



**Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission  
State Advisory Group Planning  
Committee Meeting  
August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2020 at 1:00 pm**

**Meeting Minutes - DRAFT**

**Chair Pauline Salla-Smith called meeting to order at 1:04 pm.**

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

**(VOTING MEMBERS)**

**Present by Phone:** Pauline Salla-Smith, Joey Orduna-Hastings, Rebekah Graham, Jennifer Fraser, Jack Martin, Paula Smith

**Absent:** Mayra Rodriguez-Galindo

**(NON VOTING MEMBERS)**

**Present by Phone:** Eric Smith, Heather Plager

**(STAFF)**

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

**(PUBLIC)**

**Present by Phone:** Andrew Wachter, Jami Bahney

**Meeting Minutes:**

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** All right, we have quorum. I'm so proud of all our members. You guys are doing great coming to these meetings. All right, let's open it up for public comment. Is there any public comment? Say none. Everyone had a chance to review and approve July 16th, 2020 minutes. If so, I will entertain a motion on those minutes.

**Paula Smith:** I'll make a second. This is Commissioner Smith. I'll make a second to approve the minutes of July 16, 2020 meeting.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** All right. Paula -- Commissioner Smith has moved to approve. Can I get a second?

**Jack Martin:** Jack Martin, second.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Thank you, Commissioner Martin. It's been moved and second. Any discussion? Say none. All in favor, say aye. (Ayes) Any opposed? All right. The minutes are accepted as is. Let's move to agenda item number five Nevada Center for Juvenile Justice Innovation update, Andrew. You're on.

**Andrew Wachter:** Sure. Thank you. So I'll be brief. I know that at the last JJOC meeting, there was some discussion with Melissa Sickmund about getting some resources related to COVID-19 and juvenile justice put together and maybe put those up on the website -- the NCJJI website. So, myself and Zoe and Melissa took some time and gathered some resources. They are up on the website as of this afternoon. There is a

large banner at the top of the website that says, COVID Resources Learn More. And when you click that, you will get a word document that lists resources in alphabetical order by organization, particularly some are just statements by other organizations on how they are handling the COVID epidemic as well as we did add at the very bottom, some self-care and wellness resources, particularly around stress for staff themselves. So, it's a living document. If anybody sees anything on their own, that's not there that you would like to add by all means just send me an email with a link and we can easily update this since it is just a PDF that's linked to our webpage. So that got taken care of the next email newsletter that we'll send out will be in about two weeks. And that topic is on Trauma Informed Juvenile Justice Systems. So, incorporating Leslie, some of the things that you indicated in that email to us so we're going to wrap that up in the next week and get that laid out. I would just encourage everybody to check their spam filters. I'm not sure if maybe County --there could be requirements on the County IT end that might block an email from a large mass mailing platform that we use. And in some cases that's an issue. So, if you find that email in your spam, for instance, just if you're allowed to add it to your filter, for instance, do so that, you know, we would like the information to, you know, be seen by lots of folks. So, right now I know we have 300 people in the listserv right now, uh, for Nevada. So, and then the third item that I'll report on is that we are developing another training video. So that's -- that'll be a longer 12 to 15 minute video that'll go on the website as well. The topic is to be determined. So, if anybody has any, you know, pressing matters that they think, you know, would -- they'd like to see in that video, otherwise, you know, I'll meet with the team and we'll talk about where we kind of left off last year in terms of the progression of those training videos and see if there's a natural fit, or if something's more timely, we're certainly open to that as well. So that's all on my end, I would say.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Thank you.

**Andrew Wachter:** Sure.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Now, does anybody have any questions for Andrew? And can we let the record reflect that Rebekah Graham has joined us too? So, we're even over quorum now.

**Rebekah Graham:** I apologize for being late Madam Chair.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** You're all right, Rebekah, thank you. All right, let's move to State and Federal Data Requirements, DCFS Staff, Juvenile Sex Offender Data. But before we move on to that Kayla Dunn is it possible to make me a host so I can share my screen with our documents?

**Kayla Dunn:** Uhm, yes.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** That way --

**Kayla Dunn:** I know I've done this -- oh, here we go. Try it now.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** And then I'll see if -- and hopefully nothing shows up on my screen that, you know, -

**Kayla Dunn:** There we go.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** You see it?

**Kayla Dunn:** Yep.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Okay, and I'll bring up the Juvenile Sex Offender. Oh, really? You come up on this side. Hold on. Let me try that again. Can you see it or no?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Got it?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yep. So for the record, this is Leslie. The Juvenile Sex Offender Treatment Data has been something that we have not been able to update until very recently. So I want to thank both Kayla's -- Kayla Landes and Kayla Dunn who have been able to catch this data up. The Juvenile Sex Offender Data comes to me from the counties and it is basically after a juvenile sex offender case is closed. So, once the case is closed, they send -- the County send a kind of an overall summary of the beginning of the case to the end of the case. There are in a statute, there are certain things that have to be reported on. So that's where these charts and graphs come from. So starting with chart number one, this is the average age at arrest for juvenile sex offenders. And just to let you know why we are splitting things up state fiscal year 13 through 17 is because the state fiscal year 13 and 17 we had one kind of database. And then starting in state fiscal year 18, we started splitting the data up by year. So you're going to see a combination of state fiscal year 13 through 17 on all of these charts and then 18, 19 and 20 are split up. So the first chart provided is age at arrest. So 13, 14 -- 14 years '06 was the average for state fiscal year 13 and 17. Very close for state fiscal year 14.02 years. And it dropped in state fiscal year 19 to just about 13 and a half years old. And then up to close to 14 for state fiscal year 20. Successful Versus Unsuccessful Completion, as you can see, we were very good in state fiscal year 13 through 18 on Successful Versus Unsuccessful with over 95%. That percentage dropped to 87.5 in state fiscal year 19 and to 78 in state fiscal year 20. I do not have a reason why that dropped so much. I have not been able to dig more into the data. But that's what we're showing now. The average length of stay in treatment has really increased from the first years that we kept this data. This is treatment in months of the very first graph shows 16.2 months. And then by state fiscal year 20 we are at almost 20 months of treat -- of time in treatment average length of stay. I will say that this may have something to do with the fact that, you know, the first years -- the state fiscal year through 13 through 17, we had several hundred people in that pool. And then moving over to state fiscal year 20, we only had about 15 people. So that may have something to do with the difference in average length of stay in treatment. So going on to the next page, Madam Chair.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Oh, yeah, I got it.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Thank you. So another thing that we keep track of are the re-offenses. We keep track of the re-offenses during treatment if it is a sexual related charge and the re-offenses of nonsexual related charge. So you'll see on the chart number four that there are not a lot of sexual related offenses during treatment. And then you move on to chart number five and you'll see that there are some non-sexual related re-offenses during treatment. I do not have a breakdown of what those non-offense those -- nonsexual related offenses are, but that would be anything from drug offenses to armed robbery or battery or assault, any of those things that are just not a sex -- sexual related charge. And then going on through charts six and seven, this is really why we don't get the data until several months after the case is closed, because we asked the counties to follow up on -- to see if these youth, after a successful completion of treatment, if they committed another re-offense. And again, we keep that data by a sexual type charge and a non-sexual type charge. So as you will see in chart number six not a lot of re-offenses that are a sexual charge after three to six months after treatment is over that you move down to chart number seven and you find that does go up. And for some reason in state fiscal year 19, almost a third or about a third had had a new offense. I don't have any details around why that is. But, that's the data. And then I gave you the information on the data sets. So for state fiscal year 13 through 17 we had 409 subjects. And then 94 in 18; 40 in 19, and 18 in state fiscal year 20. There may be additional data that comes in for state fiscal

year 20. Sometimes that comes in six months, seven, eight months after the year is over. So I may have some updated information for state fiscal year 20 after this presentation. But that is data related to juvenile sex offenders. Are there any questions?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Okay. Members, any questions?

**Heather Plager:** I just have a question, I guess, looking at the numbers, it looks like they've drastically dropped since fiscal year 18, just but like the number of youth. And I'm wondering if that's because, I don't know what everybody else is noticing, but I think a lot of our district attorneys in through the court system, sex offenders are getting pled down because of the registration and community notification requirements. And I didn't know if other people are seeing that or if we think that's what's causing these numbers to drop at least.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** At least for Humboldt County. That's, that's what we're seeing too. And I'm wondering if -- I mean, we're seeing a lot -- especially when the injunction was lifted from Adam Walsh requirement's right. That's when we started seeing our DA's really negotiate juvenile sex offenses. So Jennifer, did you have something you want to say?

**Jennifer Fraser:** Yeah I was just going to say in Clark County our cases have been increasing every year since '17. Sometimes we're able to negotiate to avoid registration consequences, but even then they're still pleading to gross misdemeanor sex offenses. So I imagine those would be still reported. But yeah, every year since maybe 2016 the numbers are going up a lot of filings.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Thank you. Yeah, I do think that especially -- this is Commissioner Salla, I do think, especially with those decrease in numbers that we might want to do some exploration around where that's coming from. And, and although, I mean, we have to remember that state fiscal year 20, if we're not, if jurisdictions aren't reporting until they're discharged off probation there's probably going to be a lag time. And at least previously when I was collecting the data for the State, sometimes we it's, you know, I mean, I do it here too, I forget to report after a youth has completed probation. And this is one of those areas where we might just need a gentle reminder, like to make sure that we're capturing that data after they're off probation.

**Leslie Bittleston:** And Madame Chair, maybe it would be a good idea to mention this at the next NJJO meeting to remind the jurisdictions that it's time to provide their juvenile sex offender data. S, but like I said, I do expect to see some increase for state fiscal year 20, because that does come in pretty slowly.

**Jennifer Fraser:** Well, I have another question. This is Jennifer. With the data about re-offense of non-sexual nature are violations of probation counted in any of those? Or are those not?

**Leslie Bittleston:** This is Leslie for the record, I am unable to answer that because in the data that I get, I just get a check box. And the check boxes they re-offended and the re-offense is either a sexual related crime or non.

**Jennifer Fraser:** Okay.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah. So I cannot answer that.

**Jennifer Fraser:** Okay, thank you.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Uh-huh.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Any other questions on this? All right. Let's move on to the next one.

**Leslie Bittleston:** I believe that is room con -- not Room Confinement -- Community Partnership Block Grant. Okay, Community Services Block Grant. And for those of you new to this committee the SAG Committee may not be familiar with the Community Services Block Grant so I'm just going to give you a little overview of what it is. It is a block grant of state general fund money that is awarded annually and split up amongst the 17 counties based on school-age population. So the block grant total is a little over 2.3 million and DCFS State Staff -- Fiscal Staff gather the school aged children in every county every year and splits up that 2.3 million annually. And then it goes out to the counties for frontline services. So, this report as you can see the amount -- the specific amount is \$2,349,803.97. As I said, this is state general funds. So this has a little bit different than federal funding. Even though we call it a block grant it is state funding. So for state fiscal year 20 there were 879 total youth served; 71% of those were male. The average age was 15.51 years and 53% were white and 47% were minorities. Moving on to chart number one, that is the actual breakdown of the youth served by race, ethnicity, 53% white as we said with the remaining 29% Latino Hispanic, 10% African American, and so on. Chart number two is an age breakdown of those youth served. The way that we break this down is under 10; 10 to 12; 13 to 15; 16 to 17; and 17 plus. Because we do have some youth that are 18 to 21 that are still under juvenile court. So, there is a small percentage of that. And as you can see, the majority of the youth served are between the ages of 16 and 17 and then 13 and 15. The gender breakdown 71% male, 29% female. And then chart number four goes on and talks about the YLS risk. We only received -- or I only received the risk level for roughly 36% of the Total Youth Served. So, based on the 36% that did provide a risk level this is how the risk breakdown was broken down. And as you can see, 128 were moderate, that was the highest 103 high and 59 low and 11 very high. What was really interesting about the risk breakdown, I was unable to really do a lot of analysis around what kind of offenses were associated with the risk level. The one thing that I did notice is the offenses that were assault with a deadly weapon were either high or very high. But that was about all I could do with that. I hope to have a better data set with state fiscal year 21. But that's what we've got 20. Are there any questions on block grant data?

**Pauline Salla-Smith::** I have a -- I have a question. I have a couple of questions. One, did we change the name of this money? Is it Community Corrections still or Community Services? Cause --

**Leslie Bittleston:** It's probably Community Corrections and I made an error. My apologies.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** So let's -- Yeah, Community Corrections. Okay.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** And the other thing is that, I guess my question is what is the importance of the YLS overall risk breakdown for this funding if it's for front end services? Which would technically, I mean, if we're trying to divert our kids from escalating in the system, which is the intention of this funding, like to keep kids in our community and, I'm a little confused and concerned that we would include YLS overall risk break down.

**Leslie Bittleston:** I think this is Leslie for the record, I think that being that the YLS is so new we are looking at it both on the front end and the back end because as you know, we provide data, DCFS Commitment Data, and we hope what we are seeing is going to continue. Because what we see here is that the majority of the risk level that has been provided has been moderate or low. And we hope that out of the commitments we see the majority of high and very high and some moderate. So that's kind of what we hope to see. So, that's,

I think what we internally at DCFS are looking at. It doesn't mean we always have to look at it, but we did include this because the YLS is new to all of us and we kind of wanted to see what it is showing us.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Uh-huh, I think that we need to be careful with that because it's front end, we're blurring our two systems that are our Juvenile Probation departments and then the State, and this is front end money and it just like, I just get a little concerned. I mean, the YLS, it -- like my data for front end services we're going to have a lot of moderate kids. We're not going to for my CCP money. It's for to keep our kids in our community and divert them from the system. So I just want to make sure we're using data from the YLS appropriately and capturing what we want to, especially for our funding sources. Because this makes it look like we're, you know, that we're using this money that if someone who's not aware of it will be like, well, shouldn't the very high kids, if we don't want them to go to State, but State commitment is not the only thing we're trying to divert our kids on from the front end system. We're trying to divert them from escalating in our system at all. So, I just caution this the way we're going to use the YLS data for CCP. That's just my thoughts.

**Jack Martin:** I have some thoughts also Chair Woman Salla.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Oh, go for it. Go for it.

**Jack Martin:** Well, if we're going to capture risk and that's going to be something that we've -- and we're going to quantify it in data that's great. But I don't think it's truly representative, like you just said, and I don't want to repeat what you just said, but I also think the basis other than Clark is to wrap the child in the appropriate services. Right? So if we're going to quantify that, then are we also going to qualify the services that were leveled? Right. So, I mean, you know what I mean? So, and that I think is almost un-trackable for myself because with 11,000 kids that touched my system last year then it looks like around 2300 that we would have YLS'd that could become a monster that I don't know if I can shake that tree. But I definitely agree with you that we need to be very careful that we don't try to turn this tool into something it's not.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Uh-huh.

**Jack Martin:** Just my two cents.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah. Thank you. Any other members have questions, concerns, clarifications? All right.

**Leslie Bittleston:** And then -- okay, and then going on with the list of charges so chart number five of, so out of the, youth served this was a breakdown of the charges. As you can see, the majority are drug related offenses. Some were not provided and those were mostly more referrals. Because when a charge wasn't provided the sending County said Referral or Diverted or something like that. So I did have quite a few not provided and then the assault battery, the minor in consumption all the way down. So that is what we saw for the charges for the youth that were served. So, and that is it.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** So just to keep in the spirit of transparency, this doesn't include Humboldt County's because I haven't done my State final report yet. So I will do that though and because we serve a lot of kids with that funding. But I can tell you that our YLS's are moderate on those. They're not going to be our high kids. Okay.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** Madam chair, This is Joey. May I ask a question?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Sure.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** On the list of referral charges that, Ms. Bittleston just finished on the not provided the fact that it's the second highest number I wonder if we could footnote the data to at least say, you know, upon further inquiry these were some of the things that -- or items that this 106 represents. Because to just say not provided it just concerns me that maybe further drill down is required or maybe it's not relevant that it be those, whatever those items are continue to be in the data set of 106. It's just such a high number I just wonder if it's worth drilling down a bit to clean up the data.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I agree. And thank you, thank you, Joey. Do we know why -- I mean, I'm trying to think of the ones that I reported on before. Do we know why they're not provided? I mean, were they like --

**Leslie Bittleston:** No, yeah I don't know why they weren't provided. I did not follow up with the sending counties. They would just -- they either were put NA or diverted or referral that's the -- those make up the not -- the not provided. But I -- no I did not follow up with the counties, but I can if that is a request of this committee to get some more information.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I just think that if you're going to -- if we're going to use data, I don't even think it has to be a request of this committee because if, I mean, I would follow up with the jurisdictions and just say like, you know, is there not, maybe there's so many numbers that it's hard to get, you know, to identify all those, but our kids come into our system with some kind of referral with some kind of charge. I mean, even in some of the smaller jurisdictions, it could be a community referral just to get services. So, I mean, I think that in order to us to have really true data follow up with the jurisdictions would probably be beneficial.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Will do.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Any other questions, concerns? All right, let's move on to the next one. Which is what? What's the next one? We have SB 107.

**Leslie Bittleston:** That would be Ms. Kayla Landes.

**Kayla Landes:** That's it.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** All right, Kayla, you're up.

**Kayla Landes:** Okay. Again, I don't really have a whole lot to report. This -- the graphs that you're looking at right now for the County Detention Facilities. And I will make a note that the last full JJOC a question was brought up regarding the room confinement and I had sent out an email to all the detention centers and the state facilities. The question that was brought up was is it possible to sort out how much of the decrease and confinements are due to reduced populations and how much might be due to change practices? And I've actually gotten a lot of responses back. So, during the next full JJOC I'll be able to report back on everybody. And I think that that's pretty important because I think a lot of it is the reduced number, but a lot of it isn't due to COVID like I've stated in the past. So, it's been really nice to hear back from all of the detention centers and the state facilities to see that really it's about, you know, the staff and it's about, you know, they are changing their practices and how they're trained to do the cool offs and all of that before putting a kid straight to room confinement. And I think it shows, you know, Douglas County has stated that their numbers have gone up, which you can see in the numbers, but for the most part everything's been

decreasing, which is nice to see. And it's, like I said, it was nice to hear back from all the counties to hear what they have to say about it. So I'll put a whole report together once I get everybody's responses back.

**Jack Martin:** Madam Chair, just as a question for Ms. Landes, if possible.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Sure.

**Kayla Landes:** Only if it's an easy question.

**Jack Martin:** Okay. Well, I'm sorry. And I apologize. And I'm trying to do three things at once, but I heard you say this is okay for staff. I don't understand that. Cause room confinement affects children, not staff. So can you explain that to me?

**Kayla Landes:** No. I meant that their practices with their staff training, their staff.

**Jack Martin:** Oh, okay.

**Kayla Landes:** Yeah, no, nothing for no -- it's just in their training techniques with staff and trying to detour putting kids directly into confinement.

**Jack Martin:** Perfect. All right. I was going to say boy I tell you what, when we're doing stuff for staff, that really bothers me in a whole other problem. But, okay, I appreciate that clarification.

**Kayla Landes:** Yes. And I don't want to get on your bad side, Jack. So --

**Jack Martin:** Oh, come on I'm a sweetheart.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Kayla. I've been on his bad side and I've come back around. We've worked through stuff. Jack and you -- he'll work through it with you. What, Jack, you were muted. What did you say?

**Jack Martin:** Thank God I was muted.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** We're still working through it. All right. Any questions? Let's move to DMC summary. Is that the template we're looking at?

**Leslie Bittleston:** I believe so. Oh no, that's not it. It's the red data. There you go. Okay. So again, for the new people on the committee this is the breakdown of the racial and ethnic disparity data that comes to me directly from the counties every year. It comes in around January of every year. So the first table that you see here is the raw data breakdown from each county in each contact point. The contact point of course is referral arrest. And just to go through the top referrals, arrest, secure detention. So that would be the detention in the county, state confinement. So the number of youth coming to DCFS for state services, certification, probation, so formal probation placements, citations, placed in a county youth camp, diversions, petitions and delinquent. So that is the raw data, uh, by county with the total at the bottom. So at the bottom you can see 18,609 referrals, 8,314 arrests, and so on. Moving on to table number two, again, this is a raw data breakdown of the same data in chart number one, but just broken down in male versus female. And then chart number three that is the breakdown again of the same data in chart number one, but broken down by racial and ethnic groups. So as you can see across the top Caucasian and then African American, Hispanic. So that is breaking down the data by racial and ethnic group. And then moving on to chart number one, this is the referral source. So where are those referrals coming from? So 28.8% come from school police, 55. Almost 7 come from local law enforcement and so on. And just to give you a little

more information around this data is I would say Clark County and Washoe County have a lot of referrals coming from the school police. The rural counties tend to have a lot of their referrals coming straight from law enforcement. That could be because they don't have school resource officers or something like that, like Clark and Washoe have in their school systems. So that's the referral source. The household composition, which is chart number two this data is provided -- this is a fairly new performance measure so I do not have the data for all of the individuals. So this is probably about 30% of the overall arrested youth. And this is how their household composition is broken down. The majority have one biological parent in the house. So that is a breakdown of the racial and ethnic disparity data. And I don't have the agenda up. Did I have looking at the DMC template under that?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah. I have a quick question though or --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** -- or recommendation --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** -- especially because the household composition was added, was a new performance measure that was added, I think that we should, you know, document that on here. Because there was jurisdictions who weren't collecting that for the full year. And so this data is not accurate or it won't match the number of youth in the raw data.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** And so I would -- I think we need to asterisk that.

**Leslie Bittleston:** So, we'll asterisk that. Okay, will do.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** And then I'll pull up the DMC template.

**Leslie Bittleston:** So just to give everybody an idea of what the counties provide me, every year this is the template that the county data staff provide me every year. And with new performance measures and new requests and things that come in it seems that this template is revised annually. So, the orange color or brown color or whatever, rust color I don't know what color that is that is something that's been asked year after year. The blue is more updated data. Either it was a question or a clarification on data. So this is how the counties are reporting. The data that we just went over to me -- it comes to me, I get 17 of these every year. So going forward, I have requested the Tyler Supervision create this template and so I can pull the data from each jurisdiction. My understanding from Tyler Supervision is this template has been completed. However, there is still a lot of work to configure everybody's reports since everybody captures data a little bit differently. So my hope is that Tyler Supervision will be finished with all of their configurations by the end of the year when this is due. If they are not finished, then some counties will probably have to submit this again. But just to let the committee know that this is what goes out to the counties and what is reported back to me that feeds all of that raw data that we just reviewed. Are there any questions? There's a lot of stuff on here.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah. So this, okay this is Commissioner Salla, so this looks like a combination of the federal VMC report and then the state added additional items to collect in here.

**Leslie Bittleston:** That is correct.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** So is the items that the state added to capture disparate data or to gather that data, just to gather that data?

**Leslie Bittleston:** So, in the -- this is Leslie for the record, so in answering that question just to kind of give some history, there's a lot of that data is federally required. And then in 2017, 2018 timeframe the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission requested additional information. And internally within DCFS and with the data committee, we talked about ways to collect that data, to make it as easy as possible on the counties. And this was an idea that came out from the data committee to say, Hey, if we're already asking them for a bunch of data, just add the things that we need to there. So if this is not a satisfactory thing you know, but this is kind of a combo between federal and state data requirements. I wouldn't say that all of the state data requirements are disparate or fall under racial and ethnic disparities. But it was a way to include all of that extra data that the JJOC wanted.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Okay. So, then this would be the template moving forward, it won't be asked for this current reporting period then, right?

**Leslie Bittleston:** That's correct.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** So this data collection will start -- cause we wright -- this'll start October 1st is when we'll start collecting data for this report?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right. And what I do normally is I do send out the most updated template to the jurisdictions. And then as I speak to each one of them one by one if there's something that you are not collecting then I always say, just put an NA there and note that you have to start collecting it for next year. So I like to provide the most current templates. So jurisdictions do know what is required going forward. So that option of NA we'll collect for next year is always there.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** So, this is the template we're going to get to report --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** -- going on? So, okay.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, for clarification, you will get this template. Yes. Also you will have the option to put NA with any areas that you are not currently collecting.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** So I think that this -- that this should probably be presented at NAJA with that explanation, because I think that the last time we spoke about it we weren't going to be expected to do this until a future date. So if this comes out to us to report in January, when it comes out, then really it is about asking us for data currently of new standards when that's not what our discussion had been about. So I'd give -- I'd bring this up at NAJA to have some discussion there so everybody's on the same page.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. And also to clarify that jurisdictions do have the ability to put NA in there. And that's absolutely fine. But just to keep up with the data that the state is being asked to provide that's why I always am updating this template. But I am more than happy to bring this to NAJA with that clarification.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah, we'll add it to the -- and then I just have one more question on this, were the federal definitions changed for the --

**Leslie Bittleston:** No, the federal definitions were not changed.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Okay. Some of them look different, but I could be out of the loop. So, thank you. I just wanted to know if they were changed.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** All right. Any other questions? Tyler Supervision better get hopping on that.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, they should. I talk to them every -- once a month and they said, this is a slow process because it's a lot of behind the scenes work. That's what they tell me.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** We don't get to use that though when our data is due. So --

**Leslie Bittleston:** I know I told them that too, so --

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah. All right. Any other questions? All right. I don't have a -- it doesn't look like, do I have a document for new JJDP Requirements? Because I don't see it.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Oh, maybe I forgot. I'm sorry. I originally had three committee meetings for today and one got moved. So I was really struggling to get all of the things together. So to about the JJDP requirements it was really focused on where we wanted to start with data requirements. Because at our last SAG meeting we talked about the new OJJDP requirements that came out with the 2018 reauthorization of the JJDP Act. So there were some things that we already collect. There's some things that we partially collect and some things we don't collect at all. So it was really kind of the focus where we want to start and the best way to collect that. But we can move that to the next SAG meeting, Madame Chair, if that is what your recommendation is.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah. We're going to move that. We do have a data committee too, and I'll make sure that I'm on that when we have one coming up. But the other thing is, is that it was like if we had that -- the clear spreadsheet of what we're collecting and what we're not collecting and across all the new entities that are requiring us to share data that I think we need -- that's what I want for this committee. So then we can really break it down and see. I mean, I want to know where all the data requirements coming from, because now we have AB 449 added to us too, along with all the other ones that we've already been discussing, but to have a spreadsheet of what we're collecting, what we're not collecting, then we can go through that and have a really clear conversation about if it's feasible, how we're going to do it, when are we going to set the start date, not like the way we've been doing it, because we're not getting accurate data. If jurisdictions have to backtrack and we have to pull files and count them by hand we're missing some. I know I'm missing some. So like as soon as we have that spreadsheet, then I think we can have some honest discussion about that.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah, my apologies, Madam Chair, I think that was an oversight. I will have that prepared for our next meeting.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Okay. Thank you. So let's move that to the next meeting. I'm going to move the agenda back. I got way too many sharing screens here. Okay. Let's move, oh, I'm next for the Jurisdictions and Identifying Approved Mental Health Screening Tools for the County. I'm going to share one more, I have to add this, sorry. So, you know, during our last full commission, we had approval to choose our mental health screening tool for our probation based kids, not detention, we're all using MAYSI still as long as it was reliable and validated and met the requirements of 62 P that then we could take that to the full

commission. So I'm happy to report that the jurisdictions have all identified what they're going to be using with the caveat that some are going to use the MAYSI until they look at some other ones that have been chosen to see if they want to move to that. So Carson MAYSI -- is going to use MAYSI, Washoe is MAYSI, Lyon is MAYSI, Elko is GAIN, the GAIN SS, Nye, Esmerelda is MAYSI, Humboldt we're using the same one as Elko. White Pine for now is using MAYSI. Clark is using the pediatric symptom checklist and Jack did this beautiful write-up right here that showed it's reliable and validated. Thank you, I appreciate that. Douglas is using MAYSI. Churchill is using MAYSI for now. They're actually researching some other -- some of the other tools. And Lander, Pershing, and Mineral are going to use MAYSI for now too. So all of the ones that are chosen meet 62 B that they're reliable and validated. That's one of the things we had to ensure. So if it's -- we can have some discussion about any of these if you would like to today. But then our goal is to take it to the full Commission and work with the -- and work with DCFS and the State to make sure that we're all on the same page so that jurisdictions can choose their tool. Questions, comments, concerns? No? We're good? All right. We will be moving the list forward to the full Commission and Ross Armstrong also with the State. All right. And if the jurisdictions change before the next full Commission, I'll update our sheet here too to include in our packet for the full Commission. SAG work plan?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes. I believe I did include a document, SAG, it's way over on your -- it's my very left. It says SAG Committee Work.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah. I'm bringing it up here.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. I wanted to include this for the group to look at because I will be presenting an updated full JJOC Commission with committee breakdown of their work plans. This is what I have currently for the SAG committee. A lot of the top is the evidence-based resource center thing. And those were on hold pending funding. But as you heard from Andrew a little while ago, we are starting to move forward on some of these things. So we will be able to address and put some partial completions on these. So really my question to the group is, are there things on here that you don't want on here? Are there things that are missing? What other things would you like me to have, or what would you like me to remove as I update it and presented to the full Commission at the next meeting.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I don't know if we can remove any, because some of them -- most of them were assigned through the full JJOC or their federal requirements --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** -- which fall under the SAG. So as I'm looking through them I can't see any, I mean, some of these are federal. Yeah, I don't see any that we can remove.

**Leslie Bittleston:** And my second question, do you think something is missing? Have I forgotten to put something on here?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Well, DSO follows under us too or to federal law.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I don't see that on here.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I mean, I think you can just do it. Add it to the plan to remove juveniles for adult jails. That's a core requirement. So is deinstitutionalization of status --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** -- offenders. So I would just add that. And actually I'd like to get some of these other completed before we --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** The data, I think the data requirements are probably bigger than what it says there.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. So, maybe expand the data requirement a little bit?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Uh-huh.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. And just because we complete them doesn't mean they go away, they just go on the completed spreadsheet that we have. So it's just --

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Right.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah. So they don't ever go away. They become a hundred percent and they move to the completed and we get more assignments.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Uh-huh. Any other members have questions on that? No? All right. And just -- we lost the -- Jack and Joey had to take off at two, so we lost them. So we can't -- we're going to hold YLS, CMI placeholder, because now I don't think we have quorum.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** We don't. I think we're going to hold the rest of them. Because I don't want us to get into any issues with open meeting.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** So, we'll -- do we have our next meeting set up Kayla or Leslie?

**Leslie Bittleston:** No, we don't.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Okay. So, because we're taking some stuff to the full Commission in October, like let's meet in September if we can keep it around the same timeframe on a Thursday, the part of the month that would be great. So we can finish up our action items.

**Leslie Bittleston:** That would be --

**Kayla Landes:** Should I send out a Doodle for the last week of September?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** What are we --

**Leslie Bittleston:** I think she -- I think she's saying Thursday at one o'clock.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah, the third Thursday. What's Thursday?

**Kayla Landes:** Third Thursday?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yes. Is it the third Thursday of the month? Our meetings?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes. It's the third Thursday. I'm trying to pull up the actual date.

**Kayla Landes:** It's the 17th.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah, if we can keep it around that time I think that that's been working for us.

**Kayla Landes:** Okay.

**Leslie Bittleston:** So that would be September 17th at 1:00 PM.

**Kayla Landes:** I will send out the invite.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Okay. All right. I do have to call for public comment real quick before I close it. Any public comment? All right. Let's adjourn this meeting at 2:01 PM. Thank you guys. Thank you all for joining. Be safe. Have a great rest of the week.

**Leslie Bittleston:** You too.

**Kayla Landes:** Thanks Pauline.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Thanks, bye.  
[end of meeting]