

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 TRANSCRIPT

DATE: Monday, May 6, 2024

TIME: 9:00 a.m.

VIDEO CONFERENCE: MICROSOFT TEAMS

Roll Call:

(Members)

Dylan K. Tedford – Chair
Holly Welborn
Pauline Salla
Marla McDade Williams
Brigid Duffy
Jennifer Fraser
Dawn Gearhart
Ethan Ewert
Paula Smith
Matthew Clapham

Staff Members:

Jessica Villalobos
Leslie Bittleston
Cindy Casselman

Absent:

Derrica Daniel
Sharon Anderson
Elizabeth Florez
Katherine Maher

Chair Tedford: This meeting is being conducted via teams. Would everybody please mute your microphones? I think it looks like most of you already have. Just so that the audio is clear, it's 9:01 a.m. on May 6th, 2023. I'd like to call this May 6th, 2024, meeting of the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission to order. With that, we'll move on to agenda item two roll call. Will Ms. Villalobos please call the roll?

Jessica Villalobos: Yes, this is Jessica Villalobos for the record. We have Dylan Tedford, Holly Welborn.

Holly Welborn: Present.

Jessica Villalobos: Derrica Daniel, Pauline Salla.

Pauline Salla: Present.

Jessica Villalobos: Marla McDade Williams.

Marla Williams: Present.

Jessica Villalobos: Sharon Anderson.

Pauline Salla: I believe she's not coming.

Jessica Villalobos: Elizabeth Flores.

Pauline Salla: She's excused.

Jessica Villalobos: Brigid Duffy.

Brigid Duffy: Here.

Jessica Villalobos: Jennifer Fraser.

Jennifer Fraser: Present.

Jessica Villalobos: Katherine Maher. Dawn Gearhart.

Dawn Gearhart: Present.

Jessica Villalobos: Paula Smith.

Paula Smith: Present.

Jessica Villalobos: Matthew Clapham.

Matthew Clapham: Present.

Jessica Villalobos: Perla Vega. Ethan Ewert.

Ethan Ewert: Present

Jessica Villalobos: Staff member, Leslie Bittleston.

Leslie Bittleston: Present.

Jessica Villalobos: Myself, Jessica Villalobos.

Pauline Salla: And Cindy?

Cindy Casselman: Yes.

Pauline Salla: How many members present for you?

Chair Tedford: Great, thank you. I'm Dylan Tedford. Also, present. Sorry about that. My audio wasn't working very well. I'm just confirming Ms. Villalobos, that we have a quorum.

Jessica Villalobos: Yes, we do have a quorum Chair Tedford.

Chair Tedford: Great, thank you. With that, we'll move on to agenda item 3, which is public comment. No action may be taken upon a matter raised until the matter has been specifically added to the agenda for a later meeting. Public comment is limited to 2 minutes, we are now open for public comment. If you'd like to comment by phone, the teleconference line is +1 775-321-6111. And if you'd like to provide comment on teams, please unmute yourself before speaking. And if you are making a comment, please begin by stating your name and spelling your last name for the record. Is there anyone wishing to make public comment by phone? Hearing none. Is there anyone wishing to make public comment on teams? Great. Thank you. With that, we'll move on to agenda item 4. Item 4 on the agenda is the review and approval of the minutes from the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission's February 12th, 2024, meeting. Is there any discussion regarding those minutes?

Matt Clapham: Chair Tedford. This is Matt Clapham for the record. I don't know if it really matters, but that was my first meeting I attended. On the minutes, my name isn't mentioned in members present, I don't know if that matters or not. And then in there, on page 12, just for the correction of the spelling of my name, last name is C-L-A-P-H-A-M.

Chair Tedford: Thank you, sir. I appreciate it. Ms. Bittleston, can we make an amendment to the minutes so that his name is included as those present?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Chair Tedford. Staff will make that change as required.

Chair Tedford: Okay. Thank you. Hearing no further discussion, I will entertain a motion to approve the minutes with the amendment adding Mr. Clapham's name. Is there a motion?

Leslie Bittleston: It's all moved. Holly Welborn.

Chair Tedford: Thank you. Is there a second for the motion?

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

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

Group: Aye.

Chair Tedford: Any of those opposed, please unmute yourself and indicate by saying nay. Are there any abstentions to the motion? Hearing none, the motion carries. Thank you. Item 5 on the agenda is an informational update of Title II formula grant eligibility and a general JJOC membership update. Ms. Bittleston, will you please proceed with introducing those two topics?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Leslie Bittleston for the record. As we discussed at the last JJOC meeting on February 12th, the eligibility of the state when it comes to the Title II formula grant funds, at that time, I updated the commission and the membership regarding the fact that the state is currently ineligible for Title Two Formula Grant funds based on the membership of the current JJOC. The membership, as it stood at the time the application was submitted, did not meet federal requirements. The state has made some, well what am I trying to say, processes to address this. There are some items in the Google Drive available which I will reference as part of my update. There is in the Google Drive, if you want to pull up, agenda item number 5 BDR. The first thing that you are seeing on your screen is an update proposed by the Division DCFS to update the Nevada Revised Statute regarding the membership of the JJOC. It's coming. There we go. Can everybody see the screen? Okay. DCFS is proposing ABDR to amend the membership of the JJOC. As you can see on this attachment, the update is brief. The new language is in blue. The second sentence of number 2, the governor shall appoint to the commission members who meet the requirement. The requirements specified at section 223.34 USC 111-33 section A, 3A, and then a deletion of the current membership. If you remove that one and go to agenda item number 5, annex. The next agenda item or the next document that will be shared is being shared is the actual membership of the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act that is required to be eligible for the Title Two Formula Grant funds. What is being proposed is just to match this language in NRS 62B.600. Are there any questions from members? Okay, not hearing none. Jessica, if you could move to agenda item number 5 JJOC, current membership. Thank you. The next document that you are seeing is the current membership of the JJOC. This is based on NRS 62B.600 as it reads today. As you can see, we do have some vacant positions. The good news is, we do have some pending applicants in several of the positions under member nominated by Supreme Court, Chief Justice Kadige nominated two members. Those members have submitted applications and are pending review by the governor. The next one, the director of Juvenile Services representing a county's population is 700,000 or more, or Clark County. John Munoz has been appointed to that position. The Program's Office has reached out to him to submit his application to fill that role. Representative of a nonprofit organization, we do have a potential applicant for that position. We also have a potential applicant to fulfill position titled Volunteer who works with children who have been adjudicated. We have three pending or potential youth members that we are currently in the process of recruiting. That's what the current JJOC membership looks like today. We are still not quite where we need to be eligible for the Title II Formula Grant Funds. We're making strides and I hope with the appointments of those that are pending, and those two potential applicants, we will meet requirements to be eligible for those grant funds. Are there any questions from the members on that?

Pauline Salla: I have a question. This is Commissioner Salla.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Pauline Salla: I'm looking over this list, I think there's, unless I'm mistaken. It looks like there's only maybe two or three rural representatives and the rest are from Clark and Washoe. I do know that before with the federal requirements, there had to be so much representation between the rural and then Washoe and Clark. Is that still something that we need to consider?

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston for the record. Yes, and no. I think, it's written in the federal requirements. No, it is no longer written in federal requirements. However, best practice would be to have some adequate representation from the rural. Then all 3 of the youth members that we are recruiting are rural, which is good. One of the representatives of nonprofit is also rural. We are pending some of that rural participation.

Pauline Salla: Okay, thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Any other questions on item five?

Holly Welborn: Yes, Ms. Bittleston, this is Commissioner Welborn.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Holly Welborn: I have a few questions. Just taken together these appointments, it would follow the current statute for the appointing authority, whether that's the governor or the Supreme Court once we amend the statute. Is that correct? I guess who would be making these appointments under this, the JJDPA?

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston for the record, it is the same process. The governor is the appointing officer federally under federal requirements and under state requirements, that would not change.

Holly Welborn: The recommending, I guess, authority would we have some members of the state legislature, we have the Supreme Court, those folks would still make that recommendation?

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston for the record. No. Those recommendations would be eliminated with the revision to proposed BDR revision to 62B.600.

Holly Welborn: Alright. Then just, I guess this is more of a comment, it says that this commission can range from 15 to 33 people. Are we required to take this language exactly as it appears in JJDPA or? I ask that question because, sometimes we got to limit the amount of people on these commissions for expediency and to make things easier. Otherwise, some of these are very open-ended that we can have representatives of law enforcement, representatives of public agencies, and it doesn't really give a cap on the number of those folks. I just want to put on the record that as we move this through the legislature and make these changes, that it should be clearer to make sure that the balance of interests is there, to ensure that there's an equal number or a proportionate number of folks.

Leslie Bittleston: That is a great point, current commissioner Welborn and something that the state will work on with the Governor's Board's office as we move forward. Thank you. Any other questions? That concludes my presentation. Chair Tedford.

Chair Tedford: Thank you. Hearing no more discussion on agenda item 5, we'll move to item 6. This is a discussion related to the length of time that Juveniles are spending in County Detention Facilities after commitment to DCFS until their admission into a DCFS facility. Ms. Salla, would you please proceed with your discussion there?

Pauline Salla: Thank you for the record, Commissioner Salla. I just ask that this be put on our agenda so that maybe we can start collecting data to present to the JJOC. I think each of us, jurisdiction wise keeps track of how long our kids are staying in a detention center pending a placement, not just with the state commitment, but if it's a mental health facility, either in state or out of state. One of the things that when we first had the Supreme Court Juvenile Justice Reform Commission, the goal was to look at our whole system, right? Because we must look at the entire system to be able to reform it. We've done amazing things reforming it, but I think through the process of budget cuts and places closing in our state, beds being limited, not being able to hire staff that now we're starting to see a backup in our system.

The County Jurisdictions had to reform our systems to make sure that we weren't commuting kids to the state unnecessarily, and that we were using reliable and validated risk assessment instruments and Evidence-Based programming. I think we need to look at our entire system again, because we're having kids that are pending placement because it's a mental health placement and they're in a detention center. We're seeing backup with our state commitments. Our beds have been cut, just like all of us. They're having a hard time hiring staff. We're seeing a backup. At least I would ask this commission to add this to, the data that we track to see if we need to change our system or figure out how we're going to build that up our infrastructure. Again.

Chair Tedford: Thank you, Commissioner. Is there any additional comment or discussion related to that matter? Hearing none, we'll be sure to make note of that and add it to the agenda for next meeting. Thank you. Next is agenda item 7. Here, this is a discussion topic, which is an update from each subcommittee on their subcommittee's activity. For clarity, each member is required to sit on at least one subcommittee. With that being noted, I will refer to each Subcommittee, chair, or representative for a discussion about their specific Committee. Our first Subcommittee on the agenda is the State Advisory Group Committee and the Racial and Ethnic Disparities Subcommittee. This update is accompanied by attachment 7.1, Chair Salla, would you please proceed with providing an update here?

Pauline Salla: Thank you. Commissioner Salla for the record. We met, let me pull up just to make sure I have all my notes here. Last time we met was April 18th, 2024. Our committee has been dormant for a while until the Commission started again, and we had new members appointed. Just as a reminder for our new members. The State Advisory Group is the mandatory committee under the federal, JJDPA. We ensure that we're remaining in compliance with the four core requirements. Also, our requirements under the formula grant that we just heard is we are not eligible for because of our membership, but we're working on that. We do have a lot of new members that were appointed. I will throw out that we are looking, because our group wants to be balanced too, in representation. We are looking for some members that represent different disciplines. We do not have a District Attorney who is appointed to our committee, and I think that's important for balance. I'm just going to throw that out there. Our next meeting is May 16th. We reviewed our Evidence-Based Resource Center through NCJJ. And as we know, our Evidence-Based Resource Center was created during our last legislation and really provides jurisdictions the ability to see what programs work, what's considered Evidence-Based, or evidence informed. Specifically, to our adolescent population. There was a tool that was piloted by Washoe County and feedback was given to NCJJ. We're hoping and expect that to be rolled out in this month, or probably June, I would think. We will bring that, assuring that quality, assurance tool, to the full commission also once it's

rolled out. We did talk about our JJOC membership. I will say this, I know that we've had several people apply for our commission that have a lot of experience in the Juvenile Justice system and have not received any feedback or information back on that. I'm not sure if the process is working appropriately, but we do have some amazing people that have applied and have not been appointed. I think maybe we need to investigate the process a little bit. We did receive data presentations, and we'll go through our, the ones that we did. The SAG is also responsible for monitoring any federal compliance and our State Compliance with legislation that has come, through with our Juvenile Justice reform. One of those is room confinement. Room confinement we have had that implemented for probably about 12 years now, 10 years. And was SB107. This really is about tracking the elements of room confinement, as was the intent of the legislation. I think we've gotten away from that through the years. We're reviewing that and identifying the best possible way to report that information and then analyze that information because I think sometimes how our data presented, it can be confusing and interpreted in different ways. We're working on really identifying how to report that so that the data is accurate and the data's informative, and that we can use it to make, the best-informed decisions. We also review the use of force. Again, we're talking about how we report it, and then the presentation of the data. There's a lot that goes into that. We had to determine if we're going to report per incident or report per unduplicated youth, because that does make a difference. We're working through that. We review the community corrections partnership block grant. We all know that that was grant funding that has been available to jurisdictions for decades. The intent of that legislation and that funding was to prevent youth from being placed in a higher level of care, including state commitment. When we reviewed how we're reporting that data and to ensure that we're all reporting the same way. Then we reviewed the YLS commitment data, which indicated the average commitment score is moderate, which is really the high end of moderate, rather than high or very high. Juvenile Justice, the office staff reviewed 71 cases that were moderate or low, and it was determined that these represent Juvenile Sex Offenders and youth with weapon charges. Also, I think it's important to know that even though we all agreed to be using the YLS, which is a validated and reliable risk assessment tool to help us determine the level of supervision. And the YLS captures the risk to recidivate. If we're truly following the YLS, then that should really guide us in determining what kids go to what program or what level of supervision. I think through our discussion, we identified that maybe some jurisdictions, there's attorneys are used, are having other discussions that don't include the YLS, and that's part of the process, right? So how do we balance if a plea deal is made or agreed upon, but the YLS doesn't support a level of, of care. We're working through that because that's all part of our discussion about the system. The other thing is our Juvenile Sex Offender programs we're limited in the state. I believe another one just closed too. Whereas we may have been placing Juvenile Sex Offender youth in specialized treatment, if there aren't any specialized treatment centers in our state, then you can imagine that state correctional care becomes the next viable option. That's part of us discussing the infrastructure of what we have available to our kids. We also reviewed Status Offender Data. This is one of our four core requirements of our federal act. Again, these are our status offenders, so runaways, incorrigibles, curfews. The Federal Government considers minor and consumption, minor possession, status offenses. Of course, Nevada just changed our legislation. The first two are really considered civil citation. We're just tracking that because anytime we fall out of compliance with any of our four core requirements, that does affect our federal funding. We want to make sure that we're tracking that. Then we did have a lot of discussion how Juvenile Detention Centers is a catchall for juveniles, maybe with mental health concerns. If you're on a big corridor, like we have I-80 corridor, we get a lot of runaways from out of state. They come to our facilities until we can figure out where they're from. Again, that's looking at our entire system to build up the infrastructure. Currently, we don't have any new recommendations for the commission as we work through the data. We're working closely with our Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice and Administrators to really narrow our data collection process to

what is mandated federally and mandated through the state to make sure we're all reporting the same way. With that, I'll submit.

Chair Tedford: Thank you, Commissioner Salla. Are there any questions or comments based on her update there?

Brigid Duffy: This is Brigid Duffy for the record. Pauline is on the YLS, I heard you mention, we as attorneys negotiate cases to commitment. Often those are cases that we would be looking at certification for and instead negotiate down to state commitment, which may not be equivalent to YLS of high or high, very high. But what this committee also going to look at where we are with the quality assurance of the YLS? Because I think that's an issue we have seen. Like there was supposed to be a QA, so we know that the individuals that are doing the YLS, they're being done to fidelity, because I don't want to just blame lawyers for negotiating, we do this because we're not sure we're seeing what we would expect out of the YLS and as well as the fact that there is that ability to override some of them for these very high level violent offenses.

Pauline Salla: Thank you, Commissioner Duffy. I wasn't just blaming attorneys either. I understand. We all have a pardon. I love that question. We have a quality assurance committee that is statewide for the YLS. We worked closely with NYSAP, who is our national agency, to make sure that we were all staying true to the fidelity of it. Jurisdictions have the ability to participate in that and not participate in that. And I do know that I chair that committee. I do know we had great turnout. We met monthly. We are all scored vignettes and had NYSAP review them and to make sure that we were doing it.

We have a standardized system of quality assurance for statewide for our YLS. Each jurisdiction has the ability to build their quality assurance piece in their policy that addresses how they're going to maintain fidelity to the YLS and the process, including the case plan. If that's not happening, then well, I sure would like to know. We can work on that in our committee, in our statewide committee. I feel very confident with our master trainers who are part of that committee that they are training to the fidelity of it. Of course, there's always outliers, but the override ability and the quality assurance piece were set at a statewide level in the statewide policy. Then jurisdictions were to implement that in their policy to follow it. If that's not occurring, Commissioner Duffy, I'd love to have a conversation offline so we can address that in our Quality Assurance Committee.

Brigid Duffy: This is Brigid Duffy for the record. Thank you. I'll get with our newest director of Juvenile Justice Services. I know this has been an ongoing communication with our courts as well, along with you on the YLS and case plans issue. Then I have another question if I may, Chair Tedford.

Chair Tedford: Sure, please.

Brigid Duffy: The status offenders. I'm wondering if I'm going to have a DA or, I'm asking to have a DA on the Committee, this might help. I'm not like sitting here questioning the reports and not having a representative. My question is, and maybe we can get it, the next meeting is not this meeting, but the Subcommittee meeting is, what is considered the high number of Status Offenders that you're seeing out of Clark County.

Pauline Salla: What makes that number be considered high if it's one or two runaways a month? If that's high number, that's kind of what I think I'm seeing, but I'm not sure because I don't see the numbers. Then the next question is, how do we then use that to not use security detention? It seems like we have a gap in our state, probably of an actual runaway shelter. Because we shouldn't be using abuse and neglect shelters because that's

not abuse and neglect, but just because a child ran away from a home, we wouldn't want to open a case against a parent for abuse and neglect. What's the alternative if we don't have a runaway shelter? Thank you, Commissioner Duffy. And those are all great questions. That's some of our discussions too is, how do we not have status offenders end up in our detention centers and become a catchall? I would have to defer to the program's office about the high number of out of state runaways from Clark County. I don't have that right off the top of my head, I don't want to misspeak. I agree with you. I think that's part of our gaps in our system that we need to reevaluate is, where can they go that's safe. It's not a detention center. And I probably didn't answer your question, so I'm sorry.

Leslie Bittleston: Chair Tedford, this is Leslie Bittleston. May I make a comment?

Chair Tedford: Please. Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you. Number 1, we do have a Washoe County DA who has agreed to be part of the State Advisory Group committee on the go forward. Ms. Gearhart will be part of that committee starting in May. Secondly, if this commission would like to review the status offender data at the next commission, we can add that to the agenda. Or is that something that you want to discuss offline? The program's office can accommodate whatever you'd like.

Chair Tedford: I think it would be a good idea to discuss, but I'll defer to other committee commission members there. If there's any additional comment or thought?

Pauline Salla: This is Commissioner Salla. I think we can present that data at the next JJOC through the SAG Committee.

Chair Tedford: Thank you, Commissioner Salla. Are there any additional comments or questions regarding the State Advisory Group Committee or the Racial Ethnic Disparities Committee? Great. Hearing none. We'll move on to our second subcommittee on the agenda, which is the Data Performance Committee, which is accompanied by attachment 7.2. Subcommittee Chair Duffy, would you please provide us with an update there?

Brigid Duffy: Good morning, Chair Tedford. I'm going to defer to Ms. Bittleston, if I may, due to some personal reasons, I have not been able to be in attendance, and I'm hoping to work with DCFS to work around my schedule so that I can start making sure I'm present. Ms. Bittleston if you could report for the meeting that was last week.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, Leslie Bittleston for the record. There is attachment 7.2 for everybody to review. The last data meeting was held on May 1st. The members present were Sharon Anderson, Jennifer Frazier, Pauline Salla, Katherine Maher, and members absent were Ms. Duffy. At that meeting, there was some discussion around, what the Data Committee, the JJOC data committee is responsible for versus what the Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators Data Committee is responsible for. Just to provide a little context, the Data Committee, much like the SAG Committee, was dormant for a period. NAJJA, the Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators created a committee off NAJJA to review data and has been meeting for roughly a year-ish now, to look at the data templates that jurisdictions are using to report data to the program's office. It was very important for the data, the JJOC Data Committee to understand what the NAJJA Data Committee was doing. There wasn't any duplication of efforts. The JJOC, State Advisory Committee and the NAJJA Data Committee, are responsible for the risk and needs assessment data. That's the YLS data we

discussed a few minutes ago. Status offender data, use of force room confinement, community corrections, partnership block grant, Juvenile Sex Offender treatment, training data, youth competency, hearing data, racial and ethnic disparity data, Juvenile Justice system data, in overall compliance with the JJCPA. The Data Performance Committee of the JJOC will also be working on the youth competency hearing data. They will review the data templates created by the NAJJA Data Committee. The JJOC Data Committee is also responsible for performance measures for the Juvenile Justice system. This was part of the 2017 legislation of AB472, which has been codified into elements of 62B and 62H, to really establish some of those system performance measures. The JJOC Data Committee is responsible for that. And those performance measures are included in a document called the Data Scorecard and Performance Summary. This document was created along with the FY18, FY23 Strategic Plan to gather data for FY19, FY20, and FY21. The premise of this document was to gather those three years of data in order to make a projection for FY23. However, as we know, COVID occurred and the JJOC as a whole was dormant along with the Subcommittees. There will be discussion going forward in the JJOC Data Committee around what is the future of the performance measures, what will that look like? That Committee will work in conjunction with the Strategic Planning Committee, which will be updated next. Another item discussed in the May 1st meeting was unclean Data Submissions. What that means is really something that has been discussed for as long as I've been in this position in the Program's Office, which is the different definitions of things. For example, what is a referral? If everybody is looking at the same definition of referral and providing the same data, that would be clean data. There is still some confusion on definitions around referrals and arrests. The Data Submissions to the Program's Office are not always clean. It is very difficult to look at recidivism data and data around that when the Program's Office can't verify that the same data is being presented by all jurisdictions. In discussing that topic, the committee would like to review something that's called the 2014 Data Dictionary. This Data Dictionary was created with the assistance of, I believe, the Supreme Court something. Commissioner Salla, I forgot what that was called. Supreme Court Initiative. A Data Dictionary was created and put in use in 2014. The committee will be working on this Data Dictionary because as we know, there has been new legislation and new information since this dictionary was created a decade ago. Secondly, this committee will work on defining specific measures of recidivism. What is it that the system would like to see when we measure recidivism? Again, when we discuss clean and unclean data, we must provide a specific measurement to jurisdictions. We are getting an apples-to-apples comparison. Lastly, one of the things that has been discussed in this Committee for several years is the missing data around adult convictions in the adult system. Once a youth is either certified or direct file to the adult system, the Juvenile Justice system loses them and loses all that data around them. There is a new member of the Data Committee and a pending JJOC applicant, Denise Parker, who works for the Clark County, Court Initiative Project. I probably got the name of that wrong, my apologies. But Ms. Parker believes that she may have a method or some ways that the state can begin obtaining this data. Those three things that I just outlined will be a topic of conversation for the next several meetings of the NAJJA committee. There are no recommendations for the Commission currently. Are there any questions?

Chair Tedford: Thank you, Ms. Bittleston. Seeing no questions there, we will move forward to our final Subcommittee on the Agenda, which is the Strategic Planning Committee, and that is accompanied by attachment 7.3. Ms. Bittleston, would you please provide us with an update on the Strategic Planning Committee?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Leslie Bittleston for the record. I am providing this update on behalf of Chair Elizabeth Flores, who is excused from today's meeting. The last Strategic Planning meeting was held on April 4th. The members present were Sharon Anderson, Jennifer Frasier, Perla Vega, Elizabeth Florez, Matt Clapham, and Mike Watson, who was a proxy for Commissioner Duffy. The members absent were, Chair Tedford,

Commissioner Williams, and Commissioner Duffy. With this meeting the review, continued review and discussion regarding SB398 and the Evidence-Based Resource Center. To remind everybody, SB398 was a legislative bill from the 2021 legislative session that required a study on housing youthful offenders and youthful offenders are those individuals who are convicted in the adult system, who are under 18. This bill also included some additional information on what the system would look like if it housed individuals 18 up to 20, 22, 24 years of age separately from juvenile offenders. This study was completed by a vendor and was provided to the Legislative Council Bureau by June 30th of last year. To date, there has been nothing from the legislative Council Bureau on anything regarding this bill. The second thing that was updated was the Evidence-Based Resource Center. In the next agenda item, agenda item number 8, you will hear a little bit more about the resource center. I will tie those together in agenda item number 8. Updates for the Commission under number 1, the Committee is, aware that a new Strategic Plan is due. NRS 62B.615 requires a Strategic Plan every five years. The current Strategic Plan is expiring this year. The Committee is aware that they need to work on a new Strategic Plan. The Committee has discussed a lot of ways to do the Strategic Plan but has settled on requesting that the state hire a consulting company to construct the final Strategic Plan. That is the request of the Committee. The Program's Office internally is working with grant staff to identify funds to hire a vendor. There's no update other than the Program's Office is looking for funding currently. Moving on to number 2, Dr. Kristan Russell, who is our vendor representative for the Nevada Center for the Juvenile Justice Innovation. That is the Evidence-Based Resource Center website, that acts as the State's Evidence-Based Resource Center. She provided an update to the Committee on what the vendor can and cannot do with the funding that they have available to them today. As I mentioned a couple minutes ago, I will go into more detail on agenda item number 8 with that. Is that it? I believe that's it. There are no items for the Commission currently. This Committee will continue to work on their Strategic Plan for the next foreseeable future. Are there any questions on that? I don't see any. That concludes that. Chair Tedford.

Chair Tedford: Thank you, Ms. Bittleston. Hearing no questions there, we will move forward to agenda item 8, which is an informational session and discussion regarding the fiscal year 19 through fiscal year 2023, Strategic Plan and a quick update on its status. Ms. Bittleston, would you please proceed with your update there?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, Leslie Bittleston for the record. As part of the attachments provided today, was the Strategic Plan in its entirety, if anybody would like to reference that during this conversation. There is also an attachment. Jessica, if you pull up attachments, 8, consolidated, incomplete. There is an agenda item titled Incomplete Items for from the current Strategic Plan that I'm going to go over now. Just to provide a little context to this, one of the things the Strategic Planning Committee has already completed is they have gone through the current Strategic Plan and identified the areas in the plan that have been completed, partially completed, or not completed. What we will go over with this Agenda item is, some of those items that are partially or not completed. Goal number one was completed in its entirety. Goal number 1 was around selecting and implementing risk and needs assessment. The YLS in the case planning. Goal number 1 was completed. The first item on the agenda is, goal number 2, proven programs. This goal is tied to the Evidence-Based Resource Center. The requirement for the state to have an Evidence-Based Resource Center was part of the large legislation in 2017, AB472, which was codified into, NR 62B.630 I believe. Please don't quote me, but I believe it's 630. The proven programs on goal number two were a list of items that the Evidence-Based Resource Center was to complete as part of being the vendor for the state for this. The first thing was Evidence-Based programs and practices inventory. Whereas they have, the vendor has provided some inventory on the website. The inventory is not by any means robust and complete. Part of this is because the only funding stream for the Evidence-Based Resource Center is \$51,750 annually from the formula grants. Just to provide some

history for those of you are new to the Commission, AB472 and 2017 provided some startup funds. A one-time pot of money to implement a lot of the aspects of AB472, including the risk and needs assessment and the Evidence-Based Resource Center vendor. The vendor was provided some startup funds in 2017 to get off the ground, but there were no sustainable funds, in the budget on the go forward. With that being said, the Formula grants kicked in and began providing \$51,750 per year in 2018. That has been the only funding for the resource center on the go forward. Moving on to number two, develop a plan for DCFS to help counties replace ineffective in harmful programs. The resource center does not have the resources with the amount of funding they receive to do this, so this is an incomplete item. Number three, policy should identify requirements for Evidence-Based standards in the following areas. County, Juvenile Probation, County Detention Centers, County Camps, State Parole, State Facilities, and Community Providers. Again, there are no resources available to do this, nor was there a clear understanding of where this belongs and who would oversee this on the state side. This is an item that is not completed. Are there any questions on goal number two before we move on to goal number three? Okay. I'm not hearing any. If we can move on to number three. Goal number three is system collaboration. This is partially completed. The first item is complete and implement Caseload Pro phases one and two across all counties. For those of you who have been around a while, Caseload Pro, turned into Tyler's Supervision and is currently now called Enterprise Supervision. This was implemented within DCFS and 16 out of the 17 counties in Nevada. Washoe County has not adopted Enterprise Supervision and has chosen to move to a different Case Management system, which is currently in process. That was phase one. Phase two was never established nor funded, nor identified. In phase two to, remind, the members of the commission were the piece that would build the bridges between counties and states. There was a lot of talk around the state having access to jurisdictions to pull data, as required in NRS 62B and NRS 62H. However, that phase does not exist, and was never funded or planned. That was Caseload Pro. Moving on to number two, the QA review. What was discussed and promoted was to conduct annual quality assurance reviews. The state and counties will have quality assurance reviews and corrective action plans for ensuring state facilities and county camps are using Evidence-Based practices. There was a lot of talk in the Strategic Plan about expanding this QA review to community-based providers and to county detention facilities. And this piece was not done. The tool that was selected to do the QA review is a proprietary tool. It's called the Correctional Program Checklist. It is owned by the University of Cincinnati. It's a proprietary tool that requires training directly from the University of Cincinnati. There is no train the trainer option. Currently there's no mechanism for service providers to use the proprietary tool. There is no NRS requirement for counties to use the CPC or any QA tool. And currently, DCFS does not have the resources to ensure and monitor corrective action plans. Initially, DCFS, as part of the startup money in 2017, trained eight reviewers, eight individuals who were trained on the CPC to conduct these QA reviews. Within the first year, five of those fell off and moved to other positions or retired or left the state. DCFS and Clark County did pay for an additional training in 2020. Another 8 reviewers, but as of today, there are only four reviewers available to do all these reviews and corrective action plans, which is not a sustainable number. That's partially completed with a lot of open ends.

Moving on to number 3, performance reporting. This was really talking about establishing a standard performance measurement system and, and really honing in on the database that was discussed where the state would have access to pull data directly from jurisdictions. Moving on to page two, information to be collected, analyzed, and reported. The unique identifying information of the child, basic demographic information. And as you can tell, that is really kind of youth specific information in referencing kind of what is called in data terms, a data extract. That was really the idea around this data sharing. Where we are today is highlighted in yellow. There are 11 Judicial Districts that are independent of the state and each other. Each Judicial District has different levels of diversion, formal and informal. They also report to separate Judicial Districts or Courts. This really kind of ties into the unclean data that is provided to the state because as it says here, there is no one

mechanism or one way to do things, which means the jurisdictions still have their own processes and provide data based on their own processes. Performance targets have not been established by county. Information to be collected and analyzed is in NRS 62H.210. But it requires county data to collect the data. But there is no mechanism for counties to share that data to the state. Again, specifically talking about a data extract that youth specific data of what is happening from that child, with that child from referral to case closure. And there is no standardized system. There's no data warehouse, and there's no one place to capture or pull data from. An update on this piece of the Department of Health and Human Services has a data unit that is called the Data Analytics Unit. The Data Analytics Unit has been working with the DCFS Program's Office to reach out to the jurisdictions to obtain data sharing agreements with each jurisdiction, to obtain that data extract and to use the tools of their unit to provide some analysis of those data extracts. That is in process. And the data analytics unit has recently met with the biggest counties, Clark, and Washoe. That is currently in process, more on that to come later. Lastly, number four, cross agency collaboration. There are no resources available to do this, nor a clear understanding of where this belongs. That has not been completed. That is an update of the Strategic Plan areas that either were partially completed or not completed at all. The Strategic Planning Committee has been and will continue discussing these areas for inclusion or exclusion from the next Strategic Plan. Some of this will depend on funding. If there is additional funding for some of these things, then some may be included, but if there are no additional or is no additional funding can be identified, many of these may be excluded on the go forward. That's an update on the Strategic Plan. Are there any questions?

Chair Tedford: Commissioner Salla, would you like to ask your question?

Pauline Salla: Yes. Thank you. Leslie, have we investigated other tools besides the CPC. To think that some of us aren't a fan of the CPC doesn't seem to capture what we need to capture, and I imagine, even like PBIS. I imagine there's PBS. I imagine there's other tools out there that would really fit our needs better. Has the state investigated that?

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston for the record. In 2017, when the state was looking at tools, the only tool available that was validated was the Correctional Program Checklist. And that was presented to the QA committee at that time. Since that time, there has been no additional studies or research on if there are any additional tools in addition to the CPC. That is what happened. Initially, that was the only one available, but since then, no. The state has not done any research if there are additional validated tools currently.

Pauline Salla: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Tedford: Are there any other questions for Ms. Bittleston? Hearing none, we will proceed to the next agenda item, which is item 9. That's to confirm the date and time for our next meeting. After reviewing the minutes from last meeting, it seems like Mondays is the best for everyone. And Monday morning there were no objections then. Are there any objections meeting on Monday morning now? Hearing none, we'll keep Monday mornings as our regularly scheduled time. Since we meet quarterly, we'll kick that out three months from now. That date will be August 5th. Ideally, we'll be able to have that meeting in person. Does anybody have any comments or questions about that date? Great. Seeing none, we'll confirm August 5th at 9:00 a.m. as our next full Commission meeting. With that, we will move to agenda item 10, which is public comment. Again, no action can be taken upon a matter raised during public comment until the matter has specifically been added to an agenda for a later meeting. Public comment is limited to two minutes. Again, we are open for public comment. Please unmute yourself and state your name and spell your last name for the record before providing comment. If you'd like to make a comment by phone, please call (775) 321-6111. Are there any public

comments? Hearing none. We'll proceed to agenda item 11, which is adjournment. Seeing and hearing of no additional business before the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission, I declare this May 6th meeting of the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission adjourned at 10:09 a.m. and I look forward to seeing y'all soon. Have a great day. Thank you.