

Joe Lombardo  
Governor  
Richard Whitley, MS  
Director



DEPARTMENT OF  
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES



Marla McDade  
Williams, MPA  
Administrator

DIVISION OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

*Helping people. It's who we are and what we do.*

---

MEETING OF THE NEVADA STATE JUVENILE  
JUSTICE OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (JJOC)  
DATA PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE

May 1, 2024, at 2:00 PM

TRANSCRIPT

**DATE:** Wednesday, May 1, 2024

**TIME:** 2:00 PM

**VIDEO CONFERENCE: MICROSOFT TEAMS**

**Roll Call:**

**(Members)**

Chair (Absent)  
Brigid Duffy (Absent)  
Jennifer Fraser  
Sharon Anderson (Excused)  
Pauline Salla  
Katherine Maher  
DeNeese Parker  
Eboni Washington  
Devin Gamboa  
Sabrina Schnur  
Belz & Case  
Michael Watson

**Staff Members:**

Cindy Casselman  
Leslie Bittleston  
Jessica Villalobos

**Absent:**

Chair-Brigid Duffy  
Sharon Anderson

**Leslie Bittleston:** Since the Chair is not here, I'll just call the meeting to order at 2:04 pm, and I will do roll call. Okay. Brigid Duffy is absent. Jennifer Fraser?

**Jennifer Fraser:** Here.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Sharon Anderson is excused. Pauline Salla?

**Pauline Salla:** Here.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Katherine Maher?

**Katherine Maher:** Here.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Thank you. Other members present, for staff, we have Cindy Casselman, Leslie Bittleston, Jessica Villalobos. We also have DeNeese Parker, Eboni Washington, Devin Gamboa. We have Sabrina Schnur and Belz & Case. Did I miss anybody? Okay. We do have a quorum. Moving on to the agenda, which is Public Comment. Are there any public comments at this time? Hearing no public comment.

**Michael Watson:** Hi, sorry. I was covering another meeting and just got out.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Are you a Brigid's proxy or will she be here?

**Michael Watson:** I'm her proxy.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Alright. Where were we? Public comment. Are there any public comments currently? Hearing no public comments. Moving on to agenda item number 4. This is for possible action, Review and Approval of Minutes, March 27th, 2024, Meeting Minutes, attachment 4. Members, if you've all had a chance to read that, any discussion, questions? Okay. Not hearing any. Can, we get a motion from a member please?

**Jennifer Fraser:** Jennifer Fraser, for the record, I'll move for approval.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. And second?

**Pauline Salla:** This is Pauline. I'll second.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Thank you. Any discussion on the motion? Not hearing any. All those in favor, say aye.

**Pauline Salla:** Aye.

**Jennifer Fraser:** Aye.

**Katherine Maher:** Aye.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay. The Meeting Minutes for March 27th, 2024 have passed. That is the only action item, Pauline, if you must leave. Thank you for being here.

**Pauline Salla:** Thank you.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Perfect. Okay. We're going to move on to item number 5 for discussion. This is the identification of potential, potential duplication of efforts between the JJOC Data Performance Committee, which is this committee, and the Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators, the NAJJA Data Committee. If I can share my screen or attempt to share my screen. Jessica, can you please share your screen? It would be attachment 5.1, Juvenile Justice Data Elements, because I'm having a problem. Thank you. Probably need to make it a little bigger. Okay. Can everybody see that document? At the last Data Meeting on March 27th, one of the questions arose about the simultaneous data committee of the NAJJA Data Committee that is also meeting. I wanted to provide, or the committee wanted something to kind of outline all the data requirements and whose responsibility are those data requirements. The Programs Office put together a document, just to kind of highlight all the data elements that are currently received by the Programs Office and whose responsibility is it to really review it. The document that you see Data Report Requirements, the Community Corrections Partnership Block Grant is the first data element. There is no NRS or state, or federal statute for this, but the NAJJA Data Committee is overseeing this component. The next one is Juvenile Sex Offender Treatment, which is NRS 62H.320. There is a template for that and the data, the NAJJA Data Committee is working on that one. Next one, Use of Force or Restraints. There is no state statute for that, but it does fall under federal code, which is 34 US Code Chapter 11, and this is another one that is within the NAJJA Committee. What I should also put under the Use of Force and the next one, which is Room Confinement, is the State Advisory Group Committee. This committee is also looking at this data as well as the Community Corrections Partnership Block Grant. The next one is NRS 62H.400 Youth Competency Hearings. This is a new element that we have not started data collection on. We are still working on a template for that and that falls in both the NAJJA and this committee, this will be discussed at an upcoming meeting of this committee as well as currently being worked on in the NAJJA Data Committee. Status Offender, this is a federal requirement under the same code as Use of Force. And this is also addressed in the NAJJA Data Committee. The next one is the Training Report. This is NRS 62B.250. This is addressed in the NAJJA Data Committee. Implicit Bias and Cultural Competency, NRS 62B.607. This is a new requirement that has recently been implemented and facilities have until next February to report on this first year of training around Implicit Bias and Cultural Competency, but that does fall in the NAJJA Data Committee. Compliance Surveys, this is a Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act Requirements and that falls in the SAG Committee, the State Advisory Group Committee. Federal Grants, any federal grants that are received by the Programs Office fall under the SAG Committee. Juvenile Justice System Data, which is NRS 62H.225. That does fall under the NAJJA Data Committee. Then as you can see, this is going on to the next, I would say next chart or next table. This is how often these same reports are due to the Programs Office, so the Community Corrections Partnership is due quarterly, Juvenile Sex Offender Treatment is due quarterly, Use of Force and Corrective Room Restriction or Room Confinement are due monthly. Youth Competency will be due annually. Status Offenders is required monthly. The Racial and Ethnic Disparities or the Juvenile Justice System Data is due annually. Training Report Information due annually. Implicit Bias due annually and Compliance Surveys, Jessica, could you move it up a little bit, please? Thank you. Compliance Surveys are due annually. Federal Grants, anybody who is a grantee of Federal Grant Funds, which some of the counties are, those are due quarterly. Juvenile Justice System Data, as I mentioned, is due annually. Juvenile Justice Performance Measures due annually. Going on to the next table. This is looking at specific data elements and where they fall into or what data report that they fall into. This is quite lengthy, encompasses a few pages, but what you will find here is that most of this data is aggregate or not youth specific with exception of Juvenile Sex Offender Data, which does provide a youth ID number and Status Offenders, which does provide a youth ID number. The remaining data is aggregate data. This is presented to the committee today just to inform this committee of the massive amounts of data requirements for the Juvenile Justice System that the Programs Office is responsible for and the fact that only pieces of it live here in this data committee and pieces of it live with the SAG Committee and pieces live with the NAJJA Data Committee. That was really a lot of information. Are there any questions regarding all of that? No questions. Okay.

And just to kind of let everybody know, the vision of the future with data collection is to attempt to minimize all

the Data Submissions that come from the counties, the Juvenile Detention Facilities as we begin our work in collaboration with the Data Analytics Unit under the Department of Health and Human Services. Devin, who is on our call today, is our Data Analytics Unit Representative. He will be beginning to work with Juvenile Justice Data on the go forward. The state is currently in process of working on data sharing agreements with the counties, so data can flow to the Office of Analytics, and it is our hope that down the road the Office of Analytics will be able to provide some of this data with a single submission rather than the multiple submissions that counties and jurisdictions are doing now. That's kind of the big picture down the road view. But right now, today this is what is in place. Are there any questions about that? Okay. Any questions about the pieces that this committee is responsible for? Okay. And just to kind of give a total summary, this Committee is responsible for the competency and then the scorecard summary document that we will go over on the next agenda item. Okay. If there are no questions on that, we will move to the next agenda item, which is the same thing, Jessica. It would be 6.1. Alright. We closed agenda item number 5.

We're going to open agenda item number 6, which is the Scorecard and Performance Summary Data. Just to remind everybody that the Performance Scorecard Summary Document was included as a component with the JJOC Strategic Plan in the FY18-23 Strategic Plan. The premise of this document was to capture, collect data for three years and then project data two years after that. It was to collect data for FY19, FY20 and FY21 to project data for FY23. This did not happen. COVID happened, and a lot of other things happened and so the premise of this was not seen as intended. On the go forward, this Committee will work through how to move forward with this document or some other type of document in conjunction with the Strategic Planning Committee, who will be working on the next Strategic Plan. This is the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission FY19 Scorecard and Performance Summary. If you can move to the next page. Thank you. Right there.

As you can see, this document is more than 30 pages long and the premise again of this document was to gather data for 3 years and then make a projection. Data was gathered as you can see from this document and presented at this committee before the committee stopped meeting. Where the committee was during its last meeting is the committee was looking at some of these elements that were very difficult, or the Programs Office was unable to measure. I don't know if this committee would like me to run through this whole thing or just kind of very high-level talk about it. Any thoughts? Pauline.

**Pauline Salla:** You know, I always have questions. I guess, I remember our discussion about this and I'm just looking at these numbers and I'm wondering like how we have like a 30%. 30.25. If we look at the first column, FY21 the third column, sorry. It's revocation like the state revocation and we can see or any of these Rea judication, rearrest, and we can see the 21, there was increases from 20. Correct?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Correct.

**Pauline Salla:** And then if we keep going down to like decrease percent increase, decrease in recommitment, we have like a 17% decrease where we had an increase in revocations. How, how do we do that?

**Leslie Bittleston:** This, this has been extremely difficult to work out. First, the increase and decrease in recommitment is only state data. It's only the state revocation data. I can't even sit here today and say that the data from 2019-2020 and 2021 was good data. The reason I'm saying that is because we all know that's about the time 2019-2020 when we were all moving to enterprise supervision and we were all; well, I'll just talk for the state; was struggling with some data entry, and some things around that. Whereas we do have this data available, I'm going to put a caveat on it that to the best of my knowledge and to the best of what I was able to pull, this is the correct numbers. Now would I bet my life that this is totally accurate? Probably not, because we have done since this time, a lot of work around training and data entry to make sure we are doing accurate data entry. I would say the same thing under the rearrest and Rea judication measures as well. That's one of the things I would like to

---

work on with this committee is really homing in on actual measurements. The jurisdictions have a measurement and we're all doing the same measurement to provide to the state, because I think, and I can't speak to this, but I can't guarantee that all the data I received under these measurements is correct, is apples to apples rather than apples to oranges. My best guess is this is why this data looks funny.

**Pauline Salla:** I guess, as a member of the Commission and oversees an agency, I wouldn't support sharing data that we can't guarantee is accurate. That's just from Humboldt County. The numbers don't make sense to me.

We're talking about a scorecard that is public information and if it's not accurate, it's what are we capturing? I mean, I know NAJJA has been doing a lot of work that for us to all capture data the same way and instead of creating an updated scorecard with data that we don't feel that is 100% accurate, maybe we put our focus in our Strategic Planning and performance and our performance card in continuing to ensure we're all collecting data the same way. That we feel comfortable with our data. So that's just my feedback. Thank you.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Thank you. Dee Dee Parker.

**DeNeese Parker:** Hello, it's just my second time, but when I'm looking at the data and it says I may have been jumping ahead, because I was looking at the longer one, but Adult Convictions is pending and then it says the stakeholders do not have access to this data. If you're convicted as an adult, it's public information, and I also think that we could possibly help with that.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Perfect, because I can explain this to the group on why that says pending. The jurisdictions don't all have access to their court data. The Office of Analytics, which is Devin's Unit, does not have access to court data. When we talk about moving kids out of the Juvenile Justice System into the Adult System, we lose them. That's where we're unable to provide data around adult convictions. If a youth has been certified or direct filed, once that's happened, they're in the adult system, we lose them. Does that make sense for your question, Dee Dee?

**DeNeese Parker:** Yes, I think so.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**DeNeese Parker:** Thank you.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. I think this would make our Chair Ms. Duffy happy if we can determine a method to capture adult convictions of juveniles. This has been a bone of conversation for four years. Alright. Anything else, Dee Dee?

**DeNeese Parker:** Nope, that was all. Thank you.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Sure. Eboni.

**Eboni Washington:** Hi, everyone. Eboni Washington, for the record. I just wanted to echo Pauline's concerns about publishing statewide data that we're not comfortable with. I think if we have questions about the data and we're a group that looks at this data on a regular basis without, a whole bunch of actresses and explanation, we're not going to be able to explain to the larger group. I'm concerned about decisions being made based on data, and Pauline said 100% accurate, I would probably settle for 90% if we were, 90% confident in the data. But without, more confidence, I'm just very concerned that decisions are going to be made based on information that we know

---

is not accurate.

**Leslie Bittleston:** thank you, Eboni. Having said that, I think Pauline had a great idea of, and this would be beneficial for the Programs Office and the Office of Analytics if they will start helping us down the road with this. But a specific measurement around recidivism, and the reason that I say this, we can say rearrest, but unless we have defined what a rearrest is, we're going to get data that's encompassing so many things, it could be a parole violation, it could be a new arrest, it could be a citation, until we define exactly what we are looking for, we will not be presenting apples to apples. We will be presenting a hodgepodge of information, and I've done a lot of research over the last few years on recidivism measurement, recidivism and the recommendations are always to create specific measurements that are clearly defined for all groups to capture. That's just some recommendation for this group to look at on the go forward. Pauline.

**Pauline Salla:** Thanks, Leslie. I'm going to go back to our Data Dictionary that we created in 2014 and maybe one of our agenda items for this committee instead of reviewing data we're not comfortable with is reviewing our data dictionary and updating it, especially since we've had some legislative changes. When that was created by the Supreme Court Commission on Juvenile Justice Reform, and there was a lot of us who were on that committee to develop it, the intent of that was so that we're all reporting data the same way. We're collecting, we're comparing apples to apples and oranges to oranges, and I feel like we're getting away from that and, and us as jurisdictions are reporting, I guess, however, we see fit, but that's why that data dictionary was created, so we're all reporting things in the same way. Our data we can feel confident with our data. Since that was developed in 2014, we're 10 years into this, I mean, I think maybe it would behoove us to spend time as a committee looking that over and updating it, so that we all have access to how we're reporting things. Recidivism is defined in there in different area, like at different levels and technical violations for violation of parole and probation were not to be considered part of our rearrest. It's a technical violation, so those were things that we had all agreed on when we had this Data Dictionary and if we're now reporting it differently, then, then that is a concern. I mean, I'm looking at the data dictionary right now and we have recidivism defined at different layers and we can change that, if the state wants to move that way, but at least when I input data, I'm operating of my Data Dictionary, not of anything anyone else tells me. If I'm doing that, there's probably some others who are doing that.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Thank you, Pauline. That was an excellent suggestion and willing to go that route, if the group is willing to take the time to look at the Data Dictionary and possibly update it based on some more recent legislation that has come out. And, with the definition of recidivism that was presented in the FY18-FY23 Strategic Plan. In relation to that, there's so many updates that can be done to that Data Dictionary, and if the group is willing, we can work on that over the next however long it takes. I don't know if that needs a vote. I don't know if anybody has any additional thoughts on that. Any other members?

**Pauline Salla:** And Leslie, this is Pauline. If this group doesn't want to, then maybe we take it to our NAJJA Committee to review it and update it and bring it to the Data Committee, but at some point, either we all agree not to use that Data Dictionary anymore because I'm using it. I'm reporting this way, and if other people are reporting it differently, then that's the issue. We all must be operating on the same guideline. If this committee doesn't want to, then maybe we can take it to the NAJJA Committee.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Let's see. I have a hand up. Dee Dee?

**DeNeese Parker:** Hi, everyone. So could we possibly put it on the agenda and then everyone reviews it and then if they have changes or questions, then we can address it at the next meeting.

**Leslie Bittleston:** That thing is enormous.

**Pauline Salla:** Well, it's 45 pages but it's clear and it's easy reading.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah. I think that's a good idea, if folks on this committee will have time to review it by our next meeting, at least maybe the first few pages and, we work on it from there, and see where it goes. What I believe based on being in this role in the state, I think our highest priority would be defining recidivism measurements. This is something that is asked for. I know Devin, unsure if Devin specifically, but his office has been asked for it as well. I think our highest priority would be looking at those recidivism measurements and possibly going on from there would be the recommendation from the state. Any thoughts? Okay. And Pauline, if I can make a request of you, please, if you can send the Data Dictionary out to this group on behalf of the Data Committee, because I'm not sure I have a copy of it handy. What we will do is, put this on the next agenda for review and we will table the scorecard documents until we can look at the Data Dictionary, this document hasn't been posted online. It's, other than within this committee, it's not on DCFS' website, nor has it been shared with the JJOC at this point. This is the only committee that has looked at it. Hopefully that allows us to feel a little bit better that we are not publishing this on our website. We are just looking at it in this Committee. Any other questions, comments, thoughts? Okay. Alright. Jessica, that's it for agenda item number 6. We can stop sharing that. Jessica, if you can make a note, Data Dictionary Review and Update for the next Data Committee meeting. Thank you.

**Pauline Salla:** And Leslie, I need to go.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Bye.

**Pauline Salla:** Thank you. Bye.

**Leslie Bittleston:** We can go ahead and skip agenda item number 7. I believe we addressed it in number 6, we don't want to look at data until we can verify that we are collecting the data correctly. We'll move on unless anybody has any last questions. Okay. Not seeing any. We'll move on to agenda item number 8. Our Chair is not here. Normally we would like to identify a date and time for the next meeting, but our Chair is not here today. For the Members that are currently on, would you like to try to schedule a meeting, or would you recommend a doodle poll? Not hearing anything. I believe this committee does need to start meeting regularly, because there is some work to be done, so I would like to propose we look at our calendars for at least 4 weeks out. Today is May 1st. I'm looking at either May 29<sup>th</sup>, or that day I cannot do. June 5<sup>th</sup>, which is a Wednesday at 2:00 pm. Does Wednesday June 5<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 pm work for the members? I see a yes. Good. Good.

**Michael Watson:** I suspect I'll be covering for Brigid, and I am not available on that day.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Is there a date, she can't do the 5<sup>th</sup> either. Let's see. Is it just the 5<sup>th</sup> that is bad or that whole week is bad?

**Michael Watson:** I'm at a conference that whole week.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Let's look at the week after the week of the 10<sup>th</sup>, is Wednesday the 12<sup>th</sup> of June at 2 o'clock. Is that okay for folks? Katherine, yes. Yes, Okay. I'm seeing yes. Jessica, June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2 o'clock for the Data Performance Committee meeting. Great. Thank you to everybody who is on. That closes that agenda item.

Moving on to Public Comment. Is there any public comment currently? Okay. Not hearing any public comment.

We will move on to Adjournment. Thank you very much everybody. We'll see you on June 12th. Pauline did send out the Data Dictionary, I believe, so by our next meeting, if everybody could look at it, I would appreciate it and, Dee Dee, if you are still on, I'm also going to put a topic, an agenda item to discuss Adult Conviction Data Options, if that is okay with you.

**DeNeese Parker:** Sounds great. Thank you.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Great. Alright. Thank you very much everybody. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

**Devin Gamboa:** Thank you.

**Michael Watson:** Thank you.