



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

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



Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission
Grants and Quality Assurance
Committee Meeting
December 6th, 2021 at 1:00 PM

Meeting Minutes – DRAFT

Called to Order at 1:02 pm.

Roll Call:

Voting Members

Via Phone: Jo Lee Wickes (Chair), Jeremy Setters, Liz Florez

Absent: Jessica Valdez

Non- Voting Members

Via Phone: Eboni Washington, Sara Velasquez

Absent: none

Public via Phone: Kayla Mariani – NV PEBP, Lexi Beck – Youth MOVE Reno

DCFS Staff Present: Leslie Bittleston, Jennifer Simeo, Kayla Dunn

Leslie Bittleston took roll and confirmed there was quorum.

Jo Lee Wickes: Great. Again, welcome, everybody. I think the next item on agenda is public comment. Are there any members of the public that would like to make a comment? For the record, we are being joined by Kayla Mariani who is with Nevada PEBP, so welcome to you, Ms. Mariani, also. The next agenda item for possible action is approval of the meeting minutes. I would like to put an apology on the record. Ms. Bittleston did a wonderful job, which was necessitated by my failing to do my summarization of meeting minutes. So, thank you for having my back and I appreciate that. Has everyone, or at least voting members, are you prepared to move forward with approving the minutes and do I have a motion?

Jeremy Setters: Approves.

Jo Lee Wickes: I will second that motion. Any discussion? All voting members in favor of approving the minutes from February 23rd of this, please signify by stating aye.

Committee: Aye.

Jo Lee Wickes: Ms. Florez, are you going to weigh in on this [inaudible]?

Liz Florez: Was I – oh, sorry, I can vote even though I wasn't present for that meeting. Aye.

Jo Lee Wickes: Anyone opposed? Okay. Meeting minutes are approved. Thank you. Item number 5 is the quality assurance updates. And I will turn this over to Ms. Bittleston. It looks like she has quite a bit of information to share with us.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, Madam Chair. Thank you. This committee has not met for several months, mostly due to the schedule of the quality assurance reviews using the correctional program checklist review tool. Most of the quality assurance reviews happened within the last few months of the year. So, starting with the first bullet item, we were fortunate enough to train seven new assessors to use the correctional program checklist review tool the last week of August and the first week in September. We trained two staff from DCFS, myself and Jennifer Simeo. We also trained Wendy Garrison, who is the director of China Spring Youth Camp and also four folks from Clark County. So, seven new assessors were trained. As part of that training, those assessors and the two trainers reviewed Spring Mountain Youth Camp as part of the training. The trainers, this would be Jamie Newsome and Andrew Krebs, were ultimately responsible for the review of Spring Mountain Youth Camp. They just used that to train us, but the trainers will be writing the draft report and completing the questionnaire score sheet and also writing the final report. As of yet, I have not seen the draft report, so that is why we don't have more materials to share. So, that's kind of where we are with training and review. Also, China Spring Youth Camp was reviewed October 21st and 22nd. NYT was reviewed November 8th and 9th and Summit View was just reviewed last week. So, none of those draft reports are completed and ready for review. So, we are a little bit behind on completing our draft reports. Caliente Youth Center will be reviewed next month, January of 2022. So, that's where we are with the updates. I can take questions.

Jo Lee Wickes: Can you tell us a little bit about your experience doing your first assessment at Spring Mountain?

Leslie Bittleston: Sure. So, Spring Mountain -- actually, my first review without the trainers was China Spring Youth Camp. So, maybe that would be a better one to share. I was paired with two seasoned reviewers, Sara Velasquez and Sharon Anderson. Sara Velasquez is the training officer at Summit View Youth Center and Sharon Anderson is a unit manager for state youth parole. They been on several reviews and were trained with the original trainees in 2018. So, I was paired with them for the review at China Spring in October. I, being a new reviewer, took the lead with a lot of the interviews and kind of interactions with the facility, which I thought was extremely helpful because interviewing the program director is really where a CPC assessor gets most of their information. So, I found the review to be really great and really helpful. The China Spring -- excuse me -- the Spring Mountain review that we did with our trainers and all of the assessors was not as helpful because there were multiple folks interviewing one person. So, when it came time to do my own review and a one-on-one interview with the program director, was really beneficial for me. Another thing that was beneficial for me is I now have the background and understanding to really read the reports, all of the reports, that will be submitted for each facility and will be able to look at some of the systemic issues that have been listed in several of the reports. And what I mean by systemic issues is some of those things that maybe a facility cannot change. For example, if they do not have a staff person who is qualified to be a program director with education and experience, then, you know, that's something that maybe they can't address in a facility improvement plan. So, going forward, my role is not going to be one of the actual assessors. It's just going to be kind of the overseer of the quality assurance process in the state with a better understanding of what the CPC tool is and really what we're trying to get. I think the biggest thing of importance with the CPC tool is it looks at a program as if it is the best program. So, everything we are

looking at is looking at a model program and no program will meet those high expectations, so to speak. So, China Spring actually did really well on their review. I believe they will be within the high range of meeting program requirements, just because I was part of that review. But anyway, so I will be able to explain the reports better to this group on the go forward. That probably didn't answer a lot of your questions but that's kind of my experience with being a new CPC assessor. And Jennifer is also on the phone. Jennifer, do you have anything you'd like to add? I know you've done your own review as well with NYTC. You're on mute. Jennifer, are you there? I guess she stepped away. So, anyway, so Jennifer also is a new trained assessor as well.

Jo Lee Wickes: She's raising her hand. No, that's my cursor. Never mind. Liz is raising her hand. Liz Florez.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. And so was Eboni. Okay.

Liz Florez: I'm unmuted first. I'll go. Thanks, Eboni. So, this is Liz Florez, and thank you all for allowing me to be here. I do have a couple of questions and I'm sure it's just because I have lack of experience in all of this. I'm looking at the attachment where it shows table 1 with a facility comparison with the results by facility. I think because I don't understand this language, I'm wondering, one, if we could put somewhere up there what CPC stands for. So, it says grants and quality assurance CPC results. I'm sure I should know what exactly that stands for, but I don't. But I think within the document, it's important to at least in the title indicate that. And also, perhaps it's a separate conversation with you, Leslie, you could -- I don't know if there's a, like a legend or a rubric or something that could tell me what these numbers mean. So, for example, in table 1, I see -- I'm imaging these are scores, but I don't know what the scale is, so I don't know if that could be in the document as a legend below or if there's a separate document I can refer to. That would just help me understand what I'm looking at here.

Leslie Bittleston: The CPC stands for the Correctional Program Checklist, which is the quality [audio] JJOC back in 2018. And you're right, I failed to put the legend on there. So, table 1 is scores and I just -- I don't know -- I must have spaced it. I just forgot to put the legend on there. But will do so going forward.

Liz Florez: Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Yep. Did that answer your questions, Liz?

Liz Florez: It did. Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. And Eboni.

Eboni Washington: Yeah, so just -- and I apologize if you said this, Leslie, how many trained reviewers do we have total statewide now?

Leslie Bittleston: That is a great question. Originally in 2018, we trained eight folks. All of those eight were -- oh, seven of those were DCFS employees and one was a Clark County employee, which was Mark Miramoto. Is that how you --

Jo Lee Wickes: Correct.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. Thank you. Out of those eight that we originally trained, we lost four. So, we were down to four and the reason we lost four was due to retirement or they left their position. One of the things about the quality program – the community program checklist that all assessors have to do is they have to sign an agreement with the University of Cincinnati, which is the proprietor of the tool that states that once you leave your position, you are no longer allowed to use the correctional program checklist. So, any individual that either leaves their position for another job somewhere else or retires, is no longer a CPC assessor or a correctional program checklist assessor. So, we were down to four. We trained seven more, so we have 11 assessors currently to date.

Eboni Washington: Okay. Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Sure.

Jennifer Simeo: Did you want me to speak about my experience?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, please. So, your experience really with, either with doing Spring Mountain as a group or NYTC as your new, as your first one.

Jennifer Simeo: Okay. So, Wendy Garrison, who is a new CPC assessor, and me, we went out to Nevada Youth Training Center mid-November and did our initial assessment. And on our team, we did have a seasoned assessor, John Lum, who works in the program's office with DCFS. And, you know, it's always – it was very, a little nerve-wracking the first experience but Wendy Garrison has had assessments done at her own program. So, I felt like she was kind of the co-seasoned assessor and I was really the newest one. But Nevada Youth Training Center was very accommodating. Every staff person we wanted to talk to was available. We got to look at two groups using their evidence-based curriculum. We were able to review all of their documents. They had it all prepared for us when we got there. We've had some follow-up questions and they've been very accommodating with that. So, we have – after we had our onsite, we met with Andrew with UCCI, and we scored the tool. We had two sessions with him. One was three hours, and one was like two hours so five hours total but we got the assessment portion scored and will be working on the report over the next few months. So, all in all, I think it was a very good experience and NYTC was great to work with. And they're looking forward to the recommendations because they have new leadership and they're looking to make some improvements to their program, which is really nice.

Leslie Bittleston: And for clarification, UCCI is the University of Cincinnati, the proprietor of the tool. As new assessors, we were required to score the tool with our trainers for our first review. So, just for clarification.

Jo Lee Wickes: And, Leslie, could we back up for a minute to Liz's question? Because I think that table 3 gives a little bit more information about where those scores above fall within the range of adherence. Am I reading table 3 attachment?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. So, if we want to move to the attachment, the quality and grants – grants and quality assurance CPC results attachments, table 1 actually shows the total score of each facility from 2018, 2019 and 2020. 2021 is not yet included because we, as of the posting of these meeting materials, we were not – we did not have those yet completed. So, what you will see on table 1 facility comparison, you will see that CYC and NYTC did not have reviews in 2018 but China Spring, Spring Mountain and Summit View did. That is why

you see a 0 at CYC and NYTC. For 2019 and 2020, all five facilities received reviews. So, then moving down to table number 2, the raw scores, the correctional program checklist -- and maybe I could provide some more information per Liz's request on how this data is presented. The correctional program checklist has five domains and then an overall score. So, the domains are program, staff, quality assurance, offender assessment and treatment. So, within each of these five domains are a series of questions that the assessors go through the program and look and see which questions, you know, which questions are yes or no, depending on the program itself. So, all of the questions within a domain area score up to a specific total and then -- so, each domain has a total and then there is an overall score which you see on the right. And I'm still on table number 2. So, for example, looking at NYTC, this is the 2020 results. In the program area, NYTC received a 42.6, staff 45.5, quality 25, offender 100, so on for an overall score of 50. Moving on to table number 3, I do have to state emphatically that when you look at the scores of the correctional program checklist, it is not like looking at a score of when you were in school, which is 90 to 100 is an A, 80 to 90 is a B. That is not how this tool works. The way that it works is it scores in very high adherence, high [audio] or low adherence. So, table number 3 indicates the overall score and what level of adherence they are. So, NYTC scored a 50 and they are in the moderate range, which means that the correctional program checklist determined that the program at Nevada Youth Training Center was within that moderate adherence range to the program that the reviewers reviewed. The CPC is really a snapshot in time. It is what is seen the days that they are there. It's not what they strive to do. It's not what they would like to do. It's what is actually seen and observed the days that the assessors are there for the review. So, that -- so, what I need to include on the next meeting in the range of scores and the adherence, so kind of that table. So, does that kind of answer the question, Madam Chair?

Jo Lee Wickes: I think so. And Liz or any members that have a hard time tracking all of these domains and what they mean, because I do too, I will try to look back at prior meeting minutes because in some of those meetings, we discussed each of the domains with a little bit more --

Leslie Bittleston: Information.

Jo Lee Wickes: -- information and I tried desperately, if not in the minutes, at least in my reports to the full commission to explain in a very summarized and simplified fashion what all of this is about. Because I think it is [cough] -- excuse me -- for all of us, most of the world who haven't been trained in this, it's very complicated and it's very difficult to follow and then certainly, at least for me, very difficult to retain.

Leslie Bittleston: Right.

Jo Lee Wickes: There are some systemic issues that have come up over and over again. So, for instance, one of the domains is quality assurance and Leslie can correct me if I'm wrong, I don't think there's anyone in the state of Nevada that runs a correctional facility that has a budget for the kind of person it would take to stay on top of those parameters within getting scored for quality assurance and without significant outlay of money and resources, I don't think there's anybody in the state that's going to score well in that category because we simply don't have the money earmarked in these programs to hire that kind of staff. And so, parentally, that number's going to be lower than we might want it unless funding changes significantly.

Leslie Bittleston: That's correct. And --

Jo Lee Wickes: -- world that the facilities can do to help that number get significantly better.

Leslie Bittleston: Right. And I can give kind of a very, very 10,000-foot level of what each of these domains mean if you would like, Madam Chair.

Jo Lee Wickes: Liz, Jeremy, Eboni's been here for quite a while, do you think that that would be a little bit helpful, or would you prefer to have the reports to the JJOC in writing?

Liz Florez: Well, just for me, in an effort to save everybody's time and I'm a reader anyway and I'd be taking notes of what you're saying anyway, so it might be redundant. I'm pretty familiar. I'm happy to go back and look at notes but if somebody knows where to point me to, that might save time as well but, otherwise, I'll review prior minutes.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Liz Florez: And reports.

Jo Lee Wickes: I think the easiest might be for me to look at my reports to the JJOC unless, Leslie, you're --

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah.

Jo Lee Wickes: If you have an easy way to retrieve those summaries.

Leslie Bittleston: We did have, and I can't remember which meeting it was, but the meeting minutes where we had Ms. Sara Velasquez give us an overview, might be the best place but just to help out, I'll give you just very, very briefly what each of these mean. And remember, this is looking at the ideal program. So, the program areas really looking at the length of time the program has been in existence, the qualifications of the program director, the funding of the program, whether the funding is stable or not stable. So, those are the types of things that fall in the program area. The staff, again, is looking to see if 75-percent, this is really basic, 75-percent of the staff or more have certain education or experience. The quality, Madam Chair already talked about but really what's looking for here in the quality is there somebody to do quality assurance, are staff being trained annually, are staff keeping up on the foundation of the program that they're servicing. So, that's quality. Offender, everybody's going to pretty much do good on offender because that's using a risk and needs assessment. So, that's really looking at our [inaudible]. The treatment characteristics, this is how the program is being delivered, are the staff that are delivering the program qualified, is there clinical supervision, is there oversight. So, that is really the high level of what they're looking at each of those five areas. There are several questions which steer an assessor to know if they're meeting this or not. So, it's just looking at the questions within those areas in kind of that high level view. So, hopefully, that helps a little bit of what those areas mean.

Liz Florez: Actually, I found them, February 23rd, 2021, I found the meeting minutes.

Leslie Bittleston: Perfect.

Liz Florez: And it appears, just glancing at it, that Ms. Velasquez has a lot of commentary or description of what each of the domains are and what they mean and the ranges and the characteristics and all of that. So, thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. So, moving on to some of the other systemic issues. One of them was addressed by Madam Chair, which is the quality assurance piece. Another piece is the program director. It is very difficult to, you know, hire a position because the CPC requires that the program director be a clinician, somebody that is maybe a licensed clinical social worker, or another licensed individual. And most program directors may be the superintendent who do not have that level of education. So, that is another systemic problem we've seen across the board. Staffing issues, the CPC requires that 75-percent of the staff have a minimum of two years previous experience in criminal justice in working with youth and these are hard to recruit and fill positions. So, that's another systemic problem. Another systemic problem that we see is the number of hours of services provided to the youth seem to be cookie cutter no matter what. It is not broken down by the level of risk. For example, if a youth is classified as high risk, they should receive a little bit more, or more hours of service than a youth that is medium or moderate risk. We see all youth receive the same services if they are assessed to need a service. For example, if a youth is assessed to need a substance abuse service while they're in a facility, all the youth that are assessed to need a substance abuse service, all the youth receive the same hours. It's not different depending on their risk level. Most facilities don't conduct regular staff meetings. This is partially because there are no -- their staff are not funded to work outside of their shiftwork. So, they are not funded to come in for staff meetings. We also see that for training. Funding for training seems to be lacking. So, there are some systemic issues that we have seen in the last few years of reviewing these five facilities that it will do no good to provide recommendations to the facilities on how to fix these if what they really need is a change in a position title or something like that or they need more funds for training or staff. So, those are some of the things that we are finding that is across the board that we wanted to share with this group.

Jo Lee Wickes: Thank you. Any other questions about what's labeled as attachment 6, which are the CPC results historically, not for 2021? Obviously, those aren't done yet. Some information about the raw scores, the adherence and some of the systemic problems that have been identified so far.

Leslie Bittleston: Eboni, yes.

Eboni Washington: Thank you, Madam Chair. So, quick question, Leslie. I have two questions. My first is China Spring has an exception on many of these. Can you explain that?

Leslie Bittleston: So, and Jennifer Simeo can help me as well. So, China Spring -- the director of China Spring Youth Camp is Wendy Garrison. She is a recently trained CPC assessor but even prior to that, Wendy is the type of person that strives to be perfect. And she just received her fourth CPC review, and she has really, really tried to put a lot of things in place to get points, so to speak, for each of these areas. One of the things that she has instituted was she is now holding staff meetings with all of her staff. She has adjusted some of the requirements for her staff for training. She has instituted some quality assurance pieces where they are looking for disseminating literature reviews around the cognitive behavioral program that they provide there. So, they are doing a lot of things to try to get up to that perfect program. So, the reason that there are exceptions is because China Spring has put some of those things in place whereas the other four facilities have not.

Eboni Washington: I apologize. I misread that because I read that as China Spring was excluded --

Leslie Bittleston: No.

Eboni Washington: -- from being required to have a clinician as their program director. So --

Leslie Bittleston: That is -- no, no. It just means that they have met that requirement.

Eboni Washington: They met that requirement.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Eboni Washington: Understood. And then my second question was going to be, which you answered it, was going to be do any of our facilities have a clinician as the program director? Because I see that continuing to be a systemic issue that I don't know how we will address because most of our facilities are, you know, being run by, you know, probation or parole folks.

Leslie Bittleston: Right. So, China Spring is working towards that. They have changed the title of their program director to be a licensed clinical social worker. So, they will be getting that point -- or they did last year and will be getting it going forward. That is not seen in the other four facilities. We are seeing the superintendents or -- and I don't know what you call it. I forgot what it was at Spring Mountain but that's who we are seeing as the program directors and they do not meet the role of a clinician. And so, no. Yes, China Spring is there but the other four facilities are not.

Jeremy Setters: Is there a -- do they have to be onsite directors or are they able to do it TeleMed like if they're clinicians that can work remotely?

Leslie Bittleston: So, yes, clinicians can work remotely; however, the clinician does have to provide clinical oversight of the individuals that are running the programs daily. What that means is they will need to be part of treatment planning; they will need to look at the treatment plans or the case plans or whatever you want to call them. They need to sit on groups occasionally to provide that supervisory oversight. So, there's a lot of things that clinician needs to do in addition to just being a clinician. They need to be a clinician and they need to provide clinical oversight or supervision to those folks. Yes, they can do it remotely but it's something that they would have to do on an ongoing basis. It's not just a one and done. It's a -- they need to be doing that role annually.

Jeremy Setters: Do you know if any of the facilities have been looking at that as an option, as bringing on a full-time clinician? Because that happens often as, you know, a lot of these RTCs and stuff like that will do remote work with their clinicians. They just work, you know, they'll sit in virtually in all the meetings. They'll go over case plans via DocuSign, all that kind of stuff. Do you know if that's something they are looking into?

Leslie Bittleston: No. And that's only because there's no funding for that. It doesn't mean that it's, yeah, not a good idea. Which I think it's a fabulous idea and I think it could work if we had the funding for that for each of those facilities. Yeah, but no, we have not looked into that because there's no funds for it actually.

Jeremy Setters: Got you. Okay. Just curious.

Leslie Bittleston: Yep.

Jo Lee Wickes: Any other discussion or questions?

Jennifer Simeo: I just wanted to know -- I know that part of the CPC assessment and the report would be possibly to use that to request additional funds for items, especially if there are things that keep coming up each year within the facilities.

Leslie Bittleston: Welcome, Sara.

Sara Velasquez: Sorry. I was in my boss's office.

Leslie Bittleston: So, we were just talking about some of the systemic issues that we have addressed in the CPC reviews across the board, like the clinical supervision and the quality assurance that you're very familiar with. And just to piggyback on what Jennifer Simeo just said, yes, we could use these reports to help us request positions if that's something that we are interested in. And Ms. Wickes, as the Chair, that might be a recommendation from you to say hey, we need funds for clinical supervision because, you know, that type of thing. And maybe that goes to Ms. Florez, who is the Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee.

Jo Lee Wickes: Sara, thanks for joining us.

Sara Velasquez: Sorry I was late.

Jo Lee Wickes: Commendable that you joined us at all. Any other discussions about the results of the CPC reviews?

Sara Velasquez: From me specifically?

Jo Lee Wickes: For anybody but for you too.

Sara Velasquez: Okay. Because I missed it, I didn't hear about the conversations. I do have some concerns about the quality of the reviews but I don't know if that's for this meeting or not.

Leslie Bittleston: You mean the quality assurance piece or the quality of the assessors?

Sara Velasquez: That piece, yes, what you just said.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. I think that's probably an offline conversation first and then, depending on what it is, we can bring it to this group.

Sara Velasquez: Yeah. And since we haven't seen the final scores from all the facilities, it's kind of hard to -- and with the pandemic, the scores are going down a little by anyways, just with staffing issues, with the pandemic related issues, with a whole bunch of other things. So, I think we're trying to do a lot with even less and then even more, you know, less.

Jo Lee Wickes: Sara, is it your belief that all the facilities are having similar types of issues with recruiting or retaining staff?

Sara Velasquez: I know for a fact that our HR process is too long. We are waiting months before we can even send out offer letters and we are not being able to get staff into our facilities.

Leslie Bittleston: Eboni, do you notice that in Clark as well for Spring Mountain?

Eboni Washington: We have very, very low turnover here at my organization and, you know, for those that don't know, so Spring Mountain Youth campus primarily staff with probation officers, which I think is a bit different from a lot of other facilities across the country. And so, there's just not a ton of turnover in that position but, to Sara's point, when we do get ready to recruit for those types of positions, you know, we are struggling to find enough people to meet the, you know, the fitness requirements and, you know, the background check requirements. And so, that's just an ongoing issue that I think we'll all continue to muscle through. I will say, for us, like I'm recruiting clinicians right now and clinicians are extremely difficult for us to get onboard. The pay just doesn't work out for folks. You know, they can make a whole lot more money in the private sector or, you know, somewhere else other than with the government. In Clark County, our compensation is pretty good but for those positions, it's just really difficult. For the last -- go ahead, Leslie.

Leslie Bittleston: I was going to say, and I think that again is another systemic issue. For the state specifically, we do not have high education requirements for our staff and the pay is really not that good. And we lose a lot of staff to the counties, to Clark or Washoe County, because the pay is much better. We can't keep social workers to do child welfare because the pay is so much better in Clark and Washoe. But anyway, but I think that's another systemic issue that probably needs to be addressed. You know, what should the requirements be of our staff and then hard to recruit and then the third piece is getting through the HR process. And I don't know what the holdup is on the HR process. Sara, do you -- have you heard?

Sara Velasquez: I cannot speak to that.

Leslie Bittleston: I can't either.

Sara Velasquez: I will say that we also have been without a clinician for almost a year, and they did the entire process and at the very end the recruit did not want to be vaccinated so they weren't able to go through with the hire process.

Leslie Bittleston: Right. Because we do have vaccination requirements for the state. Any more questions? Madam Chair, did you get those down?

Jo Lee Wickes: I don't have any other questions.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Jo Lee Wickes: Anybody else have anything about the CPC reviews? The next item is new business, including open discussion, assigning tasks. I will not be doing that. And confirming our next meeting date, which I would like to discuss. Does anybody else have anything for open discussion? So, I will be retiring on February 4th of next year and I have talked to Judge Walker about tendering my resignation from the JJOC. So, I would like to schedule another meeting in January if there's some hope that the assessment reports would be available by then. So, I will rely on Leslie, Jennifer and perhaps Sara, if she was involved in any of the

recent assessments, to give us an idea as to whether or not it's reasonable to expect that those reports might be available perhaps near the end of January?

Sara Velasquez: Caliente will not but I can't see why the other facilities wouldn't be able to have their reports.

Jo Lee Wickes: Leslie, Jennifer, do you think that's possible?

Jennifer Simeo: We did NYTC mid-November. It's the first time we're doing a report so, I mean, it'll be cutting it close, but we could potentially have it done by then.

Leslie Bittleston: And this is Leslie, speaking for myself as well, unfortunately, I have not even started my piece, only because I have had to take time off on use or lose and I still have more time off to take this month. So, I hope to have the draft report done for China Spring by the end of January. So, that is the hope. So, Madam Chair if we do share these, they will be the draft reports.

Jo Lee Wickes: And generally -- I know I've reviewed some -- I believe I've reviewed some drafts, but it seems like most often we're reviewing the reports with having already received feedback from the facility. Is that true?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, that's true but I don't think we will have time to -- because the facility has a certain amount of time to provide feedback. So, I do not think we will have their feedback by the end of January.

Jo Lee Wickes: So, it feels very disjointed and frankly somewhat unfair to me to have a meeting where we're talking about a draft report and then not be able to see what the response is from the facility. That seems honestly disjointed and unfair to the facility. It builds a record without a response and that seems unwise. Anybody else have a different perspective?

Sara Velasquez: Generally, the information that comes back from the facility wouldn't change any scoring necessarily. And they teach us in the training not to change if we didn't see it and go through it. So, text might change in the final draft but the actual scores -- I don't -- I couldn't even tell you -- I don't think we've ever, on any review I've done, we've never changed a score based on facility feedback.

Jo Lee Wickes: Right. Well, that makes sense to me that the score wouldn't change because it's supposed to be, as Leslie said, a snapshot of what is going on during that assessment. I wonder though if it makes sense to -- well, I'm just going to say it out loud, it doesn't seem to make a lot of sense to have a meeting around one report that looks to be most promising to be done but maybe even might not get there. So, does anybody else feel a need to have a meeting within a month or so otherwise?

Leslie Bittleston: Madam Chair, I don't believe so. I think we could probably wait until the end of February to meet right before the next JJOC, which will give time to do the Caliente review which is in January and get these draft reports completed and to the facilities and their feedback.

Jo Lee Wickes: That makes sense to me. I think then probably the best thing to do is to do a doodle poll for a meeting prior to the next JJOC meeting and, obviously, at that point we won't know for sure what the makeup of this committee will look like.

Leslie Bittleston: Right.

Jo Lee Wickes: But change is the only constant in life, so that seems inevitable. One of the things that I was thinking of in terms of open discussion is that I noted there's been some media lately about use of force in the facilities. And, Ms. Bittleston, can you remind us all, at least remind me, because I know that the JJOC as an overall commission has looked at that data before. Do you know if it's being -- is it consistently reported to the full commission about use of force data and the reports that are generated by the state?

Leslie Bittleston: Just to clarify, Madam Chair, there are two, currently, two different DOJ investigations going on. One is regarding the use of force in our state juvenile facilities, and one is regarding placements of youth in mental health facilities such as Desert Willow and places like that. They are completely separate from each other. The current -- my understanding to the last that I have heard is the use of force within our JJ facilities is almost closed, as we have provided all the information and have not received any additional information -- or request for information. My understanding is the continuation of the DOJ investigation is really surrounding the mental health facility placements. That is not my area of expertise so I can't really speak to it but that is my understanding of where we are with the DOJ investigations.

Jo Lee Wickes: And do you know whether or not there will be information provided to the JJOC about --

Leslie Bittleston: No, I don't. It certainly can be a question that is posed to Administrator Armstrong. He probably has more information he can share. I don't know if you all have, are aware but Administrator Armstrong is taking another position within the state. His last day is Friday. So, he is moving over to become the director of the commission on ethics and so he will be leaving. His last day, my understanding, is Friday. The acting administrator will be Dr. Cindy Pitlock, who is currently the administrator over community services. So, that would be child welfare and youth parole. So, that is -- I just heard that information about two hours ago. So, that's new to me as well. So, I don't know. It's a question you can pose, Madam Chair, to Administrator Armstrong but I've shared all that I know.

Jo Lee Wickes: Okay. I don't know that, what information can be made public, and I just wonder though if, given just the simple name of the subcommittee, if going forward use of force reports and documentation, which I know has been shared with the overall commission in the past, might be shared more frequently with this subcommittee. I don't know that that's a wise use of time, but I think it's something that perhaps committee members should think about, just in terms of we are the first one, other than the assessors in the facilities, who see the quality assurance CPC lists and obviously use of force is an aspect of treatment and the overall program. So, it seems like it could be something that this committee could at least receive information on.

Leslie Bittleston: Madam Chair, that's an excellent idea and just to provide some updates, historically the state has tracked use of force in the state facilities, NYTC, Summit View and Caliente. We are just this month or last month, I'm not sure if it was November or December, started collecting data from the county detention facilities. So, this is new data that we will be looking at on the go forward. So, that could be a great idea by sharing it with this group to look at as a quality oversight piece.

Jo Lee Wickes: And, Liz, aren't the counties -- haven't the counties been required for quite some time to document use of force and room confinement? I don't remember what the name of the report is but I know I've seen and read them many, many times.

Liz Florez: Madam Chair, we have -- I think it was SB107, a very, very long time ago where we had to create corrective room restriction reports, I think that's what they were called. And embedded within that report, we had to give slight narrative as to, you know, what category it fell under of violation that prompted the use, the room restriction. The use of force and, Leslie, correct me if I'm wrong, and Eboni, I'd be interested to hear from the Clark County perspective, we only recently started reporting that to the JJOC. We internally have always tracked that, but I am ignorant in that I don't know if anybody else reviewed that besides our own users. I don't think LCB has asked for that information and I don't think we've provided it to anybody else.

Eboni Washington: I would agree with what Liz Florez said. The only other place where we might be reporting that kind of information might be like with our PBS or some of our other, working with [inaudible] or some of those organizations. But formally, you know, within the state, it's as was described.

Leslie Bittleston: Right. So, SB107 required room confinement or corrective room restriction. It's really the same thing, from 2015, 14, somewhere around there on. So, the state has been gathering the room confinement data since that time from all of the facilities and the counties. The use of force is a different report, and it is brand new; brand new that the state is collecting per request of the JJOC and will be presenting going forward to the JJOC. So, there are two different reports.

Jo Lee Wickes: Okay. It's always good to learn something. So, I appreciate all that information. I am remembering vaguely some reports and I actually think it was part of the Supreme Court Commission on Juvenile Justice because there was some controversy all those many years ago and there was a request for information that I think was provided by DCSF. But I don't know that the counties were involved in that. So, it sounds like the SB107 reports are still being produced and that everybody is being responsive on the new use of force. So, that's great.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Jo Lee Wickes: Well, we're just about at one hour and as luck would have it, it also appears that we are near the end of the agenda. I will call again for if there's any open discussion from any of the committee members. And one last, anyone who wishes to make public comment. Do I have a motion for adjournment?

Liz Florez: I move to adjourn.

Jo Lee Wickes: Thank you. I will second that and this meeting is adjourned. I hope all of you have safe, healthy, happy holidays.

Liz Florez: Congratulations on your retirement, Jo Lee.

Jo Lee Wickes: Thank you.

Eboni Washington: Yes, congratulations.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, congratulations.

Jo Lee Wickes: An interesting process. Well, thank you all very much. Have a great afternoon.

Liz Florez: Thank you. Happy holidays. Bye.

Leslie Bittleston: Bye-bye.

Jeremy Setters: Happy holidays.

DRAFT