

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)
MINUTES - DRAFT

DATE: Monday, February 12, 2024

TIME: 9:00 AM - 12:00 PM

LOCATION: Guinn Room, 2nd Floor Governor's Building
101 N. Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89706
AND
Governor's Conference Room, 5th Floor
Grant Sawyer Building
555 E. Washington Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89101

Members Present:

Sharon Anderson
Pauline Salla
Elizabeth Florez
Brigid Duffy
Matthew Clapham
Jennifer Fraser
Ethan Ewert
Paula Smith

Members Absent:

Dyland K. Tedford – Chair
Holly Welborn
Derrica Daniel
Dawn Gearhart

Staff Present:

Leslie Bittleston
Cindy Casselman

TRANSCRIPT

Leslie Bittleston: Good morning, everybody. Welcome. I am calling this meeting to order at 9:00 AM on Monday February 12, 2024. This is the meeting of the Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission, the JJOC. My name is Leslie Bittleston. I am the Chief of the Juvenile Services Programs Office. I am running this meeting on behalf of Chair Tedford, who is unable to be here today. Before we get started, a couple of housekeeping items. If you are a guest in either Carson City or Las Vegas, please sign the sign-in sheet that is available in the room that you are in. There are also packets of materials available in each location. For those that are joining us via Teams, if you could please type your name in the chat box, so we have a record of your attendance. And, to let you know where the materials are located, on your agenda, there is a link.

that says supporting materials may be obtained by a Google Drive. Unfortunately, Google Drive is not working, the materials can be found at the <https://dcfs.nv.gov/> website under the JJOC 2024 Meetings and Agendas. The agenda and meeting materials are located there.

Roll Call conducted: A quorum was established. We do have a quorum; the meeting will continue. And just to identify the staff members present. Leslie Bittleston, I've already introduced myself and Cindy Casselman from DCFS.

Agenda Item #3: public comment. To provide public comment telephonically, dial 1-775-321-6111. When prompted to provide the Meeting ID, enter 866-724-634#. In providing public comment during this meeting, unmute your microphone prior to speaking. Persons making comments will be asked to begin by stating their name for the record and to spell their last name. We will begin by hearing Carson City. Any public comment here in Carson City? Seeing None. Any public comment in Las Vegas? Seeing none. Any public comments? Anybody joining virtually? Okay. Hearing none.

Moving on to Agenda Item Number 4, for possible action, review and approval of the October 23, 2023, Meeting Minutes, attachment four. Is there any discussion on the Meeting Minutes that are in attachment four? They're in your packet and on the website as stated a few minutes ago. No discussion. I'll entertain a motion.

Brigid Duffy: This is Brigid. I'll move to approve the minutes.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you. Second.

Pauline Salla: This is Pauline, this is Pauline Salla. I'll second it.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. Thank you. The motion has been requested and seconded. Is there any discussion on the motion? Hearing none. All in favor, say aye.

Group: Aye.

Leslie Bittleston: Any opposed? Okay. Passes unanimously. Moving on to Agenda Item Number 5, for information, the JJOC Membership update. I will be referring to the PowerPoint packet or the PowerPoint presentation as provided in the packet of materials, and we are pulling it up now. Moving on to page number 2. Thank you, the current breakdown of the JJOC is stated on Slide Number 2. The JJOC is a legislatively required per NRS 62B.600, and based on that legislative requirement, we do have a Chair, Mr. Tedford. We have members nominated by the Assembly, Holly Welborn and Derrica Daniel.

We have two vacant positions for two members nominated by the Supreme Court. Marla McDade Williams fills the role of Administrator of the Division of Child and Family Services. Sharon Anderson fills the role of Deputy Administrator of the Division of Child and Family Services. Pauline Salla fills the role of Director of Juvenile Services, representing a population of less than 100,000. Elizabeth Florez fills the role of Director of Juvenile Services, representing a population between 100,000 and 700,000. The Director of Juvenile Services, representing a population over 700,000 is currently vacant. Brigid Duffy and Dawn Gearhart represent District Attorneys for both North and South. Katherine Maher and Jennifer Fraser represent Public Defenders, both North and South.

Matthew Clapman is a representative of Law Enforcement. Paula Smith is a representative of a nonprofit or other organization. And Ethan Ewart is a youth member. We currently have five vacant members. So that is Agenda Item Number 5. Are there any comments or questions on the membership of the JJOC as it stands per NRS 62B.600? Okay. Moving on.

Marla Williams: This is Marla. It says, status and recruiting efforts. Are you going to talk about that?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Thank you. Not used to running the meetings, I apologize. Yes. The status of recruiting members. I have reached out to various members of the commission to discuss possible fits in, in these positions. Other

members of the Programs Office have reached out to probation staff and parole staff to identify youth members. We currently have five vacancies for youth members. We do have a potential youth member with us today who has applied pending the Governor's review. We're also pending nominations from the Supreme Court on their two possible positions. Those are the efforts we are making to fill the vacant positions. Are there any questions or comments?

This is going to roll into Agenda Item Number 6 as we talk about the Title II Formula Grant overview. Moving back to Agenda Item Number 5. This membership also meets federal requirements per the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act. Moving on to Slide Number 3 is the membership requirements of that advisory group per the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act. It's what is required, one locally elected official. There is none identified there, but since this PowerPoint was prepared, one member has been appointed to the JJOC that does fit this role, and it is Mr. Matthew Clapman. He's a locally elected school board member.

This is his first meeting, so that is now filled. Representatives of law enforcement, Juvenile Justice Agencies, and prosecutors, we currently have 6 members that fill that role. Representatives of Public Agencies, Child Welfare, Mental Health, Substance Abuse, we have one member that fills that role. Representatives of alternatives to incarceration, we currently have 7 members who fill that role. Volunteers who work with delinquent youth, we currently have 7 members that fill that role. Representatives of private nonprofit organizations, we currently have no members that fill that role. People with experience in addressing school violence, we currently have 7 members filling that role.

Persons licensed by the state for Mental Health and or Substance Abuse, we do have one member filling that role. Representatives of advocacy groups, we have no members filling that role. One member of federally recognized Indian tribe as of this printing, we have one member that fill that role, and then one-fifth of the total board must be youth members, and we currently have one member that fills that role. In talking about that, we're going to keep that in mind as we move on to Agenda Item Number 6. Before we do that, are there any questions on the federal membership requirements?

Pauline Salla: Leslie, this is Commissioner Salla.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Pauline Salla: Let me spell my last name, S-A-L-L-A. I just think that there's probably one of us or multiple, maybe several of us, that maybe sit on a nonprofit board. I'm sure there's probably others that maybe we can fill that void, so that we meet the federal requirements too.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Salla. I can investigate that with the current membership. Any other comments?

Okay. Moving on to Agenda Item Number 6, the Title II Formula Grant overview and update. As I mentioned a couple of minutes ago, the JJOC fills a dual role, state oversight and federal oversight. This is the Federal oversight role. So, moving on to PowerPoint Slide Number 4. The Title II Formula Grant is authorized under the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act per 34 U.S.C 11131-11133. The funds are to assist compliance with four core protections. Those core protections are laid out on this slide, the Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders, Jail Removal, Sight and Sound Separation, and Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparities within our juvenile justice system.

Moving on to Slide Number 5. We already addressed the statutory authority. Eligible applicants for this fund or -- this funding are state governments in U. S. Territories. U. S. Territories include Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Guam. How to receive it pursuant to Title II, Part B, of the OJJDP Act? To receive these funds, states or territories must submit and receive OJJ Administrator approval of a plan for carrying out Formula Grant Program activities on a three-year period. States must maintain a state advisory group that meets federal requirements, that is the group that we just talked about a minute ago and have a federally approved system of monitoring compliance of those four core objectives that were presented on the previous slide.

Effective juvenile justice systems prevent institutionalization of status offenders, separate youth from adult inmates, remove youth from adult jails and lockups, and reduce racial and ethnic disparities. These systems also promote positive youth development with effective programs, training, treatment, prevention, diversion, rehabilitation, and research. That is the premise of these grant funds, what they are for, and how states or what states must do to obtain those grant funds.

Moving on to Slide Number 6. The total grant in fiscal year 2020, which was the last publicly available data for the Formula Grant Program. The total grant is 52,642,386 again in fiscal year 2020. Nevada's share of that amount is \$510,482. Then state information, remembering those 3 requirements for states. Looking at how the states break down with those requirements to obtain and receive those funds. Forty-one states and territories were in good standing with Nevada included. Seven states were not in compliance with one or more of those four core requirements. Those states being Idaho, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Washington, Washington State, West Virginia, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands. Five states did not participate, meaning they did not apply or receive the funds. Those states were Connecticut, Nebraska, Texas, Wyoming, and American Samoa. Three states were ineligible to receive the funds, New Mexico, New York, and the Virgin Islands.

And then moving on to Slide Number 7. I'm going to be getting to my point in just a second. Slide Number 7, the accounting of the funds that Nevada, Nevada has received over the last five years. \$406,333 in FY 19, 510,482 in FY 20, which is the slide we just looked at. FY 21, Nevada received 610,857. FY 22, Nevada received \$608,073. FY 23 funds have been released to states, but Nevada has currently been found ineligible by the federal government, OJJDP, the Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention, who administers the funds. Nevada was found ineligible due to not meeting requirements of the federally required state advisory group, which is why we talked a little bit a few minutes ago about the membership requirements. We have been found ineligible for a couple of reasons.

One was not having a member of a locally elected member, which has now been filled by Mr. Clapman. Number 2, we do not have enough youth members currently. Number three, we are out of balance with government employees versus non-government employees. The reason that the membership requirement was presented earlier in this presentation was to inform the JJOC that DCFS staff is working on boosting up the membership that meets both the state requirements and the federal requirements. And until we meet the federal requirements, we will remain ineligible for the FY23 Formula Grant. This ineligibility does not affect any of the other grant funds as, as presented on this chart. FY21 is still available, FY22 is still available, and FY23 is. We do not have an amount, nor have we been given an award. That was a lot of information. Are there any questions from the members?

Pauline Salla: Leslie, it's Commissioner Salla again. Does that mean we are ineligible with the chance of becoming eligible, if the state advisory group meets the elements or does that mean FY23 is funded, and we do not have the opportunity to come in on that?

Leslie Bittleston: Excellent question. It is, once we become eligible, and we do have a State Advisory Group that meets the requirements per the federal membership, we will become eligible for that grant funding. I have been working closely with our Federal Program Manager from the Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention to keep her updated of our steps to meet the membership requirements. In the past, just as another piece of information, states we made eligible for grant funding if they can show efforts to try to achieve and maintain that membership. That has changed. It doesn't mean we can't become in compliance. It just means that OJJDP is no longer looking at those steps. It is whether you are complying or not. Once we come into compliance, we will be eligible for the FY 23 award. Commissioner Salla, any follow up on that?

Pauline Salla: No. Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: You're welcome. Commissioner Williams.

Marla Williams: Thank you. So were you planning to talk about what the grant funds, being new to this group, I don't know that I quite understand that, and what it carries out.

Leslie Bittleston: Absolutely. The grant is awarded annually, again meeting those three requirements that I mentioned a couple of slides ago. Every year states must verify that they meet those three requirements and then they will get awarded the

grant. Each grant is open for four years. States are required to sub-grants 66.6% of those funds to eligible nonprofit and county or other government agencies. Roughly 66% of the funds are sub granted out. A portion of those funds are used to fund a full-time position within the Juvenile Justice Programs Office. Some of those funds are used to maintain compliance with those four core requirements. Compliance includes onsite monitoring, so there are some travel funds allocated in the grant for staff to maintain compliance and do the travel required to visit the jails and other lockups within the state.

Lastly, there is a \$20,000 allotment that is specifically for the State Advisory Group. Historically, that \$20,000 was used for members to travel to meet in person for all meetings, and that changed when the JJOC was enacted in 2017. The Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission is no longer traveling as we have better methods, we can meet virtually through meeting rooms, meeting links, and Teams. So that \$20,000 has been used for other things related to the State Advisory Group. It's been used for training and used for travel for members to attend conferences. Later in the meeting, we're going to have another presentation on the use of those funds. I don't want to take away from the Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee, who will talk about that later, those are just high level what the grant funds are used for. Any further questions?

Pauline Salla: Leslie, this is Commissioner Salla again. I do is the training, the portion of the funding, was it training for Commissioners to attend or state employees or both?

Leslie Bittleston: It was a combination of both. The Programs Office provided some funds to counties, smaller counties to provide some training, which means that county employees benefited. The training for Commission members would be either if they wanted to attend a webinar that cost money, or if they wanted to go to a national conference.

Pauline Salla: Okay. Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Any other questions on Formula Grant, and membership and requirements to achieve and maintain the grant? Okay. Not seeing any.

We're going to move on to Agenda Item Number 7, which is a data presentation, which will start on PowerPoint Slide Number 8. I do have to begin this agenda item with a statement of what data is and what data isn't. There are a lot of data elements within the Juvenile Justice System, and one or two or three slides cannot accurately tell the whole story of every single element within the Juvenile Justice System. The slides and information that are going to be presented today is just very high-level information on or one or two elements within various areas within the system.

The first chart is room confinement, which is outlined in NRS 62B.215. This first chart is the total uses of room confinement for the three state facilities, Caliente Youth Center, Nevada Youth Training center, and Summit View Youth Center. What this chart tells us is the total number of uses in each facility by month. It does not tell us why room confinement was used. It does not tell us how many youths were in the facility in any given month nor does it tell us if there were youth that had multiple instances of confinement in a single month. We know that some youth can have five or 10 or more instances in a month. This is just showing us the total uses of room confinement in a state facility for the month.

There is a spike in one of the facilities. Just to give an idea of what that spike means, we did see in one of the state facilities an increase of behaviors of mental health behaviors of youth disrobing, youth trying to harm themselves or others, multiple instances of the same youth. That accounts for the spike. But I just wanted folks to know, to look at this data for what it is and don't infer something that is not there. This is just flat-out total number of uses of confinement in the facilities.

Moving on to Chart Number 9, again, this is the State Facilities, and it is just telling us overall combined how many hours of room confinement for those usages each month. If you have 30 usages in a month how much room confinement total for all those usages? This is in hours. As you can see, there is 14 hours for the Yellow, which is Summit View. Again, those spikes that we see indicate those months where we see problematic behaviors and multiple instances involving one or two or three or four youth with having multiple instances.

Okay. Moving on to Slide Number 10, I have a slide that is not numbered. Room confinement, the total to this is, and looks like Slide Number 11 and 10 should be reversed. But Slide Number 11 is the same chart as presented. Move on to Chart 11.

This chart again is the raw data. The total number of uses of room confinement by Juvenile Detention Facility, County Facilities. What this shows it's the total number of uses within the facilities. What this chart is not telling us is how many beds are in those facilities. We are presenting facilities that may have four beds and facilities that may have 120 beds. So those larger facilities are, Jan Evans, and your Clark County, have, of course, much higher beds than Teurman and Leighton Hall, which are Churchill and, and Winnemucca. You're going to see some disparity here of the number of uses, but that's not because anybody is doing anything wrong or anything like that. It is just looking at raw data without anything else presented. This is just the total number of uses by those facilities.

Then moving on to Chart 12. As presented with the state facilities, this is just the total amount of time those instances spent in room confinement. Again, if you have 20 instances, taking those 20 and adding all the time those 20 you spent in room confinement, this is the total hours for each of the juvenile detention facilities within the state.

That is room confinement. Are there any questions on room confinement?

Brigid Duffy: Leslie, this is Brigid Duffy from Clark County. When did we start taking off girls at NYTC? I'm just wondering if that spike in NYTC, if that's our girl population on the room confinements, because this is from 2023.

Leslie Bittleston: And if I can ask Commissioner Anderson to please answer those questions.

Brigid Duffy: Yes, if we could just go back to that first slide of this room confinement, so I can have that in front of me. I looked on the materials and I don't have it.

Sharon Anderson: This is Commissioner Anderson. Yes, it was the beginning of 2023, so end of 2022, beginning of 2023.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you, Commissioner Anderson. Commissioner Duffy, you are correct on what you were inferring on this chart for the spikes at NYTC. This month saw a lot of instances where females were having some behavior issues. There was one individual in particular who was very prone to self-harm and had a lot of interactions with staff for that reason. I don't want to just say that girls are the only ones that cause spikes in room confinement. Any youth can cause a spike, but this particular case was female related. Any other questions on room confinement?

And before we move on from room confinement, I do want to say that there is so much more data we can present for room confinement, like the average number of uses by population. As we move forward, we will provide more detailed data around room confinement. In addition, the President of NAJJA, the National Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators, has recommended that a NAJJA Subcommittee look at the intent of room confinement. Just to ensure that we as a State, throughout all those facilities, the State Facilities and the County detention facilities are gathering the data in the same way, because sometimes, this chart doesn't tell me if we're all looking at. There is some work to be done around this data. And I see Commissioner Florez with her hand up.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. This is Commissioner Florez, for the record. Just in furtherance of what Ms. Bittleston has described. It's the Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators not the National.

Leslie Bittleston: Oops.

Leslie Bittleston: Sorry.

Elizabeth Florez: Thanks for the promotion, Leslie. In our Data Subcommittee, we have a Data Subcommittee where we are trying to work together with the State to ensure that there's consistent reporting across all counties and understanding the definitions, understanding what each of our case management systems are able and not able to do. Related to room confinement, it's important that we also consider Use of Force in the same conversation with room confinement. When Ms. Bittleston describes the data that we dig into, we look at the profile of youths, how many youths are awaiting placement in a Camp Facility, Correctional State Facility. We have a lot of youth who are waiting for mental health beds, there's an access to care issue. That's also part of the conversation. I do look forward to the work that will be done by the State Advisory Group and the Data Committee, that we can work with the date in presenting more refined data to better explain or at least try to understand what's happening in all the facilities across the state. Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you Commissioner Florez. Any other questions or comments before we move on to our next data set? Okay. Our next data set, we're going to talk about the Community Corrections Partnership Block Grant. There is no NRS citation for that. For those new to the Commission, let me give you a little overview of what the Community Corrections Partnership Block Grant is. It is a Block Grant of money made up of state general funds. It's roughly \$2.3 million annually. The funds are split among Nevada's 17 counties based on a formula utilizing school enrollment numbers from each of those counties. The 15 rural counties receive a \$5,000 base before the funds are split up using the school enrollment formula. The historical premise of these funds was to focus on community services and to reduce commitments to state Correctional Facilities or DCFS. Per NRS 62B.630, 100% percent of these funds must be used on evidence-based programs and practices. This fund began roughly in 2013, and again, this is an annual allotment that is managed through the Programs Office, passed through the Programs Office directly to those 17 counties.

Moving on to the next slide, summary data for state fiscal year 23 Block Grant Funds. The total youth served combined for all the counties was 1170. The breakdown was 75.62% male, 24.36% female, and the average age of those youth served was; 15.41 years old. The race breakdown is White Caucasian 51.1%, Hispanic 23% African American a little over 10.5%, Native American 3.2%, Asian/Pacific Islander 1.4, and other/mixed is 2.5. The types of services these youth received is broken down by counseling, and that is community-based counseling 41.62%, group homes or specialized foster care 21 almost 22%, evaluation or assessment, again, community based, then prevention and education type services, then a small percentage of just under 2% was used on electronic monitoring. Moving on to the next slide, the top 10 offenses of those 1170 individuals. The number one offense was open and gross lewdness. Second, controlled substances, possession, or use, followed by assault, battery, et cetera.

Moving on to Slide Number 17. Another data set we keep for the Community Block Grant is the assessed risk level of those 1170 youth. The reason we look at the risk level is to determine or to kind of look at the level of youth that are being served with those front-end dollars. What we see here is 41.5% are moderate, 29 almost -- 4% are low, 23 are high, four little almost 5% are very high, a little over 1% are found incompetent. Looking at this data alone, counties are serving lower-level youth, moderate and low, some high and very high. And that's what we would expect to see with these funds. That is all the data for the Community Corrections Partnership Block Grant. Are there any questions on that particular element?

Pauline Salla: Leslie, this is Commissioner Salla, just for clarification purposes, because I think I heard that the CCP began in 2013. Is that what I heard?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, that was my understanding. If I'm wrong, please correct me.

Pauline Salla: Oh, we go way back. It was in effect in 2005 when I started with the State. I think it's been called different names. It was the Community Corrections Partnership Block Grant, then Medicaid Room and Board, now Community Correction Placement. It's gone through different names, but that has been in effect for a long time.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you very much for the clarification. As I was researching this, I couldn't find anything beyond 2013. So, thank you very much. It's been around at least till 2005.

Pauline Salla: At least that when I started with the state, it was already in place.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. Alright. Thank you. Any other questions?

Okay. We're going to move on to Slide Number 18. This again is looking at assessed risk level, but this is a different data set. This is the assessed risk level at commitment to DCFS. Commitment pursuant to 62E.506, to commit an individual to a State facility, a YLS is required. When a youth is committed to DCFS, we have an initial YLS that is sent to us from each committing county. This data set is the average score of those committing YLS's. And as you can see, it ranges anywhere from a low of 18 to a high of 25. And for those of us that are or those of you that are familiar with the YLS, the moderate and high threshold is right at about 22.

Anything under 22 is considered very high moderate, then 22 is that threshold. But I do again want to premise that this chart does not tell us everything. It just tells us an average score. Some youth that are at a lower risk level may be committed to DCFS for other regions reasons. Juvenile sex offenders, for example, tend to have lower risk levels, but require a higher level of care. Also, there are some folks that maybe have an offense that is more egregious and again need a higher level of care. This is the raw data, but again, does not tell the whole story, just tells us what we're seeing at commitment. Breaking this data down even more on the next slide.

For those that are familiar with the YLS, there are eight domains within the YLS. Each of those domains is assessed as at a risk level as well. There is number one, an overall risk level score, and then there is a risk level score by domain. For calendar year 23, the average risk level score overall was 21.92, which again I mentioned a couple of minutes ago, 22 is the threshold for high. We are right on the border of high. And then looking at the average scores by domain for each of those domain areas, prior and current offenses, moderate. But the one area that I will point out on this slide is leisure and recreation. This is one area that DCFS sees pretty much across the board as high for most, probably a good 85% to 90% of youth committed to DCFS are high in leisure and recreation. Some of these other areas do say moderate, but they again are on the cusp of, of high. So, any questions about risk level data at commitment to DCFS?

Moving on to Slide Number 21. The next data set we are going to talk about is use of force. There is no NRS citation for use of force. However, historically, the JJOC, and prior to that, the Juvenile Justice Commission did review these numbers regularly. The way that this data is broken down is, it is broken down by restraint type. So, for state facilities in state fiscal year 23, there were 507 total uses of force. Again, that -- those numbers are broken down by restraint type. Out of those 507, the highest level was two chemical restraints.

There were 358 mechanical restraints and four -- 147 physical restraints. Race breakdown of those 507, little over 50% African American, just under 29% -- roughly 29% White, Caucasian about 11%, Hispanic and just under 10% other. The average number of Use of Force incidents per month in the state facilities was 42.25. And again, looking at this data, use of force and room confinement generally go hand in hand. When you see a spike of room confinement, you will also most likely see a spike in uses of force for those same reasons that, that we discussed earlier in the presentation.

Moving on to Slide Number 22. This is just a breakdown of the total number of uses of force by month in state facilities. As you can see, the, the max October of 2022 is 76 and the minimum September the month before is -- or excuse me, the minimum is February for 20 and had 22.

Moving on to Chart 23. This is use of force for county juvenile detention for state fiscal year 23. In those facilities, there were 281 total uses of force. The highest level of restraint by type is indicated. There were 53 chemical restraints, hundred and 158 mechanical restraints, and 70 physical restraints. The race breakdown data is not available due to the fact that we do have some vacant positions in the Programs Office, and we were not able to complete this data set prior to the meeting. The average number of uses of force incidents per month for the county juvenile detention facilities is 23.41. And then moving on to Chart Number 24, same breakdown, total number by month for those facilities.

Any questions on Use of Force? Before I take questions, I will also state that what Commissioner Florez said a few minutes ago about room confinement is also true for Use of Force. We will be looking at those two areas on the go forward. Any questions? I see Commissioner Williams.

Marla Williams: Thank you. I think it would be helpful to have these numbers also in comparison to the total population, because it's hard to read them, read them out of context, of how much population is affected as well.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you. Any other questions?

Paula Smith: Yeah. Commissioner Smith, for the record. How come the counties are using so much chemical restraint versus the state chemical restraints? Is there any reason? I was just curious.

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston, for the record. Unfortunately, I can't answer that here today. That is something that NAJJA will be digging into as we go forward. I cannot answer that today.

Paula Smith: Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Any other questions?

Pauline Salla: This is, this is Commissioner Salla. I think that especially because we have a lot of new members, we do have a continuum along our Use of Force. Although some facilities have OC spray and some don't, I do agree that we need the total, like what was the total population, because it can be so misconstrued by not having all the information. We report, facilities report, like number of use of forces, what was the highest level of use of force. It may not have escalated to our highest level of force. But when we're just collecting and we're presenting this data, I think that it needs must take a real comprehensive look of how we're reporting this, because I do think it can be misconstrued. I mean, I haven't had a use of force in two years, and in the last month, I had five. So that can look like, oh, my God, what a huge spike, but I think that we need to look at how we present this and, and to make sure all the information is included.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you. Any other questions or comments?

Brigid Duffy: This is Brigid Duffy, for the record. Do we have a comparison chart to see if this has gone up or down over the last several years?

Leslie Bittleston: Commissioner Duffy, not for this meeting. It is something we can present at a future meeting. This, again, was just raw data that we were presenting at this meeting. We have a lot of ways we can present this data, which we will work through as we go forward. Any other questions?

Okay. Moving on to Number 25 and a completely different data set. This is federal data. If you remember, from the, the early on in this presentation, we talked about federal compliance with the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act, we talked about jail removal, sight and sound separation, deinstitutionalization of status offenders, those four core protections. However, there's only three of those core protections that we can provide data on.

The first core protection is jail removal. And for those that are new to the commission, let me explain what jail removal is. Jail removal ensures that we are not placing juveniles in adult jails, and if we are, for whatever reason, that we are removing them as quickly as possible. The Programs Office within DCFS collects data from adult jails on an annual basis and identifies any potential violations. The jail removal percentage is 0.45%. What that means is the rate of noncompliance per 100,000 juvenile population. Unfortunately, OJJDP, the federal agency that I mentioned earlier, has not published the de minimis rate. The de minimis rate is the threshold of anything over means the state is out of compliance federally and anything under means the state is complying. I do not have that de minimis rate to compare us to. But in my experience in the last nine years of this position, the state is within compliance with jail removal with 0.45%, the de minimis rate is usually around 3 or 4% historically.

Sight and sound separation, we had no instances of individuals indicating there was a sight and sound separation violation. And let me explain what sight and sound separation means. If we place a juvenile in an adult facility, we must ensure that they are separated from adult offenders the whole time that they are in the facility, which is one of the biggest reasons we go out to facilities on an annual basis and talk to them about maintaining sight and sound separation, if they have a juvenile in their facility. This has been around the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act has been around since the 1970s, 1974 to be specific. Many facilities are very aware and have policies around this. As you can see, we have zero instances of sight and sound separation, which is great.

Number three, deinstitutionalization of status offenders or DSO. The rate of noncompliance for the state of Nevada is 2.66 per 100,000. And I was able to find a de minimis rate for this of 8.5. As you can see, the state is complying that is because it is under that rate. And let me explain to you what deinstitutionalization of status offenders is. There are two ways to obtain a violation of a status offender. One is placement of a status offender within an adult facility for any amount of time, and, and I'm talking secure placement. I'm not talking about going in for a breathalyzer or going in for a booking. I'm talking placed in a secure area for even one minute is a violation in an adult facility. The second potential violation is placement of a status offender in a juvenile facility for over 24 hours. And that 24-hour mark can be pre-detention hearing and post-detention hearing. If there is no detention hearing held, then it would just be a flat 24 hours. So juvenile detention facilities report monthly to the Programs Office this data. So that is where we are federally with the core protections of the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention.

And moving on to number 26, this is just a little more data around status offenders specifically. The total number of status offenders placed in juvenile detention in fiscal year 23 was 194. Again, this is placed in juvenile detention facilities; 46.4% were males, 52.6% were females, the average age of all those youth were 15.43 years old, and there were no violations of a valid court order.

And for those that again are new to the commission, let me explain what a valid court order is. A valid court order is a ruling by a juvenile court for repeat status offenders. If an individual comes in on status offenses, a -- a juvenile court judge can order some type of order. If that juvenile has another status offense and they are held more than 24 hours, they could be held using a valid court order. So that is just an exception to the 24-hour rule for repeat status offenders, but we did not have any in fiscal year 23.

The offense breakdown for those status offenses, for those 194 youth, 82 were listed as CHINS. And for those that don't know what CHINS is, CHINS is Child in Need of Supervision. 23% were runaways, 12 almost 13%, were incorrigible. And for those that do not know what incorrigible is, those are youth that are beyond parental control and usually those are referred; by parents. MIC, MIC stands for Minor in Consumption of Alcohol. Here in Nevada, MIC is a delinquent offense, but federally it is a status offense. It is included in federal data as a status offense. The next one is curfew, a little over 9%. And then a new status offense, the possession of less than 1 oz of marijuana. Any questions about federal data or status offenders?

Okay. We're going to move on to a recidivism measure of commitments. Rec commitments are specific to state facilities. This data is used to measure as a measurement of recidivism. 174 youths were committed to the state in, in 2023, and 51 of those youths 51 youths were recommitted. And for those that don't know what recommitted means, it means that they were committed to DCFS, they were paroled, so they were released from a state facility, paroled, and then recommitted again to a DCFS state facility. This is just one measure of recidivism using just this one piece of data. Out of those 51 commitments, 39 of those youths were committed for their first time and 12 were committed for a second time. The rate of recidivism is 29.21% using this measurement alone.

Moving on to chart number 28, this is again the use of risk level data. Looking at the risk level of initial commitments, first recommitment and second recommitment. The first recommitment, this data was presented earlier. Initially, the 21.92 that we discussed earlier is the average score of those committed to DCFS. Breaking that number down of just those committed for the first time, the average YLS score for those youth was 24.20. And breaking down those 12 youth that we recommitted for a second time, their risk YLS score was 27. As you can see, we moved from just high level of moderate to the mid-range of high to almost at very high. The recommitments really are those youth that need more services and a higher level of care and have greater risk. So that is just, again, one measure of recidivism. Any questions about that?

Okay. The last chart, Chart Number 29 is looking at, looking at upcoming projects, but we will address that under Agenda Item Number 8. Before we close Agenda Item Number 7, are there any last questions about data? Okay. Seeing none.

We're going to move on to Agenda Item Number 8. This is subcommittee updates. We currently have three subcommittees, and we will go to subcommittee number one, the Strategic Planning Committee, which is chaired by Commissioner Elizabeth Florez. She has provided an attachment for her report, which is Attachment Number 8. Commissioner Florez.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. This is Commissioner Florez. Can you hear me, okay? Much appreciation to our Strategic Planning Committee that met us regularly while the JJOC was not meeting regularly. What I attempted to do is provide a broad overview of the items that we discussed over the many meetings over the last several years. Ultimately, we had worked by reviewing the current strategic plan as well as other legislative reports and requirements. We discussed Bill drafts as they were coming through to provide support to each other related to our recommendations to items that might have an impact on juvenile justice. Ultimately, there were recommendations that we agreed upon as a group. The first of which was to provide a stipend for JJOC youth members. Not just, not just in our state but across the country, there, there's difficulty in finding youth members to state commissions, and so there have been a recommendation by a previous youth member that had she had a stipend that would provide her support in leaving work or school, and at that point, we were traveling. Travel is no longer required for these meetings, but that might be an incentive for youth members to participate in the committee -- the commission. The other recommendation was to hire a consultant to organize the FY 24-28 strategic plan, while our small but mighty committee made efforts to provide guidance on this. This is a heavy lift. And the first strategic plan was one that the state was able to hire a vendor to create, and so our recommendation would be that we do the same for the updated strategic plan. And at this point, I don't have anything further, but I'm happy to take any questions or provide clarification.

Leslie Bittleston: Are there any questions for Commissioner Florez? Commissioner Williams.

Marla Williams: Thank you. Commissioner Florez, and this may not really be in your wheelhouse, but just in general, I mean, have we looked inside the facilities for youth or are we looking outside of facilities for youth? What type of youth are we looking for?

Elizabeth Florez: Commissioner Florez, for the record. Are you talking about youth membership on the commission? I believe in statute, it, it provides a definition for who qualifies as a youth member based on age, and I think some have -- I think there's a preference for youth who have been previously system involved, but I will defer to, I see Commissioner Salla shaking her head and perhaps Ms. Bittleston can provide further details to that.

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston, for the record. Per NRS 62B.600, youth members must be 24 years of age or below at the time of the initial appointment. Federal requirements are age 28 and below at initial appointment. It is recommended that

youth members have prior system involvement. They do not need to be within a facility. They could be on probation, or they could be out of the system completely, but the, the biggest requirements are the age requirements. State requirement is under 24, Federal requirement is under 28 at the time of initial appointment. Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Alright. Any other questions for Commissioner Florez? I do not see any other questions. Commissioner Florez has two items for possible action. The first item is the strategic planning committee. We will recommend for approval the authorization of stipends for, for youth members in the form of gift cards when they attend JJOC and committee meetings. Is there any discussion on that possible motion?

Matthew Clapman: Where does that money come from?

Leslie Bittleston: Did you hear Commissioner Clapman? His question was, where would the funds for the stipends come from? And that is a great question. The funds for the stipends will come out of the \$20,000 annual allotment out of the Title II Formula Funds. As I mentioned earlier, those funds were historically used for travel, and this commission is, is no longer traveling since we have other methods of meeting in person. The idea is to use funds out of the State Advisory Group allotment for to fund stipends. I see a question by Commissioner Salla.

Pauline Salla: Thank you, Leslie. I make a motion for this, because if we're not getting our funds yet for this year, do we still have carryover in that funding of the 20,000 that really goes towards SAG involvement? Do we still have a carryover from the previous years or like how much has been spent out of that for training and things like that?

Leslie Bittleston: That is an excellent question, Commissioner Salla. We still do have funds available. We have spent roughly half of the FY20 allotments and no funds out of the FY21 and FY22 allotments. We do have funds available to cover the stipends for these youth members.

Pauline Salla: Thank you. T hen my follow up to that is, was an amount discussed of like how much the stipend is per meeting?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. An amount was discussed based on the length of the meeting. Anything that was an hour or under would be, and I don't know if we finalized this, but what was discussed was, anything that was an hour or below would be \$50 in the form of a gift card. Anything that was one hour to three hours would be \$75, and anything over three hours would be \$100. I think that it is up for approval by this commission or recommendation, maybe that's a better word is up for recommendation by this commission.

Pauline Salla: Okay. I'll wait to see if there's any other discussion before I make a motion for the stipend.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. Any other discussion for the stipends for youth members? Okay. We can entertain a motion.

Pauline Salla: For the record, Commissioner Salla, S-A-L-L-A. I move that we approve a stipend for our JJOC youth members in the amount of \$50 for a meeting an hour or less, \$75 for a meeting that is one to three hours, and \$100 for any meeting that is three hours or more.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. There is a motion. Is there a second?

Brigid Duffy: This is Commissioner Duffy. I'll second.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. There is a motion and a second. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Leslie Bittleston: Perfect. Any opposed? Okay. Motion passes unanimously. There is also another possible action item under the strategic planning committee. The strategic planning committee will recommend for approval the authorization or identification of funding for a vendor to create a new strategic plan. And just to premise this motion a little bit, the current strategic plan is expiring this year. And per NRS 62B.615, I believe, it is -- the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission is required to create a strategic plan every five years. So we are at that five-year mark, and the strategic planning committee is recommending the commission to identify a vendor to assist with the writing of the next strategic plan. Is there any discussion? Okay.

Pauline Salla: This is Commissioner Salla. Does the state have identified vendors that we would go to? Does the Strategic Planning committee [Indiscernible] those? I mean I just need a little bit more info.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. I see a hand up by Commissioner Williams.

Marla Williams: I'll let you go ahead and answer that and then I'll go.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. The answer to that is unknown at this point. If the JJOC recommends today that the state DCFS attempt to locate money, that will be on DCFS staff to go back and to identify if there is funding for this, and if there is funding for this, most likely what occur is the state will have to do a request for proposal and obtain a vendor that way. Commissioner Salla, did that answer your question?

Pauline Salla: Yes. Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. Commissioner Williams.

Marla Williams: Thank you. I think we have vendors on the [Indiscernible] master services list, so it wouldn't require a full RFP, and it could be done quickly. I guess my only discussion point is, when you look at the statutes that you referenced on strategic plan 62B.615, I don't think that it requires a whole lot of new activity. Just reading over this, what's your sense, Leslie?

Leslie Bittleston: My sense is, it depends on what the commission wants. The current strategic plan that is currently in effect today is quite robust and was completed by a vendor. The commission may decide to make a much scaled down strategic plan in which I believe state staff and the strategic planning committee can do through, you know, a course of, of several meetings. I do not believe that state staff and the strategic planning committee will be able to make a robust Strategic Plan that is currently in effect today. I believe that a couple of questions need to be answered. A very scaled back Strategic Plan, is that acceptable? And if it is, I believe that state staff, with the assistance of the Strategic Planning Committee, would be able to do that.

Marla Williams: I mean as a new member, I'm not comfortable weighing in on that either way without seeing the former Strategic Plan and, being able to kind of weigh that. I feel like before we act on this, we should probably schedule it for another discussion to give some direction to, you know, whatever group follows it through. I know I'm not ready to do that today.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Salla.

Pauline Salla: Yeah. I think those of us who were involved in the initial strategic plan don't want to see us backslide and just do a basic one, and I do think that the elements that were included in our last strategic plan were important to our overall juvenile justice reform efforts. I think we might need a little bit more information. I do think when it falls on the committee members and the State Staff, that becomes difficult, because we all have full-time jobs that make it difficult for us to complete an entire strategic plan. I'm not against working towards finding a vendor to help, I think that's important. I do think there's things that were missing in our original strategic plan that maybe we can beef up during this one. I just think if we don't know what funding is available, where that funding is

going to come from, it's hard to, you know, make a motion to move forward unless the motion is to do more research on it. That's just where I'm at.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. In speaking on behalf of the State, unfortunately, I was not a part of the creation of the first Strategic Plan. I unfortunately do not have any information on how much was allotted or where that funding came from. So possibly the motion that we need to look at today would be directing State Staff to research how and where the funds and how much funds were used at the next or for the current Strategic Plan to bring to the next commission for discussion, so possibly to do more research. I don't know if that is something that needs to be a motion.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez. In looking at what was on the agenda for possible action, I could make a motion. The Strategic Planning Committee recommends the direction of state personnel to identify potential funding for a vendor to create the new Strategic Plan.

Leslie Bittleston: Is that a motion, Commissioner Florez?

Elizabeth Florez: That's my motion.

Leslie Bittleston: Is there a second?

Pauline Salla: I didn't know if it was going to be Commissioner Duffy or me. Thought that was good. Commissioner Salla, I'll second that motion.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. The motion on the table is for the JJOC to direct State Staff to identify funding to hire a vendor or to do research and look for funding on hiring research to bring to the next commission meeting. Any discussion on that motion? Okay. All those in favor, say aye.

Group: Aye.

Leslie Bittleston: Any opposed? Okay. Motion passes unanimously. Commissioner Florez, do you have anything else for the strategic planning committee?

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez. No, I do not. Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. The State Advisory Committee, racial and ethnic disparities. The Chair is Pauline Salla. Pauline, do you have anything you would like to chat?

Pauline Salla: Commissioner Salla, S-A-L-L-A. Just hoping that I have a whole bunch of new members, and volunteers, so that we can begin meeting, because we do have a lot to catch up on, and especially since we've been deemed ineligible for Formula Funding, because we haven't met the requirements, that really is part of what we do on the State Advisory Group, which that's concerning to me. Then, of course, our racial and ethnic disparity. Hopefully, our committee is full of people, and I have not heard if people have volunteered or be appointed, but as soon as I know we're well to go, we'll schedule a meeting.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Salla. The Data Committee, Commissioner Duffy, and just to state that there was a meeting scheduled for the Data Committee on February 7th which was canceled due to lack of quorum. Commissioner Duffy, do you have anything you want to share with the group?

Brigid Duffy: Hi, good morning. This is Commissioner Duffy. Yes, I am sorry that the Data Committee was canceled. I was one of the people that was unable to show up to my own meeting due to a health issue. I plan to reschedule within the next month. Look for that invitation group. You can see the agenda that was previously posted. It is still on the website for February 7th. That had our agenda on it to deal with our look on competency data and to review our scorecard and performance summary data. A lot of that is kind of going back and saying this was all of us

performance measures that we wanted to look at when the world was, in front of us and high level, and now kind of coming back down to some realism of what we really want to focus on getting the data around and measuring our performance against. So probably, well, hopefully, I'll get with Leslie after this meeting and get a date on the books for everybody within the next 30 days.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you Commissioner Duffy. And, just to inform the commission that there is a data element that is part of their Strategic Plan. The Data Committee will be addressing that specific element to be included within the next Strategic Plan. The performance and scorecard summary that Commissioner Duffy referenced is an element of the Strategic Plan. The Data Committee will determine what the next performance scorecard will look like or if it will be something different for inclusion into the next Strategic Plan. Any questions or comments for any of our committees?

Paula Smith: Yes. This is Commissioner Smith. Commissioner Salla, I know in the past, I was on the State Advisory Committee/racial and ethnic disparities. I'll volunteer to sit on that Committee again. Thank you.

Brigid Duffy: Thank you.

Pauline Salla: Thank you Commissioner Smith.

Leslie Bittleston: Perfect. Okay. The last bullet item under Number 8 is PowerPoint slide. Cindy

Leslie Bittleston: PowerPoint Slide Number 29. These are the major projects that each of the Committees will be working on in 2024. The Strategic Planning Committee will be working on the next Strategic Plan. The State Advisory Group will be working on a new three-year plan, it is due this year, along with some other things that we discussed earlier in the meeting. And the State Performance Committee will be reviewing the data system elements that we talked about just a minute ago in the form of the performance scorecard to be included in the Strategic Plan. Those are the major upcoming projects for those committees. Any questions or comments on agenda item number eight? Hearing none.

We'll close Agenda Item Number 8 and move to Agenda Item Number 9 for possible action, which is to discuss and decide upon next steps. Based on discussion items within this meeting, the JJOC may recommend items be assigned to committees, if they are not already. Is there any thoughts or discussion from members on things that came up that may not be within a committee at this point? Okay. Seeing none.

Are there any specific agenda items any of the Commissioner members would like to see at the next commission meeting? Okay.

Marla Williams: This is Commissioner Williams. I would like us to discuss the Strategic Plan itself and kind of have some sense of what elements of the Strategic Plan are no longer working. I don't know if that's realistic to have for the next meeting or not.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez, for the record. We can certainly provide an update, as stated earlier, not everybody has seen the, the current Strategic Plan, so we can certainly discuss that plan and highlight any items that need updating.

Leslie Bittleston: And just to stock up this, Strategic Planning Committee has also done a lot of work determining some of the current plan areas that have been completed, some of the current plan areas that have not been completed, and why they have not been completed. There is a great deal of information that we can bring to the JJOC to help guide the discussion around the new Strategic Plan. We will put that on the next agenda. Any other recommendations or requests for agenda items?

Okay. The next item is to confirm the next meeting date and time. I do not have a calendar in front of me. We meet quarterly, so our next meeting would be the first part of May. If anybody can help me with a calendar, that would be great. Cindy is helping me. And meetings do not have to be on Mondays. This was just an available time for the Chair. Historically, this commission meets on Friday afternoon, the first Friday of the month, from 1-5. This commission can go back to Fridays or can stick with Monday mornings, whatever is available. The first Friday of May would be May 3rd if folks want to go back to 1-5.

Pauline Salla: Leslie, this is Commissioner Salla. I think, were we running into issues with Friday for people like maybe not working. If they work 4-10's, or something like that, Friday seemed to be a difficult time.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Pauline Salla: I don't know if other members had the same concerns, but...

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, that is correct. Thank you for refreshing my memory. Are Mondays good for Commission members, Monday mornings? We could do May 6, at 09:00 a.m., if that works for members.

Pauline Salla: Works for me.

Elizabeth Florez: Yes.

Brigid Duffy: Good for me.

Leslie Bittleston: Great.

Jennifer Fraser: Works for us.

Unidentified Speaker: Works for us here, too.

Leslie Bittleston: Great. Thank you. The next meeting, we will send out a meeting invite for May 6, at 09:00 a.m. Any other discussion around Agenda Item Number 9? Okay. Moving on to agenda item number 10, public comment. To provide public comment, telephonically, dial 1775-321-6111. When prompted to provide the Meeting ID, enter 866-724-634#. If providing public comment during this meeting, unmute your microphone prior to speaking. Persons making a public comment will be, be asked to begin by stating their name for the record and to spell their last name. And I will begin by asking if there's any public comment here in Carson City? Seeing none. Any public comment in Las Vegas? Seeing none. Any public comment virtually? Seeing none. We will close Item Number 10 and move to Item Number 11 for adjournment. The meeting is adjourned at 10:39 a.m. Thank you very much, everybody, and have a wonderful day.