

Joe Lombardo
Governor

Richard Whitley, MS
Director



DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

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



Marla McDade
Williams, MPA
Administrator

MEETING OF THE NEVADA JUVENILE JUSTICE OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (JJOC) FULL COMMISSION

DATE: July 14, 2025

TIME: 9:00 AM

LOCATION: Old Assembly Chambers, 2nd Floor
Governor's Building
101 N. Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89706

And VIDEO CONFERENCE: MICROSOFT TEAMS

Roll Call:

Members Present

Chair DeVere Karlson – Chair
Addie Rolnick
Marla McDade Williams
Pauline Salla
Elizabeth Florez
John Munoz
Brigid Duffy
Dawn Gearhart
Jennifer Fraser
Katherine Maher
Derrica Daniel
Ali Banister
Ethan Ewert

Members Absent

Holly Welborn
Sharon Anderson
Matthew Clapham
Paula Smith
Kelly Figueroa
Perla Vega
Capri Roach

Abby Hamer

Staff Members

Cindy Casselman
Wade Ricketts
Tysean Wilson

Others Present

Frank Mourningham-Carson City Juvenile
Detention
Joseph Filippi
Kyra Morgan-DCFS
Brenna Hardtner
Ashby McDonald
Emily Maitino-Office of Analytics
Brock Landwehr-Coalition for Juvenile
Justice
Melissa Milchman-Coalition for Juvenile
Justice
Sara Velasquez-DCFS PIO
Taissa Lytchenko-Pro prospective JJOC
Commissioner

TRANSCRIPT

Agenda Item 1. Welcome, Call to Order and Roll Call

[Roll Call. We have Quorum]

Chair DeVere Karlson: Thank you very much. We'll move on to Agenda Item 3, which is 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. To provide public comment, telephonically dial 1-775-321-6111. When prompted, provide the conference ID, please dial 1-775-321-6111. When prompted to provide the conference ID, enter 579-642-272 # sign.

If providing public comment during the meeting, unmute your microphone prior to speaking. Persons making public comments will be asked to begin by stating their name for the record and to spell their last name. Is there any public comment at this time? Seeing none.

We will move on to Agenda Item 4, which is review and approval of minutes. As you can see, we have three separate minutes that we need to review. As you can see, we have three separate minutes that we need to review. We will take those one at a time. For possible review and approval of the March 31, 2025, meeting minutes. Do I hear a motion to approve those?

Ali Banister: I'll move to approve.

Chair DeVere Karlson: It has been moved. Do I have a second?

Pauline Salla: I'll make a second to that.

Chair DeVere Karlson: Thank you. It has been moved and seconded to approve the minutes from the March 31, 2025, meeting. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor, please indicate by saying, yay or aye.

[Ayes around]

Chair DeVere Karlson: Any opposed, say nay. Is anyone abstaining. Hearing none, the March 31, 2025, minutes are approved. We will now go on to the April 21, 2025, minutes. Can I entertain a motion to approve those minutes?

Ali Banister: I'll move to approve.

Chair DeVere Karlson: Thank You Commissioner Banister. Is there a second?

Pauline Salla: I'll second.

Chair DeVere Karlson: Thank you. It has been moved and seconded to approve the minutes from the April 21, 2025, meeting. Is there any discussion, comments? Hearing none. All those in favor of approving the minutes say aye.

[Ayes around]

Chair DeVere Karlson: Any opposed say, nay. Does anyone wish to abstain? Moving on to the June 9th meeting. The minutes from the June 9, 2025, meeting. Is there a motion to approve those minutes?

Ali Banister: I will move to approve.

Chair DeVere Karlson: Thank you. It has been moved to approve the minutes from the June 9th meeting. Is there a second?

Brigid Duffy: I'll second.

Chair DeVere Karlson: It has been moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the June 9, 2025, meeting. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, we will vote to approve those minutes. All in favor, please say aye.

[Ayes around]

Chair DeVere Karlson: Any opposed say, nay. Any wishing to abstain? So, indicate. Hearing none, the minutes from the June 9th meeting 2025, are approved. We'll now move on to Agenda Item 5, which is for information. I've included a new section, which I call the Chair Updates. This is merely an opportunity for me to share information on initiatives that I am working on or that are important updates that I received that may be relevant for the Commission to hear. This item is information only; no deliberation or action will be taken at this time. However, topics discussed may be placed on the agenda for future meetings if appropriate.

I'd like to start off with, there's been some questions and discussion about AB 384, which was signed into law by the Governor on May 30th and will go into effect as of October 1st. This bill will have an impact on the JJOC, even though it seems to be the Chair's name is throughout that bill extensively but moving on.

For today, I'm just going to provide a brief summary of the bill for your awareness. This will be an agenda item for our November meeting. AB 384 focuses on improving wraparound services for youth in the juvenile justice system. As such the JJOC will be required to gather information on the availability, scope and variety of services offered to youth and their families across our state.

The bill's purpose is to ensure that the JJOC formally requests and integrates input from stakeholders, such as community organizers that offer services to you, family members, youth themselves, anyone who provides services. And that includes evidence-based programs is what we're looking towards, mentorship programs, and evidence-based re-entry programs. So, towards, mentorship programs and evidence-based reentry programs.

So, that is the scope of the bill. It also states in the bill that any other matters related to wraparound services that we feel would be appropriate. Who might the Commission likely reach out to? Certainly, youth who are currently or previously on probation, who are currently detained, who are currently in facilities, family members and caregivers, community-based nonprofit and program providers, mentor, re-entry specialists, probation and youth justice professionals, and those who advocate for the system.

So, what does this mean for us? First of all, I think it means a lot of work. When you initially look at it, you're going, well, we're doing some of these things, but we're certainly not doing all of these things. As I understand it, prior to AB 384, public engagement was not explicitly required, but beginning October 1st, it will be required. We will be required to actively seek out community input. That means incorporating community identified issues into our deliberations and expanding our focus. We need to consider many new processes perhaps, such as virtual forums, surveys, focus groups, and other forms of outreach to ensure that diverse voices are heard and included in our decision-making. We will also have to collect data, interpret that data, and submit a report to the legislature every March. It will detail our finding and our progress.

Once again, this is a very brief synopsis of AB 384 as I understand it. I have lots of ideas going through my head, lots of questions. I'm going to be seeking input. In what form that might be remains to be seen. Again, this will be on our agenda in November.

In addition to AB 384, I would like to share a few other areas I will be focusing on in the next six months or so. One is membership recruitment. We are currently out of compliance with three commission appointments, two nominations from the Nevada Senate, and then one from the Nevada Supreme Court. I have reached out to someone that I know who works for the Supreme Court. I'm hoping he can perhaps give me some guidance. Both Ms. Casselman and I have been working on this issue for a while.

We also, Ms. Casselman and I have been talking about reviving the Youth Committee. Reenacting it will also be a top priority. We've had several constructive conversations about this. I've also done some research and reached out to other states and seen how they're doing and what their youth committees are doing. And I will continue to do that. I hope to be able to report back on some progress in November. I have attended some recent events and some engagements.

In April, I got to attend the Brain Health Summit in Winnemucca. That was a wonderful summit. I learned so much. It was sad, I could only attend one of the two days. But I was very

impressed with the speakers. I was very impressed with the information they presented. And I'm looking forward to going next year if I get invited.

I also attended the Coalition for Juvenile Justice Annual Conference in Washington, DC in April. There, I had an opportunity to meet with several fellow SAG Chairs and begin building stronger nationwide relationships. That's going to be so valuable to me personally as I move forward in this position. We meet monthly and I'm looking forward to having someone I can bounce ideas off, see what they're doing, what I can bring back to the table for the full Commission.

In October, I'm going to be attending the National Conference of the Youth Justice and Action Conference, which is in Minnesota, which is cold in October, just thought I'd say that. The focus will be on reducing racial and ethnic disparities in the juvenile justice system, but they also will have a track for youth and membership and mentorship.

So, that concludes my updates. I'm now going to turn it over to Commissioner Salla to talk about Planning and Development Committee.

Pauline Salla: Thank you. The Planning and Development Committee has not met yet. We just went through our name change and actually after our full Commission meeting we will be sending out a Doodle Poll to pick a date for our first committee meeting as Planning and Development. And just so we can talk about what our tasks will be and areas of focus at that first meeting also.

Chair DeVere Karlson: Thank you, Commissioner Salla. Are there any questions regarding the Planning and Development Committee? Hearing none, we'll move on to the Data Performance Committee, Commissioner Duffy.

Brigid Duffy: Good morning. My report is included in the meeting materials. We have had two meetings since the last Commission meeting. One in February and one in April. We are pending our next meeting. We probably have it scheduled by now. When I did this report, I didn't have it.

We are continuing to address some lack of consistency in how the jurisdictions are reporting certain data collection terms. So, we have, and I'll address this more so not repeat myself in Agenda Item 7. So, we have some recommendations on two terms and definitions for those terms.

We are still working on the clear definition of referral. So, at our next meeting, we're expecting a presentation from the state on how each jurisdiction is pulling data and then reporting it. So, if we know how each jurisdiction is pulling it, it will give us a better understanding of how we want to recommend the reporting of it because not everyone pulls their data the same way.

We continue to have discussions around the tribal affiliation and enrollment data. We did learn at our last meeting that it is available within the Enterprise Supervision system to collect this data and the system itself will not need an upgrade. But then again, as a committee, we also discussed how we've been told that before and there's always been some hiccups in the past with the system.

So, coming forward, we do need some assistance to know, especially from the jurisdictions that don't use Enterprise Supervision. So, Washoe and I believe China Springs is—if they have the ability to gather that data somehow within the systems that they use moving forward. And then, ultimately we're going to go back on Agenda Item 7 around some definition changes.

But our next steps are really going to be focused on making sure that everybody is consistently reporting their data the same way, what data measures we are reporting and that overview of how each jurisdiction pulls their data. And that's my report.

Chair DeVere Karlson: Thank you, Commissioner Duffy. Are there any questions? Moving on then to the Strategic Planning Committee. That would be Commissioner Florez.

Elizabeth Florez: Good morning, everybody. Our Strategic Planning Committee met on April 30th and July 8th since our last meeting, and we worked on reorganizing the goal, the goals in order of priority, which resulted in a slight change where we flipped goals four and five, and I'll be providing greater detail on the next agenda item, as to what the implications are of that so that everybody can see and hopefully approve. And that's my report. Thank you.

Chair DeVere Karlson: Thank you, Commissioner Florez. We will now move on to Agenda Item 6, for possible action. And that is discussion and possible approval of the proposed Action Plan for implementing the adopted FY 2024 to 2029 Strategic Plan Goals, Commissioner Florez.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. So, as I just indicated, the Strategic Planning Committee had reviewed the goals to determine what the proper order was based on priority and sequencing because some goals actually bleed into others or build upon others. And so, we will be proposing a change that you will see here. Also, we went through and updated the plan with where we are with progress on certain items. And so, I'll actually ask Ms. Casselman to assist me as we go through this.

Goal Number 1 is Proven Programs. And you can see the note here. Our next steps are to add to the Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators' agenda to go over the evidence-based tool that exists on the Innovation Center website, and to train it to all of the Juvenile Justice Administrators and also create a timeline. This concept had been introduced previously at NAJJA because NAJJA is comprised of administrators from across the state, from the camps and juvenile probation departments, detention centers, as well as state facilities.

It was agreed upon that NAJJA was a good forum to bring forward some of the items that are now required by the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission. And so, the plan is to bring representation from NCJFCJ to NAJJA in order to train, introduce the document again, and also train out use of the tools so that we can begin collecting the inventory and then move forward with creating policy. Are there any questions on that?

Okay. With that we'll move on to Goal Number 2, which is System Collaboration. And you can see that the next steps here are to review what prior practices have been as far as cross agency collaboration. In the past, the Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators had an offshoot committee, I believe it was called Silver State, where there were peer reviews of each other's detention centers. There was actually a tool in place, but we do not know the foundation of the tool or if it was based or rooted in any research. So, Chair Karlson was going to, because she had been a member of NAJJA at the time and Silver State was going to do some research on that.

Also, DCFS, Ms. Casselman, indicated that there was currently a QA tool in existence that is used for state facilities. And so, she and I were going to work together on reviewing that tool to see if it would assist with developing a tool for local facilities. With that, Ms. Casselman, I'm going to turn it over to you for just a moment if you don't mind.

Cindy Casselman: Yes. In addition, there you can see the performance reporting. We will continue to collaborate with the jurisdictions to ensure that we have accurate performance reporting and we can create reports for statewide data. Also, the cross-agency collaboration. This is one engaging children's services. We do believe that this will also cross over into AB 384. So, this will be worked on and figuring out what the role will be. Also, with the Nevada Center for Juvenile Justice Innovation, bringing them in as well to help us with the bulk of this goal as well too. Are there any questions in regard to Goal 2? I don't see any.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you, Ms. Casselman. Goal Number 3 is Family Engagement and Case Planning. This is another one in progress where in a survey that was conducted, there are various jurisdictions in the state included who already have family engagement handbooks and policies, as well as case plan—a case plan handbook in at the NAJJA meetings what we're doing is also taking this work there to support other entities, jurisdictions, who do not yet have policies or handbooks. And again, develop timelines within that group to ensure that we're all in compliance with these efforts. Again, Ms. Casselman from the Programs Office has been supportive of that and will also be a liaison between NAJJA and our Strategic Planning Group meeting to ensure that there's full compliance with this. Are there any questions on this one? With that, we'll move on to Goal Number 4. And Ms. Casselman, if you could please assist with this one.

Cindy Casselman: On Goal 4, its Stakeholder Education for the Juvenile Justice System. This is working with the Programs Office and the Office of Analytics to identify the stakeholders that are needed. This is including juvenile court data, as well as data across all

the jurisdictions. Creating a training curriculum that will help educate stakeholders on data sharing and best practices, as well as confidentiality and ensuring that the data that they're providing will remain confidential, no identifying information on those.

Also developing the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act compliance education for juvenile court judges and other court personnel, offering regular trainings for them so that they are aware of what the federal requirements are regarding the deinstitutionalization of status offenders and also juveniles charged as adults and how they are detained and the required court hearings that must take place. So again, this work will be done with the Programs Office and the Office of Analytics. Thank you.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you for that. Are there any questions on Goal Number 4? Okay. Hearing none. We'll move on to Item 5, Collaborative Data Sharing and Juvenile Justice System. Again, just to highlight Goals 4 and 5 have been switched so you're now seeing it in the order that we're proposing be adopted. Ms. Casselman, can you provide an update on this one, please?

Cindy Casselman: This is the Collaborative Data Sharing in Juvenile Justice System builds on Goal 4. Again, the data sharing agreements with the jurisdiction. So, we're working in conjunction with the Office of Analytics to see if all jurisdictions want to be included in the data sharing.

We currently have four counties that are participating in that, as well as conducting a comprehensive review of data analysis methods and establishing data collection standards across the state, so that we can better analyze the data that we get, present it to our stakeholders and determine our plans of action for in regard to system improvement for the juvenile justice system. As well as just evaluating the data analysis methods, determining the effectiveness of our data collection protocols and reporting those outcomes again to make improvements with the juvenile justice system.

We will be working in conjunction with Commissioner Duffy's Data Performance Committee as this goal, Goal 5 also will meet some of the work that the Data Performance Committee is doing. Thank you.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you, Ms. Casselman. Are there any questions on Goal 5? Seeing none. We will move on to Goal Number 6. The last goal which is develop essential data collection from courts and jails which also builds upon the previous goals. Ms. Casselman, could you please provide an update on this one as well?

Cindy Casselman: In Goal 6, it's Developed Essential Data Collection from Courts and Jails. We currently do not collect data from juvenile courts or adult courts on a regular basis. And so, this would assist with collecting valuable data from the juvenile court. And how cases are processed would assist with collecting valuable data from the juvenile court and how cases are processed to better identify where there may be system improvement that can

happen.

We will work in conjunction, the Programs Office, as well as the Office of Analytics to determine how we can best collect that data and then pilot those, the court jail data sharing systems and then do evaluation on that as well. Thank you.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you for that. Are there any questions on Goal Number 6? Okay. So, this is an action item, and the agenda item was discussion and possible approval of the proposed action plan for implementing the adopted FY 24 through 29 Strategic Plan Goals. Thank you.

Chair DeVere Karlson: Thank you. Thank you for that presentation, Ms. Casselman. So, I would like to entertain a motion to approve the proposed action plan for implementing the adopted FY 2024 to 2029 Strategic Plan Goals. Is there a motion for that?

Pauline Salla: So moved.

Chair DeVere Karlson: I have a motion. Do I have a second?

Ali Banister: I'll second.

Chair DeVere Karlson: Thank you. It has been moved and is seconded. Any discussion?

Marla McDade Williams: Madam Chair.

Chair DeVere Karlson: Yes, Commissioner.

Marla McDade Williams: I appreciate all of the work that has gone into this. And I know one of the issues that we worked through during the process was to ensure that we had appropriate statutory authority to perform the activities and that they were consistent with the responsibilities of the Commission.

As I'm looking at this now, I realized that we brought in some statutes that the Commission does not have specific authority over. Looking at Goal 3, Family Engagement, all of those citations, none of those relate to Commission authority. On Goal 4, there's actually no statutory authority cited, and neither is there on 5 or 6.

I realized that the strategic plan itself can get broad, right? And touch various aspects of the juvenile justice system. But I would also note that NRS 62B.625 requires the Division of Child and Family Services to adopt regulations to implement the provisions of the strategic plan. We cannot enact regulations outside of our statutory authority. So, I guess what I'm asking is, what is the Deputy Attorney General's oversight over these provisions and to ensure that they are within the authority of the Commission.

Chair DeVere Karlson: Commissioner Florez?

Elizabeth Florez: These are good questions. Without all my notes before me, I apologize, I can't answer that question directly. The Deputy Attorney General, I do not believe, has reviewed these. If that's something that was required, it has not ever been brought forward in our previous Strategic Planning meetings.

If that's the case, then we would have to wait if the group believes that that's required prior to adopting these plans. The whole strategic plan was voted upon, I believe, by this body back in March, and the whole strategic plan was voted upon and adopted. What we're proposing today are our refinements and updates. So, I will defer to the group if there is concern about a legal matter.

Brigid Duffy: If I may, Chair, One, I think that there's always the ability to ask the Attorney General's Office for a legal opinion. So, if they want to put forth, is there a DAG on the call today? I always thought a DAG attended these meetings.

Erin Grieve: Sorry, good morning. This is Erin Grieve. I am present and I'd have to review the matter and then get back to the Committee.

Brigid Duffy: Okay, thank you. So, there is a Deputy Attorney General on the call today, which is supposed to happen. Thank you for being here. The other thing is, I think that this group of experts within the juvenile justice system have collaborated, debated, and broken down everything to determine that this is the best plan for the state, for our families and children going forward.

If there is the desire of this body to find that these are the priorities, and the state doesn't believe they have the statutory authority to do it and all they need is a statutory authority to do it then we as a body need to be looking at the interim session for the state legislature and then putting forth the bill to bring it forward.

Because I don't think that these are put into the strategic plan unless we all decided that these are important to our state. Understanding that maybe we can't move forward if that's going to be the legal opinion of the Attorney General's Office, because it's not specific to what we're doing statutorily or allowed statutorily. I don't think we just say we're not going to do them. We decided they were important. I think we need to bring it forward and get a BDR to change what we need to do and move forward that way. So, those are just my comments, Chair.

Chair DeVere Karlson: Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner Duffy. Commissioner Salla.

Pauline Salla: Thank you. Just so I have it clear in my mind, which statutes Commissioner Williams, are you saying that are a concern with the strategic plan?

Marla McDade Williams: For example, 62B.645, which is cited in Goal 3 Family Engagement. It says, on or before September 1, 2017, the Division of Child and Family Services shall issue a request for proposals to establish, I'm sorry, I'm on the wrong one...45, The Division of Child and Family Services and each Department of Juvenile Services shall develop and implement a family engagement plan to enhance family engagement in the juvenile justice system. And then, there are four components outlying the requirements for each department of juvenile services.

Again, I'm not saying that we can't get a report, understanding what those plans are, but the Commission itself doesn't have any authority over those plans. So, you know, we're trying to identify a subcommittee which is an issue for the bylaws because I don't think we've established it in the proposal, for one. Review and identify evidence-based standards for family engagement. Again, you can fit that in the overall goal for strategic planning, but the responsibility lies with the departments of juvenile services, and I presume for DCFS it relies on us with respect to our juvenile services. So, just there's a line there where we are doing work instead of understanding the system and getting reports to understand the system. And I think we just have to be very careful about how we do that work.

Pauline Salla: Thank you for that explanation. I look at that a little differently in that the ones who are doing the work are those of us who have the jurisdictions, the state with youth parole and the correctional facilities. And I believe that the Oversight Commission was created to provide oversight of our system.

Family engagement is clearly identified in what the Commission was identified to focus on and to create in AB 472. And while there's a difference of us providing, to look at them to make sure that all of us as jurisdictions have them to identify what works best, what doesn't work. And then, to bring that forth to the Commission for the Commission to review and provide input to is critical.

The people on the Commission are working in the system. So, I agree with Commissioner Duffy, if this is about our statutes that probably have not been revised for a long time, if we need to do that and to clarify, to provide the oversight with clear authority to govern our system that we are all a part of, I think that's what we need to do. As a jurisdiction, my family engagement process is going to look different than some others, but if the Commission provided feedback to me to make changes or do something different, I would consider that.

It's hard for me, and I've said this in our meeting before, to have one state agency telling us how to run our system, when they're part of the system we are. And as an Oversight Commission with all different representatives that look at things that I don't see in our system is critical.

So, if this is going to be about it's not in our statute we don't have the authority DCFS doesn't have the authority, then I agree with Commissioner Duffy. Let's identify what we, what we need to do to have an effective system that's fair to our kids and our families. And then, take

that to the interim so that we're not consistently holding off on making the right decisions for our kids.

Chair DeVere Karlson: Are there any other comments before we go to a vote? We do have a motion on the floor that was seconded. Hearing none. All those in favor of approving the proposed action plan for the implementing the adopted FY 24-29 Strategic Plan goals. Respond by saying aye.

[Ayes around]

Chair DeVere Karlson: All those opposed respond by saying nay. Anyone wish to abstain. The motion passes. We will now move on to Agenda Item 7, which is for possible action, discussion and possible approval of the revisions to the Nevada Statewide Data Dictionary, Commissioner Duffy.

Brigid Duffy: Good morning again, Commission. Bringing forth based upon my data subcommittee to recommendations today. We identified changes in our statute that occurred in 2017. So, this was post Data Dictionary that was created for those who remember, by the original Supreme Court's Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee. And it's still been used by many jurisdictions. So, there were some missing definitions that are now put into statute. Two of those definitions were unique identifier and disciplinary action. In my research, I could not find them defined in statute in the NAC or the Data Dictionary.

So, after conversations and back and forth with the Data Subcommittee, we are recommending two proposed definitions. And you can see them in writing back on my report. They're written out in number two on the committee report, which is attachment 5.2.

I'll read them for you. We're going to do one at a time. The first is a definition of unique identifier. That is a required reporting element within our statute. There's no definition, so the Data Subcommittee is recommending an amendment to the Data Dictionary that a unique identifier is the unique set of numbers assigned to each child through the juvenile justice departments. Is there any discussion on the unique identifier definition? And I don't hear any discussion. Madam Chair, if you want to call for a motion, I can move.

Chair DeVere Karlson: I'm calling for a motion.

Brigid Duffy: All right. I would move to add the definition of unique identifier for the state to follow into our Data Dictionary of the unique set of numbers assigned to each child through the juvenile justice department. That's my motion.

Chair DeVere Karlson: Do we have a second?

Pauline Salla: I'll second.

Chair DeVere Karlson: It has been moved and it has been seconded. Any further discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor say aye.

[Ayes around]

Chair DeVere Karlson: Those opposed say nay. Those who wish to abstain say I abstain. Motion passes. Thank you very much Commissioner Duffy. Okay.

Brigid Duffy: Thank you, the second definition, disciplinary action was not defined in the Data Dictionary in NAC or in statute. However, it is a required reporting element for the state and the jurisdictions. After a lot of debate back and forth trying to figure out the best and most efficient way of how we would want to pull this data to report it, we are recommending that a disciplinary action be defined as an action taken against a child during the child's placement. Means any room confinement used as discipline and/or use of force incident involving the child again the written out definition can be found in Attachment 5.2 in Subsection 2. So, I would ask this chair then to ask for a motion to approve that. Is there any discussion?

Chair DeVere Karlson: Do we have a motion to approve?

Brigid Duffy: I will move to approve the definition of disciplinary action.

Chair DeVere Karlson: Do we have a second?

Ali Banister: I'll second.

Chair DeVere Karlson: It has been moved, and there's been a second. All those in favor say aye.

[Ayes around]

Chair DeVere Karlson: Those opposed say, nay. Anyone wishing to abstain? Hearing none. That passes. We will now move on to, are we moving on? We'll move on to Agenda Item 8, which is for information. It's Juvenile Justice Programs Office update. Ms. Casselman.

Cindy Casselman: So, let me get my screen up here for just a second. All right. This is the Programs Office update. The updates are going to include our Juvenile Justice Oversight membership, the Title II Formula Grant updates and the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act Reauthorization Bill for 2025 and data reporting for state facilities, which includes our corrective room restriction and our use of force.

So, first to update you regarding the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission membership. This is our current membership. As Chair DeVere Karlson had mentioned earlier in her update, there are two members nominated by the Senate and those currently are vacant.

And there is a member nominated by the Supreme Court that is currently vacant as well. So, we are working to get those appointments.

There are also a number of, you can see the term expiration dates in there. So, we reached out to the Boards and Commission and we're given direction that the current commissioners just need to send in a new application, and it will be reviewed by the Governor, and a reappointment can be made if they wish to continue with serving as a commissioner on the Juvenile Justice Oversight. I will be sending out an email to those individuals who have terms that are coming up. They can remain on the Commission until those appointments are made by the Governor. Are there any questions regarding that?

Our Title II Formula Grant, which is the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act. For FY24, we just submitted our compliance data. That includes our deinstitutionalization of status offenders, our juveniles charged as adults, our compliance visits to the adult facilities, lockups, jails, and prisons to ensure that they are complying with the federal requirements for site and sound separation, jail removal and regarding that.

Then, we are going to be sending out a notice of funding opportunity. We'll be working with the Planning Development Committee. We will be sending out the Notice of Funding Opportunities for the FY24 grant. I'm hoping to get that out in August. I'll be working with Commissioner Salla to ensure that we have all of the information that we need and that it's the notice of funding opportunity aligns with what our three-year state plan that was submitted. Are there any questions in regard to that?

And the million dollar question here the FY25 we are awaiting the announcement for the application to come out. It has not come out. We're hoping that it will be coming out soon. We have been told that it will be level funding. So, meaning that we should not be getting less, but we should be getting about the same amount. And for reference, our FY24 award amount was \$672,542. So, we're hoping to get somewhere around that as well too for the FY 25. So, we'll keep you updated as soon as the application comes out for that.

There is a Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act Reauthorization Bill for 2025. This was submitted by Senator Grassley and Senator Whitehouse. It does not change things too much. It adds a couple of things. It asks for an increase in funding as well too, which is great. It will rename the bill in addition to a couple other changes surrounding the deinstitutionalization of status offenders and the valid court order exception as well too.

Okay. So, for our corrective room restriction data for state facilities and for the county juvenile detentions, the Program's Office has been working to better collect this data and analyze it and validate it as well too. I just have a couple of charts to be able to show you. We took January of 2025 through May of 2025. We're still validating obviously the June data. So, this is just a little bit of a snapshot. The total uses of the corrective room restriction by month. This is for the state facilities. So, this includes Caliente Youth Center, Nevada Youth Training Center and Summit View Youth Center as well. In January, it showed that there was

four, mind you, we are missing data as well too. I just want to give that caveat. So, in January there was four, in February there was 25, March there was, I believe that's 18, April there was 14 and in May there was 19 total uses.

So, the breakdown for this as well too, and this was a lot of work that we did regarding the Corrective Room Restriction that was in this last legislative session regarding the timeframes as well too. So, you can see there's 0 to 1 hours there were 4, 2 to 5 hours there were 21, 6 to 10 hours there were 30, 11 to 5 hours there were 21, 6 to 10 hours there were 30, and then 11 to 15 hours there were a total of 25.

The Corrective Room Restriction for the county juvenile detentions. Each county juvenile detention reports on this as well too. I broke down the juvenile detention centers there for you. You have Carson City of Washoe County, Elko, Humboldt, Clark County, Douglas County, and Churchill are the ones that are reporting. In January, they had a total for all of those. We did not break them out for this purpose for each detention facility, but this is just a total for all of those detention facilities. They had 170 in January, 123 in February, 215 in March, 178 in April, and 51 in May.

The corrective room restriction breakdown by hours for the juvenile detention centers. Again, you can see the bulk of those are in the up to five hours. And then, it drops off significantly in there. Those are broken down by the hour. So, that zero to one, two to five, six to 10.

This is the use of force data, and this is what the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission does review as there is no NRS that is attached to the use of force data. And so, all the state facilities report, the county juvenile detentions, and the county camps. For the use of force or the total number of uses of force by month for the state facilities, and again, that's Caliente Youth Center, Nevada Youth Training Center, and Summit View Youth Center. This is January through May data as well. There was nine reported in January. Twenty reported in February, 36 in March, 16 in April, and 35 in May.

And the total number of uses of force, this is for the county juvenile detention and the county camp. So, that includes China Spring Youth Camp and Spring Mountain Youth Camp. So, for January they had 43, February 24, March was 26, April 33, and there was six in May. Any questions? And that is all the updates from the Programs Office.

Chair DeVere Karlson: Thank you, Ms. Casselman.

Marla McDade Williams: Madam Chair.

Chair DeVere Karlson: I'm sorry.

Marla McDade Williams: So, these materials were not part of our meeting packet. So, will you be sending them out? Because I was trying to find the agenda. It's not on the website

either.

Cindy Casselman: Yes, these will be published on the link. I do apologize. I did not get these done until this weekend.

Chair DeVere Karlson: We're moving on now to Agenda Item 9, for possible action, discussion and possible approval of the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission's Bylaws for immediate implementation. That is Attachment 9.

First and foremost, I hope everyone's had an opportunity and has taken the time to review the proposed revisions to the bylaws. Today's process will involve a final review of the current draft. The revised bylaws will be open for further discussion, debate and possible amendments. Once that process is completed, we will move on to a final vote.

As a reminder, a two-thirds majority vote is required for the revisions to be adopted. To ensure accuracy and to avoid any confusion, we will be conducting the vote by roll call. If the revisions are adopted, they will be immediately replaced the existing bylaws unless a motion is made to delay the implementation. Such a motion would require only a majority vote to pass. If the revisions fail, the current bylaws will remain in effect.

Additionally, please note that the full body can choose to adopt some revisions and reject others depending upon the will of this Commission. Now, following our June 9th meeting, which was where we had our first reading of the bylaws, members of the Bylaw Committee met individually and reviewed each of the comments and suggestions that were submitted. To the best of my recollection, all suggestions for changes and edits were incorporated in the draft that you should have before you. In addition to the feedback shared—

Marla McDade Williams: Madam Chair. My apologies. So, in trying to find the materials from this meeting, it appears that our meeting wasn't properly posted on the Nevada meetings website. And so, I guess I would ask the DAG if we can even continue with the meeting at this point.

Chair DeVere Karlson: How was it not, I'm unaware, could you please explain how it was not posted?

Marla McDade Williams: We are required to post on, every meeting on, it's called notice.nv.gov. And that is the Nevada public notice website. Every meeting, public meeting is required to be posted there. This meeting is clearly not posted on this site. And so, the question for the DAG is, can we proceed if this meeting was not posted? My understanding is it's not in compliance with open meeting law if it's not posted there.

Chair DeVere Karlson: That's my understanding as well, but Ms. Grieve, are you still here?

Erin Grieve: Yes, I apologize. I'm in another meeting as well. I'm reviewing it right now.

Another DAG did review the agenda and approved it. So, I'm just going through my emails right now to find that agenda.

Marla McDade Williams: I mean, the agenda says it was posted there, but it is clearly not on the website, right now.

Erin Grieve: I am on the website and don't see it on today's meetings. I would agree that I'm not seeing it on that specific website at this time as I'm reviewing it.

Pauline Salla: So, this is Commissioner Salla, are there two different websites? The DCFS website, and then, another website?

Marla McDade Williams: There are two different websites.

Erin Grieve: I am on notice.nv.gov.

Marla McDade Williams: Right, but notice.nv.gov is where we are required to repost for all open meetings.

Erin Grieve: So, we don't see that though, like we just have the DCFS one, right? I was going to say it's on the DCFS one.

Marla McDade Williams: Yeah. And so, if it's not on this website I would say that it's not in compliance with open meeting law even though it is cited on the DCFS website.

Chair DeVere Karlson: So, I guess the next question I would have is, all the actions that we've taken so far in this meeting were also not in compliance?

Marla McDade Williams: That would be, yes, that would be my understanding.

Chair DeVere Karlson: So, they will have to be done again. Okay. My inclination is to call a meeting next month to agendize those items that were for vote today and were voted on and also to vote on the Bylaws. Ms. Casselman, want to pick a date? Let's pick a date. What's the first Monday in August? I see the fourth. Let's go for August 4th, 9:00 am, and that'll be a virtual meeting. And it'll just be those three items, the two that we voted on, and then the bylaws.

Hopefully that meeting will not take more than an hour. We are now going to move to agenda item—Maybe we are not going to move anywhere. Maybe we're just going to adjourn.

Brigid Duffy: Chair, can I ask?

Chair DeVere Karlson: Commissioner Duffy.

Brigid Duffy: So, before we, when we go to the meeting on August 4th, can I just make the request that the Attorney General's Office look over the Bylaws? Because the Bylaws really indicate what the authority of the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission is. And so, we don't have any hiccups, bumps in the road like, that's already done by our August 4th meeting. And so, we can have that discussion at the time instead of having to kick it back.

Erin Grieve: Yep, absolutely that will not be a problem

Brigid Duffy: Thank you. I just wanted to make sure it's pointed out because when I reviewed them, it really is a lot of you know statutory authority where it comes from and I want DCFS to have your guidance on it. So, we don't have any other bumps.

Chair DeVere Karlson: So, Ms. Grieve if you could, this is Commissioner Karlson, if you could look through those once again that would be greatly appreciated.

Erin Grieve: Absolutely. Not a problem.

Chair DeVere Karlson: With that said we're going to move all the way to Agenda Item 12, where I'm going to adjourn this meeting at 10:07. Thank you.

[End of Meeting]