

Joe Lombardo
Governor

Richard Whitley, MS
Director



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

DIVISION OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES
Helping people. It's who we are and what we do.



Cindy Pitlock,
DNP
Administrator

---PUBLIC NOTICE---

NEVADA COALITION TO PREVENT THE COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN

DIVERSITY ENGAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

DATE: Thursday July 20, 2023

TIME: 10:00 am until adjournment

TELECONFERENCE: 1-775-321-6111

CONFERENCE ID: 516217450#

Supporting materials may be obtained online at
<https://dcfs.nv.gov/Programs/CWS/CSEC/2023MeetingandAgenda/>

Members of the public may hear and observe the meeting, and participate in the meeting by video, phone or in person. Members of the public may also provide live public comment during the public comment sections of the agenda. If members of the public desire to provide a pre-recorded public comment for a meeting, it must first be authorized before the meeting by the public body. Please contact Brianna Meads, bmeads@dcfs.nv.gov, at least 3 days prior to the meeting if any member of the public desires to provide a recorded public comment.

Reasonable efforts will be made to ensure that all attendees/public can hear or observe the members of the body, so it is recommended that members keep their cameras on through the meeting, unless there are technical difficulties, or a member can only appear by phone during the meeting.

- *Items may be taken out of order, may be combined for consideration by the public body, and/or may be pulled or removed from the agenda at any time to accomplish business in the most efficient manner.*
- *"For Information" items are informal in nature and may include discussion and ideas.*
- *"For Possible Action" items may be voted on or approved by members of the commission.*

AGENDA

- 1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Establish Quorum-** Esther Rodriguez-Brown called the Diversity Engagement Subcommittee meeting's July 20th, 2023, to order at 10:16 AM and proceed with roll call.
Members Present: Socorro Saldaña (Proxy for Joanna Granados), Makaya Swain, Nicole E. Reilly, Melissa Holland, Brianna McIntosh (Proxy for Stacy Scott), John Bryant, Ryan Gustafson
Members Absent: Calvin Criddle, Charletta Zamora-Cruz, Chris Davin, Leona Lopez, Patty Daniel
Roll call taken, and a quorum was established.

- 2. Public Comment and Discussion** (*Action may not be taken on any matter brought up under this agenda item until scheduled on the agenda for a later meeting, per NRS 241.020*)- Socorro Saldaña
No public comment
- 3. For Possible Action:** Approval of the meeting minutes from May 18, 2023
Action: Socorro Saldaña presented the May 18, 2023, minutes to the members. Melissa Holland made a motion to approve the May 18th, 2023, Meeting Minutes; Ryan Gustafson seconded the motion. Nicole E. Reilly abstained because she was absent from the May 18th meeting. Motion carries.
- 4. For Discussion and Possible Action:** Discuss and determine the next steps of the established subcommittee goals. Goal #1: Identity significant gaps/disconnections in servicing CSEC from diverse communities.
- a. Review and approve Survey I to identify major gaps and disconnections between agencies and the clients they serve.
 - b. Determine the timeline to distribute the surveys.
 - c. Determine the best way to distribute and collect the surveys.
 - d. Surveys will be developed for the following:
 - i. Survey II: For clients to assess the agency.
 - ii. Survey III: For the community partners to assess the agency.

Esther Rodriguez Brown shared her screen with the compiled survey to be discussed by the members. She informed the members that the survey was a compilation based on all the suggested questions gathered throughout the previous meetings. Esther Rodriguez Brown said that the first survey the members wanted to focus on was the Agency Self-Assessment. The first part of the self-assessment is to collect organization or agency information such as names of the agency/organization, address, phone number, website, hours of operation, and mission statement.

Esther Rodriguez Brown opened the floor for feedback from the members.

John Bryant from Washoe County asked if the survey could be put out in a Survey Monkey format to make it easier for the staff that will do the survey, such as drop-down and similar options.

Esther Rodriguez Brown thought that was a great suggestion; one of the goals to discuss at the meeting was the best way to distribute and collect this information. She thought Monkey Survey would be a great format; however, she put it on a Word document to share with the members during the meeting and make editing easier.

No more comments for this section were made.

Esther Rodriguez Brown continued with question one, “What is the primary population that you serve through your organization?” she reminded the members to keep in mind that this is focused on CSEC and asked the members if there was anybody that had any comments or suggestions.

Melissa Holland liked the idea of creating dropdowns with different options; she continued by saying that looking into the following question, do you serve survivors and victims of sex trafficking and exploitation? If yes, please answer all that apply and that perhaps that question should be moved up and if the answer is not probably the survey won’t apply to them.

Esther Rodriguez Brown agreed that was a good point and asked the rest of the members their thoughts. Everyone agrees, and Esther Rodriguez Brown starts making changes to the document. Melissa Holland said that we can remove the “all that apply” section because it is not necessary to have both options.

Esther Rodriguez Brown brings up that there are some organizations that work with CSEC victims and survivors, but that is not the only population that they serve; she continues saying that another option is to leave that portion and change the wording by asking, “Do you work with other populations other than CSEC?”

Melissa Holland said the first question should be “If they serve this population,” and if they don’t, they are not qualified to continue the survey.

Esther Rodriguez Brown asks the rest of the members if they are in agreement.

Briana McIntosh suggested adding a box for “I don’t know” Maybe some agencies don’t know if they serve that population because they have not been identified yet.

Esther Rodriguez Brown reminds the members that this is the Diversity Engagement group, so to be mindful to be inclusive and that perhaps organizations that primarily work with people with disabilities do not have the proper training to identify CSEC; however, they maybe are part of their clients, so part of the goal of this group is to assist these agencies to identify those clients that are at risk or already being exploited, but they don’t know about it.

Melissa Holland suggested the training would be more appropriate for a training subcommittee. Esther Rodriguez Brown responds that currently, there are no statewide training options other than Nevada Partnership for Training, and that is exclusive for child welfare staff.

Esther Rodriguez Brown goes back to Briana McIntosh's comment about adding the “unknown” box to track the organizations that don’t know; maybe they would like to receive training and keep that for when the statewide training is developed. Melissa Holland suggested that maybe we can ask if they would like to access triaging in the future. Other members agreed.

Makaya Swain suggested asking the agencies if they work with “identified” CSEC, and if not, then ask if they would like to access training.

Esther Rodriguez Brown summarized the conversation by saying we are moving the question “Do you serve survivors...” to number one. The question, “What is the primary population that you serve...” asked members what they wanted to do, move it, reword, or delete it.

Melissa Holland recommended leaving it in and keeping it as an explanatory question for agencies to answer broadly.

John Bryan asked if we could include the word “identity” along with “serve.” Esther Rodriguez Brown suggested maybe breaking the question into two sections to ask, “What tools you are using to identify the child as CSEC, and if referrals were made to other providers for services.” John agrees and is interested in other child welfare workers’ opinions.

Briana McIntosh agrees and further suggests that they have any understanding of what CSEC is versus at-risk. Esther Rodriguez Brown then asked if writing an introduction at the beginning to explain the purpose of the survey could be helpful for people to understand and better answer those questions. Briana McIntosh likes the idea and also suggested including what at-risk is versus CSEC identified.

Esther Rodriguez Brown continues with the questions for feedback. Melissa Holland made a comment that all the categories have “comments,” but the LGBTQI+ has “specify below,” in addition, she asked why the distinction.

Esther Rodriguez Brown said that when she was going to do the dropped boxes, there were many options, so she thought it was better for the provider to specify if the client is transgender, non-binary, etc. Melissa Holland suggested removing “comments” and leaving “specify below” only to avoid confusion.

Esther Rodriguez Brown asked if anything was missing and reminded the members that all was taken from previous meetings. She asked for clarification if she should specify any numbers on the category of “clients living below the poverty line.”

Ryan Gustafson said that that number changes every year depending on how many dependents are at home. Esther Rodriguez Brown asked the members if that question should be kept. Ryan Gustafson said that is good information to have. Nicole E. Reilly said we can find the information with a Google search.

Ryan Gustafson includes the link to find that information on the chat. Nicole E. Reilly and Esther Rodríguez Brown agreed to add the link to the survey.

Briana McIntosh asked if we should be more specific and ask if the families are large in number, what kind of financial struggles, etc. Esther Rodriguez Brown replied that is a good point; however, keep in mind that this is focusing on CSEC. Esther Rodriguez Brown, what are the other members' thoughts?

Melissa Holland said this can be very broad and not applicable to this type of survey. Esther Rodriguez Brown continues asking if the education question is relevant. Melissa Holland said that perhaps being more specific, like “Do your clients have access to higher education?” Esther Rodriguez Brown reminded Melissa Holland that was something that she brought to the past meetings, and Melissa reworded the question.

Esther Rodriguez Brown moves to the next question “Are the services offered in your organization specifically designed to reach the populations described above? If not, what barriers may have prevented you from reaching those populations? Please explain.”

Briana McIntosh asked if we already asked this question.

Esther Rodriguez Brown explained that it is a little bit different because it is asking not about the services per se but if those services are designed specifically for that population.

Melissa Holland asks if this is more of a self-assessment tool for agencies to measure the quality of their services.

Esther Rodríguez Brown affirmed that is the goal Melissa Holland continues saying that this is a very good question because it is holding agencies accountable for their services. Esther Rodriguez Brown expanded, saying that it is important to help organizations with self-accountability to deliver services to CSEC.

Melissa Holland agreed and suggested that perhaps rewording the question, “On a scale from 1 to 10, how would you rate the services offered in your organization to address the need of the population described above? Please explain.”

Nicole E Reilly suggests “meeting the needs of that population.” Ryan Gustafson likes the anchoring part of the question to rate on a scale because that will give better information from a data perspective.

Esther Rodriguez Brown continues with questions. “Can clients access services after hours? If so, please explain.” Melissa Holland likes the question as it is. For the following questions, Esther Rodriguez Brown asked if it is necessary to leave “explain” under each question. Melissa Holland said it could be removed, and no further comments were made.

Makaya Swain suggested that we leave “explain” on the question about transportation because some agencies use bus passes, and others pick up clients. Esther Rodríguez Brown said maybe it could be added some dropped boxes for agencies to choose from.

Briana McIntosh suggested leaving the “explain” portion on the following question “Check this box if your agency offers transportation or vouchers to access transportation for people with physical disabilities.”

Esther Rodríguez Brown suggested leaving it under the question of asking if agencies have language services to know which language interpreters are available.

Esther Rodríguez Brown continues with questions about fees for each agency or free services, and Melissa Holland suggested adding “grants and donations.”

Esther Rodríguez Brown continues with the next question related to accessibility. Briana McIntosh suggested maybe adding a section to ask about lighting outside of the building. Esther Rodríguez Brown continues saying that adding something about safety will be a good idea, too, like cameras, etc., and Nicole E Reilly agrees. Furthermore, Esther Rodriguez Brown suggested asking what access they have to law enforcement. Ryan Gustafson said that making the question more generic can help. “Accessibility to emergency repose services.”

Nicole E. Reilly asked to include something like “What is the agency's relationship with local law enforcement,” and Esther Rodriguez Brown said that maybe that could be a separate question.

Nicole E. Reilly also suggested asking agencies, “What is your local law enforcement understanding of the problem.”

Esther Rodríguez Brown suggested asking about “the understanding law enforcement has of the agency services” rather than the magnitude of the CSEC problem.

Ryan Gustafson asked for clarification if this question is about the perception that the agency has of law enforcement or directly for law enforcement.

Nicole E. Reilly would like both questions what is the awareness of the issue and the services?

Ryan Gustafson said that if we do this, we will have to scale it from 1 to 5 and add an anchor.

Esther Rodríguez Brown explained that these are two different things the perception providers have about the knowledge that law enforcement has versus the real knowledge.

Nicole E. Reilly shares that she is thinking more about rural areas and using that information to provide future training.

Melissa Holland suggested creating two questions and adding “In your opinion, what knowledge do LE agencies have about CSEC” and using that for feedback for law enforcement.

Makaya Swain agrees with the wording of the questions. The group moved forward with creating the two questions.

Makaya Swain shared that if this self-assessment is not only for victim providers, data about the relationship with LE would be different because LE cannot know all the services and providers in the state.

Esther Rodríguez Brown agrees and says that yes, it should be directed to victim services, and if among victims, they serve other populations.

Melissa Holland suggested adding a “N/A” option for those who do not have a relationship with LE or do not want to answer that question. And include “your local” rather than generic law enforcement. After continuing with the discussion about the knowledge that LE has on CSSEC the group agrees only to ask about knowledge of services of the organization doing the survey.

Esther Rodríguez Brown continues with the therapy services and maybe adds if the agency “refers” and asks John Bryant, Briana McIntosh, and Ryan Gustafson from child welfare. Everyone agrees.

Esther Rodríguez Brown continues with the question, “Do you offer services to unaccompanied minors when parental/guardian or guardian consent cannot be obtained? If so, please explain which ones and if there is a fee associated with those services.” She clarified that the question was mentioned in another meeting because some non-profits serve children with runaway status or unaccompanied.

Melissa Holland asked if it would be any legal issue for agencies if they serve minors without parental consent. Makaya Swain said that agencies do not provide services illegally.

Esther Rodriguez Brown specifies that most agencies will already have previous consent if the minor was in services before running away. John Bryan clarifies that child welfare will work with the guardian or parent to consent to services.

Melissa Holland suggested the question, “Do you offer services to minors and/or adults without citizenship status? If so, please explain which ones and if there is a fee associated with those services”? before creating context and then rephrasing the other one to be clearer.

Makaya Swain asked to remind her why we put if there were fees associated only on these two questions; Esther Rodriguez Brown said that another member who works for the federal government wanted to know if to be able to refer these kids to organizations for services and if there were any fees attached to it.

Esther Rodriguez Brown mentioned that we asked about fees on another question; however, sometimes grants do not cover people without status. Makaya Swain suggested maybe adding on the above question if there are any populations that are not included within the grants rather than repeating the “fees” question. Esther Rodriguez Brown said she would reword the question and add that piece.

Esther Rodriguez Brown reminded the group that was only 5 minutes left, and she asked the co-chairs and members what they would prefer if they continued or made a motion to table the rest of the survey review for the next meeting.

Makaya Swain suggested making a motion and uploading the survey with the changes for review prior to the next meeting.

Action: Makaya Swain asked if any members would like to make a motion to table the rest of the survey for the next meeting. John Bryant made a motion to table the review of the rest of the survey, and Briana McIntosh seconded the motion.

Motion carries

5. For Discussion and Possible Action: Future Agenda Items- Makaya Swain

The group made no suggestions other than continue with the discussion.

6. Final Public Comment and Discussion (*Action may not be taken on any matter brought up under this agenda item until scheduled on the agenda for a later meeting, per NRS 241.020*)- Makaya Swain

No public comment was made.

7. Adjournment- Next meeting will be August 17th, 2023, at 10 am.

Makaya Swain adjourned the July 20th, 2023, Diversity Engagement meeting at 11:29 AM.