

MINUTES

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

Notice of Funding Opportunity to Review Applications of Possible Grantees

March 22, 2023

11:00 am

1. Call to Order – Jane Saint, Spokesperson

Jane Saint called the meeting to order at 11:00 AM.

Attendees:

Name	Organization
Beverly Brown	Nevada DCFS
Desiree Mattice	Sergeant – Dept. of Public Safety
Dylan Nall	Nevada DCFS
Jane Saint	Director, Nevada CASA
Jennifer Spencer	Deputy Attorney-General
Laurie Jackson	Nevada DCFS- Rural Regions
Bruce Cole (recorder)	Nevada DCFS

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

Dylan Nall called the roll. Salli Kerr and Michelle Rodriguez were absent.

3. Initial 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) – Jane Saint, Spokesperson

No comments.

4. For Information: Review NOFO applications and CJA goals – Dylan Nall, DCFS

Dylan Nall reviewed the goals of the CJA Task Force: 1. Fund and provide CPS workers and stakeholders with training. 2. Support the implementation of our CSEC model Coordinated response protocol tool. 3. Support our Children’s Advocacy Centers (CACs). 4. Funding technology requests to improve investigation and prosecution of child abuse and neglect with the latest technology. 5. to identify needed changes for policy, regulation, and legislation to meet new requirements of federal and state policies. Our funding is based on these goals. Dylan then reviewed the applications.

5. For Possible Action: To discuss possible funding for NOFO Applications – Dylan Nall, DCFS

Clark County is seeking \$48,500. They are going to contract with the National Children's Advocacy Center to train up to 90 professionals in forensic interviewing. They also are seeking funds to assist law enforcement's ability to efficiently work with the purchase of a high-speed copier. These meet Goals 3 and 4. Great Basin CAC is requesting \$6,300 to fund two forensic interviewers seeking advanced child

forensic interviewing training through the National Child Advocacy Center. This meets Goals 1 and 3. The Nevada Institute of Forensic Nursing is a new grantee. They are requesting \$14,362 to aid the cost of virtual training for contracted nurses to work with the children under our care. They would provide new technology for the 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. Meets Goals 3 and 5.

No to Abuse – Nevada Outreach Training Organization (NOTO) is requesting \$19,849 to send 14 people to the San Diego International Conference on Child and Family Mistreatment in January 2024. It would include two staff from each discipline, which includes child advocacy, forensic interviewers, law enforcement, prosecution, medical, mental health, and CPS. Meets Goals 1 and 3.

Washoe County is requesting \$40,684. They are asking for advanced training for their CAC team to enhance services and to stay current with the emerging trends and best practices. These trainings are specifically for forensic interviewing for 5 CAC workers, CSEC Advocacy Courses for 10 child welfare staff, Child League of America annual conference for 5 assessment staff, the Shared Hope Juvenile sex trafficking annual conference for 3 assessment staff, Trauma Informed leadership for 4 MDT members in leadership roles. Additionally, they would like to purchase 2 multi-function printers needed for the medical office unit 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. Meets Goals 1, 3, and 4.

Beverly Brown noted that the cumulative amount of all the requests is just over \$100,000. There is enough money to fund all these applicants if that's what this group so chooses today.

Jane Saint said, while Dylan was calculating the total amount, that she had the opportunity to visit the Clark County CAC and it was very insightful. It gave life to what is just read off a piece of paper. She recommended that committee members visit sites after the funding has been approved.

Dylan Nall said the total for requests is \$129,695. She also gave the total assessment scores for the applicants. Clark County was 526 out of 575. Great Basin was 513 out of 575. Nevada Institute for Forensic Nursing was 536 out of 575. Nevada Outreach Training Organization was 491 out of 575. Washoe County was 556 out of 575.

Jane Saint posed the question whether the extra money be spent to fully fund all these requests, or do we stick with the \$100,000 ceiling, and make cuts in these requests?

Jennifer Spencer said she was very impressed with all the applications. Keeping in mind the \$100,000 ceiling she took the amounts down as best as she could proportionally to the points that they received in the scoring. Her thought is to reduce them by the amounts of points proportionally. Jane Saint said she liked that idea, as did Laurie Jackson and Desiree Mattice. Jane Saint then asked Jennifer Spencer what she came up with in her funding recommendations.

Jennifer Spencer said that she could go through her Excel sheets individually and then let the group know what her funding recommendations were – it is not a perfect reduction based upon the points, but she tried to get it as close as possible. Starting with Great Basin her recommendation for them was \$4000. For the Nevada Institute of Forensic Nursing, her recommendation was \$9000. The

next one was Clark County, and she reduced it to \$40,000. Nevada Outreach Training Organization she reduced to \$14,000. For Washoe, her recommendation was \$33,000.

Laurie Jackson asked what the next step is. Dylan Nall said we go to the CJA Task Force on April 4th. They basically approve it based on our recommendations. Basically, they just have to say yes or no. They could say no. She didn't think they've ever said no to what we recommended because we're doing the work, they don't have to. They rely on us to give them the information.

Jennifer Spencer mentioned she has done one of these before in a different group and the main group does like to know how we came up with these figures. They want to know, why did you reduce it and how did you actually come up with the figure? So that may be something that we talk about, this is our opportunity to talk about how we're going to decide to award the funds if it's a percentage on the points that they received or if it's something else.

Dylan Nall reiterated what Beverly Brown said, we are able to fund everybody at full funding. If we still wanted to do full funding, that's something we can definitely do.

Jennifer Spencer asked does that mean that there's funding sufficient to provide everybody with what they requested. Dylan said yes. Jennifer Spencer said her position is she thinks they should be provided the funding they requested. Jane Saint agreed these are challenging times for everybody, and so much uncertainty that this would be a wonderful gift for them to give them funding that they asked for because it is hard raising dollars out there in the environment now.

Desiree Mattice said she didn't disagree with providing the full funding, however, wanted to make sure, that we're not doing it just to provide it because we have the funds, but that we're doing it for a sufficient reason because of the request that they're providing. On the additional funding, if we were to fund the full amount, does that inhibit the funding for next go around, or is this just an additional amount that we have within our system.

Beverly Brown said yes, it is an additional amount. We have a CJA grant every single year, it's around \$180,000 and then we fund about \$100,000 for these grants. So, we have the extra funding in there and then it doesn't affect anything for next year because we'll have a new grant.

Desiree Mattice said she would like to talk about just some of the little things that she did see just so we are clear that if we are providing this funding that they understand that there were some topics that we wanted to get either more information or more clarification. That way when we do go to the full task force, we can explain that we did discuss these, and we know what the amount is being requested for, like the printers and things like that. She had a little bit of reservation about that but also was questioned about sending so many individuals from different agencies to training where we had two bodies per agency being sent and what the validity of that was. On the No-To-Abuse group, she didn't understand why we were sending so many people to this specific training. She just wants to make sure that we're all in on a grant for the same reason. Jennifer Spencer said she was asking the same question regarding many of the applications for the trainings - the justification as to why so many staff needed to go, that was one of her concerns, besides the printer.

Jane Saint said that was a very good point. She wondered about the 14 people for training. They break it down into two staff from each discipline, could they have one staff from each and they come back and do a presentation or a training for more people within that community? Jennifer Spencer said that a lot of these applications provided some information regarding the training, but there are some applications in her view that just did not provide specific enough information like exactly what training are they going to. She would have liked to see some brochures or copy of brochures. What kind of classes are offered? For the applicants for the future, just providing more detail; with the copiers, as well. What functions in these copiers are they looking at? How many vendors have they looked at? What's the price? What's the service requirement, stuff like that?

Jane Saint asked, do we have the ability to go back and ask these questions to them? Or once we get the applications, are we basing our decision on what they've written.

Dylan Nall answered that we're basing the decisions on what they wrote. However, she thought that can be discussed during our next NOFO applications. We could say, please provide a brochure or discuss at length discuss what are these trainings or we can ask for future clarification. Next year that could be something that would help us with the training issues.

Jane Saint said that this was one of the things she brought up last year, and then recommended, if possible, to actually have the applicants available to do a short little presentation and then answer our questions.

Dylan Nall thought maybe at the bare minimum we just have them explain what the purpose of the conference is for instance, a quick synopsis of what this advanced forensic training would look like.

Desiree Mattice said that one of the other things she wanted to mention with the Great Basin CAC, was questions when we're talking about training is about this advanced training and she wasn't understanding the correlation where advanced training increases the number of the population that they are actually serving. She wasn't really understanding that correlation and didn't feel that it was described well. She 100% promotes more advanced training because it does give more of an understanding. However, if we're sending a lot of people to this advanced training, what about the people who need that intermediate training, to get them more up to par?

Beverly Brown said we can talk to our Grants Management Unit and see how historically they've handled that, with giving feedback to applicants on how they can improve and just kind of see what we can come up with on a process for that because that's not something we've done yet.

Jane Saint said we had that same conversation last year because there was well-written applications and then there were not-so-well-written applications. We knew the need in that particular area was great, but their application didn't reflect that as much as it should have.

Laurie Jackson said Washoe and Clark have units. They're like machines in a way. But smaller entities like NOTO, Nursing, and the CAC, it's usually someone who gets tagged to do it. They're kind of figuring it out at the same time. So especially feedback to smaller entities would be good. She has been tagged a couple of times and didn't really understand the process, so if there would be a

way to either provide feedback or even just do a training before the NOFOs go out for these little entities that say, here are some specific recommendations to describe for training.

Dylan Nall said Clark County, Washoe County, and Great Basin come to our large committee. She doesn't want to call out specific agencies during that large committee, but just say there's some questions regarding the trainings, there were some unclear issues that we wish would have been cleared up or answered etcetera, etcetera, and maybe let's ask if any agency who has applied for funds would like to ask what our recommendations are. They can e-mail Dylan and then we can talk to them like privately offline about what they can improve and things like that.

Laurie Jackson said Great Basin's submission last year was bad; it was just very vague. They did get some feedback we provided. Betsy Crumrine provided someone for some grant writing instruction and just how to be clearer. She felt she could actually see an improvement. They got some kind of feedback that helped them understand who their readers were.

Jane Saint thanked Laurie for bringing that up. She said another thing that we could do that would be helpful is when the notice of funding comes out that we do a mini training to bring out that, this is what we're looking at in this, this is what we're looking at for that. This may be an area where the committee members can get involved and help, especially us on this committee because we've read the applications, we've gone through them, and we see each year how this got better because they got that feedback and it might be more prudent to do it at the application time because then it's fresh in their minds and there are many groups out there that if you're going to apply for money, you have to attend this training.

Dylan Nall said she would probably put that on our next Evaluation committee agenda. The session with applicants could be a short 30-minute conversation. It doesn't need to be hours and hours long, just tell them that if you're going to apply, you need to attend this.

Jane Saint said we could even call it a briefing, rather than a training, saying that these are the questions that have come up and be prepared to cover these in your application. She said we now go back to that original question. What do we want to recommend for funding? She would love to recommend that they all get the funding that they asked for, but now with some of these questions that we've had and basing it on the actual scores of the applications, perhaps we go with Jennifer Spencer's recommendations. Based on the conversation about NOTO's 14 people, do we look at maybe cutting them a little bit more and putting more into Washoe County because they scored higher? Jennifer Spencer agreed.

Jane Saint did quick math and said if we cut NOTO to one staff person from each discipline that would drop it down to \$9924.50 based on their request.

Desiree Mattice said she was now going to be on the opposite side and be a devil's advocate. If we are limiting the amount of money, it's because we're doing it for a valid reason and we're not almost appearing to be punishing because they didn't provide applications that had the full detail because, as we know, when people have submitted applications previously for NOFOs, they got their feet wet and now they know how to write to conform to what we're asking for. She doesn't disagree with what Jennifer has proposed but wants to make sure that when we make that decision that we're doing it

soundly based on purely what the application states and not because we perceive that they are not providing us enough because of the lack of information that they want to share as opposed to the information that they didn't know they needed to share if that makes sense.

Jennifer Spencer said, yes, that does make sense. She vacillates between positions because ultimately the applicants are meeting the goals of CJA and it's for an imperative need that they're asking for this and training is always a good thing. It's always important that they have best practices training and, given the fact that there are breakout sessions during these trainings and multiple individuals are going there are different viewpoints. For example, you may have two individuals from law enforcement, but very different learning processes and taking different things from the learning. Bottom line is that if there are the funds available to provide to all the parties, Jennifer recommends full funding rather than her later recommendation based upon the \$100,000 cap. She asked if these extra grant funds that we would be providing to these entities are earmarked for something else?

Beverly Brown said they were not.

Jane Saint agreed with Jennifer. It's a luxury we have this year. We should take it. But based on our conversation, let's look at putting together a briefing before NOFOs goes out next year so that we can provide better direction to the applicants to meet the needs of our committee.

Desiree Mattice asked if request updates about what courses they actually did take when we're talking about that conference, you know, what are the different courses that individuals took while they were there at the training - that way we kind of get a gauge on how to have that conversation in the future. Jane Saint asked if we had as many training grants this year as last year. Dylan said Great Basin asked for training and supplies and the purchase, production, and printing of culturally sensitive resource and education material that will enhance culturally appropriate topics and specific resources. So, it sounds like they're just asking for stuff to fund their new facility that they're getting. Washoe asked for advanced trainings for the CAC and assessment staff, including two national level conferences and a training in Reno with the national level trainer. They proposed to equip the CAC assessment and technology with 5 laptops, and 66 external CD and DVD players, but there are things that we took out of that one. Clark County did refurbish the Southern Nevada CAC which child-appropriate furniture and supplies staffing the MDT conference room and then contracting with the National Children's Alliance to provide specialty trainings with therapeutic art. But we said no to that. They proposed to virtually train up to 90 snack and community partners and forensic interviewing through three training courses. Dylan said the issue was we have five applicants instead of four applicants last year, but we did not fund the CSEC coalition. So, we funded those three. But then we have two new applicants this year.

Jane Saint moved that all five applicants be funded at their requested amounts. Laurie Jackson seconded. Approval was unanimous, with no abstentions or no votes.

Jane Saint said she would like to make a second motion that moving forward we have some kind of briefing or mini-training workshop for anyone who wants to apply in 2024 so that on many of the questions that we brought up today on training the applicants will be aware of, and that we look at if it is legally possible that we provide feedback to those groups.

Jane Saint moved that all five applicants be funded at their requested amounts. Laurie Jackson

Dylan Nall asked Jennifer Spencer, since that's not on the agenda, are we really allowed to make a motion? Jennifer replied that correct, it's not on the agenda because the agenda was pretty specific on the recommendations for the funding, but she thought just to provide some discussion for that, can do it in Public Comments. Dylan said she can put that on the Evaluation subcommittee to add that we have a briefing. Jennifer Spencer added that as far as providing suggestions to the applicants, they are also welcome to this meeting as a recorded meeting, and it is a public record. They can always listen to this and watch it to get that feedback as well.

6. For information: Announcements – Jane Saint, Spokesperson

Jennifer Spencer had an open meeting law suggestion for Dylan Nall. On these agenda items that she puts on the screen as part of the PowerPoint maybe just number them. This would be number #6 instead of a bullet point because that would help the public know which item, we're on.

7. 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) – Jane Saint, Spokesperson

No comments.

8. Adjournment – Jane Saint, Spokesperson

Meeting adjourned at 11:56 AM.