

# Nevada Advisory Commission on Mentoring

## Meeting Minutes

Monday, October 29, 2018

2:00 PM

### Meeting Locations:

#### Video Conference

OFFICE	LOCATION	ROOM
Department of Education	9890 South Maryland Parkway	Board Room
Department of Education	700 East Fifth Street	Board Room

### Call to Order

Dr. Michael Maxwell called the meeting to order on Monday, October 29, 2018 at 2:00 PM.

### Roll Call

Lorena Quintero, Nevada Department of Education Administrative Assistant, conducted roll call. **Quorum was established (eight members present).**

Commission Members present in Carson City: Matt Morris

Commission Members present in Las Vegas: Dr. Mike Barton, Michael Flores, Shawn T. Smith, Dr. Douglas Garner, Dr. Michael Maxwell, Christian Ward, Mayra Rodriguez

NDE staff present in Las Vegas: TeQuia Barrett and Lorena Quintero

Chief Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott was present in Carson City

Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson was present in Las Vegas

Others from Las Vegas: Dwayne McClinton, Charles Sebek, Eboni Caridine, Molly Latham, Nicholas Matthews, Mike Samuel

### Public Comments #1

Mr. Nicholas Matthews from Nevada State College announced that in conjunction with the My Brother's Keeper Alliance, they will be hosting a Mentoring Matters Summit at Nevada State College. This will be an opportunity for mentoring organizations and those interested in mentoring organizations to come together, highlight what's being done in the community and what could be done better to service young people. The summit will be January 12<sup>th</sup> at Nevada State College from 8:30 AM to 11:00 AM.

Dr. Maxwell asked for some details about last year's summit. Mr. Matthews shared that several different organizations within Southern Nevada got together to speak on what they do, what kind of young people they service, and what kind of programs they have. They also featured a keynote from Commissioner Lawrence Weekly, who talked about how mentoring has impacted his own personal life and benefited him. Then they finished up with a student panel, which featured some young people that were in current mentorship organizations in Southern Nevada and they talked about their experiences and how it's benefited them and helped them to be the positive young people that they are today.

## Public Comments #1 (Continued)

Ms. Molly Latham from Big Brothers, Big Sisters shared that the My Brother's Keeper Alliance came together and sent in a proposal for the National Mentoring Partnership Conference in late January and it was accepted. The topic of the presentation is Collective Impact Model, Leading Toward Public Policy Change and Mentoring. The presentation will be delivered by Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Ms. Latham, and Dr. Garner from the Commission. They will have a good delegation from Nevada attending the conference as well, and they're very pleased about that. The conference is scheduled for January 28<sup>th</sup> through February 1<sup>st</sup>. It starts with a day on the Hill, with conference attendees going to Capitol Hill and speaking to legislators about mentoring and the importance of it and the importance of keeping mentoring programs funded at a national level. They will also share the data collected by the National Mentoring Partnership about society's opinion about mentoring and that it should be funded publicly.

## Approval of Flexible Agenda

**Motion:** Dr. Garner made a motion to approve a flexible agenda. Mr. McClinton seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried and was approved unanimously.

## Approval of May 24, 2018 Meeting Minutes (For Possible Action)

**Motion:** Mr. Morris made a motion to approve the May 24, 2018 meeting minutes. Dr. Garner seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried and was approved unanimously.

## Mentor Spotlight (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)

Mr. Pat McDade introduced himself and expressed regret for having to make his presentation telephonically. He then gave an overview of his non-profit organization called Ready-Use Services. He started with a company that was primarily a residential treatment center and then branched off to start a community-based program which incorporated a social worker and youth mentors. When they began it, there were two social workers, three mentors and in one county in New York, they grew that to about 15 mentors and five social workers. That's the model Ready-Use Services is following in Nevada.

Ready-Use Services operates a little differently than some of the other mentoring programs. Their mentors are paid mentors and highly qualified and they're the backbone of the organization. One mentor will typically have up to 10 mentees and be allocated anywhere from two hours a week to 10 hours a week with those mentees, based on the service plan; either from the State or County. The clientele they're typically working with are the children you consider at-risk. Either they've been in residential placement and are coming back out or have been identified by the Court or DCFS as being at-risk.

Basically they will work off the service plan or help create a service plan with the State. They are currently operating in Ohio, New York and now Nevada. They do have a contract with DCFS and are taking cases currently in Winnemucca with the intention of spreading out through Northern Nevada and possibly Southern Nevada in the future. All mentoring is done in-person. The hours allowed are generally decided beforehand. They typically will work in four month blocks and generally stay on in a lessor capacity for a couple of months after that to make the separation easier.

## Bylaws Committee Update (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)

Mr. Matt Morris started out by thanking Chief Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott for helping with drafting the Bylaws, and Chair Flores and Dr. Barton who studied and reviewed the draft for presentation to the Commission. The majority of the provisions in the Bylaws simply reflect what was in Assembly Bill 144 and what is now in statute with regard to the Commission.

The features of the “new” Bylaws are as follows:

- **Article 1** The name of the organization is the Nevada Advisory Commission on Mentoring. The principal office for NACOM would be the Nevada Department of Education in Carson City.
- **Article 2** Mission, Purpose and Value Statement. The mission of NACOM is to carry out the Commission’s duties as prescribed by AB 144 and any future amending legislation, should it be approved, in an effort to support and facilitate mentorship programs in Nevada, for the purpose of addressing issues relating to education, health, criminal justice and employment with respect to socio-economically disadvantaged children who reside in Nevada. Added to that is the Core Values. Article 2, Section 3 would say that NACOM strives to carry out its mission and purpose with a strong and abiding commitment to promoting diversity, equality, equity, opportunity, civil engagement and social justice through supporting effective mentorship programs and initiatives in Nevada. Those core values are not spelled out in AB 144, but just as a first draft, it reflects what NACOM is all about.
- **Article 3** Membership. This is explicitly laid out in NRS 385.760.
- **Section 3.2** Quorum. This is also laid out in statute, NRS 385.770(3), that a majority of the Members of the Commission constitutes a quorum for the transaction of business.
- **Section 3.3** Initial Terms. These are set out in AB 144, Section 6.

Dr. Maxwell had a comment about Item 3.3, Initial Terms. It says that each member shall serve a four-year term in accordance with NRS 385.760, but right now there are staggered memberships. Mr. Morris said looking at Subsection 3 of NRS 385, it sounds like what was contemplated is after these staggered terms, that members would all serve a uniform four-year term. He asked Counsel if this was right.

Deputy Attorney General, Greg Ott said Mr. Morris was correct. If you look at the statute or look at the Bill, look at AB 144, Section 6, Subsection 3A, B and C, lays out the initial terms of two, three and four years. Then Section 3, Subsection 3 also states that after the initial terms, each Member of the Commission appointed, pursuant to Sections 1 and 2, shall serve four years. It does allow for reappointment. So, that is consistent. The initial terms get staggered and then after that, everybody is in for four years.

- **Section 3.4** Rotation of Terms. There will be no rotation of membership. Committee Members may be reappointed for additional terms.
- **Section 3.5** Membership Roster. Updated membership roster will be maintained and provided to the Members upon request.
- **Section 3.6** Vacancies. This is laid out in NRS 385.760(4). Vacancies of the Commission will be filled in accordance with NRS 385. Included will be removal for cause which shall include felony, misdemeanor or criminal activity, malfeasance, conflicts of interest, dereliction of duty, any other cause for which public officers may be removed from their office in the State of Nevada.
- **Section 3.7** Dereliction of Duty. Subject to the discretion of the Commission.

## Bylaws Committee Update (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) (Continued)

- **Article 4 Officers.** The statute spells out that the Commission is to appoint a Chair, a Vice-Chair and a Secretary. The specific powers and responsibilities of those officers are not spelled out in statute, so the Bylaws should have those provisions.

The responsibilities of the Chairperson will include obviously presiding over meetings of the Committee, reviewing and approving the Agenda, conducting all meetings in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order and Nevada's Open Meeting Law. Then also, the Chair would have the ability, the authority to designate any NACOM Member to preside over any meeting in the event that the Chair or the Vice-Chair are unable to preside.

The responsibilities of the Vice-Chair would be to fulfill the duties prescribed in the previous section. And, the manner of election is a one-year term. That's set out in statute, NRS 385.770.

Mr. Smith asked if there was a reason why the Secretary's responsibilities were not spelled out and shouldn't they add those? Mr. Morris said they could very easily add a section there. Section 4.4 will change to Section 4.5 and then the new Section 4.4 will just be the responsibilities of the Secretary.

- **Article 5 Meeting Schedule.** The meeting schedule is also prescribed in NRS 385.
- **Section 5.2 Membership.** Membership and service on NACOM is voluntary; however, upon agreeing to serve regular attendance and participation at meetings is required. Following unexcused absence at three consecutive meetings, the Member will be contacted by the Chairperson and polled regarding continued interest in serving. If the Member requests to remain on NACOM, subsequent unexcused absences may result in a request for the person's resignation. Unexcused absence at four consecutive meetings will constitute grounds for removal for cause in accordance with Article 3.7.

Dr. Maxwell suggested that since they only meet quarterly, could they drop the number for unexcused absences from three consecutive meetings to two? If Commission Members can't uphold their commitment then they could take the other steps that have been outlined, as far as speaking to the Commission Member and asking them to resign. Mr. Morris said the modifications to be made would be to change the unexcused absence from three consecutive meetings to two consecutive meetings. Then, towards the end of the section change that to unexcused absence at more than two meetings will constitute grounds for removal. If you have more than two consecutive, again, unexcused absences, then that's going to trigger the Article 3.7 and then the Commission could remove that Member for cause.

Ms. Barrett recommended that they remove the word "unexcused" because that word will need to require more clarification and definition of what would be considered an unexcused absence. Mr. Morris said this was a good point and perhaps instead of listing out an itemized list of reasons that could qualify as an excuse, it might just be easier to designate the Chairperson as having the ability to excuse members. If they just gave the Chairperson the ability to excuse Members, then it would put the responsibility on the Member to contact the Chair and the Chairperson would have the discretion to know when that provision was being misused. Dr. Maxwell suggested that they add if the Chair is going to be absent from the meeting then the Vice-Chair can receive that notice also.

- **Meetings.** Notice of NACOM meetings will be published in accordance with Open Meeting Law. The Chairperson will approve the meeting agenda with input from NACOM Members. On voting, each Member and Officer will have one vote and no proxies will be allowed. Action without a meeting, NACOM may not take any action outside of a meeting in accordance with Nevada Open Meeting Law but may authorize Members to act on its behalf when such action is consistent with the Nevada Open Meeting Law. Minutes shall be prepared and made available to the public, consistent with NRS 241. Again, that is Nevada's Open Meeting Law. Special meetings, any special meeting of NACOM shall be in accordance with Nevada Open Meeting Law.

## Bylaws Committee Update (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) (Continued)

- **Article 6** Governance. Language is verbatim from NRS 385.780.
- **Section 6.2** Parliamentary Authority. NACOM Meetings are governed by Robert's Rules of Order.
- **Article 7** Subcommittees or Working Groups. The Committee will establish subcommittees or working groups as necessary.
- **Article 8** Amendments. These Bylaws may be amended by a majority vote at a regular or special meeting of the Commission.

Dr. Maxwell and Chair Flores both thanked Mr. Morris for his hard work and willingness to lead this Bylaws effort. Mr. Morris asked Counsel if they would be able to adopt the Bylaws as amended? Deputy Attorney General Ott stated If the Counsel or the Commission felt that they are clear, they could adopt them as amended. They could also do that adoption and then request to have the amended Bylaws brought before them at the next meeting, so they could take another look, put them on a consent agenda or something like that. Or, they could defer to another agenda. All those things are within the Commission's power. If the Bylaws were approved today they could be agendized again at the next meeting, just so they could be revised if necessary. Since the amendments came after the original second, the seconder would have to make sure that the amendment was okay with them. But if it's okay with the seconder, then it could proceed to a vote. Dr. Maxwell said he would accept a motion.

**Motion:** Dr. Garner made a motion to approve the proposed Bylaws for the Mentoring Commission, as amended. Mr. McClinton seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried and was approved unanimously.

## Advisory Council Membership (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)

Dr. Maxwell asked Chair Flores and Deputy Attorney General Ott for their comments about the Advisory Council and/or taking a vote on the Advisory Council. Chair Flores deferred to the Deputy Attorney General to give an overview on what that Council would do and the relationship between the actual Commission.

Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott said he viewed this as sort of the bridge between the Mentorship Council and the mentorship organizations that are actually doing the work. The only obligation in the law is that the Members of this Membership Advisory Council must represent organizations which provide mentorship programs in the State. These would be working people who are doing mentorship currently and can provide real world practical advice to the Council. They would be a separate public body that could meet on their own to discuss matters and bring recommendations to the Commission. It would be the obligation of the Commission to give guidance and direction as to what sort of feedback and projects that the Advisory Council would tackle.

Dr. Maxwell asked if the membership list they had created at a previous meeting was available?

Ms. Barrett explained that there were more submissions than the positions that they had left. One of those submissions was from Tammy Bolan who actually works within the Department of Education with the GEAR UP Program. Ms. Bolan, as an employee of the Department of Education, can actually still assist with the Commission work without being formally on the Advisory Council. Ms. Barrett asked Ms. Bolan to resend her submission so that they could have Mr. Charles Sebek on the Committee. Ms. Barrett received the request from Ms. Bolan to present to the Commission so that the Advisory Council could be established at the end of the meeting.

The Advisory Council will be: Mr. Charles Sebek, Ms. Pauline Smith, Mr. Michael Samuel, Ms. Molly Latham, and Ms. Kasina Boone.

## Advisory Council Membership (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) (Continued)

Dr. Maxwell asked Counsel while the number of people on the Council has been scripted, because they report to the Commission, if they have people that attend the Advisory Council meetings, that does not stop anybody from actually participating on the Council?

Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott responded in the affirmative. As a public body, their Chair, whoever that would be, would be authorized to take input from the public at any point during the Committee Meetings. All the statute does is limit the official Members of the Council to five. So, those would be the individuals who would be able to vote. But they could have as many members of the public appear to provide additional insight as was necessary.

**Motion:** Mr. McClinton made a motion to approve the Advisory Council Members. Dr. Garner seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried and was approved unanimously.

Dr. Maxwell said that before they moved on to the next Agenda Item, Commissioner Garner wanted to speak about Mentorship.

Dr. Garner stated that at previous meetings, he was tasked with coming up with or looking at the operating definition of mentorship through Medicaid. He found out that Medicaid provides no definition of mentorship because they don't have a billing for mentorship services. In their nomenclature, they have no definition of mentorship. Dr. Garner went on to propose that the Commission come up with an operating definition of mentorship. Dr. Garner created a document with a working definition of mentorship as well as peripheral definitions and objectives which he submitted to Dr. Maxwell. He said he hoped they could vote on an operating definition very soon.

Dr. Maxwell stated that because this item was not on the Agenda, the document would be accepted, reviewed, and put on the next Agenda so that they could approve the working definition of mentorship during the next meeting. He thanked Dr. Garner for his diligence in preparing the document for review.

## Fundraising Committee/ Mentor Coordinator Update (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)

Mallory Cyr was not able to participate in the meeting, but she sent out an email that said that the Fundraising Committee has not yet met and that she was hoping to get the Committee together soon to figure out what some of the needs are in order for them to have some goals when it comes to fundraising.

Ms. TeQuia Barrett reported that's there's been some progress within the Department of Education getting an approval to have a temporary person working with the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Program, but also working on behalf of the Mentoring Commission to move forward the Mentoring Coordinator duties. That proposed person is Eboni Caridine. Due to the fact that Eboni was a former employee of the Department of Education within the last two years, there is one additional approval that has to be obtained at the Department. Once the Board does make that final approval, then she can officially begin the work. She said Ms. Caridine attended the meeting today and would introduce herself during public comment.

## Commission Goals and Objectives (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)

Chair Flores reminded members that they talked about having a workshop/retreat where they could do some concentrated work on the Commission's goals and objectives. He expressed a desire to do this before the end of the year so going into the Legislative Session the Commission will have identified priorities and what they're going to be doing as a Commission moving forward.

Dr. Maxwell stated the support was there for a retreat. He, Dr. Garner, and Mr. McClinton were ready to move forward. He said it was just a matter of coordinating schedules.

## Commission Goals and Objectives (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)

### (Continued)

Chair Flores asked Ms. Barrett if she could facilitate scheduling a retreat ASAP so that they have the commitment from the Commission to participate and get this done by the end of the year. Ms. Barrett said she would send out the information to both Commission and Advisory Council ASAP.

Dr. Maxwell said in regard to Commission Goals and Objectives, he had a few things he would like to “put on the table” so they could be agendaized and discussed at the next meeting. He said if anything came up during the retreat, it would still need to be added to the next meeting Agenda which means it would actually be six months before they actually could take any action on what’s covered during the retreat. He asked the Deputy Attorney General if that was correct.

Deputy Attorney General Ott stated that generally when Boards do a retreat, there is a meeting associated with that and there is an Agenda. There are opportunities for public comment and also the opportunity for the Commission to take action. To the extent that they would be getting together and discussing matters that come within the purview or jurisdiction of the Commission, then that would fall under the Open Meeting Law and there should be an Agenda and a published opportunity for the public to appear. So, if that’s the case and there will be an Agenda, then there would also be opportunity for the Commission to take action during that retreat.

Dr. Maxwell asked as long as they establish that the retreat is a working retreat with an Agenda, and the opportunity for the public to attend and/or comment, could they actually vote on action items? The Attorney General affirmed that they’d be following the full parameters of the open meeting. It would be recorded and minutes would be kept. As long as those strictures in Chapter 241 were followed, the Commission would be able to take action at that retreat as well.

Dr. Maxwell asked Chair Flores if he would rather him introduce the items now or save them for the retreat? The Chair said to go ahead and introduce them. Dr. Maxwell said the items he would detail were ones that had come up again and again.

Dr. Maxwell’s five items were as follows:

- **Retreat.** This was already discussed earlier in the meeting.
- **Working definition of mentoring.** Also discussed earlier in the meeting.
- **Review of upcoming mentoring events.** Dr. Maxwell suggested that this be an ongoing Agenda Item so that during their meetings, the public would get information regarding mentoring events that they may not otherwise have heard about.
- **Establishing a Mentoring Collaborative.** This Collaborative would include all mentoring organizations. They would work with the Commission. The Commission would share the things that those organizations are doing. They would have to establish what actually counts as a mentoring organization. They need to figure out if they’re talking about organizations that have their 501(c)(3)? Are we talking about mentoring organizations that have their Nevada business license, but not necessarily their 501(c)(3)? What constitutes a mentoring organization?
- **Hosting a Mentoring Conference** in the Summer of 2019 that would bring together all of the organizations across the State that are involved in mentoring.

Dr. Maxwell asked if there were any questions or comments.

Dr. Garner stated that’s why he thought it was important to introduce having a working definition, so that when they look at other organizations who are mentoring, they’ll have a good foundation as to what they’re doing, how they’re doing it and does it coincide with what the Commission’s defining statements are.

## **Commission Goals and Objectives (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)**

### **(Continued)**

Mr. Morris said these were all exciting ideas, especially the idea about the Mentoring Conference. He said he looked forward to that being on the Agenda.

Chair Flores asked Ms. Barrett how they could streamline the process for Members to submit other ideas or comments? Ms. Barrett said everything could be sent to her, with a copy to Lorena Quintero as well.

## **Executive Committee Report (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)**

Chair Flores stated he would be handing off to Mr. Morris but prefaced that by saying that the idea of possibly having an Executive Committee within the Commission came about because Members were expressing the view that didn't meet very often and there was a lot of work to get done. Mr. Morris had thought of some creative ideas to possibly make sure they were doing as much as we could with the limited amount of time that they had.

Mr. Matt Morris told members that it's not uncommon in some of the statewide boards, (i.e. Workforce Development Board) to have an Executive Committee made up of Members of the Commission; to sort of take tentative action that is subject to the ultimate approval of the full Commission. Just to sort of get things moving, in between quarterly meetings. This would be a subset of the Commission Members that obviously would be able to take action or take preliminary action that then would be approved by the Board at subsequent meetings. The whole purpose of it is just to be efficient and sort of expedite what the Commission is doing, expedite some of that work. He told members it's important to remember that the Committee would all be subject to the Full Commission approving what the Executive Committee does. So, there's a lot of flexibility there and it would be up to the discretion of the Commission.

Chair Flores said he was interested in how they would proceed in creating this Executive Committee and what kind of authority would they have or power to vote on things. He asked Deputy Attorney General Ott for his views.

Deputy Attorney General Ott said he agreed that it's an interesting idea to try to allow some work to get done outside of the Committee. He didn't think the Committee would be able to delegate full authority. It would be more of an ability to do work outside of the full meetings of the Committee and then bring things back to the Commission. He went on to say to the extent that they would be bringing recommendations to the Committee, they would probably also be subject to Open Meeting Law and require to meet with public participation. Other than that, the Deputy Attorney General said there is an area where they could be submitting recommendations and doing some work that would not infringe on the Committee's authority.

Dr. Maxwell asked since they would need to have the operating rules or procedures for the Executive Committee, who would be putting those together for a vote at the next Commission Meeting?

Mr. Morris said he would be willing to put something together for the next meeting for the Commission to look at. He didn't think it would require any amendments or changes to the Bylaws, because under Bylaws, under Article 7, the Committee will establish subcommittees or working groups as necessary. This could be consistent with that. Mr. Morris said he would find some samples of current Executive Committees in Nevada that are similar to sort of what this Commission is doing. Then, the full Commission can decide what would be best and how to assign an Executive Committee, if that's what the Commission wanted.

## **Legislative Session Report (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)**

Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson (Assembly District 17) gave an enthusiastic address to the Commission on the efforts to promote mentoring for young people in the state of Nevada. He wanted Members to "go for it" on every level when it came to meeting the needs of the state for mentoring youth. He reminded them they were appointed for that purpose. They needed to just go for it.

## Legislative Session Report (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) (Continued)

The Legislative Session starts on February 4<sup>th</sup> and concludes on June 3<sup>rd</sup> of 2019. The Assemblyman has put a Bill Draft Request (BDR #149) on the books. It's to revise provisions to the Nevada Advisory Commission on Mentoring. The Assemblyman wanted to put that placeholder in there because if there are some things that need to be added, removed, or adjusted, that's what needs to be done.

Assemblyman Thompson welcomed Ms. Caridine on board. He said they've been waiting for her for a while, and they're delighted she's going to join their ranks. He thanked the Department of Education for bringing her on board.

The Assemblyman had some discussion items to consider:

- Possible Name Change. The Assemblyman thinks the "Advisory" part in the name of the Commission is confusing, especially being that there's the Advisory Council. The name change does not have to be drastic; it could just be the Nevada Commission on Mentoring or something along those lines.
- Continuing work with Ms. Cyr and the Fundraising Subcommittee. Legislature always wants to look at sustainability in legislation that is passed. So even though Ms. Caridine is on board now, the Commission should continue the work of the Mentoring Coordinator until session is out or, a decade from now, they want the Commission to continue to go. It's very important to look at what are those funding sources to keep this moving? Because the whole idea was that this legislation would be embraced by the community, by the State and by just everybody, businesses, so on and so forth.
- Mentoring Coordinator. The Coordinator will be establishing the relationships in the community. They're going to be reaching out to all of the organizations. They're going to be doing a lot of that every day work and relationship building. That's why it's really important to have the Coordinator on board.
- Revisit Quorum. It could be quorum/composition. The Assemblyman wants to have the quorum conversation between now and the beginning of session because they should always have quorum.
- Revisit Terms of Service. The intention was to allow it to be staggered and then also allow for newcomers to come on board as well. The intent is a little bit off right now; people would be serving for six or seven years and that's not the intent. It's to kind of rotate everybody every two or three years and then have the opportunity if they choose to stay but also bring on more community knowledge and members.
- Language Clean Up. It needs to be made clear that the Advisory Council is not going to be a separate group from the Commission. The Commission needs to figure out how the Advisory Council will report up. That was the whole purpose. It wasn't to create a new Chairperson and so on and so forth. The Assemblyman suggested that they incorporate that into the Bylaws. The Assemblyman asked the Deputy Attorney General if they could talk offline about what he may need to do with the BDR to clean up that language so that the interpretation is correct.

Assemblyman Thompson addressed the issue of having "only" four meetings a year. It's in the law that you can meet pretty much as much as you want to. It's required that you have to at least meet quarterly. Any time you're creating and building something new, you really do need to meet more than quarterly. Again, that's going to be up to the call of the Chair or the majority, like it's listed in the Legislation.

The Assemblyman and Chairman Flores have been discussing the possibility about having a "Mentoring Day" at the Legislature to bring an awareness around mentoring. Assemblyman Thompson said maybe they could invite mentoring organizations to come up. There is always table space in our four-year area, between the two chambers. They could also allow for people to meet with their legislators and on the floor session be acknowledged. They could say some great things around mentoring; they could maybe even bring up some mentees. It could be the sky is the limit.

## Legislative Session Report (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) (Continued)

Assemblyman Thompson said he would like some Members to work with him on the BDR. Now that there's an established Commission, he needs input about items in the Bill and of course, the resource building piece. He would like to get this going ASAP because there's another deadline for BDRs on December 10.

Dr. Maxwell said he would be honored to serve with the Assemblyman to develop the BDRs.

Mr. Dwayne McClinton said he was on board.

Dr. Garner said he was on board.

Mr. Morris said he would be happy to help in any way he could. He said he had one comment about the BDR. In NRS 385.770(6), it states the Commission shall, on or before, February 1<sup>st</sup> of each year, prepare and submit a report outlining the activities and recommendations of the Commission to the Governor and the Director of the Legislative Council Bureau for transmittal to the Legislative Session. He wondered if they would be able to produce a report by February; should this be fixed in the BDR?

Assemblyman Thompson responded by saying he would strongly recommend they prepare a report. They're going to be presenting to 63 Legislators that voted for this. If they don't see a report, sometimes that's a flag. It's potentially a lot of work, but worth it. It would serve justice to the Commission to do so.

Ms. Barrett agreed and said this was something that the Department could help to present during the Legislative Session. It may take time to get these things going, but the vision and the need is there. She said they could put something together to actually show the progress that's been made so far and what they intend to do going forward.

Dr. Maxwell said he agreed with Ms. Barrett and Assemblyman Thompson that they provide a report in February. There are many things that could be included. They could include the bios of those who are serving on the Commission. They could highlight the Advisory Council and members on that Council, including an overview of the organizations that they work with and represent. They could detail the process to get the Bylaws established for the Commission. And most importantly, they could emphasize the work that they are going to be doing between the beginning of the session and the next time that they see them in two years.

Assemblyman Thompson said to add on that, this report would create their speaking points. Legislators have stacks of reports and so when Members come up, this will be the opportunity to revisit that report with the Legislator, whether they've read it or not. And that would be a good conversation piece when they're meeting with them.

Dr. Garner said he liked this idea of presenting a progress report.

Mr. Smith said he thought the retreat would also provide them additional information to be able to report out.

Chair Flores thanked Assemblyman Thompson for his leadership on this. He was glad that the Commission was a part of it. And however he could help in the BDR process and the legislative process, count him in. He said he was really proud to be a part of this Commission and was looking forward to continuing their work.

Assemblyman Thompson stated he thought it was very important to determine when their meetings were going to be and also to try their best to have meetings at Grant Sawyer. Some buildings in which meetings have been held are just not as large or accessible as they need to be. They don't want to have meetings just for the sake of having a meeting. They want to have their community partners listening and helping them when have these meetings.

Dr. Maxwell thanked Assemblyman Thompson for everything he has done in this process. He then said it was time to move on to the next Agenda Item.

## Legislative Session Report (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) (Continued)

Ms. Barrett said before they moved on, she would like them to revisit Action Item 5 and reverse the approval on the May 24 minutes. They found some corrections that needed to be made. The corrections are:

On Page 1 of the Meeting minutes, the date for the meeting is incorrect. The last meeting was actually on May 24. Also, on Page 1, there is an incorrect spelling on Mr. Garner's name, it has a D there that needs to be removed. Same on Page 2.

Page 3, a change to paragraph 3, Mr. Barton is addressed as Mr. Mike Barton and change the title there to doctor. In that same paragraph also twice.

Page 4 in the fifth paragraph, it should say to speak about the work of the Big Brothers, Big Sisters organization. Also, in the second paragraph, the word "match", should actually be past tense, it should have ED on the end.

Page 5, again, addressing Dr. Garner, without the D. And then in the second to the last paragraph, changing independent to independently, adding an LY to that.

Page 6, the organization CASA should be in all caps and that's in about the fourth paragraph down. Again, changing the title for Dr. Barton at the bottom.

Page 8, name correction for Dr. Garner again.

Page 10, again, changing titles from Mr. to Dr. and changing spelling of last name of Garner so it would be correct.

Page 11, addressing title for Mr. Garner to Dr. and then also in the paragraph where Ms. Gordon is speaking just to make a correction there so that the S is lower case.

Mr. Morris said since he made the original motion, he would make an amended motion.

**Motion:** Mr. Morris made a motion to approve the amended May 24, 2018 meeting minutes. Dr. Garner seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried and was approved unanimously.

### Public Comment #2

Ms. Eboni Caridine introduced herself and gave a brief bio: she has extensive background in working with mentoring, both in Chicago, where she's originally from, and Nevada. She's had the opportunity to present and attend the University of New Mexico's Mentoring Institute. She said she was "ecstatic" about this opportunity and happy to be on board.

Dr. Maxwell said he was speaking for the Commission when he said they looked forward to working with Ms. Caridine. They've got a lot to do so they're going to be calling on her an awful lot. They are very happy to have her join them.

Dr. Maxwell announced their next meeting was going to be on December 18 and the meeting locations would be the same for both North and South.

### Adjournment

**Motion:** Dr. Garner motioned to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Dwayne McClinton seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried and was approved.

The meeting adjourned at 4:02 PM.