



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

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



NEVADA COALITION TO PREVENT THE COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN: LEGISLATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE

DATE: Thursday, May 12, 2022

TIME: 10:00 am – 11:30 am (or until adjournment)

VIDEO CONFERENCE: [Click here to join meeting](#)

TELECONFERENCE: 1-775-321-6111 CONFERENCE

ID:984349254#

Supporting materials may be obtained online at

<https://dcfs.nv.gov/Programs/CWS/CSEC/2022MeetingsAndAgendas/>

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.

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.*

MINUTES

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Establish Quorum- Sara Stephan, Esther Brown

Esther Rodriguez-Brown called the meeting to order.

Members Present: Sara Stephan, Brigid Duffy, Elynne Greene, Cara Paoli, Jennifer Spencer, Andrea Davis, Joseph Saiz, Makaya Swain, Nicole Reilly, Samantha Elkins, Dr. Tiffany Tyler-Garner, Katie Ryan, Lieutenant Robert Wright

Members Absent: Abigail Frierson, Jessica Cisneros, Kimberly Yeager, Lauren Boitel, Jason Guinasso, DaShun Jackson, Annie Lobert, Christina Vela, Sharon Anderson

2. Public Comment and Discussion *(Action may not be taken on any matter brought up under this*

agenda item until scheduled on an agenda for a later meeting)

There was no public comment.

- 3. For Possible Action: Review and Approval of April 14, 2022 Meeting Minutes- Esther Brown**
Sara Stephan opened the floor to discussion or corrections of the minutes.

Action: A motion was made by Brigid Duffy to approve the April 14, 2022 Meeting Minutes, Cara Paoli seconded the motion. No objections. Motion carries.

No further discussion on this item.

- 4. For Possible Action: Continue development of the statutory language for legislative recommendation on the creation and function of multidisciplinary teams (MDTs) to support CSEC - Brigid Duffy**
Brigid Duffy began the discussion with the risk assessment and training document. Ms. Duffy indicated that there are two proposals for the subcommittee to review: the MDT and the proposal to get certain screenings and trainings for individuals in the juvenile justice system and Department of Family Services system into statute. Ms. Duffy indicated that for both of these proposals, she took existing statutes that required certain types of training and assessments and edited them to fit the screening tools the Subcommittee wishes to use and the training.

Brigid Duffy indicated that for the first part of this, she chose a chapter in NRS 62B that had the measures to improve outcomes for youth in the juvenile justice system. The first subsection includes any person, who during his or her scope of employment has regular routine contact with juveniles involved in the juvenile justice system in the state and includes without limitation: prosecuting attorney; public defender; peace officer; civilian employee of a juvenile justice department shall complete, in addition to any other required training, training related to the identification and response and victim center prosecution of CSEC. Ms. Duffy explained that Category I peace officers and other levels of peace officers are already mandated to have training on CSEC for detection, investigation and response, but that there is no harm in adding this specifically into the statutory section and qualifying with in addition to any other required training. Ms. Duffy indicated that this language comes directly from SB 108, which was just passed in 2021, and added implicit bias and adverse childhood experience training requirements to individuals that work with children in the juvenile justice system. Ms. Duffy indicated that she took that language and added the training involving CSEC, focusing on three areas of training: identification, response, and victim-centered prosecution. Ms. Duffy informed the subcommittee that today's topic of conversation will include whether those three topics address the training wanted by CSEC. Ms. Duffy further indicated that subsection 2 states that on or before a certain date the Division of Child and Family Services and each Department of Juvenile Justice Services shall implement a validated risk assessment tool to identify children who are CSEC or at risk of being CSEC, language that MS. Duffy took specifically from a statute passed in 2017 that required validated tools to be used to determine risk level of children in the juvenile justice system. Ms. Duffy indicated that NRS 432B mirrors NRS 62. Ms. Duffy further indicated that she included language from the professional development statute, 319A, indicating that school employees would have the same training to identify and respond to children who are CSEC or at risk of being CSEC, including training regarding mandated reporting requirements. Ms. Duffy asked the Subcommittee for their opinions with regard to juvenile justice.

Joseph Saiz asked if the training would be annual or a one-time training.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown indicated her belief that training should be ongoing and updated.

Elynn Greene concurred, indicating that there are multiple factors to be considered, including ongoing learning about human trafficking and the CSEC population. Ms. Greene further indicated that there is significant transition in all these facets, and one training would likely not meet the needs of those coming in or those leaving and transitioning out. Ms. Greene concluded by indicating her belief that the training itself should be reevaluated on an annual basis.

Brigid Duffy explained that SB108 requires the state to create regulations around the training and as such, proposed the idea of the LCB (Legislative Council Bureau) potentially adding something indicating that regulations will be created around this. Ms. Duffy informed the subcommittee that she specifically did not include judiciary as judges cannot be listed and have it become statutory and as such, regulations may need to be created regarding the training.

Katie Ryan concurred with Ms. Duffy regarding creation of regulations, citing the different criteria necessary for training in the medical arena as an example.

Brigid Duffy informed the subcommittee that SB108 indicates training once every two years with the regulations to be created by DCFS.

Joseph Saiz opined that two years is attainable based on the number of requirements juvenile justice professionals are required to participate in annually.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown questioned if new people coming into the workplace need to be trained within the six months and if that needs to be specified.

Brigid Duffy explained that this is dependent upon the discipline. Ms. Duffy further indicated that it's important to just broadly capture that the training should be done very two years in order to avoid significant pushback.

Lieutenant Robert informed the subcommittee that law enforcement already requires yearly training under AB478 that encompasses human trafficking and suggested adding this part into that mandatory training. Lieutenant Robert confirmed that this is a requirement of POST certification.

Brigid Duffy asked if any other specific disciplines within the juvenile justice system should be added and indicated that she used the term civilian employee because of Washoe County.

Joseph Saiz confirmed that Washoe County contains both sworn and civilian employees, with probation officers being sworn and subject to the same regulations that all law enforcement is subject to in terms of human-trafficking training. Officer Saiz further explained that Washoe also has a mix of civilian staff that interact with children.

Brigid Duffy confirmed that Clark County also has both sworn and civilian.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown asked if civilian employees also include the leadership of juvenile justice administrators.

Both Brigid Duffy and Joseph Saiz confirmed that this was correct. Ms. Duffy asked for feedback regarding the inclusion of the screening tool/risk assessment tool. Hearing none, Ms. Duffy went on to

discuss the DFS piece, indicating that the language mirrors SB108 but includes the child welfare agency, the children's attorneys and the parents' attorneys.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown concurred with this inclusion, noting that they will have direct contact with children.

Jessica Freeman asked Ms. Duffy to include CASA.

Brigid Duffy indicated she would add CASA and GAL.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown suggested including trauma form practices in the training.

An unidentified speaker concurred.

Joseph Saiz explained that juvenile justice is already required to do two validated screening tools that vary based on jurisdiction and indicated that from a logistics standpoint, he would like to know more about the validated assessment tools to ensure that no one is over assessing and that the correct information is being captured.

Brigid Duffy indicated her belief that this is broad enough that each individual agency can develop its own policies and procedures around when they would implement the tool. Ms. Duffy further suggested taking the information to Liz, the Administrator over Juvenile Justice Services in Washoe, for additional feedback or suggestions.

Joseph Saiz concurred with Ms. Duffy's suggestion.

Brigid Duffy asked when the next NAJJA (Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators) meeting is scheduled.

Joseph Saiz indicated the most recent one had taken place the day prior to this meeting and that the next one would be taking place in a month or so.

Brigid Duffy asked for recommendations regarding requiring the school district to start training.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown informed the subcommittee that New York and Washington DC are implementing this in their school districts and that Clark County School District is very interested in moving forward with this curriculum.

Brigid Duffy indicated her uncertainty regarding schools' understanding regarding mandating reporting requirements following the passing of 432C.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown opined that this piece should be left in.

Brigid Duffy informed the subcommittee of her intent to pass this item back to the next agenda in order to receive some feedback from the juvenile justice administrators' meeting on the requirements of the tool in statute, after which the package will be presented to the chairs of the judiciary and health and human services to gauge their willingness to provide a BDR in addition to or in place of CSEC's MDT.

Brigid Duffy next discussed the MDT statute, indicating that pieces were highlighted in red following

the suggestions from the last meeting regarding language around victim and survivor. Ms. Duffy reminded the subcommittee of the lengthy discussion at a previous meeting regarding who may appoint or organize the MDT. Ms. Duffy explained that she took two different types of statutory sections where MDTs are in statute: a child welfare agency driven one, which is child death review; and any agency of a local governmental entity, which is the domestic violence fatality to review. Ms. Duffy asked the subcommittee on its opinion regarding holding a vote to see which agency should be included and indicated her belief that to leave it broad, with any agency of a local government and let each jurisdiction figure it out, would be fine.

Jennifer Spencer indicated that she had a meeting with Dr. Cindy Pitlock, administrator for DCFS, who had indicated that she thought it was important to involve the Division of Child and Family Services but raised concern regarding the limited resources right now. Dr. Pitlock further suggested that if this is considered for an agency like DCFS, that it should perhaps be broadened a little bit by including DHHS (Department of Health and Human Services) in order to potentially incorporate more resources.

Brigid Duffy asked Jennifer Spencer regarding her legal opinion in noting the state given that DCFS is not a local governmental entity but a statewide one.

Jennifer Spencer indicated her belief that it would be good to include either DCFS or DHHS.

Brigid Duffy confirmed that the best wording would include an agency of a state or local governmental entity.

Jennifer Spencer concurred.

Jessica Freeman indicated that DCFS is able to provide oversight and recommendations for best practices. As such, Ms. Freeman asked if broadened, would there be someone to provide oversight or training if needed on those teams.

Brigid Duffy indicated that this may be included at the end of today's discussion given that the subcommittee may want to consider a statewide executive committee for consistency. Ms. Duffy next discussed the section regarding possibly provisionally appointing one or more MDTs to review cases of children who are victims and explained that she needs to change that to CSEC because of the removal of the reference to victims or survivors. Ms. Duffy reminded the subcommittee of its intent following the last meeting to add a provision about training, which has now been decided, and indicated that she will add in there a general requirement from training as required in whatever the statutory sections ultimately become.

Brigid Duffy next discussed the sharing of information and the concern at the last meeting regarding mandating that records are received. As such, Ms. Duffy explained that she narrowed it down to just the sharing of information in order to allow for open discussion. Ms. Duffy further indicated that it does not note anywhere that anyone will receive copies of records or be able to see a file, but rather that they may share with other members of the team information concerning the child who is subject to review.

Cara Paoli requested the inclusion of wording to exclude clinical records as there exist issues regarding the release of clinical records.

Brigid Duffy explained that she attempted to ensure that this wording was not record-related and rather

changed the word records to information wherever necessary.

Cara Paoli cautioned that there are always certain things that would not be up for discussion and although this discussion revolves around providing information that's helpful, this can get really sticky because, for example in Washoe County, the clinical team is part of the child welfare agency, which could make the sharing of information more difficult due to the necessary discretion regarding clinical records.

Brigid Duffy indicated that she would ensure that the term records has been replaced by the word information throughout and then add a section stating that insofar as possible obtaining release from the person responsible for the child's welfare.

Brigid Duffy next discussed section 4 regarding confidentiality, and the requirements regarding this confidentiality. Ms. Duffy next discussed the establishment of an executive committee to review and who would be included on such a committee. Ms. Duffy indicated that she intends to make a general request to the legislative interim committee that a statewide team be created. Ms. Duffy next explained that she would be cleaning up the documentation and would bring it back to the next meeting for a final vote prior to sending it to the chairs of the judiciary and HHS interim committees.

No further discussion on this item.

5. For Information Only: Next Meeting: June 9, 2022, 10:00 am-11:30 am (or until adjournment)

Brigid Duffy asked if the next NAJJA meeting would be taking place prior to June 9.

Joseph Saiz indicated that the next NAJJA meeting was scheduled for June 8.

No further discussion on this item.

6. Final Public Comment and Discussion *(Action may not be taken on any matter brought up under this agenda item until scheduled on an agenda for a later meeting)*

There was no public comment or discussion.

7. Adjournment

Sara Stephen adjourned the May 12, 2022 meeting of the CSEC Legislative Subcommittee.