



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

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



PUBLIC NOTICE

NEVADA COALITION TO PREVENT THE COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN: PARENT EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES

DATE: Thursday, August 10, 2023

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

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

TELECONFERENCE: 1-775-321-6111 CONFERENCE ID: 809 024 68#

This will be a virtual only meeting as authorized pursuant to AB253 (2021) and NRS 241.023

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.

Members of the public can unmute their microphone and provide their comment; if anyone is having technical problems unmuting themselves, call the following number 1-775-321-6111 with CONFERENCE ID: 982 586 823# to make your 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

Esther Rodriguez-Brown called the Parent Education Subcommittee meeting on August 10, 2023, to order at 10:07 A.M. and followed with a roll call to establish quorum.

Members Present: Kayleigh Schwartz, Brigid Duffy, Briana McIntosh (proxy for Stacie Dastrup), Jhenna Halili, Tami Goulden-Bosco, Lysette Gillings (proxy for Molly Blanchette), Danica Quiroz, Stephanie Walker

Members Absent: Socorro Saldana, Miambi Newbern-Johnson, Jeremy Stocking, Sarah Sloan, Megan Daters

Roll call was taken, and 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*)- Esther Rodriguez-Brown

There was no public comment.

3. For Possible Action: Approval of the meeting minutes from May 11, 2023- Kayleigh Schwartz

Action: Kayleigh Schwartz presented the subcommittee with the meeting minutes from May 11, 2023. Kayleigh Schwartz motioned to approve the May 11th, 2023, Meeting minutes. Brigid Duffy seconded the motion. The motion is approved.

4. For Possible Action: Discuss and determine the next steps of the established sub-committee goals- Kayleigh Schwartz and Esther Rodriguez Brown.

- **Goal #1: Review questions from subcommittee participants to finalize a survey to distribute to parents and CSEC clients for them to identify three or more major gaps/disconnections between them. Compile the answers as a baseline to develop goal number two.**
 - **Determine the timeline to distribute the surveys.**
 - **Determine the best way to distribute and collect the surveys.**
- *Public Comments will be allowed during the discussion of this action item before a vote is taken.*

Esther Rodriguez-Brown reminds the subcommittee that they are working on the survey for youth needs self-assessment. She informed the members that she sent the survey out for review, and they redid some of the questions. She shares her screen, which has the survey to continue with the reviewing and to go through each question which allows for comments to be made by the members regarding the questions. Esther Rodriguez-Brown reminded the subcommittee that they decided in the past meetings to put the purpose and disclaimer of the survey at the beginning for clarity.

Kayleigh Schwartz reads the purpose and disclaimer section of the need self-assessment, “This needs self-assessment aims to gather information to assist your identified CSEC clients in receiving support from their parents/caregivers. The responses gathered through this assessment are not intended for research and will not be published or disseminated to the public.

Only agencies that facilitated and assisted their clients in this project through the Parenting Education Subcommittee and the Nevada CSEC Coalition will have access to gather final responses without identifying the clients' participants. Agencies distributing and facilitating the need for self-assessment must have parental consent on file as part of their intake package or consent from the client if they are 18+. The CSEC Coalition and the Parenting Education Subcommittee recommend and encourage advocates or case managers of the agencies facilitating this self-assessment to be available to their clients during the process to provide any necessary emotional support.”

Esther Rodriguez-Brown then asks everyone if they approve of the introduction.

Danica Quiroz from Washoe County Human Services Agency informs the subcommittee that they are not in support of surveying the children. She is unsure whether to talk about what the Washoe County Human Services Agency disapproves of about the need self-assessment survey before or after the subcommittee reviews the questions.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown shares her recommendation of discussing now why the Washoe County Human Services Agency is not in support before continuing with the rest of the meeting.

Danica Quiroz asks if there is any objection to her explaining why Washoe County Human Services Agency disapproves before the survey is discussed. There is no objection.

Danica Quiroz goes on to explain that while there are good questions on the survey, they believe that there are potentially harmful or triggering questions on the survey, which poses a high risk to the youth survivors of CSEC that will be taking the survey. She goes on to explain that while they understand the survey is meant to understand the breakdown between the parents and their kids and how the subcommittee can help better support the parents to support their kids, they think it can be done differently. She suggests surveying the service providers, which means that the lived experience would be taken out of the survey. However, she thinks the service provider will probably have a good idea of the breakdown from the kid's perspective. She goes on to give an example that she has some therapy clients who are survivors of CSEC and that when they are answering these questions, it may be triggering for them since their parents are their traffickers or supported it in some way. She believes that if she were to administer this survey to a kid, it might take several sessions for her to convince survivors to take the survey and work through the questions since she believes every question is potentially triggering. She reiterates that the risk is too significant, and there is a different way to do it even though it is not a technical research project because it goes against their ethics as licensed therapists to do no harm, and the risk is too high. The kids are too vulnerable and could possibly send them into a spiral since they are in a triggered state.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown stops sharing her screen and thanks Danica Quiroz for her feedback, and asks if the members would like to share their opinions on the matter before she does.

Tami Goulden-Bosco asks what the alternatives are to surveying the youth.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown agrees with the idea of exploring other ways. Furthermore, she adds that some service providers have the tendency to speak for survivors, what they want, and what is best for them,

eliminating their voices. She reminds the group that agencies know whether their clients would be suitable to take this self-assessment survey. She says this is not a mandatory survey, and no one needs to “be convinced” to take it. Service providers should inform their clients that this survey will ask about their family and family dynamics before starting the survey, that it is totally voluntary, and that they can stop at any time. She goes on to say that this allows the client to feel empowered and have the option to make their own decisions, which is why this self-assessment survey is important. She says that this survey was not created to force anyone to participate but rather to gather information so CSEC can be active participants in addressing their own needs.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown asks that if they move forward, parameters to conduct the survey will be established; if not, the group will have to move to a plan B.

Kayleigh Schwartz suggests that if they move forward with the survey that they should add in the disclaimer that if the person taking it feels at any point triggered, they can stop or skip questions.

Lysette Gillings asks if they have the ability to hire a researcher to administer the survey, not the agency since the goal is to obtain research.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown informs Lysette Gillings that this is not for research or to obtain data to publish but just for self-assessment. She clarifies that this survey is just for agencies who work with CSEC to obtain information to come up with tools for parents and caregivers to assist those who are trafficked throughout their healing journey. She goes on to expand on Danica Quiroz’s earlier point that if a child is being trafficked by their parent, the therapist or service provider should have enough understanding and training to exclude that child from asking about the survey, depending on where the child is on their healing journey. She continues on by saying that assuming these questions can be triggering without giving CSEC the opportunity to decide if the questions are triggering or not is unfair and labeling them as weak and unable to speak for themselves. Some people tend to decide what is good for them without asking, which is triggering enough as the traffickers constantly do that.

Danica Quiroz appreciates what Esther Rodriguez-Brown says about the importance of not continuing the cycle of assuming and taking away clients’ voices. She states, however, that the questions in the survey are emotionally charged. She makes a point that most of the children who take these surveys have not had enough significant treatment or enough time to heal, so they may be unable to complete the survey without it charging them. She also shares that she does not know if the statement of the survey not being public is accurate because the meeting in which they are discussing the survey is public, which means there is a possibility the survey can be shared. She goes on to state that she believes there are other ways for them to accomplish the lived experience portion and share voices, such as identifying adult survivors, who have gone through healing, are in the process of healing, and have their support system, take the survey with informed consent. She says they can ask, “Looking back when you were a kid, what were the holes, what are the gaps?”. She thinks this would be helpful because their experiences as children could be similar to what the current kids are experiencing. She thinks that surveying the parents as well could still be done. She goes on to say that as service providers, they know what the kid’s lived experiences are, so they would be able to answer the questions as best they can, even though an aspect would still be missing, which could be accomplished by getting adults. She reiterates that there

is a high risk since these questions are emotionally charged, which is not in a format that is therapeutic or conducive to their healing process.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown thanks Danica Quiroz for her input. She states that she is curious as to why this was not brought up at the beginning when this subcommittee started working on the questions four months ago. Esther Rodriguez-Brown continues by saying that even though she sees Danica Quiroz's point, providers should know which clients are healing to answer the questions and which ones are not as likely to do so. She states that they often negate the right of survivors to be a part of the process and always ask for their stamp of approval after everything is done, which is not fair. Esther Rodriguez-Brown let the group know that she usually does not share her being a survivor of domestic violence. She continues saying that their voices matter as things are happening and not only after the fact. She states that she knows kids who could answer these questions, and they would bring insightful information with the right support. As well as adults that would be triggered by the questions, age does not mean that healing is completed. She says that as a group, they will continue to discuss this and try to find alternatives; if they cannot find them, they will have to find a different strategy, such as conducting a survey with the parents rather than hearing the voices of the kids going through it, which could possibly be less effective.

Danica Quiroz appreciates Esther Rodriguez-Brown's heart in sharing her story and thinks Esther Rodriguez-Brown made many great points that she agrees with, such as the voices of those going through it are powerful. She in no way thinks that they are not strong or capable, but she would rather be mindful of their healing process and what may be triggering for them and when it is appropriate to ask them these questions, which she thinks there is a different way to accomplish. She brings up Esther Rodriguez-Brown's earlier question as to why they did not bring it up earlier by saying that they did not think about it that way, and as they talked about it out loud, they realized it might not be a great idea. She thanks everyone for listening to her thoughts and the perspective of Washoe County Human Services.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown thanks Danica Quiroz and tells her she hears her points and thinks they can find a middle ground.

Brigid Duffy informs those in attendance that while she is a DA and not a therapist, she is there because she wants to help these children become survivors. She says that after listening to Danica Quiroz and Esther Rodriguez-Brown, she does believe that there is a middle ground. She continues sharing that, in her opinion, therapists know their clients well, and they can decide which clients can do the survey, which in turn would help guide people who want to help CSEC parents and caregivers to help their children. She states that this is not a state-mandated survey but rather an option to create resources and tools to continue the work being done in Nevada to help CSEC. She adds that the survey could be administered to the child when the therapist believes the questions will not trigger the youth. On the other hand, she states that if the parent is the trafficker, the therapist could fill the survey out but would have to mark on it that it was not completed directly by the survivor. She says that there is a need for the answers to these questions, which is why they are all brought together, which allows them to look at resources and go to the Legislature to tell them what are the needs that CSEC are facing and for the state legislature to allocate money to address those needs. She says that they need something to guide them and that she agrees with Esther Rodriguez-Brown that the best people for that are survivors. She

says that this information coming from kids with the support of a therapist is important because maybe CSEC wants to help other kids out. She says there is some value in making sure that these questions are therapeutically relevant for outsiders who therapists are not to help them understand how to engage parents in the process to prevent and treat children. She says that even if one therapist administers this survey to one client to share their experience, they may be able to take that information to offer educational or support components, which is more than they have now because there is nothing to support parents except a couple of classes.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown says that they all want the best for the kids. She calls on Kayleigh Schwartz, who she says is at The Embracing Project, and asks her if she can think of two clients who would be okay with answering these questions with the right support.

Kayleigh Schwartz says that she can think of a few clients who would be okay with answering the survey questions. She states that she thinks Danica pointed out that the clients are over the age of 18 now, but they experienced trafficking and exploitation under the age of 18. She thinks that this is a key area that the subcommittee can focus on, which is kids who are a little older and have moved away from exploitation but still have insight into it.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown tells them that age does not mean that trauma will not be resurfaced, so she does not think that they have only focused on those who are 18 and older. She says that she works with adults and has a client who is over 60 years old and a survivor who still gets triggered. She reiterates that age does not mean the person will be okay; in some cases, a 16-year-old could easily answer the questions without any problem, and perhaps someone older could get triggered. She says it is important to be mindful because even though someone 16 is young, they could have more inner strength in answering versus somebody older who would have a harder time. She agrees with what Brigid Duffy said that therapists and service providers know their clients well, so it gives them the opportunity to present them with the questions. Esther Rodriguez-Brown shares that as a mandated reporter, she always gives the client the power to share what they want by letting them know prior to starting any interaction. She says this self-assessment is similar, and the person facilitating the survey should always be transparent with the client and let them know what is about to happen. She reminded the group that this survey is not mandatory by the state, and no one would be penalized; this is an opportunity to find answers and bridge the gaps between parents/caregivers and CSEC children; it gives the services providers and therapist the opportunity to share the power with their clients. Esther Rodriguez-Brown reminds the group that if a therapist or provider, based on their professional experience, thinks that a client will be triggered by questions #3, #4, and #5, for example, then do not give those questions to them. She follows by saying that maybe this is something to be included on the survey to find that middle ground so they can find information to build upon.

Jhenna Strasser agrees with Esther Rodriguez-Brown and Brigid Duffy's points. She states that her background is in advocacy, and she thinks that the number one thing to give to their clients is options. She suggests that they put a caveat on the survey for service providers issuing it that this survey is not all-inclusive, and all questions are not needed, only for specific clients that they think can handle it mentally, and emotionally. She adds that Kayleigh Schwartz suggestion that the survey can be stopped at any time is a good suggestion. She states that she believes taking this into consideration at the beginning, will allow service providers to have the power on which questions might be more or less

triggering and give the clients power to say yes or no if they want to do it, which means there could be a conversational aspect before the survey.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown suggests that they could add a trigger warning before the questions so that the provider knows that the question can be triggering and continue based off of their client's reaction to the questions.

Brigid Duffy asks if they have a list of providers that are properly trained and offering the correct therapeutic interventions.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown tells Brigid Duffy that she is not aware of a list like that, but they know that Embracing Project, Signs of Hope, and Awaken are properly trained and trauma-informed.

Brigid Duffy asks Danica Quiroz if child welfare agencies have internal people. Esther Rodriguez-Brown said that they are trained as well.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown says that the survey should be contained among organizations that specifically work with CSEC, and it was never intended to be distributed to any other organization in Nevada that does not work with this population. Organizations facilitating this survey should have trauma-informed training people that support the youth taking the self-assessment.

Danica Quiroz suggests that if they move forward with surveying the children, they do so with an official researcher since they can administer it in an ethical manner. Esther Rodriguez-Brown thinks it will require funding to pay the researcher, which they do not have. In addition, she also ask to be mindful of allowing people like researchers hat do not have a relationship of trust with the child.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown presents another alternative which is to get through the questions of the survey and ensure that everyone is happy with the questions and put trigger warnings on them. They could then ask organizations that work with the population to identify one person from each who would assist with the self-assessment and meet with them to go over the self-assessment and do a mini training. She volunteers to do this and invites anyone else to participate on having a conversation with those individuals to give them the trauma-informed basics, the parameters, and ethical rules of giving the questions.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown goes back to the researcher option by saying that if they can find a researcher that will not charge them, then that could be an option.

Tami Goulden-Bosco says that she works with the Washoe County School District and that they conduct a youth risk behavior survey which could be triggering as it pertains to substance use, parents in the home, parents using substances, or misusing. She says they also have a SHARE program which includes potentially triggering things, and they allow parents the opportunity to review it before it is given to their child before they access it. They allow the parents to opt-out. She says that if the survey has something similar, like adding the disclaimer at the beginning of the survey, like Esther Rodriguez Brown suggested, informing them that there is potentially triggering information and topics, the participant has

the option not to answer a question or cease continuation of the survey at any time, which means that they tried to gather insight and information from the voice of a victim.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown thanks Tami Goulden-Bosco for her information and says that oftentimes the kid's parents are the trigger, as Danica Quiroz stated. She says that, unfortunately, most of the time, the school district does not operate under a trauma-informed scope, so they send triggering information to students often. She thinks that they have an obligation to be as trauma-informed as possible to make sure the kids are not being triggered and retraumatized because they are already retraumatized when they go into child welfare. She asks the subcommittee members what the best way would to move forward with the trigger warnings is and that she believes that the school district is not the best avenue to disseminate it because there are too many variables that they cannot control. She suggests working with organizations and agencies that work with CSEC.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown says they have to decide if they are going to move forwards with this so they can brainstorm the parameters and if they are going start out by reaching out to two agencies in the South and two in the North that they know work with the population and are well trained. To conduct the survey, She suggests inviting representatives of the agencies to the meeting so they can have a conversation with them on how they would conduct the self-assessment.

Brigid Duffy suggests that they have some time to digest everything that was said at the meeting until the next one. She says that she does not want to force a decision right now. She does ask that if this is not the way they are going to go, they need to come up with a way to engage parents to strengthen families.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown suggests ending the meeting if everyone agrees and that they have to make a decision during the next one. She summarizes that if they move forward, they will create parameters across the board to use also on the survey that will be prepared for parents, as some of the questions suggested might also trigger them.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown asks for everyone at the meeting to read the minutes when they receive them and to come prepared for the next meeting with answers.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown motions to table the discussion for their next meeting on September 14th, 2023, at 10 A.M. Brigid Duffy seconded the motion. The rest of the voting members agree to pass the motion. The motion carries.

5. For Discussion and Possible Action: Future Agenda Items- Kayleigh Schwartz

The group made no suggestions.

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*)- Esther Rodriguez-Brown

There was no public comment.

7. Adjournment- Next meeting will be September 14, 2023, at 10 am.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown adjourns the meeting at 11:08 A.M.

CHAIRPERSON MAY CALL FOR A BREAK AT THEIR DISCRETION

We are pleased to provide special accommodation assistance to persons with disabilities who wish to attend. Notify Brianna Meads via email at bmeads@dcfs.nv.gov no later than three (3) business days prior to the meeting date. Supporting materials, including Google Documents may be obtained on the website <https://dcfs.nv.gov/Programs/CWS/CSEC/2023MeetingandAgenda/> or in writing by emailing bmeads@dcfs.nv.gov

The meeting will not commence until or after the designated start time. The meeting will be adjourned after all scheduled agenda items have been addressed.

Agenda items may be taken out of order at the discretion of the of the Chair to accommodate persons appearing before the CSEC Coalition and/or to aid in the time efficiency of the meeting.

Items may be combined for consideration by the Coalition. Items may be delayed or removed from the agenda at any time.

If members of the public participate in the meeting, they must identify themselves when requested under agenda item number one.

Public comment is welcomes by the Coalition but may be limited to five minutes per person at the discretion of the Chair.

Action items are noted by the phrase “for possible action” and typically include review, denial and/or postponement of specific items. Certain items may be referred to a subcommittee for additional review and action.

This notice and Agenda have been sent to be posted at the following locations, in accordance with NRS Chapter 241:

State of Nevada- Nevada Public Notices

Website- <https://notice.nv.gov/>

State of Nevada- Division of Child and Family Services

Website- <https://dcfs.nv.gov/Programs/CWS/CSEC/2023MeetingandAgenda/>

1. Division of Child and Family Services, 6171 W. Charleston Blvd. Bldg. 8, Las Vegas, NV 89146
2. Northern Nevada Child and Adolescent Services, 2655 Enterprise Rd., Reno, NV 89512
3. Nevada Youth Parole Bureau, 6171 W. Charleston Blvd., Bldg. 15, Las Vegas, NV 89146

4. **Division of Child and Family Services, 1010 Ruby Vista Dr. Suite 101, Elko, NV 89801**
5. **Division of Child and Family Services, 2533 North Carson St. Carson City, NV 89706**
6. **Washoe County Human Services Agency, 350 S. Center St. Reno 89501**

DRAFT