



**Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission
Grants and Quality Assurance
Committee Meeting
April 20th, 2020 at 1:00pm**

Meeting Minutes - DRAFT

Called to Order at 1:00pm.

Roll Call:

Voting Members Via Phone: Jo Lee Wickes (Chair), Eve Hanan, Paula Smith, Ryley Harris

Non- Voting Members Via Phone: Ebony Washington, Sara Velasquez

Public via Phone: Dave Laity, Katie Martin-Waldman

DCFS Staff: Jennifer Simeo, Leslie Bittleston, Kayla Dunn

Absent: Alexis Waddell-Upton

Introductions:

Jo Lee Wickes: Good afternoon. This is Jo Lee Wickes and we are beginning the meeting for the Grants and Quality Assurance Subcommittee. It is Monday April 20th at 1:00 PM. If we could do an official roll call please?

Quorum: Leslie Bittleston took roll and confirmed that quorum was made.

Jo Lee Wickes: Thank you. For the record, Jo Lee Wickes, thank you all for joining us this afternoon. I believe that the Item #2 is Welcome and Introduction. I'm sorry, we've already done that, roll call. Is there anyone who would like to make public comment at this time? Hearing no public comment, moving on to Agenda Item #4, for the Formula Grant and Sub Grant Applications for FY 2020, Formula Grant applications that were submitted on March 31st of this year. I believe that this is Ms. Bittleston's item?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, Madam Chair. Leslie Bittleston for the record. This is the first meeting for this Subcommittee, so as we go through the agenda, you will find that we have three major pieces of this Subcommittee. The first piece is in relation to the Formula Grant. The Formula Grant is awarded to the State annually and it is awarded to the State because the State is participating in the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act. So the Formula Grant is a piece of the JJDP Act. The amount that the State gets annually is roughly \$400,000. States that receive this grant are required to sub grant 66% of the total award to community partners. I recently submitted this year's grant application to the Feds on March 31, 2020. So, just a couple of weeks ago. It usually takes about six months for them to approve it. So, I would hear sometime in September. In the meantime, taking 66% of this grant application and sub granting it out to community partners is normally done like around May, June, timeframe. So, what that entails is me sending out an informal RFP, Request for Proposal, to potential sub grantees. Potential sub grantees include all of our county government juvenile justice stakeholders, some non-profit organizations. We get requests back or grant applications back. So part of the work of this committee, in around June/July timeframe, will be to review those requested sub grant applications and provide a score based on your

evaluation of those sub grant applications. Then we will prepare a grant slate based on the review of the scores of those applications for overall approval. As I said, this only happens one time per year. We normally get between five and seven applications every year. They're not very extensive. So, this is just kind of an information piece to let this Committee know that behind the scenes, I will be doing that Request for Proposal and the grant applications will be ready for this Committee's review in around July timeframe. Are there any questions?

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes for the record, I don't suppose you have any way of predicting whether or not the recent pandemic is going to affect funding?

Leslie Bittleston: I do not have any idea regarding that. There has been some discussion between the state and the federal government regarding different usages of grant funding outside of what is allotted and there has not been very clear guidance on that. I don't know if there's going to be putting off of determination or increased or decreased funds. That I have not heard. I'm just progressing and proceeding business as usual with the amount that we normally get every year.

Jo Lee Wickes: Any other questions for Ms. Bittleston or any of the other DCFS Staff on—

Paula Smith: This is Paula Smith. Leslie, is there still a tribal component to that?

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston for the record. Yes, there is a tribal component to that. Normally, it is awarded to the Sixth Judicial, which is Humboldt County. They have an alternative to detention program that they have been administering for the last few years and they include their local Indian tribal community in with that. They serve Native American youth. So, yes, there is a tribal component. That's how we've been awarding it over the last few years.

Paula Smith: Okay, thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes for the record. Ms. Bittleston, do you believe then that given everything that's going on, we should still be thinking that we'll be reviewing and approving applications or voting on applications in the June or July timeframe?

Leslie Bittleston: Unfortunately, I don't know. I will—I have posed that question to our Federal Program Manager and his guidance is unclear. So, just to let you know, I have not started the Request for Proposal process. Normally I do start it around this time every year but I have not started it, based on the big unknown. So, I can bring this back, I can follow up again with our Federal Program Manager and bring this back to the Committee or via email or however I can to—to let the Committee know. But just to let you know, I have not started it and I'm still pending guidance from our Federal Program Manager.

Jo Lee Wickes: Thank you. Any other questions from anyone present on the phone, voting or non-voting members, and members of the public, regarding the Formula Grant? Thank you, I think we can move on to Item #5 which is the Correctional Program Checklist Overview and Possible Tasks.

Leslie Bittleston: This is Leslie Bittleston for the record. As I stated, for the Formula Grant, there are three main components of this Subcommittee. This is Component #2. So, the Correctional Program Checklist is a tool that was selected by the JJOC to meet a requirement in NRS to do a quality assurance review over our three state facilities: NYTC, Caliente, Summit View, and the two youth camps, China Spring and Spring

Mountain. That process has already begun and at the January 10th meeting of the JJOC, I reviewed all of the scores to date. In your packet of materials, you will find some things related to this component. The first one is the 2020-2022 Schedule. Now, this schedule has been modified based on the current situation. We had to push back our first three reviews of the year based on the fact that facilities are not allowing visitations and we're in our current state of where we're at. So, the first reference, like I said, my apologies, I'm having internet issues, so—I haven't been able to pull it up, but the 2020-2022 Schedule of Facilities and as I stated, it has been modified due to the current situation. We currently have six trained assessors in the State. Five are DCFS employees and one is a Clark County employee. Clark County has agreed to train four additional staff, Clark County staff. That training was supposed to occur in May, next month, but it has been postponed until a later date. Clark County invited the State, DCFS, to train four people as well, however, the cost to train four people is \$11,500, not including any travel associated with potential trainees going to wherever the trainer is located. I have been unable to find those funds, so I have been unable to commit to training four more DCFS employees. So currently, we have just the six trained assessors. Before I go any further, are there any questions on what I said so far? Okay.

Eve Hanan: This is Eve Hanan. I'm just trying to find the materials here. I apologize. I see the invitation, am I just missing it somewhere? I just want to be looking at what you're looking at here.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. We are not sending out materials because it does clog up people's emails and things like that.

Eve Hanan: Right, right.

Leslie Bittleston: Right. So, if you go to the DCFS website.

Eve Hanan: Okay, just look at it there, all right.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah. That's the best way to do it. Yeah, we don't want—

Eve Hanan: Okay, great, I can do that. So, you were talking about the Corrections' Checklist, which I remember seeing in the general meeting last—right in January. Okay, great. So, are there any—does the Subcommittee have any special responsibility or concerns right now with the COVID-19 situation in terms of anything we should be doing?

Leslie Bittleston: Not to my knowledge. As you recall, we talked about where we were on Friday at the JJOC, but this particular Committee, the only thing that is relevant to this particular Committee is that we did have to postpone and push back our first three reviews this year.

Eve Hanan: Right.

Leslie Bittleston: Two were supposed to be in May and one was supposed to be in June, I believe. So, we pushed them back to July, August, and September. So that's really the only—only thing that affected this particular Committee. So, if everybody has the 2020-2022 CPC Schedule attachment, there's a list of the trained assessors on that document and then the upcoming reviews. This is subject to change at any time based on situations or based on reviewers and under the Summit View for July 28th to 30th, I have new assessors there. That would be the new Clark County assessors, but that's only—it's just there as a placeholder, I don't know if that is when the training will happen. Any new assessor that is trained does have to participate in a review process. So, it may be Summit View, it may be Spring Mountain, it just

depends on when this training for new assessors from Clark County will happen. This is a working document, subject to change at any time. Are there any questions—okay.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes for the record, I do have a question.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Jo Lee Wickes: Is it—am I clear in understanding that Clark County is paying to train the four people they're training?

Leslie Bittleston: That is correct. Clark County is paying to train their own assessors and they did reach out to the State to have a training of eight, but the State has been unable to come up with the funding. And like I said, to train four people is \$11,500, not including any travel costs or per diem associated with that.

Jo Lee Wickes: And who does the training?

Leslie Bittleston: Sara Velasquez, you're on the phone, or Dave Laity, do you remember who does the training?

Sara Velasquez: The University of Cincinnati.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you.

Jo Lee Wickes: Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Are there any other questions on the schedule?

Dave Laity: Dave Laity, is there any talk about postponing these indefinitely with—I know travel restrictions and stuff will probably end up being reduced, but when we all get back to work, there is certainly a pile of work to get back to and just wanted to ask the Committee if there was any talk about postponing these until we can get back on our feet?

Leslie Bittleston: This is Leslie Bittleston for the record. The only direction I have been given to take is just to postpone and schedule the meetings for a later date. However, Madam Chair—we're getting some feedback, so could you please mute your phone if possible? Thank you. As I was saying, my only direction was to push back the reviews by a few months. However, Madam Chair, if it is the Committee's will, maybe it—maybe it should be a topic brought to the JJOC on their thoughts if they want to push these back indefinitely, because that's probably a decision that needs to be made by the JJOC.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes for the record. I'm looking at NRS 62B.620 which is the statute I believe applicable to the situation that says that, the members of the Commission shall conduct an annual quality assurance review of the State facility for detention of children and the regional facility for treatment and rehabilitation of children. The last time I looked at the Governor's emergency directive, I didn't read through them with this in mind. It's whether or not the emergency directive would allow us to postpone the annual reviews. I do think that it's probably something that we should at least place on the agenda for the full commission. I'm wondering if there's anyone for DCFS that could also take a look at the directive to see if—and do an analysis as to whether or not any of those directives would be affected in terms of delaying? Because, as Mr. Laity point out, there's going to be a lot of work to get done when people are able to return to a more normal work schedule. There may be the possibility of, Heaven forbid, another

resurgence of coronavirus related issues which obviously would have to be responded to in the future and I don't know that there's anyway to predict that. I also don't know if it's possible to get all the reviews done, given the fact that the first three were already postponed. It may also be affected by when Clark County is able to do its training on the four new trainers. Because I'm reading between the lines that it may be necessary to have the additional trainers in order to get through the complete review process. Does anyone from DCFS have any thoughts or guidance on those points?

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston for the record. I think a couple of things. Yes, the new trainers from Clark County will help us because it's very difficult just for, you know, with six of them that are available, because these reviews are extremely intensive and there's a lot of work, especially on the lead reviewer. So, there's number one. Number 2, if this Committee would like to bring this to the JJOC for overall discussion, I recommend or think that this Committee should vote to put off the upcoming reviews until further notice or guidance from the JJOC. Our next JJOC meeting is July 17th and Summit View is scheduled for July 28-30. So, we don't want to schedule a Summit View review if we're really going to be bringing to the JJOC to see what their guidance is. I think that requires a vote—a discussion and a vote by the voting members of this Committee.

Dave Laity: This is Dave Laity, for the record. I also just want to bring up that, how these reviews are done and this is for more discussion. Is there—is a ton of face-to-face interviews, group meetings that were in there and you know, have to be within the—well, I don't know if it's social distancing or not, but it's a ton of face-to-face stuff. It's not a review of—there are reviews of charts and files and stuff, but that's a small part of it. So, I wanted to bring that to everybody's attention, just by doing this, there's a lot of contact and so, as a discussion point, I'd like that to be part of it.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes for the record, Mr. Laity, can you help us understand, how the—at least at the State correctional level, what does daily operations look like right now? What kind of changes have been put into place to protect staff and residents from COVID, outside contractors. If current social distancing rules were in place right now, is there any way that a reviewer could actually even do the assessment?

Dave Laity: Dave Laity, for the record. I can tell you that State facilities have stopped all visitations. Contractors that have to go on the campus, you know, can go on to deliver goods and stuff, but they are monitored closely. So, they have stopped all sorts of visitation. I believe if I—if I needed a parole officer to go to an institution, I could work that out on a very individualized basis, but for now, we're staying away from that. So, to even have people travel from across the state, which that's what our groups are consisting of, to go into a facility, it would be good to note that our facilities are requesting a 14-day quarantine for any new youth that are admitted. There might be that issue of, do we have to quarantine for 14-days before we can even go on campus? So the likelihood of us piecing this together and having that close contact in my mind, doesn't really work under our current guidelines.

Leslie Bittleston: This is Leslie Bittleston. I would like to echo what Dave stated is that, yes, each facility has stopped visitations. By stopping visitations, that would include these assessors going out to do this review. We are visitors and you know, we schedule this in advance and you know, they allow us to come on campus or onsite to do all of this work. As Dave also stated, there's a lot of face-to-face contact with staff members and with youth to complete this whole review process. So, just to keep that in mind is, we don't know where we're going to be, even in July.

Eve Hanan: This is Eve Hanan for the record. I think one of the things that seems so challenging to me about this is, it's so hard to predict when and to what degree things will open up. Because I could imagine

a scenario where if testing becomes more prevalent, you know, you could have people go in to the facilities, especially in a—you know, in a circumstance like this and as long as they were testing negative, you know, and certain precautions were in place and they could do the assessment. I know there's an added problem of the work that's building up over this time when people can't really get their jobs done, but I—I'm just wondering about that late July, you know, timeframe. You know, things may be quite different then, you know.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes for the record. How many assessors, minimum, are needed to do the kind of assessment at Summit View that is required?

Leslie Bittleston: Ms. Velazquez, you're on the phone, or Mr. Laity, can you please answer this? These are assessors; I am not, so I would prefer one of them to answer that question.

Sara Velasquez: Sara Velazquez for the record. My recommendation is no less than three assessors per facility. And I say three because of the work not only—the work is at the facility, so it's a two-day assessment period and then about a half-day scoring the facility. Then, a couple weeks to write the report. There's multiple sections and 1-2 people, it would take longer at the facility and it would take longer to get the report written.

[crosstalk]

Dave Laity: --as well, there is some, you know, if we had five assessors at one facility at a time, it would take less time. If we had one, it would take extreme more time. So there isn't a recommended amount, but we have all decided that three is a really good amount to be able to be in and out of that campus in two full days, maybe two and a half.

Katie Martin-Waldman: Katie Martin-Waldman, I'm an assessor as well. I would also state that it's important to keep in mind that when we do go to these facilities and conduct these interviews, they often have to juggle scheduling with the staff to be available for interviews. Interviews can take anywhere from 2-3 hours. So that is also another consideration that does affect the ability to staff the facilities and conduct these interviews during those times.

Kayla Dunn: I'm so sorry to interrupt. This is Kayla Dunn, for the record. Who was just speaking?

Leslie Bittleston: Kayla that was Katie Martin.

Kayla Dunn: Okay, thank you. Sorry. Go ahead.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes for the record, again. So as I look at the schedule, there's only one person who's actually assigned to do that assessment and with the hope that the new assessors would be able to participate in filling that need, is that correct?

Leslie Bittleston: This is Leslie Bittleston for the record. Yes, that's correct. In speaking to Mark from Clark County, he felt that the training could be rescheduled for July, based on what we knew a few weeks ago when I spoke to him. So that would be him and the four assessors doing Summit View. The four new ones, trained ones, excuse me.

Jo Lee Wickes: And that assumes that the training gets done enough in advance with those four people that they can get the training and clear their schedule for those dates.

Leslie Bittleston: That's correct. And also that the University of Cincinnati could train at that time as well. If that does not happen, if all of those things do not come together, then we would have to put together a team that could not include Ms. Velazquez, because she is at Summit View, so it would have to be Mark from Clark County and two other members to do that review.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes for the record. So, if I can kind of process this out loud a little bit. What I see is that the statute requires an annual review of each facility. Out of necessity, the first three have already not occurred. We have uncertainty as to whether or not the training anticipated in Clark County, when it will go forward. I guess the uncertainty is about when it will go forward, which will require, obviously, major changes in the way society is operating currently. It sounds like the assessors need to be able to coordinate well in advance in order to do the assessment the way that it's supposed to do and we have all of the additional concerns about the fact that, at this time, such visitors aren't even allowed on the campus at Summit View because of the attended health concerns. So, my thought is that if we could all discuss the possibility of getting—scheduling another meeting and we can talk about when that has to occur, maybe 30-45 days, getting some guidance from the Attorney General's Office, specifically somebody who is assigned to DCFS to give us some analysis as to whether or not any of the Governor's directives that have already been entered would affect the mandatory language in the statute. I don't know if there's a possibility that future Governor directives will impact the mandatory assessments that's done. We may, I'm hoping, we will know a lot more in 30-45 days, because if we cannot take it to the full Commission for a vote until July 17th, I think we probably need another meeting to discuss this issue and get some guidance from the Attorney General's Office, as to whether or not the mandatory language of this statute is going to be impacted by the directives that are already in place, or perhaps we may get a clear directive in the future about the fact that it's sounding like this is going to be extremely problematic, impracticable and maybe is just not possible, given the current state of the pandemic. The attendant restrictions on travel, visitation to the campus, getting people trained in order to even do the assessment. It would also be helpful for me since I'm totally unaware, if we could get a list as to when any other quality assurance processes were completed. So we know for instance, perhaps we may have to prioritize who gets a quality assurance review during 2020 and depending on if prior reviews were done, it would be nice to see what that schedule looks like. So, if somebody is—it's been longer since somebody was reviewed, that they be prioritized over somebody who was reviewed more recently. I don't know if I'm making sense, but some ideas for discussion.

Leslie Bittleston: Before discussion of the members, I would just like to add a couple of things. Leslie Bittleston for the record. Every facility was reviewed in 2019 and the way that the—the 2022 document reads is, oldest to newest. So, Summit View, I believe—anyway, I will double check that and provide that at the next meeting. Our Deputy Attorney General is Jennifer Spencer, so I could reach out to her and have her do a little research for us prior to the next meeting as well. Thank you.

Jo Lee Wickes: Are there any comments? Jo Lee Wickes for the record, excuse me. Are there any other comments by voting members about how we might approach this problem in terms of providing guidance to the full Commission on how to meet the statutory requirements given the unique and unprecedented circumstances we're looking at?

Eve Hanan: This is Eve Hanan for the record. I concur that it's a great idea to get some input from the AG's Office and with the idea of meeting, you know, within say a month or so to discuss next steps in terms of how we'd like to approach this with the full Commission.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes for the record. Anyone else have any comments? I'm formulating a motion in my mind, but I'd like to make sure that if there's any other points of discussion. I would like to make a

motion that we seek direction from the Deputy Attorney General attached to DCFS regarding an analysis of whether or not any of the current directives by the Governor, in terms of the emergency state relating to the pandemic would excuse, or how that impacts 62B.620 and the language that an annual quality assurance review shall be conducted for each state facility and each regional facility. And that Ms. Bittleston or someone from DCFS provide us with the schedule of the reviews that were done in 2019 and that we will, near the end of this meeting, pick another Subcommittee meeting day in approximately 30-45 days in order to discuss and take possible action on the annual quality assurance reviews of the facility. Do I hear a second for the motion?

Eve Hanan: Eve Hanan for the record, I second.

Jo Lee Wickes: Thank you. Any further discussion? All those favor say aye. [Ayes around] Anyone opposed? It sounds like we have a unanimous vote on getting some guidance on when these annual quality assurance reviews will occur. Ms. Bittleston, did you want to keep addressing the other items listed for Agenda Item #5?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Just one thing, maybe it's a good thing that we're going to meet in 30-45 days. There is one thing on here for discussion and review is the Facility Improvement Plan template. This is a basic template that was created by one of the trained assessors, however, I have received feedback from a couple of the assessors and facilities, that they don't like the template. So I have provided a copy of what is currently being used. My apologies, my internet is very slow. It is titled, I'll tell you as soon as mine opens up. It is titled, The Correctional Program Checklist, Facility Improvement Plan. So one of the things that I would like to bring to this Committee, which is why I've asked that any of the CPC assessors come to the Committee as well and we have three out of the six on the phone right now, how this is working and any suggestions of changes that they would like to put in place and then we can come up with a new template, approved template by this Committee on the go forward. So if everybody has—yeah, it's called the Correctional Program Checklist, Facility Improvement Plan. Page 1 talks about the requirements that Madam Chair just went over and then the pieces of the review. Sara or Katie or Dave, do any of you want to make any comments on how this works or how it's not working?

Sara Velasquez: This is Sara Velazquez for the record. One of—it's hard to have this discussion with people who don't—aren't familiar with the actual report or the process. Very briefly, I'm just going to say, a facility can get back a report with potentially 50 problems from the assessment. It could be more; it could be less. This template is asking for an improvement plan for all 50 of those items that need to be fixed. Taking from being in a facility, I'm part of the PBS, the Performance Based Standards Process as well, and so that's another kind of quality assurance piece that their annual or their yearly report there, they're not going through every single item that is a deficit, I guess I can use that word. We're just picking for PBS, we're picking like five—five things that we want to work on in the year. My recommendation is to do something similar, maybe not go through every single characteristic where there's a zero score, but just kind of able to lessen the load of the facilities because they already are doing—whether it's the LCB report, the PBS report, all these other organizations that they have to do facility improvement plans for, too—to add on, you know, 50 plus items for this report, it's just—it's undoable, really.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes for the record. Is there a way—does the assessment itself help prioritize what items should be addressed over other items or is that really up to the facility, under the current template?

Sara Velasquez: It's up to the facility and the report does not prioritize. It just shows you where you need to be better.

Dave Laity: This is Dave Laity for the record. This discussion, it's a little strange because being a person who does that actual audit or you know, goes in, I think we need to be detached from telling—identifying things and then telling institutions what they need to fix. Because we get a lot of those questions throughout and for us to—like, we're just there to identify. It's clearly to identify and the program gets to choose what they can and will not—or, can change, even if the—you know, there's things in there that you can't change just because of the political nature of them. And so, again like, for us to be an auditor and then also come up with a tool to say, this is what you should fix, is a little odd for us.

Leslie Bittleston: Katie, do you have any thoughts on the QA tool or the improvement plan?

Katie Martin-Waldman: I agree with both Sara and with Dave—I'm sorry, this is Katie Martin-Waldman for the record. I do think it would be beneficial for the agencies to have some type of direction to help them under—you know, help them pair down what they can focus on and improve for the next year. Perhaps that's where it would come more from the Deputy Administrator or the administrative staff to determine what the focus should be for that agency. Because some of the items are very simple, as far as, they're yes/no questions. Do you stay on top of current research in the field for juvenile justice? And there are others that might be more pressing to be more beneficial to meeting the needs of our kids. So, if there could be some direction given to the agencies as far as, of the items, when we go through and look at the checklist and look at the tool, what is going to have the greatest impact? And if that could be something with programming or with staff training and retention and seeing what overall fits with our mission and impacting the youth that are in our care.

Leslie Bittleston: Really quick, this is Leslie Bittleston for the record again. I apologize, I should've started this conversation with letting the team know that the responsible party for reviewing facility improvement plans is the JJOC. So, that's part of the second piece of this Committee. This Committee is actually the responsible party for reviewing and making recommendations to the Facility Improvement Plan, which is why I brought this template to you guys. So, unless there is another way, but yet, it says specifically the JJOC is the reviewing body.

Jo Lee Wickes: This is Jo Lee Wickes for the record. For the people who actually have the expertise and have been through the University of Cincinnati training, would it be possible for us to receive as Subcommittee members some alternate templates that improve upon or address, in the assessor's mind? Because I will state that last Friday when I was anticipating this meeting and I was reading through, I think it was China Springs' plans, I was struck by how detailed the information was and at the same time, a little overwhelmed that someone would be asked to kind of address all of these items. After a while, it became clear to me that some of those items might be less critical than others. It just seemed like an awful lot of information and work. So, I'm wondering if there's a way that we could request some alternate templates. I don't know if that can be done within the next 30-45 days. So that we can look at them at our next meeting. I'm a visual person, so without something in front of me, it's very difficult for me to imagine what it should look like, or what would be an improvement.

Sara Velasquez: This is Sara Velazquez for the record. DCFS made that template and the person that made it is no longer part of the Committee. So, is that something you want the assessors to do or?

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes for the record. I have no idea who is the best type of person to do it. If that's DCFS staff, I'm fine with that. I don't think—at least speaking for myself—I'm certainly not qualified to say, here's how you improve the template, because I've not been through the training. Leslie or Dave, do you have some input on who the best—how to best to go about improving the template?

Dave Laity: Yeah, this is Dave Laity for the record. So, I'm not quite sure that a template is the best way to go. The idea of this whole assessment is to go in, look at stuff from a lot of different angles. Use evidence based statements to decide whether somebody qualifies or gets a point, or doesn't get a point. And then, to give that back to the facility. We have two county facilities, three state facilities. It's designed for the directors of those facilities to come up with what they're going to change, what they can change, what they can afford to change. So, the facilities are so different and there's different entities that are in charge of them that I'm not quite sure a template does us any good in that because we need the Director's input, or the Superintendent's input to figure out what they want to change in their own program. So I get it's easy to say, yeah, we would like a template so it looks all the same, I just don't know if it works that way for this assessment.

Leslie Bittleston: This is Leslie for the record. #4, under 62B.620 says a facility shall develop a facility improvement plan. So that kind of lets them to provide the plan. However, maybe what would be better would be for DCFS to provide some parameters. For example, maybe say select the best, or the top five, or the most important, or top five or something like that and I would be happy to put something together and I can reach out with the assessors for their input. So maybe not so much of an actual template, but maybe a couple of statements to let them know how they should develop their own template or their own plan, but just provide them some parameters.

Dave Laity: Dave Laity for the record. I do like that; some of the feedback that I've gotten from some of the directors of the program would appreciate—would appreciate that. Not only having a lower specific number to work on, but they also can own what they want to change and then justify what they can't change. So, I like that idea.

Eve Hanan: Eve Hanan for the record. I just was looking at #3 here in 62B.620 and that's—forgive me if I'm the only who doesn't understand this, but it looks like the review happens and then recommendation for improvement is shared with the facility and the Division of Child and Family Services. So is the question whether or not, I mean, when the process moves from review to recommendation? I mean, I realize it's just the template issue, which is separate, but does that happen with the assessor or does that happen in discussions in this Committee or with the Commission as a whole?

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston for the record. What is supposed to happen is, after the assessors complete their review and the final report goes out, that's when the Facility Improvement Plan comes back to DCFS, which would be to me. Then I would share it with this Committee to go over anything and this Committee can provide recommendations or thoughts or something back to the facility. It's just that this body has oversight over—over the improvement the facilities are working on. I hope I explained that well enough.

Eve Hanan: Yes, I think so. So then the question is really about whether the assessors will, you know, use this template or share recommendations in another form, or whether those recommendations will be a product not just of the assessor, but of the conversations with the facility and with DCFS?

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston. Yes, I think so because the facilities have contact with the assessors. They don't have contact with DCFS or with us. So, it would be up to the assessor, the Lead Assessor of that facility to provide the facility some guidance with how to structure or what to focus on in their Facility Improvement Plan. For me, I personally don't care what a Facility Improvement Plan looks like, you know, it doesn't have to be a template, but I think some guidance to the facilities on what we're looking for is probably warranted. Like, the top five areas or what they're most critical areas are and kind of let them

guide that—guide that process and then this body can review it and if you don't approve it, you can go back to the facility and say, hey this isn't very clear, can you tell us a little more. I think that that's how that works.

Eve Hanan: Great, thank you. That helps a lot.

Leslie Bittleston: Sure.

Dave Laity: This is Dave Laity for the record. And, please to the other assessors who are on the line, jump in, but I'm—I thought going through my training with this was that the assessor's role was clearly to assess and give them the report. We can talk a little bit about whether the report is accurate or not, but after that report goes out, like that's when we stop and we shouldn't be telling them what to work on, what not to work on. That's up to the programs to develop themselves. So I think that with an overall DCFS like, here's what—maybe, pick the top five, would be fine, but to have discussions between an auditor and a program, what those five are, I don't think that was part of our training.

Leslie Bittleston: With that being said, that makes this process a little more important to provide some guidance to the facilities after they get that final product from the assessors. So, the assessors are no longer involved. Okay. Thank you, Dave.

Dave Laity: This is Dave Laity, for the record. Katie and Sara, I got that right? I just want to make sure I was right on that.

Sara Velasquez: Sara Velazquez for the record. Yeah, Dave, you did a good job explaining that. There was one thing I—the issue sometimes that we get as assessors when we go into the facility and they've submitted a Facility Improvement Plan, we as assessors don't see the Facility Improvement Plan. So, it's kind of—as part of this Committee, I think some kind of like, overview of what the process for this CPC looks like would be good, so that we can provide to the facilities, like we're here as assessors and like, we don't get to see your improvement plan and we can't really answer anything to the Facility Improvement Plan because we're just not there. I would also want the Committee to know that these assessments are scored and each year, the objective is to get a better score than the year before. So, to have a plan in place, you know, if the facilities are scoring better every year, do we really have to have a plan in place, or template or not because we're just giving people more work to do. So, unless you know, maybe a suggestion would be, if you go year to year to year and a facility is not improving, that's when you say, hey, you need to give us some kind of plan on how to improve.

Leslie Bittleston: This is Leslie Bittleston. That would actually violate NRS 62B.620 (4). As it states, the facility shall develop a Facility Improvement Plan in accordance with the Division of Child and Family Services or a local. The plan is required to address any issues raised in the review, not more than 60 days after receiving the results of the review and recommendation for improvement pursuant to Subsection 3, the facility shall submit a Facility Improvement Plan through the Commission. The Commission shall compile all facility improvement plans and submit the plans to the Governor and to the Director of LCB with its annual review. So, I don't know. I don't know if they have a choice to not do a Facility Improvement Plan. Whether it just be one area or 50.

Sara Velasquez: Well, this is Sara Velazquez for the record. So, we don't make it as cumbersome as we've made it already. So, we've cut back and then as the—you know, DCFS or the Commission decides whether they're not improving at a rate the Commission or DCFS thinks they should be improving, then the Improvement Plan would need to be a little more, more meaty, I guess.

Leslie Bittleston: So, Madam Chair, what would you have DCFS Staff do for the Committee in this process?

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes, for the record. So, when I'm looking at 62B.620 and thinking about the discussion that we've had an annual review must be conducted on the four areas outlined in Subsection 1. Anybody who conducts such an assessment has to receive the training as stated in Subsection 2. Subsection 3 says the members of the Commission who conduct the review shall share the results and recommendations for improvement with the facility and DCFS or the local department of juvenile services. Then it says, 4, the facility shall develop a Facility Improvement Plan, in coordination with DCFS or the local department of juvenile services. If such a plan is required to address any issues raised in the review, the facility has not more than 60 days after receiving the results of the review and recommendation for improvement to submit the Facility Improvement Plan to the Commission. The Commission compiles them, submits them to the Governor and the Director of LCB. So, it does appear to me that it would have to follow a specific template. It sounds like, from the trained assessors Sara, Katie and Dave, that have weighed in this afternoon, that it would be helpful and more meaningful for the facilities to be able to develop their own Facility Improvement Plan and perhaps if they request guidance from DCFS in how to structure the Facility Improvement Plan, it might behoove DCFS to have different examples or ways that those plans have been submitted, to help them. But I don't—help them structure it in a way that's understandable and helpful for them going forward. Although it looks like we review them, it doesn't look like we have any authority to reject or accept them. It's really the facility's improvement plan. Is there anything that I've said so far, at least from the trained assessors on the phone or Ms. Bittleston that misapprehends or misstates how this process is supposed to work?

Dave Laity: This is Dave Laity for the record. Jo Lee that was very well put. There's nothing that I would add to that.

Jo Lee Wickes: I think part of the important—Jo Lee Wickes for the record. I think part of the important language in Subsection 4 is that the facility shall develop a Facility Improvement Plan in coordination with DCFS or the local department of juvenile services. So the word "coordination" to me means assistance, guidance, examples on how to structure it, but not anything beyond that, is my sense.

Leslie Bittleston: So, Leslie Bittleston for the record. So, what I'm hearing is that we can provide some—we, DCFS, excuse me. DCFS can provide some information or some guidance or even some templates to the facilities just to kind of help them, but it's really up to them to do their improvement plan. In saying that, I don't think that—it doesn't say anywhere that they need to address all 50 items on their plan, which I think is what—or, what they're doing now. So, it sounds to me like the guidance needs to be, you know, take the top five areas or select your top few areas of priority and develop a plan of how you will address those. That's just my thought.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes for the record. Interesting, Subsection 4 says, a facility shall develop a Facility Improvement Plan, in coordination with... if such a plan is required to address any issues raised in the review. It doesn't say to me that each facility must address every or any issue raised in the review. It just says, if such a plan is required to address any issues raised in the review. The sense I'm getting from Dave, Katie and Sara, that the training by the University of Cincinnati is to provide guidance and feedback for improvement, but not mandate widely so; it would be impossible. It would be impossible for any facility to address every issue that might be raised in one of these reviews. And it's economically—even if it's physically possible, it's economically impossible.

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston for the record. In saying that, maybe the requirement would be the only time a facility needs to submit a plan is if their score has decreased rather than increased because Sara said earlier the goal of this tool is, or the goal of this process is to increase, get better every year. So, if they're getting better, then maybe they don't need a plan, but if they've slipped, then maybe that's when they need a plan.

Eve Hanan: Eve Hanan for the record. So, to me it looks like, the assessor here in Section 3, the review and gets recommendation for improvement, that is not the same as assessing—and it might not—I don't know if that recommendations for improvement really lines up with the Cincinnati training or whether it exceeds that. It sounds like, from what David was saying, that maybe that's going over the line there. Just a question of whether it's a template or not, but making specific recommendations. So that's a question I have is that, was that part of the training? But it does look like that the statute has that as the assessors' obligation. And then, those recommendations are different than the Facility Improvement Plan. That goes to the facility to create that in consultation or coordination with DCFS. I don't think this really—I think it's silent as to how a facility would know whether or not an improvement plan is required. And the question is, like I said, if it's silent, can we kind of come up with a rule for it or not, or do we need to take it to the full commission to kind of get a sense of what we can do, if it's not clear when and why a facility might have to submit the plan.

Leslie Bittleston: This is Leslie Bittleston. That is exactly my point. That's why I wanted to bring this to this body because it isn't clear and you know, DCFS has no direction on this. So, we don't know. And I think we tried by making a template that seems to not be working very well. So, I think that's probably what we're looking for is the guidance. When is a plan required, what do those parameters look like?

Dave Laity: This is Dave Laity for the record. So, our report, our auditor's report has in every section that somebody did not meet an expectation. We have a spot where we give recommendations. Those recommendations are supposed to be like, no or low cost, things that they can/may be able to do without a lot of, I wouldn't say effort, but at least a lot of—it would be easy recommendations. So, the problem when the rubber meets the road is that, when DCFS administration or in the counties, maybe it's even a Judge or a probation chief or whoever's the head of those facilities, when they get the auditor's—what we end up giving them with all those recommendations, the first thing the administration wants to do is fix it all. So, we actually ran into this with a youth parole QA not too long ago where there was about 60 things that we needed to fix and I was supposed to write a program improvement plan for all 60. That wasn't the intention of the QA. The intention of the QA was to identify some things that we could get better on. So, the guidance I think Leslie is looking at, I think is much needed and I think it could be even more of an educational process for the powers that be that want to see improvement, is that we do guide them into the top five or the top 10, or whatever that is. I think anybody that doesn't know the process, from above, is just going to say, fix it all. That's not what this whole thing is about. [pause] I must've put everybody to sleep.

Jo Lee Wickes: So, this is Jo Lee Wickes for the record. And, I'm struggling to provide guidance to DCFS because I really question whether or not myself or anybody on this subcommittee and I'm certainly not disparaging any of my colleagues, have the expertise to provide guidance given the fact that we haven't been through the training. I've read exactly one of these because it's attached to our agenda for this afternoon. And, certainly want to help but I almost wonder if what we need is a discussion among the people who are actually running the facilities, have been through the process that occurred in 2019, as to what helps them comply with the statute and move forward in a meaningful way. I'm frankly at a loss to

understand the complexity of the entire process and make some recommendations for DCFS on how to improve their coordination with these facilities. I have no idea.

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston for the record. At our next meeting, I would be more than happy to invite, or if you want to put the burden on DCFS, I can reach out to the facilities to get some information from them to bring back to our next meeting to maybe help us determine what—how to provide guidance.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes for the record. So, I think it's helpful for us Committee Members, or I appreciate having as much information up front as possible. Again, I really appreciate the comment that each facility is going to develop its own improvement plan. Has DCFS received a lot—it sounds like you guys have received some feedback, which maybe could be augmented with some conversations between now and the next meeting to help us understand, from the facility's point of view, what would help them meet their statutory obligations.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah. Also, this is Leslie Bittleston for the record, I was not trained in this school, so I'm also a little bit at a loss. So, when I took this over, from Katie Brubaker, it's been—I've been trying to learn it the best that I can. So I think that there's a—you know, I'm struggling a little bit myself and I don't even have all of the corrective action plans that have already been—or, excuse me, all of the Facility Improvement Plans that have been submitted to date. I only have the one that I sent you, which is China Spring. So, I just had some conversations in passing with some of the heads of the facilities and a couple of the assessors that have said they are not pleased with this process. That doesn't mean I have any suggestions today on how to make it better, other than what we've discussed. But, I am more than happy to reach out to all of them and see if I can find those other Facility Improvement Plans and bring some additional information to the Committee, during the next meeting.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes, for the record. In reading the statute, those Facility Improvement Plans have to be provided to the full Commission to compile those and submit them to the Governor and the Director of LCB. Did that happen in 2019?

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston for the record. I am unaware that they happened. I believe all of the Facility Improvement Plans were sent to Ms. Brubaker. I can't even be positive on that. So, I took this over not too long ago, so I cannot answer that.

Jo Lee Wickes: Jo Lee Wickes for the record. I apologize if I'm floundering because this just seems a little bit—it's an awful lot of information to synthesize. So, my thought is that it might be—let's—maybe what we could do is, verify what—obtain copies of any of the Facility Improvement Plans for 2019. Seek information from the heads of those facilities about what would help them understand what they need to do. I guess just, what did you like about the process, what did you not like about the process? What was the most meaningful, what's helpful to you? And before we start just kind of back up and say, what happened in 2019, get copies of the plans, distribute those, so that we can make sure that they get attached, if they haven't already been given to the full Commission, then I think that we should take a look at them, so that we can say that they should go to the full Commission at the next full Commission meeting in July.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Jo Lee Wickes: Does that make sense?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Leslie Bittleston for the record. It makes sense. So, Eve and Paula, any other comments about that possible action item? The third subsection for #5?

Paula Smith: This is Paula Smith. I concur. I think that carrying it out and further following up with it is a great idea.

Eve Hanan: This is Eve Hanan. I think that's a great idea. I think we need to kind of understand a little bit about how the facilities have managed this process. I also did wonder if there was a point person, at DCFS, who they were talking to or working with on their facility plans or—I know that's part of the issue is how the coordination happens, but does anybody know that part of it? Like, what is the coordination and creation of the plans?

Leslie Bittleston: This is Leslie Bittleston for the record. I don't think that there was any coordination. Only because Ms. Brubaker, who was doing this position before me, or doing this process, was also an assessor. So there was a conflict of interest on her part, as being an assessor and then the QA piece. And, I think that we—we DCFS—did not have a good process fleshed out, which is why I'm bringing it to you now, so we can improve this process going forward. I think there was some confusion on DCFS's side and also Katie was—Katie Brubaker was doing this and she also was an assessor, so there was also that conflict of interest. So, I think we need to flesh this out on the go forward. I do not believe it was done correctly in the past.

Eve Hanan: Okay, that's helpful. That makes a lot of sense then. So, right. So, it does seem like the first step, I agree with that suggestion, would be take a look at the plans and go to the facilities and try to figure out that process. And it also seems really clear that the job of the assessor is done with—once they share the assessment with the recommendation and should not be part of the planning, the Facility Plan. Is that everyone's understanding as well?

Dave Laity: This is Dave Laity for the record. Yes, that's what our training was about. Just so the assess—because we're going to be going in every year and we don't want to be biased one way or the other. So, that's why I think that split is like, really—it's supposed to be a hard line of, we assess, we give you recommendations and then we're out until the next year and to see how—then we can assess you next year, see if there's any improvements and then move forward.

Eve Hanan: Eve Hanan for the record. That makes a lot of sense. That also makes it, anyone who is an assessor an also DCFS has to—there has to be a wall between them in their role as an assessor so they're not involved in the Facility Plan area. Which sounds like that was Katie Brubaker's issue.

Leslie Bittleston: Right. And this is Leslie Bittleston for the record. That is correct and that's why it came to me, because I'm an independent body. I am not an assessor. I'm not a trained assessor. So, I can provide that buffer a little bit and work with the facilities on the QA process because I'm not in there doing the assessments. So, and like I said, I think that we—we DCFS—have absolutely not done this correctly, so we need to fix it on the go forward. Which is really the big meat and bones of this Committee. Madam Chair, we are running out of our allotted time, so we can table everything remaining on the agenda for the next meeting. And then, go from there. I just wanted to let you know, we're coming to the end of our meeting time.

Jo Lee Wickes: Okay. Thank you for that. We always need somebody to keep their eye on the clock. So, Jo Lee Wickes for the record. I'm going to make a motion to table everything that has not been handled in today's agenda and also if we could, between each Eve, Paula and I and the necessary DCFS staff, talk about a potential date for the next meeting? Because obviously getting quorum is critically important. I don't know if everybody has their calendar available.

Leslie Bittleston: I'm pulling up a calendar Madam Chair. And you want to go—

Jo Lee Wickes: Perhaps an alternate suggestion is that we do a Doodle Poll that would give everybody a little more time to thoughtfully look at their calendars since it looks like we've got about two minutes left.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, I can have Ms. Kayla Dunn do a Doodle Poll for next available meetings in about five weeks.

Jo Lee Wickes: That would be nice. Eve and Paula, does that work for you?

Paula Smith: Yes.

Eve Hanan: Yes, that works for me, this is Eve.

Jo Lee Wickes: And also I'm going to make a motion to table the rest of the items and we will rely on the Doodle Poll to set the next meeting and I would move to adjourn.

Paula Smith: Second.

Jo Lee Wickes: All those in favor? [Ayes around] Anyone opposed? Thank you all for joining us today.

Eve Hanan: Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at