

Joe Lombardo
Governor



Richard Whitley
Director

Children's Justice Act Subcommittee- Evaluation of Grantee

Division of Child and Family Services

Dylan Nall

May 10, 2023



Department of Health and Human Services

Helping people. It's who we are and what we do.



TEAMS' MEETING LINK

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer, mobile app or room device

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 269 335 706 107

Passcode: 7n4cD9

[Download Teams](#) | [Join on the web](#)

Or call in (audio only)

[+1 775-321-6111,,80787941#](#) United States, Reno

Phone Conference ID: 807 879 41#

[Find a local number](#) | [Reset PIN](#)

Thank you for planning to attend this Teams meeting.

[Learn More](#) | [Meeting options](#)



Welcome

1. Call to order

2. Roll call



Initial Public Comment

- 3. 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.



Meeting Minutes

4. For Possible Action: Consideration, discussion and possible action to Approve March 01, 2023 Meeting Minutes (Please see attachments)

- Motion to approve
- Motion to 2nd
- Vote



Proposed Grantee Activities

5. For Information: Review and discuss upcoming grantee and their proposed activities.



Clark County Department of Family Services

- CCDFS seeks funding to contract with the National Children's Advocacy Center (NCAC) to train up to 90 SNCAC and Community Partner professionals in forensic interviewing.
- CCDFS also seeks funding to assist in providing the latest technology to enhance law enforcement's ability to efficiently work on site at the SNCAC through the purchase of a high-speed copier machine for use by Law Enforcement.
- \$48,500
- Goals 3 & 4



Great Basin Children's Advocacy Center

- The GBCAC requests funding for two Forensic Interviewers seeking advanced child forensic interview training, Advanced Forensic Interviewing (AFI): Beyond the Basics, through the National Child Advocacy Center.
- \$6,300
- Goals 1 & 3



Nevada Institute of Forensic Nursing (NVIFN)

- NVIFN is requesting CJA funding to aid in the cost of vital training for our contracted nurses to work with the children under our care. The awarded funding would also provide the cost of the new technology VALT Cloud system to be used in the soft exam room and mobile unit, which will allow for remote viewing of interviews by law enforcement or attorneys. All use of the VAL T Cloud information is admissible in court.
- \$14,362
- Goals 3 & 5



No To Abuse - Nevada Outreach Training Organization (NOTO)

- NOTO intends to send 14 people from the NCCAC MDT to the San Diego International Conference on Child and Family Maltreatment in January 2024. This would include 2 staff from each discipline including child advocacy, forensic interviewers, law enforcement, prosecution, medical, mental health and child protective services.
- \$19,849
- Goals 1 & 3



Washoe County Health and Human Services

- WCHSA will provide a range of discipline specific and advanced trainings for the CAC team to enhance services and stay current with emerging trends and best practices. Trainings are specific to forensic interviewing for five CAC child protection workers, Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) Advocacy Course for 10 child welfare staff, Child Welfare League annual conference for five assessment staff, Shared Hope Juvenile Sex Trafficking annual conference for three assessment staff, and Trauma-Informed Leadership training for four MDT members in leadership roles.
- Additionally, this project includes the purchase of two multi-function printers needed for the medical unit office and the assessment workers' office within the CAC to increase efficiency and accessibility and seven large monitors for intake/assessment workers to increase intake efficiency.
- \$40,684
- Goals 1, 3 & 4



Grantee Update Template

- 6. Consideration, discussion and possibly make edits to the quarterly grantee update form.
(Please see attachment)

- Motion to approve
- Motion to 2nd
- Vote



Future Agenda Items

- 7. Consideration, discussion and possible action regarding future agenda items.
- Motion to approve
- Motion to 2nd
- Vote



Announcements

- 8. Information Only: Tasks members to discuss any important announcements regarding their agencies.



Final Public Comment

- 9. 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.



Adjournment

10. Thank you for your time and commitment to improving services for children and youth in Nevada.

THANK YOU!

CJA Grantee Quarterly Update

As a CJA Grant funds recipient, it is mandatory that a thorough and complete report be provided to the CJA coordinator each quarter during the grant fund year. Failure to provide these reports may result in a withdrawal of grant funds. If you have any questions about the reporting requirements, please contact the CJA Coordinator.

Grantee Information

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Name: | Date: Click or tap to enter a date. |
| Agency: | |
| FFY2020 Grant Funds Received: | Dollar amount |
| Funds expended: | |

Activities Funded and Evaluation Work

| |
|---|
| Describe the activity funded: Curriculum review; creating new assessments; incorporating into new format. |
| |
| Describe any evaluation work related to this activity including evaluation methods, outputs, and outcomes of the activity. (Please include or attach supporting data, statistics or other relevant documentation when available): |

MINUTES

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

March 1, 2023

12:00 PM

1. Call to Order – Janice Wolfe, Spokesperson

Meeting called to order at 12:00 PM

2. For information: Roll Call – Dylan Nall, DCFS

Dylan Nall called the roll.

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 Wolfe | Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada |
| Salli Kerr | Western Regional CAC |
| Bruce Cole (recorder) | Nevada DCFS |

Absent:

| Name | Organization |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| Michelle Rodriguez | Family Court Magistrate |

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) – Janice Wolfe, Spokesperson

No comments.

4. For Possible Action: Approve the last two meetings’ minutes – Janice Wolfe, Spokesperson

Betsey Crumrine moved to approve the November 9, 2022 minutes. Desiree Mattice seconded the motion. Minutes were approved, with Janice Wolfe abstaining due to absence. Desiree Mattice moved to approve the August 11, 2022 minutes. Betsey Crumrine seconded. Minutes approved, with Salli Kerr abstaining due to absence.

5. For Possible Action: Introduce the three (3) year Assessment – Janice Wolfe, Spokesperson & Dylan Nall/Beverly Brown, DCFS

Dylan Nall said her job is to write the three-year assessment. Our report is nothing really without evaluation inputs and outputs and so she wants everyone to discuss what kind of evaluations we want to see in the future, what kind of things we want our grantees to see, where do we see this task force going? Basically, she knows that's a bigger picture maybe for the task force, but again this is the evaluation committee, but the Feds want something a little bit more than what we have been giving them, so she wanted to talk about that because this is our big report that's due every three years. This will be due May of 2024.

Dylan proposed that we get through the legislative session and table an in-depth discussion to a later date. She did want to talk about it a little bit, but also give everyone the adequate amount of time to look it over before we go on to a deeper discussion.

Janice Wolf suggested that Dylan provide a “Cliff Notes” overview today and then we can table it for further discussion after we've all had a chance to digest it.

Dylan said that next meeting is May 10th. We can either discuss it then (that will be in the middle of the legislative session) or in August. We meet a month after our large Task Force meeting, which is July 11.

Salli Kerr said August appeals to her because by then we maybe have started seeing some reports come in from grantees. Having established some different evaluation processes, we could have some practical knowledge about how people are responding to that.

Desiree Mattice asked if there are questions in reviewing this assessment, she wanted to make sure if we needed to bring those questions to a meeting, so it's on the record, or if emails are acceptable. Dylan said emails would be acceptable because we're not changing anything, because this has already been submitted. Dylan Nall also said she has been meeting with the CJA coordinator for the state of Washington and he has office hours for his task force; he sets aside 2 hours a month for them. This is a time for the task force to come in and ask questions. She is thinking about having that.

Dylan Nall said basically with this three-year assessment, it's going to focus on what our task force goals are, what kind of things we want to see in the next three years. The Children's Bureau really is focusing on how we are evaluating the funding that we're giving out; they really want these numbers to correlate to have quantitative answers. She has talked about seeing if we could find someone to do an evaluation on our subcommittee. Dylan asked the gentleman in Washington about this. His fell through due to COVID, but prior to COVID he was going to spend roughly \$9500 on an evaluation of his subcommittee. and this. This was a PhD student out of Washington State University.

Jane Saint asked if this is an evaluation of the subcommittee or helping to develop an evaluation for the grant money that we're giving out? Dylan Nall replied that it would be an evaluation of our regular task force and the things that we're doing, how we can improve and what things we're doing well, to help us out moving forward.

Jane Saint asked where the money would come from. Beverly Brown said we are granted roughly \$180,000 every year. CJA allows us three years to spend the funding and so we work very diligently to make sure that money gets spent. You will see in the CJA report from last year, we did. There is some additional stuff we're doing around CSEC data, and then we funded laptops for caseworkers in the Rurals in the past. We have an upcoming training that she believes Washoe County and the rural region are interested in that she believes we're going to fund with CJA funds. We always have a little bit too that we need to make sure we keep aside in case they resume meetings in Washington DC because we are required to go.

Janice Wolfe said she was still a little bit confused about the evaluation. Are we looking at the quality of the grants? Whether the grants conform in quality to our criteria for awarding the grants? Or evaluating the follow up on how the money was spent? Dylan Nall said this is something we're going to probably must put on the next agenda because it's going to be an item that we will have to obviously vote on if people agree. She is meeting with her counterpart in the Washington state in the next week or two and she can ask question about that. He's had some great ideas. We will bring all this back up in the May meeting.

Janice Wolfe wondered if there is any way to compare the projects and allocations that we've made here in Nevada versus what grant projects look like in other States and other jurisdictions? Are our priorities and our allocations and our grant approvals consistent with what's happening across the country?

Dylan Nall said that in Washington they obviously get a lot more money than we do. Their agency gets \$369,000, so almost double of Nevada. They put on a three-day huge conference for all the MDT members across the state of Washington and it fluctuates between the eastern side of Washington and the western side of Washington. Dylan was told that \$300,000 is spent for all that huge conference. Washington gives \$25,000 in grant money, so significantly less money to grantees, but they spend a lot of their money and funding on that conference.

Salli Kerr asked about the report that came back from the Feds, does it include their feedback and evaluation?

Jane Saint said that when she and Salli attended the conference last May there were so many things that other people were talking about, their reaction was, we should be doing that. Then again, you must have the resources to do it.

Beverly Brown said that the three-year assessment is important because it defined our goals for the next three years. This upcoming year between May 2023 and May 2024 is going to be our final year with our current goals. Over the next year is when we really need to kind of lay that groundwork for what do we want our next goals to be, because maybe some of the ones that we have are still relevant. Maybe they need to drop off and we have some other ideas coming out there, but that's really what we probably want to spend the next year doing with our assessment. We can line out those goals and have some ideas for some projects. Janice Wolf said she had noticed in her five years on the task force, our practice has been to allocate small amounts of money to multiple agencies right across the state. Do we do we keep that focus or are we going to, considering our evaluation, take the bulk of the money and give it to one blockbuster, difference making, project, or

do we want to continue our practice of smaller grants to multiple agencies? She was wondering if that was something that an evaluation process would help us look at. Salli Kerr said she and Dylan Nall had a conversation about how it seems to be the same organizations applying each year for basically the same amounts. It was nice to see with the applications that there's not the same group this year, so maybe we are making progress. Dylan said, to go back to Sally's question, she would pull up The Children's Bureau feedback and recommendations from our submission in May 2022:

Our membership was full despite turnover, but we kept on with their quarterly meeting calls. The information was clear, and the activities carried over the past year and proposed activities for year to come appear to be appropriate for the CJA program and aligned with the Task Force recommendations. It is helpful to read updates regarding ongoing activities such as sub grants for multiple MDT training, support for CACs and domestic training for the trial welfare staff. They are looking forward to updates on the work around implementation of the CSEC protocol and then enhanced data collection of victims of CSEC. For the future explore adding a parent with lived experience as a task force member. With that recommendation Dylan did find out that we are able to add categories to our membership. Next, support the Child and Family Services Review PIP, especially on safety outcomes and the interim report narratives - there is a lack of clear and specific data provided in these areas. In future reports, the Children's Borough would like to see more detailed information as results of surveys or post and pretests and then related to trainings to extend the possible information such as the type of training provided, to whom and the number or percentage of targeted people who should have been trained that received the training.

Jane Saint said the funding committee was saying last year we wanted to see more information and that's why we were asking for verbal reports at our quarterly meetings instead of just written reports, and time when we can ask questions because we were just seeing outputs, we weren't seeing what the outcomes were of these programs.

Desiree Mattice said that she agreed with getting a little bit different output because as was just mentioned that when we receive it on paper, it's kind of just shows more quantity versus quality. And when somebody's talking, we're kind of really seeing the effect as opposed to how it is written. She thought especially during this process and reviewing the next NOFOs it's going to be interesting to see how society is changing and the requests that they are also making and the changing of the trainings that are needed. Maybe we will be in that situation where we have fewer people requesting for larger sums as opposed to a lot of people requesting smaller sums. Betsey Crumrine said her personal and professional opinion is that she would rather push the money out and let people spend it on direct services than spend \$100,000 or \$50,000 on a conference, which can easily happen, especially when you're paying somebody else to set it up. And if you're not paying somebody else to set it up and you're going to do it yourself, it is going to become your full-time job for about 3 months. There are a lot of trainings that professionals can go to and if there were a specific need or a reason, if we had an MDT team that was struggling in an area and we needed to do something to lift them up and shore them up, then that would be different. But just to have a big conference for two or three days, she doesn't think it's a good use of the money personally.

Janice Wolfe and Desiree Mattice agreed about the priority of direct services. Janice added that she was just thinking more in terms of being open to at least looking at different ways to allocate money as opposed to keep allocating it in the small amounts that we're doing.

Dylan Nall said she and Beverly Brown are working three hours a week on the annual report right now to get it done and submitted to our director's office by the end of April. She knows this will be put on the agenda as an Action Item. Do we want that for May or August? There was agreement on August, so as to finish the legislative session, and there is no urgency otherwise.

Jane Saint asked if this outside evaluation is done, who would do it and what are the costs?

Dylan Nall said she would try her my hardest to get them that information as soon as she can. That's also a bigger Task Force decision. If she doesn't have it at the May meeting, she will in August. She said there had to be a vote to move this to August as an Action Item. Jane Saint made the motion, and Betsey Crumrine seconded. Approved unanimously.

6. For Information – Announcements – Janice Wolfe, Spokesperson

No announcements.

7. 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) – Janice Wolf, Spokesperson

No comments.

8. Adjournment – Janice Wolfe, Spokesperson

Meeting adjourned at 12:42 PM.