



Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission
Data Performance
Committee Meeting
August 25th, 2020 at 2:00pm

Meeting Minutes - DRAFT

Roll Call-

Commissioner Brigid Duffy, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:05pm. Leslie Bittleston took roll call and confirmed that quorum was made.

(VOTING MEMBERS)

Present by Phone: Chair Brigid Duffy, Ross Armstrong, Gianna Verness, Pauline Salla-Smith, Scott Shick

Absent: Ryley Harris

(NON VOTING MEMBERS)

Present by Phone: None

Absent: Ali Banister

(STAFF)

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

(PUBLIC)

Present by Phone: Lexi Beck – Youth Move Nevada

Meeting Minutes:

Brigid Duffy: Okay. Any public comment or discussion? All right. Hearing none, I'm going to move to review and approve the minutes from March 23rd and June 11. They were in the meeting materials. Hopefully, people got a chance to review them. Do I have a motion to approve? We'll start with March 23rd, 2020. I thought -- we didn't approve those last time? We had quorums.

Leslie Bittleston: We did that but we didn't have the --

Brigid Duffy: Minutes.

Leslie Bittleston: -- meeting minutes completed.

Brigid Duffy: Okay.

Scott Shick: I wasn't here, so I can't participate.

Brigid Duffy: Right. It would have to be Ross and Gianna.

Gianna Verness: I'll move, Gianna Verness for the record, to approve the meeting minutes from March 23rd.

Ross Armstrong: And this is Ross. I second that.

Brigid Duffy: All right. All those in favor, aye. (Ayes around). Any opposed? All right. They pass. And the June 11 minutes?

Gianna Verness: Giana Verness again. I would move to approve those minutes, June 11th, 2020.

Brigid Duffy: I can second those. All those in favor, aye. (Ayes around). Any opposition? All right. They pass. Now, and for those who kind of jumped on a little late, we do have some time constraints. Thank you for moving the meeting. I needed it moved. We did the grand opening of our third Harbor here at Clark County last Thursday and it fell right in the middle of our meeting time and I did not want to miss that. It was a very limited amount of people that could be there for the opening due to social distancing and since we worked so hard to start it, I didn't want to miss it. So thanks for moving this meeting today, but now we do have time constraints with a few members, so that's why I'm trying to move as quickly as I can to get as much done as possible. We will have to end by 2:50 at the latest. So in Item Number 5, we have the Supreme Court Data Dictionary Review, and thank you for attaching that, Leslie, to the meeting materials or Kayla. I'm not sure who attached it. I did spend time last night. Well, I've reviewed it years ago when we were on the original Supreme Court reform, but reviewed it again last night and had a couple of things I, you know, wanted to talk about as far as what this subcommittee was looking for definitions for and what is currently in this data dictionary. So, Pauline or Scott, do you want to give a background for this data dictionary from back in 2014?

Scott Shick: Sure. Go ahead, Pauline.

Pauline Salla-Smith: Go ahead, Scott. You got it.

Scott Shick: You know, they called us together and for weeks, we, you know, worked on this document and back and forth and shot it out to legislators and the chiefs as far as the data dictionary and I know that the Supreme Court staff worked on it very hard with us to configure it. I'm looking at it right now and we felt when the project was done, when, you know, when the dictionary was done, it reflected very accurately at that time, you know, what, you know, with the categories that it was broken down into and the definitions and what we found across the state was that there were, you know, people had different definitions for the same thing and so we tried to kind of streamline that and kind of get the best possible definition for traffic offense or a referral or a petition or whatever that might be in order for us to collect, when we did start collecting data on like we are now, that we would all be reporting on the same thing. It was reflected in statute. So that's the result of this document, and I was just looking at the recidivism definition that we had gone through. I know that came up in your last meeting, so here it is. So I think its 2014, how much has changed since then. That might be something we want to, we want to take into consideration.

Pauline Salla-Smith: And the only thing I'll add to that is that I think it was our 2012 DMC report to the Feds, jurisdictions were using different definitions for each of those categories and so our numbers didn't look very good for some of our larger jurisdictions and that was the discussion we had is that some people were reporting on definitions through the state and some were using the federal definitions, so we had to separate out the OJ JDP definitions for DMC so that everyone collects it the same because we had disparate treatment in 6 of our 17 counties, so that wasn't, we were red flagged on that, and so we wanted to separate out what you have to use for OJ JDP reporting, what we use for NRS statutes, and then NACs, so that we were all collecting the data on the same definitions.

Brigid Duffy: And I still think that the state is struggling with counties giving different information that they're trying to gather. Right, Leslie?

Leslie Bittleston: Sorry. I was on mute. I think that, yes and no. Yes, because sometimes I've had conversations with individual counties on clarifying, is this what I'm collecting? The biggest one we have is the referrals and I think that the confusion sometimes comes that every referral's an arrest or every referral's something else, so I think that that is still a confusion amongst the counties. The other areas like diversion and things though, that's another area that we struggle with because all counties do diversion a little bit differently, so they want to know what's counted as diversion and what isn't counted as diversion, so I think those are the two areas that we still struggle with.

Brigid Duffy: Right. So this committee or subcommittee recommended that referral be any time, regardless of whether it's an arrest or a petition being filed, a citation that that be considered a referral to the juvenile justice system. So on Page 22 of the data book --

Scott Shick: Yeah, I see it.

Brigid Duffy: Yeah. So I made sure I wrote down the page. So that Page 22, it's kind of broken down differently and I can see now with kind of, with the explanation that you have, the OJJDP, which just means petitions filed, if I'm reading that correctly.

Scott Shick: That's a court referral.

Brigid Duffy: That's a court referral.

Scott Shick: Yeah, and that's then just to NAC, Nevada Administrative, just a referral.

Ross Armstrong: On the next page, that there's a definition for DMC report referral and that looks closest to what we, I think, had agreed upon earlier in the committee, Brigid?

Brigid Duffy: Right.

Ross Armstrong: Because it includes anytime it's sent forward for legal processing and received by a juvenile court or juvenile intake agency.

Scott Shick: So that's a potentially delinquent. That's good language.

Gianna Verness: Right, and, Brigid, this is Gianna Verness. Hadn't we also discussed wanting to make sure that minor traffic that's handled by traffic court not being included?

Scott Shick: Yes.

Brigid Duffy: Yes.

Gianna Verness: Okay.

Brigid Duffy: Like it's potentially delinquent.

Pauline Salla-Smith: And that is clarified with OJJDP, too, that traffic citations do not count.

Scott Shick: Yeah. And that's a good point because we used to aggregate those years ago.

Brigid Duffy: So would it be helpful to make a recommendation that we seek to have a definition of referral put into statute because we referred to, we refer to referrals in statute, but there's no definition of it.

Scott Shick: But I agree with that. I think that would bring all these brains together to figure that one out and, along with recidivism and because there's a lot of room for interpretation sometimes if we just leave it in a dictionary.

Brigid Duffy: Right. But it appears from following along that there is an OJ JDP report that each of the counties is required to do and now there are statewide reporting measures that we are requiring counties to do. Right?

Scott Shick: Yes.

Brigid Duffy: And I don't think, for what I see with your DMC and this subcommittee that the state wants to limit it just to court referrals that we really want to look at every referral to the juvenile justice system. But the OJ JDP re-only does court referrals. Is that right?

Pauline Salla-Smith: The OJ JDP does referrals, so any type of referral, citation, police report arrest, the DMC report referrals is all of them excluding traffic.

Brigid Duffy: Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: Right. And just to add to what Pauline said, that's been something that I've tried to clarify over the last few years with counties, that we want everything that's referred to the department, the probation department, with exception of traffic.

Brigid Duffy: Okay.

Ross Armstrong: And this is Ross. Leslie, did we include a definition of referral in the NAC revisions that are with the legislature now?

Leslie Bittleston: No, we didn't.

Ross Armstrong: Okay. So that's something we could add before final adoption of those NACs.

Leslie Bittleston: Right. And we are still pending the drafts of those. I just requested an update a week ago and they're still going through LCB review process.

Scott Shick: So Ross, you would recommend the DMC report language or is there a different shape in your mind to that?

Ross Armstrong: I mean, I think that it sounds like we would want to include that DMC language is closest, but we would want to check it and make sure that it excludes traffic citations and maybe take a look at where the and's and or's are and make sure those are correctly organizing things. But I think it's something we could easily put in the newly drafted NACs, which wouldn't necessarily take an NRS change.

Brigid Duffy: Why does it say complaint by a citizen?

Scott Shick: My kids or neighbors are having a party. I don't know.

Brigid Duffy: You can refer that to the juvenile justice system without calling for law enforcement intervention?

Scott Shick: You can file a report, you know, come down and file a report and give it to somebody to look into. You know, I mean, you, and if somebody threw a rock through my window and I wanted to come down to the sheriff's department and I saw Billy do it, and I could just say, Hey, Billy did this and I saw him do it and I just want to file a complaint and the sheriff had looked into it. I mean, that's a simple --

Pauline Salla-Smith: It comes to us as a police report with just like submit to juvenile services for review or if they file a report with a law enforcement agency.

Brigid Duffy: And then what can the juvenile services do with that?

Pauline Salla-Smith: We can forward it to the DA, but with those kinds of reports, nothing's going to happen. So, usually we submitted just keep it as information only and the law, our law enforcement, tells the people who are filing it, like, look, we're not investigating it. We didn't see it. We can file a report for you for insurance purposes or if there's destruction of property or something. But, I mean, I don't think I've gotten one of those. I think maybe I've gotten one in five years. It's not a common thing for us. I don't know. For Scott maybe.

Scott Shick: Nor for us.

Pauline Salla-Smith: I do think that some of the confusion comes from, it looks like on our DMC template that the definitions that the Feds meant, like, have for us to report on have been changed or shortened, because we used to have the-the specific federal definition on there, which I know is a little longer, but that way, you know, it says it can be referral as a potentially delinquent youth sent forward for legal processing and received by juvenile or family court, juvenile intake agency, either as a result of law enforcement action or upon a complaint by a citizen. I don't even think we had that and we had that part, but I think our definitions have been shortened on the report, which leads to the ability to interpret it differently for jurisdictions.

Brigid Duffy: I don't know that I've seen a copy of it, of that DMC report.

Leslie Bittleston: You will later.

Brigid Duffy: Okay. I looked over to my left. I don't know what that looks like on your screen, but that's this that you sent out?

Scott Shick: Yeah.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Brigid Duffy: Okay. All right. Yeah. I did review that. That's why I looked over on it, because I'm like this and you said you see, and that's on here, Pauline?

Pauline Salla-Smith: Well, when the template, that template, looks like definitions have been shortened. So what we used to have, like, with our DMC report is the specific federal definition after each One so that jurisdictions knew, like, we have to report. This is for DMC. Its federal definitions. We have to report on this, on these definitions, not what we think it is, not what we want it to be, and it had like excluding traffic

citations and status offenses. It had that little caveat before that those two were, you know, were kicked out.

Scott Shick: It's a way different report.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah, and that's and that's on me and I will double check the federal definitions as they have changed. Some of them have changed over time and we no longer have a federal manual. There used to be a federal policy manual. That has been removed from use, so it's getting harder and harder to determine what the Feds want.

Pauline Salla-Smith: I have the old version, so if it's helpful, I can --

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah, if you have the old version, if you can send it, that would be great. I don't have any references anymore. They've removed everything.

Scott Shick: Is there an office of OJ JDP still?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, but they're-- don't get me started on that.

Scott Shick: Understood. Sorry.

Brigid Duffy: So our job is to make a recommendation to the full commission on the definition of what a referral is for our state and, you know, going back to, I mean the data book really does sum up where we were going anyway, except I've never heard of a complaint by a citizen going directly to a juvenile justice agency. Like, we only get citations or --

Scott Shick: I mean, a complaint could be, there was a party next door and then they bust it, but, you know, and then they find stuff that, you know, violations here. But I don't know how, you don't want to read into that. It's really not necessary. In my opinion, but it's in there.

Pauline Salla-Smith: Yeah. And the referral definition from the Feds that by a complainant as I'm looking at it. It didn't have that. It has everything except with the exception of traffic citations and status offenses.

Brigid Duffy: Okay. And I have the feeling that school referrals are different, like, you don't mean like school police or school resource officers citing a kid. You mean like the school principal sends a referral to the juvenile justice agency.

Pauline Salla-Smith: That could be for diversion and truancy, so like a school official has, like, the principal or whoever the attendance officer is.

Brigid Duffy: They have the ability to do that?

Pauline Salla-Smith: They can cite in statute for smaller jurisdictions.

Scott Shick: School resource officer can, yes.

Pauline Salla-Smith: And vice-principals can. Whoever the attendance official is.

Scott Shick: Oh.

Leslie Bittleston: Right, and with the 2018 reauthorization, the feds have requested an additional breakdown of referrals, like how many come from school grounds? How many come from off school grounds, but a school function? So there's some new things that we have been talking about in the side committee on how to obtain some of this new information. So yes, they do change and usually they want more information.

Brigid Duffy: So somewhere in NRS for smaller counties, there's the ability for the school, not a law enforcement agency, to cite a kid into juvenile court.

Pauline Salla-Smith: To cite a kid for habitual truancy. I'm looking it up right now.

Brigid Duffy: Okay. Great. Thank you, Pauline.

Pauline Salla-Smith: In 392.

Scott Shick: If there's a crime committed on campus, it's typically the school resource officer and we have them that frequent all of our campuses here that do that arrest if necessary and citation to follow up with that and sometimes those kids are on probation, so it could be it.

Brigid Duffy: And they are not law enforcement.

Scott Shick: The school resource officers, yes, they are share, the school, yeah, they are. School resource officers are law enforcement. Yes.

Brigid Duffy: Okay.

Scott Shick: Yeah.

Brigid Duffy: So they would they would be a referral from a law enforcement agency?

Scott Shick: Yeah.

Brigid Duffy: Okay.

Scott Shick: Yeah, I mean, they're just hired by the school superintendent on a contract to be school resource officers for our schools.

Brigid Duffy: Okay.

Scott Shick: Yeah.

Brigid Duffy: Thank you.

Scott Shick: Yeah, I don't know how you would read that because it's the intention of the school superintendent to have these people on deck on campus. Either way you go, I mean, they're there. I don't know if that would be considered a school referral or a --

Brigid Duffy: Well, I'm to figure out a way we can streamline it and just consider it as a law enforcement agency.

Scott Shick: Excellent.

Brigid Duffy: Yeah, instead of --

Scott Shick: That's fine. Yup.

Brigid Duffy: So, Pauline, what did you find?

Pauline Salla-Smith: So in NRS-392.190, Criminal Complaint by Attendance Officer in a School District, having an attendance officer, the attendance officer shall, if directed by the Board of Trustees, which are given that power, make and file the complaint provided for NRS-392.180 and shall see that the charge is prosecuted by the proper authorities.

Scott Shick: That's truancy. Yeah.

Pauline Salla-Smith: And then NRS-293.200 is Criminal Complaint by School Administrator or School Officer. This one says any taxpayer, school administrator, school officer or deputy school officer in the State of Nevada may make and file in the proper court a criminal complaint against a parent, guardian or other person who has control or charge of any child who is under 18 years of age required to attend school pursuant to a blah, blah, blah.

Scott Shick: It's a neglect thing.

Pauline Salla-Smith: It's the parent's responsible for the truancy. So NRS-392.190, NRS-293.200 --

Brigid Duffy: Okay, and attendance officers, I do not believe are law enforcement officers.

Scott Shick: No, ma'am.

Pauline Salla-Smith: No, they're not.

Brigid Duffy: Do your counties still get a lot of truancy referrals?

Pauline Salla-Smith: We do because we have diversion for truancy.

Brigid Duffy: Okay.

Pauline Salla-Smith: So we have truancy advisory board and truancy court.

Brigid Duffy: Okay.

Scott Shick: Yeah, we have a truancy review board and it meets monthly or maybe biweekly, and they're constantly reviewing those cases and citations and follow-ups and, you know, all of those matters.

Pauline Salla-Smith: Okay. It's the blessing of living in smaller towns.

Brigid Duffy: There are probably many blessings of living in a small town.

Scott Shick: Everybody knows your business.

Brigid Duffy: Plus you see how much you've given to this committee just by, I mean, like, I had said it's difficult because you're talking about Washoe, Clark and then, you know, DCFS, but we're missing a really important voice of the probation department, especially in the smaller communities because I know how our probation department runs, but we're just the machine that's Clark County. Like I can't forget about everybody else.

Scott Shick: The state of Clark County.

Brigid Duffy: That's right. How we go, you all go.

Scott Shick: Yeah.

Brigid Duffy: So --

Pauline Salla-Smith: Except we just have citizens making complaints.

Brigid Duffy: Well.

Ross Armstrong: Now that I know that, I've got all sorts of plans for after work.

Brigid Duffy: I'm thinking about, yeah. Like, okay, the little-known statute of if I'm just a parent in school and your kid, you're not taking care of your kid, I'm just going to go and file a complaint? Like I'm just another parent --

Pauline Salla-Smith: I didn't make it up, Brigid. It says or any taxpayer. That's what it has in the statute.

Ross Armstrong: Yeah. I mean, so in terms of what's in the report now, I think we would just want to add that sentence, that it doesn't include traffic, right? Traffic and status offenses?

Scott Shick: Yeah.

Ross Armstrong: We could probably --

Pauline Salla-Smith: Yeah. Until we go change the statute and stop letting taxpayers file complaints against their children to tie them up in the justice system.

Brigid Duffy: I don't think too people know about that, because I don't get too many taxpayers.

Pauline Salla-Smith: I don't get any taxpayers just filing reports.

Scott Shick: What is that in 392, you said?

Pauline Salla-Smith: Yeah, 392 --

Brigid Duffy: Yeah, I got 392.200. I'm going to go start writing up some complaints for the taxpayer.

Pauline Salla-Smith: But I do think that the smaller jurisdictions has an attendance officer, so, like, for us, it's the vice-principal, like the dean of students, which is the vice principal and he's actually, like, so involved with our truancy advisory board and truancy court, but he can give citations for habitual truancy with the

documentation provided, like the three letters, all the days missed, every phone call they've made, home, I mean, he can write citations.

Scott Shick: And I believe our system operates with, we have a truancy officer, but we also have the school resource officer, a sheriff's officer, is also on the truancy review board and they're the ones that write the citations when the day's done and if so, then the District Attorney is also involved in that and if they're seeing they're neglected, the parents are just refusing to get children up and get them to school and things like that, then the DA would maybe come in a little harder and file some neglect charges and things like that. Yeah. But yeah, it's on a case-by-case basis and yeah. The whole population of Douglas County is not even 50,000 yet, so that's not even, that's just adults and children, so.

Pauline Salla-Smith: But I'm like at 16,000.

Scott Shick: Yeah. I mean, I get it, Brigid and, yeah, it's kind of interesting to compare those things.

Brigid Duffy: Yeah. I mean, here in Clark next week, we're launching a big truancy prevention program with our marijuana money and, you know, I know I've rallied my team and we're personally going to go out to, like, apartment complexes and housing communities and try to get the word out to try to engage these kids, but we're talking about 320,000 school district kids.

Scott Shick: Yeah. And it's just, you want to create a momentum. You want to create a culture of getting to school and how do you how do you that? Okay, you guys have done that down there for the last three or four years, trying to increase the truancy review boards and all those things that went along with it. I know Jack has been working pretty hard on it with the school districts, you know.

Brigid Duffy: Well, I just forget that that would be a referral because we've also hammered it to the school district, do not send truancy to us because we're not doing anything.

Scott Shick: Yeah.

Brigid Duffy: So there's is a big drop, I think, in around 2012 where we went from, like, 50,000 referrals to the juvenile justice system to, like, 18,000 and people were like, what happened? Like, I'm, like, well, we stopped taking truancy from the same paper, so we --

Scott Shick: But didn't you refocus, try to help the school districts refocus there, you know, on truancy internally within their campuses?

Brigid Duffy: Yes. We started the school attendance review board like that out in the rural communities and we did all of those things and a few cases, maybe three or four, went to court or they didn't participate in the SARB but yeah.

Scott Shick: Right.

Brigid Duffy: So I didn't even think about that. So yeah, I agree that we could probably just make sure we tack on excluding traffic to Page 23, Definition of Referral next to the DMC report and it just kind of captures everything that this subcommittee has talked about in a clean way and then some complaint by citizen or school.

Scott Shick: I would concur with that.

Brigid Duffy: Ross or Gianna?

Gianna Verness: I think that will do it. I agree.

Ross Armstrong: Yep. Same here.

Brigid Duffy: Okay.

Scott Shick: Pauline, you good?

Brigid Duffy: She wrote it.

Scott Shick: Oh.

Pauline Salla-Smith: I'm used to federal definition, so I'm, like, yah.

Brigid Duffy: I didn't mean to exclude her, but, she's, yeah.

Scott Shick: CIA.

Brigid Duffy: Okay. The other one is, as far as the data book goes, the other one that I could find that kind of directly conflicts to what we've done in this committee, but it's, I mean, this boat's been out to sea for a long time, is the recidivism definition. I mean, that was approved by the full committee, the full commission a long, long time ago.

Scott Shick: It's Page 35 if --

Brigid Duffy: Yeah. Page 35. Thank you. And we really expanded it as far as the full commission, but we've already, like the full JJOC already voted on the most recent definition of recidivism, so I don't know whether it's possible to go in and update the data dictionary. I don't know who's in control of this data dictionary to update that. The Supreme Court, perhaps. I have no idea, but the recidivism definition was voted on over a year ago, maybe even two years ago.

Pauline Salla-Smith: And I think that I actually might have the Word document of the data dictionary on one of my flash drives, but I need to check that out because Stephanie Hanan and I worked on it, so I might have that. If not, I think we can go to the Supreme Court and I agree with the recidivism definition that the recidivism definition we had on here took us, remember Brigid, like, 16 months, because nobody could really agree on getting specific, so the more specific definition for recidivism, I like, and I'm not worried about, I mean, I'm okay with that so.

Scott Shick: Where is the definition that we revised and agreed on? The new one? It's not in this text.

Gianna Verness: It was sent in the packet materials. Yeah.

Scott Shick: Oh, it is?

Brigid Duffy: It's on the website. It was attached in this meeting packet.

Scott Shick: Okay.

Ross Armstrong: Yeah, there's one that says it's a document entitled Recidivism Document.

Scott Shick: Okay. Thank you.

Brigid Duffy: So, okay. So Page 23, we're going to tell the committee we want to use the BMC definition, add a line, excludes traffic. Okay. Anything else on the data book? As I went through it, those are the only areas that I could see dispositions. What page was that on? It's a pretty general definition of dispositions in the data book. Page 29.

Pauline Salla-Smith: Yeah, dispositions. Well, it's on 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32.

Brigid Duffy: So yeah, the definition in the data book, as I recall, was a pretty general definition. It's basically the sanction ordered or treatment plan decided by a court for the performance measure. We have it as disposition by type, so specifically, we want to know county camp, formal probation and DCFS commitments. So all of those, of course, are sanctioned orders or treatments decided by the court, but these were by type of disposition so I don't --

Pauline Salla-Smith: Which is included in the DMC report, too, Brigid.

Brigid Duffy: Right. You know, you'll find most of what we decided, thanks to the guidance of DCFS, who was very familiar with the DMC reports and the OJ JDP and all of their guidance, most of the things that we debated over the last couple of meetings and landed on were guided by the DMC Report and other areas for where we have to put forth data. Right, Leslie?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, that's correct.

Brigid Duffy: Yeah. So you'll see that that really is how we were guided in the beginning, but we did have two very conflicting things between referral and recidivism from what I can tell, so let me ask Scott and Pauline, did you get, and if you haven't and I don't believe this was in our meeting materials. This is what we were going to present to the full committee. Do you see what I'm holding up, Leslie?

Scott Shick: I remember that document.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Brigid Duffy: Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah, that was, I believe, in the committee report, but I don't believe it went to the full commission and it is not on this meeting, but I --

Brigid Duffy: Right. It wasn't in this meeting material but I wasn't sure if it was sent out to, like, the whole group of the committee, the subcommittee, so if not, can we just send this to them again?

Scott Shick: Because there's some key points that you wanted some feedback on, right?

Brigid Duffy: Right. Because I'd like the two of you, because we're crunched for time. We only have 10 minutes left today. Our next full commission meeting's October, right?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Yeah.

Brigid Duffy: Okay. So maybe we can come back in September and we can go through this with the two of you and Gianna, you know. I understand. Like, as long as I have a quorum that includes the two of them and me and Ross, then we can get through this, if you can't make the next date, but just so we can go through this. I can go through this with you all and get your feedback on it before I go to a full committee. Because again, I did not have a probation officer unit on this, and it's really important to me to have that before I take it to a group of people.

Ross Armstrong: And Brigid, it's possible through open meeting law to have Leslie send that to Pauline and Scott individually, and then get, like, a track changes or their comments back and then we can put that together in one document to kind of guide that discussion next time, too, so that's possible.

Brigid Duffy: Yeah, I think I might need, well, you two let me know if it, because it's very general, so it lacks commentary, so it might not be in context unless we walk through it together to understand it, but maybe not. So, okay. So we'll do that for the next, we'll schedule a meeting sometime before the next Full meeting to discuss that and then I am on a recidivism definition, Item 6. Let's see. I took that note. So the recidivism, I'm looking at my work plan. So is this the part, Leslie, is this talking about connecting us to the adult system?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. And maybe we want to put this off to our next meeting because I think it'll be a robust conversation. I just want to say that we do have a mechanism to track our parole youth into the adult system, which is a report that I've provided, but we just do not have a mechanism to track the probation youth. So that was what that's all about.

Brigid Duffy: And it's my understanding that adult parole or probation is contracting with Tyler Supervision, so we should start being able to connect some of that data, because I did reach out to Jack and ask him where they picked up on that after our last prison superintendent left.

Leslie Bittleston: That would probably, and I have not spoken to anybody in adult parole and probation, but as with anything with data systems, we would require a bridge to be built. So I don't know if there's funding around that or if that's even been discussed.

Pauline Salla-Smith: I did hear locally, they were looking at Tyler Supervision for adult EMP. I don't know if everyone, but --

Scott Shick: So we would tie in the juvenile's number and that could be calibrated at the adult arena? Is that kind of the idea behind it or? I made it sound very simple.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah, not simple at all. I've learned more about data than I ever wanted to know in my whole life.

Scott Shick: And you're good at it.

Leslie Bittleston: So the part of the problem is every time we enter a new youth into Tyler Supervision, a number generates a summary.

Scott Shick: Reports.

Leslie Bittleston: Right. So a unique identifying number generates. However, when that youth comes to, like, let's say DCFS, there is no mechanism to put an already existing number into Tyler Supervision. So when we, DCFS, enter the youth into our system, it generates a completely different number. So we've

probably got some work to do around how to, and that's probably funding and enhancements and all of that to allow us to put in the same number as the kid moves systems.

Scott Shick: Yeah. Or maybe they acquire a new adult identification number of some type, and yet the juvenile number would travel with them. Does that kind of --

Leslie Bittleston: Well, that doesn't happen now.

Scott Shick: Understood.

Leslie Bittleston: So we would need different identifiers other than that unique identifying number to track youth, like a birthday. Yeah, things like that.

Pauline Salla-Smith: There is the ability to merge files though. Like if I gave youth parole viewing privileges to our system for kids that are transferred to the state they would have all that information and if they create another case for that youth, there's the ability to merge those two files together. It would just keep it separate from ours with the state. But we tried it with an interstate compact just to see if we could do it. Like if we give them another jurisdiction viewing ability out of Tyler Supervision, so they have all the information and services that were provided to that youth already. I think it's possible. It's just going to take a lot of money.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Brigid Duffy: And just to kind of wrap up Number 6 and real quick, when I attended the strategic plan meeting yesterday, there was conversation around kind of really narrowing in data we want now versus, you know, our big wish list of data so that we can get moving on getting the data we really want and need. Of course, some of that is statutory. Some of that's required by the Feds, but we do have a lot of things on a wish list of how we, hopefully, in an ideal world, we'll be able to match up data so we can get some true outcomes. So that something I need to bring back to talk about with this group as to our priorities of data collection for the next year or two, while we're launching Tyler Supervision in a, I don't know, streamlined way, I guess I'll use, because right now they're having problems pulling reports is my understanding.

Leslie Bittleston: Right.

Scott Shick: Clark County is? Or everybody?

Leslie Bittleston: Everybody.

Brigid Duffy: Well, Clark, for sure.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah. And Washoe still does not have a go-live date.

Scott Shick: Jeez, what's going? Are they just not going to go there?

Leslie Bittleston: According, I had a conversation with Frank yesterday prior to the strategic planning committee, but we kind of talked a lot about Tyler Supervision.

Scott Shick: Sure.

Leslie Bittleston: He is not happy with the slow response from Tyler Supervision. He doesn't think he's getting the information he needs to make the right decisions, so he's at the point where he's ready to use all of the forms and reports that Clark has already created rather than have his own created, so I think it's a communication issue and a response issue.

Scott Shick: Yeah. He would know.

Pauline Salla-Smith: I mean, we're not having any problems with reports, so our reports are only as good as the data we put in and so if we have issues, it's because we're not putting the right stuff in.

Brigid Duffy: So Number 7 for discussion, our revised DMC template.

Leslie Bittleston: We can move that to the next meeting.

Brigid Duffy: Okay. And we'll talk again about the link between juvenile and the adult system.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Brigid Duffy: Okay. And then Number 8, Agenda Item Number 8, the YLS commitment to DCFS. Leslie, thank you, or Kayla, for this.

Leslie Bittleston: That would be Ms. Jennifer Simeo.

Brigid Duffy: Jennifer, thank you.

Jennifer Simeo: You're welcome.

Brigid Duffy: Okay. Because I heard about this yesterday at the strategic planning committee. On the bright side, when you broke it down by month, it appears that Clark has gotten better. January was 15, but June was only four that we sent to DCFS without a YLS completed, so that's progress.

Jennifer Simeo: Yeah.

Leslie Bittleston: That is progress and I think that we have a good plan from the strategic planning committee to take this to NAJJA and just remind folks that, you know, a YLS, a current YLS, within six months needs to be included in the commitment paperwork to DCFS.

Brigid Duffy: Right. So for those that weren't on the strategic planning meeting yesterday, there was a conversation about children that are committed to DCFS and they haven't had a YLS completed and it's within six months, right?

Leslie Bittleston: Mm hmm.

Brigid Duffy: Right. So then it's delaying their commitment because they need a YLS to determine which facility to put the child in, kids to be --

Leslie Bittleston: And case planning and all of that.

Brigid Duffy: Yup. So we've had a conversation about the need to expedite and the need to complete them before commitment to DCFS.

Scott Shick: Oh, that would be good.

Brigid Duffy: And, of course, by pure numbers, Clark is the biggest offender. There were 30 kids in six months who didn't have the YLS completed before commitment, 27 of those 30 from Clark, so one was Churchill and two were Washoe. So Clark was on the call yesterday. I believe they're going to talk to NAJJA about it, and hopefully, we'll be able to ensure that runs more smoothly and the next, I also need to put on a future agenda, I don't know if we'll get to it depending on how busy I think our other agenda will be fairly busy, but I do, for our next agenda, need to get on the family survey portion of our work plan. We were approved by the JJOC at the last meeting to put together a family survey, which was a performance measure that this group voted on, so we can start talking about that again and just so it gets on the agenda, but it might just keep getting kicked until we have time to get to it in our limited time that we usually have.

Pauline Salla-Smith: Hey, Brigid, we just finished our draft family. Is it for family engagement? Is it like the family satisfaction surveys?

Brigid Duffy: Yes. That could be one term for it, right. And there's also, I know that Ross brought up, I think PBS has a survey that they do at the facilities. I have an exit survey that we do at the Harbor for families, so kind of bringing it all together and it's really geared toward the experience in juvenile court, that leaving the juvenile system, so I think it would be geared toward families that come into court. It could be geared toward families that just deal with probation intake, so however we want to gear it.

Pauline Salla-Smith: We just finished a draft, but ours is all inclusive, so juvenile services, court, and we just finished our draft one, so I didn't know if you want me to send it.

Brigid Duffy: Great. Yeah. No, if you can give that over and we can put it in the next meeting material so we can start looking at them and, you know, making it work for each county, however we want to do it, so it's uniform.

Leslie Bittleston: And we are at 2:53. Do you want --

Brigid Duffy: So we need to figure out a next meeting date and, well, let me go to public comment, so I don't lose Lexie if she has any public comment, besides to say that this meeting was not as colorful.

Lexi Beck: I don't have any other public comments.

Brigid Duffy: I probably just violated something by putting public comment in her mouth, right, Ross?

Ross Armstrong: You're good.

Brigid Duffy: Okay.

Ross Armstrong: I'll defend you.

Brigid Duffy: Okay, good. All right. So our next meeting date, let's do one in September because we definitely have to have another one before the full meeting. This is a Tuesday so can go, or Thursday. We were scheduled on Thursday, so Thursday, the 24th? I know we try to stay away from Wednesdays.

Scott Shick: Thursday, the 24th would be good for me.

Gianna Verness: Sounds good here.

Pauline Salla-Smith: But Leslie, that's not our SAG, right? I don't have a hold on.

Kayla Dunn: The next SAG meeting is on the 17th.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you.

Kathryn Roose: I don't know if I got moved, but I have the CIC summit on my calendar that week.

Brigid Duffy: CIC for, like, child dependency?

Kathryn Roose: I don't know if that might impact Ross.

Brigid Duffy: Oh yeah. You know what? That is usually that week because that's my daughter's birthday weekend and I know I was always in Reno that weekend.

Kathryn Roose: But I know it moved because it went virtual, so let me see if I can get the new date.

Brigid Duffy: But it wouldn't be on, what, about Tuesday, the 22nd? Because the CIC is usually Thursday, Friday, like half day Wednesday, then Thursday, Fridays. So what about Tuesday, the 22nd?

Ross Armstrong: In the afternoon?

Brigid Duffy: Anytime but between 10:00 and 12:00 because I have C-SAT between 10:00 and 12:00.

Ross Armstrong: Yeah, we do. Yeah, the afternoon's good for me.

Scott Shick: It's good for me.

Pauline Salla-Smith: The 20th. Wait. The 22nd? Yeah, afternoon is good for me.

Scott Shick: 2:00 p.m.?

Leslie Bittleston: Do you want to do 2:00 p.m. again?

Pauline Salla-Smith: Yeah, 2:00 p.m. works for me.

Gianna Verness: As of right now, I cannot do the afternoon. I'm scheduled for court. We're down to two people for the month of September, but I will try and switch it, but it sounds like you have a quorum without me.

Brigid Duffy: Okay. Yeah. And that's what I said, Gianna, in this meeting, we're going to go back through some of the stuff you have already participated in to do so --

Gianna Verness: Right. Right. Okay.

Brigid Duffy: Yes. So, okay. Well let's do that and if you can make it, we all, you know, I like having you here, so.

Gianna Verness: Thank you very much.

Brigid Duffy: You're welcome. Good luck with your kiddo.

Gianna Verness: Thank you, guys. I do apologize for having to leave early.

Scott Shick: No.

Gianna Verness: I wasn't expecting this to come up.

Leslie Bittleston: Bye-bye.

Scott Shick: Have a good afternoon.

Gianna Verness: Thanks, guys.

Brigid Duffy: Okay, so we'll get a meeting date out for September 22nd at 2:00. We'll schedule it, like, 2:00 to 4:00, but maybe we'll be done by 3:30.

Scott Shick: Thanks for your direction on this, Brigid.

Brigid Duffy: No, thank you. I'm telling you it's really been great having you here.

Scott Shick: Well, we try harder.

Brigid Duffy: Okay. That's all right. We'll get through this. We needed you. I didn't want to go do all of this and then end up having to reel it back in. So all right. Have a great afternoon.

[end of meeting]