

Steve Sisolak
Governor



Richard Whitley, MS
Director

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

DIVISION OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES
Helping people. It's who we are and what we do.



Ross Armstrong
Administrator

**Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission
Grants and Quality Assurance
Committee Meeting
February 23rd, 2021 at 2:00pm**

Meeting Minutes – DRAFT

Called to Order at 2:02 pm.

Roll Call:

Voting Members

Via Phone: Jo Lee Wickes (Chair), Eve Hanan

Absent: Alexis Waddell-Upton

Non- Voting Members

Via Phone: Eboni Washington, Sara Velasquez

Absent: none

Public via Phone: Lexi Beck

DCFS Staff Present: Leslie Bittleston, Jennifer Simeo, Kayla Dunn

Leslie Bittleston took roll and confirmed there was quorum.

Jo Lee Wickes: Thank you. Do we have any public comment or discussion? Hearing no public comment or discussion, we will move on to the next item in the agenda. I believe Ms. Bittleston had prepared and sent out as part of our packet, the updated COVID-19 statewide facility numbers.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, that is correct. I am not prepared. I did not have my document up.

Eve Hanan: Uh, Madam Chair? Eve Hanan for the record. Do we need to approve the minutes from last meeting first?

Kayla Dunn: Yeah, we skipped an agenda item.

Jo Lee Wickes: We did. I skipped an agenda item. Thank you very much. Let's back up. We do need to approve the minutes from the November 24, 2020 meeting before we move on to the other agenda items. Do I have a motion to approve the November 4th, 2020 minutes?

Leslie Bittleston: There's just the two of you, so.

Eve Hanan: I guess that's quorum. I move to approve.

Jo Lee Wickes: And I'll second that motion. Is there any discussion? All those in favor?

Committee: Aye.

Jo Lee Wickes: Anyone opposed? No. Okay. Now we're moving on to the COVID numbers. And it looks like the document was prepared through the end of January.

Leslie Bittleston: That is correct. At the beginning of every month, I request updated COVID numbers for the previous month, and this is a running total of all of the detention facilities, the youth camps, and the state facilities. As of January 31st, our positivity rate for youth was 5.83% and positivity rate for staff was 9.71%. There is a running list of the number of positives by month, by staff or youth, and by facility. So if you go down, we had quite a lot of positives [audio cuts off]

Sara Velasquez: It was like a one and done kind of thing. And also we don't know -- all of our youth were tested, but another instance with our nurse was also positive. And so we don't know if the samples were contaminated because the nurse was actually positive who was handling samples and stuff. So there's a couple of different opportunities for positive testing for the youth, unfortunately. So that was a fun couple of weeks there.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you, Ms. Sara.

Jo Lee Wickes: Is there a way that the facilities have to isolate youth that are testing positive?

Leslie Bittleston: Every facility is different, um, and depending on the facility layout and makeup, um, they may have an infirmary or medical area, like Summit View. So for Sara's facility, there is a medical section that can separate youth. Other facilities that do not have that type of layout separate by units or housing units or wing or something like that. And I don't know, Eve, if you were on the call yet, but my camera is broken. So I apologize for my black face. Broke yesterday.

Eve Hanan: No problem. Camera is optional, I suppose, too, as well. Well, actually --

Leslie Bittleston: Go ahead. I was done. Thank you.

Eve Hanan: I just wanted to note that the positivity numbers are lower than Clark County, at least in general. So that's good. You know, I assume that could be because there's diligent testing happening as well as being taken care to isolate people once it's clear they're infected.

Jo Lee Wickes: It might be also related. I know that the county, or at least some of them, so in Washoe county, if there's a new booking, they put them in quarantine for a period of time. And so I know that they're being very careful to try not to introduce anybody to the correctional facilities that are positive.

Sara Velasquez: I just wanted to say so that the county is quarantining. All the counties are quarantining. If I think about a week, depending on the county. And then we quarantine for five days when they get to the facility at our facility. So they're segregated. And to answer your question about some of you, because we had so many, we actually had a whole unit that was COVID. So we didn't have to do medical or anything like that. All the COVID had one of its own units. And it's the same thing at Caliente, they just had their own cottage and only staff that either had COVID or are in charge of the COVID unit are allowed to enter or mix with those youth. The state has a whole laundry list of

recommendations and requirements that you have to have for a COVID unit. So we had to work on a plan for that when we had the COVID in our facility. That was just rampant for that couple of weeks.

Eboni Washington: So in Clark County, we do have a separate housing unit, um, for the youth, and we're still quarantining all youth that come into our facility for two weeks. So I don't know if we'll be modifying that anytime soon, you know, based on the updated CDC guidance, but that's our process. And then we're also still doing a wellness screening for staff, for every DJJS employee, regardless of which building or facility are assigned to.

Jo Lee Wickes: Any other discussion regarding the COVID update? Hearing none, moving on to item number six is the overview of the correctional program checklist results.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Since we last met, I believe in November, we were in the process of completing our last review of Caliente Youth Center, which has been completed. And there is no final report yet, the draft report for that just went out. But we do have final reports on the remaining facilities, which would be Summit View, NYTC, Nevada Youth Training Center, and the two youth camps, which I included as part of the documents for this meeting. For the purpose of not going over all of those massive reports, attachment 6.A, we're trying something different now for all of our numerous attachments. We're starting to number them. So attachment 6.A gives you an overview of what the facilities scored and we do have Caliente's score. So if you pull up that document, does everybody have that document or can find it? Okay, perfect. On table one, the facility comparison, the CPC result by facility from 2018 through 2020, China Spring has received three reviews. They are doing very, very well. CYC did not receive a review in 2018, but did receive one in 2019 and one recently for 2020, and they fell a little bit. NYTC did not have a review in 2018. They improved a little bit from 2019 to 2020. Spring Mountain has fluctuated a little bit, as they have had three reviews, and Summit View has also had three reviews and they've improved every time. So the way that the CPC is laid out, if we move on to table two, if you remember from Sara's presentation, uh, back in November, she talked about the different domains of scoring, and the domains are program staff, quality offender treatment, and then an overall score. So I provided the scores in each area for each facility, and then the overall score for the facilities. And just to let you know, most facilities found in -- excuse me, China Spring was found to be an in high compliance, CYC was in low. Am I right, Sara? Based on the score? Yes. She's shaking her head yes. Okay. And NYTC was moderate. Spring Mountain was moderate and Summit View was like a half a point away from moderate. Is that correct, Sara? Yes. Okay. She's shaking her head. So that is the overview of what we saw for the CPC reviews. The final reports, which I have attached for your reading pleasure, if you want something to read, it goes through everything. Sara is laughing at me. They're quite extensive reports that talk about what processes are in place within the facilities, what areas they did well in, what areas they didn't, the recommendations that the assessors have put in place. What I do not have currently is I do not have all of the facility improvement plans, which is really the portion that this group needs to review. So I hope by our next meeting, we will have the facility improvement plans to compare to the final reports. We just do not have those at this point. But that's kind of an overview of our CPC results for 2020. And I can take any questions.

Jo Lee Wickes: I don't know if there's a way to pass along my comments, but I thought the reports were very well-written and the one that stood out maybe the most is the one for Summit View. And I don't know if that's because I had more caffeine on board when I read it, but I thought that it was very, well-written easy to follow, easy to absorb. I hope that they are encouraged that they have really increased their score dramatically since their first review. I also thought it was interesting that one of the recommendations was the need to develop a policy outlining both inclusive and exclusionary admission

criteria, which is interesting since the state of Nevada takes who the counties send them for correctional care. And they've got to go to one of the three facilities. So exclusionary admission criteria, I would think would be very challenging since state's not in control of who they get.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah.

Jo Lee Wickes: But I thought the reports were very well written and it will be interesting to see the facility improvement plans, especially when they decide how to prioritize what during a period, I think of what will be an ongoing pandemic effort for a while.

Leslie Bittleston: Right. And I agree with you. They were very well-written and I don't know, Sara, if you want to add anything as an assessor, you know, Sara can't do Summit View, because she's Summit View staff. So, but she did participate at NYTC, um, Caliente, and China Spring. So I don't know.

Sara Velasquez: And Spring Mountain.

Leslie Bittleston: And Spring Mountain. So I don't know if you want to add anything to Madam Chair's comments.

Sara Velasquez: No, I'd just like to speak to the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Just as an auditor or reviewer, we are given a set of criteria that they would have to meet in order to get a point for that specific indicator. And that just happens to be one of the indicators, exclusion and inclusionary criteria just as there are a total of 79 indicators. And that just, yeah, the state gets who they get. But, you know, just speaking about some of you in terms of exclusionary criteria, some of you can't take females because we don't offer services to females. So that would be an exclusionary criteria. And you know, Caliente, they would take females and males, but also in regard to exclusionary criteria, like for instance, China Spring, they wouldn't take fire starters. So that would be their exclusionary criteria, or high violent offenders. So even though we don't have a choice on who we get, we can just, depending on which facility they get directed to, those facilities, according to the CPC, should have some kind of criteria so that we can -- and mental health is another issue because, you know, some of the youth that we're getting in the state system, none of the facilities have the services to offer these kids. And if we can put in writing that we don't have that, it's better for the facilities, just because we can upfront say we can't take care of the needs of these kids. So I went off on a tangent.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you, Sara.

Eve Hanan: I agree that these -- I have not read all of them, but as I've read through, I think that they're really thorough and clearly written, really easy to follow. I wondered in terms of, I guess, we'll see when we see the plans as they come back for, you know, increasing the benchmarks, how much the effect of the pandemic and budget cuts is going to impact, you know, what can be done. Because I see treatment as an area across the board where facilities are scoring lower in their overall scoring. And I'm sure, I don't know, perhaps Sara could speak to this. Is it partly due to what's available right now, at least? I'd just like to hear more about it.

Sara Velasquez: It's not really about what's available now. So in regard to Caliente Youth Center, Caliente and Spring Mountain actually, because Spring Mountain has been housed at the detention center in Las Vegas. So they've had pretty much their entire program eliminated like their wilderness program and things, same with Caliente. The CPC, it doesn't necessarily look at programming per se, but I'm

looking right now at the indicators. And to give you just kind of a reference, the program leadership and development, there's 14 indicators, staff characteristics, there's 11 indicators offender, there's eight indicators, treatment, there's 32 indicators. So for the treatment section, there has to, you know, to get 32 -- so 50% would be 16. And these things range from just how many targets are you reaching? So targets would be substance use or family planning or family values. Just all of the different targets that you're trying to program to. Do you have program manuals? Do you have an overall program manual for the facility? Or do you just, when you do have programs, does each facilitator use the program manual to fidelity? Do you have punishers or reinforces stated and written down and do all the kids know what they can get or what they can't get? Are staff trained on negative effects of punishers? Modeling. A lot of the point, it's a big spectrum of things in this treatment category. And in reality, all of the facilities, number one, and our group supervisors for the state facilities are expected to be security, teachers, models, coaches, and everything like that. So if they're not programming effectively, according to the CPC, you know, what, what more can we ask our group supervisors to do? So let me just, I'm counting. Modeling, skill training, graduated practice, there's four different indicators, and if you're not doing any of those, then you're just not going to get the point for those. So they kind of fall on each other. So if you don't get this, you don't get that. And then you don't get the other thing. There's a lot of indicators that if you don't get this point, you can't get another point. And another part of that is the family trained. So we don't have the capacity to train families, especially since we're getting kids from all over the state in all of these facilities, but there's not really, I mean, we have virtual training ability, but with short staffing and everything else, are you really going to be able to train family? And that's not just one or two that's, you know, a lot of people. So there's just some things. And I know that further on down in the agenda, quality assurance is something that we're going to talk about, but some of these things are -- it's not practical that we will ever score a hundred percent on a CPC, let alone, like, you know, most of these areas we can do better in. But if you're not meeting the criteria, it's not going to show in terms of the scoring.

Eve Hanan: Thank you. That helps clarify the meaning of the numbers. That's really helpful. Thank you.

Jo Lee Wickes: Any other discussion on the final CPC report? Hearing none, I think we can move on to the discussion about quality assurance area and what's needed to improve, which we've kind of touched upon. Sara, there's additional information you think that we should hear about?

Sara Velasquez: So for the quality assurance area, there are eight indicators that could be scored, or there are eight indicators that are scored for quality assurance. One is internal quality assurance. One is external quality assurance. One is participant satisfaction, offender reassessment, whether recidivism is tracked, program evaluation, positive finding, and a program evaluator. So just in terms of across the board, the last three, program evaluation positive finding and program evaluator, in the near future and given budget restraint, I'm not seeing any of the facilities will ever get those points. So off the bat we're missing three of the eight. Recidivism track that would be more of a state practice. And I am not sure where we're there. Leslie, you can chime in if you want, but each facility gets graded on whether they track recidivism and the facilities as individuals don't. But I believe that there was a process in place are going to be a process in place for the state to track recidivism. And in order for the facility to get credit, they would just have to get those results shared with them by the state and look at them and read them and understand.

Leslie Bittleston: And when you're done, I can touch on recidivism.

Sara Velasquez: Okay. The internal and external quality assurance indicators, internal QA, I'll speak to some of you that is part of our facility improvement plan. And all of that really means is that you have

someone in the facility or a couple people in the facility reviewing youth files and records and checking out the programs, making sure that classes are being done by facility staff to fidelity. And then also just making sure that there's a plan in place to give youth feedback. And for all of the facilities, we have at least monthly CFT. So there is an avenue for internal quality assurance to be scored positively. It's just whether the facilities can meet that need. And also I'll speak just for some of you, because as some of you, we have case managers and that's their primary goal, is to make sure all of these things are happening, but the other facilities don't have those case managers to do that youth records and child and family team meeting thing. So we're putting it on other staff who it's not their primary job to do things like that. External quality assurance would be, if you have programming from an outside provider, do you have someone in there, not all the time, but regularly observing and making sure that they are using an evidence-based curriculum? Whether they're doing it to fidelity and just making sure that what programming going on is actually the programming that's supposed to be going on. And most facilities and camps -- or none of them I don't think got that. I don't know if it's a staffing thing or if it's just that -- because I mean, these were going on three years of this CPC. So most of the recommendations and all of the reports have been given this recommendation, but a lot of the facilities over the last year because of the pandemic, didn't even participate or didn't have outside providers coming into the facility. Participant satisfaction. That's one of the other indicators for the actual state facilities. They generally get this point because we do the performance-based standards program that PBS allows youth to complete surveys. And that is so they're able to discuss and talk about their satisfaction with the program. So I think for the most part, the facilities are getting that point, but that might be the only point that most facilities are getting. The last indicator that I didn't talk about is offender reassessment. And I think once the facilities have staff to get their CFT programs running smoothly, they'll be able to get this offender reassessment score. But again, it's something that has to be regular and ongoing and not just one here or there, but it's kind of one of those things where it has to be a practice in place to get the credit.

Jo Lee Wickes: With regard to external QA, is that related to, at least at the state level, the dichotomy between mental health services and who supervises that?

Sara Velasquez: We don't consider mental health and an external provider at the facility level because they are technically facility staff, they're just housed at the facility. This would be more of a substance abuse provider that's not staffed by the facility or mental health, or like a rape crisis center program or the boys and girls club that comes in to meet with the youth. So it's more outside providers. And it wouldn't necessarily be like a religious service. It would be -- even though they're coming in, but they're not technically providing a program per se, they're providing like a religious service. So it would just be someone who comes in and providing programming, trying to get the YLS scores down.

Leslie Bittleston: And Sara, just really quick on the outside providers, who would be the program evaluator for that? Would that be part of the outside provider or one of our staff? You're on mute.

Sara Velasquez: So those are two different indicators there. It's not the same. A program evaluator would be one person whose sole job it is to evaluate the facility or camp based on QA. And because I don't have it in front of me, I can't remember exactly what that entails, but it's like, that's the one doing all the data. That's the one doing all of, not necessarily observing all the groups, but ensuring that all of the criteria for that are met. So it's not necessarily the person doing an external QA, or not the person who would be QAing an external provider. It's different. Did that answer your question?

Leslie Bittleston: I think what I'm trying to figure out is, the big piece that we're missing internally is a QA program evaluator. That's what it sounds like to me.

Sara Velasquez: Well, it's one piece. I wouldn't say that the state is missing it or not missing it. It's just one piece of an eight piece pie.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Sara Velasquez: What I would say is the program evaluation and positive finding. So the CPC is not meant to get a hundred percent, like they tell you that up front, the trainers will tell you, no program has ever, or will ever get a hundred percent on the CPC. These are just the best practices that this university of Cincinnati put together to do this assessment. And their goal is not to get you to a hundred percent. The goal is to just to get better in certain areas. And in this QA area, I just don't know that we would get past like a 50-ish percent based on just the structure of the state, the different positions in the facilities. There is no position in a facility that who would be a program evaluator. An external QA person that could be the clinical supervisor that could be the head group supervisor that could be anybody who is in charge of programming. You don't have to have any certain credentials for that. That would just be that you're observing and making sure what's going on is going on. And that's what's supposed to be going on.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Jo Lee Wickes: Quick question. Do you know if China Spring and Summit View do CFTs?

Sara Velasquez: I know that Summit View does. I know that Caliente does. I believe that NYTC and Caliente do, I don't know about China Spring or Spring Mountain. They have a process, but I don't know if they call it a CFT or not.

Leslie Bittleston: And just to add to that, we the state are required to have CFTs. I don't know if the youth camps are required to have CFTs. So it is in our policies and procedures that we do it.

Jo Lee Wickes: Sara, when you look at table two of, I think it's the 6.A document that gives us the raw scores, the lowest score overall is for quality assurance. Do you have any specific recommendations other than the influx of more money to hire a quality assurance person at each of those facilities? Could possibly address three of those eight factors it sounds like. Do you have any suggestions for areas that you think should be considered on how to address the quality assurance?

Sara Velasquez: Hiring an evaluator would not fix three. It would fix one. The program evaluation isn't - it would be like an -- I'm sorry, I don't know your background, but it would be like a research study with a control group and a not control group, something that is an ongoing, not ongoing, but one point in time. And you would have to do this research study. I can't remember if it's three or five years, but it's one of those, it's very tedious. It's something that would have to be somebody's job. And I guess the program evaluator could do that, but it's more than what a program evaluator would be doing for their day job. So my recommendation isn't necessarily to get a program evaluator because I don't know that -- I guess when you asked that question, it's what does the state want to do? And in reality, I would focus on the first one, which is -- hold on, let me, I want to just make sure I'm looking at what I'm -- the internal QA, because that's what we want to focus on. So internal QA would be looking at the case files and making sure everything is happening that we want to be happening. And that involves youth records,

programming and participant feedback. So that is the core for the quality assurance that I would focus on, external QA. In reality, there's not that many external programs that would need to be quality assured in the grand scope of things. Like I know that we want to QA everything, but most of the programs are doing stuff in-house. Participant satisfaction is being done if the facilities are utilizing PBS. Offender reassessment, we are doing YLSs at the facilities at five months and they would get that point if they're on track, based on what the state is saying. But again, when we're making multiple people do multiple things, some things fall through the cracks. And as long as the state can figure out how to track that recidivism, and be able to share those results, I think that we're good. So I think like I would focus on the first five areas of quality assurance and not necessarily the last three. And I know I'm saying number one, two, three, and I'm looking at a list and you guys aren't.

Eve Hanan: Can you just remind us what the first are?

Sara Velasquez: The first five are internal quality assurance. The second one is external quality assurance. So I don't say focus on that one. So I focus on the first four. So internal, one is the internal quality assurance. Two is external quality assurance. Three is participant satisfaction. Four is offender reassessment. Five, recidivism tracked. Six, program evaluation. Seven, positive finding. And eight, program evaluator.

Leslie Bittleston: What does positive finding mean?

Sara Velasquez: Positive finding is if you've done that program evaluation, you got a positive finding. So that's one of those, of you don't get number six, you can't get number seven.

Leslie Bittleston: So we can focus on internal QA, participant satisfaction, offender reassessment, and recidivism.

Sara Velasquez: Yes.

Leslie Bittleston: Was there a fifth one?

Sara Velasquez: No, I said five, but I lumped external QA in that way. I mean, and it's not that we couldn't, it's just it's a lot harder to externally QA a juvenile sex offender's programming when those are one-on-one interactions with youth. But that there could be, so if you have external substance abuse providers that do groups, then you'd want to make sure that they're providing an EVP, evidence-based practice curriculum.

Leslie Bittleston: And I can talk about recidivism when we're done about QA.

Jo Lee Wickes: So if I'm understanding this correctly, from Sara's point of view, the state of Nevada at its three correctional facilities could make some progress on the indicators that she's just outlined, although not all eight of them, by focusing on those and thereby presumably increase the score for NYTC, Summit View, and Caliente. But that at least for Spring Mountain, it's up to Clark County in terms of their facility improvement plan, what they want to focus on. And that would be true also for China Spring.

Leslie Bittleston: That's correct.

Jo Lee Wickes: Okay. I just wanted to make sure I was clear on those issues. So I appreciate that.

Leslie Bittleston: I'm keeping notes for you, Jo Lee. It's a little messy. I hope you can read it.

Jo Lee Wickes: For the record, I have a little bit of use of my right arm after my shoulder surgery. So Leslie's going to help me take some notes so that I can hopefully fashion some minutes that are comprehensible. Or at least --

Leslie Bittleston: Review the minutes, because we do the minutes.

Jo Lee Wickes: Right. Just summarize it so that we have a record of all of that.

Sara Velasquez: So real quick about quality assurance, these low scores are not specific to our state. These are across the board. I just wanted to point that out. It's not just Nevada here that aren't doing this. It's just a really hard section to get a good score on.

Jo Lee Wickes: And did you have any questions or comments regarding the quality assurance area?

Eve Hanan: Yeah, I don't think so. That answered my question. So it's those four areas. And it does seem that it's more feasible to get improvement in those areas than to have than an external. At least I understand Sara's perspective on this, so that is helpful. Thank you.

Jo Lee Wickes: Any other comments or questions regarding the agenda item for number six with discussing quality assurance area and ways to improve?

Leslie Bittleston: I can talk about recidivism now or I can wait until later in the agenda where we talk about the governor's report. So whatever your wish is, Madam Chair.

Jo Lee Wickes: I think talking about recidivism now it makes sense, given the fact that we've talked about that offender recidivism tracking being one of the eight items.

Leslie Bittleston: So recidivism has been historically difficult to capture for several reasons. One of the biggest reasons is because data lives at the county level and lives at the state level. So that's number one. Number two is we do not have a link to the adult system. So it's very difficult for us to track youth that turn 18 after, you know, to see what happens to them one, two, or three years later. One of the things that the Data and Performance Committee is working on is trying to figure out how to do a link or create a link or to work with the adult system so we can track some of these youth after they turn 18 and we still have three years to track them or whatever. And then another reason why recidivism has been difficult is because definitions and measurements are very difficult. So if you remember back when the JJOC started and the group approved the definition of recidivism that was quite extensive and had like five areas that they want to look at, which were youth involvement. And excuse me, while I am kind of summarizing. So a youth's involvement into the system and then looking at their reinvolvement at one year, two years, and three years at arrest, adjudication, and a few different areas. That is a definition. It is not a measurement. So for those of us that live in a data management system, we have to do measurements. So for example, we have to say, okay, all youth who were arrested in 2019, we need to take that group of youth and then do a comparison to see if they were rearrested in 2020. That is a measurement. So just saying what it is, isn't enough to gather data. So there was a lot of reasons why we were not doing well in the recidivism measure area. With that being said, over the last year, we have been able to gather some recidivism data. I have requested from the counties that they provide data on two areas. One is rearrest and two is

readjudication. So what that means is taking youth that were arrested or adjudicated in the previous year and looking at that same group of kids to see if they were arrested or adjudicated in the next year. So we have kind of that 12 month recidivism measure and that information has been included in the governor's report, which when we get to the governor's report, I can point that specifically out to you. So that's on the county level. On the state level, we look at recidivism a little bit differently. We look at revocations for recidivism. And Sara, that would be a question for you to say, is revocation a good enough recidivism measure, or do we need something different? So we do have the revocations, and that information is in the governor's report, which is later in our agenda, which I will point out when we get there, unless Madam Chair wants me to point it out now, which I have to pull up.

Sara Velasquez: It doesn't specify how you should be looking at recidivism. I think as long as you have how you're defining your recidivism and it's being tracked, then that should be good.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. So I just pulled up the governor's report. And if you give me a second, I will identify page numbers specifically for recidivism. The governor's report is quite large. Recidivism starts on page 11 of the governor's report, which is document attachment 9.A. Hi, Jennifer. I see your face. My camera's still broken. Okay. Recidivism attachment 9.A, starting on page 11. In the italics that is the approved recidivism definition that the JJOC approved, and then table 12, recidivism measure number one is arrest versus rearrests. This is a county measurements, and I have it by county and overall. And our recidivism rate for rearrests is 11.39%. And this is a 12 month look back period.

Jo Lee Wickes: Could ask a quick question?

Leslie Bittleston: Sure.

Jo Lee Wickes: I know that as a result of more than a decade of work with JDAI, Washoe county Clark County, and I'm sure some of the other jurisdictions worked on police, officers not making an actual arrest, handcuffing, booking at the facility, but to proceed by doing referrals or citations. Do you know whether or not the "re-arrest" includes citations and referrals? In other words, a new case submitted by law enforcement that even if it didn't necessarily result in a, you're arrested handcuffed and taken to the facility for booking?

Leslie Bittleston: My understanding is that it is an actual arrest, which would mean -- and I think that we need to clarify what an arrest is. Being that I get this information from the county probation departments, it would be those youth that are brought in probably by local law enforcement that probably get booked into a detention facility. Not the ones that I think are brought in and they're just releasing them. I wouldn't call that, or I'm not sure that that's what is being captured here. I think it's those kids that are brought in that are being booked in a juvenile detention facility or something like that. I don't think this includes citations or anything like that.

Jo Lee Wickes: So the recidivism tracking doesn't include new involvement in alleged delinquent activity.

Leslie Bittleston: No.

Jo Lee Wickes: That's really going to be driven by the officer exercising his discretion to put the handcuffs on and take them up to booking.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. And again, that goes back to the measurement problems. You know, the biggest problem that we can talk about is all of the counties call a citation something different. All of the counties call a referral something different. Being that we cannot compare apples to apples, when we look at a measurement, we have to look at something that is comparable. And the biggest thing that's comparable is an arrest. We can start to look at referrals versus referrals or arrest versus referrals, if that's something we want to look at, but like I said, this is a work in progress, and this is the first year that we've really been able to get something on paper that shows some measure.

Eve Hanan: I can see the challenge here. I'm looking at our definition as well as recidivism. So I see the issue around arrests, but I also, what it makes me think is that the adjudication numbers are, you know, I think they're better numbers in a way. So what comes to mind is first of all, this, you know, choice that an officer has to issue a citation, to make a referral, or to actually physically arrest a child. You know, it creates a lot of variability, but then you also have some, you know, you don't have a sort of uniform practice of around what children get arrested for, you know, depending on the school or depending on the neighborhood or the police officer. Whereas adjudications to me seem to be, you know, one step along in the process and better indicators of recidivism, because, you know, you may have kids arrested who -- well arrests, even if we could decide on the definition of it, don't quite mean as much as an adjudication, you know, where a judge has, there's been some kind of resolution of the case, which says this child has been adjudicated delinquent or being given a different kind of disposition. So do you find that the adjudication definition and data is easier to get your arms around than arrest?

Leslie Bittleston: Unfortunately no, because I don't get any cooperation from the courts.

Eve Hanan: Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: Early on when I took this position one of the things that I realized early on is that we the state rely on county data that comes from the county probation staff. A lot of that data, especially around the court adjudications, and we also have other court measures, you know, like the number of youth with a defense attorney, the number of youth with the -- we still rely on the county probation staff to provide that data. Anyway, back up a couple of years when I try to engage with the courts to provide that data. And I had a couple of juvenile court judges call me and tell me that I was out of my mind, that there was no way that they have any staff to gather that data, and to work with the probation staff. So with that being said, this data is as good as what I get from the counties. Is it actual court data? No. And I would trust court data more than county data, but I'm just saying, that's what I get.

Eve Hanan: That sounds incredibly frustrating. Um, and I wonder if the data, I mean, just having the Tyler system in place, if there'll be a way to kind of at some point, get the data without relying so much on people who might not have the time or the inclination to cooperate.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah, that is a work in progress. We would have to get Tyler supervision to talk to the court systems. And I know in Las Vegas, and Eboni may be able to speak to this, but I know in Las Vegas they are working with, I think its Odyssey to have a link between Clark County and -- excuse me, a link between their Tyler supervision and Odyssey. So they should be able to get some accurate port data. But that doesn't mean the rest of the state is following suit. And I don't know, Eboni, if you want to talk about that or if that's in place yet or what.

Eboni Washington: We're still working on it. And so Tyler technology owns our case management systems, which used to be called caseload pro, and they own Odyssey. They're two different, you know,

teams of people or teams of programmers that support the systems. But we are still kind of stuck trying to coordinate with the IT staff that work for the court here to do some testing. We have made a little bit of progress, but still have a ways to go. We're close though.

Leslie Bittleston: So with that being said, going forward, I do not think we're going to be able to rely on accurate court data anytime soon. So we will continue to rely on probation staff to provide the best information that they've got. I hope that helps. It's not the best answer, but it's the honest answer.

Eve Hanan: Thanks. Do you think there'd be any use in getting data from the Department of Indigent Defense?

Leslie Bittleston: I don't know. And maybe that's a Madam Chair question. Does the Department of Indigent Defense, do they represent all of our youth?

Jo Lee Wickes: In Washoe County? We have a process that's been in place for decades, well before my tenure, where it is assumed that every child who's coming to court cannot afford a lawyer. There's never a court order actually appointing the public defender's office. It's just a matter of practice that the district attorney's office assumes that the public defender's office is going to represent every child where we file a petition. So unless we have advanced notice that the family has retained private counsel, we, in every single case, file the petition and provide the petition, the application for setting, a copy of the summons, and discovery to the public defender's office. They then a conflict check. And if they believe they have a conflict, they file a notice of conflict. And then all that information is transmitted to the alternate public defender's office. So in our court system, our youth does not come to court without an attorney, and we just assume by longstanding practice, that that attorney will be the public defender's office or conflict counsel. They also have a group of people who are under contract with the county to provide conflicts if both PD and APD have conflicts. My understanding, and Ms. Washington can correct me if I'm wrong, is that I don't know what the process is, but that the Clark county public defender's office represents the youth who are appearing in Clark county juvenile court. I don't know what each of the other counties are doing, although I occasionally get phone calls from defense lawyers and DAs across the county saying, how does it work in your court where every kid has a lawyer? So I believe that there are kids appearing in court without lawyers, and there's some subsections of the NRS that allow that to happen in some limited circumstances. I don't know that the state public defender's office is tasked with representing juveniles and juvenile delinquency hearings in those smaller counties where they don't already have a system in place for indigent defense. I don't know the answer.

Eve Hanan: The more I think about it, it is, you know, the department oversees and collects data, but it is, you know, the smaller counties have, sometimes appointed attorneys. And I agree with Ms. Wicks that we don't really know whether they even appoint attorneys in all cases, whether they should or not is probably another question. And then the other problem now I see is, if you're looking for data on specific youth, which is what you actually need for recidivism, you know, you can't get that from the defense attorney or the defense bar, because that's going to be client information for them. You might be able to get like general numbers of how many youth they've represented, like at the state public defender, or the Clark County, but you wouldn't get details. So I was just trying to think if there was another, you know, source of some information to fill out the data here, but perhaps that's not the way either.

Leslie Bittleston: Just to provide some additional frustration to this state, I've been to conferences where some states have, I don't know what they call them, but it's like research data people within their court systems, to provide this type of data, you know, the looking at the minutia and, you know, because

really the courts are the -- that's where the data is. That's where the accurate data is on adjudications. That's where all of that is. We here in Nevada just don't have that level of support in the court system. And it's really, really frustrating when I go to conferences and I see this really great court data that I can't even get a judge to be nice to me. So, you know, that type of thing. So I think that maybe going forward, we need to engage our courts, you know, to see if we can do something to have like a, what do you call those, a data warehouse or something where all the courts dump data into and maybe somebody to pull that data out? I don't know, it's just a thought, but I think that the most realistic and the best data, it lives in the courts.

Jo Lee Wickes: All the courts are required to present certain information to the AOC or Administrative Office of Courts. It's been a while since I read those annual reports and I don't know that there would be any way to squeeze out or tease out more detailed information from the information that the court has to provide to the AOC. There's a lot of challenges around that, in that, you know, for instance, take this example. A youth is arrested, referred, or cited, in that case is processed by juvenile probation, sent to the district attorney's office. We file charges. The youth goes to court with his lawyer. He admits, and the court enters dispositional orders. To me, adjudication can have two kinds of meanings. One is have the facts been determined to be true? Like are the facts adjudicated? Adjudication also has a very technical meaning in terms of, are you placed on formal probation in the state of Nevada by a juvenile court, versus are you on a supervision and consent decree? Are you sent back to juvenile services, or DJJS, or some other probation department for informal responses to you having admitted to the offense? Right? And so then, you know, does that count as an adjudication? Not only has the facts you've been determined, but like sentencing or disposition been entered. So from the district attorney's point of view, once I get a police report from RPD and I file the charges and we've been to court and the youth is admitted and we've entered sentencing orders, that whole case is closed by our records. The court, however, at least locally -- and I don't know what they're currently doing -- until that youth was terminated from probation, they were counting that as an open case. And so even if that youth never, ever has another court hearing, but they're on probation for 18 months, the court's going to count that as an open case under that way of doing business. And I'm not saying its right or wrong, it is what it is. They're going to count that as an open case for 18 months. So if you looked at the court's data on how many open cases do you have, and you compare it to my data, the only charging entity in Washoe County, our numbers are not going to look anything alike. And it's simply because of the way that we would say, well, this case is closed because it's gone to disposition. Now we can have, especially like in project one, we can have repetitive and repeated court hearings on a closed case because we have review hearings and review hearings and review hearings in some of the cases. Right? And so even though our case is "closed," we're still appearing in court every time that there's a hearing. So I don't know if there's a way to look at the reports produced by the AOC to see if there's any way to tease any data out, I'm guessing no. I don't know if it's possible for the state of Nevada to, you know, dialogue with the AOC to see if perhaps the courts could be encouraged maybe even to measure just a few things that would help resolve or move the discussion forward.

Leslie Bittleston: Right. And just to say, one of the things that the courts could really, really help with that we do not do a good job is, what is the arresting charge? What's the file charge? And what's the adjudication charge? You know, those things that -- and Jo Lee, were you at the meeting with, what was the name of them? The council for state governments when they talked about our high number of technical violations and we couldn't define them, you know, because we just say technical violations. Those are those charges that are plead down as parole or probation violations and other things. It's that substantive new charge. It's that type of data I think the courts would be pretty, or maybe that lives in the district attorney's office. I don't know.

Jo Lee Wickes: There's a statewide push that I'm not as familiar with as perhaps I'd like to be. The courts, at least in Washoe County, do not have that data that you're talking about. So in other words, when the police officers book someone both at the adult and the juvenile level, they have to use, what's called a NOC code. And so they're going to book and they're going to pick a NOC code. There's a statewide effort to do exactly the tracking that you're talking about, where you compare, what NOC code was this person arrested for? What were they charged with? What did it ultimately result in a disposition or sentence for? To see how that changes over time. And so the court's not going to know necessarily, at least in the juvenile world, they're not going to know because they don't track the NOC codes. And if a kid is arrested and released without a detention hearing, the courts never, ever going to know, they're never going to see a PC sheet, which would have the NOC code on it. In our county, my petition or anybody on my team that files a petition, we have to have a NOC code of what we're charging. And so obviously we have discretion over what we're going to charge, and sometimes we will charge exactly what the police officer has indicated on the PC sheet. And other times it's going to be wildly different. And sometimes there'll be a little bit of both. So I could reach out to someone in our office who tracks those things. I don't know how juvenile information along those lines is reported, but I do believe that there's a statewide effort. I'm sure there is, because we went through a major revamping of a NOC codes and I think they continue to evolve, frankly. So I would be shocked if a court ever had the data, at least at the juvenile level, if they ever had the data. And I would, I mean, I'll just tell you in Washoe County, the court's software program is beyond antiquated. It's abysmal. I don't even know if it qualifies for the word software. There's no way that Washoe county could provide you that data unless they had a person whose job was to -- you know, figure it out by hand and they don't have that person.

Leslie Bittleston: And I think that that's what I got from the juvenile court judges, the couple that I spoke to is, and the data that they do have, there's nobody to gather it. And so when I get asked all this very specific data questions, I'm like, I don't have that. I don't have that. I don't have that. And I think we're getting to the point we, and I'm not mean we, I'm talking legislators and decision makers are trying to get to deeper levels to try to help steer their decisions. So that's why we're getting asked for more and more specific data. So hopefully we can do something and we can probably talk about this all day, but yeah, so that's just one of the things. And maybe the courts are not the right place. We just have to figure out how to do a better job.

Eve Hanan: I do see that this, and at some point maybe this is something to take back to the full commission, this question of data, because it's coming up for us, but it's going to be a major issue for other committees too under the commission, getting like a disproportionate minority contact, you know, the DMC data and every, you know, it's all, a lot of it resides with the courts. And so if they're using some kind of software management tool, I mean, it's not Odyssey statewide, I suppose.

Leslie Bittleston: No.

Eve Hanan: But the data is whenever you put in a case number and a defendant's name and, you know, a charge and a disposition, it's got to be in there somewhere. It's just that if it's, it's not easy to get, it's not uniform. So, this is probably something that needs, I don't know. Does it need more legislation to kind of get to that point? Because it seems to me that a lot of that data is only going to be in the courts. Chairwoman Wicks mentioned, you know, the DA's decision about what to charge is one question, but then some of the other data is really going to reside just in the courts, I think.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah. I think this is a bigger conversation and maybe one that the JJOC needs to tackle. I don't know, but I don't know what the answer is. I just know that there's so many things that we can't provide because they live all over the place. You know, county data, state data, court, data, DA data, defense attorney, just all over. So everybody has a piece. So anyway, to finish the recidivism discussion, while I have Sara's face here, so Sara, if you move to page 14 of the governor's report, you will see that we have a state measurement for recidivism based on revocations and commitments.

Sara Velasquez: Which attachment is that real quick? Sorry.

Leslie Bittleston: It's attachment 9.A. That's 9.A as in alpha.

Sara Velasquez: Okay. And I'm going to 14.

Leslie Bittleston: Page number 14.

Sara Velasquez: Okay. What's your—

Leslie Bittleston: In table number 14, it says recidivism measurement, number one and number two. So the number one measurement would be the recidivism rate based on revocations 26.32. And as you can see, we have very small numbers. And then we decreased from 2019 to 2020. So our revocation decreased by 17% from 2019 to 2020. So those are the state measurements that we currently have. And I don't know if those will work with the CPC.

Sara Velasquez: I can get with you and read through the criteria necessary to meet that indicator if you want offline tomorrow. I don't have it in front of me.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Sara Velasquez: But again, I think as long as we're measuring some type of recidivism, if that's what the state is counting recidivism, and then shares that information with the -- I think with the facility would have to have a breakdown of their youth. So even though the state tracks recidivism, we might need to break it down a little bit further.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. I'm just taking notes. State recidivism may need to be broken down by facility.

Sara Velasquez: And even that's kind of getting in the weeds because for example, youth at Summit View have spent some time in the other facilities as well. So I don't know if they would get double counted or not only one or what.

Leslie Bittleston: Jo Lee, my notes are a mess, I'm sorry, but I'm going to give them to you anyway. So that's kind of it on the recidivism, what we've got in there. So unless there's any more questions on recidivism, we can move on, Madam Chair.

Jo Lee Wickes: We can spend a week on it. It's fascinating.

Leslie Bittleston: It is.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Weeks for the record. I just want to be clear. It looks like we have 16 minutes left in the meeting.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Jo Lee Wickes: Okay. And we would be -- so we have items seven, eight, and nine left. I'm wondering if we should, if there's -- I think item number seven is important, the evidence-based matrix, which is attachment 7C.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. And that is just a reference item to show you the 7C, and the JJOC should have seen this before it was voted on by the JJOC. And when Sara was talking about evaluating for evidence-based programs and services, this is the matrix that is approved by the JJOC showing what is evidence-based, what is research based, and what is evidence informed. So this is just a more reference for you to know kind of the difference between evidence-based, research-based, and evidence informed. And I know Ms. Hanan probably knows this well working for a university, it takes an awful lot of time to deem a program evidence-based. It takes four years my understanding at minimum. So I don't know if Ms. Hanan wants to say anything about that, but that's just to give you an idea of how we evaluate programs here in the state.

Eve Hanan: Not in that role, but on the strategic planning committee, I was part of the discussions around making sure that the evidence informed column was robust, because we do believe that there are, you know, many programs that, you know, staff people see working for kids, but you don't necessarily have data and you don't necessarily have the ability to test them. And you want to be able to innovate, right? So not just adopt things that other people that worked for them, but also innovate for the issues that might be unique to an area or population. So I think that's, I don't know, I like the table personally, so I'm glad that we've added that. I was worried if it was just evidence-based that it would really limit the ability to just have programming, if only interventions that have had studies done, that have been replicated, and show that they work, are the only kind of things you can ever do with children and receive the funding. Yeah, then that would be too limiting.

Leslie Bittleston: Right. And for our providers, our external providers, we hold them to a little bit of a higher standard. We hope that they are using evidence-based models because they're clinicians mostly. But this matrix really focuses on those programs that we are providing in house by our staff. You know, we use programs like forward thinking for example, which is an interactive journaling series. And we train just line staff how to do it. It's those types of things that we're talking about, is just making sure that we are providing the best programs we can for the kids, whether it's in-house or external.

Jo Lee Wickes: So, did I understand that this chart, including the very important column of evidence informed, has already been approved by the JJOC?

Leslie Bittleston: That is correct. It was approved back in 2018, I believe, and included in the strategic plan, the FY19 to FYI23 strategic plan. I've just provided it to this group, just to remind you that it's there. And that's the standard that we are using.

Jo Lee Wickes: Any other discussion regarding item number seven? Item number eight.

Eboni Washington: I'm sorry, I have a quick question. I'm sorry, Leslie, of I missed it. Did you say where we were with the approval process for the reg change?

Leslie Bittleston: Did I skip over that? Excuse me. My apology. I don't have the agenda in front of me. I was relying on Madam Chair, but the regulations, did I -- let me double check what I provided to you.

Eboni Washington: I think its attachment 7.B.

Leslie Bittleston: 7.A and 7.B. Attachment 7.A is the regulation change that was one of the regulations that came out of AB472. So AB472 required that DCFS, the state, evaluate facilities to ensure that they are providing evidence-based programs in services. Step one of that was to provide that matrix that we just went over. Step two was to do the regulations. So the regulations have been -- so we did hold two public workshops. Those are already completed. And this is the regulation draft that came back from LCB. And attachment 7.B is a change that we would like to present back to the LCB that says that we can use evidence-based or evidence informed. We want to follow the matrix, so this is just an amendment that we will be providing back to LCB. And then one step further. The next step of this process is going to public hearing, but that is on hold because we are in a legislative session. So to answer your question, Eboni, we are on hold until the legislative session is over, and then we will go to public hearing, but we already recognize that we do have a change to language that we need to make. You're welcome. She said thank you on mute, but I saw it.

Eboni Washington: Thank you for the record.

Leslie Bittleston: You are welcome.

Jo Lee Wickes: I apologize. That actually is on the agenda. It wasn't a bullet point, so I missed it because I had scribbled some notes there with my left hand, which are in comprehensible. Obviously I think the NAC is taking quite a bit of time and it sounds like it's going to take some more time being that focuses reasonably necessarily on the legislative process at this point.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Jo Lee Wickes: And we can keep our fingers crossed that the amendment, um, gets incorporated into the language of the regulation because otherwise we're going to be in a position where the regulation from DCFS is in contradiction to what JJOC has approved many years ago. So hopefully that will get worked out as time goes forward. We have about eight minutes left. So I think we should probably, if there's no other discussion regarding item number seven, move on to item number eight, which is the training for new CPC assessors that I think is still scheduled hopefully September.

Leslie Bittleston: And item number nine, just an FYI, is just a review of the governor's report that will be posted on the state's website. So there's really nothing that I'm asking you all to do unless you want to read it. And let me know if you have any changes. That's all for nine. So going back to eight, I can address two birds with one stone. Items, eight and nine. So item number eight, we are still on for CPC training in collaboration with Clark county juvenile services. Clark County has offered up a training room for free. So if this can be held in person, which we are hoping that all staff will be vaccinated by then with the COVID vaccine and we can hold this training in person. It is scheduled to be held either late August, early September, which will coincide with the next review of Summit View Youth Center. So the training will happen early in the week, and then the new trainees will collectively review Summit View Youth Center with the trainer, and they will be the one responsible for that review. Clark county and the state, Clark county will be providing for people and the state will be providing for people. Clark county and the state

are paying separately. It is roughly 23,000-ish, around there, for the entire training, which will be split evenly between Clark county and DCFS. And just to let you know, we are having some contractual issues with the training for this. Our previous training, the contract was directly with the University of Cincinnati, which is another governmental agency, so we were able to use kind of like a memorandum of understanding, a very informal contract. However, the University of Cincinnati now has a private company, which is their parent company, or this piece of the University of Cincinnati. So our contract process has greatly become harder. We had to do a request for bid, which of course we didn't get any bids because nobody does this training, but the University of Cincinnati. So our contract on the state side is not yet completed, but it is in the process and moving. And the good news is we have time. I mean, we don't need a finalized contract until it's finalized. We will pay half upfront, half of our portion upfront, and then half once the training is completed, that is the requirements of this entity that we training with. So that's an update overview. We just don't have the names of those that will be trained yet. I do know some interested people on the DCFS side, which would be good folks for the training. Sara could greatly use the help as an assessor. So that is the update for number eight.

Jo Lee Wickes: Any questions, discussions regarding item number eight? Hearing none, I think we should move on to item number nine. I appreciate the report, I did start it. I can't say that I read all 51 pages, but it seems like it's very thorough, what I have seen. Any discussion regarding item number nine? Item number 10. I think we can combine with item number 11, if there's any public comment or discussion. We've got three minutes.

Eve Hanan: Do you mind if I just go back really quickly to the evidence-based issue? I just was thinking about it. Is that possible to do?

Jo Lee Wickes: I think we can take -- this is open discussion time, so I'm comfortable doing that.

Eve Hanan: Okay. Sorry. I don't always know the rules of order, but I was just thinking about this issue here. So in the chart, the strategic planning committee proposed and the commission approved this other category of evidence informed practices, hoping that legislation would authorize it when we could advance that. And so I've liked the proposed change there, but Ms. Bittleston, I was actually wondering if there's another part of the statute that would need to have evidence informed in it too, and I could find the part and send you just the section, but it's the section that talks about the percent of programming that must be evidence-based by certain time periods by a certain time. It's like the benchmark dates.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. That is already in NRS. Yeah, it is. Oh my gosh. NRS 62B625, 30, 40, somewhere around there. Yes. So we don't need to put it in the regulation because it is already in NRS.

Eve Hanan: And does it allow an NRS to do the evidence informed and not just evidence-based or does it just say --

Leslie Bittleston: You know, it basically just says that the state will develop regulations. And I think if we say what we need say on the regulations, then we're good to go. And if you have a change to the proposed amendment, I am all ears for that. We just want to make sure we say what we need to say in the regulation.

Eve Hanan: I see. Okay. All right. I think that's fine. I'll take a look at it again, but is it -- yes, I will do that. All right, thanks. And I'll let you know.

Leslie Bittleston: Perfect. You can email me directly.

Eve Hanan: Great. Okay. Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you.

Jo Lee Wickes: Thank you, Ms. Hanan, for that. I think it's critical from my point of view that evidence-based include evidence informed. When we started down this path many years ago, we thought we were going to have some professional assistance in getting some of these local practices through the rigorous steps of getting them deemed to be evidence-based. And as sometimes happens in Nevada that fell apart because of funding issues. It would be catastrophic really bad, I can tell you from my perspective in Washoe County, if state monies could not be used for both evidence-based and evidence informed. I believe that Washoe county Department of Juvenile Services still uses most, if not all of the state funding for sex offender treatment, and it would leave us in the worst shape imaginable, in my opinion, for us to not be able to access those kinds of services. So I do think it's critical. I think it's also important that the state has the ability to pull funding, but they're not required to pull it. But I think we all want the best programming we can get for our dollars, because we don't have many dollars to spend. We need to spend them wisely still.

Leslie Bittleston: Correct.

Jo Lee Wickes: I do think that's important. We're now one minute over. So I don't think I need a motion to adjourn since I believe that Ms. Hanan and I will agree that it's time to shut this down. I appreciate all of you who have joined us today. We are a small group, but it's nice to have participation. So at this point in time, I think we will adjourn. Perhaps, Ms. Bittleston, you and I can discuss possible future dates. I don't see the need to have another meeting anytime soon. I think many of us are in the position of doing more than our day jobs and that includes legislative issues.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah.

Jo Lee Wickes: And I'm sure that Ms. Washington has numerous hats that she wears for her agency, as well as Sara, and all of us do.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. And I agree with you. I think we could probably wait until session is over before we meet again.

Jo Lee Wickes: Great. So maybe we can do a doodle poll or whatever those are called.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. But we can touch base soon about that.

Jo Lee Wickes: Everyone be well, stay safe. Take care. Thank you again.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you.

Eboni Washington: Thank you, you, too.

Eve Hanan: Take care, everybody.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay, bye.

DRAFT