

MINUTES

Nevada Children’s Justice Act (CJA) Task Force Subcommittee Notice of Funding Opportunity to Review Applications of Possible Grantees

March 24, 2022

11:00am

1. Call to Order – Dylan Nall, DCFS

Dylan Nall called the meeting to order at 11:06 AM.

Attendees:

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

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

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) – Dylan Nall, DCFS

No comments.

4. For Information: Review CJA NOFO Subcommittee purpose – Dylan Nall, DCFS

Dylan Nall reviewed the purpose of the sub-committee: to disburse \$100,000 to one or more projects to further the goals of the Children’s Justice Act. These goals (on a Power Point) were reviewed by the attendees silently before moving on to consideration of the applications.

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

Laurie Jackson moved that Jane Saint be appointed spokesperson for the sub-committee to the CJA Task Force. Jennifer Spencer seconded. This was unanimously approved.

6. For Information: Review NOFO applications – Dylan Nall, DCFS

Dylan Nall gave a quick review of the entities whose applications are under review:

Great Basin Children Advocacy Center’s request is for training supplies and the purchase of production, printing, and culturally sensitive resource and education and material, which will

enhance culturally appropriate, topic specific, resources. This will facilitate a reduction in trauma experienced by children and their caregivers.

Washoe County Health and Human Services seeks to provide a range of discipline specific, advanced trainings for the Child Advocacy Center (CAC) and the assessment staff throughout the year to enhance services and stay current on emerging trends and best practices. Trainings include two out of the area national level conference and a training in Reno with a national level trainer. They propose to equip the CAC and assessment staff with enhanced technology that includes 5 laptop computers and 6 external CD/DVD players. This will increase data efficiency and generally assist in providing more efficient and proactive planning to improve abuse and neglect assessments and investigations.

Clark County Department of Family Services is in its final stages of refurbishing the Southern Nevada CAC to provide a safe place for the children of abuse to disclose their trauma. Child appropriate furniture and supplies will be purchased as well as finishing the multidisciplinary team conference room where community partners convene. They will contract with the National Children's Alliance Center to provide specialty training of 2 staff members in the therapeutic techniques of art. They propose to virtually train up to 90 Southern Nevada CAC and community partner in forensic interviewing through 3 training sessions at 4-month intervals before June 30th, 2023.

Beverly Brown announced that CJA will not be funding the Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence, which has nothing to do with their application, which she called "absolutely wonderful." She noted that Health Management Associates, which met with the January CJA meeting, is also working on a rather large-scale statewide domestic violence project for Nevada and it would be duplicative to fund essentially both things. She will be meeting with the Nevada Coalition because there will still be collaboration with them, and they will be involved in the process with HMA.

Jane Saint noted that this meant the \$100,000 can now be split three rather than four ways

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

Dylan Nall set out last year's funding for the three remaining grantees, what they are now requesting, how big an increase or decrease that is, and the scoring done on the applications by the NOFO reviewers. The total scores were: Great Basin 371 out 575, Washoe County 411 out 575, and Clark County 378 out of 575.

Beverly Brown then spoke about the role of the Grants Management Unit (GMU). Once there is approval for funding, that is sent off to GMU and then they take it from there, they send out the notice of award and they are the ones who really maintain communication with the grantees throughout the year. What is called the GMU score is the past performance of the agencies with the DCFS Grant Management Unit. This includes the timeliness and accuracy of request for funds, timeliness and accuracy of performance reports, and then recipient monitoring findings, which HMA has explained as monitoring all of the agencies to ensure program and fiscal compliance and if there are any findings of a policy or procedure as lacking or nonexistent. These make up 50 points. The scores accorded by GMU were 13/50 for Great Basin, 43/50 for Washoe County, and 43/50 for Clark County.

Jennifer Spencer asked for further explanation of how the scores were tallied. Beverly Brown pulled up on the screen a blank sheet, which was provided to applicants, with various questions and criteria, for the applicant to fill out. Reviewers then looked at these and assigned their scores.

Dylan Nall asked the reviewers to speak about how they went about their work on the various applications.

Jane Saint spoke about Great Basin. The need is there, and she felt that they should get some help in writing applications - that would really help strengthen their position. It was a rather weak application, but still their passion came through. She gave them a 91 score, and thought that they should be fully funded, as they are asking for a smaller amount than last year. She wondered if they could get help in strengthening their future applications. Dylan Nall said she would reach out to Great Basin. Jane Saint also wondered if Great Basin's trainings would be state-wide; Beverly Brown thought that if they were virtual, that would be the case.

Massey Mayo felt similarly to Jane Saint. She struggled to understand what type of training they meant. They didn't name the training or really set out specifics about the goals. She understood that it was like a team building training and educating newcomers or reeducating some holdovers. If they could explain she would support that. She also felt it was vague about what the materials were in terms of the flyer that they wanted to have handy. What would the flyer contain? Was it just educating the public about their organization or was it something specific about data points for their area? She said she would recommend partial funding.

Laurie Jackson read the training proposed as being for MDTs. She voted for full funding.

Desiree Mattice said she too, had a little trouble understanding what Great Basin proposed for training, but saw Great Basin working toward greater cohesion in and between communities, so voted for full funding.

3 out of 4 for full funding for Great Basin.

Jane Saint began the comments about Washoe County. She appreciated how comprehensive but concise the application was, their use of statistics for their area, and how they listed their partners and how they collaborated with them. She gave Washoe all 115 points and recommended full funding – noting that there were now just three applicants.

Massey Mayo questioned, in terms of the goals for the committee and how it related to the request for further funding, the Out of Area Conference request. That was the only part of the application that she took a little bit of issue with. Conferences are important, but how would that improve front end services? Based upon that she recommended partial funding \$19,800 and that would include fully funding the training in Reno as well as the laptops and external CD DVD request.

Laurie Jackson thought the application was very well written but had a question around the laptops and the external DVD 's simply because they sit at the CAC. She was unclear why you would need the external DVD players when they have the equipment. She would assume they would have the equipment there. It would make more sense for non-CAC investigators that are going out and not

assigned to the CAC to have laptops and external DVD 's, but that's not what she understood they were asking for so that was the only thing she had that she decreased.

Jane Saint asked if applicants could make short presentations and be asked questions about things like the equipment situation Laurie spoke about, and committee members wouldn't have to make assumptions. Beverly Brown said she would look into that for the future.

Desiree Mattice recommended full funding. She commented on the CD/DVD issue. In Goal Summary 2 in the application, it actually says 6 external CD and DVD players will also be purchased for the use of the CAC workers. Often interviews with victims are stored on CD or DVD. Most current laptops do not include a built-in drive, thus external drives will be purchased to ensure workers have access to these files. So, it does give a description of what the CD 's and the DVD players would be. She knows that when they do interviews, they do record it and they use that for further investigation if they're sharing it with other detectives as well as prosecutors.

Jane Saint wondered if laptop users could conduct interviews and type their notes during the interviews and go back later to transcribe them. Desiree Mattice said from her experience that the interviewer is less concentrated on the notetaking precisely because there is a recording. This is important especially when interviewing children.

Beverly Brown said that for CAC workers out in the field who are not recording the note taking will happen at the interview, with transcription later. There has been a similar experience with workers in the DCFS Rural Region and with Washoe County.

Laurie Jackson started the comments on Clark County. The only issue she had with Clark County was the 5 tables and 20 chairs to reappoint their conference room. She as for funding everything apart from that.

Massey Mayo didn't take issue take issue with the furniture request because she presumes that the space in which the interviews take place is for children and families. She disagreed about their request for the 2 staff members to be trained in specifically art therapy. She took that as direct services. She was in favor of funding partially funding them for \$33,000.00 and that the reduction would be for the 2 staff on the art therapy.

Jane Saint recommended for full funding but did question the expense of training 2 people in art therapy.

Desiree Mattice was very impressed with the application and recommended full funding, though she she too questioned the art therapy. She wondered if Clark knows if this is a proven method. What are the statistics on this, what resources does this bring up as they are only having 2 staff able to take the training? Is this a trial period to identify if this is a productive training method? She had no problem with the furniture as the conference room setting is good for interviews.

Dylan Nall summarized the reviewer's findings. The total comes to \$112,585.00. \$12,585 will need to be eliminated

Laurie Jackson asked if the amount could be split down the middle between Clark and Washoe. Jane Saint and Dylan Nall used their calculators to see what those amounts would be. It would be

\$6292.50 each. Jane Saint wondered if, to avoid the 50-cent figure, the two amounts would be \$6293.00 and \$6292.00. Beverly Brown said that would work.

Massey Mayo said that, for the record, and for the benefit of the applicants, they should tie the amounts that were reducing to the actual requests. She knows that's more work, but a better approach than arbitrarily saying there was this much, and we just split it down the middle between the counties.

Desiree Mattice agreed with that and used the example of Clark County, about which several people had concerns. Perhaps a specifically partial funding for the furniture would be appropriate.

Jane Saint moved the full funding of Great Basin at \$14, 520.00. Massey Mayo seconded. It was unanimously approved.

Dylan Nall noted they would have to now look at the specific budgets of Washoe and Clark. Beverly said the modified figures would be presented to the counties, who then present modified budgets and scopes of work to GMU.

Massey Mayo moved \$45,221.00 for Clark County (\$33,000 for training and \$12,221 for furniture. No money for art therapy.) Jane Saint seconded. Approved unanimously.

Massey Mayo moved \$40,050.00 for Washoe County, with \$209.00 extra going to Clark to make the total appropriation come out to \$100,000.00. Jane Saint seconded. Unanimous approval.

Jane Saint reiterated that she wants to reach out to Great Basin and help them.

8. For Information: Announcements – Jane Saint

Jennifer Spencer announced that Sharon Benson would be in her place at the next CJA meeting. She then asked if applicants get notification of the next CJA meeting. Beverly Brown said that historically Great Basin, Washoe, and Clark have had representation at the meeting.

Massey Mayo noted she no longer has a judicial post and is running for public office. She wondered if she can remain on the committee, which she would like to do. Beverly Brown said she would look into this and get back to her.

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 12:23 PM.