

Joe Lombardo
Governor

Richard Whitley, MS
Director



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

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



Marla McDade
Williams, MPA
Administrator

NEVADA STATE JUVENILE JUSTICE OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (JJOC) STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING December 6, 2024, at 9:00 AM

DATE: December 6, 2024

TIME: 9:00 AM

VIDEO CONFERENCE: MICROSOFT TEAMS

Roll Call:

Members Present

Elizabeth Florez - Chair
Brigid Duffy
Marla McDade Williams
Sharon Anderson
Perla Vega
Kelly Figueroa

Members Absent

Jennifer Fraser
Dylan Tedford
Matthew Clapham

Staff Members

Jessica Villalobos
Ty Wilson
Cindy Casselman

TRANSCRIPT

Agenda item 1. Welcome, Call to Order and Roll Call

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. I apologize if I missed it. You saw Ms. McDade Williams? I apologize. Okay. Wonderful. Thank you for that. With that, we'll move on to item number three, Public Comment and Discussion. To provide public comment telephonically, dial +1 775-321-6111. When prompted to provide the Conference ID, enter 814-449-699#. If providing public comment during this meeting, unmute your microphone prior to speaking. Persons making comments are asked to begin by stating their name for record and to spell their last name. Do we have any public comments? Where I'm sitting, it's difficult for me to see everybody, but somebody at a desktop, do you see members that are unidentified, or we don't know.

[Roll Call. We have Quorum]

Cindy Casselman: Madam Chair, I do not see any hands raised.

Elizabeth Florez: Excellent. Thank you. Okay. With that, we'll close agenda item number three and move on to item number four for possible action, Review and Approval of Minutes. Minutes were sent previously, and hopefully, everybody has had time to review. Are there any corrections or comments? Seeing none. I'll seek a motion to approve the Minutes of September 30th, 2024, which is attachment four.

Marla McDade Williams: This is Marla. I'll make a motion to approve the Minutes.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you.

Elizabeth Florez: I will second that motion. This is Liz Florez for the record. All those in favor, please say aye or raise your hand.

Brigid Duffy: Aye.

Marla McDade Williams: Aye.

Elizabeth Florez: Are there any opposed? Any abstentions?

Sharon Anderson: This is Sharon Anderson, I'll be abstaining.

Elizabeth Florez: Oh, thank you for that. Noting that, the motion carries. Thank you. Moving on to agenda item number five, Discussion and Possible Action and Update on the Strategic Plan Goals for FY19 through '23 to send to the Full JJOC Commission for consideration to continue with or dispense with goals. I will add at this point that I'm very appreciative to Cindy Casselman, as well as Matt Clapham. We've met multiple times since the last meeting related to this agenda item, and part of our discussion is, today that we hope to move forward with is, to decide what items to carry over that are in progress or incomplete into future goals. At this point, I'm going to ask for Ms. Casselman to pull up attachment number five, so that we can move through the discussion of the items.

Cindy Casselman: Okay. Is everybody able to see that on the screen? Thank you, Jessica, for pulling that up.

Elizabeth Florez: Yes. Okay. We can go to goal number one and start talking through that. Ms. Casselman, I'll ask you to start walking us through it.

Cindy Casselman: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. If you see on goal number one, that was the initiative for the risk assessment tool. As you can see, those goals have been, all have been completed. We're able to move on to goal number two. As you can see in that top section for the Initiative 2.1 for the Evidence-Based resource center, those goals have been completed. Under Initiative 2.2 for the Evidence-Based criteria, there are several goals that are still in progress. We did receive an update from the Nevada Center for Juvenile Justice Innovation from Dr. Russell at our Full Commission Meeting, she provided us with an update stating that they did have that Evidence-Based tool that had been launched on their website. However, it had not been utilized much. If we want to continue with this goal, the background is already there for that and just potentially publicizing it to the other jurisdictions, that way we can go through and review all of their programming that they do to ensure that it is evidence based. Commissioner Williams, I see your hand up.

Marla McDade Williams: Yeah, I think I have a couple of questions. The first, when we say that we've completed something, for example, the funding; secure sustainable funding of EBP Resource Center, where is documentation that any of these items was actually completed and the process that they went through for completion and the final product? I guess, I'm trying to understand that.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Liz Flores for the record. Going back up to item 2.1, Resource Center Creation established the EBP Resource Center, there is an agreement in place between what is under the State's purview. I'm uncertain if we would need to attach that agreement or what further evidence will be need of that completion.

Marla McDade Williams: I guess for me it's somewhere to see where that documentation is, you know, and not necessarily for me, but right moving out into the future for others to be able to see how it was actually completed.

Elizabeth Florez: Do you have a recommendation for how to accomplish that? Because the State own is the lead on that contract.

Marla McDade Williams: Yeah, I suppose we probably should just post it on our website. Right? That there probably should be a link to the completed portion to show how it was completed and documentation of that.

Elizabeth Florez: Is that something that you have administrative authority over to make happen or would that require further information.

Marla McDade Williams: No, I do.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay.

Marla McDade Williams: My first question was just where we are keeping this, you know, understanding that it's kept within staff, that's helpful for me, and I will ensure that we have it made publicly available for others to follow.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. Cindy, I see your hand up.

Cindy Casselman: This is Cindy Casselman for the record. I think that's an excellent recommendation that we would be able to accomplish through the Programs Office. On our website, we could publish the link to the Nevada Center for Juvenile Justice Innovation, as well as creating some sort of an announcement to go out that says that this is what this does and the purpose of it and how people can access those services and resources that are available through that website. We could indicate what funding source that it does come out of that it is part of our Title II Formula Grant Funding, and there is an agreement, a subaward that gets administered to ensure that this website does keep up with the requirements that have been set forth through the JJOC. Thank you.

Marla McDade Williams: Cindy. You had said something else I wasn't quite following the second part of what you said prior to my question about, having met some objective for Evidence-Based training.

Cindy Casselman: This is Cindy Casselman for the record. As far as, when we publish, when we publish the website on the DCFS webpage, we can do an announcement as well that says like.

Marla McDade Williams: No. It was in relation to presenting attachment five. You had gone past the goals that we completed and then you were saying something about, you had moved on to the next thing, I just didn't understand what you were saying.

Cindy Casselman: Yes. Okay. As far as the Evidence-Based, determining if the practices and programs that our stakeholders are using are evidence based, is that what your question was in reference to, Commissioner Williams?

Marla McDade Williams: It says in progress. What were you saying about it being in progress?

Cindy Casselman: Yes, that portion has been launched. It was part of the update that was given at the Full JJOC. There is a form that each jurisdiction can fill out for each program that they have to ensure that that program is Evidence-Based. The Nevada Center for Juvenile Justice Innovation will verify that information and will also keep a log of that as well, so that we know what evidence based programming or best practices are being presented to the different stakeholders within the State.

Marla McDade Williams: Okay. Thank you.

Cindy Casselman: You're welcome.

Elizabeth Florez: Going back to Commissioner McDade's questions, did that satisfy the questions related to this, to goal number two?

Marla McDade Williams: For me?

Elizabeth Florez: Yes?

Marla McDade Williams: It did. I was at the last meeting and their presentation, they had asked for more things than, what's on here, I just presume that we're really just focusing on these items right now, and at some point, in the future, we may consider those other items.

Elizabeth Florez: Liz Florez for the record. That's correct, this previous Strategic plan and determine what needs to be added to and carried over for the next five-year plan. Okay. Cindy, if I could, this is Commissioner Florez, if you could pick up where you left off.

Cindy Casselman: Yeah. Just to piggyback on the State's Evidence-Based assessment, that one is in progress as well too assessing the current practices to determine the number of practices and programs that are Evidence-Based. I believe that this can continue to be accomplished as the different jurisdictions as they submit their reviews for their Evidence-Based programs, then we are able to work with the Nevada Center for Juvenile Justice Innovation and create a matrix for Statewide matrix as well too for other stakeholders to access and see what programs evidence are based and being utilized. Are there any questions in regards to that?

Moving on to Initiative 2.3, the Evidence-Based Inventory, the first action plan on that one has been completed. The rollout and implementation for Counties executing that kind of falls into what I was discussing in the previous goal there, that this is in progress and that we will continue to work with the Nevada Center for Juvenile Justice Innovation to ensure that they are the clearinghouse for all of our Evidence-Based programming's, where they have a matrix that can be accessed by the various stakeholders throughout the State. Are there any questions in regards to that one? Okay. Then the

AB 472 that the DCFS and each department of juvenile services shall use the following percentages of money. This has been completed. This is also in line with our Community Corrections Partnership Block Grant where they have to utilize Evidence-Based programming in order to receive that funding.

Brigid Duffy: I'm sorry to interrupt. This is Brigid. Can you scroll down? Because I'm only seeing 2.2. I can't see that you're still on 2.2.

Cindy Casselman: Jessica, can you move to 2.3, please? Thank you.

Brigid Duffy: Thank you.

Cindy Casselman: Sorry about that. Ms. Duffy. Any questions in regards to that last one on 2.3? Okay. Moving on to Initiative 2.4, the Evidence-Based practices. This was requiring providers to create a policy and we are unsure of how we can require providers to create policy in regards to this as we don't directly have oversight over them. Maybe this could be accomplished with like whatever their policy, whatever policies they go by and then in relation to the County policies. The Counties do have rules in place and practices and procedures that they will only engage in Evidence-Based programming or best practices. Commissioner Florez, I don't know if you want to piggyback on that as well.

Elizabeth Florez: Yes. Thank you. This is Commissioner Florez for the record. Starting with the providers policy, this is one that we've never been clear on how it is we could directly impose any requirements on providers in our community. At the County level though, because of the requirements of the Community Corrections Partnership Block Grant which requires 100% Evidence-Based programming be provided for purposes of any reimbursement or any allocation of those grant funds. That's I know for Washoe County and for other Counties because we've spoken in our NAJJA Meetings, in order to qualify for those funds, we have to demonstrate in that Grant reporting that all of the funds are directed towards programs, evaluations, programming, placements that fit within the JJOC Evidence-Based matrix. In order to qualify for the funding, we have to follow the JJOC Matrix. That's the means by which I believe Counties are complying with this specific goal of the strategic plan, we would certainly welcome any feedback related to how it is this is currently being accomplished or if there's any concerns about that. We had talked about bringing to the larger commission this provider policy specifically, this specific goal to gain direction on whether or not this should be a goal going forward. I do welcome any opinions from this group on their thoughts on this specific goal for the provider policy.

Brigid Duffy: This is Brigid for the record. If I may, on Clark County's end, I think that one, Chair Florez, I agree with you that this should be taken to the Full Commission, because I don't have a Juvenile Justice partner from Clark County on this. My knowledge is that there is a very robust vetting process for anybody that wants to work with our children in Clark County, so much so that it excludes many people. I would think that the easiest way to get this done in Clark County would be to have this part of the vetting process that in order to be somebody that we refer our children to that they have a policy that we can review, because I know in the vetting process, they have to provide their list of policies and procedures. It seems to me it wouldn't be that complex in Clark County. Now, as a community partner who is a part of the JJOC, I think it would be very important that any child that we're sending or their adult care provider sending to a program, it should match what this JJOC has done, which is make sure that everything we do is Evidence-Based. I think it's important to keep that out there, but my recommendation would be like, as you said, is take it to the Full JJOC, so I can hear how Clark County would be intending to implement this and whether or not they believe it's important. As a DA, I think it's important, so our families are going to the best programs that we can provide them.

Elizabeth Florez: Excellent. This is Commissioner Florez. Thank you for that feedback, Commissioner Duffy. I'm thinking in Washoe County, I'm trying to rack my brain, I would have to review whether or not we have a specific policy. I know that embedded in all of our contracts is language surrounding certain requirements for all of our vendors and providers. It may be that we could develop a policy. I don't think it would be very difficult, but I really like that idea. That would be a great piece to bring forward to the JJOC as well, because I'm thinking of smaller Counties and I don't believe we've ever spoken about a policy, I think this is the greatest idea towards helping all of us accomplish what I believe was

the original intention was to ensure that quality programming which met the requirements of the JJOC Evidence-Based matrix could be implemented. Is there any feedback to that? I think that's a great idea. Okay. I'll turn it back over to you, Ms. Casselman.

Cindy Casselman: Thank you. Cindy Casselman for the record. As far as Initiative 2.5 for the County Engagement; inform and engage Counties of the intent and desired outcomes, this was already completed. All of these on 2.5 were completed. I think, for lack of a better term, there was a road show that was completed in regards to what the goals of the AB 472 were. This has been done. Does anybody have any questions in regards to that? Alright. Moving on to goal three. Jessica, if you can scroll down to page five. Thank you so much. Okay. This is in regards to 3.1, is Enterprise Supervision. This is developing phase two with enterprise supervision. This is in progress as we are currently executing data sharing agreements with the stakeholders who utilize enterprise supervision, so that we can better share data when we compile reports for Federal and State reporting. Are there any questions in regards to this initiative?

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez for the record. Ms. Casselman, one thing that I guess I'm seeking clarification on is, having been minimally participating in the Unity Modernization Project, I imagine in the future this would eventually just morph into that large scale project. Would that be correct?

Cindy Casselman: Yes, I think ideally that would be. However, there still may be the need for a data sharing agreement based on what type of information the different jurisdictions want to share with other jurisdictions as well, besides basic demographic information that was part of the discussion that we did have during those database workshops. There may be a need in the future for data sharing agreements. If an agency does not want to utilize the Statewide system that's in the process of being developed, then we would still need a data sharing agreement, potentially for our Office of Analytics to be able to pull data from their systems that they're utilizing.

Elizabeth Florez: Great. Thank you for answering that question.

Cindy Casselman: You're welcome. Okay. Any other questions in regards to that initiative? Okay. Moving on to Initiative 3.2, which is the QA review to conduct annual quality assurance reviews. This is in regards to the CPC Tool that we currently utilize for the facilities. We have selected that tool. It's currently being used. We discussed the possibility of utilizing at detention centers. However, it really isn't designed for detention centers because they are short-term placements for youth. This was, and Commissioner Florez can speak a little bit more to this as well, that it isn't designed for. We potentially could work with CPC to try to modify the tool to better meet the needs of that, or if we can look for another tool, if we want to do quality assurance as far as detention centers or community providers.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez for the record. Just to add to that. Thank you, Ms. Casselman. I have personally reached out to the University of Cincinnati and had asked if any of their research, and they have a very impressive body of research and statistical evidence to support the CPC Tool. I asked specifically if any of their research had been conducted on short-term facilities and their answer was no. If that's something that the JJOC, I believe this might be an item we need to take to the larger body for clarification, on how it is we are to promote seeking "more standardized quality assurance practices on detention centers". I do know and may be somebody else can educate me more on this, but the LCB conducts audits of detention centers, to my knowledge, and all detention centers are required to follow the State's; it's Juvenile detention center facility standards, and it's actually on the DCFS website. I would need to inquire, but I believe the LCB inquiries about whether or not we're in compliance with those juvenile detention facility standards. That's information that I could also bring forward to the larger commission, but I'll open it up to the group for any comment.

Marla McDade Williams: I don't have any comment. Go ahead Brigid, or whoever.

Sharon Anderson: This is Sharon Anderson. I don't know if everyone else was experiencing glitches in the audio. The beginning of what you shared was a little garbled and then there was clarity through some of it, but not all of it.

Elizabeth Florez: I can repeat that. This is Commissioner Florez. Commissioner Anderson, our detention center is periodically audited and visited by LCB, and they have their standards that they go through to ensure that we're compliant, and also, many years ago, prior to the creation of the JJOC, the Governor's Department on Juvenile Justice [indiscernible] juvenile detention center standards. Though we also have to comply with those standards for it's a state standard. My comment was, I will bring that information forward when we bring this to the larger commission, so that we can have dialogue about it, because I'm not sure to the extent that everybody is aware of LCB's role with the oversight of detention centers, as well as this book that was adopted for juvenile detention facility standards. I was seeking feedback as well on this item.

Sharon Anderson: I want to try to summarize what you said, because there were still some glitches throughout that. My understanding is your facility, and you believe other detention facilities are audited by LCB and you guys comply with LCB standards, you just wanted to bring this to the larger body to have a discussion at the larger body pretty much.

Elizabeth Florez: Correct. There's also Juvenile Detention center facilities. It's not a policy manual. It's detention standards that we were all required to abide by that were adopted by the State.

Sharon Anderson: Okay. Got you.

Elizabeth Florez: If there's no feedback on that, I will bring this item, when we bring this item forward to the larger body, we can discuss those items and see where the discussion takes us as far as whether or not that satisfies the quality assurance piece or if we're directed to explore other.

Sharon Anderson: I would also say then we probably would want to ensure that those standards are part of the packet of information that everyone would receive at that meeting.

Marla McDade Williams: This is Commissioner Williams, I think this needs more in-depth discussion about who actually has responsibility to conduct these reviews; and Deputy Anderson, correct me if I'm wrong; but we have staff who do it who are not funded to do it. The statute requires the commission to do it. To me kind of envisions individual commissioners going out and doing this, and I think you all have had that discussion previously that you don't have the time to do that, but we are also not funded to do it. I don't believe I have a budget initiative to actually designate someone to do this. I want to have that discussion as well, just to, you know, determine if I need, with what the expectations are there and what I guess some of the history is behind it to kind of figure out how to move forward in a more systematic way. Right?

Elizabeth Florez: Liz Florez for the record. Thank you, Commissioners Anderson, and McDade Williams, because those are excellent points and, and things that I don't want to fall off our radar. In the past, just for historical purposes, I'll share that, separately there was a group, it was called the Silver State something, but it was a sister committee or subcommittee of the Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators that was comprised of various administrators and detention managers from jurisdictions across the State too, and there was actually, there was actually a standard with a checklist and a policy where this group would travel to all of the detention centers and conduct an audit. Now, I would have to dig way back. I wasn't directly involved in that. My guess is it wasn't like an Evidence-Based checklist. I don't know the research behind it. Maybe it was, I don't know. I'm just sharing that for informational purposes. Maybe that's something that could be resurrected if the JJOC had confidence in an approach like that, but that's also another item that I'll bring forward. It was, to my recollection, it was because that body, the previous bodies had recognized the importance of ensuring that there was an external independent group that was coming into facilities to ensure that best practices were adopted. Again, not sure, it wasn't driven by any legal authority, it was [indiscernible] just adopted by the group. That's just another bit for your information.

Sharon Anderson: This is Commissioner Anderson. I also wanted to actually bring up in this section, the frequency of the reviews, how they've been conducted annually with the exception of, I think, one year there was, there was something that happened with one or two of the facility evaluations, but with the CPC, I believe we had reached out to the University of Cincinnati and their recommendation was for it to be completed at, you know, the minimum of, or not minimum, but at the 18 month mark, not an annual mark. We've been doing it every 12 months and trying to make it an annual thing. There may even be a longer timeframe that could be more appropriate for the State just because of the amount of time it takes. Once an evaluation is completed, the recommendations are submitted along with an action plan for the facility to give them an opportunity to really implement what is, what is on the plan and then have an opportunity for it to, you know, be planted, and worked through at that the respective facilities. That's just not, you know, outcomes that are happening, you know, with the annual reviews, a lot of them don't change much at all. That's a lot of resources being utilized on a regular basis to get similar results, because there's not a lot of time to implement and, you know, work on change. I'd like for us to really look into the timeframe that's statutorily required currently, which is every year, and seeing if we want to move to change that frequency also. I think that needs to be woven into this discussion.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you for that Commissioner Anderson. What you're describing would require likely a bill draft change [indiscernible] is what I'm understanding, because it's in NRS?

Sharon Anderson: (Nods head).

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. Thank you for clarifying that. Okay. I'll turn it back over to Ms. Casselman.

Cindy Casselman: Okay. Cindy Casselman for the record. Moving on, I'm not really sure we addressed the community provider aspect of it, but I believe if you want to bring that to the Full Commission as well for some further discussion, how we could do quality assurance with those community providers.

Elizabeth Florez: Commissioner Florez for the record. Yes, my opinion is that that's appropriate. Again, it might tie back into the previous goal where we talked about potentially developing counties developing policies that would require us to be in compliance with quality assurance Evidence-Based practices, whether it be through our contracts and policies and such. This may tie into that because our authority doesn't extend necessarily directly to community providers. Thank you for that.

Cindy Casselman: Thank you. Okay. Moving to Initiative 3.3, the Performance Reporting. This is, develop a procedure for reporting by Counties. This in regards to the approved performance measures, this is something that we currently collect data through the Community Corrections Partnership Block Grant for the Evidence-Based performance measures. Those are collected quarterly by the JJ Programs Office and are reported out in State and Federal reports as well too. I guess this would be in progress if we really wanted to change it, unless there needs to be, this is something I think that we did address in previous discussions as well too. Do we want to create a document, that one of the questions that came up was creating a document with the requested data in timeframes and why the need to report those to the JJ Programs Office.

Brigid Duffy: Thank you. This is Brigid. This is something that the Data Committee should be working on; right Cindy; to develop the procedures for reporting that? I feel like in my Data Committee, where we're kind of going down that path of asking everybody how they gather the data, how they report the data, and then ultimately coming up with a way for everybody to be consistent in how they report. From my perspective as the Chair of the Data Committee, I think it's important to keep this on the strategic plan. It just kind of goes into my committee to figure out what the procedure is and then come back to add it to this plan when it's completed.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez. Thank you, Commissioner Duffy. I think that's an excellent idea, and it makes perfect sense to be the nexus between the work of the data committee, which has already started related to this

item, and makes sense that the recommendations would be coming from that committee. Are there any other thoughts on that? Okay. [Indiscernible].

Cindy Casselman: Sorry, Commissioner Florez. I think your, your audio is cutting in and out a little bit, so I did notice you were talking, we just couldn't hear you.

Elizabeth Florez: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

Cindy Casselman: No. It's okay. Thank you. We appreciate you being so flexible with your time today. In regards to the performance measures, and this goes back in line with what Commissioner Duffy was saying that this is the Data Subcommittee's work as well too and they are currently updating the performance measures for the County. This was done by the Data Subcommittee. However, they're taking a look at the performance measures to update those for the counties as well. It has been updated, it has been completed; however, we're doing updates to determine if those performance measures are the performance measures that we want to continue with or if there are new ones that we want to add as well. I don't know, Commissioner Duffy, if you want to chime in on that as well.

Brigid Duffy: I could just say that; this is Commissioner Duffy for the record; that we are, you know, working on getting through what you just said, Cindy, getting through all the performance measures, deciding what's required, statutorily deciding what we as a committee years ago decided we all wanted but can't gather, and then just ultimately trying to find that procedure to report it out. Everybody is reporting the same data.

Cindy Casselman: Are there any other questions or comments in regards to that performance measure or to the performance measure? Then, I will move on to the next page, which talks about the next one is the Reports, develop reports within Enterprise Supervision. This has been completed. There are multiple reports that have been created on an as needed basis in Enterprise. When a data set gets presented to us, then we have the ability to create reports in Enterprise Supervision. However, now with the Office of Analytics as well too, since they do have back-end access to some of the Enterprise systems for the jurisdictions that they are able to write reports as well for us. Are there any questions in regards to that one? The next one is the Report Access, determine process for State to gain access to reports. This one is currently in progress as well. Same thing with the data sharing agreement with the Office of Analytics, that we can access their data for reporting purposes as well. The next one is the Policy, determine policy for the JJOC to review and report to Governor and Legislature on required outcome measures by January 31st. This one is in progress. There is a DCFS policy regarding Statewide data collection in regards to several different NRS statutes that require that data collection and a report of that. Any questions in regards to that action item? I don't know if the discussion maybe is if this wants to be marked complete as there are NRSs that outline what the data collection is and the due dates for those reports from the JJ Programs Office?

Marla McDade Williams: I'm not quite understanding this role on the Strategic Planning portion, but it says determine policy for JJOC to review and report. Are we moving away from their role to review? Is that what you're asking?

Cindy Casselman: No. Not at all. I just asked if we wanted to mark this as complete as there is a policy, a Statewide policy, that we have DCFS for the statewide data collection and we also follow the NRS statutes for that data collection and the reporting requirements for that.

Marla McDade Williams: I'll defer to the group. I guess it would be appropriate to call it complete as long as that we have a policy that identifies how the JJOC reviews it, so this is where I continue to get confused is, if you're saying the NRS requires it, then is there no role for the JJOC? That's where I'm confused.

Cindy Casselman: The requirement too is with the policy is that it is reported to the JJOC as well.

Marla McDade Williams: I feel like we're not communicating at the same level. This says, and I can't, if you could scroll up just a little bit, Jessica, to let me see the heading. I don't know what this is under, but it says determine the policy

for the JJOC to review and report to the Governor. You're saying the policy on the JJOC reviewing and reporting is developed?

Cindy Casselman: Yes.

Marla McDade Williams: Okay. Then, yes, it would be completed in my mind. Then again, the policy would be attached as backup for showing completion of this item.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez for the record. Can you hear me?

Marla McDade Williams: Yes, you're much clearer now.

Elizabeth Florez: Wonderful. I was hoping by turning off the camera that would help. Thank you. My comment was going to be to actually state what Commissioner McDade Williams just said, would be to attach that policy, so that we can demonstrate that it's been completed. That's my only comment. Thank you.

Cindy Casselman: Are there any other questions in regards to that section? We'll be able to provide the policy for that for documentation as well. Moving on to the Initiative; Jessica, if you can scroll up to Initiative 3.4; the Cross Agency Collaboration, engage children's services providers including child welfare, children's mental health, community providers, schools, Division of Public and Behavioral Health and Nevada Medicaid. The first action item there is the contact, determine points of contact for various children services agency. We mark this as incomplete. One of the questions that we had was that these points of contact can be fluid depending on the needs and is this to educate or collaborate, that we do, that the stakeholders do have MOUs with the different service providers, including child welfare, children's mental health, all of those providers that are listed up there to work in collaboration together. Commissioner Florez, I'll let you expand on that.

Elizabeth Florez: Certainly. Thank you. This is Commissioner Florez for the record. It is true that we weren't quite sure exactly what the intention was of this goal. If the overarching goal is cross agency collaboration and this specific sub goal is determining points of contact for various children's services agencies, my response to that was that in Washoe County, we have developed relationships and it includes some of the people on this very meeting where if we need to make contact related to something we know, who and where and how. On top of that, we also, in Washoe County, have MOUs with various partner governmental agencies as well as, nonprofits and such, where that, that support our collaboration. We wanted to bring it to this group to see if what your thoughts were on this. I'm not sure if it was thought that there would be a list of people with all of their emails and phone numbers listed that would then be shared with a larger commission or posted somewhere, but that would require somebody to develop to devote resource to maintain that list. Our very own Washoe County Community Resource List is one that requires significant time to keep it current. With that, I'll turn it over for feedback, if there is any. If not, this is something we tended to bring to the larger group for to see if, you know, there were others who had perhaps a historical perspective on the intent of this sub goal.

Brigid Duffy: This is Brigid for the record. I actually find this to be very important, and especially in light, I believe this afternoon or earlier: I'm in a different time zone, so I'm a little confused; but today is the very last Children's Commission Meeting, if it's still going forward today. Over the last few months, I've been pulling every statute in Nevada Statutes to find all of these statutorily created groups that meet regarding children's issues and trying to get a list of who is on each committee, I think, there's gaps. One of the gaps I identified is kind of a lack, besides DCFS, our partners with DCFS, but not even directly a child welfare DCFS person, there's a lack of a, you know, a child welfare person on the JJOC, a school district person on the JJOC, a children's mental health person. You know, all of these kids unfortunately cross into all of these systems at some point, or I wouldn't say all of them, a majority of them. Most all of them should be in school. They're all touching school. A majority of them have mental health needs. I'd say at least half of them have somehow had child welfare involvement. I think we need to be a little more thoughtful in ensuring that we are all sitting on all of the discussions that we have around our children, because everybody has something to provide. I think Cross Agency

Collaboration and even with the, with the ending of the children's commission, with the ensuring that we have the right people on every committee that is required by statute, that is taught that are talking about our children, we are there. However we get there, whoever is in charge of making sure that that list is updated, I think, in my opinion, we need to figure that out. Because the one thing I've known over my decades is the most important thing I have is the ability when I have a crisis for any kid is to pick up the phone and know who to call. I've had that with great partnerships. Sharon, I'm going to call you out. I mean, my partnership with you over the years has been fantastic. Marla, as you know, with mental health, you are being over pretty much everything, besides education, you're probably happy you don't have to handle that, you know. Being able to pick up that phone and say, look, we have a crisis, and we need to figure it out, because our kids and families deserve that. I'm not at my desk every day for my deputies to come in and say, hey, what do I do? Having that list and points of contact I think are important. Those are just my comments, especially since for dissolving the one commission that was designed to try to bring us all together. We were all talking about the same issues.

Sharon Anderson: This is Commissioner Anderson. That was extremely well put, Brigid Duffy, not just because you gave me a compliment, but because the content of what you said is absolutely correct. I believe, it could be a great stake for us all to begin to work better together because of our different lenses, and just being able to, like you said, have that list and be able to really contact who is needed for whatever the issue that arises would be a huge resource for us all to have. I just wanted to comment that. Thank you.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez. I thank you, to both Commissioners, Anderson, and Duffy for that feedback. At some point on this agenda we're talking about, we will make a decision about what moves forward and what we can consider complete. We will keep this as incomplete because it truly is. Then we can have further dialogue about how it is that we can accomplish what was, what was stated. I also want to talk about in the commission about who would be responsible for maintaining these points of contact. I'll turn it back over to you, Ms. Casselman.

Cindy Casselman: Thank you. I will just make note of that for moving forward on that one, that so further dialogue to establish how this can be accomplished. I don't know if you want me to go through each of those, but I feel like they're all encompassing. For the Cross Agency Collaboration and that this is something that you as a subcommittee would like to move forward to the Full Commission for further discussion as to how this could be accomplished.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez. Yes, please.

Cindy Casselman: Thank you. Okay. Moving on to the next page to goal four, which is --

Elizabeth Florez: I apologize. This is Liz Florez for the record. I believe, going back to Initiative 3.4, at the very bottom, we had added that legislative subcommittee to create a committee to review future bills. That had come up in our last conversation as well, and especially in light of Commissioner Duffy's most recent comment about the, the membership requirement of various commissions, I've seen two bills now already early related to the composition of many commissions across the state, and the JJOC is mentioned in both of those bills. It just highlights that. I wanted to get feedback from this group about this addition that, that was made under this 3.4 goal. If anybody has any feedback in support of or not related to this goal?

Marla McDade Williams: This is Commissioner Williams. This is actually one of the areas, where I always remind my staff to look at the authority of the group. If we have the authority to consider this, then I'm fine with it. If there's no statutory authority for the JJOC to do this, then I think it goes beyond the purview of that group.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez. Thank you for that. I think when this specific goal was that we talked about was not to request a bill draft, but to review them to ensure that we were all understanding potential impact to Juvenile Justice, that they would, so it would be more of an educational opportunity to ensure, especially with some of the members of the commission who have excellent experience with legislative matters, including Commissioners McDade Williams and, and Duffy. I believe that's why we have the word review, not necessarily, you know, submit bill drafts, but

does that change anything related to that, or I imagine we would still need to do the exercise of really looking at what JJOC's role is within NRS to see if any of that could be interpreted to expand to this potential goal. Does that suffice if we do that? Review that?

Marla McDade Williams: Yeah, I think we need to review what the authority is. I get it, but it's just like running a state agency. I don't get to go in and tell people what my opinions are on anything. I help people understand what it would take to implement something, but in the end, I have to implement. I just think there's a fine line. I think reviewing the statutory authority and then maybe re-crafting kind of what the purpose of it would be is where it should go.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you for that feedback. I'll turn it back over to Ms. Casselman.

Cindy Casselman: Thank you. I did add that note in there for us as well for reference. Moving on to goal four of the Initiative, I realized the time too as well, it is, we have this scheduled till 10 o'clock. This is the last goal to go through. However, we have not looked at the new set of goals that were present that are going to be presented as well in the next agenda item. Just to let you know for time's sake. Initiative 4.1 is the Family Engagement Policy, Plan, and Procedure, a family engagement subcommittee and to identify the Family Engagement Subcommittee. Liz, your note on here was your recommendation to move this over to the SAG Committee as this has not been completed in addition to the family engagement evidence reviewing and identifying Evidence-Based standards for family engagement.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez. Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead, Cindy.

Cindy Casselman: No, go ahead. I was just going to open it up for questions.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. This is Commissioner Florez for the record. Yes. In our previous conversations as we've further reviewed this, it was thought that perhaps moving this [Indiscernible] the SAG Committee for further review and development and recommendations would be appropriate and our, there are already working committees. It made sense to move this item under a working committee and I'd certainly be open to discussion about keeping it under this committee as well [indiscernible] Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators, we've had conversations about who has family engagement policies and who doesn't. It's about 50:50 right now and, but the further work about identifying Evidence-Based standards for family engagement in my mind would be something that we could also discuss with Nevada Center for Innovations as they're the Evidence-Based clearinghouse. I'll open that up for discussion. These two items are incomplete and will need to go forward in our next set of goals to the JJOC. I'm not hearing anything, so I'll turn it back over to Cindy, Ms. Casselman.

Cindy Casselman: Thank you. In regards to the family engagement policy, develop policy for family engagement, this has been completed at the State level. We currently have a policy in place. The County level, there are several Counties that do have it. Based on what Commissioner Florez had just explained that they've been working with NAJJA to determine who has these family engagement policies as well as the next one under there which is that family engagement handbook. Again, this is completed at the State level and some Counties do have it. The County level is unknown; however, it's been completed at the State level.

Elizabeth Florez: Commissioner Florez for the record. Thank you, Ms. Casselman. This is something where, I believe in the last meeting we talked about the authority for this to ensure that Counties, have family engagement policies and handbooks. This is something where we would just develop, we would have to communicate to get guidance on how it is Counties would be directed to comply with these. We'd have to also develop the reporting to whom. I'm not sure if it would directly be to the Commission, to a committee, but that would be under further development. I think that's something that the larger group or this group can easily come up with a, you know, a reporting sort of strategy for this. Ms. Casselman, I'll turn it over to the next item.

Cindy Casselman: Okay. Initiative 4.2 is the Case Plans and Re-entry Planning. They identify the case planning subcommittee, and this was previously marked as it was completed through NYSAP and case plan requirements through NYSAP as well when we adopted the YLS. The next one is again the Case Plan Evidence-Based Programming, review national standards of Evidence-Based planning standards. This was completed with NYSAP and then case plan tools, ensure case planning tools are in Enterprise Supervision. There is a case plan section that is in Enterprise Supervision. This was completed and the case plan reports that are tied to the YLS and to the MAYSI is also in Enterprise. The case plan handbook, develop a case planning handbook. This has been done by the State for DCFS and there is a YLS approved case plan handbook that we utilize since we have adopted the YLS as our risk and needs. There's a case plan handbook that is attached to this. Commissioner Florez, I'll just say some of the notes that we had on here were to follow up with NAJJA to determine if there were different case planning handbooks for the different jurisdictions and also what authority JJOC has for to ask for that documentation or to ask for that to be completed.

Elizabeth Florez: [Indiscernible] with the same conversation we had regarding the family engagement policy in our survey of various County jurisdictions, again, it's like 50:50 about how many actual handbooks or policies have related to case planning. Most do, some do not. I [indiscernible] this I would also think that this would be appropriate to move to the SAG Committee or assign to this committee to develop that reporting mechanism for the Counties to ensure that everybody is in compliance with this specific goal. I believe if there's no comment on that, I believe we worked through this and we are now over time. I will turn it over to initially, I was going to discuss whether or not we wanted to make [indiscernible].

Marla McDade Williams: Liz, I'm sorry. You broke up again. We didn't hear you.

Elizabeth Florez: Oh, I apologize. At this time, I wanted to turn it over to the committee to see if we would like to discuss moving over all of the in progress or incomplete items over to a separate document for future consideration. We need to make a determination if we are comfortable with the items that we've delineated as completed and the items we've delineated as in progress or incomplete so that will help us move forward into another agenda item for another which will be continued to another meeting about what items and goals we need to move forward onto the new plan. Is anybody uncomfortable with what we have discussed as being completed, in progress, or incomplete at this point?

Marla McDade Williams: This is Commissioner Williams. I am fine with everything in your plan moving forward.

Brigid Duffy: I agree.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you, Brigid. I should have waited for further comment on that. I apologize. At this point, I'd like to, and these are I'm always bad at these, but I believe I need, we need to make take a seek motions and a vote on this to make that decision, so that we can move forward with other items in the future. This is Commissioner Florez, I will make a motion that the status update be updated to remove all of the completed items and only reflect items from the FY 2019-2023 Strategic Plan to reflect the goals that are in progress or incomplete.

Marla McDade Williams: I will second that. Commissioner Williams.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you for that. Is there any discussion on this before we take it to a vote? Okay. All those in favor of this motion, say aye or raise your hand.

Group: Aye.

Elizabeth Florez: Are there any opposed? Are there any abstentions? Hearing none. The motion carries. Okay. Since we are over time, unfortunately, we will have to adjourn the meeting.

Marla McDade Williams: Madam Chair, I have looked over the system collaboration, the new goals, and I presume the plan was to forward those to the Full JJOC for consideration.

Elizabeth Florez: Commissioner Florez. Yes, that was the intention, but I was unsure if we needed to have time for discussion for those who maybe had not had time to review or had issues with that, but, if the group is willing, we can certainly discuss that.

Marla McDade Williams: I mean, we have a pretty low quorum count, I don't know if that's an issue, but I've reviewed them, and I think it's appropriate to move them forward to have the JJOC discuss them.

Elizabeth Florez: Are there any other?

Brigid Duffy: This is Brigid. I will second Marla's motion, and I believe that would be a motion to move it forward to have the JJOC discuss them and vote in support of it.

Marla McDade Williams: Correct.

Elizabeth Florez: Excellent. I love the efficiency. This is Commissioner Florez for the record. With that, all those in favor of the motion, please say aye or raise your hand.

Marla McDade Williams: Aye.

Group: Aye.

Elizabeth Florez: Are there any opposed? Any abstentions? Seeing none. The motion carries. I don't think that was agenda item number five. Is that correct, Ms. Casselman?

Cindy Casselman: Number seven. Oh, I'm sorry, number six. My apologies.

Elizabeth Florez: Number seven.

Cindy Casselman: Number six.

Elizabeth Florez: Number six. That was related to the introduction of the new goals. Okay. I'm not sure what the rules of the game are here. Do we want to continue with item number seven, or should we defer that to the next meeting?

Brigid Duffy: This is Brigid. I'm sorry, Elizabeth Florez, but I have to leave because I have an appointment. I got to start walking there.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. Excellent. Thank you for that, Commissioner Duffy. This is Commissioner Florez for the record. With that, I'm going to again apologize if I'm breaking rules here, but we do not have time for item number seven, so we will have to defer that for another meeting. Going on to item number eight it's for discussion and action is to identify the next meeting date and agenda items. If anybody quickly has any future agenda items, they'd like to suggest feel free to send them out. Otherwise, I would like to ask that Ms. Villalobos to send a doodle poll for the next meeting. Are there any other items? Okay. I'm not hearing any. With that, we'll close item number eight. Item number nine, Public Comment and Discussion. Is there any public comment? Seeing none. We'll move on to item number 10, Adjournment. Thank you so much, everybody. This was very productive, and I appreciate your support.

Meeting Adjourned.