and supplies and software to support virtual meetings and presentations. A breakdown of costs can be found on the next page.

Total Cost: \$203,820

Crime and Justice Institute, a Division of CRJ
 Budget Detail: NPRA Validation
 Proposed Project Period: 9 months

This rate is good for three months from the date of proposal delivery

	FTE	Hours	9 months Rate	Cost	1560 Subtotal
Personnel					
Jessica Hickman, Manager	20% ✓	312	\$ 125.00	\$ 39,000	
Mei Yang, Senior Data & Policy Specialist	35% ✓	546	\$ 95.00	\$ 51,870	
Michelle Io-Low, Data & Policy Specialist	60% ✓	936	\$ 90.00	\$ 84,240	
Policy Specialist	20% ✓	312	\$ 90.00	\$ 28,080	
Subtotal	1.35				\$ 203,190
Subtotal Personnel					\$ 203,190
Supplies					
Supplies	Freq./ Months	Rate	Cost		
	9	\$ 30	\$ 270		
Subtotal Supplies					\$ 270
Other Costs					
Conference Calls, Live Meeting Software, statistical software	9	\$ 40	\$ 360		
Subtotal Other					\$ 360
Total Budgeted Expenses					\$ 203,820
Total Budget					\$ 203,820

TAB 4

[Return to Agenda](#)

MEMORANDUM

To: Nevada Committee to Study Evidence-Based Pretrial Release

From: Jennifer Lanterman, Ph.D., University of Nevada, Reno

Date: September 11, 2025

Re: Costs associated with revalidating the Nevada Pretrial Risk Assessment

I submitted a scope of work (SOW) and budget for a statewide revalidation of the Nevada Pretrial Risk Assessment (NPRA) in July 2025. Ms. Gradick contacted me in August 2025 inquiring how the proposed budget might change if we shifted the SOW from a statewide focus to a focus on Clark County, Washoe County, and the Ely Justice Court. I explained that I could explore the options with the College of Liberal Arts grants and contracts analyst. I also explained that there might be some limitations associated with relying solely on the Ely Justice Court rather than courts in all of the rural and frontier jurisdictions. One of the biggest factors in deciding whether we can produce meaningful analyses are the annual case processing statistics for Ely and how many of the defendants have had an NPRA conducted for them. As such, I asked if there any way to work with the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) to review preliminary data. Ms. Gradick explained that the AOC doesn't have direct access to individual court NPRA data because Nevada has a non-unified judiciary. At this point, I am unsure if there is a sufficient number of cases from that court to assess the predictive validity of the NPRA in rural jurisdictions without data from any other courts in rural or frontier counties.

After a discussion with the CLA grants and contracts analyst, it appears that the budget is relatively fixed due to 1) certain funding requirements (i.e., GRAs must be employed at 20 hours per week and have their tuition paid), 2) the separation of analytical and oversight responsibilities (i.e., my work versus the work of the research associate), 3) materials (e.g., software licenses), and 4) the vast majority of the data coming from the two urban counties. We have significantly reduced the costs of the project up front by 1) eliminating data collection travel costs, 2) choosing a platform to collect data that will not generate any costs to the state (i.e., NevadaBox), 3) using the state project F&A rate of 8% rather than the federally-negotiated F&A rate of 47%, and 4) including a research associate and a GRA rather than me, as a Professor, conducting the entire study, because the research associate and GRA have significantly lower daily rates than me. These design choices result in costs that are lower than you would pay to an independent doctoral-level consultant to conduct the study themselves or to subcontract the project out through their LLC. Rather, this estimated budget represents a good deal for the state—we will integrate

and analyze as much data as you can give us from as many jurisdictions as you can provide it for the same cost.

I am happy to answer any additional questions you might have about the SOW and budget.