



TEXAS
JUVENILE JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT

Friday, June 17, 2022 – 9:00 a.m.

1100 Congress Ave.

Capitol Extension - Room E1.030

Austin, TX 78701

1. Call to order

Chairman Jarrett called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

2. Prayer

Mona Lisa Chambers led the board in prayer.

3. Pledge

Chairman Jarrett led the Pledge of Allegiance and the pledge to the Texas Flag.

4. Discussion, consideration, and possible approval regarding excused absences (Action)

Melissa Martin and Allison Palmer were absent. Chief Barnes move to excuse their absences. Jimmy Smith seconded. The motion passed.

5. Discussion, consideration, and possible approval regarding the February 25, 2022 Board meeting minutes (Action)

Chief Pama Hencerling moved to approve the minutes. Chief Barnes seconded. The motion passed.

6. Report from the chairman

Chairwoman Jarrett reminded the Board that the August meeting will be held at the Williamson County Juvenile Probation Department in Georgetown.

7. Public comments

Isiah Smith spoke to the board about his experience as a volunteer and his disappointment in how he was treated.

8. Report from the executive director

As a new interim director, I feel it is important I share my beliefs and assessment of what our current system are. While this statement is a bit lengthy, it feels necessary.

As you know, the Texas Juvenile Justice Department has undergone a great deal of change since we met in February. That meeting saw the retirement of Chief Inspector General Forrest Mitchell, and the elevation of Daniel Guajardo to the interim role. In mid-April, Board Chair Judge Wesley Ritchey announced that he was stepping down, with Judge Lisa Jarrett being named to lead the board. Then, at the end of April, Executive Director Camille Cain announced that she would be stepping down after four years in that position. I was named interim executive director, and I am pleased to be here today to provide an update from the Executive Director.

In my previous position at the agency, I served as the Deputy Executive Director for State Services. I often shared with the board the struggles that our secure facilities faced, and the crisis that loomed as a result of our intense staffing issues. Today, in my new role that has not changed. I still have great concerns that I want to share with you about the crisis facing the Texas juvenile justice system as a whole and how it affects state services, county probation departments, the Office of the Inspector General, the Office of Internal Audit and the Office of the Independent Ombudsman.

It is often presented that TJJD and its multiple stakeholders are in adversarial and opposing positions. In reality, I believe we all want the same thing. Safety in our communities and rehabilitation of the youth from those communities. None of us who work every day in the juvenile justice system want to keep youth to just hold them. Anyone who sticks with this work does so because they care about kids and simultaneously care about their community. We are tasked with what appears to be two opposing truths of choosing between public safety or advocacy, care and treatment for kids. The reality is that we want both and they do not have to be mutually exclusive. TJJD and our county probation partners are not responsible for creating the need for our system. We are a responsive system. No one in this continuum has a goal to have 600-800 Texas youth in the state's care. And yet we are all really clear that youth in our care and custody need targeted treatment in a secure setting in order for them to be safe in their communities. The same holds true for our county partners. They work tirelessly with limited resources to reduce risk to their communities. They commit youth to TJJD whom they have exhausted all available resources for intervention and are left with no option to serve the youth and their communities but to commit the youth to the state's care. I would invite anyone who criticizes those of us trying to keep youth and communities safe to spend time with us in the trenches. A day in the life of a JPO, JSO, TJJD Coach, CM, parole officer, Juvenile Justice educator, MHP is something most folks just cannot imagine. These staff are the unseen heroes of our communities. I do not believe that the recognition or the compensation they receive matches the service they provide.

The county juvenile probation departments and the secure facilities are all interconnected and dependent on one another, but we are also forced to operate from the same scarce resources. As a result, we have struggled to work together. It is long past time for the idea of a "unified system" to be more than a slogan. As long as I am serving in this capacity, I am determined to do that. I am convinced we are going to fail if we continue to work in silos and believe that the struggles of one part of the continuum does not have a direct impact on the rest of the system.

There is not a single person in this system that I have worked with or spoken to who does not understand the severity of the situation we face—and has not tried to find ways to alleviate it. No one is comfortable with the amount of risk that the system faces at this time.

There is an acute detention bed crisis. Only 45 of our 165 county departments have the resources to operate detention facilities. Among these 45 facilities, there are a total of 2,704 physical beds, but due to severe staffing shortages, only 61% of beds are operational. This causes incredible strain on the counties who do not run detention facilities and have to rely on their fellow counties to hold and care for their

youth. The consequence of this detention bed crisis ranges from increased staff burden, like driving a youth 4 hours one way to a county that has a bed available only to have to return the next day to pick the youth up and drive them back to court, all the way to increased risk to the community. Our smaller counties continue to share very significant concerns about the consequences of not being able to find a detention bed. They are often faced with making a decision that carries a level of risk that just does feel acceptable. They struggle to find detention space for youth who commit violent offenses, leaving counties with the only option of releasing a youth on electronic monitor, even while the youth has pending aggravated felony conduct.

While TJJJ may not be able to solve the shortage of available county beds, the agency contributes greatly to the problem. We currently have 121 youth on the waitlist. Some of these youth have been waiting as long as 3 months. If we were able to absorb these youth into the secure facilities, that could open those 121 beds to the counties. Unfortunately, the very same staffing crisis is crippling secure facilities. Just to safely serve the 616 youth in our custody today, we need 788 direct care staff. We have 452 direct care staff available to work. We have 57% of what we need. I feel like I need to provide context to what these numbers actually mean.

Youth are spending up to 22 hours alone in their rooms per day.

Youth are engaging in problematic behaviors, like tying a ligature around their neck, just to get out of their room.

While youth are still receiving treatment from our licensed mental health providers, a significant part of rehabilitation occurs in the milieu. We cannot create this healthy social environment that is critical in changing behaviors when youth are locked alone in their rooms.

Our educators are regularly pulled from teaching to provide direct supervision.

Our case managers are regularly pulled from helping youth to provide direct supervision.

Our facility leaders (Superintendents, Asst Superintendents, Managers) are frequently in count providing direct supervision.

Our direct care staff are working unhealthy amounts of overtime.

Our FMLA rates, absences due to illness and call-ins are astronomical.

Just this month, I had to request help from central office staff, parole, and halfway houses to help provide coverage at Ron Jackson. We were facing staffing numbers that could not even provide coverage for lockdown. Lockdown meaning that there is zero programming for youth and we are just supervising. Unfortunately we are having to prepare for this to be an ongoing concern.

If we think about the needs of secure facilities from the lens of a hierarchy of needs, we are absolutely at the ground level. We are just trying to ensure physiological and safety needs. Like restroom access for the staff and youth. Like adequate sleep for staff in between shifts. When this base level cannot even be met, everything else is compromised. We cannot achieve a sense of safety nor engage in effective programming if we cannot ensure basic supervision. While goals like vocational programming, GEDs and diplomas are important to the agency, we just cannot prioritize these higher order objectives until we have a solid foundation. I use the analogy of building a house on a foundation of toothpicks. Right now, we have to direct all available resources to the foundation. We still believe in the model and want to move forward with reform efforts in the facilities but we just do not have the ability to make that a priority right now.

We have also stretched our releases to the community to its absolute limit. In an attempt to try and reduce risk in the facilities and absorb youth on the waitlist, we tried multiple avenues for getting youth back into the community. When my responsibility was only the secure, HWH and the parole pieces of the puzzle I absolutely pushed for all creative options for increasing safety in the facilities which boiled down to increase staff and/or decrease population. I am now responsible for a much larger picture. Community safety must be a top priority and woven into all the decisions we make. This means we are going to be left with a much slower trickle of youth leaving secure. This will then cause a slower ability to intake youth on the waitlist. We are all against sending a youth back to his or her community before they are ready, recognizing that the term “ready” is subjective.

Our staffing crisis has frozen our options. Previously the system was flawed but functioning. Today we are in a much more precarious position, and it touches every part of what we do. For those departments in charge of agency accountability, it slows their ability to respond to complaints about youth rights, investigate criminal acts that endanger youth and staff, and conduct audits that ensure the efficient and ethical operations of the agency. The instability of secure facilities greatly impacts our partners in Audit, the Ombudsman, Office of Inspector General, and Special Prosecutions Unit. If we do not have enough staff for basic supervision then we certainly do not have enough staff to ensure accurate and timely reporting, documentation and notifications. All of which are essential to those partners being able to successfully move forward with their pieces of the puzzle.

And despite all of those problems, the agency remains fully focused on its charge to promote community safety and provide structure and accountability for the youth in our care, both at our state and county facilities. Personally, I am committed to providing continuity and transparency as we move through this period until a permanent executive director is named. I have appreciated the opportunity to visit with members of the board, agency leadership, and county probation departments to hear their feedback and their concerns. Our future success is dependent on our ability to move forward as a unified system and to build and develop the partnership necessary at all points of the juvenile justice system in Texas.

At the same time, I believe that no one person has all of the answers. We must work together, find solutions in common, and understand the problems we all face. We know that stress on the system in one area has an impact on others. By making decisions together, we can find shared solutions to our shared problems.

I believe in an agency that is focused on reform and the evidence-based frameworks of treatment and rehabilitation that are embodied in the Texas Model. For us to achieve that goal, however, we must stabilize our operations and provide a basic level of safety and structure. Until we can do that consistently, we will not be able to move beyond the basic needs of a juvenile justice system.

I recently shared with counties and Board members a breakdown of the difficult choices the agency is facing.

Option #1 is to continue with current intake flow. This will cause the overall secure population to continue to increase, as we do not have a number of youth leaving that matches the number of youth coming in. We will be facing regular lockdown in all 5 facilities until we are able to recruit and retain more staff. We will face increased resignations, especially from our case managers and teachers who have regularly been in count as a direct care staff. The risk with this option is that we will struggle providing the minimum required for supervision of youth who are already in lockdown. As we have already seen, this increases risk for suicidal behavior and staff assaults.

Option #2 is to release youth to HWH and parole. The risk here is that we do not have a significant number of youth who meet criteria for a release. There have been surges of releases this year that are no longer occurring. Our release flow has significantly reduced in the past two months. This is leaving less secure bed space for those in the waitlist. The risk with this option is releasing a youth who is not ready (in as much as we can assess that level of risk) and putting community safety at increased risk.

Option #3 is to pause intake. We have been taking 8 youth a week but the commitments are coming at a higher rate than 8 youth per week. The waitlist continues to grow and the 121 TJJD youth in detention facilities are taking bed space that could be use by the counties. This will increase instability and risk in the detention facilities. It seems the biggest risk with this decision is that a youth who should be detained and removed from the community will remain and pose serious risk to community safety.

Option 2 and 3 just do not feel like viable choices because community safety is our top priority. In order to maintain option 1, we have to safely supervise our current population and then absorb the 120+ youth on the wait list. This requires us to increase direct-care staff. The first step to increase direct-care staff is to increase their salaries. We are proposing an increase for starting direct-care staff from \$36k to \$44k. I want to pause and acknowledge that this will likely have impact on our county detention centers near our state secure facilities. We are vying for the same limited resources, but it is not the agency's intent to further the detention bed crisis by possibly offering a higher starting salary than our county partners. This just feels like the first essential step in developing short-term solutions. We hope that this increase will allow us to absorb the waitlist and provide some relief for the detention centers housing those youth. We fully intend to work with our probation partners to develop solutions targeted to the needs of the counties and will be prioritizing these needs and solutions in our LAR.

I would also like to provide updates on two significant efforts impacting the agency, The Sunset Commission and the Department of Justice investigation.

We are now in the second phase of our Sunset review process. The Sunset Commission staff report is published, and they focus on a few areas of improvement for the agency: increased staffing with an appropriate recommendation, greater focus on regionalization and diversion efforts with more resources for the counties, higher level of staff communication and more deliberate staff and board collaboration on these issues, and improving our county standards to allow more appropriate staff to be certified officers and to provide the greatest level of assistance to counties during our monitoring operations. We agree with all of these recommendations and look forward to working as a single system to push solutions forward.

The Department of Justice (DoJ) is investigating whether the State is keeping kids in TJJD's five secure correctional facilities reasonably safe from harm. Specifically, DoJ is looking at issues related to physical and sexual abuse, excessive force by staff, including the use of pepper spray, and the use of isolation. They are also looking at whether the facilities are providing adequate mental health care. DoJ conducted its first on-site visit to a TJJD high restriction facility at Ron Jackson May 23-25, 2022. The visit consisted of visiting with TJJD staff and youth, as well as UTMB medical personnel. They also reviewed video of select use-of-force incidents and youth grievances. TJJD's current staffing challenges and the resulting impact on operations, e.g., youth spending more time in their rooms, was readily apparent. DoJ personnel were frustrated because TJJD did not have sufficient staff to allow them to break up into more than 2-3 groups at any one time. Overall, there were no surprises. DoJ will conduct its next site visit at the Gainesville State School on June 9-11.

The support from the Law Enforcement Defense Section of the Office of the Attorney General has been tremendous. Leah O'Leary and her team have done a wonderful job of advising and representing the Department throughout this matter.

As I close, I would like to speak to our staff directly, at all parts of the agency, to reassure you that we are focused on solving problems and providing the safest workplaces possible. I am grateful for your efforts and the dedication you have shown under difficult circumstances. I know that we are in an uncertain time. I want to hear from you about the ways we can move ahead together. Historically, I know that the pendulum has often swung back and forth between perspectives on how to best run a juvenile justice system. I want you to know that we will move forward in a deliberate way to address concerns and build your confidence in the agency.

9. Report from the chief inspector general
Interim Chief Daniel Guajardo presented.

OIG material starts on page 20 of the board packet. The information is data from the second quarter of OIG operations (December –February)

I'd like to brief on the investigative operations of OIG.

Currently, OIG is fully staffed with our investigators on funded positions. OIG has 7 positions which are in an abandoned posture due to no funding to fill those positions. They include a supervisor position, investigator position, a crime victim's position, and an IRC position.

Investigative Operations:

Number of Criminal Investigations: 318

Assault on Staff: 133 (the largest number of case opened in 2Q) Evins the highest at 64 followed by RJ at 28.

Prosecutor cases: 50

OIG arrests (this included adult and juvenile) 54

OIG DTA arrest or assistance on arrest: 7

OIG State ANE Investigations: 249 (average day to close of 71) (Evins highest at 88 cases)

OIG State ANE confirmed cases: 24

OIG County Reports Received: 756

OIG County ANE confirmed cases: 9 during this quarter.

I'd like to report on significant arrests since last board meeting in February. Since that time OIG has made 57 arrests

25 have been juvenile committed youth

27 have been adult age committed youth

5 have be a mix of TJJJD staff, contract staff, and a civilian.

The majority are physical assaultive offenses, along with harassing offenses.

Computer forensics stats will be noted on the board and quarterly reports. Two years ago OIG established our own independent computer forensic analyst to reduce the reliance on external resources.

CRIMES database go live anticipated for July 1st.

OIG is completing our 2 year training cycle

Personnel acknowledgements

Capt. Fritts Masters degree
Jason Wall 20 year service

Alisha Balderrama and Trey Weathermon competing in police games.

Kevin Dubose completing executive leadership training, northwestern university school of police staff and command.

10. Report from The Advisory Council on Juvenile Services

Chief Ed Cockrell updated the Board on what the council has been working on since the last Board meeting.

11. Report from the Trust Committee

Jimmy Smith reported on the agenda items discussed at the committee meeting.

12. Report from the Finance and Audit Committee

Chief Scott Matthew reported on the agenda items discussed at the committee meetings.

13. Discussion, consideration, and possible approval regarding a new contract with Premier Protection & Investigations LP, DBA PPI Security, increase the NTE of Consolidated Telecom, Inc.- Residential Telephone Services contract and construction change order for South Texas Buildcon and requiring board approval pursuant to GAP.385.1101 (Action)

Christian J. von Wupperfeld briefed the board on the each of the contract proposals.

Chief Scott Matthew moved to approve the first contract. James Smith seconded. The motion passed. James Castro moved to approve the second contract. Chief Hencerling seconded. The motion passed. Ann Lattimore moved to approve the third contract. Chief Matthew seconded. The motion passed.

14. Discussion, consideration, and possible approval of the grants allocation for FY23 (Action)

Ashley Kintzer presented.

Staff seeks TJJJ Board approval of proposed Fiscal Year (FY) 2023 probation grant allocations, including State Aid Formula Funding and targeted/competitive grant programs. Specific departmental awards across all grants are shown in the attachments, which are marked "Draft" to indicate that allocations are pending TJJJ Board approval. Departments will be notified that allocations received Board approval as soon as practicable after that occurs. There is funding that remains to be allocated under non-reimbursement programs, while reimbursement funding will be allocated to individual departments over the course of the fiscal year. A resolution approving staff's recommendation and providing necessary funds management flexibility is attached for Board consideration.

SUMMARY

- State Aid formula funding. Provides \$131.8 million to counties, implementing the funding formula adopted by the TJJD board in April 2022.
- Targeted and Reimbursement grant funding. Provides \$26.3 million in legislative appropriations, with \$15.7 million obligated to discretionary grant programs. Continues discretionary grant funding as allocated in FY 2022 with the exception of grant awards for programs discontinued by individual departments. Includes \$3 million in prevention and intervention funds and \$384,824 in discretionary state aid to be allocated through calls for grant applications in FY 2023.

15. Discussion of the agency's Legislative Appropriation Request for the 2024-2025 biennium and discussion, consideration, and possible approval of plan to develop the LAR (Action)

Emily Anderson presented.

We are going to take a different approach to developing the Legislative Appropriation Request this year. Tomorrow, I will be asking Chair Jarrett to form a special board committee that will work with staff to develop the agency ask for the upcoming session. In addition, we will be working with a special workgroup developed by the advisory council to help drive the ask for probation funding. We want this LAR to represent the will of the board and the true needs of the counties.

Emily will be coordinating with both workgroups to schedule meetings and to provide relevant or requested information so that each group can move forward their charge.

At this point in time, we do not have the submission schedule for the LAR. If the submission of the LAR is due before our August board meeting, we will need the Board to either delegate approval authority of the committee approved request to Chair Jarrett or we will need to call a special Board meeting.

16. Report on the External Quality Assurance Review of the Internal Audit Department

Eleazar Garcia presented.

Before I get started on the report, I do want to thank Chief Auditor Catherine Melvin from the Texas Department of Public Safety, Senior Internal Audit Analyst Katie Fitch, also from DPS, and Senior Auditor Edna Torres from the Office of Attorney General for their performance of the External Quality Assurance Review. It's good to receive a different perspective on the things we do and the work we perform.

The Report on the External Quality Assurance of my office is found on page 77 of the Board materials. We undergo an External Quality Assessment every 3 years.

The purpose is to evaluate and express an opinion on internal audit's compliance with:

- Texas Government Code Chapter 2102 known as the Texas Internal Auditing ACT.
- The *Government Auditing Standards* U.S Government Accountability Office (GAO)
- The Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) Code of Ethics and
- the *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing*
- As noted on Page 79, we passed and received the highest of the 3 possible ratings. (means that policies, procedures, and practices are in place for ensuring the independence, objectivity, and proficiency of the internal audit function).
- This is pretty important, and I appreciate the efforts of my staff for the work they do.

- Page 80 provides Background and Scope Information
- And starting on Page 81 are the Detailed results for the areas reviewed
- Best Practices are noted on page 83 which include the tenure of the Chief Auditor and Deputy Chief Auditor, Professional Auditor Certifications maintained by the staff of the department, our established relationships with members of management and the Board, the process for conducting the Annual Risk Assessment, and The Chief Auditor serving as the Chair of the State Agencies Internal Audit Committee which is comprised of Chief Audit Executives for State Agencies and Universities.
- Page 84 reflects the opportunities for improvement
 - One of the items brought up in this review is a repeat item that came up in our own Annual Quality Assurance that we presented during the November Board meeting.
 - This was the perception of potential influence on the Chief Auditor's independence and objectivity due to the perceived relationship with the Ombudsman and the Inspector General.
 - Besides trust and integrity, Independence and objectivity are pretty critical to Internal Audit. It's something we discuss within our department quite a bit. For each audit engagement, we complete an independence statement to assure there are no potential conflicts.
 - Neither the Ombudsman nor Inspector General influence any of the work we do. They are a great resource just as every other member of TJJJ, we try to have discussions with everyone through our audit and risk assessment process.
 - More importantly, with our limited resources in IA, we try not to overlap with work the Ombudsman and Office of Inspector General may already be performing and reviewing, so our discussions with those two parties are critical towards this end.
 - As noted by the peer review team and discussed with Shandra, Sean, and Lou Serrano, I do think it points toward an opportunity for us in Internal Audit to provide more background to the agency's leadership on our Mission, Core Values, the Code of Ethics, and audits in general to the Leadership team at TJJJ. It's something we have discussed with Shandra and she welcomes this information since we do have quite a bit of new staff at the top.
- Most important about this report, we appreciate the relationships and support of TJJJ staff and the TJJJ Board to help us accomplish our objectives and to meet our mission.

Eleazar Garcia presented.

Before I get started on the audit, I do want to thank Jocelyn Lewis for her assistance on the audit. She is very good about working with the audit staff to ensure a successful audit.

The Report on the Legislative Reporting Division Use of TEA Student data report may be found on page 359 of the Board materials.

The objective is to determine if the agency complies with the "Access to Confidential Information" Agreement maintained between TJJJ and the Texas Education Agency.

This is an annual audit required by the agreement.

- The scope included review of access, transfer, storage, protection, destruction of confidential TEA student data
- As well as follow-up on audit findings reported in the prior year.
- As required by the "Access to Confidential Information" agreement, results of this review will be reported to TEA.

Auditors communicated the following findings related to information security to management in writing.

- Controls can be improved to ensure appropriate access to confidential student data.
- Confidential student data is appropriately transferred, stored, and protected.
- Confidential student data is destroyed within the retention schedule and proper notifications are provided.
- Documentation is provided to TEA in accordance with the TEA Access to Confidential Information Agreement.

Due to the nature and sensitivity of these findings, details and recommendations are not fully included within this report in accordance to Texas Government Codes, Sections 2059.055 and 552.139.

Management concurs with the results of the work and responses to the recommendations are captured within Internal Audit's confidential working papers.

This Concludes my presentation, I'll be happy to answer any questions or provide further details as necessary.

18. Report from the Programs Committee

Chief Edeska Barnes reported on the agenda items discussed at the committee meetings.

19. Discussion, consideration, and possible approval to publish proposed revisions to the following rules in the Texas Register for a public comment period of at least 30 days and possible conditional approval to adopt the final rules: 37 TAC §§380.8501 (Definitions), 380.8521 (Facility Assignment System), 380.8702 (Rehabilitation Program Overview), 380.8703 (Rehabilitation Program Stage Requirements and Assessment), and 380.8751 (Specialized Treatment)

Cameron Taylor presented the proposed rule revisions.

I appreciate the opportunity to present the proposed rule changes to you all today, which were favorably recommended to the full board by the Programs Committee yesterday.

These changes are the culmination of a concerted effort to reevaluate TJJD's rehabilitation program and the system of Stages on through which individual progress of a youth is gauged. In October 2021, Dr. Evan Norton presented to the programs committee some limitations of the stage system of which we were aware.

To address this, Dr. Evan Norton and his team set out to comprehensively integrate the "stage of change" therapeutic model, also referred to as the "Transtheoretical Model," as you heard from him back in 2021. Each stage within the Stage of Change indicates the degree of willingness for and inclination toward behavioral change. These stages are: Precontemplation, Contemplation, Preparation, Action, and Maintenance.

Within the revised stage model in TJJD's rehabilitation program, these are represented by a progressive expectation of the youth as they move throughout the program. The specific factors on which youth are assessed are enumerated for each stage, and these are designed to build off the previous to foster further skills development and emotional regulation in a way the builds on previous successes; the priority is safety with an emphasis on the responsivity of the program to a youth's specific risks and needs.

Because of the interconnectedness of stages in other areas and programs established by agency rules, there are some minor changes in associated policies including, specialized treatment, facility assignment, the rehabilitation program overview, and definitions.

These five rules are for your consideration for approval to post in the register for public comment, and conditional approval for final adoption if the conditions in the resolution are met.

I am happy to answer any questions you all may have or offer more detail as needed.

Materials begin on page 88 of board book with a summary of changes beginning on the next page

- ☐ §380.8501, concerning definitions;
- ☐ §380.8521, concerning facility assignment system;
- ☐ §380.8702, concerning rehabilitation program overview;
- ☐ §380.8703, concerning rehabilitation program stage requirements and assessment;
- ☐ §380.8751, concerning specialized treatment;

Ann Lattimore moved to approve the rule revisions for posting. Chief Barnes seconded. The motion passed.

20. Discussion, consideration, and possible approval of the 2023 Strategic Plan (Action)

Sean Grove, Chief of Staff, laid out the agency's strategic plan for FY 23-27. Sean explained that this plan was developed similar to previous versions, but incorporated more feedback from the chiefs and additional stakeholders. The goals also were reframed to focus on the agency's core mission: public safety and youth rehabilitation. The goals of Public Safety, Building a single juvenile justice system, and developing a fully trauma-informed system, began with the Agency's strategic plan for 2019-2023, and continues to be the focus for the agency.

Chief Matthew moved to approve the strategic plan. Mr. Smith seconded. The motion passed.

21. Discussion of the Sunset Advisory Commission staff report on the Texas Juvenile Justice Department, and consideration and possible approval regarding formation of a committee(s) to address Sunset staff's recommendations. (Action)

Sean Grove, Chief of Staff, provided an update on the Sunset Commission Staff's review of TJJJ operations. Sean thanked the staff at Sunset for their work in understanding complex issues facing the juvenile justice system, and provided the Board with an update on where the agency is at. The first Sunset hearing was set for June 22nd, where TJJJ will provide testimony for the Sunset Commission members. There are action items for the Sunset process that the agency staff will work on through the summer and fall.

22. Report from the Safety and Security Committee

Chief Pama Hencerling reported on the agenda items discussed at the committee meeting.

23. Discussion, consideration, and possible approval to publish proposed revisions to the following rule in the Texas Register for a public comment period of at least 30 days and possible conditional approval to adopt the final rules: 37 TAC § 380.9504 (Rules and Consequences for Youth on Parole) (Action)

Sean Grove presented the proposed rule revision to the board.

Chief Matthew moved to approve the posting of the revisions. Chief Barnes seconded. The motion passed.

24. Discussion, consideration, and possible approval regarding the discipline of certified officers- Agreed Orders (Action)

Chelsey Oden

- a. Anthony Clay, Certification No. 28095; Docket No. 21-28095-210093
- b. Cedrick Stewart, Certificate No. 28774; Docket No. 22-28774-210165

Jimmy Smith moved to approve the agreed orders. Chief Hencerling seconded. The motion passed.

25. Discussion, consideration, and possible approval regarding the discipline of certified officers- Default Orders (Action)

Chelsey Oden

- a. Sharod Davis, Certification No. 21740; Docket No. 22-21740-220006
- b. James Harris, Jr., Certification No. 34670; Docket No. 22-34670-220027
- c. Benjimon Kelly, Certification Number: 36828; Docket No. 22- 36828 -220027
- d. Eric Momon, Certification Number: 34895; Docket No. 22-34895-220007
- e. Paxton Seals, Certification No. 35624; Docket No. 22-35624
- f. Keandra Randolph, Certification No. 32309; Docket No. 22-32309-220039
- g. William Burton, Certification No. 33922; Docket No. 22-33922-220018
- h. Rodney Chatman, Certification No. 35867; Docket No. 22-35867-220011
- i. Yamil Lebron, Certification No. 36352; Docket No. 22-36352-220040
- j. Chancellor Pickett, Certification No. 35985; Docket No. 22-35985
- k. Brian Webb, Certification No. 36928; Docket No. 22-36928-220034
- l. Ladarius McMillon, Certification No. 33160; Docket No. 22-33160-220035
- m. Rocky Garcia, Certification No. 31579; Docket No. 22-31579-220045
- n. Jeffrey Johnson, Certification No. 29325; Docket No. 22-29325-220078
- o. Latisha Ranson, Certification No. 34486; Docket No. 22-34486-210156
- p. Jalisa Byrd, Certification No. 30571; Docket No. 22-30571
- q. Clarissa Reyna, Certification No. 36761; Docket No. 22-36761

A -f Ann Lattimore moved to approve. Chief Hencerling seconded. Chief Barnes and Mona Lisa Chambers abstained. The motion passed.

G Chief Matthew moved to approve. Ann Lattimore seconded. Chief Hencerling abstained. The motion passed.

H Chief Barnes moved to approve. Ann Lattimore seconded. Chief Matthew abstained. The motion passed.

I-n and p Ann Lattimore moved to approve. Chief Matthew seconded. The motion passed.

26. Closed Session – Executive Session 11:05 a.m.

- a. Government Code §551.071 Consultation with attorney regarding litigation (see footnote)
- b. Government Code §551.072 Deliberation regarding real property (John C. Wende and Parrie Haynes trusts)
- c. Government Code §551.074 Discussion regarding personnel matters, including possible appointment of Shandra Carter as TJJJ Interim Executive Director and process(es) to permanently fill TJJJ Executive Director and Chief, Office of the Inspector General, positions.

27. Reconvene in Open Session 12:00 noon

28. Discussion, consideration, and possible action regarding approving settlement of a lawsuit with Ulysses Mack v. TJJJ (Action)

Christian J. von Wupperfeld presented the case.

Jimmy Smith moved to approve the settlement. James Castro seconded. The motion passed.

29. Discussion, consideration, and possible approval regarding the appointment of Shandra Carter as TJJJ Interim Executive Director. (Action)

Christian J von Wupperfeld presented the proposal.

Chief Hencerling moved to approve the appointment. Jimmy Smith seconded. The motion passed.

30. Adjourn

Chairwoman Lisa Jarrett adjourned the meeting at 12:02 p.m.