



**Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission
Strategic Planning Committee Meeting
May 26th, 2020**

Meeting Minutes - DRAFT

Call to Order: Chair, Frank Cervantes called meeting to order at 1:00pm.

Roll Call:

(Voting Members)

Present: Frank Cervantes (Chair), Jennifer Fraser, McKenna Finnerty, Keven McMahill, Brigid Duffy

Absent: Egan Walker, Jo Lee Wicks

(Non-Voting Members)

Present: Mike Whelihan

Absent: William Voy

(Staff Members)

Present: Leslie Bittleston, Jennifer Simeo, Kayla Dunn

Meeting Minutes:

Kayla Dunn took roll and confirmed quorum.

Frank Cervantes: Okay, great. Do we have anybody from the public on the line? I hear none. So we will move right into Agenda Item 4, For Discussion, and Juveniles in Adult Jails. And I know that during the last legislative session, Assembly Bill 449 – is it 449 or 439, Leslie?

Leslie Bittleston: It is 449.

Frank Cervantes: 449, okay.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah.

Frank Cervantes: Was to establish an interim committee to study essentially juveniles in the adult system and there's some other elements, and so I know that we were going to have a discussion about that, and I don't know if anybody on the line has any updated information. I know that there were two hearings, one in April and one in May, but it doesn't look like there was any action taken that I saw. Do you have anything different on that, Leslie?

Leslie Bittleston: This is Leslie. No, I don't have anything different on that.

Frank Cervantes: And I know that Brigid is on the line as well. And Brigid, this bill looks a little bit like some bills of the past that the ACLU is involved in, in looking at kids that are in both adult jail, short-term, awaiting

sentencing on the outcome of their cases, and also in the state correctional system on actual adult sentences from being certified. And I know that we had a previous study similar during the Supreme Court Subcommittee on Juvenile Justice that looked at both regionalization of the State Youth Corrections and some of the adult stuff. And I just would open it up if anybody has comment on that, and I know Brigid was part of that as well.

Brigid Duffy: Yeah, this is Brigid. I – did you say they’ve already been working on this study? They’ve been meeting? I’ve not heard a thing about it. I mean I testified in support of it.

Frank Cervantes: Yeah, I haven’t heard anything. I just know that hold a couple things off, actually that’s the wrong one, no, so they haven’t done anything actually.

Brigid Duffy: Okay.

Frank Cervantes: I take that back. Those were the previous – previously, I had the wrong year. Yeah, that – I had never heard anything on that study. I know that was going to look at those topics and at least in Washoe County, I wasn’t contacted on that project, so maybe there’s been no work on it, not that I can see.

Brigid Duffy: Yeah, I know there was a – this is Brigid again, for the record. I know there was a presentation in front of the subcommittee, the Legislative Interim Committee, but other than that, I have not heard of anything moving forward regarding this study.

Mike Whelihan: Mike Whelihan from DJJS. Clark County hasn’t heard anything either from this study.

Brigid Duffy: Yeah, so I think we need to reach out. And it was ACLU’s bill with Holly Wellborn [phonetic], so maybe we can find out what’s going on with it.

Frank Cervantes: Okay. And like I noted, we’ve done quite a bit of work on this over the years, so there should be some existing information to take a look at in going forward.

Leslie Bittleston: This is Leslie. Just for the members, we did post in your materials Assembly Bill 449 for your reference.

Brigid Duffy: Thank you. I’m looking at it right now, Leslie.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Brigid Duffy: It’s very convenient for me to recall off the top of my head. [laughs] So –

Frank Cervantes: And so, Leslie, just for my help, you know, I see Jennifer, Kevin and is there anyone we haven’t typically worked with before on the committee? Just find out who we got on the phone.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay, we have Mr. Kevin McMahill, who is our law enforcement representative. We have McKenna Finnerty, who is a youth member representative. I can’t tell you McKenna’s background. McKenna, if you feel comfortable, do you want to share anything about your background?

McKenna Finnerty: Yes. So, I'm currently a student at the University of Nevada Reno, studying Criminal Justice and Substance Abuse Treatment. So that's why I'm passionate about Juvenile Justice and have had friends and family involved in the Juvenile Justice System as well.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. And then we also have Jennifer Fraser, who is I believe a public defender, Juvenile Public Defender, in Clark County. Is that correct, Jennifer?

Jennifer Fraser: Yes, that's correct. I'm the Supervisor at the Juvenile Public Defender's Office here in Clark County.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay, and then we also have Brigid, who is the, of course, the opposing legal counsel, the Prosecutor.

Brigid Duffy: Now, come on. [laughs] We get along more than we don't.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. But Frank, this is a new group for you, you know, this is – these are all new people than what we had in the past, so a little different group for you.

Frank Cervantes: Okay. So, I'll try to, you know, frame some of this stuff for our new appointees to the committee, and if you have questions or if I'm moving along and something doesn't make a lot of sense, please just ask me for clarification. And we have Leslie and Brigid. Some of us have done this for quite a long time, and so sometimes it feels like autopilot and I'll just move through it. But if you need me to slow down on something, please let me know. But I think for today's purposes, you know, we've been trying to get this started for some time, and I know that we're in the middle of a health crisis which is really interfering with a lot of work that some of us are doing on the Juvenile Justice Commission in our respective jobs. There's a lot going on at this time, so we will press forward with this. So, as I move into Agenda 5, just for your information, I think it was 2017, God, I'm losing time, a group called Council for State Government did an appraisal on Nevada's Juvenile Justice System and some of the recommendations that came out of that were a look at evidence-based programming, some validated risk assessments, and really an overview of how juvenile justice is administrated in Nevada. And out of that, you know, there was a bill that really encapsulated or codified some of these recommendations, and the Juvenile Justice Commission was really responsible for a lot of oversight and direction to the states and counties to aspects of this bill. And so, we've actually been at this reform thing for many, many years starting in 2004 with the JDI Juvenile Detention Project, which is through the Kasey Foundation. So, you know, reform and re-engineering our system is not new to Nevada. We've been doing it for a couple decades now it feels like, so if that helps bring you up to speed as to where we're at as a system, I think we're always kind of self-appraising where we've been, where we are and where we're going. So, you know, one of the requirements out of the Assembly Bill and CFG project was to develop a five-year strategic plan. And Leslie, I think they have that. Does everybody have what I have, Leslie?

Leslie Bittleston: I believe so. Kayla, we did post the strategic plan, is that correct? In the meeting material?

Kayla Dunn: Everything that – yes, JJOC Strategic Plan FY19-23.

Frank Cervantes: Yeah.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, that is – that's it.

Frank Cervantes: Okay, so what you have in front of you or on your computer is the 19-23 Strategic Plan. We commissioned On Strategy [phonetic], which is a public relations group, to help us navigate the completion of this plan. And so in there, you have five years of a set of metrics, vision and kind of what we were trying to do. And so why we have it on today's meeting is I think some of the discussion was to see what part of this strategic plan has been completed and what parts we still need to work on. And so, Leslie, I don't know if there is a – I'm not used to doing this stuff all on the computer and everything, so you know, kind of a streamlined way to let the group know, you know, what has been completed off that list and what hasn't.

Leslie Bittleston: This is Leslie, for the record. Let me just give an overview to the group of what this plan kind of looks like from start to finish. The first several pages is background information, planning, process data that we use to make decisions. And then starting on about Page 14 is the first piece of the strategic plan, which is the definition of what – or no, excuse me, it is the overview, the vision and the goals and the mission of the JJOC. And then, starting on Page 15, we define what recidivism means, and that goes on to Page 16. So, I think that that's right, Frank –

SPEAKER: [inaudible]

Leslie Bittleston: Sorry, go ahead.

Frank Cervantes: Go ahead.

Leslie Bittleston: Was somebody asking a question? I'm sorry. Okay.

Frank Cervantes: I thought so, but go ahead and continue.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. And then, so about the first 19 pages of this is really kind of background and the definition. Starting on Page 20 is where we start talking about the goals and what we want to accomplish with the Assembly Bill was AB 472. That was the big reform bill that was passed in 2017 that kind of morphed into the strategic plan. So, AB 472 is now gone. A lot of that stuff has been put into either statutes or into the strategic plan. So, I think, Frank, the best way would be to start on Page 20 and see if we go through each goal, have we completed it or haven't we?

Frank Cervantes: Okay. So, and I'll try to – I'll provide my version of the definitions of some of these things, and please, you know, feel free to interject for those who aren't quite familiar with them. So, like I said earlier, when we started looking at the system, you know, using data was important, consistent evaluation and review of that. And so over the years, each county has used an independent kind of screening tool to determine the level of risk for a youth in the community and what those needs or what we call responsibility factors were. And so, the primary goal and central to this project was how do you standardize the assessment process across all the counties in one state that would come out with similar recommendations for similar behaviors and needs on kids. And so, what we agreed to be an instrument called the Youth Level Screening Instrument. And it was developed at the University of Massachusetts. So, we agreed to use this instrument and we also agreed to utilize the training from Dr. Gina Vincent [phonetic] at the University of Massachusetts to come out and train a cohort of staff who would become, you know, the agency experts and also have the ability to train others on the utilization of validated risk and needs assessment tools. And so, if you – Leslie, what we could probably do is get the members, you know, some information on the YLS so they'll know when we have this discussion, it will look real familiar to them, and I would also encourage you if you want to reach out to your juvenile justice agencies in your jurisdictions, they should be able maybe to sit down and have a

conversation and really bring you up to speed. Or if we need to, at another meeting, we could do a Zoom and actually put this thing up on the screen and kind of go through it and explain what it is. It's really complicated when you look at how it's administered, scored, and then utilized. Once you get it, and trained, it's not, but if you haven't seen it before, it can be a little confusing. But we have actually initiated that, all of the counties are using that instrument, which in and of itself was a really big goal to accomplish. And I know, you know, Mike down in Las Vegas and his crew down there have been using this and some others as well, but we have everybody using the YLS. And so, for a state our size, that's a pretty good goal to accomplish relatively quickly in the middle of a five-year strategic plan. So, you have the YLS on board. We have our counties using them. Kind of a sub-goal of the YLS being actually utilized by the Probation Departments was to get this instrument or this tool inside of a new case management system called Tyler Supervision. And you know, we talk about data and how important it is and, I mean considering the pandemic we're in and in the future on any information at all, all you're going to get is a lot of data and metrics because it's so important to help make decisions. And so, we rely quite heavily on what our data tells you and how we operate our businesses down in Juvenile Justice. So, CaseloadPRO was a Juvenile Justice case management system that was agreed upon in AB 472 to be our standardized case management system. And I'm going to keep using the term "standardized" because that's a lot about what we were trying to do to shore up the state system. And so, Tyler Industries or Tyler Technologies bought CaseloadPRO and it's now named Tyler Supervision. Basically, it's a Juvenile Justice electronic case management system. And we have been marching down a path for almost – I think Clark County – are you into your third or fourth year, Mike?

Mike Whelihan: We're well into our third year.

Frank Cervantes: Okay. So, not a simple – Not a short-term project, so a lot of the counties are up and running, including Clark County. I think, and I'm not sure, Leslie, Washoe is not – we're still working to get up and running, but the end goal is to have one case management system and everybody is using the same instruments and putting that information into the same system so that when we're aggregating data, we can use it to help inform our decisions on kids, so it's much more standardized and less subjective on who gets what service and what is true risk. So those were lofty goals, and I think the commission and the counties and the Juvenile Justice staff have all done a really good job to get some of those things up and running in what I would consider short order, now that I've seen how long it can actually take to commission some of these projects. So we have the YLS, which is our risk assessment for community risk and needs. We have our case management system, that hopefully soon everybody has access to, and that's the go-to state system that all counties in the State of Nevada use for Juvenile Justice. Inside of that first strategic initiative on Page 20, I'm not sure if I'm seeing it here, and this is a – this will end up being a whole other conversation, but I just want to bring it up now because in the end, a lot of the other subcommittees will have to pass through the Strategic Planning Committee in order to get something basically ratified in front of the JJOC for the most part. So when the bill was written, AB 472, there was language in there about risk and need assessment. There was also language about mental health assessment. And some of us in the Juvenile Justice community were not on the same page on A, do you really need that instrument if the counties are using one, and two B, if you do, what instrument should we use? So, there was a little bit of confusion which is going to be sorted out through some of our subcommittees around an instrument called the MAYSI-2, and the MAYSI-2 is a tension instrument that's required by statute that is used on every kid who is booked into a detention facility and it assesses kind of acuity and suicide ideation, thought disturbance, and it measures for some other things that you're trying to gauge in real time is that young person at risk of harming himself in any way? And so, we use that across the state right now. And what happened during AB 472 and some of the discussions around mental health assessment at the probation level was, you know, we're going to take an instrument that we use at detention that some feel was designed for detention and some others don't, and should we be using that instrument at

the probation level when we are preparing to adjudicate young people for probation? So at the time, it was determined that the MAYSI would be the instrument to use at that level. Since then, there hasn't been full implementation of that instrument at the probation level because there was never a final decision. And now there's a question of should we even have an instrument at that level and should it be MAYSI, and there's some disagreement on that. That is being sorted out through the SAG Committee and I think the Risk Assessment Subcommittee, but I'm not positive on two of those. But that's a discussion that we will all be involved in as the commission goes forward, so just kind of throwing a lot of acronyms your way and stuff, but just know there's risk and needs assessing and there's mental health assessing and screening. And it's really important that we know when we're talking about it, it's a mental health screening tool. It's not diagnostic and it's not used for therapy and those things. It really is just a screening tool. And at a future meeting what I will do if you guys are interested, is I will bring one of our LCSW's or Licensed Clinical Social Workers, in an attempt to really articulate exactly the definitions and the purpose and scope around the MAYSI so it's not so abstract for you all because I've just kind of given you the 30,000 foot view of it. So, my or Brigid or Leslie, do you have anything on assessments for our new folks?

Leslie Bittleston: This is Leslie, for the record. The strategic, excuse me, the State Advisory Group Committee, the SAG Committee, is taking up this task and is working on identifying some possible screening tools to bring to the JJOC. So, this will be a conversation at the larger – the full Commission. But there will be some different selections brought by the other – the SAG Committee. I don't know if it will be at this July meeting or if it will be at the next JJOC.

Frank Cervantes: Okay, taking a little break, does anybody have questions or need some clarification? If not, I will just keep plowing through our agenda. So, Strategic Initiative No. 2 talks about our reporting policy. And so, you know, the goal was to bring in, as I said, the case management system and then as counties and states, they enter information from our respective jurisdictions into that system. And then the state required reports that Leslie gleaned are pulled directly from that system. And so until that system is fully operational and really proficient in what it does, we will still be sending Leslie, you know, a version of the information, but it's still the requested information. So, one county may be sending Leslie information directly through Tyler Supervision. We may be sending it through another portal or through just a, you know, a pdf. But the goal is that if Leslie pulls a disproportionate minority contact report, she should almost just be able to go hey, every month this thing automatically populates and goes to the state, and it makes it a lot cleaner and more consistent so that when we go back to report on the health of the Juvenile Justice System, that information really should just be pulled readily from the Tyler Supervision Case Management System. So that is a goal and that is a goal that has not yet been completed, so that's one that we will continue to report on and define exactly where we are in the project so that we can advise the full Commission on the status of when, if possible, that goal will be achieved and approximately, you know, what's the timeline. So those are some of the things we'll be trying to report on here in the next coming months to the JJOC. The case planning – so, if you look at Strategic Initiative No. 3, we start off with a YLS. We risk assess kids, you know, we look at their risk, we look at their needs and then we determine, you know, what's the case plan going to be to help them get better and exit the system? And so, case planning is really that vehicle that gets us there. And another standardization that came out of AB 472 in our initiative as part of the reform was, you know, can we get, you know, some similar looking case plans so that when we move kids from different parts of the system, you know, it can become quite mobile if you're moving from county to county or from county to state, that we're all looking at some similar reading the same language. So streamlining the case plan was a big part of that and I'm going to have Leslie help me because I know or I think we're close to having some of those case plans in Tyler Supervision, and I know that we did come up with a standardized case plan for everybody to use. It's

how we're implementing it and how it finds its way to the state is probably the part of the goal that is left. And Leslie, if you want to comment on that?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, this is Leslie, for the record. The Risk Assessment Subcommittee is no longer active because it accomplished all of its goals. It did three things. It selected the YLS, it selected the MAYSI-2 which you've – Frank has talked a lot about, and it also selected a case plan. So with that being said, that committee has disbanded and kind of morphed into a different committee called the Quality Assurance and Grant Committee, so that's of no importance here. So the fact that they selected a case plan and at the state level, one of the things that I have been working on is working with Tyler Supervision, which is the statewide vendor, to our case management vendor, working with Tyler Supervision to get all of these assessments that we need into the system. The first goal was to embed the YLS, the Youth Level of Service Risk and Needs Assessment Instrument. That instrument is now within Tyler Supervision and available for everybody to use. The second piece of that was to embed the selected case plan, the case plan that the Risk and Needs Assessment – or excuse me, the Risk and Needs Committee selected. And that case plan kind of goes hand in hand with the Risk and Needs Assessment. So, selecting the items off the Risk and Needs Assessment that the youth needs to work on, those items will then be transferred over to the case plan and that's all of the things that the youth need to work on. With that being said, we are embedding the case plan in Tyler Supervision as well, and we were down to two pieces of development before the case plan is completed. One of those pieces was to include a re-entry piece to the case plan, which you will hear about in a later goal. And the second piece was to assure that the case plan was properly identifying the risk of – the overall risk level of the youth from YLS to YLS. The YLS, you have to – just because you do a Risk and Needs Assessment, you have to redo a Risk and Needs Assessment at least, at minimum, every six months. So every time you assess or re-assess risk, you're going to update your case plan. So, the second piece that we are waiting for development is to assure that we are getting the previous overall risk level and the current overall risk level transferred to that plan. So, we're waiting for two more development pieces and then the case plan will be ready to go. Another thing I want to say that Frank described extremely well was CaseloadPRO. We are all using, with the exception of Washoe County, all 16 counties and the state are using CaseloadPRO. We are using the same platform, but currently the platforms don't talk to each other. So, like the state DCFS and Clark County are not sharing data. We are not sharing data across county lines and state lines. So what Frank was describing was configuring reporting mechanisms for each county so I at the state can just click a button and just pull that data. But that doesn't mean that we're going to have complete access to other counties' data and things like that, so we still have to share data across state lines and county lines. So we'll have to continue to share the results of the YLS and the case plan as we move kids through the system. So, we're close on the case plan, and I suspect another week or two and the case plan should be ready. But the YLS is ready and usable in the system. Are there any questions?

Mike Whelihan: I'd like to point out that the MAYSI-2 is in the system as well.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, the MAYSI-2, and that's a great point, Mike. The MAYSI-2 is in the system and available which is – and there's two pieces to the MAYSI. There is the general screening, which is 52 questions, and then based on the results of the MAYSI, there are six second-level screening assessments that can drill down in certain areas like substance abuse or suicide ideation or some other things. So, there's two levels. There's that screening and then there's that second level of assessment. But let's not confuse the MAYSI with the complete, full mental health assessment. The MAYSI is only a screening tool, and the second level is only a screening tool that digs a little bit deeper. So, screening tools only.

Frank Cervantes: Excellent clarification. Thank you for that.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Frank Cervantes: And then that gets a little confusing when that discussion occurs because there is quite a bit of difference. And so, you know, if we conduct a MAYSI this afternoon on a young person who is at our detention center, it could be determined that they need a full mental health evaluation and could end up being transferred to a local acute hospital or having somebody come in that specializes in mental health evaluation, which is real different than just the screening. The screening just guides us to the full evaluation, if necessary.

Leslie Bittleston: So with that being said, Frank, I think that for the most part, the case plan has been selected. We're just embedding it in CaseloadPRO. The state DCFS does have a draft case plan policy. As soon as it gets completed, we will be happy to share that with the counties. So overall, I would say that Strategic Initiative No. 3 is completed.

Frank Cervantes: Great. So a quick review, Leslie, for the group is that, you know, the YLS we can check off.

Leslie Bittleston: Uh-huh.

Frank Cervantes: It just needs continuous maintenance and training, you know, to keep it up to its fidelity. The MAYSI is in discussion, so we'll keep that as our not completed. Tyler Supervision, you know, since Washoe doesn't have it prominently completed, we can't quite check it off yet, okay.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah.

Frank Cervantes: I think the case plan we can check off and really focus on some of the things that require more attention. And there are some of these products that will be ongoing, like evidence-based programming, you know. We're probably not just going to have a library catalog of a bunch of different EBP's in the near future. That's something that we're going to have to continue to work on for some time to come. So some of these goals will just be transient. We'll just keep working on them until they're completed, or we'll just continue working on them until they're not, because some of them will just go on. So I think we have an idea now of what needs our attention and what doesn't, and so we'll figure out exactly how to track and follow those and we will report back to the group. So, the last part of the agenda, No. 5, is determine if there are new goals and objectives required. And I know that we talked about, you know, Assembly Bill 449 and the study for, you know, using the adult system. I think that would probably be considered, you know, a new goal, or at least something we'll be tracking and contributing to at some level. So as a group I think we'll have to decide as a subcommittee, you know, what we would like to look at, if anything, in addition to the elements of the strategic plan that have already been outlined. So, I would entertain any discussion on that if anybody has an idea if there's something that they think is not in our strategic plan that could be.

Leslie Bittleston: And Frank, really quick before the group talks, can I kind of talk a little bit more about juveniles in the adult jails? Just to give them a little more background on that because I think it's new to some of the people on this committee.

Frank Cervantes: Yeah if you want to go back to –

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Frank Cervantes: – No. 4, okay.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah. So, one of the things that I do as part of my job with the state, with the Division of Child and Family Services, is I oversee a Federal law called the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act. This act has been around since 1974 and has been reauthorized or revised several times over the years. The last revision was done in December of 2018. And one of the things that they did is they changed the language around adults in – excuse me, juveniles in adult jails. So for the purpose of this discussion, in your packet of materials there is a three-page handout that is titled, Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act Summary of 2018 reformed. So, there's that. So I'm going to give you a little background and I'm going to morph into this document. So, the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 created what is called Four Core Requirements. And the essence of this bill was to keep juveniles in the criminal justice system safe. So they created in 1974 four core requirements that they felt would keep juveniles in the criminal justice system safe. So those four core requirements are what are called, and I'm going to go into these a little bit more in just a second. One of those core requirements is sight and sound separation. Sight and sound separation is keeping juveniles and adult offenders separated if they're housed in the same facility. Another core requirement is to deinstitutionalize status offenders. And for those – McKenna, you may not know what a status offender is. I think everybody else does, but are you aware of what a status offense is?

McKenna Finnerty: Yes, I'm familiar with that. Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Perfect. Okay, so okay, deinstitutionalization of status offenders, jail removal and then racial and ethnic disparities. So to go over all four of those really, really quickly is racial and ethnic disparity is basically we as states need to do something to try to address the disparities that occur in our criminal justice system. That's adult and juvenile, you know, we see more black and brown kids in the system, you know, nationwide, so it just basically says states have to work on addressing that issue. So, that's core requirement No. 1. Sight and sound separation is keeping adult and juvenile offenders separated if they're in the same facility. The institutionalized – which means not lock up status offenders. And then jail removal. If we have to lock up a kid in an adult jail, we have a certain amount of time to get them out. So those are the four core requirements in their essence back from 1974. Over time, language has been changed, and this last reauthorization in 2018 really addressed the juveniles in adult jails. So, basically, if you go to the handout titled Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act Summary of 2018 Reformed, you're going to go down a little past half the page where it says, "sight and sound/jail removal." This is a brand – this is an update to what the Federal government requires that the states do. It says, "Not later than three years after the date of enactment, states are required to ensure sight and sound separation and jail removal of youth awaiting trial as an adult." This protection previously applied to only youth being held on juvenile court charges. An exception continues to exist for cases where a court finds after a hearing and the blah, blah, blah. What all of that means is prior to 2018, the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act only protected juveniles that were held on juvenile charges. It never addressed or looked at youth that were certified or direct filed into the adult criminal system on adult charges. So that is a big change and a big thing that the Feds are putting down on the states. And then I attached another one-page document, and I don't know what it's titled, but the top of the document says, "Guidance JJRA Revised Adult Inmate Definition." And you can see if you have it in color that there's some red attached to this new definition. And basically what that red says is a juvenile is a juvenile, whether they are held on adult criminal charges or juvenile charges. So we states can no longer house juveniles held on adult charges in adult jails or convicted as adults in adult correctional facilities. So, this coincides with AB 449. It just happens to come at the same time. AB 449 is really centered around the services and the education that youth are getting in adult jails and adult correctional facilities, but it just

happened to coincide, and I don't know if it was a coincidence or what. So, this youth and adult jails is really, really an important topic. Federally we need to figure out either how to get them out and get them out of adult jails and adult facilities and then the 449 talks about the programs and the education for youth. So, I just kind of wanted to give a little more background to you all to let you know why this is so important and why we really need to begin focusing on this because according to the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act, we states have to have whatever we're going to do completed by December of 2021. And that's not a lot of time, especially in Nevada. We do have roughly 20 youths already sentenced as an adult at the Lovelock Correctional Facility and we also have a pod of juveniles in Clark County Detention Facility in Las Vegas that are pending adult criminal charges, roughly 20 of those. So, we do have the issue in Nevada. So that's kind of a background on why this issue is important. We've got the Federal changes and this bill at the same time. So, I hope that I provided more of a well-rounded explanation of the importance and the why that we are looking at this.

Frank Cervantes: Yes, I agree with that. So, that is – that's why it's likely to stay – I don't know if we would term it a goal actually or if it's under monitor, but we'll sort that out and then agenize it; how's that?

Leslie Bittleston: Good. Sounds good.

Frank Cervantes: Move down to Agenda Item 6, Across Agency Collaboration.

Leslie Bittleston: On Page – let me help you, Frank. We're back on the Strategic Plan for those of you who are on the phone. It is on Page 26.

Frank Cervantes: So the first paragraph that gives a bit of a definition, it says by assuring that services and programs that youth receive are coordinated across agencies, providers, and organizations, youth will receive a continuum that is more effective.

Leslie Bittleston: Right.

Frank Cervantes: So, our Juvenile Justice System is, you know, underpinned by a couple things. It has a public safety wheel. It has a kind of service industry, so it's a little bit social work and a little bit law enforcement. And so, when you look at it from a social work model, when you're working with clients it's all of the services are wrapped around an individual and/or their family. And so that's one of the perspectives we use in the Juvenile Justice System is how do we provide a juvenile and their families services so as to keep them from escalating delinquent behavior or moving into the adult system? Hence, that's one of the ways you provide public safety is deterring future criminality. And so, you know, the – one of the newer models and it is wrapped around service is what they call it, but really, it's just standardizing how do you provide multi-systemic services for one kid and one family. And so, the Juvenile Justice System takes all of these different providers and kind of targets them towards the family and the youth who have been assessed in that YLS. And so, in the system, I think, you know, we've done that pretty well over the years. It's just putting it into a package, standardizing it, and making it that you can do some quality assurance on it. It's part of one of the goals of the JJOC's oversight on case management -- what does that really look like? And so, you start going all the way back. You assess with a validated instrument. You use these interventions that are evidence-based when applicable. And you target resources towards the individual and their family rather than just using a shotgun approach and saying I'm just going to send young James here to every class we have. Those days are really over. And I think you know, the idea of system collaboration is that if you're in, you know, Clark County, you should be able to call Clark County Social Services and say, we've got a kid in both systems. They are in

the Child Welfare Dependency System and they are also in the Juvenile Delinquency System. How do we bridge our services work together in a common goal? And that is what system collaboration really is. And so, again, some of these targets aren't really something you do and then you're finished with. They're continuous. We'll be working system collaboration for the rest of our careers if you're doing it correctly, because it requires in many cases more than one system to really provide the correct dosage and intervention for a particular kid and their personal risks and needs. So rather than going through all of that, that's a kind of a Cliff Notes version of what system collaboration is. It really is just getting the services to the right kid at the right time in the right way. That's, I think, a really noble psychological perspective that Nevada has been using for quite some time, and that's part of what I read in some of those system initiatives as part of the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission. I don't know, Mike, if you agree with that or have comment on that.

Mike Whelihan: Yeah, this is Mike Whelihan. We actually have a dual custody unit actually Brigid helped, and Jennifer helped that some of the staff created. So, we actually have probation officers and it's not Social Services down here; it's Child and Family Services. So, we actually have Family Youth Services working with our staff, so on kids that would be considered dual custody; we already do that. Also, I think the fidelity of the YLS is – one of the keys to it is you're going to check to make sure that people are actually following the validated risk tool and not going off script. So, I think one of the things we should be looking at is to make sure that people are following it and not doing what you said earlier and just adding things because they feel it's necessary and to follow what the score says because you already work with the school, the families and other providers when developing the YLS, so the YLS is the key.

Frank Cervantes: Yeah. You make a good point, Mike, not to overuse the word "strategic" but really, it's very strategic that you don't inundate kids and families, with services that aren't necessary. It gets in the way of, I mean what the real progress is, and I think that's why it's so important to have those relationships with the school district, your local mental health providers. Everybody has a role to contribute, and one of the difficulties is, and this is part of what Leslie's crew was working on is, you know, how do you quantify and track some of that? Those are part of what is encompassed under the quality assurance role of some of our initiatives. And so, those are the things, quality assurance and the new goals, that as we left the Commission in the change of Governors and it was suspended for a bit was when we came back, what does this look like and where are we headed? So, you know, and I'm just sharing, so I'm completely open to any feedback here is, you know, the goals that we've outlined here that have been completed, some are in progress, some really need a lot of work to finish, are a major strategy for us. Obviously, the Federal changes in those, you know, adult holds and kids in the adult system can require a lot of attention, and Assembly Bill 449, depending on what the interim study eventually makes recommendations, will have, you know, significant impacts on the Commission and particularly this subcommittee, since it's the planning committee. It is, I think, heavily involved in that portion of that bill if it moves forward. So –

Leslie Bittleston: And Frank, this is Leslie. I can kind of give the group an overview of what we think is completed and what we think we're still working on. On Page 26, No. 1, CaseloadPRO Phase 1 is completed. We still have a lot of work to do with Phase 2. Phase 2 is some of that data sharing and report creation, so half of No. 1 is completed, but the second part of No. 1 is still working on. No. 2, the QA reviews, the Risk and Needs Assessment Committee selected the Correctional Program Checklist, which is a validated quality assurance review tool. That tool is currently being used on space facilities and county youth camps. And Frank, one of the questions that we had talked about is are we going to move the CPC to the counties. So for the state and youth camps it's completed, but I don't know if you want to talk about incorporating it with the counties. Either we complete No. 2, or we change No. 2 to address it for the counties.

Frank Cervantes: My suggestion on that, Leslie, would be that we send Pauline correspondence, who is the President of NAAJA right now.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Frank Cervantes: And present that information to NAAJA.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. I agree.

Frank Cervantes: I'm not – Mike's remanded, and I don't want to speak on behalf of the rest of the counties on that, so I think the appropriate thing to do would be to confer with the counties individually in those jurisdictions and find out their interest in that.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay, I will do that, but No. 2 is completed. No. 2 may be changed if there is some thought from the counties with detention facilities if they want to participate in this rotation of quality assurance reviews. No. 3, Brigid is on the line, so she can update the group on this, but we are working diligently on trying to identify some of those performance measures that are a little strange to measure. Brigid, I don't know if you want to talk about performance measures with the group.

Brigid Duffy: Yes, hi, this is Brigid. Thank you, Leslie. So, we actually, as Leslie kind of introduced, my subcommittee has been working to clarify some problems within that statute, in some places within the statute, where we don't quite understand what specifically needs to be measured because the net can be really, really wide and really bog down everybody. So, we had a great meeting last week, piece by piece, going through all the problem areas. We intend to continue that meeting in a couple weeks to finish up just to kind of get more clarity so that every county is measuring the same thing because it can be interpreted a couple different ways. So, that's – I'm just going to give that little bit of an update because we haven't concluded what we're doing yet. But it was a great meeting a couple weeks ago, and I think a better meeting to come as we are now are kind of focused on our task at hand.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you, Brigid. And with that being said, that is not yet completed and is still in process. And then as we go on to Page 27, No. 4, Cross Agency Collaboration. This one, Frank, I don't know if we've done a lot of work, so this is probably something that needs to stay.

Frank Cervantes: Yeah, I think it's – again, sometimes what's the definition, right? I mean cross agency collaboration is a work in progress. It's an action that you don't just finish and complete it I don't think. If we're looking for a way to label it and define, okay, we've got this out. But it really feels like an activity more than a goal. And so, but we can talk about that. How does that look? That's kind of what I hear Brigid saying is sometimes, you know, when you're trying to quantify really subjective things like family engagement or, you know, conversations, it's really tough to sometimes put numbers on them. That's what we've been – and I say "we", we have all had that discussion at time to time here. And so, let's look at that one and see if there's another, you know, what that really means, right? Because again, I think that's what unless there's a breakdown, you know, in those collaborations, but I don't know that there is. We'll have to figure out what that means. I think it's a work in progress because if you look down, everybody, on No. 4, Cross Collaboration, they go through all the service, and the last one if the Department of Corrections. So, that's the discussion around a 15-year old sitting out in Lovelock, right, a kid that is juvenile by age who has been jurisdictionally transferred over to the adult system and sentenced and is now a part of the Department of Corrections. That is a relationship that will have to be strengthened as we go on with those discussions about how kids are

serviced, where they stay, are they youthful offender or the adults. Lots of questions on that. That's why that one is going to stay on our radar for quite some time. So, I would define it like that, Leslie.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Frank Cervantes: Unless you're looking for something different on that, I think that's pretty open ended for a bit.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah, I think the only thing we can do, like you said, is maybe define it a little bit better and maybe put some things underneath it like some more specifics, cause this is lofty, so I think if we're going to make progress we might want to put some action items.

Frank Cervantes: Yeah, and I think we – and maybe what we do is we provide some working examples like Mike was just talking about on his collaboration with health services agency or human services, you know, we have Project 1 here that the court services both of those kids. So, there are real time working examples of how that collaboration – but it really feels like an ongoing kind of activity to me.

Mike Whelihan: I'd also like to point out Clark County is doing that assessment centers called the Harbors. What we've done is we've identified a list of charges, first time offenders and some misdemeanor charges along with the district attorney and the PD that work with all the agencies except for DOC, and it actually works that this proportional minority, contact, all that stuff like that, so that is a good – if you look at that program that has a lot of these providers and things.

Leslie Bittleston: Right.

Frank Cervantes: And maybe what we could do, Leslie, is in our next publishing of documents is just put those in there in that column.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Frank Cervantes: I think that are completed or examples, and so you know, a really small jurisdiction may have something of their own. They're not going to have a Harbors, right, in a small rural community; it's not big enough. But this would be – that would provide some definition to what cross collaboration is so the reader would understand that.

Leslie Bittleston: Mike, I may reach out to you directly for a little more information on your child welfare and JJ collaboration and maybe like a better definition of your assessment center.

Mike Whelihan: Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you.

Frank Cervantes: All right. So, the second bullet that would determine cross agency partners. I think we know most of that. My question would be, Leslie, has there ever been an inventory, and I know we've done this exercise through all of our evidence-based programming and partnerships, that – cause you have most of the titles above, cross-collaboration including welfare. I think what's missing on there as a title would be nonprofit.

Leslie Bittleston: And I also believe schools are – oh, schools are there, nonprofits. I just saw it.

Frank Cervantes: Yeah, and you know what else is this law enforcement and, you know, we have officers that work with the gang – I mean there's – remember the Juvenile Justice System is pretty broad. It works, you know, with both sides of that kind of law enforcement, you know, human services, education. It's really in the middle of a lot of systems so –

Mike Whelihan: It should have the public defenders and the district attorney's office on there as well.

Frank Cervantes: Right. So maybe what we can do without creating a list seven miles long is we'll look at an inventory of all of the systems that we currently work with that would meet some definition and keep it under a broad definition of like Behavioral Health rather than every single mental health facility like you have, but make sure we're not missing the big systemic partners.

Leslie Bittleston: Right.

Frank Cervantes: The lawyers, the law enforcement, the court, right, so the –

Leslie Bittleston: What about private defense attorneys? Do youth have – or is it mostly just public defenders?

Frank Cervantes: Well it's both, and remember, you know, there was – and I can't remember what part of the – I think it was as part of the Juvenile Justice – remember there was a push to get Juvenile Justice training, Brigid, to the state public defenders and county DA's and to private attorneys who practice in the juvenile family setting?

Brigid Duffy: This is Brigid. I do remember that, but I don't know what happened to it.

Frank Cervantes: Yeah, and I don't know where it was under the offices of the JJOC. I just remember it was the discussion about legal training for the lawyers, and it's actually a really great question because you guys do it every day, but when a private attorney comes in that's not quite familiar it's so different than the adult system that there was – I don't know whatever happened to that.

But that was a discussion, Leslie, so you know, we'll keep that in our hip pocket in case we want to put that as a goal soon, but we also need to also recognize that, you know, we're in different times now and budgets are going to be affected. Things may look differently here for a bit, so we'll have to have our vision, but we'll have to look realistically at what the goals are.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. I got it.

Frank Cervantes: Okay, so New Business. Again, open discussion. Does anybody have anything they'd like to add? I know this is our first meeting and a lot of information in an hour and a half here, but open discussion if anybody would like to comment on anything.

McKenna Finnerty: Yes, this is McKenna. I actually had a question about sight and sound separation.

Leslie Bittleston: Uh-huh.

McKenna Finnerty: So in the event that we have a group of juveniles in the adult facilities, do we have in place already separate cell blocks for them or are we doing anything to ensure that the way they're not separated is just in solitary confinement?

Leslie Bittleston: That's a really great question, McKenna. And when we can start visiting facilities again, I think it would be beneficial if you accompanied me on a couple of the facility reviews, especially the adult jails, cause I think that would help a lot. But to answer your question, we do have convicted, meaning they've already been sentenced, youth, out at Lovelock Correctional Facility. That's the only correctional facility that we have youth under the age of 18, and they have their own cell block I guess you can say, their own area that they are at so there is no issues with sight and sound separation there. In Las Vegas, Clark County Detention Facility, same thing. There are about 20 juveniles, all males, there and it is also their own cell block. Unfortunately, we don't have any place for juveniles, so mostly we keep – juvenile females, so females generally stay in juvenile detention facilities, even if they are pending adult charges. It is the smaller jails that we really are more concerned about. Washoe County, where Frank is at, the Washoe County Jail, when they have a certified youth, they tend to keep that youth in the infirmary to keep them away from adult offenders and where they can watch them all the time. So, to answer the question, yes, there are separate cell blocks, but also these jails are very – they know what they have to do, and they have very good policies and procedures in place to keep adults and juveniles separated and if you can go out on a couple of reviews with me, I can explain it better because it's much easier if you can see what I'm describing. But it is part of my work. I do go out and visit adult jails every couple of years just to make sure that they are keeping kids sight and sound separated. So, that's part of my other job, making sure that our kids are safe in the state. So, I'd be happy to talk to you more about that offline if you'd like.

McKenna Finnerty: Yes, that would be great. Thank you for clearing that up.

Leslie Bittleston: Sure.

Frank Cervantes: And Leslie, it might not be a bad idea to do, you know, with the full Commission, you know, an update on this.

Leslie Bittleston: Oh, you think?

Frank Cervantes: I think, but, you know, we'll talk about it offline. It may be helpful.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Frank Cervantes: Yeah, we'll talk about that. So thank you for that question. And at this time, I don't have any tasks to assign anybody. I think we're getting grounded here after some time off, and I will have Leslie send out new time and date. Is there –

Leslie Bittleston: A Doodle poll?

Frank Cervantes: Yeah, that's probably the best way, yeah, let's do that. Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: All right. But how long do you want to go? Do you want to go two months?

Frank Cervantes: Yeah, when is the next full commission?

Leslie Bittleston: July.

Frank Cervantes: Let's go August, towards the end of August.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. And I will do some work in the meantime. I believe I have a Word version of the Strategic Plan so I can kind of redline the things out that we've already accomplished so we can see a different version of what's remaining and add some of the things we talked about.

Frank Cervantes: That would be great, give us kind of a to-do list and prioritize it a bit. Okay, great. Agenda 8, if there's anybody that's joined the conversation since the beginning, is there anybody from the public on the telephone line? I hear none. At this time, I would adjourn the meeting. I'd like to say thank you and welcome our new members to the subcommittee.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you, everybody.

Frank Cervantes: Thank you, everyone.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you.

Frank Cervantes: Bye-bye.

Leslie Bittleston: Bye-bye.

Meeting adjourned at 2:18pm.