

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

MEETING OF THE NEVADA STATE JUVENILE JUSTICE OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (JJOC) FULL COMMISSION MEETING

DATE: August 5, 2024

TIME: 9:00 AM

Roll Call:

(Members)

Present

Dylan Tedford
Holly Welborn
DeNeese Parker
Addie Rolnick
Marla McDade Williams
Sharon Anderson
Pauline Salla
Elizabeth Florez
Brigid Duffy
Katherine Maher
Ali Banister
Paula Smith
Ethan Ewert
Perla Vega

Absent

Dawn Gearhart
Jennifer Fraser
Derrica Daniel
Matthew Clapham

(Staff Members)

Jessica Villalobos
Cindy Casselman
Ty Wilson

Others Present

Frank Mournighan
Nicole Mathias
Christine Eckles
Michael Watson
Tyler Peterson
Michael Whelihan
Katie Brandon
Kristen Russell
John Munoz
Dominique Carter
April Stahl
Lea Case
Heather Plager
Izaac Rowe
Laura De La Cruz
Linda Anderson
Motulalo Otuafi

TRANSCRIPT

Agenda Item 1. Welcome, Call to Order and Roll Call

[Roll Call. We Have Quorum.]

Chair Tedford: Great. Thank you. Seeing that we have a quorum, we'll move on to Agenda Item #3, which is public comment. No action may be taken on a matter raised until the matter has been specifically added to an agenda for a later meeting. Public comment is limited to 2 minutes, and we are now open for public comment. If you'd like to make a comment by phone, the teleconference line is +1 775-321-6111. If you'd like to make a comment by Teams, please unmute yourself prior to speaking. If you are making a comment, please begin by stating your name for the record and please spell out your last name. Is there anyone wishing to make public comment by phone? Great. Thank you. Is there anyone who'd like to make public comment by Teams? Great. Thank you. Hearing none. We will move on to Agenda Item #4, which is the review and approval of the minutes from the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission's May 6th, 2024, Meeting. Is there any discussion regarding those minutes? Great. Hearing none. I'd entertain a motion to approve those minutes. Is there a motion?

Marla McDade Williams: Moved.

Chair Tedford: Thank you. Is there a second?

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

Chair Tedford: Thank you. Hearing that, let's vote to approve the minutes. All those in favor, please unmute yourselves and indicate by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Tedford: Aye. Those opposed, please unmute yourselves and indicate by saying nay. Great. Are there any abstentions?

Elizabeth Florez: This is Liz Florez for the record. I was not present, so I'm abstaining from the vote.

Chair Tedford: Thank you.

DeNeese Parker: This is DeNeese Parker for the record. I'm abstaining as I was not present.

Chair Tedford: Thank you.

Addie Rolnick: This is Addie Rolnick for the record. I'm changing my vote from approved to abstain because I also wasn't present.

Chair Tedford: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Villalobos, do you have those names noted down? Great. Thank you. Well, with no votes in opposition, the motion carries. Thank you. We will move on to Agenda Item #5 which is

an informational discussion of Title II Formula Grant Eligibility and a JJOC Membership Update from Ms. Casselman. Ms. Casselman, please proceed with introducing those two topics.

Cindy Casselman: Thank you. Let's pull up the membership for everybody to be able to see here. Alright. What's being projected is our membership that we currently have. If you recall, our last time that we met as a commission, our Title II eligibility was frozen due to our membership. We have been able to bolster our membership, and our Title II Funds are now eligible for use. We still are currently recruiting for several different positions. We have several youth members who are still pending appointment from the Governor's Office, and there are several other members too. John Munoz from Clark County Juvenile Services and Kelly Figueroa out of Signs of Hope, which is a nonprofit organization, and they are pending their memberships as well too. We are following up; the Program's Office is following up with the Commission's Office on that as well. If you can see at the top two, there are several vacant positions that, those are members that are nominated by the Senate who's not a member of the Senate or Public Officers. We will be working with the Commission of the Governor's Office to ensure that maybe we can get some members appointed that meet that requirement as well too. As of right now, our membership does meet federal requirements and our Title II Funding is eligible.

Chair Tedford: Are there any questions or further discussion on Agenda Item #5?

Marla McDade Williams: I just have a quick question. Cindy, where you've got vacant down there fourth to last line, what is the role of that person in that vacant position?

Cindy Casselman: On the bottom, that's another youth member.

Chair Tedford: Thank you, Commissioner. Are there any other questions there? Great. Hearing none. We'll move on to Agenda Item #6. Here I will ask representatives from each of our Subcommittees for updates on their subcommittee activities. For clarity, each member is required to sit on at least one subcommittee, and I will refer to each Subcommittee Chair representative for more discussion on their specific Subcommittee. Our first Subcommittee on the agenda is the State Advisory Group Committee and the Racial and Ethnic Disparities Committee. This update is accompanied by an attachment on the record. Sorry. It looks like my note is a little bit outdated. Let's see if I can put my new Attachment 6.1. If there's any, and Subcommittee Chair Salla, would you please proceed with updating us on the activities of that Committee, please?

Pauline Salla: Thank you, Chairman. For the record, Commissioner Salla. Sorry. I'm not appearing on camera. I am under the weather and working from home, so please bear with me. Our State Advisory Group has reconvened, if you reference our Committee report we've met 2 times since our last Commission. We have now set our monthly meetings on the third Thursday at 8:30 a.m., just so we can keep it consistent, and members can block out their calendars. Our next meeting is August 15th at 8:30. The State Advisory Group has really been focusing on our state and federal compliance. At the moment, we are working directly with NAJJA Subcommittee focusing on data, and that's, NAJJA is our Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators. One of the things that we really realized is that since the beginning of our Oversight Commission to present, we have had numerous Data requests from the Jurisdictions. Some are Federal, some are State, and some arrived from the work of the JJOC. It was becoming a little difficult for the Jurisdictions to complete all these reports when we really were reporting to different entities and the same Data to a couple entities, and it was getting confusing. Our work has really been focused around streamlining our Data collection for our State and Federal Compliance and then our JJOC needs and ensuring that the Jurisdictions are all

reporting the same way so that our data is true, is captured effectively, and can really help drive our informed decisions. On the committee report, you can see what we've been reviewing, what we've completed, and then and then what items will be pending. Later in the agenda, we will be bringing forward two templates for Data collection for full approval from the JJOC. I believe those are separate agenda items, so I will wait till those items, and then we will continue to work on our Juvenile Sex Offender Data Collection template, our Corrective Room Restriction Data reporting requirements, and then we do review the community corrections partnership block grant, and the YLS data also. Since our agenda items to approve are separate, that's the report from the State Advisory Group Committee, and I'm open for any questions.

Chair Tedford: Thank you, Commissioner Salla. Are there any questions for Commissioner Salla? Okay. Hearing none. Thank you, Commissioner Salla. We hope that you feel better soon. With that, we will move on to our next Subcommittee, which is the Data Performance Subcommittee which does not appear to be accompanied by an attachment today. Subcommittee Chair Duffy, would you please provide us with an update there? Oh, it looks like you're muted.

Brigid Duffy: Yes. Thank you.

Chair Tedford: Thank you.

Brigid Duffy: This is Brigid Duffy for the record. Good morning, everyone. Sorry, there's no attachment. I'm out, on medical leave and just kind of popping in and out on meetings, so I did not get to type up the report, but I will in the future. I'll be back full time in a couple weeks to work. After very long gaps in meeting times, we had a meeting in June, and we set our goals for 2024-2025. Those goals are to review our Data Dictionary for those who have been around a while. You'll remember under the Supreme Court's Juvenile Justice Commission a very robust data dictionary was created. It took a lot of time and effort a lot of dedication of, of people that are currently still serving on this committee. It was about 10 years old now and so we've had about five legislative sessions since then and lots of changes. We need to review that Data Dictionary, make sure it's updated. As a Subcommittee, we agreed that since that foundation is already there, it would be best to guide the Jurisdictions with definitions that we already have in place and just keep updating that one, that one dictionary into the future. Our other goal for 2024-2025 is to tighten up our recidivism definition and add the measures for recidivism. And we have the addition of our public representative, who works for our specialty courts. There is already some work being done within the courts around recidivism and measuring it. We're going to be bringing that back to the Subcommittee meeting in a couple weeks. We have also decided that we're going to look at defining the term technical violation as opposed to substantive violations, and we'll be reviewing that within the data committee. Finally, we're going to look at our statutory requirements for performance measures and kind of like what Commissioner Salla had said understanding how each Jurisdiction is gathering information and how they report it out. It's great to have Pauline on both Subcommittees because she will help make sure that we're not stepping on each other's toes and more complimenting each other as we work forward in the data subcommittee. Our next meeting is August 22nd, but you'll have to excuse me, because I forgot the time.

Chair Tedford: Thank you, Commissioner. Are there any questions for subcommittee Chair Duffy? Please.

Marla Williams: Question. Marla McDade Williams. Will the data look subjectively at recidivism in terms of decisions that are made to pull somebody back from, say, parole, or are we only looking at actual re-offenses? You've completed parole, and now the recidivism data is only going to look at a re-offense.

Brigid Duffy: Thank you for the question. This is Commissioner Duffy for the record. I don't think we're going to be looking specifically at what decisions are being put into, if this is your question, to find that somebody has had a violation of parole or probation. It's more of how we calculate that they have recidivated, and that's done currently by statute. We already have a definition of recidivism and I believe that that definition does exclude technical violations already. It would have to be a substantive violation. But one of the issues we have is we're not all consistent in what we consider technical violations versus substantive violations across the state.

Marla Williams: Thank you. That's helpful. I guess, from my perspective, I'm really trying to understand once, once the youth are in the system and are on probation, that whole system, and I don't know if this is the group that deals with that or not, if there's some, some other entity out there that deals with that, but to me, that's also important, because, I don't feel like we should have a goal of keeping people in the system until they're 18 and moving them into the adult system. I don't know what the answer is to that, but it is on my mind. Thank you.

Chair Tedford: Thank you. Is there any further discussion or perhaps clarification for Commissioner McDade Williams on that question?

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez. I merely have a comment. It's, it's wonderful to hear my fellow Commissioners and the work that they're doing on their Subcommittees, and there are conversations that are blending over, and overlapping within the groups. One thing that I'll just add is that before Ms. Bittleston left her position, she had provided clarification on one of the reports that per statute is required. I apologize. I'm not sure if it's an NRS or if it's a NAC. That follows a youth from a referral all the way through the lifespan of a case. It's something that I believe the NAC has been updated, which I'll talk about. But in, in offline meetings that we've had with representatives from the Office of Analytics and now an individual who went from the Office of Analytics to DCFS we have been working with her on a data sharing agreement that proposes just that. In there, we've had conversations about recidivism, and there are some frameworks nationally on how you do that from a data standpoint to capture every decision point or action point, either on behalf of the child or the system. It's very complex, but there are frameworks for that. I just wanted to add that that's also a conversation that we've been having in a data Subcommittee group that I will share with Chair Duffy just for purposes of deciding if there's anything helpful there that could help with the data committee's work. Thank you.

Chair Tedford: Thank you. Are there any further comments or questions there? Great. Hearing none. We will move on to our final Subcommittee, which is the Strategic Planning Committee. Subcommittee Chair Florez, would you please provide us with an update there?

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. This is Chair Florez for the record. The Strategic Planning Committee has been meeting for years, consistently even when the larger JJOC was not fully operational. Our last meeting was July 25th, and our next meeting is, I had it written down, and now I just lost it. I think it's August 26th at 10:00 a.m. Is that correct? Ms. Villalobos is giving me head nod. Thank you. The work of this group and prior representations we've provided is the next five-year plan was supposed to be from FY 2024 through FY 2028, which is the next five-year plan. In previous meetings I represented that for the first Strategic Plan, the state had entered into an agreement with a third-party vendor to assist with the creation of and the ultimate production of a plan. Our recommendation, after multiple meetings our internal committee was to bring forward that same recommendation. In the interim, we elected, though, to at least refine what elements of the Strategic Plan have been completed and which have not and bring forward recommendations. With that, I'll, I'll go into the goals.

And much of this was borrowed from previous work that, that Ms. Bittleston had done. The first goal was to have a uniform adoption of an Evidence-Based Risk Assessment tool and case plan, and that's been complete. All Juvenile County Jurisdictions, as well as the State are utilizing the YLS/CMI assessment as well as the case plan. Goal number two is to establish the Evidence-Based Resource Center and require all Juvenile Services Agencies receiving state monies to utilize the programs fitting within the JJOC adopted Evidence-Based Practices Matrix, and that's per statute. This has been partially completed. The State had awarded NCJFCJ the, the RFP to bring forward the Nevada Center for Juvenile Justice Innovation. In multiple conversations with NCJFCJ, they've indicated that, and according to Ms. Bittleston, there is not enough funding to completely comply with all the requirements as listed in statute. Also, the Community Corrections Partnership Block Grant requires Juvenile Justice Agencies to use the Evidence-Based Practices Matrix. For goal number three, it was to develop uniform standard procedures for reporting and measuring outcomes to determine the effectiveness of, of the Juvenile Justice System and establish quality assurance measures and to collaborate with other child serving agencies. This has been partially completed. DCFS and other agencies have contracted with the same case management system with the goal of establishing a data collection that's uniform across the state. Washoe County did not enter into an agreement with that same vendor. Number two, the updated data reporting requirements, and regulations were approved by the Legislative Commission in 2021 and 2022 but have not yet been codified in the Nevada Administrative Code and those codifications were reflective of the 2017 reforms that are in Chapter 62. Number three, the JJOC adopted the Proprietary Correctional Programs checklist for State Correctional Facilities and regional facilities for the treatment and rehabilitation of children. That was in completion of the goal number three for quality assurance for facilities. And number four, cross agency collaboration has not been implemented as envisioned under the JJOC's goals. Goal number four was to develop family engagement policies and case plans. It is inconsistent across the state as to the implementation or development of policies by all Juvenile Justice Agencies. When I took a recent poll, it's about 50:50 for those who have implemented family engagement policies into their agencies. That was just a recap of the goals and which elements have been completed or remain incomplete. As far as recommendations from the Committee, the first is to discuss options for supporting the JJOC in creation of the next five-year Strategic Plan to include the potential hiring of a consultant. For this group it would be a recommendation to have further dialogue about what the feasibility is of hiring a consultant to assist with that plan. It may be that after I go over further recommendations, there may be some ideas about if the state has capacity in any way with the work that's already been done in the Strategic Planning Committee to put forward that Strategic Plan, and that will be a point of discussion. Number two recommendation is to request a presentation from NCJFCJ and the Nevada Center for Juvenile Justice Innovation Center for an accounting of the work that has been completed on the website and a report on current capacity for deliverables and cost estimate of potential contract expansion. The last time they gave a presentation, it was in October of 2023 and some time has passed and we're meeting more regularly now. At this point, I feel it's appropriate to recommend that for the next agenda in October, they provide an update as to the status of the agreement and what they can offer and what the challenges are with meeting all of the legal requirements. Item #3, requesting an update from the Legislative Council Bureau on the status of codification of the adopted NAC's related to data reporting. There were many public hearings that took place, I believe, starting back in 2020, maybe even 2019, 2020, 2021 where there were solicited comments in public hearings and the Juvenile Justice Agencies worked very closely with the state as well as the DCFS Administrator at the time to arrive at language that we felt that all came to compromise on and what we all felt satisfied the requirements under the Juvenile Justice reform in 2017. Those changes were adopted by the Legislature but never put into writing in the NAC's nor did any of the Juvenile Justice Agencies, at least at the County level, receive any direction on how we should be reporting our data distinctly from prior to the prior, to the adoption of those regulations. We're seeking information and updates on what exactly we should be

reporting from the counties. Item #4, request presentation from DCFS and regional facilities for the treatment and rehabilitation of children on the CPC tool, its results, and other feedback. This is something that the JJOC adopted for purposes of ensuring quality associated with Evidence-Based Programs in the Spring Mountain Youth Camp, China Spring Youth Camp, and the State Correctional Facilities. Much time has passed since then, and we have a lot of new members that it would be appropriate, in my mind to request a presentation related to feedback on that tool and its purpose. Number 5 is related to record sealing and expungement requirements. Right now, there is confusion related to how these rules in the law impact data sharing for purposes of performing outcome and recidivism studies. This is a point that we would need clarification, perhaps legal clarification, on what can and cannot be shared from counties to the state to ensure that we're able to truly track all the outcome measures that were contemplated. Under the law, it appears to me that the courts from each Jurisdiction or judicial district can unseal records. One of the potential things we can talk about is agreements between counties and their courts to unseal, perhaps an administrative order to unseal records to allow for the sharing of information. But that's something for further discussion that we would need legal, we would need our legal partners to weigh in on. Number 6 is to discuss potential role of JJOC in the upcoming 83rd legislative session. I do not personally know if the JJOC has, has the ability or the authority to submit field draft requests. I'm uncertain of that process. That's something that we're also seeking clarification on. If we had the capacity, what are potential items this group would want to bring forward? Number 7 is to discuss gaps in the system that impact justice involved youth, including Mental Health, Foster Care, Commercially, Sexually Exploited Youth, Runaways, and other vulnerable populations. The original goals from the Strategic Plan, there was an area related to system collaboration amongst all partners who are Child Serving Agencies. This is an area that has not been fully implemented. There are, I remember discussions way back when that there are multiple bodies that exist in the State that all do that all work on these areas. We would need conversation related to how the JJOC sees itself coordinating with or working with or what our role would be in addressing system gaps. With that, I'll open it up to questions.

Chair Tedford: Thank you. Are there any questions for subcommittee Chair Florez?

Marla Williams: This is Commissioner Williams. I have a couple of comments. First, the Legislative Council Bureau will not be codifying regulations anytime soon. What we've had to do in our division with other sets of regulations is manually do our own type of codification to ensure that they sync up, because once they are adopted, they are the law, and we don't get to use the excuse that we can't apply them once they've been adopted. I'm happy to direct staff to develop a document that incorporates all the changes to ensure that everybody is on the same page. With respect to the ability of the Commission to adopt regulations I believe, it's NRS 62B.615 through 620 or 625 that lays out the authority of the Commission, and there is not the authority to adopt or to propose bill draft requests. I would suggest that if there is legislation that the Commission is committed to, that it be set for an agenda item, and then we can decide whether or not the Division wants to move something forward or whether or not it's something that should be brought forward to the Joint Committee on Judiciary for that body to carry on behalf, behalf of the Commission.

It's very late in the game right now. As you know, bill drafts started dropping July 1st already. The Legislative Committees have done their work. We've already submitted our bill drafts as a division, but I would say out in the future that if that is the intent, that it happens much earlier than at this time. Again, if there are specific things, I think we can still set it for an agenda item to at least have awareness of what the need is. If there's a legislator that might want to pick something up, then at least that record would be there for them to pick up. I think there are some other things in here that speak to the role of DCFS, and I will talk with staff and figure out

whether we need to be doing something differently to ensure that information is conveyed, and direction is given. But I appreciate this report. It's very helpful for me. Thank you.

Chair Tedford: I just like to note for the record that even though, as you mentioned, we are late for this legislative cycle, we're early for the next one. Getting a record established and having an idea of the things that it is that we want to do and having it really organized and moving forward when we get to the next biennium will be helpful for everyone. Thank you. Are there any additional questions or comments there? Okay. Great. Hearing none. We will move forward to Agenda Item #7. This is for discussion and possible action. This item is a presentation of a Status Offenders' Template, and further consideration of whether to adopt that template to ensure Federal Compliance with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. With that, I will introduce again, Commissioner Salla, to provide a presentation here. Thank you.

Pauline Salla: Thank you, Chair. For the record, Commissioner Salla. This is our Status Offender summary template that we work through the Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators Data Subcommittee. All the jurisdictions participated in this. Just for the information, Status Offender Data Collection is one of our federal requirements for the Juvenile Justice Act, and what we wanted to do is to ensure that we were all collecting data the same way to report to the Juvenile Justice Program's Office. This is an easy template for all of us to fill out, it allows us to report monthly and, and as the jurisdictions are reporting monthly, this allows Cindy and her staff to make sure that our facilities are really not holding status offenders inappropriately because we all know that with deinstitutionalization of status offenders, that is one of the core requirements of the federal act, and it does have the potential to put us out of compliance if we reach a certain number of detaining status offenders. This has been worked on for several months. The jurisdictions have agreed upon it. This was brought through the State Advisory Group. All of us have agreed upon it, too. We're seeking full approval from the Oversight Commission to allow jurisdictions to start utilizing this template to report the information in the same way. I'll take any questions.

Chair Tedford: Thank you, Commissioner Salla. Are there any questions for Commissioner Salla?

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez. So moved.

Chair Tedford: Great. Is there a second?

Sharon Anderson: This is Commissioner Anderson. I second.

Chair Tedford: Great. Thank you. Then let's vote to approve the adoption of this template to ensure compliance. All those in favor, please indicate or unmute yourself and indicate by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Tedford: Aye. Thank you. Any opposed, please unmute yourself and indicate by saying nay. Thank you. Are there any abstentions? Okay. Hearing none. With the overwhelming support, I will say that the motion carries, and we will adopt this template for all the counties to use in reporting this information. Thank you.

Pauline Salla: Thank you.

Chair Tedford: Our next agenda item is also for discussion and possible action. This agenda item is for discussion of the revised Use of Force template and consideration of whether to adopt the changes for the monthly report to ensure compliance with the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission's data request. Again, I will refer to Commissioner Salla to provide a presentation here. Thank you.

Pauline Salla: Thank you, Chair. For the record, Commissioner Salla. This also has been a template that we have been working through and discussing previously before the, the Oversight Commission stopped meeting regularly. This was a request that came from a couple of the members for the jurisdictions and the correctional facilities to report total Use of Force activities in our facilities. This is not a federal requirement or a state requirement per se, but it is really important information especially for facilities to collect to help us determine, you know, if we have gaps or if we have needs or, or if we need to do anything different. This template allows us to track every incident of Use of Force in our facilities and then what level of Use of Force that was used. We collect all our demographic information along with it. As you can see, we identify if there was chemical, mechanical, or physical, and we report only the highest level of Use of Force. Through the process of working of reporting this data, the jurisdictions identified that it was important for us to be able to identify total number of incidents and then, and then the unduplicated youth that were involved in those. Through the discussion, our total Use of Force incidents surrounds how many Use of Force we had with each use. This template allows us to really capture of true data and then for us to identify what level of, of Use of Force was used, and then the unduplicated youth. All the NAJJA Data Subcommittee has been working on this. All the NAJJA members have seen it. We ran it through the State Advisory Group. We had discussion on it, and we're hoping that we can move this template forward for full approval from the Oversight Commission so that each jurisdiction and State Correctional Facility is reporting data the same way. I'm open for questions.

Chair Tedford: Thank you, Commissioner. I have a question.

Pauline Salla: Mm-hmm.

Chair Tedford: Right now, without this template, how is this information being reported? Then I guess my second question would be, what response have we had from the locals and from the state in terms of their willingness to report this information in record format like this? Thank you.

Pauline Salla: Thank you. Those are two great questions. We have been reporting this information on this template. We have just some change or minor changes to this. But all the jurisdictions and State Correctional Facilities have been reporting this information monthly, and I believe it's been for at least the last year and maybe longer. Cindy might have to help me on that one. We're all willing to do it. We've been doing it. We just want to make sure we're capturing it in the same way.

Chair Tedford: Great. Thank you. Ms. Casselman.

Cindy Casselman: Yes. Cindy Casselman for the record. Yes, we've been capturing it for approximately the last two years.

Chair Tedford: Okay. Great. Thank you. Is there any other discussion or questions for Commissioner Salla?

Sharon Anderson: This is Commissioner Anderson. I did have a question to get clarification on whether the incidences captured the individual youth within an incident or are we speaking of the incident isolated by itself and then reporting the numbers on that? Because I've heard in meetings there have been different ways that it has been reported and just wanted to get some clarification on that.

Pauline Salla: Thank you, Commissioner Anderson. Yes, this is Commissioner Salla. There has been a lot of discussion surrounding that. This template will be taken back to our full NAJJA Group also to really clarify. When the request of the Use of Force first came to the commission, and it's been several years that this was pre-Covid, that the Use of Force requests came through the Oversight Commission. The discussion really surrounded us capturing what was occurring in our facility. The total Use of Force incidents at least with the discussion and the attempt was to capture. Let me give you an example. If we have a fight breakout in one of our facilities, three youth are involved, three youth are restrained, that the intent of the request was to capture three youth had a Use of Force on them, not just it was one incident of a fight and that counts as one. When we're talking about incidents, and this will be taken to NAJJA to have discussion too but initially, the Use of Force incidence was every youth that had a level of Use of Force on them. That is why as we were collecting the data, we started, we added the unduplicated youth, because it's important to capture that. Right? How many youths had a Use of Force and then how many of the same youth are consistently having a Use of Force, so that we could back that data out and to see, what interventions or different things we could do with some of our higher risk kids. Total Use of Force incidents in the beginning was to be captured for each youth that had a Use of Force applied.

Sharon Anderson: This is Sharon Anderson. Thank you.

Marla McDade Williams: Commissioner Williams. On Column F where it says youth biological gender, was this reviewed to ensure that it complies with requirements in state law to have questions about sexual orientation and gender identity?

Pauline Salla: Thank you, Commissioner Williams, for that question. Yes, this matches what we have in our Enterprise Supervision and unless something has changed with the requirements of that, this meets that requirement.

Marla Williams: I think it might have been legislation in 2021. If we could just get some assurance that it does comply with that legislation, then I'd feel comfortable with that. Then there's also, legislation in 2023 about requiring Middle Eastern or North African collected and I see in Column G, H it does say Middle Easterner. I would just suggest that be changed to Middle Eastern or North African to ensure compliance with state law.

Pauline Salla: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Tedford: Thank you, Commissioner Salla. Are there any other questions or comments for Commissioner Salla on this template?

Addie Rolnick: This is Addie Rolnick for the record. I'm new, so it's a general question about all these data collection templates. Has there been consideration of adding a column for tribal affiliation for native youth?

Pauline Salla: Thank you. This is Commissioner Salla. That's a great question. I think that we would capture that. That is one of the elements we capture in the demographics. We haven't talked about specifically adding a column on here. That's something we can take back and have discussion about, but we would capture their race.

Addie Rolnick: Thank you. This is Addie Rolnick again. I would suggest a separate column from race for tribal affiliation, because race column will just capture usually self-report data on what the child says which isn't enough information usually to make sure that federal laws are complied with. In general, if it's possible to add a tribal affiliation column, I think, it would be helpful.

Pauline Salla: Thank you, Commissioner. This is Commissioner Salla. We will take that back to the group.

Chair Tedford: Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner Florez.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. This is Commissioner Florez for the record. To the previous Commissioner's point, a lot of what we collect is by self-report. There we're unable to verify things because our systems don't necessarily talk to each other due to confidentiality, but it's an excellent point. We have had multiple conversations about race and ethnicity. There's a document, not before me, that was an OJJDP document that conveys what the requirements are on federal reports. Part of the challenge in our subcommittee meetings is to overlay the federal reporting requirements, which says that on a lot of these measures, we must follow what the US Census Bureau dictates, which is very challenging, because it's ever evolving and it's the very long list, but that's something that we're, we're working with Ms. Casselman on. There are the state requirements, which Commissioner McDade Williams spoke too as well. All these points are well taken. I just wanted to confirm that these are the discussions we're having in those groups. Thank you.

Chair Tedford: Great. Thank you. Is there any further discussion or comment on this template? Great. Hearing none. Considering the legal compliance questions that Commissioner McDade Williams raised, I think it would be best to move possible action for this item to our next meeting, so that in the interim, we can make those changes to ensure compliance with both state and federal law. Is there any discussion there? Okay. Great. Hearing none. Commissioner McDade Williams, can you help to make sure that those issues that you raised are addressed in, in this interim period?

Marla Williams: Yes, I will. Thank you.

Chair Tedford: Great. Thank you. Okay. Hearing no more discussion on those items. The next item on the Agenda is Item #9, which is the identification of the next meeting date and agenda items. It still appears that Mondays are the best day for us to meet to ensure that we have good attendance across the board. If there are no objections to continuing to meet in the morning, I would suggest that we meet at 9:00 a.m., again next quarter. Given that we meet quarterly, that would place our next meeting on November 4th. Not that it's material for our purposes here, but that is the day before election day. To the extent that there are conflicts and people are busy that day, I'd be amenable to moving that date to the following week on November 11th, but I'd be open to discussion on whether the 4th or the 11th is best for everyone. Oh, whoops. Never mind. Let's try to stick to the 4th then, especially because we don't have political activity here, so it shouldn't be the biggest burden for us to meet. Does the 4th work for everyone?

Elizabeth Florez: Yes. This is Commissioner Florez.

Holly Welborn: This is Commissioner Welborn. It likely will not work for me, but we can figure that out.

Chair Tedford: Okay. Understood. Thank you. Is there anybody else who that date does not work for? Great. Then we will plan to meet at 9:00 a.m., on Monday, November 4th. With that, we will move on to Agenda Item #10, public comment. No action may be taken on a matter.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez for the record. I apologize. I thought we could also talk about future agenda items.

Chair Tedford: Oh, please. Yes.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for that. Also, I before we moved on from setting the date and time this meeting was scheduled from 8:00 to noon. I understand from Ms. Villalobos that there are technical challenges associated with why that must occur, but it does create confusion. It did create confusion for me because it blocks out on my calendar four hours when this is not a four-hour meeting. I'm just making a request that if anything could be done to clarify and adjust that it would be appreciated. I did have multiple people texting me this morning at 8 o'clock wondering where everybody was. That's just a request. For future agenda items, going back to a report that I gave verbally related to recommendations. For future potential agenda items, I would like to formally request that we have a presentation from NCJFCJ related to an accounting of the work on the innovation center the Juvenile Justice Innovation Center, as well as a cost estimate of potential contract expansion. I know Ms. Commissioner McDade Williams previously had indicated that she would do some work towards that, so I don't know if that needs to be reported to this group, my recommendation is that it would be since it's something within our Strategic Plan. Another thing, I'd like to recommend as a future agenda item is to also receive a report or presentation from DCFS Correctional Facilities as well as Spring Mountain Youth Camp and China Spring Youth Camp related to the CPC tool that has been implemented, and also to solicit their feedback related to how that tool is working for them. I would also like feedback from DCFS or whomever the holders are of the current contract or the previous contract with the Strategic Plan development to give an update on what the feasibility is of putting out to contract or bringing back the former vendor related to supporting the development of the next Strategic Plan. That's all I have. Thank you.

Chair Tedford: Thank you, Commissioner. As we discussed earlier also to have on that next meeting agenda would be a vote on the Use of Force template that will be revised and prepared for that meeting. Is there any other discussion or other items to potentially add to next meeting's agenda?

Holly Welborn: Yes. This is Commissioner Welborn. I would love at some point to get an update from the Nevada Department of Corrections on the youth detained in their system. I mean, I think it's helpful for us to know as a group the totality of where all youth under 18 are and what the conditions are. There have been recent transitions to more suitable location for young people, so I would love an update from the DOC on those youth.

Chair Tedford: Okay. Great. Thank you. Tentatively, let's put that on the agenda for the next meeting. I'll reach out to the Director of Department of Corrections and see if we can fit his schedule in for somebody from that group to come and give us a presentation on that at the next meeting. Okay. Are there any other potential agenda items for the next meeting? Great. Hearing none. We will move on to Agenda Item #10, which is public comment and discussion. Again, no action may be taken on a matter raised during public comment until the

matter has been specifically added to the agenda for a later meeting. Public comment is limited to two minutes, and we are now open for public comments. Please unmute yourself and state your name, spelling your last name for the record before providing comment. If you'd like to make comment by phone, the teleconference line again is +1 775-321-6111. Thank you. Is there any public comment by phone or on Teams? Okay. Hearing none. We will move to Agenda Item #11, which is adjournment. Seeing and hearing of no additional business before the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission today, I declare this August 5th, 2024, meeting adjourned at 9:56 a.m. It probably isn't said enough, but I really appreciate all the hard work you guys are doing for the State of Nevada, and we will see you all soon. Thank you.

This Meeting adjourned at 9:56 am.