



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
State Advisory Group Planning
Committee Meeting
April 29th, 2021 at 11:00 am**

Meeting Minutes - DRAFT

Chair Pauline Pauline Salla-Smith called meeting to order at 11:00 am.

Roll Call- Leslie Bittleston took roll call and confirmed that quorum was made.

(VOTING MEMBERS)

Present by Phone: Pauline Salla-Smith(Chair), Jennifer Fraser, Rebekah Graham, Jeremy Setters, Jack Martin, Jaquelyn Nadar

Absent: Joey Orduna-Hastings, Jessica Velasquez, Paula Smith

(NON VOTING MEMBERS)

Present by Phone: Heather Plager, Eric Smith, Christine Eckles

(STAFF)

Present by Phone: Kayla Dunn, Kayla Landes, Jennifer Simeo, Leslie Bittleston

(PUBLIC)

Present by Phone: Lexie Beck – Youth Move

Meeting Minutes:

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Great. Thank you, everyone, for joining us. We do have other members present, non-voting. We have Heather Plager from Elko County, Christine Eckles from Washoe County, and Jennifer Simeo from the State, Kayla Landes from the state, Eric Smith is on meeting also, and Kayla Dunn. Did I miss anybody?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Lexi Beck is also on. I believe she's from Youth Move.

LEXIE BECK: Yes.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Lexi --

LEXIE BECK: Yes, my name is Lexi Beck. I'm with Youth Move Nevada.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you, Lexi. Thank you, everyone, for joining us. Let's go to agenda item number 3, public comment and discussion. Does anyone have any public comment?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes, Madam Chair. This is Leslie. I would like to introduce a new youth member to the JJOC Commission and she has selected the SAG Committee as one of her Committees, so welcome to Jacquelyn Nader. Jacquelyn, would you like to say hi to the group and tell the group a little bit about yourself?

JACQUELYN NADER: Yes. Thank you. Hi, Madam Chair, members of the Committee. My name is Jacquelyn Nader. I am currently a public affairs coordinator with Argentum Partners. However, I just got accepted into law school, so I will be a law student here very shortly, but I'm very excited to join this Committee and the Commission. So thank you for having me.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you, Jacquelyn. We're excited to have you too and congratulations on being accepted into law school. That's quite an accomplishment. Hopefully you'll be, like, representing juvenile justice kids from around our state. That's always important. All right, let's move to the approval of our meeting minutes from March 16th, 2021. Hopefully everybody had a chance to review it. If anybody has any changes or comments, please let us know now.

JACK MARTIN: Motion to approve, Jack Martin.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you, Jack. Is there a second?

JEREMY SUTTERS: Jeremy Sutters, seconds that.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you. It's been moved and seconded. Any other discussion? All those in favor, say aye.

MEMBERS: Aye.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Any opposed? All right. Minutes are approved as submitted. Leslie, let's talk about our COVID-19 data update from the jurisdictions.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes, ma'am, I'm pulling that up now. My apologies. I am having some internet problems so my computer is running awfully slow. Unless you have yours up, Madam Chair, and you can share on your screen.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Let me share it.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes, that would be -- for some reason, I'm not able to pull it up. Computer's acting weird.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Can you guys see that? Can you see it?

JEREMY SUTTERS: Yeah, we can see it.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Okay, great.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair. Okay. So just to bring Jacquelyn up to speed we have -- DCFS has been capturing COVID data for youth and staff in our juvenile facilities since roughly May of last year. So every month is updated data so this is just the updated data at the end of March 31st of 2021. So far, 1,263 youth test have been given with 62 youths positive for a 4.92 percent positivity rate; 1,166 staff test; 203 -- or is that 103?

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: One-hundred and three.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah. It's really small on my computer. 103 staff tests for an 8.83 positivity rate. And then I just arbitrarily took the month of December, three months ago, to compare what we looked like in December as compared to now. We have seen an increase in youth positivity by 27 percent but a decrease by 15 percent in staff positivity rate. And then the -- table number 2 is a running list of all of the positives in the state by month and the facilities, so either youth or staff. So going onto page 2, there is -- there we go. Going on to page 2, which is a continuation of chart number 2, we had just a few positives in March, which is the last updated data. So it looks like we are getting -- we are seeing fewer positives. Then moving on to vaccination data, I was asked to present this data by the Chairs of the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission so I did reach out to the counties and to the state facilities, and this is the information based on county that I received, broken down by facility: Clark County and Washoe County was not tracking that information so you can see the percent of detention staff vaccinated versus either not vaccinated or did not choose to disclose. There is I am unable to determine the percent not vaccinated, whether it's they're just not vaccinated or they just didn't disclose it; and then moving on to China Spring, same data; and then for these state facilities. Again, I cannot differentiate between those not vaccinated and those that did not disclose. So that is our update on COVID. I can take any questions.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Any questions? And before I forget, can we let the record show that Rebekah is present? She sent us a chat.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Oh, thank you, Rebekah.

REBEKAH GRAHAM: No problem. I'm just in the Vegas airport. It's super loud.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Okay. No questions on that one. I'm just going to stop sharing for right now. I can go back -- I can share the next item if we need to. Let's talk about agenda item number 7. This is new data requests from the counties, and I think I will share these county use-of-force data template. I'm thinking it's this one.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Madam Chair, we skipped over 6.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Oh, I'm sorry. I was rushing the agenda. I know, Jack, that makes you really sad.

JACK MARTIN: Madam Chair, I'd like to skip 6, 7, potentially 8.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: I did that just for you, Commissioner Martin.

JACK MARTIN: Thank you.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Okay. Onto item 6, formula grant accounting and SAG allocation. Maybe -- let me see if I can find it. I'm going to download it real quick and then I'll share it.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And while you're doing that, Madam Chair, I will update or just provide some context again for our new member. DCFS receives a grant every year, a federal grant, and out of that grant, we have available \$20,000 out of that grant each year to support the JJOC, the Commission, so to speak. So this is an accounting of how that \$20,000 is spent. So this was prepared by our fiscal staff so I will be able to go through this by each year. So for FY '18, which is up on your screen, we have spent 5,149.90 with a remaining balance of 14,850. And what the membership dues are, for those of you who

don't know, The Coalition of Juvenile Justice is a national nonprofit organization which lobbies on behalf of juvenile justice to the federal government. So we, as a state, pay dues to have them lobby for Nevada. So it's just dues to be part of this organization. So that's what you're seeing there. And then moving on to FY '19 -- there we go. The same thing: we spent \$5,000 and the reason that it is 5,190 for FY '18 and 5,000 for FY '19, we were late in paying our dues so it was a little more expensive and the lateness was caused by frozen funds. So that's why. So we have 15,000 remaining in FY '19, and then moving on to FY '20, we have spent nothing. So we still have 20,000 remaining, and this grant is 100 percent frozen. So are there any questions on the SAG portion of the grant?

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: So this is Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith. Leslie, for the '18, we're going to have to -- that has to be coming to the three-year-max mark, correct?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: That's correct and we are considering doing an extension because, like I said, we can't touch the money that's still frozen.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Mm-hmm.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So we are going to have to do an extension.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Okay. Any questions from members on the SAG allocation? All right. Let's move to agenda item 7, which now will be the county use-of-force data template. Let me pull that up for everybody. This is Leslie too. It looks like it's this one. So as you recall, there was discussion I believe in our NAJJA meeting and Jacquelyn, our NAJJA meeting is the Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators. So that's all the chiefs and directors from around the state that the Oversight Commission was interested in seeing use-of-force data at all the facilities and NAJJA just requested that they be -- that there -- that we could see a template and then have discussion surrounding that to ensure that we're collecting appropriate data and we're all reporting the same way so that we're streamlined in our collection process. So that's just a little history of it. I'll turn it over to Leslie now to talk about the template, and then we can have more discussion.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Thank you, Madam Chair. This template was based on what we request of the facilities, so this is almost a mirror image of the information that we require our state facilities to provide us. So as you can see, we are asking by month the total number of three different types of restraints: a physical restraint, a mechanical restraint, and OC spray, and then in order to calculate the percentage, we are asking for the average monthly population. So that's kind of what this template shows. We did not define or put a definition of physical restraint, mechanical restraint, and OC spray without discussing it with the Committee. Internally, within DCFS, we define a physical restraint is any restraint that if a physical touch or a hold; a mechanical restraint would be handcuffs, leg restraints, or a belly chain of some kind; and OC spray would be the use of pepper spray or anything like that. So that's how we internally in DCFS define those, but I wanted to leave it up for discussion for you all so we're not -- you know, so that's what we've come up with for your consideration.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: So before I open it up to the group, I'm wondering if tracking -- I mean, I think the use of forces in the average daily population without reporting unduplicated youth could be a little misleading. Like, if you have one youth who's consistently getting restrained, I think that just reporting -- and I'm just processing out loud here so. I'm not sure that you're capturing true data without knowing unduplicated youth, and I'll open it up to the members for their thoughts on this. Anyone?

HEATHER PLAGER: I would agree with that, Pauline. I think that's typically what you see is you get certain youth who consistently act out, not a lot of youth who occasionally act out, and so I think we need to be careful because those are two very different situations in which you might have that you're dealing with, and I want to make sure that we do capture that correctly and it's not misleading if we don't have that ability.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you, Heather. Anyone else?

JEREMY SUTTERS: This is Jeremy Sutters.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Go ahead, Jeremy. I'm sorry.

JEREMY SUTTERS: Oh, no worries. Yeah, no, I definitely agree with that, that the data, you know, wouldn't give the full picture, although I do think it's important to understand, you know, if there is individuals who are kind of continually needing to be restrained, that data as well as important. So if there's any way we could break it down into knowing, you know, like a repeat offender per se, of physical-restraint needs, I think that's important to know, what we're doing -- like, you know, what we're doing in the facilities for them.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you. Commissioner Martin?

JACK MARTIN: I'm just going to keep it simple and say yup, agree completely.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you.

KAYLA LANDES: This is Kayla Landes and for what it's worth, when I get the information from the facilities, Caliente does report, like, a total number, and then they also report unduplicated numbers just for that -- for exactly for what we're talking about here because there are so many, you know --

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Yeah, repeat offenders.

KAYLA LANDES: -- repeat offenders, yes.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Yeah. And I think -- this is Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith. I think that's going to skew your percentage without -- if you're not reporting unduplicated it's the same as with our DMC data, our disparate treatment, if you're not drilling down the data, it really -- it's not going to be effective in driving our decisions or to see what we need to do different. So, I mean, my recommendation would be that we add an unduplicated youth element.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: We can do an overall, which I think is skewed data though. I mean, if the group wants to keep it, that's -- we can have that discussion, but I would do number the types of use of force I agree with. I think you're going to have questions on a physical restraint, depending on what curriculum you use. That might vary in some curriculum: a hand on the back of the elbow to guide them, if you're considering physical touch that would be considered a physical restraint, but you're not restraining them, you're just placing your hand. So I think that we're going to have to have a lot more discussion about that or people are going to report it different, and if we're going to count a hand on the back of the arm or the back of an elbow to guide as a physical restraint, I think that's going to paint a different picture too, but what I'd like to see is for this to go to NAJJA a discussion at NAJJA, and then bring it back to the Committee with feedback from them.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: That sounds great, Madam Chair. We can also -- before we present it to NAJJA, we can add another line for the unduplicated count. I will have Kayla Landes make those changes as Kayla did create this. So I will have her update that and we will present it at the next NAJJA meeting.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Members, thoughts on that? Are we all supportive of that?

JEREMY SUTTERS: Yeah, this is Jeremy Sutters. I agree.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Great. Thank you. Thanks for the template too. It's a good place for us to start. I think we're just going to have to drill down now on the info.

JEREMY SUTTERS: Yup.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Okay. Let's move to county length-of-stay template, which I think is just right here.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. So again, this was based on what we are already asking the facilities, so we just -- average length of stay, the way that the state defines it is looking at all successful discharges and how long they stayed. However, that doesn't mean that's how you guys would like to define that. So again, this is also up for discussion and maybe we want to send this to NAJJA as well for them to define how they want to look at length of stay.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: This is Commissioner Sala. I think Tyler Supervision does a great job figuring out our length of stay in detention centers.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Because you're not unsuccessful or successful you're detained or released --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Right.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: -- and it does break it down. I mean, it gives you an average length of stay, your monthly average length of stay, right, in Tyler Supervision?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Right. And the difference is you don't have to worry about the successful versus unsuccessful.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Right.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So, yeah, but I just wanted to provide that's how we measure it in the state, but.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Okay. We'll take this whole form --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: -- to NAJJA.

CHRISTINE ECKLES: Paula -- Pauline?

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Yes.

CHRISTINE ECKLES: This is Christine. Am I allowed to make a comment because I'm not --

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Sure.

CHRISTINE ECKLES: So I know at juvenile services here in Washoe County, we break this out into two different ways of looking at average length of stay. Any kid that comes to the door counts as -- could count as one average length of stay, but then we also count what the average length of stay is once you go to court. So if you've been here 72 hours and now the judge has detained you, what is your average length of stay in detention, and so it's a very different number, right, and data can give us different things. Our average length of stay for kids who just hit the door and then may get released is, like, 11, but the average length of stay for a kid to attain by the judge is -- last year was 39 and it was 35 before that. So as a detention division director, that's the number that feels real to me. If a kid is detained by the court, how long do they stay until they leave our facility and head home, or to a correctional home on probation, to a correctional facility, or to an RTC? So I just bring that into the discussion because for me, it feels like kids stay about 30 days after the judge detains them versus other data that says they only stay for 12 days, which I don't think is accurate.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you, Christine. That's a good point. Anyone else? We'll take it to NAJJA and then we can have this conversation. I'll make a note to add it to our agenda for our next meeting. All right. Thank you for doing the template, Kayla. Thank you very much. Let's move to YLS data for Community Corrections Partnership Block Grant. This is the YLS score, which is our risk-and-need assessment tool versus supervision level. Let me bring it up here. Maybe if I can find it. Do we know what attachment is? Attachment, YLA -- do we have an -- we don't have an attachment for that? Is this just a discussion for information?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. Madam Chair, that's just discussion.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Okay.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: We wanted to present to you for discussion how we in DCFS track it and how the counties would like to track it. We would like some type of uniformity so we would like to track the same way the counties do. Currently, what we do for all commitment YLSs, so the state takes all of the commitment YLSs and all we do is look at score. We do not look at supervision level, we look at score: overall score and score within each domain, and Jennifer Simeo, are you on the line? If you would like to talk a little bit about that cause that's your area of expertise? Are you here?

JENNIFER SIMEO: Hi. Sorry. Jennifer Simeo for the record. So I apologize. I am multitasking. What was the question?

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Jennifer, this is Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith. We're just having the discussion on the agenda item, the YLS data for Community Corrections Partnership Block Grant, the score versus supervision level, because during our NAJJA meeting, we did have concerns that the supervision -- we were unsure as to why that information is important since jurisdiction's policy may differ about supervision levels tied to YLS scores.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Right. And, Jennifer, I explained that for DCFS, we take the commitment YLS and we'd just look at score. So I was just asking you to provide some context around that.

JENNIFER SIMEO: Right. So, yeah, I'll just follow up with what Leslie said that, you know, we wrote to our YLS policy in conjunction with NISAP, where we would use the YLS total risk level to come up with the supervision level. Of course that would vary by county and I wonder if it's something that might want to be asked of Dr. Vincent as to her recommendations on that. I know that we do have policies that also

veer from that, like a juvenile sex offender, even if they have a low risk level, they're going to be supervised at a moderate or higher category, so there are some, you know, kids that aren't supervised necessarily per their YLS risk level.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you. And this is Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith:. I think that all of our policies were written in conjunction with NISAP and we had to do the statewide template that they reviewed and worked with the jurisdictions. I think that our discussion during NAJJA was really -- the question was is, like, the -- how come that's important, that the overall -- the overall risk to reoffend score of course is important, right? That's why we utilize the YLS, but I didn't -- I think I'm the one that had the most concerns about it is that when we start breaking it down per domain and supervision level, are we getting in the weeds with Community Corrections Partnership Block Grant, because what we determined to be an appropriate supervision level for our kids after the YLS, and honestly, other evaluations, if it's psychiatric or psychological or substance use, is really specific to jurisdictions and community-based programming available within those jurisdictions and if we're going to report that on our Community Corrections Partnership Block Grant, like, what would be the use of that data I guess was my question from the very beginning.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And I think that the question really is around what should the counties be reporting. Rather than the supervision level, should it just be the overall score, so we can -- you know, so we can kind of compare apples to apples. You know, what -- the kids we are serving, their average score is 20. I'm just throwing that out there. So I guess that's kind of the question: what should be reported on the block grant? Should it be a supervision level or should it be just the score, and just to --

JENNIFER SIMEO: This is Jennifer Simeo for the record. I wonder if it would be advantageous for us to see how each county is supervising kids because do we want to look at, you know, low-risk kids may be getting too much contact, for example?

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Yeah. This is Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith. I think that's the stuff I'm concerned about because what you consider a low-risk kid in your community might not be a low-risk kid in my community and as a jurisdiction who provides 90 percent of the prevention efforts in our community for at-risk youth, and I don't know how many other jurisdictions do it, but there's not much else here. I think that, you know, if the state came in to tell me that I'm having too much contact with our kids because they're doing group once a week and they're low risk, but if they were doing group once a week at a community-based treatment center in Washoe County or Clark County, nobody would be saying anything, that's an issue to me because if you don't know what the capacity of the community is, I think that's a leap of faith to make.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So with that being said, I think what would be appropriate would be rather than the supervision level to have the jurisdictions just provide the overall risk score, whatever that is.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Which -- this is Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith, I think we've been doing that, right? We've been providing --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: No, ma'am. What is normally provided is just a high, medium, or low so -- and then some jurisdictions are not even reporting anything so I don't know if they're not doing YLSs or what. I just want to clarify on the performance measures, what should be required in it. If we want to settle on the score, then the score should be required.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: I'm going to open it up to the other members because I've been yapping so, members, and jump on in.

JACK MARTIN: I'm sorry, Pauline, President Pauline of All Things. I stepped away for a minute, but I'm obviously a little trepidations about creating scoring where, I mean, are we talking about the level of risk, low, medium, high, or are you actually talking about the actual scores?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: I'm talking about just the actual overall score, the final score.

JACK MARTIN: So it would be the low overall -- I mean the low, medium, high risk, is that right?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah, the zero to 30.

JACK MARTIN: Oh, okay. So I haven't taken the training yet in the YLS so I'm a little behind here.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay.

JACK MARTIN: So can you explain to me what the benefit of you knowing that is?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So basically the benefit of looking at that is because first of all, we want to make sure -- and this is a very generic question. We want to make sure that we are serving the lower and more moderate -- you know, the lower-score kids in the community whereas for our state facilities, we want to look at to see if we're getting the higher scores, which we are seeing right now. It's just to continue to provide the data that we are serving the right kids in the right places.

JACK MARTIN: Here would be my argument, and I see where you're going and I love that, that we're actually going to do stuff based on score and risk versus, you know, the whims of an adult. But, I mean, by that same logic when I get stuck with the kid that's a state kid for a very long time that's low-risk, do I get denied a placement of that kid? Like, you're planning to deny placement a state -- of a county kid?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: No, no, no, no, no, no. There are always exceptions. All we're doing is looking at the average. We're not saying that a person that scores a 2, which is pretty low, can't be a state kid or a person that's a 30, which is the highest, can't be served in the community. We're just trying to look overall to say hey, we're doing what -- we're doing what we're supposed to be. Overall, we're serving the average lower kids and the average higher kids. There's going to always be outliers and we see it in our state data. We're already doing that. We're already looking at the scores and providing all of the scores. We are seeing some outliers, but there are reasons: some of them are because of the crime; some of them are because they're a juvenile sex offender, so there's outliers. That's not what we're trying to say. We're just trying to see what the data shows us.

JACK MARTIN: And, you know --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And remember -- yeah, and I'm not the judge so we're just doing the data.

JACK MARTIN: Well, you know, how much I trust the state.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: I know. I know.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: He didn't trust it -- he didn't trust it when I was there either so okay.

JACK MARTIN: Or when I was there. I didn't trust myself or my leadership at that point in it.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah.

JACK MARTIN: And I had a good governor. Look what you guys are stuck with.

HEATHER PLAGER: So I just had a quick question, Leslie. So when I went through the training, one of the things that stood out to me was that while we may not all come up with the exact same number as we were scoring children, they were all in the same range, and so I guess I'm a little bit concerned if we're using the actual numeric value over low, moderate, high, very high, that we are, and potentially not looking at the right thing because somebody may score them two points higher than what you would have scored them at, but they would still be low. So I guess I'm kind of concerned about numbers versus just levels because to me, you get the same information. If I just give you a level versus if I give you an actual number. Does that makes sense?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: It does, and I guess I just want the counties to let me know what they want to provide, one or the other. So I think it's up for discussion and maybe it should go back to NAJJA for -- or this group can decide, I don't know, but I think that it's just we want to know the overall what the counties are doing, what -- either we're serving the moderate kids, great, or we're serving the equivalent of 20 or an average. I'm just throwing that out there. I just would like the counties to let me know which one they want to provide.

JACK MARTIN: And we want the same thing from the state. We want to know what the hell the state's doing too so, I mean --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah, so, and part of the thing is is not all counties are providing. Some are providing both currently, some are providing just the risk level, and some are providing nothing. So, yeah.

JACK MARTIN: I vote for risk level.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay. Just low, medium, or high, or very high? Okay.

JACK MARTIN: That's what I'm voting for cause Pauline, she messaged me and told me vote for that so that's what I'm doing.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Jack, I haven't even messaged you this whole meeting.

JACK MARTIN: I know, but -- hey, if the state gets to be dishonest, I get to be dishonest too, Pauline.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: I mean, usually I am messaging you, but today I've been a good girl. Members anybody want to chime in, have any thoughts on this?

ERIC SMITH: Pauline?

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Yes?

ERIC SMITH: Pauline, this is Eric. I would just also add to that. So supervision level can be a moving target depending on the timeframe that you're looking at reporting. So you can have a kid that immediately comes in at a low level of supervision, violates, he's dealt with informally but given within a time period, depending on his circumstances, he could raise up a level of supervision. So what time period would the agencies be reporting, you know, over what kind of distance? I don't think it's going to give an accurate picture as to what the state's looking for so the overall risk seems to be the most stable snapshot.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you, Eric.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: I would say, Eric, to answer your question, so we know that a kid is served at that period of time with the funds. I would say whatever their risk level at the time of the service is what should be provided. So if they are a medium and that's when you're providing the service -- or not a medium, a moderate, and that's when you're providing the service, then you report moderate.

ERIC SMITH: But even at that, we're reporting that quarterly, correct, Leslie?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes, you're reporting it quarterly.

ERIC SMITH: I have a kiddo, you know, minor violation, gets put on house arrest and then is released from it and he's going to go through at least -- that's at least two different supervision levels, being placed on house arrest for a minor violation that's not necessarily going to trigger a new YLS.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Well, the only way to combat that would be to provide just the overall score.

ERIC SMITH: And that's what I'm pushing for.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay. So we have one for level, we have one for score.

ERIC SMITH: I'm sorry. In my mind, it's a little bit synonymous so.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thanks, Eric. Anybody else or we --

JEREMY SUTTERS: This is Jeremy Sutters. I'm not super familiar with the YLS. I've never particularly -- I've never actually used it, I've worked with kids who have had it done. I think the -- if it's the score that is more finite and has less ability to move and fluctuate over the course of their care, I think that would be the one that I would more use. If they could transition from moderate to low to high, more often I don't see that as being as beneficial, especially in the reporting aspect of it.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Mm-hmm. Thank you, Jeremy. And let me just provide some just a bit of clarification, cause I think we're talking about a couple of different things here. So you have the -- you have the actual score, right, overall score, which is a number, you have the overall risk to re-offend, and then you have supervision level. I think that what Eric's talking about is supervision level, that that can change, you know, depending on what's being addressed with that youth in that jurisdiction. The overall risk to re-offend is either low, moderate, high, or very high, right, and within that there's ranges, there's point ranges in there.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: So I think what Jack was saying, and, Jack, correct me if I'm wrong, I know you will, is the overall risk to re-offend, whether it's low, moderate, high, or very high, and that would solve Eric's concern because we're not talking about supervision level because that is fluid. Does that help clarify? Did I do that right? Did I speak properly on behalf of everyone?

JEREMY SUTTERS: Then I, myself, would go with more of the risk level. I think reporting the risk level would be more beneficial and more advantageous for reporting.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you, Jeremy.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And, Eric, did that help clarify?

ERIC SMITH: Pauline hit the nail on the head.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Yeah, I think we're just talking about -- we have -- like, we're just talking about different things, but I think if we report on the overall risk to re-offend, which in the training I went through with the YLS was really what drives our supervision decisions, and then we break it down further when we're case planning for individual domains.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: So.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So, Madam Chair, with that being -- oh, sorry, Eric.

ERIC SMITH: I was just going to add one more concern. Something that we've been talking about lately is just as the risk level raises in the YLS, the accuracy of the tool diminishes. So you can have a disproportionate response if you just use the risk level and jack the supervision through the roof. It's -- I don't think supervision level will always be appropriate in the tool. There has to be some thought behind implementing this into (inaudible), so just that one little tidbit that.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Yeah. I think we agree, Eric. This is Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith:. I think we agree that supervision level is really individualized in jurisdictions and is difficult to report on.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah. And with that being said, Madam Chair, I can update the performance-measure template to be completely clear that the state is requesting overall risk to re-offend, which is either very high, high, moderate, or low, and that we request all counties to provide that data for the youth served with the block grant. So that is very helpful to me, and I could make that change on the go-forward starting next fiscal year.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Is everyone okay with that? We're good? Non-voting members, are we all good with that? I'll take that as a yes. Silence is acceptance. Okay. All right. Good discussion, you guys, thank you. Data requirements, spreadsheet, this is attachment 7B. I think we talked about -- we spoke -- we reviewed this last time.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Madam Chair, it has been updated a little bit. Kayla is working on adding the NACS, the performance scorecard and, Kayla, if you want to outline for the members, what has been newly added since they last reviewed this?

KAYLA LANDES: Sure. This is Kayla Landes. Yeah, and this format looks just a little bit different, I think because there's some trouble with trying to get tabs converted into PDF so this is an Excel spreadsheet with tabs at the bottom, but for this purpose, it looks like Kayla Dunn just did PDFs for each tab. So the tab for the score cards, the JJOC -- nope, you were right, Pauline. Yeah, so this one was updated from discussion from the data committee on the scorecards so this will reflect everything that was brought to the data committee and discussed and approved and added to that section, and then the other section that was updated was the NAC 462H, I believe, and that one is pretty long and there was a section -- yes, this one. So it had a lot that I added to it and there's a section on here that discusses status offenses that the counties already provide. I did include it just because it was included in the NAC, but I was just kind of hesitant because I didn't want to -- I mean, it's a lot of information so I didn't want to overload people with it, so you are -- we do collect that information and I did state it -- like I said, it's a lot, so it's pretty -- it's down towards the bottom, I believe. So, yeah, right there, section 6 that this information is provided.

There is some new information. It's been a while since I updated this so I can't recall it off the top of my head, but if you go through and just -- you know, it's light reading, review it when you have, you know, free time like you all do then -- and nothing is set in stone so if there's anything you disagree with or if there's any way you want to change it or, you know, whatever you want to do, just feel free to let me know.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And thank you, Kayla. And just to let the members know this is a living documents and this kind of puts into one place all of the data that we're all providing for various reasons. So that's -- this is just for your information. We, of course, can answer questions are update it with anything else you guys see, but this is really just for information.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you, Kayla. Thank you for putting this all together.

KAYLA LANDES: Sure.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Let's stop sharing here. Okay. Let's see. Let me go to agenda item number 8. Oh, mental-health screening tools for the counties. So for those of you who've been part of us, if you remember, there was lots of discussion about the mandatory mental-health screening tools that jurisdictions were using for all of our kids prior to -- those kids who are moving to disposition, a dispositional hearing for court. Some jurisdictions do it with kids who they're working with that they're handling informally or supervision and consent or something like that. So this kind of went by the wayside a little bit. I think COVID took over my brain too and forgot to move forward with it, but the overall Commission, Oversight Commission selected the MAYSI as the mental-health screening tool for all jurisdictions to use, and the MAYSI-2 is actually the screening tool that all juvenile detention centers are mandated to use per our statute. Some jurisdictions wanted to use something else besides the MAYSI. I love the MAYSI in detention, I wasn't loving the MAYSI for probation kids. So we -- all the jurisdictions -- we worked with the jurisdictions to identify what tools they would use or would like to use if they didn't have to use the MAYSI and as you remember, I did take it to the full commission. I want to say it was in our maybe August meeting of last year that the jurisdictions could bring recommendations of other screening tools to use if they would entertain hearing that and, yes, they will entertain that. So for our next Oversight Commission, I would like to move -- I would like to move through this group a motion to approve jurisdictions to utilize -- and we have -- we still have the MAYSI, some jurisdictions are going to use the MAYSI. A couple of us want to use the GAIN'SS, the G-A-I-N, hyphen, S-S as the assessment tool, and then, Jack, I'm hoping that Clark is still using the pediatric symptom checklist, and so those are the three that we want to take to the full Commission and just to get their approval, and then DCFS Ross Armstrong will actually provide any guidelines that jurisdictions may need if there's some discussion from the Oversight Commission to be able to use them. But we just want to be able to use the screening tool that best fits our community and our agency and still captures the important and critical information we need to for our kids to identify needs and risks in mental health and actually with co-occurring disorders. So I just want to bring it through to this group, make sure that everyone's okay with moving it to the full commission for approval for jurisdictions to be able to use one of those three screening tools.

JACK MARTIN: Just so you know, Pauline, Clark, we've transitioned over to a new mental-health -- our healthcare services manager is a different one so we are looking at possibly exploring other tools. You know, when we get the two CS and all these different things she pointed out to us the other day that we were assessing children so much it was ridiculous, so she's going to look to do some streamlining and

possibly some reduction of assessments so, you know, hopefully whatever we submit and Ross presents, such a joyful day that will be, that we will be able to -- that's not set in stone.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Okay. Thanks, Jack. Well, and this is Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith, I'm wondering if maybe we can present to the Oversight Commission that as long as it's validated and reliable and captures the information we need, can the jurisdictions then select the instrument that they would like to use. If that's a no-go, I think our plan B is to get at least these three right now approved, and then we can always revisit if you change, Commissioner Martin.

JACK MARTIN: Sounds good.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thoughts, comments, concerns? Others got some ideas.

JACK MARTIN: Heather's got some ideas, I think.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Heather wants me to get the GAIN'SS approved is what she --

HEATHER PLAGER: Exactly. I just want the GAIN'SS. That's all. I'm like but give me the GAIN'SS and I'm happy.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: If there's not any concerns or questions, if we can have a motion to move to the full commission on the approval of different mental-health screening tools?

JACK MARTIN: So moved.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner Martin. Is there a second?

JENNIFER FRASER: Jennifer Fraser, second.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you, Commissioner Fraser. It's been moved and seconded. All those in favor, say aye.

MEMBERS: Aye.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: I'm going to count that as eyes. Any opposed? Give me thumbs down if you're opposed or if you don't want to unmute. Okay. We're good. All right. Motion carries. So Ms. Dunn and Leslie, can we make sure that we put that on the agenda under the SAG Committee because that'll be an action item?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes, ma'am. Kayla Dunn, please write that down for me.

KAYLA DUNN: Yes, ma'am.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you. All right. Let's move to agenda item number 9. We're approaching an hour here so I'm not going to keep you guys all afternoon too. Let's move to legislative items. I think we have an update. We're just going to touch on this briefly.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And, Madam Chair, I don't know if a new draft has been created since I presented that, so it's probably two weeks old by now.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Oh, okay. All right. Let me just do this then. So I'm going to share my screen real quick. This isn't the most recent, but let's just so everybody's aware. Yeah, there have been some updates on this. So I'm just going to briefly talk about this. There's a lot of legislation that's occurring

that has the potential to touch the juvenile justice system, and there's a lot of legislation that is addressing peace officers and training and requirements and all of that good stuff. So one of the things -- the reason that we do this spreadsheet is just to help keep us all on track and focused and things change so quickly. It's not always the most up-to-date, but any of these legislative bills, the blue links right here will take you right to the text of the bill, and it'll also take you to the page that if there's a scheduled hearing or what happened at the last hearing. If there's been amendments to the bill, then you just click on the amendment and it'll take you to the different amendments that's been submitted. Oh, yeah, this one's actually much older. I'll send out the most recent one after the meeting, and Leslie can send that out to everybody. There are bills that NAJJA, as an association, has testified on. There's also been individual jurisdictions that have provided testimony either in support, in opposition, or neutral. There's some legislative bills that support our juvenile justice reform efforts, and then there's some language that had been introduced that I think it's trying to go backwards a little bit so we made sure that we were available and provided at least feedback as much as we could. If there's certain legislation that someone wants to talk about, we can talk about it today. In keeping with respecting everyone's time, I just want you guys to know that this is available and I'll send the most recent one after the meeting. And some of it's color-coded just because depending on what was going on with me that week, it was probably colored-coded for that reason. I don't know. Like, we had to testify for it or something. I can't remember what my color coding was. Questions on the legislative bills? All right. Let's move to NAC 62B and NAC 62H revisions. Are these different revisions than we discussed last time, Leslie?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: No, ma'am, they are not different revisions. There's just one question on a NAC 62B, and then it looks like we are going to make requests in addition to 62H. So these are pretty -- these are pretty quick.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: So let me share this real quick.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So the question, if we start with NAC 62B, one of the -- so attachment --

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Is it up?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Sorry. I was looking. Let me see. Yes, so this came from another member of the JJOC, who is not a SAG member, a SAG Committee member. Based on the proposed amendment that this committee discussed a few months back which is attachment 9-point -- which one is it? Nine-point --

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: So not 9.B

LESLIE BITTLESTON: It's 9.D-1. So 9.D is the email from the staff member regarding attachment 9.D-1.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: It's up.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay. So this was discussed in this committee several months back to add what is underlined, it's -- in line number 3, it says shall use evidence-based and/or evidence of informed, and then evidence-based practices definition. So that was a proposed amendment. However, one of the fellow JJOC members had a concern that this amendment is even needed at all based on the fact that the JJOC approved the evidence-based practices matrix. So I was bringing this back to this committee just to say, you know, maybe we don't need it because the JJOC has approved that matrix, which is referred to in the NAC itself.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: So this is Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith. Can we move this under the SAG Committee to the full commission because I think this warrants --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: -- a full commission discussion.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes, ma'am. Kayla Dunn, can you please note that?

KAYLA DUNN: Yes, ma'am.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Thank you.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: I mean, I agree we don't need it either, but I'm not an attorney and, I mean, I think this we need a full --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: -- full Oversight Commission discussion.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Cool. Okay. Then moving on to 62H, there has been some discussion about adding a data requirement to 62H and that is around juvenile competency. DCFS has been asked -- has been getting quite a few questions around competency and as we all know, there is a bill currently out for juvenile competency. So we are looking to possibly add to this piece of legislation somewhere in here, it hasn't been done yet. I'm just -- I'm looking to add the counties to provide data on the number of youth found incompetent.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Members, thoughts? Anything?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And also just to let the committee know, I know I've said this before, but our next step is public hearing for these NACs, which will happen after legislation -- the legislature closes. So once the legislature -- the session is completed, we will be scheduling that public hearing. I'm just bringing the thought that we may be adding juvenile competency just so it's not a surprise.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: I think there's -- there was two or three bills that were addressing that in the beginning so, I mean, I think we're going to have to report on that.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah. So that -- those were all for the NACs.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Members, any questions, comments? All right, let's move to SB107, room confinement. Kayla.

KAYLA LANDES: Okay. I believe it's just for January and February for both the state and the county, and there really isn't anything that stood out. It does look like Clark County went up by 30 from February to March. Oh, I believe I said January and February. I meant February and March. I apologize. But aside from that, that was the only drastic change I saw in anything. So unless anybody -- just to save time for everybody, if there's any questions on anything?

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Members? No questions, comments?

REBEKAH GRAHAM: I have a comment, Pauline. I just know when I listened to the JJOC that Judge Walker gave us all a lot of kudos for the reduction of corrective room restriction and although I think that we all -- are all constantly working hard at reducing it, I do want to make it noted that a lot of it is due to

COVID and that our populations have decreased by probably 50 percent and so our staff are working with six kids instead of 12 kids in a unit, which has probably assisted us in reducing corrective-room restriction. So although I appreciate the kudos, I think we have to be realistic that the numbers may go up again when we start seeing our populations increase.

KAYLA LANDES: And I will say that's a good point because I know that, you know, when COVID first hit, we did kind of press on that a lot, that the numbers did decrease quite a bit and, yeah, we could bring that up again, that's --

REBEKAH GRAHAM: Yeah.

KAYLA LANDES: -- once the numbers start to increase, we may see an --

REBEKAH GRAHAM: Yeah.

KAYLA LANDES: -- obviously increase in the numbers of room confinement.

REBEKAH GRAHAM: Right. Right. Hopefully they don't, but I just don't want it to be, like, you know, what the heck happened, you were doing so good.

KAYLA LANDES: Right.

REBEKAH GRAHAM: It's just reality.

KAYLA LANDES: Absolutely.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you. Anything else? All right, Leslie.

KAYLA LANDES: Thank you. Sorry.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you, Kayla. Let's -- Title II questions, attachment 11A. Leslie?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Hi. Yes, this is just an overview of some grant performance measures. So OJJDP, and for Jacquelyn, OJJDP stands for the Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention. It is under the federal department of justice so it is the federal office that I work with on the grant that I discussed earlier. So OJJDP has recently come out with some new performance measures around the funds provided -- or the funds used to provide services. So the performance measures that were being used were -- I don't know if they were old, outdated, but OJJDP decided to update their performance measures. This will directly affect any sub-grantees that DCFS has for the formula grant. Currently there are seven sub-grantees. So this will go into effect with the start of their new program year. So if their program year starts July 1st, it will go into effect July 1st. However, I just received these performance measures, so I've got some work to do to provide some information to the sub-grantees on the new data that they are required to collect. So that will be going out. This is just kind of a four-year information that the performance-measure reporting for the grant has been completely rebound. And there's two attachments and those attachments were provided to the states by OJJDP.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Well, and actually they look like they're written much better. So --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: -- I mean, they're not so convoluted, I don't think, so I'm glad that they updated them.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah. So and that just kind of talks about -- the second document talks about the fact -- the requirement to states to report on performance measures for the funding, and then the progress-reporting questions that is for me as the grant manager to answer going forward when I report to OJJDP annually on the grant. It's already cumbersome and I -- so there's some more questions that are going to be added. So some of the data provided comes from the state and data that the state keeps, and some of it comes from the actual grantees of the funds. So it's just kind of letting everybody know new data requirements around the formula grant.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Well, if they would unfreeze our money, then I'd feel better about reporting information to them.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah, I know.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: All right. There are some additional references listed on your agenda. We're not going to go through all those right now because we're pushing an hour and 15 minutes, but those are for your information. A lot of good reading there. I encourage everyone to go on there and check those out. Let's move to agenda item number 12. We're going to set the time for the next meeting. I think that we have our full meeting in June, right? So we'll meet in May before our full meeting in June just to tie up anything because we have some action items going to the full commission. We'll keep our standing agenda items that we have. Does anybody have any other agenda items they want to add to our next agenda for May? Right, seeing none let's set the date. So we're going to stick with our -- are we doing third -- oh, no, we had to reset this one. So usually we do --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: The third Thursday.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Yeah, but I mean, that's -- you know, in three weeks we're not going to have much more information, so I hate to set it. What about May 27th? That's the last Thursday? May 27 at 11:00 a.m. Does that work?

JACK MARTIN: I will not be there. That is Wifey's birthday so there will be no Jack Martin.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Oh, my gosh. We can't even have that, Jack. You have to be here.

JACK MARTIN: Oh, I -- no, no. Trust me. What I find, the wifey's birthday's priority here, but just have Heather sent me notes.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Oh, I'll send you texts all through the meeting.

JACK MARTIN: Good. That is good.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: All right. Let's do May 27th. Tell your wife happy birthday from us that day, Commissioner Martin.

JACK MARTIN: I will. Thank you.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: And have a great time and I appreciate you all. Thank you for joining us today and hanging for an hour and 20 minutes. We covered a lot of information. Welcome, Jacquelyn, one more time, we appreciate you being here, and you guys have a great rest of the week and a wonderful weekend, and I'm going to adjourn the meeting at 12:18 p.m.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Thank you.

KAYLA DUNN: Chair, what was the time on that meeting? I'm sorry.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Eleven.

KAYLA DUNN: Okay. Thank you.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Thank you everybody.

[end of meeting]