

Joe Lombardo
Governor

Victoria Gonzalez
Executive Director



Justice Lidia Stiglich
Chair, Nevada Sentencing Commission

Christine Jones Brady
Vice Chair, Nevada Sentencing Commission

STATE OF NEVADA

DEPARTMENT OF SENTENCING POLICY

625 Fairview Drive, Suite 109
Carson City, NV 89701-5430
Phone: (775) 684-7390
sentencing.nv.gov

NEVADA SENTENCING COMMISSION

MINUTES

Date and Time: June 30, 2023

Location: VIRTUAL ONLY

MEMBERS PRESENT

Chief Michelle Bays
Dr. Shera Bradley
Chairman Christopher DeRicco
Deputy Chief Aaron Evans
Evelyn Grosenick
Athar Haseebullah
D.A. Chris Hicks
Jim Hoffman
Judge Tierra Jones
Dr. Jennifer Lanterman
John McCormick
Julia Murray
Director Beth Schmidt
Director Christopher Sewell
Vice Chair Christine Jones Brady
Chair Justice Lidia Stiglich

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Senator Nicole Cannizzaro
Director James Dzurenda
Judge Scott Freeman
Senator Pete Goicoechea
Kimberly Mull
Assemblyman David Orentlicher
Jon Ponder

STAFF

Executive Director, Victoria Gonzalez
Deputy Director, Jorja Powers
Management Analyst II, Erasmo Cosio
Management Analyst I, Jose Sepulveda
Administrative Assistant, Hunter Jones

1. Call to Order / Roll Call
[Meeting called to order at 9:00 a.m.]

Chair Justice Lidia Stiglich: All right, thank you. I will now call to order the June 30, 2023, meeting of the Nevada Sentencing Commission. So, good morning, everyone, good to see you. Welcome to those viewing the meeting on the Department of Sentencing Policy YouTube channel. I'm going to ask Director Gonzalez to take the roll.

Executive Director Victoria Gonzalez: Thank you Chair.

(ROLL CALL IS CONDUCTED BY DIRECTOR GONZALEZ; QUORUM IS MET)

2. Public Comment

Chair Stiglich: All right, thank you. I'll now open agenda item number two, the first period of public comment. There are two periods of public comment, one at the beginning of the meeting and one at the end. Members of the public have two options for submitting public comment. First, they may do so in writing by emailing the Department of Sentencing Policy at sentencingpolicy@ndsp.nv.gov. Public comment received in writing will be provided to the Commission and will be included by reference in the minutes of the meeting. Members of the public who wish to testify may do so by telephone. Due to time constraints public comment will be limited to two minutes. Any member of the public that exceeds the two-minute limit may submit your comments in writing to the Department of Sentencing Policy. At this time, I'm going to ask staff to manage and direct those who wish to testify by telephone. Ms. Jones?

Ms. Hunter Jones: Thank you Chair. Members of the public who would like to testify by phone, press star nine to raise your hand. When it is your turn to speak, please slowly state and spell your first and last name. Chair we have no callers who wish to testify.

3. Approval of Minutes of the Meeting of the Nevada Sentencing Commission held on May 26, 2023.

Chair Stiglich: All right, thank you. I'll now close the first period of public comment. We'll turn to agenda item three, approval of the minutes. Members of the Commission have been provided copies of the minutes from the May 26, 2023, meeting. Are there any edits, comments, or corrections?

JOHN MCCORMICK MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 26, 2023, MEETING.

JULIA MURRAY SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSED

4. Review and Discussion of Job Posting and Procedure for Selection of the Executive Director of the Department of Sentencing Policy

Chair Stiglich: We will turn now to regrettably to open agenda item number four. Which is review and discussion for job posting, and procedure of selection of the Executive Director of the Department of Sentencing Policy.

As we've become aware, our current director will be leaving us in August to pursue an opportunity in another state. I'm very happy for her, they're very lucky to get her. I feel that's a huge loss for this commission under her leadership, but she of course has put together a plan to help us find her successor, and since I have such great faith and confidence in Director Gonzalez, you know, she will steer us in the right direction. We're going to review and approve a job announcement and process for recruiting candidates who we can vet and then approve for the purpose of making a recommendation to the Governor to be appointed. I'm going to now turn the time over to Director Gonzalez and let her give us that update. So, Director you may proceed.

Director Gonzalez: Thank you, Chair. I will save my remarks and emotion on this for our last meeting, when we get together for the interviews, but I really want to thank the Chair for those remarks and the support of this commission. Like I said, I'm sure I'll have lots to say before then, but thank you very much.

So, I will go over what the plan is or what I will outline in the next few moments of this agenda item. So, first I'm going to review the statute and what that specifically requires this commission to do when it comes to appointing the Executive Director. Then, I will walk through the proposed procedure. This procedure is based on what the Commission did previously when I was appointed and then, we will review the announcement. Then, turn to the Chair to add any additions or edits that the Commission would like to add to the procedure, to the announcement that we can then move forward with.

So, in terms of the statute, what is required is in NRS 176.01323, is that in subsection two, the Executive Director of the Department must be appointed by the Governor from a list of three qualified persons recommended by the Sentencing Commission. As we know in AB 32 this past session we made the change to add the term qualified. We also recommended the change to the qualifications for the Director. So, under subsection three, it says the Director, there are no specific requirements as far as what needs to be expected of the Director. Previously it was, that the Director had to be an attorney and so that's been removed with the passage and signage of AB 32. So, with that we have very limited guidance from the statute on how to proceed. So, again, I will rely on the procedure that, a proposed procedure that's based on what we did last time and then, of course, the Commission can add and implement what you would like to do moving forward. So, we have this flexibility for the Commission to move forward in a way that works best for what make sense for the next appointment.

So, what I would propose is that after the job announcement is approved today, we will submit that for posting. Currently the job announcement we have proposed today, which we'll review and decide if we want to extend that. Then the next step would be to hold public interviews at a Sentencing Commission meeting, just yesterday we were able to find a date that works before I leave and get everybody together, hopefully. So, that is on Friday, August 4th, and that will be in person at the Legislature, and so, we've confirmed those committee rooms that we'll be able to use and so we'll have the very specific information when we get closer, but we are all set for August 4th at the Legislature in both the Grant Sawyer building in Las Vegas and then the building here in Carson City, and those will be in person. So, we'll be able to put that information in the job announcement. Then, at that meeting we'll conduct the interviews and then if satisfied with any or up to three of the applicants, the Sentencing Commission will vote to approve up to three names to send to the Governor to then be appointed. After that, what happens is the Governor will then appoint the member or the candidate based on the list that the Commission submits.

For the interview, I recommend that each applicant be prepared to give a three-to-five-minute statement to the Sentencing Commission and then, we could open up after that statement for questions from the Sentencing Commission. Last time, the Sentencing Commission asked standard questions of each applicant and then, also asked additional questions, and I think my recommendation comes from, that we have a lot of information from the individual's cover letter, from their resume and so, you have a good sense of their qualifications. I think if we get their statement of why they want the position and what they're hoping to achieve for their vision that will give a good sense, and then based on that, I think it'd be appropriate for the Commission to ask individual questions based on what's appropriate for that applicant, and the information they have before them. So, that would be my proposal for the actual interview process.

So, moving on to the job announcements, I'll go ahead and share my screen so we can review that together. So, the beginning of the job announcement is standard language as far as what's required for this open competitive recruitment. You can see that the second paragraph indicates that the meeting will be conducted based on the Open Meeting Law, and that it will be recorded, and all the resumes and information they submit will be considered public record. Of course, we will remove public information.

On the next section, we lay out what the description is for the Director. So, I have here, oversees the function of the Department, and then moving onto what I think what's important is making sure that they know that the position is tasked with addressing the dynamic and challenging issues, and then of course, supporting the Sentencing Commission and advancing its statutory duties. These duties that I have proposed here have been changed and adjusted based on what I think would be best when we are recruiting. So, it does not match exactly what was posted last time. So, emphasizing that liaison between the Sentencing Commission, the Executive Branch, the Legislative Branch and the Judicial Branch, and of course, all of our stakeholders. The Director must be able to facilitate the collection and aggregation of data

from all criminal justice agencies, be able to understand that data and identify sets of variables regarding data that either are not being collected or shared. That does come from statutory language in terms of duties of both the Commission and the Director. Prepare reports as required by the statute, and of course, other reports. Assist the Sentencing Commission in fulfilling its statutory duties. Be able to manage four staff-- we actually just got approved for an additional position, so we will change this-- that the Director will be able to manage five staff. And of course, be able to make presentations to stakeholders, and schedule and prepare meetings. Moving onto the second page, those duties continue as far as assisting the Commission and ensuring that they can comply with the Open Meeting Law, be able to submit requests for information from agencies and stakeholders, provide guidance and technical assistance to various agencies and stakeholders, and then of course, be able to collaborate with everyone.

The minimum qualifications here are very open based on what the Commission thinks would be appropriate. So, this is just based on what some of our previous discussions in the meeting and just what I think would be a minimum of the expectations that the Commission should be looking for: a bachelor's degree, a minimum of five years in any area of criminal justice, high level experience in the criminal justice system with demonstrated knowledge of criminal law in Nevada, demonstrated understanding of corrections, sentencing and criminal justice policy, demonstrated excellent management interpersonal skills to foster a team environment, demonstrated creative policymaking, project management, and problem-solving skills, excellent written communication and public speaking skills, demonstrated understanding of criminal justice data collection and analysis, astute understanding of Nevada government, politics, and the legislative process, and the ability to successfully manage the dynamic and differing needs interests and viewpoints of multiple criminal justice stakeholders.

The process we will provide here in the job announcement will again, clarify that this will be conducted consistent with the Nevada Open Meeting Law. Applications will be reviewed to determine whether those applicants have the knowledge, skills, and abilities required for the position, and then, the qualified applicants will be invited to an interview. So, now that we have the date, I would put that date here in the job announcement, to clarify they will need to appear, their expectation would be that they would appear here in Carson City because that's where the position is located, and so, I will put that in the announcement as well. Then, at the conclusion of the meeting as I have noted here, the Commission will forward the names of one to three qualified applicants to the Governor, who will then review and appoint this position. It is possible that the Commission might not find any qualified applicants and may want to start the recruitment process over, so I can adjust that, so that expectation is clear, or I could put up to three qualified applicants to the Governor.

Then, the recommendation I have for how the interested individuals will apply will be to submit a cover letter, a resume, and then two letters of recommendations. This is based on the requirements for last time. What I have here is the date is July 21st; now that we have our August meeting scheduled, we can adjust that. We will need time to compile the applications and then get them to the Commission in time so that you have time to review them before the interviews. So, if we do adjust this, my recommendation would be to not be too much later than maybe the middle of the following week of July, to make sure we have that time to get them to everybody, based on what we have. Then, the materials will be sent to Hunter Jones in our department, our Administrative Assistant and then we have instructions here on how to submit other additional information they must submit with their application materials. So, with that I will turn the time back to the Chair for recommendations on what the Commission, would also like us to do in regards to the procedure and to the job announcement.

Chair Stiglich: All right, thank you Director. Well, comments, thoughts? People had a chance to review it; is there anything we're leaving out? Anything we should include? Anything that should be softer? Anything that should be harder? In terms of like, maybe if somebody has, you know, crazy legislative policy experience but they don't have as much experience in one area, like what, you know, I think that'll come down to the end determination but is there anything that you all think we need to make this as attractive as possible to get somebody as close to Director Gonzalez's mad skills as we can? Vice Chair Brady please.

Vice Chair Christine Jones Brady: Thank you. I was kind of comparing this one to the one with the job posting we used last time and I kind of liked how, I mean we didn't have a lot of applicants at the time

because it had the requirement of being an attorney, but at that time the only minimum qualification was to be an attorney, a licensed attorney in Nevada. I'd like to recommend that for this minimum qualification we have a bachelor's degree and then state, like give examples, if we want to like types of bachelor's degrees that we think are relevant. Then, for all of the rest of them, I kind like how they did it last time, where they talked about qualifications preferred. So, instead of making all of those things, like minimum qualifications because I think that narrows the pool, I would recommend that we put, I think what we had last time was additional desired qualifications, and then, we also had a section of preference may be given to candidates who have *colon* and then there's another list of things. So, one other addition, another recommendation--I had a couple of questions, but I'll come back to it if other people don't have those same questions—but to add something in there about knowledge of Nevada's criminal court system, and then, legal terminology, procedures, and legal ethics. I didn't see that we really emphasized court system, but I'd like to kind of, you know, sort of enumerate that specifically, court system, because sentencings, courts, it would be nice to have that as one of the qualities that we might be looking for. Other than that, I agree with you, Chair, that you know, we want to make this as attractive and spread the net as wide as, well kind of implied, you know, spread the net wide and make it attractive so we get a lot of diverse candidates.

Chair Stiglich: All right, thank you. Chairman DeRicco.

Chairman Christopher DeRicco: So, from statutorily and being involved in this process the last time when we got Ms. Gonzalez, I believe we had one meeting. We did not have enough candidates to refer on to the Governor, we continued it out a second time to make sure, and statutorily it says to have the Department must be appointed by the Governor from a list of three persons recommended by the Sentencing Commission. I think I heard some language on which up to one to three members and I think we actually statutorily have to submit three names to the Governor's office. I just wanted clarification for that with the statutory language.

Director Gonzalez: Thank you, Chairman DeRicco. Yeah so, what happened last time was the interpretation of the statute and what would lead to a not absurd result. So, what happened previously was only one name was submitted to the Governor previously. There were not three names submitted, because what was interpreted and applied in that meeting was that if a list of three individuals was required that could lead to an absurd result where either the commission is forced to recommend someone that it does not want to be recommend and/or forced to just move anybody along which would lead to an absurd result of the Commission not having the qualified person that it wants appointed to the Commission. So, what was applied was that it would be, even though the language does not say up to, if it was required to be three, it could lead to a situation where the Commission never had three qualified candidates to send to the Governor. So, moving forward based on that interpretation as was applied at that recruitment. I've moved forward as an ongoing recommendation for this is how the Commission should proceed. So, that in the future the Commission continues to get the applicants that make the most sense, knowing that it's going to be up to three people to submit to the Governor.

Chairman DeRicco: Okay. All right, I just wanted to bring that up. That language said a list of three and so, I heard the up to, so I just wanted to make sure we're okay with doing so, if potentially it's just one.

Chair Stiglich: All right, thank you Chairman. Mr. Hoffman?

Mr. Jim Hoffman: Yeah, so my concern is there's the item about Nevada, astute knowledge of Nevada politics, policy; Vice Chair Jones Brady was talking about courts. I wonder if having it just be Nevada might sort of scare off out-of-state applicants. Maybe we could change that to something like state-level politics or policy, and then that way we are not expressing a preference between in-state and out-of-state applicants.

Chair Stiglich: All right, thank you Mr. Hoffman. Mr. McCormick?

Mr. John McCormick: Mr. Hoffman sort of stole my thunder on my point, but I was thinking that, like Vice Chair Brady said, minimum qualification shouldn't be Nevada-specific, we could say that is preferred. Again, just kind of reiterating what Mr. Hoffman said, we don't want to scare away out-of-state applicants.

Chair Stiglich: All right, thank you Mr. McCormick. Other comments? Thoughts?

Dr. Shera Bradley: I was trying to find the raised hand thing, but I couldn't for some reason. I wondered about the necessity of it being in Carson—I mean it's probably much easier—but is there a possibility that it can be in Vegas? It might attract other applicants, if so.

Chair Stiglich: Yeah, I'm shaking a no, because the staff is here, the building's here, and you know, hopefully with the salary change and you know, those types of things, we can attract somebody here. I mean, that's just me, if everybody's like, if you don't care, but having a supervisor off-site would be, I think unfortunate. I mean we all struggle with that now when we have these split kind of offices. I think it's a Carson recruitment. I mean weigh in; these are just my thoughts.

Dr. Bradley: I think that makes total sense. I just wanted to throw it out.

Chair Stiglich: Vice Chair?

Vice Chair Brady: I think that to your point, working for the state, I know that office space is at a premium. So, that's probably why they wanted it in Carson because they've put a lot of --and I'll defer to Director Gonzalez--but a lot has gone into securing office space, and I don't know that the state has it budgeted to procure office space down in Las Vegas for this position. So, I agree that it would be nice to make it statewide, but I don't know how doable that would be for the state.

Chair Stiglich: Well, it is statewide. Anybody can apply, you just have to come to Carson, right? Or Reno? Or Gardnerville? Or you know, the northern Nevada world's your oyster, it's up to you. You know, part of this too is when you recruit, you see what happens, and if everybody is like, I'm not doing it, you know then that's a different situation, but I don't think that's where we are and I don't think we want to suggest to people that it's an option, personally. Those are just my thoughts. Chief Bays?

Chief Michelle Bays: Does this announcement get tied to all of like, the state benefits? That might be something that people are interested in hearing as well. I didn't see anywhere it talked about that because that's a big draw for people.

Director Gonzalez: Yeah, it does include those benefits so I can add that to clarify that's part of it.

Chair Stiglich: Dr. Bradley?

Dr. Bradley: I think that would be really good. I'm a hiring manager, and so I definitely highlight our benefit package because it is very good. The other thing I was going to ask is there a strategy for disseminating the posting because putting it on the NEATS website is one thing, but it's not very effective usually I find.

Director Gonzalez: So, the strategy right now was just that because I guess, I was hoping through, we have you know, a variety of stakeholders here that word of mouth will also spread as far as the availability of the position, but I am open to what else we can do. I think last time that was what it was limited to. There might have been one other place they tried to recruit, but yeah, that would be the general strategy here would be through posting on there. Then of course, notifying all of our stakeholders that this position is available or that it's now open and so, hoping that word of mouth will kind of help, because my thought is too, that will actually get to the type of applicants I think we are hoping to recruit, those who interact with our stakeholders and members of the Commission here, to focus on those that would understand the process and what we're looking for locally. As far as nationally, I don't have a strategy for that right now.

Dr. Bradley: Let me know if you want any suggestions because I have gone through multiple hirings and it's a challenge.

Mr. McCormick: If you send it to us Victoria, we can push it out through our channels as well.

Director Gonzalez: Great, thank you.

Chair Stiglich: Ms. Murray?

Ms. Julia Murray: Just along those lines, is there any type of publication that goes out to the various state sentencing commissions in affiliation with like the conference we're holding next month, that this could push out to so maybe we get some high-level applicants from a similarly structured state.

Director Gonzalez: Yes, I can absolutely do that. Yep, I can send that to them and as you mentioned that too I could also send it to the State Bar. Even though we are not requiring an attorney, it's in that realm.

Ms. Julia Murray: And if you send that to me, I can probably talk to the bar about doing that free of cost. They tend to do that on some of the public postings, if asked.

Chair Stiglich: Dr. Lanterman?

Doctor Jennifer Lanterman: Similarly, I am in the American Society of Criminology Division of Corrections and Sentencing, so we've got sort of like, it's a national organization for researchers whose areas of expertise in corrections and sentencing. So, they do this type of work, and we can post it at no cost there. So, I think like in the terms of the word of mouth, we've all got those types of professional affiliations where we could distribute it to appropriate targeted audiences.

Director Gonzalez: Excellent, yeah when it's finalized, I'll send it out to the Commission as a whole. So then, yeah, please take it and run wherever you want to post it and then, whatever else you need from me to post it. Thank you.

Chair Stiglich: Vice Chair Brady? Your hand is still up if you have something.

Vice Chair Brady: No, sorry I'll put it down.

Chair Stiglich: You know, I mean, I think once it's finalized, all the channels; I mean you don't leave it to chance. You know, let's just throw it out and see who shows up. If you know qualified people, if you have organizations where the qualified people congregate, make sure that we're, you know, we're casting, we're fishing where we might find fish, so, do it. Like I say, don't leave it to chance. Anyone else have any comments or? Ms. Murray?

Ms. Murray: Sorry, I was just sort of thinking about Vice Chair Brady's suggestion of putting some preferred degrees or required minimum degrees. I would just suggest that maybe that go as a preference as opposed to a minimum requirement when you are listing out for certain degrees. My understanding of the reason for coming down from a law degree to a bachelor's degree was limiting the pool. Likewise, you know, people study all kinds of things in undergrad and then go on to have vast experience in fields, and I wouldn't want someone to be eliminated due to having studied communications or something. Which wouldn't necessarily populate on our list of required, but you know, that's all.

Chair Stiglich: So, to that end in Ms. Murray's comment, what would our minimum qualifications be then? Because the preferred experience is obvious, we preferred a lot of other things but what is the minimum? A bachelor's degree is going to be a minimum requirement, is five years in criminal justice going to be a minimum requirement, you know, and then, these other things become preferred relevant experience or those type of things? I just want to throw that out to the group. Chief Bays?

Chief Bays: You could add some language in those minimum qualification that catch-all language about equivalent combination of the experience and education. That would allow like that flexibility but also you know, maybe people who have a very on point degree, but they only have four years of experience. So, that might help to be specific.

Chair Stiglich: Excellent. Other comments? Director Gonzalez are you kind of working on a red line while we're doing this. Something you could maybe pop up because I am hoping to leave this meeting with, well we need to leave the meeting with something you can run with.

Director Gonzalez: Yeah, what I could do like, it'll take me a minute to figure out my computer on how to do that, but I have got notes here. So, what I will do is repeat what I think we have and make sure we're clear on that. At least, what I hear right now is we don't, like what you were just going through Chair, is that we don't have the minimum qualifications. What I would say that I've heard so far is that everything is listed here would be a preferred qualification, or preference will be given to the individuals with these qualifications. I could try and look up something really quick to see what we might want to consider for minimum or I could pull up that previous announcement to see if there's any of those but based on what I've heard so far, I haven't heard anything that would be a minimum, that these are preferred. Then, something

about what Chief Bays just mentioned about a combination of these will be considered as far as experience, and degrees, and such.

Chief Stiglich: Anything else from the group on this? I'm sorry, Ms. Murray?

Ms. Murray: I just to at least clarify for my own thoughts, I don't think you need to fully abandon the list as you have it stated as minimums. I think that the bachelor's degree is a minimum, is a minimum-minimum. Your second point there, a minimum of five years, I think you could add a phrase to the end that says or ademonstrated equivalent thereof in a field related to criminal justice and then, that could remain a minimum, so that we have some baselines, and we don't get a weird floodgate of applicants. Skipping over the third point, because I think that would move to preferred. The next one, two three that begins with demonstrated, I think those can remain as minimum qualifications because it shows connection to the field and it's also interpretable by our evaluation. The fourth, that begins excellent and the fifth that begins demonstrated, I would say the same too. The next, that begins astute and then refers to Nevada, I think I would pull out to your preferred and then the last, I think could stay as a minimum. Then, you could add to the preferred a list of specific degrees that you know, we, the group believed was relevant as Vice Chair Brady suggested, and some of the other suggestions that came up. But it would allow you to not have to fully start over since we're on a very tight timeline and most of this we do actually really, really care about, and it does sort of close the floodgate a little but not too tightly.

Chair Stiglich: All right, thank you Ms. Murray, those are great suggestions. Deputy Chief Evans?

Deputy Chief Aaron Evans: Good morning. With those MQs, those three that start with demonstrated you know, level of experience in certain areas. You know being in state service, it's pretty easy for a lot of positions to meet the MQs, minimum qualifications, because it's a degree, it's training in a certain area, it's you know, a certificate or years of experience, but how is an applicant going to demonstrate, you know excellent management and interpersonal skills just in the application process. Just to show they meet those minimum qualifications to get moved to the you know, to the interview process. So, I think those would be better as preferred qualities as opposed to minimum qualities because I don't know how an applicant is going to prove that they have an understanding of corrections, sentencing, and criminal justice, just through the application. Like, that'll be proved out in the interview process. I just don't know, because I've seen like in my own state service, I've seen people that I know are qualified because of the work they do, but because they don't meet the MQs as written you know, they don't get the chance to interview. So, some of those ones that are demonstrated, I think those will be demonstrated in the interview. I'm assuming this posting would go out like any other State of Nevada employment position and you know, it's going to get reviewed by the DHRM or whomever and they'll make the call if a person meets those MQs, and I think those are kinda hard to pinpoint.

Director Gonzalez: If I could, because this is unclassified, they would actually all go through us and the Commission, so, it'll ultimately be up to the Commission. So, based on whatever the Commission approves here in the job announcement. I will consult with the Commission if we want to make sure you know, who we're going to include or if we just include all the applicants we receive. Then, at that Commission meeting, the Commission can compare to the qualifications and the applicants and then, you know, disqualify, or take that into consideration when you're analyzing it. So, we do have flexibility there as far as that vetting process with it being an unclassified position.

Deputy Chief Evans: Very good, thanks.

Chair Stiglich: Vice Chair Brady?

Vice Chair Brady: I would still like to move those, just I don't know how other people feel but I agree with a lot of his statements. I know that this isn't going to be a classified position, but I think by having all those there as minimum qualifications, there will be some good people that self-select out of the process. So, I would concur that we move it to preferred, or recommended, or whatever the language. Thank you.

Chair Stiglich: All right, thank you Vice Chair. Anything further?

Director Gonzalez: I am working on something we can look at Chair.

Chair Stiglich: Awesome.

Director Gonzalez: I'll go ahead and share my screen, and then, Ms. Murray I think I wrote everything down but then I'll move around what you have proposed, and we can work from that. Okay, so let's see. Okay, so I have our minimum qualifications and our preferred with the bachelor's degree I just left that, because-- I'll come back to that, let's see oh yes—because then I left that, in the minimum of five years in any area of criminal justice and added that language of the demonstrated equivalent in a relevant field. Then, I believe you said, the next two, three demonstrated of understanding corrections, management skills, and creative policy-making would be minimum, is that correct Ms. Murray?

Ms. Murray: That is how I proposed it but obviously it's just a proposal.

Director Gonzalez: Right, just so have something everyone can look at. Yeah, perfect. Then, the communication and writing skills would make sense in the minimum, correct? Is that what you were thinking, Ms. Murray? Okay. Then, let's see, data analysis and then, that last one, I had noted the ability to successfully manage would be also in the minimum. So, this is what I have right here, if the Commission wants to look at this and then help me where else you want to add language or adjust from here.

Ms. Murray: That is how I suggested it. I would also suggest that you look at the chat and the language that member McCormick suggested for, in the parenthesis on the second bullet. I actually think it is a better fit, then what I said when I was speaking.

Director Gonzalez: All right, Mr. McCormick if you could state that, so then I could put it in here.

Mr. McCormick: Yeah, mine was just sort of the standard we use at the court in our job announcements, or an equivalent combination of education and experience, because that way you know, it gives the reviewing body a lot of flexibility in making that determination.

Director Gonzalez: Okay great. Oh! And I will remove Nevada as well because that was also recommended.

Mr. McCormick: Do we want to combine those first two points? A bachelor's degree and a minimum of five years in any area of criminal justice, parenthetical, or equivalent combination of education and experience. So, that's all there on one line. Does that make sense to people?

Ms. Murray: I think that if that parenthetical is going to be worded that way, that's a good suggestion.

Director Beth Schmidt: One of things we do is, we have those minimum qualifications in our postings but where we say preferred, we put best candidates will have. Just a thought.

Vice Chair Brady: So then, have we decided we want to keep all of those demonstrated things as minimum qualifications? So, if we have like an excellent person that's worked in court services or something, but they have never worked in corrections, they don't qualify?

Mr. McCormick: I was thinking that maybe the issue there is the terminology "demonstrated". So, what if we said, an understanding of corrections, management, and interpersonal skills to foster team environment, and you know, policy-making, project management and problem-solving skills. So, if you take the "demonstrated" off, then we get out of that sort of discussion on what I think demonstrates that, is different than what the Chair thinks, is different than what Ms. Murray thinks.

Director Gonzalez: Great, could you say that again please.

Mr. McCormick: I was just, excellent management and interpersonal skills to foster a team environment, so just remove the "demonstrated" because I think that's where we get into the, what is demonstrated. Then, policy-making, project management and problem-solving skills, and I don't have a preference on "creative" there. Maybe if we take that "demonstrated" out then someone could necessarily think, well I could do that, but I don't know how to demonstrate it, so I'm not going to apply.

Chair Stiglich: Those were my comments as well. Vice Chair Brady?

Vice Chair Brady: Thank you, Chair Stiglich. Can we also add knowledge of Nevada, it doesn't have to be Nevada, but knowledge of the criminal court system, legal terminology, procedures and procedures. I don't know if that would be for minimum or best candidates but something to do with knowledge of criminal court system.

Director Gonzalez: What was the other piece Vice Chair Brady? Courts, procedures?

Vice Chair Brady: Legal terminology, and procedures. I guess court procedures or legal procedures. Thank you.

Chair Stiglich: All right, anything further? Ms. Murray?

Ms. Murray: We left one "demonstrated" in the minimum qualifications, so I didn't know if Mr. McCormick wanted to address a proposal for that one. I think it's just that you eliminate it and make it "understanding", but I don't want to speak for him.

Mr. McCormick: I concur.

Ms. Murray: And then, on that newly added bullet point, knowledge of criminal court. I think the comma is misplaced, I think, if the idea is to say not, because in the sentence above you say knowledge of the courts, this one I think what Vice Chair Jones Brady was actually saying was, knowledge of criminal court procedures and legal terminology as specific to that item. So, it's just grammar, sorry.

Director Gonzalez: No, the comma thing, help me out please. Thank you.

Chair Stiglich: I am assuming whatever motion that we approve, that Ms. Gonzalez will have the authority, the independent authority to make us look better. Comma, grammar, spelling, and any of those that we catch. All right, anyone else have any further comments on this draft? All right, that said I'll entertain a motion to approve this job announcement to recruit the next Executive Director. If anyone has that motion?

JOHN MCCORMICK MOVED TO APPROVE THE JOB ANNOUNCEMENT FOR THE RECRUITMENT OF THE NEXT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF SENTENCING POLICY WITH LEEWAY FOR TECHINCAL CHANGES.

JIM HOFFMAN SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSED

5. Discussion of Potential Topics and Dates for Future Meetings

Chair Stiglich: As you may be aware, this is the last meeting of the 2021-2023 meeting cycle. Our next meeting will kick off the 2023-2025 meeting cycle and will be held August 4, 2023, at 9:00 AM. This is an in-person meeting at the Legislature building in Carson City and the Grant Sawyer building in Las Vegas. So, at that meeting we are going to need to elect the Chair and Vice Chair for 2023-2025 cycle and conduct the interviews of the candidates of our next Director, and then, I can work with staff to get the meetings scheduled for the rest of the calendar year. I did have one question Ms. Gonzalez. I think I got a letter, that there were a couple people up. I did have a brief--I don't see him on here--conversation with Judge Freeman and I know he had spoken to Judge Jones, and it may be that we need to replace those two. So, with the Commission's, well so if they're, oh, Ms. Jones or Judge Jones, do want to serve or do you got other things going?

Judge Tierra Jones: I've got the same concerns as Judge Freeman, and I did speak to him, and he had told me that he had spoken to you. So, I share his position that I don't think that I should be reappointed.

Chair Stiglich: So, I think that to some extent, maybe we haven't made the Commission of Sentencing Policy sexy enough or interesting enough for, no I'm just joking Judge Jones, but you know, new blood is always good. Then, it's new opportunities and new ideas so I'm going to prevail upon you Judge Jones, to kind of cast the net down there about who you think may be a good fit, if they are interested from the eighth to serve on this, because I don't know who has criminal assignments or you know, has that interest, or expertise. So, with the Commission's permission I'm going to prevail upon Judge Jones to maybe make

some suggestions about you know, who might be a good, and interested. Certainly, I can reach out to them and then, the Director can reach out to them. I'm going to ask Judge Freeman to do the same up here, if there are any of the rural judges that people are aware of that may be a good fit, have this interest, send some names. Do it with relative quickness, not like tomorrow, but you know, in the next few weeks so that they can also fully participate in the process that we're going to undertake. So, I do thank you, I thank you for your service and your input, and I think as I explained to Judge Freeman, you know before I was on this Commission, you know, what the focus is kind of ebbs and flows as the needs are, you know. So, certainly before I was here there was a big focus on population, that turned the focus to classification of felonies, you know Bs versus As or whatnot, then it kind of turns at some points to what's going on in corrections and release. So, it kind of ebbs and flows as the needs. You know, the needs come out with obviously the data-driven mission underpinning it. So, who knows what the future holds, but very grateful you know, for your participation and Judge Freeman's participation, and what you've brought to the table. So, think about who might be fun.

Judge Jones: I definitely will, and I will reach out to you regarding that very soon.

Chair Stiglich: All right, I appreciate it. All right, is there anything, anybody have anything further then, or future meetings? If you do--I don't see any hands--please contact you know, myself or Director Gonzalez, for a minute and do that. So, at this time we will turn to the second period of public comment.

6. Public Comment

Chair Stiglich: Ms. Jones is there any people here waiting for public comment?

Ms. Jones: There are no callers at this time.

Chair Stiglich: All right, at this time I will close the second period of public comment.

7. Adjournment

Chair Stiglich: Thank you all for your work during this meeting and this cycle. Thank you to the staff, the members of the Commission. I think we have a good, kind of template going forward and I really want to encourage you again, cast a wide net, encourage people you think would be wonderful and be ready to fully participate you know, in this process, so that we can keep the you know, good and important work, and continue to build on Director Gonzalez's good work in the direction of this Committee. So, I look forward to seeing you all in August, many of you in person and the meeting is now adjourned. So, thank you. Be kind, have a great day, and we'll see you in August. Bye-bye.