



**Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission
Grants and Quality Assurance
Committee Meeting
August 24th, 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: none

Absent: Eboni Washington, 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: Okay. Thank you, I can't see. The next item on the agenda is the review of the minutes from May 28, 2020. I believe that they were distributed. Does anybody have any discussion about the minutes? Any corrections or discussion? Hearing none, can we get a motion to approve the minutes from May 28, 2020?

Paula Smith: Yeah, Commissioner Smith. I'll make a motion to approve May 28, 2020 minutes.

Jo Lee Wickes: This is Commissioner Wickes. I second. All those in favor, say aye.

Eve Hanan: Aye.

Paula Smith: Aye.

Jo Lee Wickes: Any opposed? Hearing none opposed, the minutes for May 28 have been approved. I believe the next on the agenda was an overview of the Correctional Program Checklist. I don't know if Sarah is available or if there's anyone else who might be able to give us that overview.

Leslie Bittleston: Madam Chair, this is Leslie Bittleston. Sarah was going to give the overview. Unfortunately, she is on her way to Elko for the CPC review at NYTC. So if we could move this to our next meeting, that would be much appreciated.

Jo Lee Wickes: That's perfect. We will move that to our next regularly scheduled meeting. Item number six on the agenda, we've already heard a segue for Ms. Bittleston to give us an update on the revised CPC schedule.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. In your packet of materials, there is a attachment called 2020-2021 Schedule Revised. Unfortunately, this is also out of date. When this was revised for the previous meeting, we were going to put a third person on each of the reviews to do some of the curriculum and policy review. However, Mr. Lum [phonetic] has been out on family medical leave and we thought that would end, but that has continued. So, he will be removed. So, as you heard just a minute ago, Sarah Velasquez is on her way to Elko for the NYTC review starting tomorrow and Wednesday. Summit View has -- will be September 21st through 23rd. Spring Mountain will be October 12th through 14th. China Spring will be October 28th through -- 26th through 28th, and Kelly NT Youth Center will be November 16th through the 18th. Ms. Eboni Washington was unable to join us today for this meeting, so we will not get an update from her on -- if Clark County new CPC reviewers will be trained and ready to go for that Kelly NT Youth Center review. So -- but that's the revised schedule going forward and NYTC will be done this week. So that's where we are with that.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes for the record. Does anyone have any questions of Ms. Bittleston regarding the revised CPC schedule?

Eve Hanan: Hi, this is Eve Hanan for the record. I just wondered if there'd been modifications to what they will or will not be able to observe and review based on COVID-19 protocols, if we know that?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, thank you for the question. I forgot to address that. So the reviewers, I have met individually with each of the reviewers and they are allowed to do as much as they can virtually. Some of the things that they will be doing in person, we'll be looking at youth charts and observing programs in session. They may do all of the programmatic reviews like policy review, curriculum review, and interview of staff virtually over Zoom. So, once they are completed out in Elko, they can come back and do the remaining reviews virtually. However, this, again, is up to the reviewers themselves. Some reviewers feel very comfortable going to the facility and conducting a lot of it at the facility. Some of the reviewers would prefer to do most of the work virtually. Sarah Velasquez and Katie Brubaker-Rosacchi [phonetic] who are going to Elko for the review this week feel more than comfortable going into the facility for the -- a good portion of the review. The next review, Summit View, the lead reviewer, Ms. Katie Martin, does have some medical issues herself and will be doing the majority of her portion virtually. So, again, this is -- they're allowed to do whatever they would like to do. And again, it's up to the reviewer to determine what portion they will do in person and what portion they will do virtually.

Paula Smith: Okay, great. Thank you so much, Leslie. Appreciate it.

Leslie Bittleston: Sure.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes for the record. Can you hear me?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Jo Lee Wickes: Okay. I can never remember if I'm on mute or unmute because I keep hitting star six. Any other discussion or questions regarding the CPC schedule? Moving on to item number seven -- excuse me, I think Leslie was slated to give us some information about the evidence-based program review policy followed by the county youth camp notification.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. During our last meeting, I brought a draft policy, brand new policy called Evaluation of Evidence- Based Programs. At that time, the committee wanted to ensure that the facilities had a chance

to review the policy. So, I'm here to update the committee to let you all know that the policy has been through the review process and is pending Ross Armstrong's signature. A lot of things were -- not a lot, a few things were added, changed since I brought this policy forward in May. So, there is in your packet of materials an attachment called Evaluation of Evidence-Based Programs Policy. This is the policy that will be signed and the one that we will put into effect when it is signed. I want to point out a couple of things to you that we did through this review process with the facilities and some of the conversations that we have had in this committee about what exactly do we require the facilities to provide us on a program improvement plan or facility improvement plan. So, we addressed some of those things within the policy. And if you have the policy up on page three of four under the header, Facility Improvement Plans, which would be 6B, we added this to provide some better direction to the facility. It reads, each facility not meeting standards with portions of the review shall provide a facility improvement plan, Attachment B, to the JJPO, which is my office, not more than 30 days after receiving the final report. If the CPC overall score for the facility is less than 65%, number one states, no facility improvement plan is required for a facility with an overall CPC score of 65% or better if none of the domain scores from the current review are in low adherence of 45% or less. And then, moving on to number three, another area that we addressed within this committee, it states facilities may choose between five and 10 recommendations and one or multiple domains from the final report to address in their facility improvement plan. These were included to kind of help the facility say, hey, if you're meeting the high adherence, you know, we do not need a facility improvement plan. And if you're required to provide one, you only need to choose between five and 10 recommendations. You do not need to provide a plan for all the recommendations that are on the final CPC report. So, that was added. And then moving on to number seven, quality assurance review oversight, A and B, A states, completed facility improvement plans, attachment B shall be provided to the JJPO which is, again, my office, not more than 30 days after receiving their final reports. And B states, facility shall improve a status update every 90 days using the facility improvement plan attachment. So, we have provided some really strict guidelines and timeframes in this policy for our state facilities. And then just to kind of follow up, there is also an attachment in your packet of attachments, 116 -- excuse me, 116A, evidence-based practice definition. This attachment is the evidence-based practice definition matrix that was approved by the JJOC and included in the strategic plan, so this was added as an attachment, and then 116B, the CPC revised facility improvement plan. When you pull this document up, you will see that it is very similar to the previous one with the notice change of the boxes of initial 90-day, 180-day and 270-day status updates. So, this is what we have proposed for state facilities going forward that will be approved. That was a lot of information. Are there any questions or clarifications?

Jo Lee Wickes: This is Jo Lee Wickes for the record. I had a question regarding do you have a sense -- so if I understand correctly, this policy is in draft form still pending review by Ross Armstrong. Do you know whether or not there's going to be a request from DCFS for this Subcommittee to approve or comment on the policy and take it to the full JJLC Commission?

Leslie Bittleston: I think the best thing to do would be to maybe comment on -- provide comments if you would like to. You're certainly not required to. It's up to, you know, DCFS to provide a set of guidelines for the facilities for this NPC process. But, also, you are more than welcome to provide comments and, also, we recommend that you take it to the JJOC not for so much comments, but just to let the JJOC know that there is a policy in place for the CPC reviews and the facility improvement plan process.

Jo Lee Wickes: Thank you. One other question, Jo Lee Wickes for the record. This policy is for the three state facilities, not for the county facilities, correct?

Leslie Bittleston: That is correct. We -- DCFS does not have oversight over the two county facilities. However, what we would like to do once Ross approves this policy is to send the policy plus the two

attachments to the two youth camps and say, this is the state process and please use this policy as a basis for your own policy just to, you know -- that is how we plan to notify the youth camps.

Jo Lee Wickes: Thank you. I have no other questions. Do any other committee members have any questions regarding the draft policy on Evidence-Based Program Evaluation? Hearing no questions, I think, then, Ms. Bittleston, if you can, we can move on to the County Youth Camp notification unless that was already covered in your comment that you're sending the policy to them?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, and I can state for the record, again, that DCFS does not have administrative or operational oversight over the county youth camps. The reason that the county youth camps are included in the CPC review process [inaudible] annually out of our state general funds. So, that's why they are included in the CPC review process. However, saying that, I will be providing them with this completed policy plus attachments to let them know what our expectations are and ask that they develop a policy or a process similar or close to what we are doing internally in DCFS.

Jo Lee Wickes: Okay, thank you. Does anyone else have any questions about item number seven? Okay. Moving on to item number eight, Ms. Bittleston, again, any updates regarding the NAC revisions?

Leslie Bittleston: Unfortunately, no updates on the NAC revisions. They -- we -- DCFS revised NAC 62B and NAC 62H, and provided those draft revisions to LCB in February of this year. In March and April, I met several times with the LCB attorney drafting those NACs and they are supposedly done. But due to the COVID pandemic, the review process within LCB seems to be moving at a snail's pace. And we, DCFS, have not received the draft NAC documents back from LCB. I have asked several times for status updates and I'm told every time that they are still going through the review process at LCB, so that's where we are. Part of what we are proposing in NAC 62B is fund withholding from the counties for not providing data as requested. So, that is part of one of the tasks of this committee is how that will look like or what that will look like. But, unfortunately, we are at a standstill until we get those NACs so we can figure out our process going forward with fund withholding for data requirements. So, we're still holding and waiting for those drafts to come back from LCB.

Jo Lee Wickes: Okay. Jo Lee Wickes for the record. Does any committee members have any questions about the process of getting the NAC approved? Hearing no questions, though, any committee members have any items that they would like to discuss this morning? Hearing none, moving on, once again, to public comment. Ms. Bittleston, have we been joined by any members of the public?

Leslie Bittleston: No, we have not been joined by any members of the public but I do want to [inaudible] that this committee will still be reviewing facility improvement plans when they come in. So, this -- I just wanted to let you know that that process has not been removed from policy, so once they come into the programs office, which is my office, I will provide them for review and comment by this committee.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes for the record. Do you have suggestions over when we have the next meeting? I don't see anything critical on the horizon. If we were to wait perhaps 60 to 90 days, we may have some facility improvement plans to review, depending on how long it takes to get those done after the CPC review?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. My recommendation would be about three months from now.

Jo Lee Wickes: I like the sound of that. Once from DCFS, send out a doodle poll so that we can get our next meeting scheduled?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, for three months. And, as I stated, I hope to have the NACs back by then from LCB and our first facility improvement plan to reveal.

Jo Lee Wickes: Great. Can I get a motion for adjournment?

Eve Hanan: This is Eve Hanan for the record. I move to adjourn.

Jo Lee Wickes: A second?

Paula Smith: Commissioner Smith will second it.

Jo Lee Wickes: Thank you, Ms. Smith. All those in favor say aye.

Eve Hanan: Aye.

Paula Smith: Aye.

Jo Lee Wickes: Thank you, Ms. Bittleston, and Jennifer Simeo, for your help in keeping us organized. I appreciate it. I hope everybody takes care and be well.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you.

Eve Hanan: Bye-bye.

Jo Lee Wickes: Bye-bye.
[end of meeting]