



STATE OF NEVADA EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

515 E. Musser ST., Ste 101 | Carson City, Nevada 89701
Phone: (775) 684-0131 | www.hr.nv.gov | Fax: (775) 684-0118

Meeting Minutes of the Employee-Management Committee Date: September 17, 2026

(Subject to Committee Approval)

Held at the Nevada State Library and Archives Building, 100 N. Stewart St., Conference Room 110, Carson City, Nevada, and the Eureka Building located at 7251 Amigos Street, Suite 120, Las Vegas, Nevada via videoconference.

Committee Members

Adriane Roberts-Larson - Chair	X
Thomas Jepsen	X
Rosina Barrientos - Vice Chair EMC	X
Patricia Olmstead	X
Dakota Peterson	X

Staff Present: Jenniffer Carroll,
Michael Waltz
Christine Nelson
Carl Stanfield
Michael Balls

I. TO ORDER, WELCOME, ROLL CALL, ANNOUNCEMENTS

ROBERTS-LARSON: Yeah. Perfect. And for those in cars, I'm going to speak a little bit louder because of the microphone, so I'm not holler at you. Are we recording? Thank you. So again, good morning for the record, my name is Adrian Roberts-Larson. I serve as the Chair of the employee management committee. I'd like to call the meeting of the employee management Committee to order. It is 9:01 a.m. on September 17, 2026. This meeting is being video conference between the Nevada State Library and Archives Building located 100 North Stewart Street, Room 110 in Carson City, Nevada, and the Eureka Building located at 7251 Amigos Street, Suite 120 in Las Vegas, Nevada. Before we move through the agenda, I would like to review a couple housekeeping items for those in attendance. If you've not done so already, please make sure that you sign in. Please place any cell phones or electronic devices on silent. Should you need to take a call, step out of the room to do so. And in the event of an emergency, the meeting will be recessed and no discussion of agenda items will be allowed during that time. Attendees in Carson City will follow me to the evacuation point, and attendees in Vegas will follow Chair, uh, Vice Chair Barrientos. I'd also like to set the expectations for conduct during this meeting. The goal is to run a courteous in an efficient meeting. I'm asking that you do not speak unless per -- have permission of the Chair. When you have permission to speak, speak only to the members of the committee and not to, uh, other parties or anyone else in the room. Do not interrupt other parties or committee members when they are speaking. Do not speak, make noise or gesture with your body when someone else is speaking. Do not argue with the Chair, committee members or other parties to the hearing. Do not speak down, demean or harass anyone in the proceeding or in the meeting, and do not raise your voice or act in a hostile or aggressive manner. This meeting is being recorded and the minutes are being transcribed. Please identify yourself each time you speak, if you forget, I will remind you, speak clearly and slowly so we may have an accurate record for those testifying today. Would you please stand and raise your right hand to take an oath? Will you be testifying today as well? Okay. Do you swear that your testimony during the proceedings will be truthful? And if so, say I do.

CARROLL: I do.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Thank you.

STANFIELD: I do.

ROBERTS-LARSON: You may be seated. Moving on to agenda item two, which would be public comment. This is no vote or action to be taken upon a matter raised during public comment until the matter itself has been speci -- specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Comments will be limited to five minutes per person, and person's commenting will be asked to begin by stating their name for the record. Is there anyone here in Carson City wishing to make public comment? Seeing none, I'll move to Las Vegas. Is there anyone in Las Vegas wishing to make public comment?

PETERSON: Chair, this is Dakota Peterson for the record. I'm seeing none down here.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Thank you.

PETERSON: Did we do a roll call to determine forum? I see three people up north, but I -- I don't -- I don't know who they are. (Inaudible) apologize.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Yes, we will do the roll call as well here --

PETERSON: Perfect.

ROBERTS-LARSON: -- before we get into the agenda, and actually that is the, um, next item. So let's do a roll call in Carson City members. Thomas Jepsen.

JEPSEN: Alright, here.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Patricia Olmstead.

OLMSTEAD: Here.

ROBERTS-LARSON: In Las Vegas, Vice Chair Rosina Barrientos.

BARRIENTOS: Present.

ROBERTS-LARSON: And, uh, Dakota Peterson.

PETERSON: Present as well. Thank you, Chair.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Thank you. Okay, moving on to adoption of the agenda for adoption of the agenda for the members. If you agree, please state aye. If not, state nay.

OLMSTEAD: Aye.

ROBERTS-LARSON: And the adoption of the agenda is approved, we will now move to approval of minutes from July 8, 2026 meeting again. Uh, members, if you have any changes, let me know. Uh, if not, if you agree to adopt the minutes as written, please say aye. If not, nay.

OLMSTEAD: Aye.

BARRIENTOS: Aye.

ROBERTS-LARSON: And the minutes are approved. Okay. Moving on to agenda item six, discussion and possible action related to grievance number 11530. Jennifer Carroll, Department of Employment Training and Rehabilitation. Possible action may include determining that the grievance may be answered without a hearing because it's based upon a previous decision of the EMC or does not follow up in the EMC's jurisdiction and consequently deny the grievance. Or if that threshold is not met, hearing the grievance and therefore granting or denying the grievance. We have allotted one hour for this hearing. If we need time, we'll take it. If not, uh, we can conclude prior to that, but we will begin with a brief opening statement by or on behalf of the employee state and nature of the grievance, what the employee to disprove, and a short description of the resolution being sought. Uh, time allotted for this is 10 minutes.

CARROLL: Do I need to stand?

ROBERTS-LARSON: You don't need to stand, but if you want to move up please and then just make sure you speak so we can all hear you clearly.

CARROLL: Sure.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Thank you.

CARROLL: Good morning, Madam Chair and committee members. Thank you for granting me the opportunity to speak before you today. My name is Jennifer Carroll and I have the honor of serving as the unemployment insurance tax chief for the Department of Employment Training and Rehabilitation. I have devoted more than 22 years to serving the state of Nevada 17 of those with dear with unwavering professionalism, integrity, and dedication. Across all those years my record has remained exemplary. I have never received discipline, never raised ethical concerns and never demonstrated lapses in judgment. My career reflects a deep commitment to public service and to the mission and values of Dieter. My career reflects a deep commitment to public service and to the mission and values of Dieter. I take tremendous pride in the work I do for the state of Nevada, and I lead by example, because -- because of that I must acknowledge that this is profoundly disheartening and frankly embarrassing to stand before you today with my integrity under question. I come from a military family deeply rooted in law enforcement and service to our country. Integrity is not simply an expectation, it's the moral foundation on which I was raised. Being here today has rattled me, not because I fear accountability, but because intentions and characters -- but because my intentions and character have been misinterpreted. I'm here to address the written reprimand issued to me for installing the Move Mouse application on my computer. I intend to demonstrate that this installation was not done with any malicious intent, that

I did not violate any existing installation approval procedures, and that my sole purpose was to improve operational efficiency within the agency. I will also show that the matter was already being proactively addressed before any discipline was issued. I come before you today to respectfully request the rescission or at a minimum the reduction of the written reprimand dated December 8, 2025. Not because I reject responsibility and not because I seek exemption from policy, but because this reprimand is disproportionate, unsupported by documented facts and inconsistent with the principles of fairness and progressive discipline.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Thank you. Okay. For the, uh, employer then saying, please provide the committee with a brief opening statement on, uh, state of the nature of the grievance, what the employer -- why do I have this? Both what the employer intends to prove in a short description, um, of the resolution, whether you agree or disagree with the resolution being proposed.

WALTZ: Good morning, Madam Chair, members of the Committee for the record, I'm Michael Waltz Dieter's HR Manager. Dieter's position of this matter is that Ms. Carroll clearly violated Dieter's IT policy by downloading unauthorized software under speed on computer, putting both Dieter and the state at risk. In October 2025, Dieter conducted a department wide scan for unapproved unauthorized software and hardware installed, installed on stable computers as part of IT technology audit activities. The scan resulted in the identification of an unapproved unauthorized software called Move Mouse that was downloaded and ran from WMI Microsoft Store application on Ms. Carroll's computer asset CU385362L on September 10, 2025 between 12:17 p.m. and 12:41 p.m. The scan also found two leather Gator staff had downloaded this unapproved program. The other two staff accepted without question their HR 52 written reprimands. Move Mouse is a free software utility in general term for tools that automatically move your computer mouse cursing. It prevents your PC from going idle and stops the screen stakeholder lock screen from coming on and keeps your online status active. In essence, what that what that is doing is overriding a security feature. The screen log is, or when somebody is leaving their computer inactive for an amount of time, such as maybe getting up to use the restroom, it just disallows other individuals from accessing the data on that particular computer. Ms. Carroll's actions constitute violation of Dieter's Information Technology usage policy section five, and was an inappropriate and potential danger to Dieter's network and or systems. This resulted in inappropriate action with an assumed attempt to deceive and or present a false accounting, but Ms. Carroll actively working and potentially caused a risk to Dieter's network and or systems. This activity is a violation of the following Dieter penalties and prohibitions, which are approved and ratified by the commission jeopardizing the security, the departmental property, installing or using unauthorized personal -- personal or unauthorized software and state home technology resources without proper authorization and proof. Also, as part of Ms. Carroll's set for grievance response, she indicated that there was a lack of clear communication about which tools are unauthorized. It isn't possible to list all unauthorized programs as the list would be infinite and require revisions daily. As a manager, Ms. Carroll was held to a higher standard and is expected to follow Dieter's policy. This particular violation is especially egregious considering the recent cyber attack that shut down state's computer system. Ms. Carroll was appropriately issued an HR 52 on December (inaudible).

ROBERTS-LARSON: Did we lose Vegas or are you, um, finished with your statement?

WALTZ: I'm -- I'm -- I'm finished.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Okay.

WALTZ: Maybe just one moment. Thank you. Dieter rejects proposed resolution made

by Ms. Carroll in that a letter of instruction is not a reasonable action given the severity precedent Ms. Carroll placed the and state and by downloading and an offer of software under her state on computer not informing the leadership appropriate means that she had done so and waiting weeks while she went on vacation before action was taken to remove set. I've completed. Thank you.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Thank you. Ms. Carroll, uh, uh, or for you and for the department, I have a couple questions.

CARROLL: Yes, ma'am.

ROBERTS-LARSON: So, in reading through the materials and listen to the statement, it's -- it's unclear. So I'd like some clarification on in your statement it was that you didn't ask permission to put it on your computer. However, um, it makes it sound as though you notified your IT department. And then I have it saying that there was a scan that was done that identified it. So could someone speak to the order of events and, um, how it came to be that this was, uh, discovered first?

CARROLL: Yes. Manager, Jennifer Carroll for the record. Um, the scan was performed on September 10, 2025. I was -- I received the written reprimand on December 8, 2025 prior to receiving the written reprimand prior to my scheduled annual leave, um, I had been in communication with a IT technician and I have some of that information in my exhibits and I will be going over that, but, um, I was already working with IT to have it removed from my system once I found out that it was authorized.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Okay. And so that conversation that you had by it to start talking about getting it moved off of your computer was when? What month?

CARROLL: I'm not sure of the exact month, but I would say it was probably somewhere in October or November. Maybe November, because I had gone on leave on November 10th and that's what postponed having it removed from my system.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Okay. And so the scan was done sounds like prior in September?

CARROLL: Correct.

ROBERTS-LARSON: And so then speak to between September and October then, so CN was done in September. Conversations happening with it in October. Did -- did IT come to you?

CARROLL: So what transpired -- Jennifer, Carroll, for the record, thank you. Um, what transpired was I had an issue with my printer and I -- the IT tech that came over to work on my printer and that we ended up having a conversation about it because I had indicated, you know, I'm utilizing this because this is what I have to do. Do we have a better method or is this what I should be using? So on and so forth. And he was the one who had indicated to me, this isn't authorized. And so then I was, you know, at that point, like, oh, then I need to get it off of my computer, blah (inaudible). He said, I will come and take it back, take it off of your computer when I come back with all of the stuff for your printer. I said, okay. And then that's what transpired there was that he never came back before my scheduled leave. So it never came to fruition.

ROBERTS-LARSON: And I just want to make a comment. Uh, we all -- all the committee members, uh, and, uh, or the members, let me know if you feel differently, but, um, we've -- we have your packets, we've got the materials for both the employees packet material, all the exhibits clearly. So unless the individual members of the moment feel a need to go through exhibit, you know, one by one, um, I -- I feel that -- that we have that. So I don't feel that we need to get in depth into what we've already gone over. Um, so I'd like to hear from you, why -- why did you install? What was the purpose of installing this on your computer?

CARROLL: Jennifer Carroll for the record. Um, I purposely installed it to keep my computer from timing out. I'm not, you know, discrediting that at all. Um, the reason that I installed it was -- was for my workflow efficiencies. I have two desks in my office. My adding machine is on one desk, my computer is on another. I can't put my adding machine on that desk because it's a standup, so it doesn't have room for my adding machine. So what I will do is I will bring up all of the spreadsheets that I need to calculate because I have to run a tape. So that's why I have to use my adding machine. Can't use my computer calculator. So, um, I have to run the tape. So I sit at my computer here looking at my screen ting all of the figures and my computer times out when I'm in the middle of doing that. So what happens is, is that I have to reenter my password, I have to find my place where I was on all these documents and then continue it was causing major disruptions in -- in my work procedures. So in order to prevent that I installed the Move Mouse application.

BARRIENTOS: This is Rosina Barrientos for the record, I have a question for Ms. Carroll.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Go ahead, please.

BARRIENTOS: Um, Ms. Carroll, um, before you installed the software, did you ask IT if you could install it?

CARROLL: Jennifer Carroll for the record. No, ma'am, I did not.

BARRIENTOS: Thank you.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Um, are you -- Ms. Carroll, are you up to date on your security awareness training?

CARROLL: Um, Jennifer Carroll for the record. I cannot answer that truthfully because I'm not positive.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Okay. Uh, for the department, are you able to answer that question if Ms. Carroll is, uh, current on her security awareness training?

STANFIELD: Morning, Carl Stanfield for the record. Yes, she is current at the moment. We're putting out new training program starting next month.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Uh, do you have, uh, the month and year, the last time that she, uh, took the training?

STANFIELD: I do not have that with me. Carl Stanfield, I do not have that with me. I apologize.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Okay, thank you. I have just a couple more questions, then I'll open it up to rest of the numbers if you do as well. Um, Ms. Carroll, in your uh, packet, you also stated that, um, there was an issue, uh, my question as far as it's an issue with the computer's timing out and you -- you have stated that you didn't ask for help from IT. So my question for you is, how would your department be aware that there is an issue if it's not brought to them or if you haven't posed the question? It seems like a -- a case of they don't know what they don't know unless they're told.

CARROLL: Jennifer Carroll for the record. Yes, ma'am. Um, I, I would agree with that statement. However, because of my position within Dieter, I run a program, um, and because of that, I make these decisions every day. Um, I was one of the main contributors to developing our whole new Nevada unemployment insurance system for the tax side of the -- the department. Um, I do this every day, so it really didn't cross my mind because it was for workflow efficiency and nothing else. To me, it was just streamlining processes.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Thank you. Uh, for now, I'll turn it over to the other members.

OLMSTEAD: Uh, Patricia Olmstead. My question to you is two other people were

found to have the same app on their computers, and they also received, I'm assuming the same, uh, write-up as you and the department said that they did not have any, um, grievances on that. Do you feel like you are different because you're a manager and maybe they're not managers?

CARROLL: Jennifer Carroll, for the record. I appreciate your question, ma'am. Um, I do hold myself to a higher standard than others. I don't know who the other two individuals are, whether they were management and in leadership, um, you know, just administrative staff. I'm not positive who those individuals were. Um, so I really can't speak to that. But what I will say is that I do take responsibility for my actions. This is not something that I'm saying that I didn't do. I did it, you know, um, I'm just saying that it wasn't for anything malicious. It wasn't for anything like timekeeping fraud, which is my assumption of what others were probably using it for. Um, but again, that's just an assumption on my part. I'm not aware or privy to any of the, the factual relevance of those written reprimands. So I'm not sure that I could answer that fairly. Thank you.

JEPSEN: Thomas Jepsen, for the record. Um, question for the department. The write-up was issued in the beginning of December, but the scan was done in October. Why is there such a large gap between the scan and when the written reprimand was given?

NELSON: I can -- Christine Nelson for the record, um, I serve as the Employment Security Division administrator at Dieter. Um, I can't tell you why there was a gap. I, um, understand that the scan was done by our IET division and that it was brought to the attention of the administrators in the various, um, Ms. Carroll's was the only person in my division, um, that was brought to my attention. Um, but I -- and I'm not privy to the other two individuals, um, that received the same, um, written reprimand for the violation. Um, but I -- I believe that that, you know, was just of gathering and making sure that this scan was, um, adequate and sufficient to demonstrate that these violations have actually taken place before we as leadership that could, um, review and decide upon, um, what appropriate action was to be taken.

JEPSEN: Um, and Ms. Carroll, Thomas Jepsen for the record, um, do you -- are you in an office or are you in a cubicle?

CARROLL: Jennifer Carroll for the record. I have an office.

JEPSEN: Um, and do you close your door and lock your door when you leave your office?

CARROLL: Jennifer Carroll for the record. Sometimes.

JEPSEN: Um, when you downloaded the Move Mouse software, did that prohibit you or impeded you from locking your computer when you left your office in the time that you did not lock your office?

CARROLL: Jennifer Carroll for the record, um, the only time that I close my door is when I don't lock my computer and when I don't lock my computer, it's for specific reasons. Um, for workflow purposes, like if there's something on there that I don't want to have to try to find my place in, again, when I unlock my screen and then figure stuff out, I will shut my door while I run to the restroom or something of that nature. Otherwise, when I get up from my desk every time I lock my computer, so the mouse knew for that purpose in my situation would be irrelevant.

JEPSEN: Um, and for -- for the department, um, Thomas Jepsen, for the record, what was the thinking behind the difference between an oral warning and a written reprimand? Why was a written reprimand decided outside of, or why did -- why did you jump all the way to in written reprimand versus (inaudible) warning?

NELSON: Christine Nelson for the record, um, oh, Michael, did you, sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt.

BALLS: Oh, that's okay. Who, uh, Michael Balls for the record. Uh, Ms. Nelson, go

ahead. And then I probably want to add that.

NELSON: Christine Nelson for the record. Um, because of, we were just coming off the heels of the, one of the largest, maybe the largest cyber attacks in the state's history, um, this, this violation rose to a significant potential risk kind of scenario. And so it was -- it was because of that, that the written reprimand was chosen as the appropriate action.

BALLS: (inaudible) for the record, um, Dieter's prohibitions and penalties, uh, for the, uh, infraction started with an oral warning and went through a suspension for his first offense on one of them. On the other of the offenses, it starts with an oral warning. It goes to a termination for first offense. Between -- between that and the recent cyber attack, we felt that a written reprimand was adequate and appropriate. Uh, additionally, circling back to the question on the delay between the, uh, scan and the issuance of the written reprimand, I'd like to propose that the month of November has a lot of holidays. A lot of people are on annual leave, as was Ms. Carroll, and we did have to wait for her return before we could issue that written reprimand. I'd also, if you would, uh, like to allow Carl Stanfield our IT administrator, uh, to provide a witness.

STANFIELD: Morning again, Madam Chair, members of the committee. And I'm Carl Stanfield. I'm the IET Division administrator. Shortly after the cyber attack, the state failed victim two investigations on unrelated matters, provided information of unauthorized software possibly in use within the agency. While reviewing the most current scans of agency computers, I requested a new scan of the environment to show what was in fact installed Agency Y. Scans revealed there was in fact, unapproved software installed on multiple computers, three in the agency and mitigation steps were taken to have it removed. As this software is in use, it prevents the computer from sleeping or logging off to inactivity, which we've already covered. The software allows the user to appear to be online and actively working when they are not physically at their computer. The use of this software brought about several security concerns that staff addressed immediately during the mitigation procedures. I reported my findings appropriately to agency leadership after discovering the installations had taken place and informed them of the mitigation steps being taken. NRS 242.300 states and all state agencies that utilize at least one computer shall create a written policy on the use of computers within the agency. Within the (inaudible) information technology usage policy. Last updated in 2006. One item specifically called out as being appropriate is the installation and modification of software and hardware without authorization. Discussions with HR and leadership. After considering the applicable prohibitions and penalties, it was determined that given the serious nature of the policy violation due to the cyber attack coming about by the same exact reasoning, a written reprimand was appropriate for all staff members who violated the policy. And what I mean by that is the cyber attack happened by unauthorized software being downloaded and installed on a single computer.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Thank you.

JEPSEN: Um, Thomas Jepsen for the record. One more question, if I may Chair.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Yes.

JEPSEN: Um, Ms. Carroll, you state that you unknowingly violated policy like you, it wasn't willing, but you've been with Dieter for 17 years. I'm -- I'm having -- I'm confused as to why you didn't know about the policy prior. Did you check with it for (inaudible) for to authorize an application? You -- you were there for 17 years. I imagine your manager, you would go through this with all of your other team members that you manage and supervise. So why is it that you didn't know about this policy?

CARROLL: Jennifer Carroll, for the record, thank you for your question. Um, it is -- it is not something and I don't mean this to downplay the situation at all because I understand the severity

of it now. However, I do this every day. I make these decisions every day to keep my program running and -- and to keep workflow processes moving and streamlining things and, you know, essentially getting the most work that you can, having an eight hour day. So for me, it wasn't I was violating an IT policy. For me it was, I was streamlining a workflow. So on top of that, the other thing is that it was a Microsoft product. We use Microsoft every day. I would've never thought that a Microsoft product would've been unauthorized to put on a computer that already has Microsoft on it. So maybe I didn't like analyze the situation as well as I should have but overall it was nothing out of the norm from my daily routines.

ROBERTS-LARSON: A question, uh, for you then, when there are updates, when there are installs to be done to computers within your agency, who typically is responsible for doing that?

CARROLL: Jennifer Carroll for the record. Um, our IT department is.

ROBERTS-LARSON: So was there, um, a moment of thought before you installed this, uh, as to stop and check with them because they are your IT department responsible for the overall health of the computer system and, um, integrity of your it?

CARROLL: Jennifer Carroll for the record. Um, no, it did not cross my mind because it was a Microsoft product, because it was a, uh, for a business purpose and for efficiencies, um, it did not cross my mind. It did not even become an issue in my mind until I was speaking with, um, Justin who was the IT tech that came to work on my printer when we were having this discussion and he said it was unauthorized. That is the first time I went, oh, no, then I need to get this off of my computer. We had talked about it. We had come up with a plan to have it removed. I figured everything was fine.

ROBERTS-LARSON: And for the department, um, in the materials, um, and I believe they're by Ms. Carroll, uh, and I'm paraphrasing, but stated that, uh, it was in the process of removing, uh, these, this application, um, was that just on the three computers that it was found on or was this department wide?

STANFIELD: Carl Stanfield for the record. This was issued as a department wide order that this particular software be blocked and it was mitigated by removal immediately. That was the order that came down.

ROBERTS-LARSON: And this order was that, uh, an order that was disseminated to all staff, or at least management?

STANFIELD: That was disseminated to my entire IT team as they were about the state. They're responsible for locating it and removing it.

ROBERTS-LARSON: And was it disseminated outside of your IT team to the rest of the agency so that they were aware that this was either unauthorized or, um, or was now unauthorized and would be removed from the computers?

STANFIELD: Carl Stanfield for the record, yes ma'am. It was shared with leadership that this was unauthorized software and that we had located it all three computers had needed to be removed.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Okay. Thank you. Uh, Vice Chair Barrientos, do you have any questions?

BARRIENTOS: Uh, yes, Madam Chair, I do have a question for Ms. Carroll. Uh, Ms. Carroll, since you had already taken the classes that I take has offered and you already know the consequences and are already aware, um, I know that you had stated like to make your workflow easier, but what was your other intention? I just cannot, um, I just cannot understand why you would download it without asking permission and with, and with taking the classes that have been

provided to, um, to us at statewide.

CARROLL: Jennifer Carroll, for the record. Um, the only IT classes that I take on a regular basis are the know before trainings for it. Um, and those don't really go over, um, downloading Microsoft software. So I'm not sure that those IT trainings provide the information that was needed in this participa, um, particular instance. But I mean, overall, like I said, it didn't require any type of IT administrator privileges to be input, like most blocked applications due. It didn't barracuda, it didn't do any of the normal activity that your system does when you're doing something that's unauthorized. Therefore, because it was the Microsoft product, because I do this on a daily basis, workflow efficiencies, and, um, because of those reasons, I -- I truly didn't think it was an issue. I have literally just helped build our whole entire system. So downloading a Microsoft application didn't seem farfetched.

BARRIENTOS: Madam Chair.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Yes.

BARRIENTOS: I have another -- I have another question for Ms. Carroll. Um, we also have trainings too where you, where you read the policies. Have you read the policies on the downloading where you cannot download any software?

CARROLL: Jennifer Carroll, for the record. Um, the policies that are presented for Dieter, it are presented when you are hired with the agency, which for me was 2009. So it -- it's been a long time since I've -- I've actually read those and -- and acknowledged what has kind, there have been many changes since I have read those upon my, um, the beginning of my employment with Dieter.

JEPSEN: Chair, I have a few follow up questions if I may.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Yes, please.

JEPSEN: Uh, Thomas Jepsen for the record, this is for the department. You -- the software was downloaded in September and Ms. Carroll states that an IT technician came to her, um, and that's when the whole discussion was that took place in regards to her knowing that it was then on unauthorized, if we're putting so much clout into the jeopardizing of the security of the department, why did it take so long for it to then remove this software once they were notified?

STANFIELD: I'll stand for the record. It's my understanding that the technician came out because of a printer issue Ms. Carroll was having and was advised to come back later and uninstall it. Um, instead of uninstalling the program, he was given instruction to change the settings to keep it from going to sleep at that time.

JEPSEN: But why -- why did it not then follow up? The scan was done in, um, October, and Ms. Carroll went on vacation in November. I -- I don't understand why if -- if we're talking about the security of the department, why no intention was done to get it off the computer as soon as possible.

STANFIELD: Carl Stanfield for the record, um, the intention was clear to go get it removed as soon as possible. I believe there was miscommunications back and forth between IT and Ms. Carroll and leadership. Uh, Ms. Carroll is in fact a chief of her division and the IT technicians will not override what she's telling them to do. That being said, a true time to schedule to remove just resignation.

JEPSEN: Okay. Um, and Ms. -- Ms. Carroll, you stated that it has since found a solution for you, um, and then changing the timeout settings of your computer. Um, is that correct?

CARROLL: Jennifer Carroll for the record? So once it was, uh, once the move mouse application was uninstalled from my computer, the IT tech had indicated that he could make it so that my computer wouldn't time out. And it works, but it only works for one day. Once you log out

of your system, it resets. So it's not something that I could do every day. He would have to come over and do it for me every day.

ROBERTS-LARSON: I have a question for the department, uh, regarding, uh, the timeout and automatic -- automatically timing out after so much time. Is that a security feature?

STANFIELD: Carl Stanfield for the record. Yes, ma'am, it is.

ROBERTS-LARSON: And what is the duration of time before the computer Time's out?

STANFIELD: Carl Stanfield for the record. 10 minutes.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Thank you. Do the committee members have any questions at this time? Any further questions? Okay. Um, Ms. Carroll, I'll turn it over to you to make a closing statement.

CARROLL: As we conclude today, I want to speak with the utmost respect, clarity, and conviction. Not only on my own behalf but on behalf of every dedicated state employee who strives each day to uphold the mission of this agency. Over the past 22 years, I have served the state of Nevada with integrity, professionalism, and unwavering commitment. My record reflects that no discipline, no ethical concerns, no breaches of trust, just consistent devoted service, including the enormous responsibility of safeguarding and reconciling over \$1 billion in unemployment insurance, tax revenue annually. These hearings are defining moments in state careers. The decisions made here do not simply address a single incident. They shape the future of an employee's livelihood, their opportunities to advance and their ability to continue contributing at the highest level. A permanent mark on an employee's record follows them throughout their career. It appears in jacket reviews, it stalls, promotions, and collectively, these marks beat the very employee retention deficit that the state of Nevada continues to struggle with. So I must ask, should a 22 year state employee with an impeccable record be blocked from advancing her career because she was trying to be efficient while managing billion dollar responsibilities? I believe such an outcome sets -- sets a dangerous precedence, not only for me, but for every employee who takes initiative, who tries to solve operational challenges and who acts in good faith. And that brings me to another critical concern. If the agency believed this application posed a true risk to system security, why was the scan conducted in September and yet not acted upon until December? Three months passed. Three months during which the agency knew the application existed and nevertheless took no action to remove it, despite having full capability to do so? If system harm were genuinely feared, such a delay would be inconceivable. Why then was no technical remediation performed? Why did the agency not act immediately to remove a tool that claimed was dangerous? And why was the burden placed solely on the employee who had no administrative privileges rather than on the very department asserting the wrist? The only logical conclusion is the truth supported by the evidence there was no harm, no imminent threat, no deception, no malicious intent, only a misunderstanding arising from systemic gaps, unclear processes, and the absence of training or guidance about tools pre-installed on state systems. Committee members your decision today carries weight far beyond this room. It sends message to current and future public servants about what happens when they act in good faith, communicate openly and attempt to solve operational problems responsibly. The principles of fairness, proportionality, and progressive discipline compel a decision that aligns with the facts. I acted in good faith with operational necessity. I cooperated fully with IT. The delay was caused solely by scheduled use it or lose it. Leave the application appeared authorized through the Microsoft -- Microsoft Store. There was no deception and no system harm. And the permanent reprimand will unjustly hinder a 22-year record of service and leadership. I respectfully asked this committee to rescind the written reprimand or at a minimum, reduce it to a letter of instruction.

Such a decision would appropriately address the concern while preserving the integrity of a career spent serving the people of Nevada with honor. Thank you for your time, your thorough consideration and your commitment to fairness.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Thank you, Ms. Carroll. Department closing statement.

NELSON: Um, I can start. Christine Nelson for the record, I want to start off by acknowledging Ms. Carroll. Um, I appreciate you, I appreciate the service and dedication that you have, the State of Nevada Dieter, um, your dedicated and very good employee. Um, but it's my position that the written reprimand should stand. Um, I think it was a lapse of judgment, um, on Ms. Carroll's part on downloading that amount price software. And even though it didn't result in an actual harm to the state, to the department, the potential for harm was there. And so for that I asked the written defense stand and I'll ping it to Administrator Stanfield if he has any closing statements with regards to the -- the actual technology parts.

STANFIELD: Carl Stanfield, for the record, I too agree Jennifer Carroll, you're an outstanding employee. You do an excellent job in what you provided to not only the citizens of Nevada but the employees as well. This could have provided irreparable harm to the entire state. However, um, there's a lot of referencing to the Microsoft Store and how it's allowed. The Microsoft Store is not an allowed app store. It is separate from Microsoft applications that are pre-installed in the computers that we put into service, such as Word, Excel, and PowerPoint. In fact, there's other applications Microsoft provides that we currently have to get permission to install, such as this (inaudible). But that's not only that, the Michael Balls for any further comments.

BALLS: Um, Madam Chair, Michael Balls for the record. Um, I've worked with Ms. Carroll in my po -- current position for quite some time, and I too concur that she is a -- a valued employee for state of Nevada and her -- her, uh, her duties are -- she -- she conducts her duties very well. However, I'm referring to Exhibit C, section five as the internet technology usage policy. Section five says, installing a modified software or hardware without authorization is, uh, a violation. Uh, Ms. Carroll's signed on November 9, 2009. She is the manager. She's held to a higher standard. And during Ms. Carroll's closing statement, she said she works with an account in excess of, I believe she said, a billion dollars. I would like to acknowledge the fact that, uh, a possible danger of a cyber attack on account, on an account that has an excess of a billion dollars is real legitimate and concerning. And that's why Dieter takes our IT security as serious as we do. Thank you.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Thank you, Ms. Carroll. Any follow up?

CARROLL: No.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Alright. Thank you members. It's now time for discussion. Um, so I'll start with you, uh, Mr. Jepsen.

JEPSEN: Um, yes. So Thomas Jepsen, for the record. I -- I appreciate that you came to us acknowledging the fact that you did download the software. And while the written reprimand does state and -- and your prohibitions and penalties, I think are fair, you did download something without authorization and without reaching to -- reaching out to it to find a solution. Um, though I'm -- I'm -- I'm finding it difficult on the departments, um, on the department side, in the jeopardizing of security of departmental property, I -- I'm confused as to why it took the department so long to remove such a per se, egregious software from a computer. And it was then allowed to, or her position, Ms. Carroll's position as chief was then allowed to bypass security protocol. Um, you know, that the scan was done in September or October. It wasn't removed until very later on, and a written reprimand wasn't done until December. That's quite a large gap for something that poses such a large security risk. Um, I think that is a bit of a stretch to put on this written reprimand. And

nonetheless, even with that removed, which I would, I think recommend, um, H13 does allow the department discretion in regards to an oral warning through, um, suspension determination. And I think the written reprimand is within that discretion. While I think it's something that I may not have as my profession and human resources, I may not have stretched this to a written reprimand. I think the department has that discretion to do so. Um, and I think Ms. Carroll, you were -- you should have been aware of the policies and your -- your stance that the policy was done in 2009 or you were hired in 2009 and you didn't reread the policies is I think unfair to the department. You are a manager and it is your responsibility to ensure not only you, but your team members, um, follow the policies outlined. Um, and I imagine, and I assume that the -- the Deiter has these policies out for everyone to read at any given point. Um, so I -- I believe the written reprimand should stand because the department has that discretion. Um, though I would, I think it's a stretch to include B15 as jeopardizing departmental property. Um, I think that is -- I think that's a bit of a stretch and I think harms Ms. Carroll's overall service record as she put it, her future. But in reality, the -- the department didn't set a clear expectation that the security was, was breached by lack of, or their delay in fixing this.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Thank you. Ms. Olmstead.

OLMSTEAD: I feel like the letter of instruction, which is part of a disciplinary action, it would be more appropriate for this, um, since it feels like the, uh, discipline was based on the most recent cyber attack and not a history of what happens and what kind of reprimand there is prior to that cyber attack for somebody downloading an app. And for me, I know that, and anytime you try to download anything, you have to have it come and -- and put it on. So an app that was easily downloadable, uh, as Ms. Carroll said, I think that's unfortunate that it did not know that was part of the Microsoft Office. So I think a letter of instruction would be a better option.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Vice Chair of Barrientos.

BARRIENTOS: I think, uh, the letter of reprimand should stay because the fact that she didn't consult it before downloading and second she, um, Ms. Carroll stated that she ran and billions of dollars, which makes me question, I would be more secure and try not to have downloaded that -- that because the fact that I run so well, the fact that she runs so many things. And third, she should have known her policies, um, due to her position. Thank you.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Thank you. Uh, Ms. Carroll, it sounds like all those that you work with commend you on your overall work and I commend you on a long state service career because that is a rare thing these days. Uh, so thank you for your service to the State. Um, I do think that this is just unfortunate that it was a lapse in judgment. I do think me a longstanding employee, uh, of the State in a position such as yours, I do have to echo that on the heels of the cyber attack. I think most employees, most and all State agencies have really tightened up not only their security, but also their thinking when it comes to, whereas before, if I would've thought, ah, maybe I can do this, it would give pause to say, maybe I should not. So I do think that was a lapse in judgment. Uh, I've looked at the, um, penalties, prohibitions as well, uh, that were provided. Uh, I do think that your agency was more than fair at, uh, issuing a written reprimand, especially given that the first offense for B15 could be all the way up to suspension and for H15 could be to a dismissal. And so in weighing all those factors, I do think it that the, uh, written reprimand is -- is fair. It is unfortunate. Um, however, I think it is a reasonable, uh, reaction to your action that was taken. Um, yes, I will address, there could be some concern if you're trying to promote, uh, something in your, uh, jacket. However, I would think that that would be looked at as a whole, along with the rest of your record for whomever you might be going before to, uh, make a decision on continued future, uh, promotional opportunities. With that said, um, I'm ready to

entertain a motion.

JEPSEN: Um, Thomas Jepsen, for the record, I move to allow the Red River man to stay with the recommendation that B15 be removed from the written reprimand.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Do I have a second?

BARRIENTOS: Aye. Rosina Barrientos second the motion for the (inaudible).

ROBERTS-LARSON: All those in favor say aye.

NELSON: Aye.

BARRIENTOS: Aye.

OLMSTEAD: Aye.

ROBERTS-LARSON: So the motion is to -- for the written reprimand to stand removing B15. All right. That will conclude this hearing portion for agenda item six. The written decision will follow this hearing and will be received within 45 days. Thank you all for being in attendance today and for your participation in this hearing. Moving to agenda item seven, discussion of possible action to adopt the state of Nevada Employee Management Committee's language access plan committee members. Have you had a chance to review the language access plan?

BARRIENTOS: Yes.

OLMSTEAD: Yes.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Are there any questions, concerns, changes? Hearing none I will, um, I'll go ahead and take --

PETERSON: Dakota Peterson for the record.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Yes.

PETERSON: I apologize. Sharon, I do want to point out one thing under two general policy, it mentions the committee is composed of 10 members as follows. I think that should be either six or 12 depending on, technically the committee has 12 people who are appointed to it, but there are a maximum of six that would actually appear at a meeting that's not elected a Chair. At any event, I think it should be changed from 10 to one of those numbers.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Okay. Any other changes? And Dakota Peterson, what uh, what section was that again? (inaudible) policy.

PETERSON: That's, uh, the second page of the policy under two. Correct. General policy.

ROBERTS-LARSON: So we're proposing that the language would read committee is (inaudible). Right now it's committee is composed of 10 members as follows. And so you're saying that this should be, the committee is composed of six or 12 members as follows. Six.

PETERSON: Correct. I'm looking at the statute just to decide which one I think is more appropriate. Uh, this -- the reading statute actually says consisting of six members appointed by the governor. I would go with that.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Okay.

PETERSON: And then it would be on a B three persons who are members, et cetera through AB.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Okay. So changing 10 to six and then under A and B, five to three.

PETERSON: Correct. That would be my suggestion just to keep it consistent with statute.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Okay. Any other suggested changes from any of the members or Dakota Peterson?

ROBERTS-LARSON: Okay. All those in favor of the changes proposed by Dakota

Peterson to change, uh, the wording of the committee as composed of six members as follows, three persons who are members designated as supervisors or managers in the respective departments. And three persons who are members that are not designated as supervisors or managers in respective departments. Um, say aye or nay.

BARRIENTOS: Aye.

OLMSTEAD: Aye.

NELSON: Aye.

ROBERTS-LARSON: That recommendation, uh, is approved. So overall, uh, for the rest of language access plan, uh, all in favor of adopting it with those changes in its entirety, say aye.

BARRIENTOS: Aye.

OLMSTEAD: Aye.

ROBERTS-LARSON: All right. The language Jackson plan is adopted with no language changes as we just discussed. Moving on to agenda item of eight, public comment, again, this is a, no voter action may be taken upon a matter erased or in public comment until the matter itself has been specifically included on agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Comments will be limited to five minutes per person, and person's commenting will be asked to begin by stating their names on record. Do we have any public comment or anyone wishing to make public comment here in Carson City? Seeing none. Do we have anyone in Las Vegas wishing to make public comment?

PETERSON: Dakota Peterson, for the record, I'm seeing none.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Thank you. That leads us to our next item, which is number nine, which is adjournment. I believe that we have covered all items on the agenda, and as such, we stand adjourned.

NELSON: Thank you.

ROBERTS-LARSON: Thank you everyone. Thank you.

BALLS: Excellent. Thank you.

*** END OF MEETING ***