

Joe Lombardo
Governor



Richard Whitley, MS
Director

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

DIVISION OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES
Helping people. It's who we are and what we do.



Marla McDade
Williams, MPA
Administrator

Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission *STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING* *December 6th at 9:00 am*

Transcript

Called to order at 9:02 a.m.

Roll Call:

(Voting Members)

Present: Elizabeth Florez (Chair), Jennifer Fraser, Sharon Anderson, Dylan Tedford

Absent: Brigid Duffy, Ethan Ewert

(Non-Voting Members)

Absent: Pauline Salla

Present: Michael Whelihan

(Staff Members)

Present: Cindy Castleman, Leslie Bittleston, Kayla Williamson

Elizabeth Florez: I will call the meeting to order. It is nine zero -- 9:02, and Ms. Bittleston, if you could please check roll?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Liz Florez?

Elizabeth Florez: Present.

Leslie Bittleston: Jennifer Fraser?

Jennifer Fraser: Here.

Leslie Bittleston: Dylan Tedford?

Dylan Teford: Here.

Leslie Bittleston: Brigid Duffy? Sharon Anderson?

Sharon Anderson: Here.

Leslie Bittleston: And Ethan Evert [ph]? Okay. Pauline Salla [ph]? I don't see her. Staff present, we have Cindy Castleman [ph], Leslie Bittleston and Kayla Williamson. I do not see any guests on at this time. We do have a quorum, Madame Chair.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you very much. This is Liz Florez for the record. Ms. Bittleston, you did call Pauline Salla's name. Is that as just an --

Leslie Bittleston: As a, as a non-voting member.

Elizabeth Florez: As a non-voting member? Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Because she does come sometimes.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. I appreciate that. Thank you. This is Commissioner Florez for the record. We'll move on to # 3, public comment and discussion. Is there any public comment or discussion? To -- I must read this. Is this correct? Do I need to read this Leslie? To provide you with --

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Elizabeth Florez: -- telephonic --

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Elizabeth Florez: -- dial 1-(415) 762-9988. When prompted to provide the meeting ID, enter 864 0708 0984# and passcode 650933. If providing public comment during this meeting, unmute your microphone prior to speaking. Persons making comments will be asked to speak in by stating their name for the record and to spell their last name. Again, I don't see public comments. So with that, we'll move on to #4 for possible action, review and approve minutes. The minutes were from October 17, 2023. If everybody's had an opportunity to review them, I'll seek a motion to approve the minutes.

Sharon Anderson: This is Sharon Anderson, I move to approve the minutes.

Jennifer Fraser: This is Jennifer, I'll second.

Elizabeth Florez: Excellent. Is there any -- I forget what I'm supposed to ask for discussion. All those in favor, say aye.

Group: Aye.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. Any opposed? Seeing none. The minutes from October 17 are approved and we'll move on to item #5, housing of youthful offenders. Ms. Bittleston.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Leslie Bittleston for the record. This is a standing item on this agenda just in case we get something back from the Legislative Council Bureau. As of this time, we have not received any comments or feedback or questions.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. This is Commissioner Florez for the record. At the last meeting, we talked about an upcoming visit to the Northern Nevada Correctional Center with Commissioner Duffy. Did that occur?

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston for the record. Yes, it did occur. I accompanied Commissioner Duffy at -- on the visit. I can't remember the date. I could look it up, but yes, it did occur. We met with the Warden, the Assistant Warden, the Case Manager of the youthful offenders, and we visited the pod where the offenders are held. One of the things that came about -- there's Mr. Whelihan, which I will add to the list. Good morning, Mike.

Mike Whelihan: Good morning. Running from one meeting to the next it's hard for being like --.

Leslie Bittleston: No problem. We're --I'm just giving an update on a visit to Northern Nevada Correctional Center with Commissioner Duffy. So Commissioner Duffy's assessment that she shared with me was that she was grateful to talk to the youth, because a lot of the youth are from the Las Vegas area that are there. One of the things that came out on my side was that many of the youth do not have family support and what I'm specifically talking about is apparently they, the inmates, just general inmates, rely on family members for, you know, funds in their part to be able to buy things up at the facility and shoes and personal items and things like that. One of the things the youthful offenders were in need of were shoes. Apparently, they have had -- they were using the slippers that they get, I don't know, but those are cold, I'm sorry, but many of them couldn't play basket ball or play games outside in the yard due to no tennis shoes. So I have reached out to a local company, The Change Companies, and for those of you who are on the facility side, The Change Companies provide the interactive journal in the forward thinking and voices and they have offered to do a shoe tree for the youthful offenders, but I'm waiting for Warden -- the Warden to get back to me if they would like to take that up. So that's where that is and that's the result of that visit.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez. Thank you for that update. I was curious how it went and what Commissioner Duffy's impressions were. So thank you for that. Are there any comments or questions about that?

Jennifer Fraser: This is Jennifer for the record. I know Ms. Duffy sent an email to the stakeholders down here about her impressions and that was like a couple of months ago, so I don't remember all the details, but one thing that was brought up in addition to the shoes was just the lack of resources for families for visitation and so that is something that I know obviously our office is interested in and I think we all should be interested into figure out a way. I know funding is limited, but figure out something for that since they are mostly from Southern Nevada and then so far away.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. Alright. Thank you. We'll move on to item #6. This is Commissioner Florez. For information and discussion, the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission update. And Ms. Bittleston.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you. Leslie Bittleston for the record. Since I prepared this agenda with Madame Chair, the state DCFS has had, had -- has received the FY 3 Formula Grant. It was not received at the time of the preparation of this agenda. However, what's important is the FY23 Grant is currently unavailable and frozen due to the fact that the state has a State Advisory Group that does not meet federal requirements at this time. The problem areas are youthful offenders -- the youthful offender -- gosh, you could tell I'm sick -- youths, youth commissioners. So we have one out of six youth commissioner positions filled. So we are actively working to recruit youthful commissioners. Cindy who is within my office most recently has been working with her contacts to try to recruit youth. Thank you, Cindy. I would just also say it if anybody else, any other commissioners have any thoughts on a potential youth, we could really use some youth on the commission, preferably with some ec - experience or history with the juvenile system. Any questions?

Dylan Tedford: (Inaudible).

Leslie Bittleston: Oh.

Dylan Tedford: Yeah. This is Dylan Tedford for the record. Just out of curiosity, how much is the preference there related to a history in the juvenile system, a preference versus mandatory? Are some of the position, is it mandatory that they are or they all kind of the same product?

Leslie Bittleston: What is required is the commission that we have three members with prior juvenile history. So, it could be anybody. It could be the adults; it could be the juveniles. I believe, we only have one commissioner right now who has past involvement in the juvenile system, so to answer the question, it is a preference, it is not mandatory.

Dylan Tedford: Okay. Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Yep. The other area that we are lacking is an elected official, and we do have a pending elected official right now. Thank you to Cindy again. We have a school board -- elected school board member who has applied and who is pending appointment in the Governor's Office. So any questions on membership? Oh, I also need to say that I'm meeting with Dylan next week in person to talk about the membership issues that we have had over the past several years. Those of you who have been on the commission for a while know that we have had some membership issues and that the JJOC doesn't necessarily match the federal requirement, so we have to work really hard to make sure our members on the JJOC are also meeting federal requirements. So Dylan and I are meeting next week to discuss that. So, we, it's -- we're working on it and what's really important is the FY23 funds will not be available until we can fix our SAG. So it is a priority and something that is being worked on. Any questions or comments? Alright. That's it, Madame Chair, for that one.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. This is Commissioner Florez. Can you hear me?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Elizabeth Florez: Wonderful. Thank you. I am uncertain what happened, my desktop just died on me. So I had to transition to my phone and so you won't see me. So I'm just glad you can hear me. So I apologize for that. Moving on -- are there any comments or discussion related to item #6? Okay. Thank you for that report. Moving on to item #7, the Strategic Plan Preparation - Goals. Ms. Bittleston, since I'm a little bit incapacitated here, can I ask you to please start the conversation on this?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Leslie Bittleston for the record. As we have discussed in this committee over the last few months, the strategic plan is due for not so much revision, but a new one. So the current strategic plan is expiring this year. So I prepared a document for this agenda item. In your packet of materials, you have the complete strategic plan as it is today and then another document called Incomplete Items from the strategic plan. This document is used for discussion purposes only and it's outlining those areas in the current strategic plan that are either not completed or partially completed. I've provided this to this committee for discussion if this committee has any appetite to use those same incomplete areas or just scrap them and start again. So does everybody have the document called Incomplete Items?

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. Thank you. So I -- the other one is completed. We do have a view -- is everybody muted? Perfect. Okay. Goal #1 is not listed because that is complete. So we'll move on to goal #2. This -- and for those of you who participated in the preparation of this back in 2018, the Strategic Planning Committee at that time worked with a vendor, I can't -- OnStrategy, I think, is the name of the vendor. So this was created with the help of the vendor. So moving on to goal #2, I just want to outline the items that were not complete and why they were not complete. To begin -- there's Liz. Hi, again. So we're on page #2. So Proven Programs, this is the evidence-based practices inventory and this is partially

completed because there is a lack of funding for the evidence-based resource center, and for those of you who recall the evidence-based resource center is the National Coalition for Juvenile Justice and our representative is Kirsten Russell. She presented at the last JJOC Meeting to refresh our memories of what the evidence-based resource center does. So item #1 under goal 2 is partially completed only because of the lack of funding. Number 2, Develop a Plan for DCFS to help the counties replace ineffective and harmful programs. This is not complete. DCFS does not have the resources to do this and the lack of funding with the resource center has also made this goal not accomplishable at this time. Moving on to # 3, this goal was really -- and this is my reading of the goal and please let me know if it's wrong or if you look at it as a different -- in a different way, but when we adopted the CPC, the quality assurance assessment process of the state facilities and the UPMs [ph], I believe there was discussion at that time to begin to incorporate the county detention facilities, community providers and all of that. However, this has never gotten off the ground for a couple of reasons, no resources to do it and no statute requiring this be done for detention facilities or community providers. The statute only outlined state facilities and UPMs. So I will stop there unless there are any questions, and like I said, I'm presenting this to the group to see if this is something they just want to scrap or if this is something we want to include in our next strategic plan.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Liz Florez for the record. Thank you for that, Leslie, and I apologize Commissioner Duffy just texted me and said that she is tied up in court and sends her apologies for not being able to join. So, goal # 1 is completed. Goal #2 is Proven Programs. We can -- this is the one related to the evidence-based resource center, which continues to be unfunded or only partially funded.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Elizabeth Florez: And one of my questions I had over the course of time is related to -- if we have any idea of the traffic that the website has received to know if it was utilized when it was fully operational, and I am not certain if we have -- if we can gain access to that information before we determine whether or not it's something -- I think it would just help inform the decision. I know just in Washoe County, we do a tremendous amount of research work constantly seeking or regularly seeking innovation, best practice, and there is a whole host of resources across the country that are at our fingertips and the -- I remember when I had been using the evidence-based -- the website, it reflected that it was not terribly robust and didn't provide anything that was helpful beyond what we could already find elsewhere. So for whatever that's worth, I think it would -- I'm not -- but I don't want to speak on behalf of other district jurisdictions that may have utilized that website. So I'll just -- I'll leave my comment at that and see if anybody else has any other feedback related to that.

Mike Whelihan: I agree with Liz, it's not robust enough and I think sometimes it's confusing on what -- and those are not like trainings and stuff like that and almost seems like they're mandatory, but they're really not mandatory, so I think kind of the -- I don't know the advertisement, I don't know how to say it like how they -- it's not really been pushed out to where it's something that would people like oh, this is an asset instead it seems to be like, hey, you need to do this, and you're like, well, not really, but, you know, I agree with Liz, we do a lot of stuff like we're bringing RFK, Liz you're familiar with that and so Sharon does and so we do a lot of that, so we get a lot of our stuff through them, but I think may be just -- if we're going to do this instead and there is no funding and then really it's pointless. If they don't increase funding, and as you make it, like a -- assist instead of -- it's like, it's like punishing people, hey, you got to do this, and you're like, oh, I already got this as best practice but you need to do this training, well, no, let's -- I just think kind of the way it has been advertised isn't effective either, like this be no more effective and it's kind of have more resource. If it doesn't have the resource, like it should be telling us, like, hey, man, I think there is no one -- there's no (Inaudible) it should be helping on us like with grants to get, you know, it's evidence-based practices to say, here's these grants, you know, kind of been like a real tool, if it is -- that's because that was really intended for us to assist as to get these evidence-

based practices and often times those grants and things that you could apply for, but it -- really it's not there.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez. Thank you Mike for adding that. And because we're a little bit of a larger jurisdiction, mid size jurisdiction in the state, we have resources within in our own agency they go and seek these things actively. And I know that may not be the case for a much smaller jurisdictions, so the concept of this is one that would have been just clearing house where all of that could be maintained by, you know, by the state or by the, by the, you know -- our vendor, so that it could be a one stop shop, but I, it, it -- we've just been talking about this so long and if there is not a commitment to make a really significant investment in this, I'm not certain -- I mean, I, it -- it is in statute. Right?

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah, it is in statute.

Elizabeth Florez: So I don't know how we remove it as a goal, if, because it's still a goal statutorily and perhaps we just leave it here and report to the larger body that this is the concern we have that we are -- we were not effectual in meeting this requirement due to the lack of resource to maintain it.

Mike Whelihan: Or we leave it alone to serve point like, just ask for more funding, I mean, we have to have it, so I think if we create this negative thing to, but it's just going to make it worse on all of us. I think if we just ask for more money because say it was limited, which is the truth, right, we're limited in services and options and need to really meet its intent in the legislation, it needs funding, and right now, there -- there's not, \$50,000 is nothing.

Leslie Bittleston: Which is why we are where we are because we, -- there's just no resources to do what we needed to do and I don't know if -- I mean, can we identify this as an unfunded mandate? You know, is that something and -- I mean, we --

Mike Whelihan: What's in --

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah.

Mike Whelihan: It's got 51,000, so I wouldn't say it's unfunded, it's underfunded.

Leslie Bittleston: Underfunded. Okay.

Mike Whelihan: Yes. Underfunded, because clearly, to meet the intent of the legislation, I would say we go with that is, because what the intent of the legislation was supposed to be this robust one stop shop like -- Liz was saying it, we should be able to -- some of the small, yeah, we got grant writers and stuff too, so I'm speaking more for the smaller jurisdictions in the sense that, you know, they need this to be more robust where they can look at this and be like, hey, these are some trainings that are, you know, and here's some -- may be some grants help these trainings and you know who is the -- train the trainer thing for this best practice and, you know, I think that would be the -- what the robust part of it should be as it gives you those resources, set you up with the -- that funding and whether it's still a grant or, you know, you need to ask for through your own agency but, yeah, I think asking for more funding would be -- there needs to be full time staffs that actually do this, not just -- yeah, and -- need to be some of the reports of the state that truly, that's their job, it's just to build this like -- it's almost like a service array, like what we would have down here like for services, but this would be a program array for all the facilities and probations and everything else in the state, so.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez. I agree with what Mike is saying and underfunded is more appropriate term than unfunded. So with that, Ms. Bittleston, I, I'll suggest that we, that we report this out to the larger body I can include. So if this could be -- it's still goal, so I don't think we can move it as a goal. Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Just moving on to goal #3, just for conversation, policy should identify requirements (Inaudible) based standards for probation, detention county camps, community providers. This is something that I would like to provide to the Committee that the state does not have the resources to do this nor is this in statute. What is in statute is a quality assurance review of the facilities and the youth camps. Well, I don't know if this needs to be there, I don't know, but my perspective is it shouldn't be there if we can't do it.

Mike Whelihan: Are you talking goal 2 or goal 3?

Leslie Bittleston: I'm on goal #3.

Mike Whelihan: Okay. Yeah. Because I think the CPC meets the -- because we also were talking about the CPC meeting that a legislative requirement. Right?

Leslie Bittleston: Right. And what's in NRS is just using the quality assurance to all the CPC on the three state facilities and the two youth camps. It does not include probation, parole, detention, and community providers. And even if it did, the state doesn't have the resources to do it. We could barely do the five facilities that we have.

Mike Whelihan: And --

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez for the record. So right now, this is, it -- when you -- it says at the top system collaboration partially completed for purposes of the CPC, and there is compliance, because as written in the statute, it only requires for the state and the regional camps. Right? So --

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah.

Elizabeth Florez: -- So, the goal has been accomplished, and like you mentioned, you -- you're doing it, it is a stretch, because of the resource issue, but this goal has been accomplished as this statute lays it out. Correct?

Leslie Bittleston: Correct.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay.

Mike Whelihan: Yeah, I would agree and I'm going to be honest, I don't only care for the CPC, I think it's -- **you, you** just can't do well on this audit, no matter how well you're doing, and we don't want to have this roll into probations or anything else, just it makes everyone look bad. Even when you're doing a good job on this, you'll get a 40%, you know, when -- and you know, when you're reporting to these big bodies of people that don't know what it's about, they're going to be like, oh, 40, you guys are awful and, and really 40 is a really good score, and so, yeah, I think, we met this and pull everything else out, just, it's completed, it's not partial, it's completed, and we're still doing it, so, and it's a burden on every jurisdiction that has to do it.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Liz Florez for the record. And I am less failure with CPC, and I understand it's a proprietary tool. Ms. Bittleston, this language as written in this goal, this came directly from the last strategic plan. Is that correct?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, that's correct.

Elizabeth Florez: So this was language agreed upon and a goal agreed upon by the larger body, so I think, I guess, I am seeking guidance on this -- on procedurally, we would need to report back to the -- if this body agreed, this is just something that has been completed and that we don't want to necessarily expand upon to include counties. We would need to report that to the larger body for discussion. Correct? We can't arbitrarily just remove this, we need to report back to the larger body is my assumption.

Leslie Bittleston: Honestly, I don't know the answer to that,.

Mike Whelihan: So I guess the question is, and this is going to require some research, was this only from this committee or was this approved by the full commission, so we have to go through the history to see if this was actually even presented, because is this -- if this was never presented, this was just a committee that did this and we don't know that the board approved it yet. So I guess, Liz, we would have to know if this is really approved through the whole thing or this is just something that the committee was working on which we could remove.

Elizabeth Florez: And this is Liz for the record. That's what I'm -- that's what I'm trying to get at, and I don't know Leslie if you have the answer. Is this language in the prior strategic plan listed as a goal? I guess --

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, it is.

Elizabeth Florez: It is?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah, but I changed nothing, the only thing that I added is the stuff that's highlighted, which is the information as to why we didn't complete it or how are the issues we have with it. So the way that it is written is what was in the strategic plan and I can also answer the question that yes, this plan was taken to the larger JJOC and approved by the JJOC. With that being said, I think that the strategic plan falls within this committee and I think it is this committee's responsibility to present something to the JJOC for approval. So I don't know if you have to actually say, hey, this wasn't done, can we remove it?

Mike Whelihan: So I wasn't on the last JJOC at union negotiation, so did they pick all the new members for this strategic plan committee and then they did discuss that at all, what they liked, what their goal is with this committee?

Leslie Bittleston: No. No. That's --

Mike Whelihan: At least ask the real question is --

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Mike Whelihan: -- what is the goal of this strategic planning committee, because this expired in a couple of weeks. So --

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah.

Mike Whelihan: -- are they going to create a new -- I guess, are we going to do 24 to, you know --

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Mike Whelihan: -- another strategic plan --

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Mike Whelihan: 24 to 28?.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Mike Whelihan: And then in that way, we should be given some autonomy to create some new ones ---

Elizabeth Florez: Right.

Mike Whelihan: -- and then (inaudible) the Board.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Liz for the record. Yes, and I think we're going to continue to talk about that today --

Leslie Bittleston: Mm-hmm.

Elizabeth Florez: -- and for pull -- full transparency purposes, I, in my report that I'm preparing for the full JJOC meeting, I will make comment on all of these goals as listed, so that the larger body is aware of our recommendations related to these goals and what we, what we -- and what our recommendations are related to that or at least provide an update, so that the larger body can make a determination as to whether or not they agree with our recommendations about where to move forward with these goals and --

Mike Whelihan: So, I guess -- this is Mike for the record, so I guess when we're talking about that I would say if we're going to present this, I wish that you, Liz, are the one presenting it.

Elizabeth Florez: (Inaudible)

Mike Whelihan: It's a -- I mean it's -- the thing is that the NRS say that the requirement per the NRS was completed. Right?

Leslie Bittleston: Mm-hm.

Mike Whelihan: So that, that part was completed and then may be discussed at the -- we're not sure if the CPC is a tool that could be used for probation, detentions, and longer term commitment facilities, because it's not. So I think when they orig-originally did this CPC for want to do it in the field and all these other plans, I don't know if that tool would actually even be worth using --

Sharon Anderson: This is --

Mike Whelihan: Go ahead.

Sharon Anderson: This is Sharon Anderson for the record. Fortunately, in a way, I was trained as one of those auditors and I recall a discussion about a tool for probation and parole departments and they do have one. It is not the current one that is used for the facility, but they do have one, but of course it costs money in order to be able to pull that in and implement it so they do have one, but it's just not something that was invested in from prior mission.

Mike Whelihan: So to me, after using the one that we're using for the state facilities and the county camps, it's tough, and I know Leslie, you've been doing it for quite some time.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Mike Whelihan: Is it tough to meet those marks, and even when you meet them, I think it to me like, when I have seen, because I have been on that back end of the results, they want you to have like clinical staff running your facilities, and that's never going to happen.

Sharon Anderson: They want clinical staff to provide oversight of the thing. Right? So that **there**, there is continuity of understanding what works and what doesn't work, so that they can provide some interventions or training or you know just oversight. That's kind of what it's designed for.

Mike Whelihan: Okay.

Sharon Anderson: I know that it is a tool that is, you know, not favorable, because of that grading system, and a lot of it -- and there has been a lot of controversy from day one with that and in -- I know that subsequently several county -- different county staff have been trained in it to assist with the actual assessment, so that they could understand it. Those numbers don't represent what most of us think they represent. It's just a weird, you know, it's interesting -- this is an interesting, you know --

Mike Whelihan: Yeah.

Sharon Anderson: -- thing that is kind of risen from it, but the truth of the matter is those scores, true as they are, they do, it's just a comparison to a perfect environment, and so no one is going to reach, you know, 100%, because there is no perfect program, and all of these things are just suggestions to help you get closer to having more evidence-based practices within, and so -- I don't know just --

Mike Whelihan: Yeah, yeah, and I agree with you. I think, we -- for us as a County, we struggle hiring clinical staff. We have to contract most of our stuff out. So when you look at the standards, and you're 100% correct, it's like they want the mental health people running the facility, which to me is, I don't know if I even agree with that to begin with, and secondly, I can't even get mental health to come and work in the facility --

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah.

Sharon Anderson: -- much less run the facility, you know. So, I mean and then to -- I haven't seen and I, yeah, I know they have those different ones for the different like for probation and stuff like that. I would be scared to pull one out, I would rather use someone else, that's the point I'm trying to get at its -- it is so rigid and so like -- it's like a set up that you -- no one can really do well on it, it, it makes the facilities look like they're not, you know, trying to do better and it's -- there are certain points like, there's, there's questions I will never do, because we're not going to do it. Right? Because some of -- we're not going to

have a clinical director running, you know, our detention facility, you know, it would be mental health facility. So I mean it's kind of, it seems to like really meant for mental health facility, but somehow it's morphed into jails and prisons and things of that nature, and it's to me it's, you know, that are -- I just, I don't see how any -- you're never going to get the funding to do what the CPC requires to get a good score, because there is no one that's going to have that many staff working in the facility just -- it's literally they have to be involved in every decision making like both, like you got to have the, you know, institutional staff meet with clinical staff on almost at every level of decision making and there's not that many clinical staff in the state for every institution and every detention center and it's, yeah, it's just not going to happen.

Elizabeth Florez: So this is Liz for the record. I think the purposes of this item, and I'll work with Ms. Bittleston on this, this recording where we're with these roles, and, as we -- when we began work on a new with hopefully a vendor that's funded, we'll see if that transpires, we can work on the next strategic plan, which I -- where I think we can incorporate and address some of these issues. As the law is currently written, my understanding is we are in compliance with this goal, and that's what I will be reporting. The next strategic plan is where we can probably speak about if it's the belief that there was an intent statutorily to expand it to the supervision and such, that's where I think we can pick up that conversation.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Mike Whelihan: Right. I would rather -- if they're going to do funding, obviously, that -- I think that's part of -- I would rather be able to have the option to look at another --

Leslie Bittleston: Tool?

Mike Whelihan: -- tool.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Mike Whelihan: And then may be --

Elizabeth Florez: And (inaudible).

Mike Whelihan: (Inaudible) like RFK or someone else, I'm not -- but to come in and look at your practices, if you want to truly do best practice, you should bring someone in to work with not just audit, you know, audits are tough in itself. Right? When you just come in to get audit, you get pounded, you try to fix the mistake, but you're lit-literally these things take years, like we have been working on a probation system reform for years, so they come in and do like an audit once a year or once every year really doesn't improve performance.

Elizabeth Florez: Ag-Agreed Mike and I think we'll have an opportunity to educate a large group about other potential ways to accomplish the intent behind this. Ms. Bittleston, is there anything else on goal #3?

Leslie Bittleston: Goal #2. That was Goal #2.

Elizabeth Florez: I am confused, I thought --

Leslie Bittleston: Oh, no, no, no. I am sorry, #three under goal #2.

Elizabeth Florez: Oh, okay. Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: Sorry. No, nothing else.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: And then moving on to goal #3, and this is where we talk about (Inaudible) now enterprise supervision, so for those of you who were part of the JJOC from the very beginning, there was a lot of conversation around the state having a standardized system to have data, pull data, all of that. And that was really supposed to be phase #2 of implementation of (Inaudible) which again is now enterprise supervision. As we know where we are today, phase 1, is mostly completed with exception of Washoe County who is not on enterprise supervision but all the other counties in the state are on enterprise supervision. Phase 2 was never completed. There are no bridges. There are no mechanisms for the state to go into the counties to pull data on this -- well, I just wanted everybody to know that phase 1 is completed but phase 2, there was no funding, nor do I even know how much that would cost to build those bridges or those type of things.

Elizabeth Florez: If I may make -- this is Commissioner Florez. If I may make a comment on this?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Elizabeth Florez: Um, so, in, at, as a -- as NAJJA, Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators, in that working group, we had discussed working with the state directly on all the data reporting requirements and so we have created a data subcommittee and Leslie is very active in that as well as key members across the state representing their jurisdictions and it's a group that I feel is highly productive and we are making progress on how to streamline data collection to help the state and so that we are all uniform and one of the things that we learnt through this process is that by not having a mechanism to build this bridge and have this information go in a -- this highway between counties and the state that really places a lot of burden on the state to collect this information in such a way that maximizes the reliability of the data and we were able -- we, we've been able to learn this in our conversations with Ms. Bittleston, and the other jurisdiction partners. So knowing that the bridge may be far off, I believe that through this data committee, we're moving towards at least the system that will enhance the purity of the data, because right now, as it's being collected, I have a lot of concerns about the validity of how that information is collated and reported out. I, I really believe that the State need to provide greater support to the Juvenile Justice Programs Office to do that, and it doesn't necessarily have to be a bridge, there are other technologies that currently exist that would help us have greater confidence and the collection of reporting on that data. I just wanted to make that comment.

Sharon Anderson: This is Sharon Anderson for the record. I didn't want to share, just so I give you a little bit of an answer to that. The State is providing more support to the office through our Office of Analytics. The specifics of it is currently all being worked out and you guys should be seeing more participation from that office at some of our data meetings, but just wanted to kind of answer that on the record here.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you for that. So I had lost my place. Ms. Bittleston, is there a decision point on this one or we just reporting -- this is something that we would continue to report after the larger group. Correct?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. And also I think that on the state side, one of the thing that is in NRS 62H is, it does say that DCF will establish a standardized recording system. So I think that this is something we need to continue to talk about and it's not necessarily going to be this bridge, it's going to be something

else, and it's going to be the Office of Analytics helping. It's going to be counties doing other things, so I think we need to kind of revamp this strategy for what we are doing and how we can meet this goal without these bridges, because I don't know if they will ever be funded, I, I -- that we just don't know. And then -- yeah. So that's it for #1 from me.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. Are there any questions related to that item? Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: Number 2 is the QA reviews and we have already discussed this and really my notes here are not to say that we are not in compliance, it was more to talk about the tool that was selected, that as a propi-proprietary tool and it sounds like I'm hearing that may be this -- the recommendation going forward is to maybe looking at a different tool. So, yeah, so the CPC is a prop-proprietary tool, the only way to obtain training for this tool is through the University of Cincinnati, they own the tool and there is a steep cost for the training. There are no mechanism for service providers to use this tool. We have no interest requirement for the county, so this is just what we already talked about. Okay. And then the last one on here --

Sharon Anderson: I'm sorry, excuse me for one second, I, maybe, I'm missing something. So for #2, we're saying this is not complete or it is complete --

Leslie Bittleston: I'm saying it is complete.

Sharon Anderson: Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: I'm just sharing some additional information.

Sharon Anderson: Got it. Okay. Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: My apologies for not being clear. It is complete, just additional information.

Sharon Anderson: Alright. Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah, # 1 is not complete, # 2 is complete. And then #3, this is really talking about that recording piece of making sure that we get accurate and valid data. I think that right now where we are at, the data required was pretty lofty from the data committee, which is Brigid's team, that data committee has not met in a few couple of years, so I think that committee needs to get moving again and really identify the data they want to capture. So here under the note, under #3, on the second page, there are 11 judicial districts that are independent of the state and each other. This -- what I'm talking about is the difficulty in collecting data at the state level because there are different levels of groups. I made a boo-boo, that should say diversion not division, you know, there is also different definitions of referral. There are different definitions across the state of different things, which makes it difficult on the state side to report out accurate and valid data. So there is also some references in 62H for juvenile courts to report data, that currently does not happen. Any data that is received by the Programs Office comes from the local county departments. So I don't know if there is some appetite to really look at how we can get data from juvenile courts, especially around the petition that the adjudications and those other things. I don't know, that just a conversation. And in the last one, we already talked about there is no standardized system, no data warehouse, and no one place to pull the data.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Liz for the record. Thank you, Leslie. The Administrative Office of the Courts, don't they -- I guess that's under the Supreme Court if I am correct.

Leslie Bittleston: I believe so.

Elizabeth Florez: I wonder if there is an opportunity to gather that, because I believe the Courts, I could be wrong, collect, have to provide all that information to the AOC, and where, you know, is that duplicated in some way, because -- and may be that's why courts are not doing this, because it's already recorded, and I am not sure what access we have to any of that, but that might be worth asking.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah, and I don't have any access to any data from the Supreme Court or the Office of the Courts, so may be that's something that we can explore and may be that's something we can bring in with the Office of Analytics, may be -- because the Office of Analytics, as they continue to build out their capacity, they have access to data that the Programs Office does not, like Medicaid claims, adult arrest records, things like that they can do comparison to, and that's great, because we can do some comparisons across the way, but the Programs Office does not have any outside access to any data other than what is obtained from the counties currently.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. Are there any questions on that or further discussion?

Leslie Bittleston: Number 4 is the last one. This is across agency collaboration and this is really here because from the Programs Office and the DCFS perspective, there was very little guidance on this and really what, what is -- what was the goal of this and it says institutive system of care by improving service provision, communication with all stake holders, and the note that I provided no resources, nor a clear understanding of who this belongs to or what this is really about. So if this is something we want to address, I think we need some clarity around what it is we're trying to do here.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Liz Florez. I made a note on that one and that -- and somebody please correct me, I wish Brigid were here, because I think she may have this, but at one point, I know, I believe the Children's Commission still exists and I know that there had been an effort during the last session to re-configure the JJ -- JJOC and move it under the umbrella of the Children's Commission and that didn't move forward, and this year, I agree with you Leslie, this is written so broadly and it's not, I mean, my assessment would be that this is -- that this is not the -- the Juvenile Justice umbrella would not be the one that should own such a large task and so I agree that we need to bring this forward for further conversation to get clarity on the intention of this specific goal.

Leslie Bittleston: Mm-hmm.

Elizabeth Florez: Are there any comments on that? Okay.

Mike Whelihan: I agree with you.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah. I look at this goal and I just don't even know where to start with this and so that concludes the kind of the review of some of those areas that are partially complete or maybe need some more discussion. And if they want to be in -- if we want to include that in the next strategic plan or not.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you, Leslie. When I write my report, I'll be bringing these items forward for discussion. So thank you for that.

Leslie Bittleston: Perfect.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. If no further discussion on item #7, we'll move on to #8, which is the JJOC Strategic Plan Placeholder, and we had discussed in previous meetings that we would be seeking from the larger group, the pursuit of hiring a vendor, so that just as was done with the original strategic plan. Are there any comments on that or further discussion? I don't think anybody is volunteering to quit their day

job to do this, so I like the idea. Okay. Alright. If there is no further discussion on that, we'll move on to item #9 to confirm the next meeting date and time. I would ask that Ms. Williamson send another doodle poll, that seems to be the most effective way to enhance greater participation.

Leslie Bittleston: Perfect.

Elizabeth Florez: Wonderful. Thank you. And with that, we'll move on to item #10, public comment and discussion. Is there any public comment? Okay. I will be working on the report. I'll work with Ms. -- the state office on the report, so it will be ready on time for submission for the next strategic -- I'm sorry, for the larger JJOC meeting. Ms. (inaudible) or Ms. Williamson, can you remind me my deadline for that?

Unknown Speaker: Not right now, I will follow up with a email.

Elizabeth Florez: I appreciate that. Thank you.

Unknown Speaker: And just a reminder to include the stipends that we've already agreed upon as a committee.

Elizabeth Florez: Correct. Correct. Okay. With that, I thank you all for your participation and we will adjourn at 9:58. Have a great day.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you.

Sharon Anderson: Thank you, everyone. Have a great one.

Elizabeth Florez: Bye, bye.

Leslie Bittleston: Bye.

Mike Whelihan: See you.