



**Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission
Grants and Quality Assurance
Committee Meeting
May 28th, 2020 at 10:00am**

Meeting Minutes - DRAFT

Called to Order at 10:00am.

Roll Call:

Voting Members

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

Absent: Alexis Waddell-Upton, Mayra Rodriguez-Galindo, Ryley Harris

Non-Voting Members

Via Phone: Eboni Washington

Absent: Sara Velasquez

Public via Phone: none

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

Leslie Bittleston took roll and confirmed there was quorum.

Jo Lee Wickes: Thank you. Good morning, everyone. Happy Thursday.

Leslie Bittleston: Good morning.

Jo Lee Wickes: The first action item is number 4, Review and Approval of the Minutes for the meeting. It looks like we have reverted to what I think we used to do or the former commission that was in charge of grants, and someone did a transcript which - very thorough. I also had prepared a form that we used to report to the JJOC in - for the last couple of years, which is obviously a lot shorter, and I'm fine with the fact that there is a transcript. I don't know if - I don't think it's legally required, and so perhaps going forward, we can place that - we can have a discussion, perhaps, about what format the subcommittee would prefer to use. This item is to review and approve the document that was attached for the meeting minutes. It does appear to be a verbatim transcript of what was done. Do I have a motion to approve the minutes as attached?

Kayla Dunn: I'm sorry to interrupt, Jo Lee, but I'm not sure we're looking at the same thing. The minutes for the 4/20 meeting were put in minute format, so I'm not sure where you got -

Jo Lee Wickes: Okay, okay, I had relied - I apologize, Jo Lee Wickes, for the record, I had relied on an email and hadn't gone on to the website, so let me go onto the website now to make sure that I'm looking at the same document that the rest of you are looking at.

Kayla Dunn: Okay, I apologize if I sent out the transcription. I take the transcription and I put it in minute format, so I apologize for the confusion.

Leslie Bittleston: That was probably my fault, Jo Lee. I'm sorry about that.

Jo Lee Wickes: One moment. Let me get to the proper link. There we go, one second. Computer is a little bit slow today. Okay, so now that we're on the same page, and I apologize for that, do I have a motion to approve the minutes as attached?

Paula Smith: Paula Smith. I make a motion to approve it.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes, I'll second the motion. Any further discussion? All those in favor? [Ayes around] Anyone opposed? The minutes have been approved. Thank you. The next action item which would be Annual Quality Assurance Reviews, and I would like to thank Jennifer Smith from the Attorney General's Office for joining with us this morning.

Leslie Bittleston: It's Jennifer Spencer.

Jo Lee Wickes: I'm sorry, it is Jennifer Spencer, I apologize. I actually know a lawyer, Jennifer Smith, and I got confused. I apologize.

Jennifer Spencer: No worries.

Leslie Bittleston: So, Jo Lee, I reached out to Jennifer Spencer after our last meeting and posed the question from the committee to her, and she provided an email response, which I have attached to the materials for everybody to view or Jennifer, Ms. Spencer, can go over what her thoughts are on the last question. And to remind everybody, the question was, "With the required annual quality assurance visits of the three correctional facilities and the two youth camps, being that we're currently in COVID and unable to visit the facilities, what does it look like putting those visits off?" So that was the question posed to Ms. Spencer.

Jo Lee Wickes: Ms. Spencer, is there anything you would like to state other than what is provided in your written response to Ms. Bittleston?

Jennifer Spencer: Thank you. This is Jennifer Spencer. I did provide that information regarding Directive 9, 2 and 3 which were the closest items I could find at the time, as well as today. I looked again today at the directives, and I don't see anything directly on point, but those would be the directives that I could look at to provide some guidance that it's possible it could be held for 30 days upon expiration of the directives for the State of Emergency. And at this point we're still in the State of Emergency, however, I know that the Governor yesterday had indicated that he's working on guidelines for reopening state offices, and so I don't know how that may affect this. And I also know that we just entered phase two, so it's hard to say exactly when offices may be open, and I'm not finding anything else that's more direct on point besides the information in Directive 9 at this time.

Jo Lee Wickes: Thank you. There is – there was some additional information, I believe, provided about a revised schedule. Ms. Bittleston, can you talk about the possible revised schedule?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. I'm sorry, I'm also having a problem with my computer, so I'm pulling up the materials as we speak. I was in them and then I got booted. Okay. So, the revised schedule that I provided, it is also in your materials, it is called EPC Schedule 2020-2022. So, we have rescheduled – we have left Summit View the way that it was, but we have rescheduled China Spring and Caliente Youth Center, which were due in May. We rescheduled both of those to October of this year. So that's where we stand – excuse

me, not – it was NYTC and Caliente Youth Center that were moved from May. So, NYTC was rescheduled for August 25th/26th and Caliente was rescheduled to October 19th through 21st. And that's the way that the schedule looks today.

Jo Lee Wickes: Can you give us an update? I'm sorry, Jo Lee Wickes, for the record. Can you give us an update about whether or not Clark County believes that the University of Cincinnati will be able to do the training of the new assessors in July?

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston for the record. I have not heard. I have not been given a definitive answer on if that is going to happen or not. I don't know if the decision has been made yet.

Ebony Washington: This is Ebony from Clark County. And so, the University of Cincinnati is willing to come out. It really just depends on the travel restrictions, you know, into the state of Nevada and out of, you know, the location that they're coming from. So they're willing to come here, but we couldn't really move forward until we have clarification around travel.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. Thank you, Ebony.

Ebony Washington: You're welcome.

Leslie Bittleston: So with that being said, Madame Chair, we don't know if we'll be able to host the University of Cincinnati training in July until we get word that it is safe to travel to Nevada.

Jo Lee Wickes: And from my reading of the schedule, it looks like Summit View's planned assessment can go forward only if new assessors come online based on that training.

Leslie Bittleston: That is correct because what we wanted to do – Leslie Bittleston, for the record, what we wanted to do was to train the new assessors, and then after that, have them go out to Summit View with the trainers and do the assessment there because you need to tack on an actual assessment or audit with training. That's part of the training. So whenever the University of Cincinnati can come out is when we will schedule Summit View. And if we have to reschedule Summit View based on travel restrictions, we will do that.

Jo Lee Wickes: That makes sense. It also vaguely in my – I'm sorry Jo Lee Wickes, for the record, vaguely in my memory I think that at our last meeting had recommended a minimum of three assessors, and Ms. Bittleston, do you believe that if the University of Cincinnati can conduct the training in July that then the assessors would be added to NYTC and China Spring cause they now list only two?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, that is correct. We lost two assessors, like I mentioned at the last committee meeting. One left the position – actually two left their positions, one additional assessor, Mr. Maramodo, from Clark County, will be retiring soon, and Mr. Laity was given a promotion, so we are really looking for help – excuse me, and also Mr. Love is out on family sick leave. So we are really hurting right now for assessors. So, we really don't even have enough assessors to – we would be using the same couple for every assessment. So, yes, it is really crucial that we get the training and get new assessors on board so we can continue moving forward with these – and yes, we will add a team of three for each review.

Jo Lee Wickes: And can you help remind us how many people are scheduled in July?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Leslie Bittleston, for the record, Clark County is willing to train four individuals directly from Clark County. They invited the state, DCFS, to provide four staff. We have identified, DCFS has identified, the four staff needed or that we would be willing to train, however, we have not yet been able to find funds for travel down to Las Vegas and also for the portion. It's \$11,500 just for the training of four people, not including travel or per diem or anything. And currently, the state is in a 4 percent reduction until the end of the year, so finding that money is probably going to be darn near impossible. So, and I don't know if Ebony has any additional comments on the budget of Clark County, if they are still willing to train or have the funds to train four people. Ebony, are you on mute? Or gone?

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes, for the record. So, if – it doesn't sound like the state is going to be able to come up with the money. If Clark County doesn't come up with the money can you recap us how many trained assessors are actually available? Because I've been taking some notes about who might be retiring and Family Medical Leave, but how many assessors would actually be available if the training in July does not occur?

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston, for the record. The way that it stands today, it would be Katie Martin, Mark Maramodo until he retires, Sara Velasquez and Sharon Anderson, so four assessors. And Dave Laity could be a backup assessor, but he is now the Chief of Parole and does not have the time, but I think he may do one here or there, but he does not want to be on the rotation schedule anymore due to his promotion.

Jo Lee Wickes: Okay, that makes sense.

Leslie Bittleston: And Mr. Love is out on Family Medical Leave. I have no anticipated date of his return.

Ebony Washington: Hi, this is Ebony Washington from Clark County. So, I'm not sure if you're aware, but the county just started a voluntary separation program. So, we're anticipating a flood of retirement, so I would not count on Mark Maramodo being available, depending on how this program goes.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you, Ebony. Leslie Bittleston. With that being said, so we're down to three assessors, Katy Martin, Sara Velasquez, and Sharon Anderson. So, and unfortunately, that is not enough to do five of these in a short amount of time. So with that being said, Jennifer Spencer, since we are down assessors, is there anything that would allow us to postpone the reviews because we are down so many assessors and you have to be trained in the tool in order to complete one of these reviews?

Jennifer Spencer: Thank you. This is Jennifer Spencer. Based upon that information, I would need to do some additional research regarding that. Right now, I'm not seeing anything specifically allowing for the continuances because of the statute that requires that this be done every year. So, what I will need to do is I will need to look into this further to provide a more definitive answer since I do not have specific information that addresses this at this time based upon the directives that are currently available.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you, Jennifer.

Eve Hanan: This is Eve Hanan, for the record. I wonder if we could just go back a little bit here. With regards to the training, is there any possibility of doing a remote training that's less expensive because it doesn't involve transportation and, you know, location related costs?

Leslie Bittleston: Hmm. Leslie Bittleston, for the record. I was not the one that spoke to the folks at the University of Cincinnati did this. I believe Mr. Maramodo was. I don't know if Ms. Washington has any information on that.

Ebony Washington: This is Ebony. I don't have any details about whether or not there's a virtual option available. I can certainly have Mark research that. For Clark County, we have already paid, I believe, for half of whatever the cost is for the training for them to come out, so we do plan to move forward as soon as they're available. Those dollars have already been allocated and we'll get additional people trained, but it, you know, obviously, would be unfortunate if you guys aren't able to participate because of travel. But I'll have Mark research the virtual option.

Leslie Bittleston: Right.

Eve Hanan: Okay, thank you.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes, for the record. So, Ebony, do you believe that those four Clark County individuals will be trained as long as travel restrictions are modified enough to allow the University of Cincinnati trainers to come out?

Ebony Washington: Yes, I do.

Jo Lee Wickes: Okay. That's the best news we've heard all morning.

Leslie Bittleston: You're right.

Ebony Washington: Only – so, this is Ebony Washington, for the record. The only thing that would change that is if there's some reason that kind of central county finance thinks there a need to fight the money that we've already allocated, so I don't have any indication that they're planning to do that at this time, but should, you know, the situation get dire enough, that's the only other kind of caveat that I'd like to put on the record.

Jo Lee Wickes: So is – Jo Lee Wickes, for the record. Is there any other questions or information that voting members or anyone else who's on the phone would like to provide regarding the annual reviews to recap? It sounds like we are in dire need across the state of additional assessors. But there is a plan for the University of Cincinnati to come out to Clark County in July assuming the travel restrictions allow it, and that is a budgeted item, at least for the time being, for Clark County to train four people. It doesn't sound like the state of Nevada will have any ability to send additional staff to Clark County to participate in that training. And it looks like there are annual reviews scheduled for the five facilities that are required to be reviewed with the possibility the Summit View could be moved to a different date if for some reason the July training can't go forward. Any additional information or questions? I appreciate every – hearing none, I appreciate everyone's updates in that regard, especially Ms. Spencer, Ms. Bittleston and Ms. Washington, appreciate that. We thank you for thinking about the fact that maybe some of this can be done remotely. I know the world is trying to adjust to the new realities and it's a good reminder, you know, to think through is there a way that it can be done in perhaps a new and different way.

Eve Hanan: This is Eve Hanan again. I guess one of my feelings is that we may end up like opening things up, but then having periodic closures if there's, you know, new outbreaks, and so it's just nice to know about the flexibility in addition to possibly creating new – more trainings that could be at lower cost.

Jo Lee Wickes: And I would also hope that during this training, because it appears that the training is designed to be done in person, but as Eve points out, there are new realities facing our world, and perhaps during the training there can be a discussion about whether or not these quality reviews can be done using

technology without the need to be physically present at the facility. As things evolve, that may be a way that the quality assurance can go forward in a slightly different way, but still complies with law and the intent behind the statute is to actually do a review at least based on my reading the review doesn't – the statutes don't require that it be done in person, just that it be done using a validated assessment. And maybe the University of Cincinnati could be asked about the possibility of doing it in ways other than being physically present at each of the facilities. I think, unless there's any other discussion, we can move on to the next agenda item under 5 which is the Facility Improvement Plan Process. And the first item listed on the agenda there is The Facility Improvement Plan Template, which I believe Ms. Bittleston attached to our packet.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, I did. It is titled CPC Facility Improvement Plan. Excuse me, when you open the attachment it is titled Correctional Program Checklist, CPC, Facility Improvement Plan.

Jo Lee Wickes: Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: And also, as part of this, this is Leslie Bittleston, for the record, since our last meeting, I did write a draft policy that I have attached to this as well titled – where in the heck did it go? I just lost my internet. My apologies, I just got booted out of my attachments.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes, for the record. Before we maybe – before we move on to the draft policy, looking at the template, I think Step 4 is what I remember talking about at the last meeting, which is that the statute says that the facilities will develop their facility improvement plan in coordination with DCFS or the local Department of Juvenile Services. But we had talked about providing a template that the facilities could use if they chose to use a template, this template, or a template, versus deciding upon their own format. This does appear to be the template that the facilities have used to date based on the Facility Improvement Plans that were also attached to our materials. Ms. Bittleston, is that true?

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston, for the record. Yes, that is true. This is the template that was developed about a year ago and the one that is currently being used.

Jo Lee Wickes: And under my reading of 52B620, subsection 4, it just stated the facility can – shall develop a facility improvement plan. So, they have the option. I would think that they could develop their own format, or they could use this as the template in the format. Does anybody have a different view of that?

Leslie Bittleston: No, I don't have a different view of it, and unfortunately, we didn't get any of our CPC assessors, the current ones, on the phone call today. If you remember from the last meeting, the assessors were concerned that the facilities didn't like our template. Is that an accurate review of –

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes, for the record. I do remember there being some concern about the facilities maybe not liking the template. I don't – perhaps it's one of those items where it could be clearly communicated this is our attempt to provide a template; you are welcome to use a different format.

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston, for the record. That's probably a better way to put it, and I don't think that the CPC assessors were given that direction, you know, a year ago when we started this. I think that their direction at the time was here's the template, use this. So, I think that that is a – we can change the way we present that to them. Another thing that I worked on in the policy were some of the other questions regarding the template. Do we have to do – when we move on from the template, I will address that, my apologies.

Jo Lee Wickes: So, this is listed as a possible action item. I believe that the template has already been developed by DCFS and shared with the facility. I don't know – I don't – from my perspective I don't believe that this subcommittee has to approve the template, but certainly if someone has a different perspective on it –

Eve Hanan: Hi, this is Eve Hanan, for the record. I don't have a different perspective on it. I don't know if it's in terms of the correctional program checklist, the first page, would it be valuable to get a small edit on it? I did see one typo, or is it already out and circulating? There's a—

Leslie Bittleston: This is Leslie. I think its okay to point out a typo. We can absolutely fix that.

Eve Hanan: Okay, great. So, the second sentence of number one which begins, "Each review must" – and I think you just had the word 'you' instead of 'use' there. Each review must use a validated service assessment. It says 'y-o-u' instead of 'u-s-e' there, yeah.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you. Yes.

Eve Hanan: Putting my paper grading skills to work.

Leslie Bittleston: As many times as I've looked at this template, I don't think I ever noticed that.

Eve Hanan: It won't underline either since it's a word, so it's just correction for you automatically, yeah. That was all I had, thanks.

Leslie Bittleston: And one other thing that I would like to point out on this template and also on the policy when we get to it, under number one there are – or maybe it's in the statute, number one, A, B, C and D, I worked with a couple of the current assessors on drafting the draft policy and the feedback that I got was that the selected tool does review number – letter A and letter B, but does not cover C and D. So, I'm not sure what to do about that, and I don't know if that's maybe a different agenda topic for down the road.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes, for the record. One of the things that I thought I would like to put on a future agenda is, just for at least my education and hopefully it would be helpful to the rest of the committee members, to have a presentation by either the University of Cincinnati, cause I know in the past in other subcommittees and the JJOC as a full Commission have been very willing to provide – to appear telephonically and provide us with educational overviews.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Jo Lee Wickes: So, it's either from the University of Cincinnati or I hate to task our trained assessors with additional work, but I would appreciate having an educational summary of the training that was provided, the goal of the training and how the assessors believe that this process is supposed to work. In part because I remember at the last meeting I think those, Katy Martin, Sara Velasquez and Dave Laity stating that they saw their role as assessing and identifying, providing information to the facility, but not being in a position to say what they had to address, what they had to prioritize, that they're really like a fact finding and information conduit. But I think it might be helpful to have kind of that educational summary of what the training is. With regard to Leslie's concern that she's passing along that the University of Cincinnati's program may not address C and D, we could certainly place that on the agenda, but we're going to need a lot more detailed information about perhaps why the validated assessment chosen by the Commission doesn't address those two items or maybe doesn't address them as fully as we might think. Also, that kind

of dovetails into – and I’m trying to remember the term of art that’s used for performance-based, the performance-based standards that indeed may address C and D.

Leslie Bittleston: And we do have our PBS person on the line. Ms. Simeo, does performance-based standards address C and D, or do you know?

Jennifer Simeo: Hold on. What documents are you looking at?

Leslie Bittleston: We are looking at the facility improvement plan. If you pull up the Facility Improvement Plan document on Page 1 there is an NRS and then a number 1 and there’s an A, B, C and D.

Jennifer Simeo: Oh okay.

Leslie Bittleston: I think it might address C, but I’m not sure about D.

Jennifer Simeo: So, a review of the facilities policies on supervisor and behavior management?

Leslie Bittleston: I think we get that out of PBS.

Jennifer Simeo: PBS, I would say PBS does not do C.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. We just – okay, we just gather the data on C, the behavior management.

Jennifer Simeo: Correct. Yeah, it’s more data driven on, you know, the number of restraints or, you know, the type of programming the facility offers or what kind of, yeah, what kind of programming, but it wouldn’t really do an analysis or review of the policy and procedure, even though we do need to submit to PBS our policies and procedures, but it’s not really part of the data, per se.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you, Jennifer.

Jennifer Simeo: Yep.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes, for the record. For other committee members, would you be interested in an educational summary either by the University of Cincinnati, if they’re willing, or perhaps by one of the trained assessors if we can give them enough notice?

Eve Hanan: Yeah, this is Eve Hanan, for the record. I’m very interested in that. I would like that, and if C and D are not adequately addressed, then I think it has to go back to the full Commission to figure out how – to make sure we’re capturing, even though the policies and procedures are getting recorded, if there’s no real analysis or assessment of them, then I think we have to supplement somehow.

Paula Smith: Yeah, this is Paula Smith, and I would be interested in some training or getting more information.

Jo Lee Wickes: And I wonder if it would behoove us to also ask either the University of Cincinnati or the trainers if they believe that the tool and the training that they have been given actually does review the facilities policies on supervision and behavior management. By reading the improvement plans that have been submitted to us, I have to state I’m a little bit surprised that somebody would think that it’s not included, because there is so much detailed information in there.

Leslie Bittleston: I was going to say that was just an opinion of one of the reviewers and maybe they were not thinking about it in the bigger scope because I agree with you, Jo Lee, I think that there is a lot of material and information if you actually read the reports that go to the facilities. So, I was just sharing with you what their thoughts were.

Jo Lee Wickes: So, first of all, is there any other discussion around this idea that we would ask for an educational summary from either the University of Cincinnati or the trained assessors so that we have a better understanding of the training, their process, and those aspects? Any other discussion regarding that? Hearing none, I would like to make a motion that DCFS staff reach out to the University of Cincinnati and/or the trained assessors to see if they can prepare and give us a presentation of the educational summary about the CPC process, the training, just a thorough kind of summary of the entire process. Do I hear a second?

Eve Hanan: This is Eve Hanan and I second the motion.

Jo Lee Wickes: All those in favor? [Ayes around] Anyone opposed? Thank you. So, if we could reach out and see if we can add that to the next agenda item, I think we can move on to the next item in the agenda of – which is the draft policy. And Ms. Bittleston, if you can remind us all what that is entitled.

Leslie Bittleston: This – part of your – this is Leslie Bittleston, for the record. Part of your meeting materials, the document is called Evaluation of Evidence – Based Programs. This policy was written for DCFS facilities, not for Youth Camps as DCFS does not have any authority over county Youth Camps. I am presenting this to the committee for review, if they so choose.

Jo Lee Wickes: Has this policy been reviewed by DCFS administrative staff?

Leslie Bittleston: Not yet, I have presented it to this committee first.

Jo Lee Wickes: I appreciate the opportunity to review the policy, but I recommend that DCFS administrative staff review the policy first, and then this committee can review it.

Leslie Bittleston: No problem. Will follow that process.

Jo Lee Wickes: Any questions from members on the policy? None, okay, moving on to the next agenda item. New business. None, okay, moving on to public comment. No public comment. We don't need to meet prior to the JJOC meeting on July 17th, so after the JJOC, we will send out a doodle poll for our next meeting. Meeting adjourned.