

**MINUTES**

**Nevada Children’s Justice Act (CJA) Task Force Subcommittee**  
**Evaluation of Grantees**

**August 11, 2022**

**12:00 PM**

**1. Call to Order – Dylan Nall, DCFS**

Dylan called the meeting to order at 12:03 P.M.

**Attendees:**

Name	Organization
Betsey Crumrine	Nevada DCFS
Beverly Brown	Nevada DCFS
Desiree Mattice	Sergeant – Dept. of Public Safety
Dylan Nall	Nevada DCFS
Fran Maldonado	Nevada DCFS
Jane Saint	Director, Nevada CASA
Janice Wolf	Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada
Monica Cypher	Nevada DCFS
Bruce Cole (recorder)	Nevada DCFS

**Absent:**

Name	Organization
Michelle Rodriguez	Family Court Master
Salli Kerr	Western Regional CAC

**2. For Information: Roll Call – Dylan Nall, DCFS**

Dylan Nall completed roll call.

**3. Initial Public Comment (Discussion only: Action may not be taken on any matter brought up under this agenda item until scheduled for action at a later meeting) – Dylan Nall, DCFS**

No comments.

**4. For Information: Review CJA Evaluation process – Dylan Nall, DCFS**

Dylan Nall reviewed the purpose of the subcommittee. The CJA wanted the subcommittee to oversee the effectiveness of the CJA grantees and monitor the grantees’ goals and objectives, as well as follow and meet the CJA task force goals. They plan to develop an evaluation process to help write the annual CJA report which is submitted in May of each year to the Children's Bureau. In summary, we're going to talk about how we think we should evaluate our grantees, make sure that they are adhering to their goals and objectives, and ensure we're providing

money to the people that need it and will benefit from it.

Dylan Nall presented a slide for review of the five goals of the CJA Task Force. 1) To work with the Court Improvement Project. 2) Support implementation of the Commercially Sexually Exploited Child (CSEC) Model Coordinated Response Protocol and to provide training and support the formation of Multidisciplinary Teams (MDTs) and Task Forces. 3) Help to establish new Children's Advocacy Centers (CACs) or other multidisciplinary team approaches to help improve the capacity of the existing CACs which provide a multidisciplinary response for victims of child sex abuse and exploitation, including the identification of rural healthcare providers, investigation of funding opportunities for infrastructure, operating costs, and the use of telehealth and telemedicine statewide. 4) To fund technology request to improve the investigation, assessment and prosecution of child abuse and neglect, and support the use of new and existing training. 5) To identify new or needed changes to policy, regulations and/or legislation to meet the requirements of federal program improvement plans and other federal and state initiatives, and to support training and policy needs related to new or revised policy regulation and legislation.

It's important to have a subcommittee for evaluation of our grantees because the Children's Bureau is on an evaluation committee. Dylan thought West Virginia, Oregon, and some Midwest states are on it. These states have evaluation subcommittees with more information that's provided to them than Nevada does. One of the States, she thinks its West Virginia, contract and pays for an evaluation. A contracted agency evaluates their CJA task force and then provides them what they need to improve on and what is needed to improve the grantees. She thought our CJA task force could benefit from it, and she says we can talk about later. The outside agency would help write the three-year assessment by CJA; the next one is due in 2024.

Betsey Crumrine asked if this would be paid with CJA money and Dylan confirmed it is. Betsey's concern was that this would be money that then would not be spent on direct services. She wondered if there might be a way to glean some of the benefits of those assessments by looking at other states' goals or annual reports to get ideas that way rather than spending money that takes away from direct services. Dylan Nall said she definitely understood that, but seeing that when we submitted, our CJA report back in May, we got the responses back in July and the Children's Bureau basically said they wanted us to spend a little bit more time on the evaluation and how effectively this money was spent on X, Y, and Z. She can get more information if everybody would like her to, to see if they can let her see their reports and she can present it at our next subcommittee meeting.

Betsey Crumrine asked who she can ask for that information? It was Betsey's understanding that the Grants Management Unit (GMU) has been the one getting the reports from the grantees, but it's minimal numbers. Numbers of families served; kids served etc.. She asked if that is what Dylan is referring to regarding those reports and evaluations?

Dylan Nall explained that she sends out a quarterly report to all our grantees, before they meet. She asks them to fill out a template of information on how much they spent. That is attached to her CJA report every quarter when we meet and that tells us what they're doing, how they're serving and

how they're spending their money. Then at the end of the year, some agencies send her their yearly report while others haven't been, so she's been stuck with this influx.

Beverly Brown added that every year there is feedback from the Children's Bureau wanting more focus on evaluation methods, this is why we've created this subcommittee. At times, we struggle with getting enough information back from the grantees. Beverly noted that Jane Saint pointed out that we need more follow up with these grantees to really understand what they do, and the impact they are having. This is what the Children's Bureau wants to know. They're wanting more than what we're giving them. We may want to contract someone for evaluation, but right now we're looking at doing this subcommittee and assessing where we can improve our evaluations.

**5. For Possible Action: To appoint a spokesperson – Dylan Nall, DCFS**

Betsey Crumrine suggested that someone from FPO should be the spokesperson. Dylan Nall noted that she is not on the subcommittee, but just the task force coordinator. So, it has to be a member of the subcommittee and/or task force.

Beverly Brown noted that Salli Kerr was absent but that we had Betsey Crumrine, Desiree Mattice, Fran Maldonado and Janice Wolf present. Janice Wolf said she would be willing to serve.

Jane Saint moved that Janice Wolf be elected spokesperson. Desiree Mattice seconded. Motion was unanimously approved.

**6. For Possible Action: To establish future subcommittee dates – Dylan Nall, DCFS**

Dylan proposed the following dates and times:

November 9, 2022 at 10:00 AM

February 8, 2023 at 10:00 AM

May 10, 2023 at 10:00 AM

The meetings would occur a month after the CJA task force meetings.

Jane Saint moved the dates be approved. Desiree Mattice seconded. Motion was approved unanimously.

**7. For Possible Action: To discuss possible evaluations for CJA grantees and discuss future subcommittee work – Dylan Nall, DCFS**

Dylan Nall went through the funding of the current grantees.

Great Basin Children's Advocacy Center serves a diverse population in rural Nevada, which spans four counties. They propose to develop and provide a compassionate trauma-informed response training to refocus and bring together a well-functioning, compassionate team of new and existing MDT team members. Training supplies and the purchase, production and printing of culturally sensitive resources and educational materials will enhance culturally appropriate topics and specific resources. This will facilitate a reduction in trauma experienced by children and their caregivers. Great Basin Children's Advocacy Center, with what they proposed for their funding, would meet CJA goals One and Three.

Washoe County Health and Human Services seeks to provide a range of discipline specific advanced training for CAC and assessment staff throughout the year in order to enhance services and stay on current and emerging trends and best practices. Training includes two out of the area national level conferences and a training in Reno with a national level trainer. They proposed to equip CAC and assessment staff with enhanced technology, which includes laptop computers and external CD and DVD players. This will increase data efficiency and generally assist in providing more effective and proactive planning to produce or to improve abuse and neglect assessments and investigations. This would meet our CJA goals 1,3, and 4.

Lastly, we funded Clark County Department of Family Services. They are in their final stage of refurbishing their Southern Nevada CAC to provide a safe place for children of abuse to disclose their trauma, child appropriate furniture and supplies will be purchased, as well as furnishing the MDP conference room where Community Partners convene. They propose to virtually train up to 90 Southern Nevada CAC and Community Partners staff in forensic interviewing through three training sessions at four-month intervals before June 30th, 2023. Again, this meets Goals 1 and 3.

Jane Saint thanked Dylan for the clarity of her presentation. Dylan said that, obviously, the grantees had just started their funding cycle July 1st so there were no updates. She asked if anyone who's on the call had any ideas about how we want to further evaluate their work and how they're meeting our goals.

Janice Wolf asked if on specific reporting deadlines, are we supposed to get accounting or updates every quarter? Dylan said she e-mails all of the grantees quarterly, about a month before our big task force meeting. She will be sending out an e-mail in September. There is a document that is attached and the document asks how much they spent, what activities were provided, what did they use the money on and how is it going? There's no specific policy, but she knows that the task force has asked that our grantees report via a Word document every time we meet.

Janice Wolf wondered what mechanisms are in place if one of our grantees fails to meet goals and objectives they are targeting with the appropriation of the grant. What mechanisms are in place if they're not meeting the goals, like the quarterly goals in terms of expenditure? Let's say they don't get the training done they said they would or they didn't purchase the equipment that they said they would purchase. What happens when it's not done?

Beverly Brown said that in the past, we discussed issues with not receiving updates. It is possible that they could have their funding ended. Obviously, it's never gotten to that point and someone would really have to mess up to get to that point. She believed the grantee updates that they get quarterly tells them, by not giving us information we need they can have their funding rescinded. The other piece to add is our Grants Management Unit is now doing their own scoring of these grantees every year. They keep track of how well the grantees report back to them. She believes we're going to start incorporating decisions in future meetings that when grantees had poor performance in years prior, how will it impact their ability to continue to get funds.

Betsy Crumrine said she vaguely recalled when she was helping the Great Basin CAC with their grant applications in previous years, there is a section on the grant application that asks how they are going to evaluate their request for their program. Does the quarterly request for feedback specifically tie back to how they say they're going to evaluate it?

Beverly Brown said this was sometimes the case, but that's really an area where we could probably strengthen our applications.

Betsy Crumrine agreed that program evaluation is hard anyway, on a good day. She remembered with the CAC that she had been talking about having the clients actually fill out some sort of pre- and post- survey about the services that they received there. That can be difficult too because when they show up for the service, they're a captive audience. You could have them fill out the survey then. But there was a lot of conversation and struggle around how to get the post survey filled out because even professionals don't always fill out surveys. The return rate is historically really low for that. It's an issue all the way around. But she thought they should start by going back to the application and seeing how folks said they were going to measure it and then make sure that they're doing that as a minimum.

Beverly Brown said we did start doing that last year (and that we are doing that at least internally with FPO) and we could start doing it with this group because we started developing the spreadsheet that reviews what they said they were going to do, etc. We can probably bring that back to this group.

On another topic, Beverly was thinking we do tend to have a lot of the same applicants every year. Perhaps it's worth seeing what kind of evaluations trainings are out there for people that are doing these applications. Perhaps CJ A can look at having them attend some type of training or education around evaluation work.

Betsy Crumrine thought that was a great idea. Perhaps, if we had some sort of an evaluation webinar, people could be required to watch that before they submit their application. She seemed to recall years back that Fiscal actually implemented a system like that, or GMU with 4-B grantees. It was such a train wreck and there were so many different people applying every year. Everybody was new, they had these mandatory webinars that sort of walked people through the process and you couldn't even apply unless you had attended a webinar. You could do some sort of stipulation like that. She added that, for instance, the presence of the CAC in Elko means a probable increase in prosecutions and the people in Elko could learn how to incorporate that kind of information into the evaluation.

Desiree Mattice asked if there is a way to do a concrete follow up when they provide their report, whether it be quarterly or whatever. We need the details from when we did the original review that these were areas they were working on, and then having that as an evaluation, so we have something to also reference when it comes to another evaluation. Also, if we have the repeat requesters, is there a way to go back and see what the progress was from the previous request to see if they are requesting the same information or same financial assistance for training and things like that?

Beverly Brown said definitely she thinks that those are things that we can do and also would anticipate by our next meeting we will have the first update from people and we can kind of tell you what the applications were, what we funded, when they're supposed to do it, what they said they do for an evaluation and then, here's the update they gave. We can definitely have all the information for our next meeting.

Dylan Nall said she pulled up a random application and there is a question that states, what are the measurable expected outputs and outcomes for this project? And then another question is, explain what measurements will be used to report on your proposed project success. This includes any evaluation tools your organization will use to measure your outputs and outcomes and what data will be tracked.

Janice Wolf asked, while we're talking about previous recipients, is there a place on the grant application that requires them or that asks them for prior grant payments? For example, when we get a grant package, whether these are the same people that applied two years ago or a year and a half ago. Not that that's a disqualifier, but she was just curious to know whether there's a way to track whether the same people are getting the money repeatedly, or whether it's being dispersed over different organizations and agencies. And is that a factor? For example, when the Children's Attorneys' Project applies for certain grants, they have to say whether they've gotten money from this particular agency before or how often, so she was just wondering whether that was something we do on these or not.

Dylan Nall did not think there's anything on the particular application but believes Grants Management Unit has their own score and that question might actually be on that.

Desiree Mattice wondered if, for example, we provided funding for a specific task force and then when they received the funding that did not come to fruition. They didn't utilize the funds as needed, or as appropriate. Is there a denial, or a tracking of that? Is that something that we do have in place?

Beverly Brown thought that at DCFS they know when those things happen. They haven't had anyone inappropriately spend funds. Usually, it's that all of the funds weren't able to be expended and an activity wasn't completed. They can have that information available to the NOFO Subcommittee that's making the decisions or making the recommendations for next year's funding.

Betsey Crumrine said again that it might be helpful to look at what other states are doing. What are their goals? What other things are they doing for evaluation, especially states that have paid for this evaluation. Everyone's plan should be a public record. Maybe we could ask those states to send us theirs and she would volunteer to review some of those just to sort of see if we're in the ballpark or if folks are really doing big, great things. She just hated the idea of spending 30 to 50 grand on an evaluation. What we're going to get back isn't rocket science, and we could glean some great ideas from looking at other people's work, who have already done that kind of assessment or evaluation.

Dylan said she would research this.

Betsey said she attended federal meetings years ago, and Nevada was one of the leaders. "We had better goals; we were doing more creative things with our funding than many other states that would just sort of report out on using it for administrative purposes." She stated she was always really proud of the fact that our money was going to fund actual programs. An example is that CJA task force funded the Great Basin CAC for probably over a decade. Every year they would apply for it, and maybe five or ten grand at one point in time, people were sort of scoffing at them for continually asking. But the reality was, they limped along for a decade as a small group of volunteers trying to get this initiative off the ground. Now twelve years later, they finally have the DA's office on board, and they're building a multimillion-dollar CAC in Elko. They always have their MDT team, but

they never had a building, and everything is coming to fruition. If they had not been allowed to continue to apply for the small amount of money that they got, which they used for equipment and cameras and training of nurses to do the exams and doctors, they wouldn't be where they are today. So, she definitely thinks having a section on the grant application that asked people how many years in a row they've applied for the money and how much they got and what they did with it, is OK, but doesn't think that we should necessarily put a limit on it because it was instrumental in getting that CAC off the ground in Elko.

Janice Wolf agreed and wasn't even suggesting we have a limit. She wanted to see if there was a mechanism to assess whether the same organizations were reapplying every year, and if there was more of a cross section of applicants.

Betsey doesn't think there is a cross section because she doesn't believe people know about this grant or what they can apply for. She states that maybe it's a part of the evaluation plan. "If we don't pay somebody fifty grand to evaluate us, maybe that's a part of the plan. We have a little public service work that goes out to educate more people about this so that we get a broader array of people applying."

Janice Wolf stated she likes our grants because they attract applicants that we don't normally see on some of the others, like CIP grants and so forth and so on.

**8. For Information: Announcements – Dylan Nall, DCFS**

There were no announcements.

**9. Final Public Comment (Discussion only: Action may not be taken on any matter brought up under this agenda item until scheduled for action at a later meeting) – Dylan Nall, DCFS**

There were no comments.

**10. Adjournment – Dylan Nall, DCFS**

Dylan adjourned the meeting at 12:52 P.M.