

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 (JJOC) STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING April 4, 2024, at 10:00 am

TRANSCRIPT

Roll Call:

(Voting Members)

Present:

Elizabeth Florez
Jennifer Fraser
Sharon Anderson
Matthew Clapham
Perla Vega

Absent:

Brigid Duffy
Dylan Tedford
Marla McDade Williams

(Non-Voting Members)

Present:

Michael Whelihan
Pauline Salla
Carmen Jones
Michael Watson

(Staff Members)

Present:

Cindy Casselman
Leslie Bittleston
Jessica Villalobos

Elizabeth Florez: It is 10 o'clock. And Ms. Bittleston, can you please take roll?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Liz Florez?

Elizabeth Florez: Present.

Leslie Bittleston: Brigid Duffy? Not here. Jennifer Fraser?

Jennifer Fraser: Here.

Leslie Bittleston: Dylan Tedford. Marla McDade Williams? Sharon Anderson?

Sharon Anderson: Present.

Leslie Bittleston: Matthew Clapham?

Matthew Claphman: Present.

Leslie Bittleston: Perla Vega.

Perla Vega: Present.

Leslie Bittleston: And Michael Whelihan is a non-voting member.

Michael Whelihan: Here.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. Then I see Dr. Carmen Jones. For our staff members, we have Cindy Casselman, Leslie Bittleston, and Jessica Villalobos. For those of you who have not met Jessica, she is our new Administrative Assistant, she's on week number 5. We were without an Administrative Assistant in the Programs Office for about three and a half months. We are happy to have Jessica. Thank you, Jessica. We do have a quorum, Madam Chair.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. Again, this is Liz Florez for the record. Ms. Bittleston, before Public Comment, could we do introductions again, please. I will start. I'm Liz Florez, the Director of Washoe County Juvenile Services.

Leslie Bittleston: I will call everyone out and you guys can introduce yourselves. Matt?

Matthew Claphman: I'm Matt Clapham. I work for Lyon County Juvenile Probation and I'm also Elected School Board Member in Carson City.

Leslie Bittleston: Sharon?

Sharon Anderson: Good morning, everyone! I'm Sharon Anderson, the Deputy Administrator for Juvenile Justice Services. I'm going to take a moment since I have the mic to introduce everyone to Dr. Carmen Jones. She has been newly brought on and she's a pediatrician for the Division. I'm going to pass it to her, so she can share a little bit more about herself and then she can call on the next person. Dr. Jones.

Carmen Jones: Hi, everyone, good morning. This is day four for me in a newly created position for the Division. They're calling me Senior Physician, in which I presume that role will be developed as I join the meetings and learn the ropes. I'm a pediatrician of well over 30 years, we'll leave it at that. That gives you a little bit of background, there's a lot more to it. I am glad to be here, thank you for having me. I will be listening and learning.

Elizabeth Florez: Welcome, Dr. Jones.

Carmen Jones: Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Sharon Anderson: Okay. Mike Whelihan, go ahead.

Michael Whelihan: Mike Whelihan, Deputy Director of Juvenile Justice down here in Clark County.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. Jessica.

Jessica Villalobos: Hello, I'm Jessica Villalobos, staff here at DCFS Juvenile Justice.

Jessica Villalobos: Perla?

Perla Vega: Hi, I'm Perla Vega. I'm the Adoption Reunion Registry Coordinator for the JJOC. I'm a youth member.

Leslie Bittleston: Cindy.

Cindy Casselman: I'm Cindy Casselman, with the Juvenile Justice Programs Office. I'm the statewide PREA coordinator, YLS, and other duties as assigned.

Leslie Bittleston: Jennifer?

Jennifer Fraser: Hi, I'm Jennifer Fraser. I'm the Chief Deputy Public Defender, Juvenile Division in Clark County.

Leslie Bittleston: Michael?

Michael Watson: Michael Watson. I'm with the Delinquency Team for Juvenile, part of the DA's Office for Clark County.

Leslie Bittleston: Are you Brigid's proxy?

Michael Watson: I am Brigid's proxy. Yes.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. Thank you. I'm Leslie Bittleston, Chief of the Juvenile Justice Programs Office. Welcome, everybody, that concludes introductions, Madam Chair.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you, everybody. With that, we'll move on to Public Comment. To provide public comment telephonically, dial 1-775-321-6111, when prompted to provide the passcode, enter 441749649#. If providing public comment during this meeting, unmute your microphone prior to speaking. Persons making comments will be asked to begin by stating their name for the record and to spell their last name. Is there any public comment? I'm not seeing any. We will go ahead and close public comment and move on to item number 4, Review and Approval of the December 6 Meeting

Minutes, attachment number 4. I've had an opportunity to review and would move to accept these minutes.

Jennifer Fraser: Jennifer Fraser, for the record. I'll second that.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. Is there any discussion on this matter? Seeing none. All those in favor of accepting the Minutes as is, say aye.

Group: Aye.

Elizabeth Florez: Any opposed? Any abstentions? Seeing none. The motion carries. We'll move on to item number 5, the JJOC Full Commission update. And at this time, I will turn it over to Ms. Bittleston regarding identifying the outcome of the committee recommendations presented on February 12 at the Full JJOC Meeting.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I'm trying to share my screen right now. Okay. Can everybody see my screen? Okay. Perfect.

Elizabeth Florez: Yes.

Michael Whelihan: Yes.

Elizabeth Florez: Liz Florez, for the record. Is that one of the attachments?

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair. Going back a few meetings ago, the Strategic Planning Committee voted or recommended, I can't remember if it was an actual vote or recommendation, to reach out to the Nevada Center of Juvenile Justice Innovation, NCJJI. This is an arm of the NCJFCJ, the National Coalition of Juvenile Family Court Judges. Did I get that right?

Elizabeth Florez: National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.

Leslie Bittleston: Perfect. Thank you. So NCJJI is the research arm of NCJFCJ, and they were selected back in 2018 to be the vendor to provide an evidence-based resource center in Nevada. The requirement to have an evidence-based resource center in Nevada started with Assembly Bill 472 and was codified into NRS 62B.635. The state did an RFP, and the contract was awarded to NCJJI. With that being said, the funds that began this project was a one-time allotment of funding that came with Assembly Bill 472. NCJJI received a set amount of money, I believe around, \$100,000, to kick the project off the ground. However, there was no sustainability for that funding after that first year. Since that time, the Formula Grant has provided \$51,750 to NCJJI on an annual basis. That takes us to the request of this committee a few months ago, which was to reach out to this organization to determine how the funding is being used and if the funding is adequate, because we, The Strategic Planning Committee, believe that it's not adequate to do all the things that it was required to do. This is a report that was received back from NCJJI on what they have done in accordance with NRS 62B.635. This is page 1. The black print is the requirements, and the blueprint is NCJJI's response to how they have addressed that requirement in NRS 62B. Moving on to number 2, one of the elements was to provide technical assistance to the division and to local jurisdictions. What NCJJI has done to do that is they've created a website and they have responded to specific training requests. Moving on to B, the use of evidence-based programs and practices. NCJJI has included already available services or links to services on that website, and they have provided some specific training courses to address specific needs as identified. In B number 2, this is an

area that has really been a struggle for NCJJI due to the lack of funding. This task was supposed to be done back in 2019. However, as you can see from the response from NCJJI that the Quality Assurance Tool was finally created in 2023, with a couple of jurisdictions piloting the tool. The NCJJI will be asked to present at the next JJOC SAG Planning Committee Meeting on their results of this pilot. Number C, act as a clearinghouse for those trainings and programs and practices. That is the clearinghouse it is the website that they have established. Facilitate collaborations, this was part the current Strategic Plan, to enhance collaborations across state and county lines and into the provider community. That has happened to some degree, but not to the degree that I think we all had hoped when the plan was created. Then going to E, they have provided numerous training and resources, their current goal is to finalize the QA Tool in 2024. Current challenges, they're doing the best they can with the annual budget of \$51,750. Our work would be greatly enhanced by additional fundings. Then it's been challenging to foster and encourage investment amongst Nevada practitioners. The last bullet, the website currently includes a host of useful resources. This is just kind of talking about the fact that they can enhance their whole program with some additional funding. I will not be going through the rest of this section 2, but going on to section 3, it is the hope of the vendor NCJJI to infuse some additional funding into the project, that way they can improve their whole program, website, as well as improve the quality of the training, then improve the communication and the outreach. Apparently, there's a link to an email address on their website, however, that email address isn't staffed. It may go a couple of weeks before anybody gets back to that, because there's just not a lot of funding around, even staffing somebody to answer emails. That is really a high-level review of what the report from NCJJI was. Madam Chair, back to you.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. Liz Florez, for the record. I do have a question in reviewing this, Leslie? I'm not seeing a specific ask for funding. Do we know what they are suggesting is required to meet all of the legal requirements of the innovation database or website?

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston, for the record. No, they did not put a specific ask on this report. I have not followed up with them on this report pending meeting of this Committee. This Committee may recommend that I go back and ask specific questions, which I will do, but I have not done that to this point.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. Thank you. Are there any questions or comments related to this item? My understanding: this is Liz Florez, for the record; Ms. Bittleston, is that at the next JJOC or at the next State Advisory Group Subcommittee Meeting, there will be further presentation on the results of the QA Tool pilot or pilot that they did. Correct?

Leslie Bittleston: That's correct. I will be reaching out to them to provide an update to the Committee on the results of their pilot.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. Thank you. Liz Florez again for the record. In reviewing the Minutes from the last meeting, we did have conversation, and I believe Mr. Whelihan also weighed in quite a bit about our thoughts on the efficacy of the website and what we believe as super users, what would be required for it to be beneficial to us. Those have all been documented in previous Minutes, so I won't go over those again. But I know that this is something that the larger Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission would have to, as a group, provide guidance on as to the funding request. I think without knowing what exactly they're asking for, I think we need that information so that we know what we're going to be asking for potentially or advocating for potentially. Ms. Bittleston, is that something you could seek clarification on? Thank you.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Leslie Bittleston: Very quickly, just for clarification, if you could provide me the specific questions that you would want to know from them, I will reach out.

Elizabeth Florez: Certainly.

Leslie Bittleston: Sorry. Go ahead, Mr. Clapham.

Matthew Claphman: Liz, this is Matt Clapham, for the record. I was just curious, being new to this, where does the 51,000 come from? Who funds that?

Leslie Bittleston: I will answer that. Leslie Bittleston, for the record. The Division of Child and Family Services Programs Office receives an annual grant, federal funds, which the grant is called the Title II Formula Grant. This grant is provided to states who comply with the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act. With that grant annually, there are several sub grantees, so individuals that receive funding to provide services, and NCJJI is one of the sub grantees of this annual grant, which is where they receive the \$51,750.

Matthew Claphman: Thank you.

Elizabeth Florez: Ms. Bittleston, this is Liz Florez for the record, to your earlier question about sending questions, I think it would also be helpful to know what exactly that \$51,750 does provide. Perhaps if it were more succinctly lined out, I do see the information which answers some of that, but I think more specificity. I will provide further clarification on what answers I think the full body JJOC would need to have answered.

Leslie Bittleston: Perfect. Thank you.

Elizabeth Florez: Are there any other questions or comments on this item? Okay. Moving on to item number 6. I, and Ms. Bittleston, seek your guidance. It looks like we just discussed item number 6 related to the vendor.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, we did.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. Is there an item number 5 on the outcome of committee recommendations?

Leslie Bittleston: I'm pulling up the Strategic Agenda. Item number 5. Item number 5 was talking about what was discussed at the JJOC Full Commission back in March. I'm blanking on the date, but there was a couple of recommendations that came from the Full Commission to the Committee, and of course, I'm blanking on that. One of the recommendations was to provide an overview of their Strategic Plan to the Full Commission, because some of the members are new, and to determine if there is funding for a Strategic Plan, which I can answer in just a moment. That was what item 5 was supposed to be. It was supposed to be the follow up from the Full Commission on the items that were meant to go to the Strategic Planning Committee.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. This is Liz Florez, for the record. I'm not sure what more information we have to add to this. I know we have recommended that there be a review of whether funding was available to assist in the update of the Strategic Plan. We, as the former or the earlier iteration of this committee, had a lot of discussion over a course of a couple of years where we really believed that we did

not have the bandwidth to do this important lift. And that's why the recommendation was to go back to the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission to seek direction on how to fund hiring a vendor. You had mentioned that you had some information on the financial piece. If you could share that.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Thank you, Leslie Bittleston, for the record. I did some research after the last Full Commission Meeting and determined that the funding for the original Strategic Plan did not come from Juvenile Justice Funds. It came from the Mental Health, and I don't know the name of the actual grant, but it came from the Mental Health. There's a big, huge block grant. With that being said, I also did some research in the Programs Office budgets to determine if there was funding currently to fund a Strategic Plan, hiring contracting with a vendor to do that and there is not currently. I did reach out to partners within the division, specifically the Grants Management Unit, who oversees VOCA and Child Welfare Funding, ARPA, and some of those much larger grants. I was told that there is no funding for this fiscal year, which would be fiscal year, 23 July of last year to June of this year. However, she will be checking to see if she can identify some funding for the next fiscal year. Which would be after July 1. I will follow up with her after July 1 to see if she has identified funding. I have asked for roughly \$50,000. The last vendor in 2018, they completed the plan for \$50,000. I've asked for the same funding amount, and as stated, I will follow up after July 1 to see if some funds have been identified that we can utilize for a vendor.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you, Ms. Bittleston. I'm looking at the document, and it sounds like you've done some research to see what other opportunities there may be within the state. I'm looking through the attachments, and I see that you did attach for everybody's benefit, the first Strategic Plan. I'm not sure if everybody has had an opportunity to review, but I will at this point ask if anybody has any other thoughts, if there's been any other creative thinking related to the obligation that we must update the Strategic Plan. I know Ms. Bittleston in the past has provided documentation in our earliest Committee meetings where she organized sort of what's been accomplished, what hasn't been accomplished, and tried to collate that information so that it's digestible. That would help everybody understand what are the main areas that really need updating, what are others that have been completed. Perhaps for the next meeting, Ms. Bittleston, you would be able to share those documents, I think it would be helpful for the group at the next meeting to see all the work you've done that had helped us prior to really narrow the focus. With that, I'd like to turn it over to any other members of the committee if they have other thoughts or ideas related to updating the Strategic Plan.

Matthew Claphman: This is Matt Clapham. I just have a quick question; I was looking over the draft. Is that kind of what we're referring to? I think one concern I have, just as a probation officer. Where we going as a state under the data sharing on page 5 of that draft, often I wonder, like, we have stat forms that we're required to collect info on. And, a lot of times people will just say, "I'm not answering that or whatever." Maybe it's financial, maybe it's gender, or maybe it's like any of those questions. They don't want to answer that stuff. I'm wondering like how do we ensure that we're getting good data?

Leslie Bittleston: Right. And Matt you've moved on to agenda item number 7.

Matthew Claphman: Oh, I'm sorry.

Leslie Bittleston: If we can hold that question until we get to agenda item number 7.

Matthew Claphman: Sure.

Leslie Bittleston: Sorry about that.

Matthew Claphman: That's alright.

Leslie Bittleston: Also, Madam Chair I did share the working document today as attachment 7.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. I'm seeing that now.

Leslie Bittleston: When we go on to the next agenda item.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. Wonderful. Thank you.

Jennifer Fraser: This is Jennifer for the record. I went back and looked at my notes from the Full Commission Meeting in January to see where we ended, and this isn't helpful, but I do, however, have a note that talked about the Strategic Plan and for us to look at what things are not working anymore. I can't specifically remember what we were we supposed to go through and kind of maybe get rid of things to make the updated plan easier or not easier, maybe more manageable or does anyone remember that or what specifically?

Leslie Bittleston: This is Leslie Bittleston, for the record; in being a part of the Strategic Planning over the last few years, I think what you just said, Jennifer, was correct to ensure that the Strategic Plan has items that can be achieved. Because there are things in the current Strategic Plan that cannot be achieved due to lack of funding. For example, one of the things in the current Strategic Plan is phase two of the Enterprise Supervision Project. Phase two was originally supposed to include building bridges between state and county lines, so youth information could be like electronically shared rather than, a paper copy or that which we are still working with today. There has not been any funding for that. There has not been any discussion about that since the original Strategic Plan. That's just an example. Include in the current Strategic Plan things that can be achieved and if there is bandwidth to build something new to ensure that we are working our way towards building that with funding requests and building the infrastructure that we need to achieve that goal.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you, Leslie.

Leslie Bittleston: Sure.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Liz Florez. Thank you, Ms. Fraser, for that question. I'm beginning to recall, and unfortunately, I have not taken the time to or had the time to go through it myself. What I'll recommend is that as Chair of the Committee, I'll work with Ms. Bittleston in a separate conversation, perhaps create those categories, what has been completed, what is yet to do, what is the feasibility of all the outstanding items and what are some updates that perhaps we would recommend. There's a lot that's happened in our state in the last expiration of this plan, and we could also work on that and present it at the next meeting we have here to this group, and perhaps that'll help guide more poignantly conversations and help us come with recommendations to the larger body.

Jennifer Fraser: This is Jennifer. Yes, and I do remember at previous meetings, we've had drafts of what Ms. Bittleston has presented already like when we were talking about how we wanted to say, "if we've completed the goal or not." Right? I think some of that's already there, maybe it's just the added layer of just identifying what's feasible and what's not.

Leslie Bittleston: You're correct, Jennifer, a lot of that work has already been done by this Committee over the last few years. It's just re-digging that old work up and identifying the feasibility of some of those things. Like the phase two of the Enterprise Supervision Project. Is that really feasible or not? I'm not a tech person. I have no idea how much that would cost to build those bridges. But to me that doesn't seem feasible, because there's never been any discussion around funding that. I think, Madam Chair, for the next Committee Meeting, the Programs Office can dig up some of that old work and we as a committee can go back and look through and identify some of those issues as being feasible or not. Mr. Whelihan has a question.

Michael Whelihan: One of the things I think, because this plan is expired, so that's the first thing we got to recognize this plan is an old plan. If we're going to develop a new plan, I think we should start looking at some data elements for some of the things that we did put in place, because when you develop programs and things of that nature now sustainability and efficacy. I think in the new plan that we should do, an example would be like the YLS. Let's look at some of the standards that are created by the JJOC when it comes to the youths. Like for each new crime, we got to do a full YLS. Is that effective? Is it what the data looking like on the child, on their recidivism rates, high, medium risk, start looking at some of those things. I think that should be part of our plan moving forward, is some of the things like the PSC and some other things we put in place that, maybe we look at that, maybe we change some of the standards or if it's working well, at least we have data to show what it is or isn't.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Liz Florez. Thank you, Mike. I know that the data Sub-Committee, I'm not sure if they met recently or not, Ms. Bittleston, do you know if, one, they've met, and two, were there conversations like this that may overlap with the Strategic Plan?

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston, for the record. The Data Committee recently met and there is another planned meeting, I believe, on May 1ST. The Data Committee kind of recapped some of the stuff from the past, what they've been talking about. Nothing nuts and bolts related has been discussed yet, and their focus is really over the performance summary, scorecard summary, which was a part of their Strategic Plan, if everybody remembers that. If you don't, I can provide a copy at the next Committee Meeting just to refresh our memories, because there are data elements on that performance scorecard summary that the Programs Office is still unable to get. For example, like the number of adult convictions in criminal court, the number of direct files, things like that the Programs Office have no access to data wise. So right now, currently, Madam Chair, we have not discussed that at this point. I see Pauline has a question.

Pauline Salla: Thank you. I know during our Data Committee Meeting; we did talk about all the work our NAJJA Data Subcommittee has been doing to streamline our reporting and to revisit at the JJOC level some of the data requests that had come out of the Full Commission that is either duplicative or not required in our statutes or NACs. That we would give an update at the next Data Subcommittee of the work the NAJJA Data Committee has been doing, because I do believe the work in the Data Subcommittee is going to blend with the Strategic Plan also because we can't have a Strategic Plan that's not data driven.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you, Commissioner Salla. Are there any other questions related to this item before we move on? Okay. With that, we'll move on to item number 7 regarding the Strategic Plan working document, and I will ask Ms. Bittleston to talk us through that.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you. Some of you are new to this committee, but just to let everybody know that the Strategic Planning Committee has been extremely active over the last few years even with the JJOC Full Commission being inactive, this committee continued to meet and has done quite a lot of work.

The goal of this working document is to identify the things that we want to put in the next plan and provide that this working document to the vendor, when a vendor is chosen, which this will be the baseline for the vendor to write the next Strategic Plan for us. Just to kind of go through this document, some of the things we wouldn't change. Like the purpose of the Strategic Plan is outlined in NRS 62B.615, the mission of the JJOC, this is right out of the current Strategic Plan. The vision of the JJOC is right out of the current Strategic Plan. As you can see, there is a note section for each one of these. If anybody would like to change the mission and the vision, we as a committee can recommend a change or keep it the same. And then moving on to page number 2, the definition of recidivism, this is currently in the Strategic Plan. This is how recidivism is defined today. Then there are note section again, if there is any discussion on changing this definition or clarifying, revising. And then what data elements should be included in the current plan? That is in the bottom of page 2. Moving on to page 3. This is continuation of data elements. Then we move on to the resource center. NRS 62B.635 requires the presence of an evidence-based resource center in Nevada. It was this item on the current Strategic Plan that prompted the Nevada Center for Juvenile Justice Innovation report, which there are some additional questions that we will put in these notes when Madam Chair provides those to me. Quality insurance. Currently this is actual language at the bottom of page 3. This is language right out of the current Strategic Plan. QA review conduct annual quality assurance reviews, the state and counties will have a quality assurance reviews and corrective action plans. However, the question here that I want to bring out to the members is the bottom bullet that says community-based providers to use CPC. This, I believe is not feasible. We don't have the staff or the infrastructure to review providers. This is one of those feasibility areas that I believe folks that created this plan thought it was a good idea, however, didn't really provide the infrastructure to do this. Moving on to the top of page 4, the next bullet is counties to use the CPC and Detention Facilities. Again, that has not occurred. I don't know if we would classify that as feasible or not feasible, but the Programs Office does not have the staff or the resources to review all seven detention facilities. Then moving on to NRS 62B.620, this is the actual NRS around the Annual Quality Assurance Review. Continuing with page 4, system collaboration. This is the piece that really AB 472 wanted to put on the evidence-based resource center. And it's unclear with the current funding or I believe it's not feasible, perhaps that's a better way to say it, not feasible with the current funding that the evidence-based resource center be able to do this. That is system collaboration. Number 5, data sharing. These are some ideas that the Programs Office has discussed with the Chair of this committee separately. It doesn't mean that it's set in stone. It's just some ideas around some things to put in the new Strategic Plan. Create a protocol or outline to ensure uniform Data Collection across the state. This is kind of in line with the NAJJA Data Committee to ensure that we are providing what we need and what is required. The idea is to come up with a procedure or an outline, maybe from that NAJJA Subcommittee. I'm not sure, but to have statewide, so all jurisdictions know the right template to use the data that they need to provide. That was idea number one. Idea number two is to create a policy procedure for data sharing and the concealing of records. As we all know, NRS around this is a bit vague and could use some discussion and some more concrete information for the state and jurisdictions. Then work with the state agencies to create data sharing agreements or include the Office of Analytics. This bullet, if Sharon were to say something right now, she'd say, "Yes, we are including this bullet", but the lead of this will be the Office of Analytics. It doesn't necessarily mean that it's jurisdictions or the Programs Office, the lead will be the Office of Analytics for that one. Moving on to another idea for discussion is education. Ensure that all stakeholders within the Juvenile Justice System are educated on confidentiality, information sharing restrictions, and available, as well as shareable data to increase knowledge, understanding and effective working relationships between stakeholders. That's another idea. Then ideas for additions to Nevada Revised Statutes. There is nothing in NRS currently around the Community Corrections Partnership Block Grant, the use of force or the use of restraints or death in custody. Currently, 432B, which is specific to child welfare, has some information on death in custody, but there's nothing in NRS 62 that talks about death in custody. And then these elements, revisions to NRS in Nevada Revised Statutes,

these are just additional ideas for review to determine if updated language is needed or revision in language is needed. That is this document and what it is and, how it will be used for this committee going forward to determine those elements that this committee wants to include in the next Strategic Plan. .
Madam Chair.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you, Ms. Bittleston. This is Liz Florez for the record. It's very helpful the way you've organized it. I can see this being a point of reference for you and me when we continue to work offline to report back to this committee. I will ask for the revisions to Nevada Revised Statutes, and I also apologize if I've just forgotten, are these ideas which are here for potential discussion, did they mostly generate from 62E.710. We've had conversations about where the Nevada Revised Statute conflicts with the JJDP, and I see that which is the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Elizabeth Florez: The next one for 62B.215, is the Corrective Room Restriction. Did that make this recommendation? Could you explain what we might be seeking in this area for clarification by NRS?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Leslie Bittleston for the record. At the time this document was created, the State Advisory Group Planning Committee was not meeting. The State Advisory Group Planning Committee is now meeting, and many of these elements will be shifted to the State Advisory Group Committee. For example, as was said, NRS 62E.710 conflicts with the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act and then the 62B.215, which is the Corrective Room Restriction is something that's been talked about in the SAG Planning Committee for a while that we just want to review the language of NRS and see if it makes sense and end that. Madam Chair, those will be removed off this document and placed on the other committee.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. I'm making a note of that.

Michael Whelihan: Mike Whelihan, for the record. My understanding in the Juvenile Justice Prevention Act, the violation was that they had to have court within 30 days, not the fact that they're sitting in a jail, because they were certified under the state law either direct or indirectly.

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston for the record. Not necessarily. So 62E.710, number one, allows for individuals under the age of 18, and that is a direct violation of the JJDP. The second one, which is indicating that individuals 18 plus on a parole or probation violation can be placed in adult jails, the problem with that and the reason it is a violation is those individuals are still under the juvenile court supervision. They're still considered a juvenile in the State of Nevada. Therefore, it is a violation. A second piece of that is, some instances individuals are staying well past 30 days, they're staying 60, 90 days, then they're being recommitted to Summit View or NYTC. That whole practice violates the JJDP. With that being said, it's okay to put a parole violator over 18 in an adult jail, however, what we need to do as a State is to, terminate them from juvenile supervision and let the adult system deal with them, or if we're going to deal with them on the juvenile side. We don't want to deal with the adult system at all. That's a conversation we need to have regarding that NRS.

Michael Whelihan: Then you also need to think about that juvenile sex offenders under state law they can be up there till age 24.

Leslie Bittleston: Yep.

Michael Whelihan: Mike Whelihan, for the record. We're not going to put them into the Juvenile Detention Center, as 23 years old, because they violated their probation, parole or sex offense. The judges aren't going to be willing to take them off probation, because we want to give them a violation of parole or probation. That's a more complex issue.

Leslie Bittleston: Agreed. Leslie Bittleston for the record. I believe that also plays into the education piece that was recommended as an idea. I believe there's some issues out there where judges just are not educated and aware of all these factors that play into the ages of some of these kids and juvenile jurisdiction and all. There's a lot of conversation which need to be done regarding many things, but I'm just trying to share with you now, why it is a current violation of the JJDPa the way that we are doing it in practice.

Michael Whelihan: Mike Whelihan, for the record, Leslie, so if they're 17, then turn 18, if the crime was committed when they were a minor, does that apply to this too?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, correct.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Liz Florez, for the record, for those of you who are newer to the group, this continues to be a complex conversation. NRS conflicts with the federal requirements. In Washoe County, our civil attorneys are reviewing, they're also placing NRS side by side with the OJJDP regulations and reviewing for rendering of an opinion to guide us in Juvenile Delinquency. It is very complex, and it's something that I'm certain we won't be able to move meaningfully and within this committee because it is a large matter. It is something in which I anticipate, I could be wrong, but it would require a law change in NRS, and that would be a bill draft submitted by someone, then there would be robust debate at the legislative level related to this item because it is so complex and there are many ramifications associated with it. I think we would all agree that for the jails, at least in Washoe County, and for smaller jurisdictions. I do know Clark County is unique, but there is a tremendous burden on local jails when they hold youths because of the sight and sound separation federal requirement, which also means that they're isolating minors in the jail, and that's not optimal either. Regardless of the circumstances that led to the youth being certified. It is something for greater discussion, and we all need to work towards a remedy. There's also a lot of other implications because there isn't a lot of infrastructure that's been established in the juvenile system to adequately, in my opinion. I'm biased because I run a detention center to adequately provide for all youth that we're responsible for. It's an important topic that we will continue to discuss, not just in this committee, but I know it's happening in other committees as well. That's just a little bit of information for others who are newer to the conversation.

Michael Whelihan: Mike Whelihan for the record. I would like to point out the CPC that Leslie discussed a little bit earlier. I agree having that audit of the CPC in the detention facility would be difficult. Challenging at best, because the audit itself seems to me when we get the results, it should be more for a mental health institution. They want, a high level of mental health people in comparison to the number of staff, it is like you can't reach the standard they want you to reach, because it seems to me it's more meant not for Juvenile Programs or Juvenile Detention Facilities, seems it's meant more for juvenile mental health facilities. Most of our institutions aren't run by mental health staff, so they're criminal justice in nature, not mental health in nature. I would like that we use the PBS for both our institutions. I am not sure if there's a way to get rid of, or move away from the CPC for all the institutions and just go to PBS, and do a better job with that? We're already required to do that by state law as well, which seems to be more in the realm of comparing institutions to similar sizes, doing similar work, like a detention facility of a 100-bed would not be compared to one with three beds versus a long-term institution. I think the PBS is a more fair, practical approach than the CPC.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you for that, Mike. This is Liz Florez. Ms. Bittleston, I'm not sure if we made it through this list yet.

Leslie Bittleston: We haven't yet, my apologies. Let me re-share.

Elizabeth Florez: I think it's confidentiality.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you. Lastly on page 7, confidentiality, and sealed records. NRS 62H.170 outlines the effective sealing records, the inspection of sealing records in certain circumstances, and NRS 62H.210 talks about information to be collected by a standardized system, in confidentiality. There are some questions around these NRS's. The NRS does not address how, or if data can or should be shared with the division, which is DCFS. For the purposes of collecting and analyzing data as outlined in NRS 62H.200, through NRS 62H.400 prior to the sealing of records. This NRS places the onus on the juvenile court to allow recidivism research to be completed. The division must petition, the juvenile courts will evaluate recidivism. There is a question mark there. This, as the Programs Office reads this, it is extremely confusing on the state side to determine how to measure recidivism if we're only getting some records, or really the Programs Office is just asking for clarity on this specific area based on an internal state review and we didn't know where to add it, so we added it here. We thought that the Strategic Plan may be a good place to look at this.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Liz Florez, for the record. Just out of curiosity, is the interpretation of this statute is this state attorney's opinion?

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston, for the record. No, that was just Internal Programs Office opinion, confusing to us.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Liz, for the record. My recommendation would be that the state attorneys review this and render an opinion on it only because if ever the state is to make and or ask something from the Programs Office of data sharing or an opinion related to confidentiality, we would have to run it through our legal counsel anyway.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Elizabeth Florez: I believe that's just my recommendation. I'm not sure how feasible that is, but I believe the state attorneys should provide some guidance on this.

Leslie Bittleston: Perfect. I will ask Deputy/Commissioner Anderson if she would send that to the DAGs. Thank you.

Michael Whelihan: Mike Whelihan, for the record. One of the things that I believe should be talked about too with them as well is the bill that was passed where misdemeanors are destroyed. They're not even sealed anymore. Once they're 18 and they've completed their probation, the record is destroyed. How do you use that in a recidivism study if it's already destroyed?

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah.

Elizabeth Florez: And this is Liz, for the record. My recollection, which is always faulty, and I'm not a lawyer, I thought there was a carve out specific to recidivism studies that allowed for it. That's why I think it would just be great if somebody could provide some guidance from a legal perspective.

Michael Whelihan: Mike Whelihan, for the record. I agree with you, Liz. The problem is, like, on our side, we must destroy the record. On our end, there's no, like, "Hey, you can use it?" When the record is destroyed, it's not sealed, it's gone. You're supposed to purge the record. So, how do you use it for data sharing when by state law, the agency that's the owner of the record, Clark County, we destroy it.

Elizabeth Florez: Right. I think we had talked about de-identification, but I'm making all kinds of assumptions. I see Ms. Fraser; we have a lawyer who wants to say something. Ms. Fraser.

Jennifer Fraser: Well, I think it's a complicated issue. We've come across this with just the sealing records because you have two agencies that are holding the records. Right? You have the court and then you have DJJS. When we do a motion to seal records for our clients, we'll get notification that family tracks are sealed. DJJS, and they send out the reports or the letters to the law enforcement agencies, but then that doesn't mean that the court has sealed their records. Right? Even when the court seals their records, they still have them available. The court is more behind in sealing than DJJS is. I believe depending on what the Attorney General's attorneys say, I think probably the court administrator and staff attorneys for court need to be looped in on this as well, because you have two gatekeepers of records. Then on the expungement for the misdemeanors, it says that the probation department has to destroy the records, the court is not destroying them, they're just expunging them. There is still records there. Again, that goes back to where we have two different agents or two different agencies doing two different things around two different levels. It is problematic and I don't think the statutes address that there's two different layers. Yeah.

Elizabeth Florez: That's a great point.

Leslie Bittleston: Which is, why the statutes is are confusing.

Jennifer Fraser: Yes, agreed.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, and another thing, I believe that brings up a good point; is the Programs Office does not have an MOU or anything in place to obtain data from courts. Maybe that is another element to, the data committee or something to try to determine how to lessen the burden on the Juvenile Probation Departments and get some of that data directly from courts. I am not sure how that would work, but maybe that's another conversation area, Madam Chair.

Elizabeth Florez: Yeah.

Michael Whelihan: Mike Whelihan, I got another wrench for you guys. Misdemeanors don't go in front of the court because they're either not filed, or deferred out, wouldn't not be in a court record.

Jennifer Fraser: Right. Some would, you're right. The ones that never get to court, you wouldn't. Then some are, right, or if the case is negotiated to a misdemeanor. But that doesn't give a full picture either.

Elizabeth Florez: Right. Is there anything else on this item, Ms. Bittleston?

Leslie Bittleston: No, Madam Chair.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. Is there any further conversation? Or are there any further questions from anybody else related to this? As I stated, I will work with Ms. Bittleston separately and we will pick up some older work from documents that Ms. Bittleston worked hard on in this committee prior to that. I will help organize these into certain columns, and then that'll help narrow it down to focus for this group to review at our next meeting. With that, let's confirm our next meeting date and time. I believe we're meeting monthly. Ms. Bittleston, can you remind me or Ms. Villalobos, did we do a doodle poll for this meeting, or did, did we all agree at one time when the, when the next meeting would be? Can't recall.

Leslie Bittleston: I don't believe, did we do a doodle?

Jessica Villalobos: Yes, I believe for this meeting we did do a doodle.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Liz Florez, for the record. I'm going to do a little experiment before we go to a doodle poll. I have an Administrative Assistant who dislikes doing a doodle poll, because you must monitor, and follow up with people. I'm just going to ask if everybody could look at their calendar for May. How's May 9th at the same time of 10:00 am, would that work for most? I'm looking at my voting members, and I believe it does. I will ask Ms. Bittleston and Ms. Villalobos to send out a calendar invitation for May 9 at 10:00 am, please?

Leslie Bittleston: And just a question, Madam Chair. Do you want that to be recurring? Because we can make that a recurring meeting every monthly on the second Thursday at 10:00 am.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Liz Florez, for the record. That generally works for me.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Elizabeth Florez: If that generally works for the group, we can certainly try that. I'm seeing head nods. I'm seeing a question from Ms. Anderson.

Sharon Anderson: Yes, I'm looking at my calendar already for the second Thursday, it looks like there is an IFC on that date. That would be a date I wouldn't make it unless, I believe, I have stuff on that.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Elizabeth Florez: Is that a standing meeting? That would just be a conflict on that one day. Let's do this. Let's just plan the one meeting for now, and we'll reevaluate that at a different time.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. May 9th at 10:00 am.

Elizabeth Florez: Yes, please. I may seek clarification, Ms. Bittleston, on who are the voting members of this committee? I believe I've lost track.

Leslie Bittleston: Sure. Let me provide you. Let me get my list. The voting members are Liz Florez, Brigid Duffy, Jennifer Fraser, Dylan Tedford, Marla Williams, Sharon Anderson, Matthew Clapham, and Perla Vega. Michael Whelihan is a member of the committee, non-voting.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. This is Liz Florez, for the record. Pauline Salla is not a voting member of this.

Leslie Bittleston: No.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: She attends when she can.

Elizabeth Florez: Got it. Okay. I show we have 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 voting members. Is that what you show as well?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you, for that clarification. Okay. With that, we will move on to item number 9, Public Comment and Discussion. Is there any public comment? Not seeing any. We will adjourn today. I thank you, everybody, for your time. I think the next meeting, we're gonna move to a point where we can make some decisions or at least narrow the focus of some of our items. Again, thank you very much for your time.

Michael Whelihan: Have a good weekend, everybody. Bye.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. Bye-bye.