

MINUTES

Nevada Children's Justice Act (CJA) Task Force

January 10, 2023

9:00am

1. Call to Order – Salli Kerr, Chair

Salli Kerr called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM.

Members Present:

Name	Organization
Angela Blare	Adult Survivor
Cheryl Cooley	Clark County Department of Family Services- CAC
Cory Martin	Great Basin CAC (Elko)
Desiree Mattice	Sergeant – Dept. of Public Safety
Fran Maldonado	Division of Child and Family Services
Jamie Wong	DCFS
Janice Wolfe	Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada
Jane Saint, Vice-Chair	State Director, Nevada CASA
Michelle Rodriguez	Family Court Master
Rachell Ekroos	
Salli Kerr, Chair	Western Regional CAC
Tammi Williamson	Washoe County CAC

Members Absent:

Name	Organization
Betsey Crumrine	DCFS- Rural Regions
Cole McBride	Washoe County CAC
Jennifer Rains	Washoe Public Defender
Jennifer Spencer	Deputy Attorney General
Jonathan Slothower, DO	Great Basin Advocacy Center
Kendra Gipson	Nevada PEP
Kimberly Martin	Washoe County
Kimberly Mull	Victim Advocate
Laurie Jackson	DCFS Rural Regions
Lisa Ruggerio	Nevada CAC
Zaide Martines	Court Improvement Program

Guests:

Name	Organization
Kristy Mills	Great Basin CAC

Staff Support:

Name	Organization
Beverly Brown	Division of Child and Family Services
Bruce Cole (recorder)	Division of Child and Family Services
Dylan Nall	Division of Child and Family Services

2. For Information: Roll Call – Salli Kerr, Chair

Dylan Nall called the roll.

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) – Salli Kerr, Chair

No comments.

4. For Information: Review CJA Task Force Goals – Dylan Nall, DCFS

Dylan Nall set out a slide showing the Task Force Goals. Especially since we have quite a few new people today, she wanted to go over the CJA goals fast.

Our first goal is to provide child protection workers and stakeholder front-end specialty, discipline- specific, and advanced training. This training should be prioritized but is not limited to training requirements of program improvement plans, child protection model assessments, Indian Child Welfare Act, sexual abuse, domestic violence, forensic interviewing, trauma informed practices, substance use, and co-occurring mental health disorders and training needs identified in collaboration with the Court Improvement Program.

Goal #2 is to support the implementation of our Commercially Sexually Exploited Children (CSEC) model Coordinated Response Protocol and provide training and support for the formation of the Multi-Disciplinary Teams (MVT) and Task Forces.

Goal #3 is to support establishment of new Child Advocacy Centers (CAC) or other MDT approaches and improve the capacity of our existing CACs to provide a MDT response for victims of child sex abuse and exploitation, physical abuse, and child victims with disabilities. Activities may include the development of a strategic action plan for project implementation, identification of rural healthcare providers, investigation of funding opportunities for infrastructure and operating costs, and the use telehealth and telemedicine statewide.

Goal #4 is to fund technology requests to improve the investigation, assessment, and prosecution of child abuse and neglect using the latest technology and to support the use of new and existing training technologies.

Goal #5 is to identify new or needed changes to policy regulation and or legislation to meet requirement of federal program improvement plans and other federal and state initiatives. Support trainings and policy needs related to new or revised policy regulation and legislation.

Salli Kerr pointed out the importance of these goals as we are opening a new Notification of Funding Opportunities (NOFO). It opened yesterday and is due next month. Those applications must tie what they what they ask for in funding to one of these goals and we have to be able to clearly show that there are supporting and meeting one of these goals in order to be funded with CJA funds.

There were no further questions or comments.

5. For Possible Action: Approve the last two meetings' minutes – Salli Kerr, Chair

Jane Saint moved the minutes from the October 4, 2022, Task Force meeting be approved as written. Christine Sullivan seconded. Motion approved, with Desiree Mattice, Char Frost, and Wonswayla Mackey abstaining.

Jane Saint moved that the minutes from the November 8, 2022, subcommittee meeting to establish a subcommittee to review CJA by-laws be approved. Tammi Williamson seconded. Motion approved, with Char Frost and Wonswayla Mackey abstaining.

6. For Possible Action: Review and/or Approve 2023 CJA's annual recommendations – Rachell Ekroos, Subcommittee Chair

Rachell Ekroos noted that she has had the opportunity to have been involved in several different layers of infrastructure evaluations across the state from different perspectives at different times. So, coming in and being able to bridge those observations over the past 10 years, working on committees such as this and then bridging that over to being able to participate in the recommendations has been quite the journey. The subcommittee met and did a lot of what we've done already today and reviewed the goals and reviewed last year's recommendations, the feedback we had last time, and talked about where we are in the state to have that as a foundation for the recommendations. Continuing to bolster the infrastructure, we're not just talking Clark County in Washoe County, we're talking the entire state. How can we write these so that we are serving in a capacity to bolster all areas of the state and be inclusive in that? And in doing that, we had a conversation about stakeholders and looking at the different stakeholders, not only the end users of products and trainings and things like that, but the community-based stakeholders. How do we engage the stakeholders and support them to build the infrastructures in all these areas?

Dylan Nall put up on the screen the two recommendations that came out of that meeting

#1: The Children's Justice Act Task Force recommends that the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) continue to prioritize training for all child welfare staff and stakeholders in the state of Nevada to improve the investigation and handling of child abuse and neglect or cases involving both, particularly child sexual abuse and exploitation. This training recommendation includes, but it's not limited to child protection model assessments, family and interpersonal violence, mandatory reporting, medical, forensic interventions, and trauma informed practices.

#2 The CJA Task Force recommends that the Division of Child and Family Services support efforts to translate best practice and support community specific needs to coordinate the multidisciplinary response to child abuse and neglect or cases involving both, particularly child sexual abuse and exploitation. This MDT support recommendation includes introducing and establishing child advocacy centers (CACs) as appropriate.

Rachell Ekroos said you'll see that we are recognizing the areas in the state that have already developed infrastructure, those that are starting to develop their infrastructure, and those that have a need and are still needing assistance in developing that. For example, about introducing and establishing CAC's as appropriate, it may not be appropriate for all communities at this time. If you go up to the first recommendation, the last sentence of including child protective model assessments, family and interpersonal violence, mandatory reporting, medical forensic interventions, and trauma informed practices - we're trying to build support for that response process, but also the services. We had a lot of discussion about the gap in the mental health services, which everyone on here has talked about. That is the gap of mental health services for the children and for the families. To build this infrastructure, we had to have the medical forensic folks as well. That's how we got to the specific wording that's in the two recommendations.

Salli Kerr asked Dylan Nall, for the sake of the new members, to walk through the recommendation process. Dylan replied that every year, every Citizen's Review Panel (CRP), of which the CJA Task Force is one, is required by the Child Abuse and Prevention Treatment Act (CAPTA) to submit recommendations to the Division of Child and Family Services. DCFS has six months to respond back to these recommendations. So probably in our July meeting she will come back and provide the responses that DCFS has come back to these recommendations. DCFS can reject recommendations and then we will explain why we reject them. We want them to come from our CRP members and not necessarily from DCFS, writing our own recommendations. That's why it's very important that we had this subcommittee getting these recommendations drafted and then presented.

Char Frost asked if, in the first recommendation, was there any consideration to including, in addition to the trauma informed practices, cultural competency training and system of care values and principles training. Rachell Ekroos said they didn't have a specific discussion about that. She would say that the systems of care do fall under some of the models that we were already looking at. For her, the trauma informed care includes the cultural component, but that may not be true for all practices, so that's an excellent point. Rachell asked if they could include language at the end of the first recommendation about "trauma-informed practices which include cultural competency." Char Frost said that would be great.

Jane Saint asked if recommendations ever have been rejected, and what would we do then as a group? Beverly Brown said that DCFS had never rejected anything from CJA, but they did reject something from another group last year. There was no particular follow-up on that. Beverly said she now wants to see what other states do when there is a rejection. Rachell Ekroos shared from her experience with other states in this area that sometimes they're written too specific and they're too directive. So that creates an issue. A lot of times that's because there's not the collaboration and meetings like this ahead of time to discuss and move forward and send it back. Beverly said that had been the case with what was rejected last year.

Cheryl Cooley returned to the issue of cultural competency to say a part of Clark's accreditation standards is to talk about how we are promoting cultural competency in each of their CACs, as well as having all the multidisciplinary team folks agreed and signed up and signed on for that approach.

Rachell Ekroos said she was playing a little bit of a devil's advocate here: we're also trying to build in the areas without CACs because we're trying to build that support system and infrastructure too. Her question would be to the other experts. In the child protection models that you're different implement, and the system of care models, do they include cultural competency as a fundamental component of the model? Dylan Nall said every agency in Nevada has the same safety models assessment. It's called the SAFE model.

Tammi Williamson said she understands that for Washoe's CAC Washoe County they're not doing anything differently than they have been to maintain accreditation. Barbara Scofield confirmed that they do have cultural competency as one of the standards that they have to meet every three years reaccreditation.

Char Frost said she is a co trainer with the Division of Child and Family Services system of care unit. There are three modules of the training that they've developed through the system of care; the second module of it is around health disparities and inequities. It could be super valuable for everybody to understand, especially walking to a home that may not represent the culture that you are from. The other pieces of the training are around health and healthcare equities and disparities. It's on-line, and it's been recorded. It's more than just cultural competency. It is understanding those healthcare disparities as well as understanding the culturally and linguistically appropriate standards.

Wonswayla Mackey from Clark County said that regarding their safety model, they don't have cultural competency in effect called out within the safety model because that was a model that they acquired through a contractor, but they do have cultural competency that is inclusive of accreditation for the CAC and then with regards to cultural competency training for staff, they go through different types of training.

Rachell Ekroos asked, are we looking at cultural competency or cultural responsiveness? Because competencies are different from responsiveness. A lot of the responsive models speak to what Char was describing. It's understanding cultural differences, recognizing potential biases that you bring when you walk in that door, looking beyond the differences to work productively with children and families and communities whose cultural contexts are different from one's own. So that tends to be more under the umbrella of cultural responsiveness because it requires awareness, understanding, and acting as well as being aware of your own biases that you bring in. So, if we use that broader term of cultural responsiveness, then that allows for capturing all those cultural competency, specific cultural awareness depending on the needs of those stakeholders.

Desiree Mattice asked, whatever we put in there, is it going to be recognized by all parties? And if we are using specific language such as responsiveness, are they going to be aware of what exactly we're requesting? Are there terms that for the trainings are synonymous to what we're requesting? Are there specific phrases or something to that effect that we can utilize to assist in description?

Rachell Ekroos said the reason she was recommending responsiveness is what Desiree was bringing up. On childwelfare.gov they use "cultural responsiveness," so that's why she thought it was a more overarching term to recommend. Char Frost said, regarding the first recommendation, that she was not aware there is a "system of care model assessment," so that last word was struck.

Desiree Mattice asked, as we're talking about cultural responsiveness, is there a difference in the training when it comes to child abuse and exploitation? Is there a difference as far as being aware on how to respond? Char Frost said she was not sure that cultural responsiveness is about what is suspected. It's about recognizing your own internal biases, whether those are explicit or implicit and approaching individuals in a culturally responsive way, that honors their culture. It doesn't. It doesn't really have anything to do with the

suspicion of abuse or neglect. Char Frost moved to approve the recommendations as amended. Jane Saint seconded. Motion approved unanimously. Salli Kerr thanked Rachell and the subcommittee. Her leadership in this, and the idea that we really have moved to CRP and away from relying on Dylan and Beverly and moving out to the expertise of the group is a big step forward in how we have done these recommendations.

7. For Information: A presentation on the Children Family Services Review (CFSR) overview regarding round 4 – Lupie Janos, DCFS

Lupie Janos of DCFS gave a PowerPoint presentation:

CFSR is the acronym for Child and Family Service Review. It's a collaborative process between the federal government, the Children's Bureau, and the state of Nevada (and all the states). It helps us in ensuring that our children and families that we work with are receiving quality services through any system they touch in child welfare. That includes not only our child welfare agencies, but also our courts, legal system, our community resources, and our service array that we refer people to. On average, CFSR takes 5 to 6-7 years. When we talk about round 4, round 4 starts later this year, but there will be three or four years of round 4 going on. That's only to accommodate the number of states that we have as well as our territories.

The review really involves looking at all our statewide systems. Not only our child welfare agencies and our courts and our service arrays, but how those integrate and intersect and how well we do with those intersections. They involve looking at our statewide data that's taken from UNITY and other reports., There are comprehensive case reviews that are done on individual cases and including a bunch of interviews with both case participants as well as stakeholders throughout the state. The goal of these reviews is really to get a better picture of what we are doing well and where we have opportunities to improve. Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) processes are utilized throughout the entire review.

What really is it looking at? Outcomes regarding safety, permanency, and well-being again for all the people that we service. A Key point about the CFSR is that it evaluates our *efforts* to achieve outcomes in addition to the outcomes themselves.

Round 4 starts later this year, in October. It aligns with federal fiscal year. So, this year would be considered year one. The nine-month process is really the review period: looking at our data, doing our case reviews, doing a statewide assessment, doing all the interviews. Then waiting for a final report from the Children's Bureau. What happens at that point is again where you identify those opportunities to improve as a state and then we'll develop our PIP. That's our Program Improvement Plan, which will then take us into the work that we do over the next two years from there.

The Children's Bureau is focusing hard on two specific areas. 1. Assure authentic, meaningful, and ongoing stake holder engagement, especially of youth, families, those with lived experiences. 2. Advancing equity and inclusion by encouraging consideration of the experience of populations within the state that may experience bias, inequities, or underservice – either in their communities or by the systems seeking to serve them. Jane Saint asked who all is involved in this process.

Lupie Janos said it's the child welfare agencies, the rural region, Washoe County, Clark County, as well as the family programs office. They also invite encourage people to come from outside (stakeholders). Anybody that would like to be a part of the process could express their interest. There's training. There's a time commitment. If somebody wanted to come and be a case reviewer if they just expressed interest to

somebody in the Family Programs Office, we could evaluate that and assess the possibility for that. On the court side, the court has a whole separate process that they use specifically.

Wonswayla Mackey said that from the child welfare perspective, all their managers and some of the supervisors participate in the case reviews. It's usually a weeklong commitment that they are asked to dedicate specifically to the case reviews. They are looking at the three different areas that would be mentioned with regards to safety, permanency, and well-being. They're looking at the efforts that were made as well as the actions that were taken to ensure that all those areas have been met. They either show that they achieved the goals, or they didn't achieve the goals, and the areas that need improvement. So, it's an extensive process that we go through. The benefit of it is that any supervisor or manager who has participated in that process can speak to how valuable it is with regards to learning how to engage those families as well as interacting with those parents. They do have parents who have been involved with the cases - they come back, interview them, and get their input as to what the engagement was like during their cases as well.

Tammi Williamson added that in Washoe County they even use their senior caseworkers. That's been beneficial for them at the front line and at the permanency level to see how the case is affected from the day you get it till the end of it. It takes some of that higher level discussion down into the trenches of the workers that are doing the work and that improves outcomes as well. Salli Kerr was curious about what community assessments work hand in hand with this. Is there a broader demographic kind of assessments, what kind of community assessments do you do?

Lupie Janos they've really looked at what a family or a child may have experienced, through the life of their case. It may be very specific. She wouldn't say that it's a broad spectrum, but hopefully they take a sample of cases from across the state. Janice Wolf asked what happens to the outcomes Are they published? Does it go into a book? Does it go into a report that sits on a shelf? Does it get released to the media? How are the findings used and communicated to people who may or may not have been involved in the process?

Lupie Janos answered that we as a state receive that report from the federal government. That report is published on a federal website. We utilize that information to develop our Program Improvement Plans and develop reports. Those are all published at least at the state level on our statewide website It's an area of focus on how do we better get that information back to the people who were either involved, through the process or in a particular case?

Char Frost asked again about who is involved in the case review process.

Lupie Janos replied, typically just professional staff. There are occasionally stakeholders who become trained up and can participate as well, but it wouldn't necessarily be somebody from just the general public.

Salli Kerr thanked Lupie and moved the meeting along to Beverly Brown's presentation

8. For Information: A presentation on the Children Family Services Review (CFSR) overview regarding items 1, 2, and 3 – Beverly Brown, DCFS

Beverly Brown said she would go over specifically items 1, 2 and 3 here as they do all pertain to child safety. The first item is the timeliness of initiating investigations and reports of maltreatment. The purpose is to determine, essentially, whether we responded within our allowed response time that we have when we assign an investigation. Beverly showed a quick graph that's been put together by the Family Programs Office that shows where we've been at each review. There is a Clark County review and a Washoe review.

The quarter, at the beginning of our PIP, is the baseline where we started. For the PIP goal, what we needed to meet was 68.9%. So, we met that.

Then for item 2, this one is about services to families to protect the children in the home and prevent removal or reentry into foster care. So, this one is concerned with when we're initiating a case, what efforts are we making to prevent their removal in some circumstances, and then also to prevent children's reentry. Once they're reunifying with family, what efforts are we providing to prevent those children from coming back into care? So again, here our baseline was 71%, which is where we started. We didn't do well in some quarters and then we kind of improved and we didn't meet our PIP goal until the very end.

Item 3 is probably one of the larger items that is in our CFSR. This one has to do with risk and safety assessment and management. This one is to determine during our period under review whether we made efforts to assess and address the risk and safety concerns related to the children in their homes or in foster care. This one is a little bit trickier because it pertains to the entire life of the case, so sometimes what we might see is that they did everything right the whole time, but there was one little mistake made and so that this item will be moved to an area needing improvement and it's no longer identified as a strength. On this, our baseline was at 46%. Again, this one is a little trickier for us to meet, but we are obviously making improvements as we brought it all the way up to 84% during our last review.

Beverly Brown said it had been a while since an update on the PIP activities. She went over what they did during this last PIP and where we are now: Training and clarification on our response times, efforts that meet our response times, persistent efforts to locate families, and reason the state was not meeting standards; update the Intake and Nevada Initial Assessment (NIA) policies; develop and track multiple data reports; create a standard for, and a tool to measure, proficiency in Nevada's child welfare practice models.

For continuing activities, now that our PIP is ended, our proficiency tool is developed and part of our Child and Family Services plan, which is our five year plan, we have a goal of getting 70% of our supervisors proficient in our child welfare model and so right now is we're waiting for a work group, cause we're going to do a brief project with the Capacity Building Center for states to further identify the parameters around the testing, coaching and retesting individuals per proficiency to give us a better process to move that forward. And then again, we continue to utilize the data reports that we created.

Her thoughts are that with the CJA 3-year assessment approaching next year that the task force consider if there are any activities or goals that this task force may be interested in that relate to these three items that she went over here today.

She put the links in for the reports that Lupie Janos was talking about the annual progress and services report and then the Child and Family Services Plan. Those are on the DCFS website and there's a link on there. There are more reports than these two, but these will give an idea of some of the things that our state is working on.

Jane Saint asked about a big drop in the rural region in Item 2, quarter 06. Beverly replied that when we do these case reviews it does pull a random sampling and so there's times where there's a lot of cases that are not applicable for item 2. So, if we receive a sample and the child was removed prior to the period that we're reviewing for this item will become not applicable which doesn't make it negative. It just means that there's going to be a smaller sample size that applies. Then sometimes it also varies whether we're looking at children who were those in home safety cases. If you don't have a lot of cases and then you get a couple of cases where maybe some stuff went wrong, you're going to get a really low percentage rate.

Jane Saint then asked about training staff, making sure that they're proficient. How has staff turnover, which across the country is very high, impacted making sure that staff supervisors and managers are proficient?

Beverly Brown said there were processes in place in the jurisdictions where, even with some of the turnover, supervisors or CQI units or whomever is looking at these reports and going through some of this, which is good, but she also wanted the jurisdictions to answer if they any more information.

Wonswayla Mackey said at Clark County turnover has been an impact, but with regards to training, they have continued with their Academy schedule ongoing throughout COVID and through all the challenges of CSFR, they have continued with processes in place so that supervisors are able to contact those workers even through telecommuting. They have them staffing or going out with some of the senior workers. There are virtual meetings with their staff to ensure that there's training, but here in Clark some workers did find that difficult. Some of the staff decided they wanted to go try to work in different other avenues of child welfare such as the school district, juvenile justice, and things like that. So, it's been it's been a challenge, but it's one that they made sure that we're very aware of it and very intentional about ensuring that those touch points are happening with both current staff and the new staff that are coming out of the academies.

Tammi Williamson said Washoe County has been fortunate. Upper leadership has remained unchanged, or they have very senior people who are supervisors who are now coordinators, and they've been involved for many years and been able to continue that support to workers and staff and as senior staff promotes into supervision, they've also been involved at that level of overview.

Desiree Mattice had a couple of questions about the Rurals. For those numbers to drop, were the numbers more specifically for specific areas in the rural because the whole entire state is considered rural outside of Washoe and Clark. Not only that, but when we do have this massive turnover and we're short staffed, do we have people who are able to cross assist and be a resource, maybe from Washoe or Clark for those rural areas that may be lacking in those resources?

Beverly Brown said she couldn't recall off the top of her head if it was specific areas or not in the Rurals. It's a random sample and so you end up with cases from all the different rural jurisdictions. She added that they consulted with the Children's Bureau on item 2 sometime after that really low number because there were questions about how we were rating item 2 for ourselves. Once they got clarity on that, they also saw an increase right because they had a better understanding of rating that item.

Then for the second question they do not have people practicing in other jurisdictions and there is legal stuff around that, so she knows that at least what she has been told is that Clark and Washoe aren't able to practice outside of their counties, unless there's inter-local agreement between the agencies. Right now, if there is any kind of cross jurisdictional stuff, it might be because a child, say, is from Pahrump, but they're currently in Las Vegas in the hospital. It's very, very specific incidences and they just can't be that crossover. Char Frost asked about "persistent efforts to locate families." Is that like locating family members who are outside of that nuclear family that is being investigate?

Beverly Brown said no, that is when we go out and we attempt initial contact and can't find the family. What is the worker to do now? Maybe they're trying to see if the children are school age, if they go to school, seeing if maybe they get welfare and supportive services to where there's more updated contact information, contacting other collateral sources family or law enforcement background checks. There are all sorts of stuff that the workers can do, but it's really to try and initially find that family because we obviously

have an allegation of maltreatment, and we need to assess it. It's just the instruction for how they locate them.

9. For Information: Notice of Funding (NOFO) application dates – Dylan Nall, DCFS

Dylan Nall put up a slide with the NOFO application dates. It is also posted on the Grants Management Unit (GMU) website. The deadline for submission is February 17th. The subcommittee on evaluation of grants will be reviewing these. The evaluation period is from March to April 2023. They take these to the Task Force in April. The announcements of the awards will be in June of 2023 and then the program start date will be July 1st of 2023. The program end date will be June 30th of 2024. The total dollar amount is the same as last year - \$100,000.

10. For Information: Evaluation Subcommittee update – Janice Wolf, Subcommittee spokesperson

Janie Wolf was not able to be at the November 2022 meeting of the subcommittee. Salli Kerr chaired the meeting. Dylan asked if Salli could give quick update of the meeting. Salli Kerr said that we wanted to be able to have measurable outcomes and asked our grantees to be able to provide for us how they were going to make sure of those outcomes, what measuring tool, or how is it going to be several trainees, or number of trainings, what we were going to use to evaluate that. So, you will want to pay special attention to that piece if you're on the subcommittee.

11. For Information: Grantee updates for FY 2022 – Salli Kerr, Chair

Tammi Williamson spoke for Washoe. They are excited about the next part of their grant. They are going to be bringing in a speaker, a training program to help train 35 staff members, 10 or 12 from Washoe County and then the remainder are all law enforcement CAC staff that do the forensic interviews. This will be from May 31 to June 2 and is run by Reed Behavioral Analysis. They also sent 8 employees to attend the Crimes Against Children Conference in Dallas this year and that's the most they have been able to send at one time. Normally it's two or three. They were able to bring back a lot of information to counterparts here in Washoe. There's been some other technology devices and things like that to help the CAC workers in interviewing, having digital files and that kind of thing, so the money has been super beneficial and we're looking forward to requesting some money again for this coming year. Cory Martin said Great Basin hasn't accessed their grant funds yet because they're waiting to purchase all the community informational brochures, etc. for when they get into the building. As anyone involved in construction knows, there are all kinds of little roadblocks. So, the move in date has been moved back to February and they are hopeful to get all the construction products and get that building done. Then you are all welcome to come and see it.

Cheryl Cooley said Clark County is going to be completing their third virtual training in March, which will complete the three trainings that they've had. They have been able to train 45 people virtually and then the next class will be a class of 30 and they're able to offer this training to all folks across the multidisciplinary team. They are going with the NCAC model out of Huntsville, AL. So that is going to happen in March. She thanked Jane Saint who talked about the Children's Week for the legislature because we were able to make the application. So, this this chapter will be able to represent the CAC for Children's Week in the legislature. She noted that with Great Basin's accreditation, 75% of Nevada's CACs are accredited. She said that she and Kristy Mills in Pahrump have developed a great partnership. She commented on the

concern with the stats from the Rurals. The CACs do have crossover and so you know via someone that lands up north, she can call to get a forensic interview for that child and services for that child. Or someone can call them and ask for a forensic in Las Vegas. So, they do really work well together.

12. For Information: Discussion about adding to our membership list – Jane Saint, Vice-Chair and Salli Kerr, Chair

Jane Saint said she knows that that we have some gaps. We should be adding to our overall membership roster people with disabilities, children with disabilities, etc. It would be beneficial to really look at who we have. Dylan then reviewed the required categories for representation on the CJA Task Force. Every year we must turn in our CJA report which is due the last day in May. So, we have certain categories that we must fill. We do not have to have multiple people, but we must have someone in there. We can have multiple people. If we are looking to have multiple people, then we need to make sure that they're dedicated to coming to every meeting because sometimes it is very hard to make quorum and then we can't get what's done on our agenda. Today we met quorum as we had 13 out of the 16 people that we have. We only needed nine out of 16 because we must have a majority. It is important that we do have a diverse population of people, especially since Nevada is a large state. Clark County takes up 90% of the population, unfortunately there is a large part of the state that is the frontier. The rural counties are not represented. We need to have more people; we just want to make sure before we do that that we get these people that are very committed so we can continue making quorum and continue with the great progress that we've been making. Jane Saint said one of the things when she does board recruitment, she puts together a matrix of what we're looking for to make sure that we have a good representation from the north and the south and the Rurals. She must make sure she has judicial districts covered. That might help us when we look at this.

Discussion followed on who could bring in rural representation. Jane Saint said Betsey Crumrine works with rural populations. Char Frost said she works primarily with the Rurals these days. Dylan noted that Great Basin has brought in people from White Pine and Eureka counties. Jane Saint said she'll go ahead and work with Dylan and put together a matrix of what we have right now, and then we'll be able to see the areas that we need to add what we'll need and reaching out to some of you to help us fill in that matrix on where we are and where we are not. Salli Kerr pointed out that we can invite people to come to this task force that are not designated as task force members, but rather as member without voting; they can bring their input and expertise. So, we're not limited to only having the people that fill the spots on this matrix or what's required by the CJA but can be outside of that.

13. For Information: Announcements – Salli Kerr, Chair

Jane Saint said one of the things that they're doing for Children's Week is they are putting at least one bus together. The Kid Mayor of Reno and the Kid Mayor of Las Vegas both do a little presentation. It's out on the lawn in front of the legislative building. If you have anyone who might be interested in attending but not having the resources or doesn't want to drive over to Carson City, be sure and get involved that way. Jane has a form or a flyer regarding the buses and can share that with everybody. The bus departs from Las Vegas at 9:30 AM and they drive up to Carson City and then they leave Monday evening when they get back late but nobody must worry about driving because you've got the bus driver, but it's a great experience, especially if you've got some kids who want to learn about the legislature and some parents who want to make their story be heard. Char Frost said there are two buses now. She is hoping there will be a third bus from Elko.

14. Final Public Comment: (Discussion only: Action may not be taken on any matter brought up under this agenda item until scheduled on an agenda for action at a later meeting) – Salli Kerr, Chair

There were no comments.

15. Adjournment – Salli Kerr, Chair

The meeting adjourned at 10:54 AM. The next meeting is scheduled for April 4, 2023.