

**STATE OF NEVADA COMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
(BATTERER'S TREATMENT CERTIFICATION COMMITTEE)**

Minutes of the Meeting

Tuesday, April 4, 2006 at 3:00p.m.

Location:

Office of the Attorney General
Grant Sawyer Building, Suite 4500
Las Vegas, Nevada

Video Conference Access:

Office of the Attorney General
100 North Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada

Please Note: The Batterers Treatment Committee may address agenda items out of sequence to accommodate persons appearing before the Committee or to aid the efficiency or effectiveness of the meeting. The Committee may convene in closed session to consider the character, alleged misconduct, professional competence or physical or mental health of a person (NRS 241.030).

***Asterisks (*) denote items on which Committee may take action.
Action by the Committee on an item may be to approve,
deny, amend, or table.***

1. ***Call to order, roll call of members and introduction of new members.**
Meeting called to order by Kathleen Brooks at 3:10 p.m.

Members Present

Kathleen Brooks
Tim Hamilton
Brad Simpson
Patricia Lynch
Noel Waters
Walt Dimitroff

Others in Attendance

Mike Freda

Attorney General's Office

Henna Rasul – Deputy Attorney General
Kareen Prentice – Ombudsman
Jennifer Kandt – Administrative Coordinator

Kathleen welcomed Tim and Brad to the Committee and thanked them for committing to do this work.

2. *Review, amend, and approve Minutes of meetings.

Kathleen said that item a. on the agenda should actually read August 19th instead of August 18th. Patricia asked if the Committee could wait until the end of the meeting to approve the minutes because she felt some people were still reading the minutes, but would be finished by the end of the meeting. Kathleen asked if the rest of the Committee members were comfortable with reviewing items out of order.

This item was returned to after item 8.

a. August 18, 2005 Meeting

Kathleen noted that the minutes are actually from August 19th, not 18th. She asked if there were any changes or comments to these minutes.

Motion: Noel moved to approve the minutes as written.

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried.

b. September 15, 2005 Hiring Subcommittee Meeting

Kathleen said that these minutes were from the interviews of Frank Karr and Victoria Coleman. Patricia asked legal counsel if the Committee should approve minutes if they were not part of the subcommittee. Henna said she thought that the subcommittee would probably approve those minutes. Kathleen asked for a motion to table until they could figure out whether these needed to be approved or not.

Motion: Tim moved to table this item.

2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried.

c. September 21, 2005 Meeting

Patricia said that she came to this meeting a little late, but did attend, so her name should be added to members present.

Motion: Noel moved to approve the minutes as amended.

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried.

d. December 9, 2005 Meeting

Patricia asked who Debora was. Kathleen said she was one of the newer members, fills the victim advocate slot, and is also a rural

member. Patricia asked if Debora's name had an "h" at the end. Jennifer said that it did not. Kathleen asked for a motion.

Motion: Walt moved to approve the minutes.

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried.

3. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding regulation changes proposed in workshops held on August 17, 2004, November 18, 2004, and April 4, 2006.

Kathleen said that the Committee spent considerable time reviewing the regulations and adjusting the language. Kathleen asked Henna if another workshop was needed or if the regulations just needed to be re-written. Henna said they would need to be re-written incorporating all of the comments from today's workshop, then the Committee could decide if another workshop was needed or if they wanted to just submit them to the legislature. Kathleen asked for a motion to approve the regulations as changed. Patricia said some of the changes were confusing and the Committee might like to first see the changes. Henna said that they will hold off on making a decision until the Committee can see the actual changes. Kathleen said that the Committee will then table voting on this item.

4. Budget report by Kareen Prentice, Domestic Violence Ombudsman.

Kareen handed out an expense breakdown and said she was not handing out a budget, just a report on what had been spent. Kareen said that she could prepare a budget for what future expenses might be or what the Committee wants them to be. Kareen said that at this time she only did a breakdown of what has been spent for this fiscal year not including March or anything outstanding from Dr. Hughes. Jennifer said that there was an invoice that had been recently submitted by Dr. Hughes. Kathleen asked Jennifer if she knew what the amount was. Kareen asked if it was the \$8,000 invoice. Jennifer said it was. Kathleen asked if then \$30,000 had been spent. Kareen said that was correct. Kareen said that the total fees collected to date from July to the beginning of March was \$53,915.45, which gave them approximately \$74,000. She said there was also approximately \$100,000 plus that rolls over every year. Patricia asked if the \$100,000 was in addition to the amounts shown. Kareen said that there was over \$100,000 that she did not put in the report at all as it is in a rollover. Kareen said that if the Committee spent more than \$69,000 it would come from that \$100,000 plus. Patricia asked if the \$100,000 was just for this Committee alone. Kareen said it was for this Committee and the ombudsman. Patricia said that she thought there were two accounts. Kathleen asked how that money could be spent because the regulations indicate that any money left over can go to assist battered women in some way, and the Committee has never done that. Patricia said there were 4 different things the Committee could do with the money. Brad said that the Committee should have financial statements or budgets on everything the

Committee has and has access to and how it can be used. Kareen agreed. Patricia asked about using funds to help provide training in the rural areas or even subsidize a program in Ely which seems to be a place which can't keep anything together. Patricia said that as far as the Committee knew, they never had any money. Kareen asked if the Committee had ever seen a breakdown of the \$100,000 before. Several Committee members said no. Patricia said they were all surprised. Kareen said that this was her first time doing this, but that what was explained to her was that the \$100,000 was not even included in the approximately \$38,000 they have left for the year. Kathleen said that was great and thanked Kareen.

5. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding training for State of Nevada Rural Mental Health.

Kathleen said that she contacted Nevada Rural Mental Health because she knew that there were a lot of concerns in the last legislative session. SB 75, 76, and 77 proposed by Senator McGuinness were a great concern to the Committee and the State. The bills created a change in the rural counties and how often they attended treatment. Kathleen said that she was referred to Dale who retired, and then was referred to Ray Kendall. She spoke with Rebecca Thomas, former chair of the Committee and she said that she had met with Dale and Ray extensively and had developed a pilot program that would be started in Ely. Kathleen said that Rebecca also indicated that Ely was going to be starting its own program. Kathleen said that Paula Berkeley was instrumental in pushing the Rural Mental Health Clinic to be involved. Kathleen said that Paula asked for a letter from the Committee, and she took it upon herself to adjust some of the things Paula had written in support of \$50,000 going to the Rural Mental Health Clinic so that their staff could be trained as facilitators for perpetrator treatment. Kathleen said that according to Rebecca there was supposed to be \$50,000 in the pot before, but the information she received was that there was no money in the pot, according to Mike Weldon, head of Nevada Rural Mental Health. She said that Mike Weldon was very surprised by her phone call, and didn't know what she was talking about, which made her confused as to all the ins and outs. Kathleen asked if Walt could add some information since he had been contacted by Nevada Rural Mental Health. Walt said that he was contacted to make a proposal to provide training in Elko for 4-6 staff to bring them up to speed with training, observation hours, and CEU's. He said that he is still waiting to hear whether his proposal was accepted. Kathleen said that Elko has two DV programs, and asked if they were just going to meet in Elko. Walt said that they were just going to meet in Elko, and his understanding was that they wanted to have programs up and running in Winnemucca, Ely, and Wendover. Walt said that there was also a separate proposal for a town down south which he thought was Pioche. Kathleen asked if he meant Mesquite, and that Safe Nest had a program there. Kathleen asked if he was referring to Pahrump. Walt said that maybe it was Pahrump. Kathleen said she made it clear to Paula Berkeley that the Committee

could not get involved in training but had an interest in supporting the effort. Kathleen said that Paula came up with a rough draft of the letter, then Kathleen re-wrote it, and had Jennifer send it over to Paula so that she could get it to the IFC today. Kathleen said that she told Paula that they would agendaize this item, and discuss it. Kathleen said that she felt Nevada Rural Mental Health was “all over the map” with who they have contacted, and doesn’t feel that it is the Committee’s responsibility to keep them on track. She said she wanted to hear from the Committee members, and said she also wants to make it possible for rural areas to go back to having weekly groups as opposed to bi-weekly groups. Patricia said she couldn’t tell exactly what the Committee was offering in terms of assistance, and asked if the Committee was offering to assist with funding, or just their expertise. Kathleen said that actually the Committee is just saying that they know this is important and supports the effort, and we want the IFC to give the Rural Mental Health Clinics \$50,000. Kathleen said that this was something that the Committee has been discussing for years, and said that Paula had wanted Noel to attend the IFC meeting, and Kathleen said the Committee would do a letter instead. Noel asked about page 2 and who “the department” is referring to. Kathleen said that they had approximately \$200,000 and they had four programs that they were going to give that money to, so the department would be the Rural Mental Health clinics. Noel asked if Mike Weldon was the Nevada State Welfare chief. Patricia said she thought he was from human resources. Kathleen said that he referred her to other people. She had also talked to Rebecca who had done quite a bit of work on a budget and pilot program, but she wasn’t sure what had happened to that. Noel asked if a motion of some sort was needed, and if Kathleen was wanting an endorsement of some kind. Kathleen said that would be nice.

Motion: Noel moved that the Committee support and endorse any provisions that are possible to encourage the rural mental health clinics to undertake the role of getting training and expertise in batterer’s treatment provisions to rural counties.

2nd: Tim.

All in favor. Motion carried. Walt abstained.

Kathleen asked that Walt keep her up to date on whether his proposal is accepted or not. She told him that he might want to connect with Sue Mueshke from the Network because she indicated that there might be some funds there to assist with training.

6. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding contract for Dr. Alfred Hughes, site evaluator. The Committee may consider the character, alleged misconduct, professional competence or physical or mental health of this individual.

Kathleen asked if everyone had a chance to review the contract. She explained to the new people on the Committee that Dr. Hughes was the

only person to apply as the independent contractor and has worked for the Committee for four years. She said that he has been very helpful in reviewing the programs. Jennifer said that she wanted the Committee to be aware that Dr. Hughes' rates did increase slightly from \$1240 to \$1285 per day. Tim said that the number of programs also increased. Patricia asked if all of the programs have had a site visit this year. Jennifer said she didn't think so, that they were reviewed possibly once every two years. Patricia said that ideally all of the programs would want to be reviewed every year, and asked if this contract required that every program get reviewed this fiscal year. Jennifer said that it did not, that the contract requires between 23 and 28 site reviews over the next two years. Walt asked how many programs the Committee had. Jennifer said she wasn't sure, but that they were listed at the end of the contract. Patricia said that she counted 29 which would be close. Noel said that the NAC requires the Committee to inspect at least annually every treatment provider, which the Committee has previously discussed in terms of Committee members possibly doing site visits. Noel said the fact is that the Committee has not been able to accomplish that requirement, so this might be a good time to amend the NAC to say every two years (228.130). Kathleen said she thought that the Committee has done well in that they have gotten programs inspected, and doing so every year would be difficult unless Committee members are willing to commit to doing inspections themselves. Patricia said that the Committee had previously not had any money to pay for travel of the Committee members. She said that is why they were so happy to hear that the Committee has so much money. Kathleen said that they have money now. Patricia said she didn't feel she was qualified to the level that Dr. Hughes is to do inspections. Brad asked what the purpose of the inspections was. Patricia said the inspection was to insure that the programs were in compliance. Kathleen suggested that the Committee decide at this point whether they want to renew Dr. Hughes' contract, and then at the next meeting discuss how they want to make changes. Patricia said that since the Committee had more money, that perhaps they can renegotiate with Dr. Hughes to provide more sight visits. Henna said they could revise the contract later. Walt asked how many programs he usually audited. Jennifer told him the previous amount was fewer, and she would check on that. Patricia said that she had received an e-mail from a previous member of the Committee who is now living in Atlanta and said he would be willing to work with Dr. Hughes. Jennifer read from Dr. Hughes' proposal which said, "In the last proposal, I suggested a daily fee of \$1210, maximum of \$22,000 per year. I stated that I would visit between 22 and 24 sites over two years, and even though I have not yet finished all of those reviews yet, I anticipate that I will have evaluated 25 sites by June 2006. Therefore, instead of needing 18 days per year, I may need 19 days to complete between 23 and 28 sites over the two year period. I am now suggesting a daily rate of \$1285, with a maximum of \$24,415 per year." Patricia said that one part of the contract indicated \$24,415 per year, and another part seems to be \$24,415 for the term of the contract which is two years. Noel asked how many days and

the daily rate. Kathleen said 19 days at \$1285. Noel said that 19 days times \$1285 came to \$24,415 for the two years. There was some discussion on whether the \$24,415 was per year or for the term of the contract.

Motion: Patricia moved to approve Dr. Hughes' contract and to also authorize the chair or legal counsel to open discussions with Dr. Hughes on possibly amending the contract in order to provide yearly site reviews if the Committee has enough funding.

Kathleen clarified that the motion included negotiating further with Dr. Hughes and then bringing any further proposals in front of the Committee.

2nd: Noel

All in favor. Motion carried.

Jennifer asked if she should ask Dr. Hughes if he would be willing to submit another proposal. Kathleen said yes, and that she had a discussion with him where he indicated that he was willing to work with whoever does the rural programs and things that have to do with the AOC and the programs being evaluated.

7. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding commemorating Edna Harris.

Kathleen said that Edna died this year. Edna worked closely with Kathleen before there were regulations. She was on the Southern Nevada Domestic Violence Task Force subcommittee that worked on the standards, so she had a long history with the Committee. Kathleen said that she thought the Committee could do something to honor her. She suggested a plaque being sent to the family, and said that the Committee did send flowers but wanted to do more if the Committee would like to. Patricia said that a plaque is nice, but maybe since we have money, and if the Committee could do something with the money in her honor, it would be a living, ongoing tribute to her. Tim said possibly a memorial fund. Patricia said it was obviously state money, but it could be in her honor. Kathleen suggested an emergency fund of some sort. Patricia said it would be great if the money could go to victims. Kathleen said she liked that better than a plaque. She asked for any other ideas. Brad suggested a scholarship for training of Nevada Rural Mental Health. Brad asked if we should table this item until we can come back with specific ideas on how we can move forward on this. Kathleen said that would be fine. Henna said a motion would need to be made to do that.

Motion: Brad moved to table item 7 until the Committee could determine the most appropriate way to proceed with this commendation.

Patricia asked if the motion could be amended to have the chair and whatever staff is appropriate to look at possible ways to commemorate Edna.

2nd: Tim

Jennifer asked for clarification on whether the Committee was wanting her to come up with ideas on how to commemorate Edna. Brad said the Committee was looking at different ideas on how to do it, such as emergency funding for victims, and training for Rural Mental Health, and maybe those should be itemized and a plan developed that can be brought back for the next meeting. Kathleen said that Patricia suggested Kathleen and Jennifer do that. Tim asked that if anyone had ideas, then they could e-mail them to Jennifer. Kathleen said that they needed to come up with a list, and the Committee could vote on what they felt was most appropriate. Noel said that Chapter 228 does allow for the Committee to provide for victim services, so he wondered if they could approve a regular budget line item for whatever amount, to the extent that funds remain available to set up an Edna Harris victim assistance fund that allows the ombudsman to process the requests for applications for certain services that might help victims. Noel said that we could go about approving it as a regular line item budget. Kathleen said she liked that idea, and liked the idea of a scholarship for victims that they could apply for possibly going back to school or dental work. Patricia said that they would have to stay within the statutes for providing the money to victims. Tim said that the Committee would have to develop a process for the victims to access the money. Noel said the statute says that the ombudsman has the ability to spend those funds anyway.

All in favor. Motion carried.

Kathleen said that she also wanted to thank Edna for her friendship, her work, her commitment, and said that she missed her.

8. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding video-conferenced Committee meetings versus face-to-face Committee meetings.

Jennifer handed out a cost comparison. She said that this item had been on several other agendas, and had been tabled. She said that in previous discussions, some Committee members said they felt a disconnect from the rest of the members, and preferred face-to-face meetings. Brad said that this item had been raised with the Prevention Council as well and they prefer in-person meetings. The Prevention Council decided to have half of their meetings via video-conference and half in person which is a nice balance. Jennifer said that was suggested in previous meetings. Kathleen asked for more ideas. Patricia said that any type of hearing should be done in person because of the amount of communication that is non-verbal. She said the decision of video-conference versus face-to-face would depend on the nature of the meeting. Walt said he felt face-to-face

was better especially with the issues of trying to hear Mike Freda on the equipment. Noel said he wondered what Mike Freda thought. Mike said he had not been able to hear Walt, Noel, or Patricia during the entire meeting. Tim said that was one of the problems. Noel asked Mike Freda how he felt about the video-conferencing. Mike said that he thought face-to-face was better, but sometimes there are constraints with that. Kathleen said that her preference was face-to-face. Tim agreed. Kathleen said that unless it was a very short agenda, she would like face-to-face. Noel said that since sometimes Jennifer has a difficult time getting everyone to agree to a meeting, maybe a video-conference would mean the difference between having no meeting at all. Jennifer suggested that she and Kathleen could make that decision based on what was on the agenda.

Motion: Noel moved to continue meeting in person especially when having any licensure or administrative hearings, but allow the chair to set up video-conference meetings especially if there are quorum issues.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

At this point, the Committee returned to item 2 on the agenda.

9. Comments from Kathleen Brooks, Committee Chair.

Kathleen said she had some questions and hoped that this would be an appropriate place to bring these items up. She said that the meeting minutes from September 21st indicate that Great Basin is on probation for 18 months, and were to pay \$1000 to the Committee. She asked for an update on that. Henna said that the attorney for Great Basin called her the week after the hearing asking where to send the check. Kareen stated that there was a deposit of \$1000 in November which could have been from September or October. Kathleen asked if they were being monitored in any way. Jennifer said that as far as she was aware, there had not been a site visit. She said that the minutes from the September meeting state that there would be site visits by Dr. Hughes or a Committee member, probably Rebecca Thomas, but that she was not aware of any visits at this time. Henna said that any further discussions on this would need to be put on the agenda for the next meeting. Kathleen said she was concerned about the lack of follow through and would like to see this on the next agenda.

10. Public Comment.

Mike Freda asked what the discussion would be for the meeting on the following day. Kathleen said that the Committee would be discussing renewals, corrective action plans, and CEU's. Mike asked about the regulations. Kathleen said that the regulations were discussed earlier at the workshop and the vote was tabled. Mike asked how he could go about submitting recommendations for regulations. Kathleen told him he

could submit a letter. Mike asked if the letter would be sent to Jennifer. Kathleen said yes. Jennifer said she had sent out the notice for the workshop 15 days ago, and on that notice it indicated that any suggestions for changes could be sent to the Committee in writing.

Patricia said that the meeting for the Prevention Council would be July 21st in Winnemucca and that the legislative committee is going to hold a workshop so that input and comments can be gathered from rural providers. She said that the Prevention Council and this Committee would have to submit reports to the legislature and they have to specifically survey the rural judges and include their comments verbatim. Kathleen said that the ARC also has to do a report. Patricia said that if anyone wanted to have any input on the survey that was going out, they could let her know. She said that some of the responsibilities that were placed on the Prevention Council probably should have been under this Committee, but the bill was stuck on the Prevention Council. Kathleen said she did talk to the AOC and since the next meeting was going to be in Reno, she was going to invite Robin Sweet to talk about what she is doing in terms of evaluating batterer's treatment programs. Kathleen said that herself and Sue Mueshke had been invited to sit on the oversight committee for that. Patricia said that the AOC has to report back on the effectiveness of the batterer treatment programs. Kathleen said that it had started out that they would just review rural programs, but now included all programs.

Adjournment at 4:30 p.m.

**STATE OF NEVADA COMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
(BATTERER'S TREATMENT CERTIFICATION COMMITTEE)**

**MINUTES OF WORKSHOP
REGULATION WORKSHOP – Las Vegas**

Tuesday, April 4, 2006 at 11:00 a.m.

Location:
Grant Sawyer State Building
555 E. Washington Avenue, Suite 3100
Las Vegas, Nevada

Video-Conference Access:
Office of the Attorney General
100 N. Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada

***Asterisks (*) denote items on which the Committee took action.
Action by the Committee on an item may be to approve, deny, amend, or table.***

1. *Call to order and roll call of members

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Kathleen Brooks at 11: 45. The following committee members were physically present:

Kathleen Brooks
Brad Simpson
Noel Waters

Tim Hamilton
Patricia Lynch
Walt Dimitroff

Additional staff present:

Henna Rasul, Deputy Attorney General representing Committee on Domestic Violence
Jennifer Kandt, Administrative Coordinator, Committee on Domestic Violence
Kareen Prentice, Domestic Violence Ombudsman

Members of the public present:

Sandra Dietrich-Hughes, S.A.F.E House

NAC 228.100 Application; requirements; abbreviated application for additional program; verification of information. (NRS 228.470)

1. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 4, an organization which desires to obtain a certificate for a program must submit an application to the committee on a form provided by the committee, including, without limitation:

(a) Proof that the organization has satisfied the requirements of subsection 3; and

(b) A copy of the curriculum and the instructional materials that will be used in the program and that satisfy the requirements set forth in NAC 228.185.

2. The application must be signed by:

(a) The person who will manage and control the organization; and

(b) The person who will be the supervisor of treatment for the program.

3. To obtain a certificate, an organization which operates a program must:

(a) Employ, or retain as an independent contractor, one or more providers of treatment who are qualified pursuant to NAC 228.110 to treat persons who commit domestic violence;

(b) Employ, or retain as an independent contractor, at least one supervisor of treatment who is qualified pursuant to NAC 228.110 to supervise the treatment of persons who commit domestic violence;

(c) Satisfy the requirements of NAC 228.010 to 228.225, inclusive;

(d) Provide treatment:

(1) To persons who have been convicted of a first offense that constitutes domestic violence within the immediately preceding 7 years which includes, at a minimum, weekly counseling sessions which meet not less than 1 1/2 hours per week for not less than 6 months.

(2) However, a court may allow a person convicted of domestic violence who lives more than 70 miles from the nearest certified domestic violence treatment provider to participate in domestic violence counseling sessions on a bi-weekly basis (versus the current requirement of 1.5 hours a week) for a total of at least 6 hours per month.

(3) A person convicted of a first offense that constitutes domestic violence shall only be allowed 2 absences within the 6 month counseling period; and

(e) Provide treatment:

(1) To persons who have been convicted of a second offense that constitutes domestic violence within the immediately preceding 7 years which includes, at a minimum, weekly counseling sessions which meet not less than 1 1/2 hours per week for 12 months.

(2) However, a court may allow a person convicted of domestic violence who lives more than 70 miles from the nearest certified domestic violence treatment provider to participate in domestic violence counseling sessions on a bi-weekly basis (versus the current requirement of 1.5 hours a week) for a total of at least 6 hours per month.

(3) A person convicted of a second offense that constitutes domestic violence shall only be allowed 4 absences within the 12 month counseling period.

4. In lieu of complying with the provisions of subsections 1 and 2, an organization that operates a program certified pursuant to this section and wishes to obtain a certificate for another program may submit an abbreviated application to the committee if the curriculum and instructional materials for the additional program are substantially similar to the curriculum and instructional materials used in the certified program. An application submitted pursuant to this subsection must be on a form provided by the committee and be signed by:

(a) The person who will manage and control the organization; and

(b) The person who will be the supervisor of treatment for the additional program.

5. By submitting an application pursuant to subsection 1 or 4, an applicant authorizes the committee to investigate as it determines is necessary to verify the information set forth in the application. Upon the request of the committee, the applicant must submit verification of that information.

(Added to NAC by Com. on Domestic Violence by R161-97, eff. 1-6-98; A by R213-99, 8-1-2000)

Henna said that several of the items are based on legislative changes, and other items are just from past workshop discussions. Henna said that the changes to 228.100 have to occur due to changes from SB77. Kathleen said that we would discuss that further in our meeting. Patricia asked if these were the requirements that came out of the last legislative session. Henna said that 228.100 is – the other items are not. She said that some of the items listed do not have any changes because there was no definitive decisions that came from the discussions. She said that she made changes from the prior two workshops where decisions were definitive. Kathleen asked if there were any comments on NAC.100 having to do with the rural areas (people living more than 70 miles from the treatment program being able to do 6 hours of treatment per month). Patricia asked if 1(d)(3) was included in the legislation pertaining to the number of absences or if that was a suggestion from Dr. Hughes. Henna said that could have been part of Dr. Hughes discussion. Henna said that she wanted the record to reflect that on subsection (e)(1), that the period should be bold because that is a change. Patricia said that she sees where Dr. Hughes has requested that the Committee put in a certain number of absences. Kathleen said that it would be discussed later. Patricia said that it is here, but she could come back to it. Patricia said she would like to hear from the treatment providers as to what that means, and what happens if they don't comply. Kathleen said that this subject is also in another section and we would discuss it then. Kathleen asked if there was anything else in NAC 228.100. There were no responses.

Chapter 228 of NAC is hereby amended by adding thereto the provisions set forth as sections NAC 228.105, NAC 228.107 and NAC 228.108.

NAC 228.105. Certification of a program located in another state; attendance by a Nevada resident. (NRS 228.470)

1. The committee will authorize a person who lives in Nevada to obtain domestic violence counseling in a neighboring state if the neighboring state is the closest provider of certified domestic violence counseling.

2. The out of state program must comply with all requirements of NAC 228.104.

Henna said that 105, 107, and 108 are all additions. She said that these were created from past discussions, so if the Committee does not want to incorporate them, that's fine, or if they want to make changes, that is also fine. Henna said that the purpose of the workshop is discussion. Patricia asked where 228.105 section 2 came from. She said that they typically have not required programs to comply with the requirements of our state, but with their own state. She said she wants to make sure that it is easy to certify those programs. Kathleen said that she felt that this was a change in language, and she is not sure that we've required out of state programs to comply. Tim said that we certify them for a year. Henna referred to 228.104. She said that for people who live in Nevada, but the closest treatment provider is another state. Patricia said that was referring to 1 and that was fine. Walt asked what 104 said. Noel said that 104 says that the Committee will certify for one year a program that is located in another state and provides treatment to a person who is a resident of that state in order and was ordered to participate in a program by a court of this state if the program is a) certified by and in good standing of that state or b) is not certified by a regulatory agency in that state that is approved by the court that sentenced the offender. And 2. Upon request, the Committee will renew the certification of such a program. So Noel said that would fit because all we are saying is that a Nevada resident who wants to attend an out of state program, for instance someone who wants to go to Utah, and the court allows them to do so as long as that program is certified in the State of Utah or is approved by the court in Nevada it is ok. Henna said that is basically it, so if it needs to be

more clearly stated you could do that. Kathleen said the Committee could more clearly state or eliminate that and state that they “must comply with all our requirements”. She said the Committee had avoided that in the past thinking that it might create difficulty. Henna said that was fine, and the Committee could come up with different language. Patricia said she thought it should be the same language but take out “who is a resident of that state” because we’re saying now that people who live in our state can actually go out of state. Patricia said she would use the language that is in 104, but just say “an offender” and take out “who is a resident of that state”. Then just incorporate that into number 102. Noel said that we should just repeat the conditions that are already in 228.104 and just repeat them in 105 where it says the program either has to be certified by that state or it has to be approved by a judge in this state. Noel said to just repeat it again. Kathleen asked if there were any other comments.

NAC 228.107. Fees. (NRS 228.470)

1. A program must pay the following fees for certification:

(a) Certified program:

- (1) Initial application \$150**
- (2) Renewal application..... \$ 50**

Patricia asked if the Committee had a current fee structure. Kathleen said no. Patricia asked if the Committee was within its guidelines to apply fees. Henna said yes. Jennifer asked if fees needed to be addressed in the NRS before they can be addressed in the NAC. Patricia said that she thought as long as the amounts were equal to an amount required to process the application, that we would be fine. Henna said that she has seen other boards who have set out their fees in NAC. Patricia asked if \$50 was sufficient for a renewal application, or should we make those higher. Henna said she came up with the amounts from looking at other boards. Brad said he felt the amounts were low as it takes less time and effort to be certified as a therapist, but costs more. Henna said it was up to the Committee. Sandra Dietrich-Hughes said applying fees was fine, but providers will want to know what it is for. Brad said that payment was for review of the qualifications. Brad said he felt \$150 was also low. Patricia said that she felt \$50 was a drop in the bucket. Tim said we could go off of Dr. Hughes’ charges for reviewing a program. He said we could use that as a comparison point. Jennifer said that Dr. Hughes made \$1285 a day. Tim said that was per program, so that could be a benchmark. Patricia said that when you get in trouble with fees is when you can’t justify them. But the Committee could justify them with paperwork, postage, administrative services. Noel said that he felt the fees were very modest in terms of reviewing and monitoring programs, and proposed \$200 for applications, and \$100 for renewals. Patricia said she felt \$250 and \$150. Jennifer asked if there would be any issues since the Committee currently is funded by court assessments. Henna said no. Kathleen said that the budget would reflect where that money came from. Noel said it is very costly to monitor compliance with the on-site visits, but he is hesitant to ear-mark funds for a particular cause. Patricia again said that \$250 and \$150 would be appropriate.

NAC 228.108. Payment and handling of fees and remittances; lapse of applications. (NRS 228.470)

1. Fees and remittances to the Committee must be made by a money order, bank draft or check payable to the Committee. Remittances in currency or coin are made wholly at the risk of the remitter, and the Committee assumes no responsibility for a loss thereof.

- 2. Payment in full of all required fees must accompany each initial application or renewal.**
- 3. The Committee will establish bank accounts necessary for handling of fees and remittances. The accounts will require for the transaction of business the signature of:
 - (a) Two members of the Committee; or**
 - (b) Any member of the Committee and the Administrative Coordinator.****
- 4. An application for certification on which no action has been taken by the applicant for 1 year after its receipt by the board will be considered by the Committee to have lapsed. The Committee will not refund any fee related to an application which has lapsed.**

Henna said that she added this because she had looked at other boards and usually in a fee structure, this language exists immediately after the fee structure. Patricia asked what the current process for spending money was, and if we were setting up something different. Jennifer said she gave all invoices to Elaine in the Attorney General's office, but did not know what happened after that point. Kareen said that Elaine handled that portion of payment, but the Ombudsman handled tracking. Patricia said that she did not want to set up something different because a Committee member would be needed to spend the money. Since we are already in the Attorney General's Office under their structure, we didn't want to set up something where we couldn't pay. Henna said she would look into whether the monies received from this may be able to go into whatever account the court assessment fees are going into. Patricia said she felt that would make sense. Patricia said she didn't want to create a situation where someone had to chase down a Committee member in order to pay someone.

NAC 228.110 Qualifications for supervisors of treatment and providers of treatment. (NRS 228.470)

1. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 2, a person may be employed, or retained as an independent contractor, in the position of a supervisor of treatment at a program if he:
 - (a) Possesses a master's or doctorate degree in a field of clinical human services from an accredited college or university;
 - (b) Except as otherwise provided in subsection 3, is licensed in good standing in this state:
 - (1) As a psychologist pursuant to chapter 641 of NRS;
 - (2) As a marriage and family therapist pursuant to chapter 641A of NRS;
 - (3) As a clinical social worker pursuant to chapter 641B of NRS; or
 - (4) To practice medicine pursuant to chapter 630 of NRS and practices psychiatry;
 - (c) Has at least 2 years of experience in a supervisory capacity in the provision of services to victims of domestic violence or in the treatment of persons who commit domestic violence;
 - (d) Has satisfactorily completed at least 60 hours of formal training in domestic violence which includes at least 30 hours of training in the provision of services to victims of domestic violence and at least 30 hours of training in the provision of treatment to persons who commit domestic violence.
Consideration of providers' training and education level may be taken into account, in lieu of some or all of the 60 hours of formal training in domestic violence requirement;
 - (e) Has satisfactorily completed at least 60 hours of in-service training;
 - (f) Has never been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude;
 - (g) Is free of violence in his life; and
 - (h) Is not currently an abuser of drugs or alcohol.

2. The provisions of paragraphs (c) and (e) of subsection 1 do not apply to a person who is employed, or retained as an independent contractor, in the position of a supervisor of treatment at a program on August 1, 2000.

3. A person who does not comply with the requirements of paragraph (b) of subsection 1 may be employed, or retained as an independent contractor, in the position of a supervisor of treatment at a program if:

(a) He submits a written request to the committee that includes, without limitation, a statement concerning his work history, education and experience;

(b) He participates in an interview with the committee; and

(c) The committee determines that he is qualified to be employed, or retained as an independent contractor, in the position of a supervisor of treatment at a program.

4. Within 120 days after the committee receives a request pursuant to subsection 3, the committee will provide written notice of its approval or denial of the request to the person who submitted the request. If the committee denies the request, the notice will include the reasons for the denial of the request.

5. A person who is employed, or retained as an independent contractor, in the position of a supervisor of treatment at a program pursuant to subsection 3 is qualified as a supervisor of treatment until he is no longer employed, or retained as an independent contractor, by an organization that operates a program if he meets the annual continuing education requirements set forth in NAC 228.210.

6. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 7, a person may be employed, or retained as an independent contractor, in the position of a provider of treatment at a program if he:

(a) Possesses a bachelor's degree or more advanced degree;

(b) Is supervised by a supervisor of treatment who is qualified pursuant to subsection 1, 2 or 3 and that supervision includes, without limitation, meeting with the supervisor of treatment in person at least once each month and having the supervisor of treatment submit annual reports of satisfactory performance to the committee;

(c) Has satisfactorily completed at least 60 hours of formal training in domestic violence that includes, without limitation, at least 30 hours of training in the provision of services to victims of domestic violence and at least 30 hours of training in the provision of treatment to persons who commit domestic violence. ***Consideration of providers' training and education level may be taken into account, in lieu of some or all of the 60 hours of formal training in domestic violence requirement;***

(d) Has satisfactorily completed at least 60 hours of in-service training;

(e) Has never been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude;

(f) Is free of violence in his life; and

(g) Is not currently an abuser of drugs or alcohol.

7. A person may be employed, or retained as an independent contractor, in the position of a provider of treatment at a program although he does not meet the requirements of paragraph (a) of subsection 6, if the program is located in a county whose population is less than 50,000 and the person proves, to the satisfaction of the committee, that:

(a) There is not another program located within a 50-mile radius of the program, or within the city or county in which the program is located;

(b) He possesses the necessary skills and training to perform his job; and

(c) He has satisfied all other requirements of this section.

8. A person who is employed, or retained as an independent contractor, in the position of a provider of treatment at a program pursuant to subsection 7 is qualified as a provider of treatment for a period which ends on the expiration date of the certificate issued for the program pursuant to NAC 228.100.

9. One-third of the in-service training required by this section may be completed by observing a videotape of a group counseling session if:

(a) The in-service training is completed in a county whose population is less than 50,000 and which is located more than 50 miles from a program;

(b) The videotape has been approved by the committee; and

(c) The person receiving the in-service training meets in person with at least one provider of treatment or supervisor of treatment who is familiar with the contents of the videotape to discuss the group counseling session that was recorded on the videotape.

10. As used in this section:

(a) "Free of violence in his life" means that a person:

(1) Does not engage in acts of physical violence;

(2) Does not verbally abuse, threaten, coerce or intimidate other persons on a regular basis;

(3) Does not deny personal responsibility for his actions or blame other persons for his mistakes on a regular basis; and

(4) Lives his life in a manner that is capable of serving as a model of nonviolent behavior.

(b) "In-service training":

(1) Means participation or observation of a group counseling session that:

(I) Is conducted for offenders in a program;

(II) Complies with the requirements of NAC 228.010 to 228.225, inclusive; and

(III) Includes a discussion reviewing the group counseling session that is conducted in person with both providers of treatment or the provider of treatment and the supervisor of treatment acting as a provider of treatment who conducted the group counseling session.

(2) Does not include the conducting of a group counseling session by a provider of treatment or a supervisor of treatment acting as a provider of treatment.

(3) Consideration of providers' training and education level may be taken into account in lieu of some or all of the 60 hours of in-service training requirement.

(Added to NAC by Com. on Domestic Violence by R161-97, eff. 1-6-98; A by R213-99, 8-1-2000)

Discussion of 1(d) Kathleen said this dealt with consideration of training and education in lieu of 60 hours of treatment. Patricia asked if someone could explain this. Kathleen said that instead of the structure we have where you have to attend 30 hours of classroom for victim training and 30 hours for perpetrator training, that some of their prior training and education level would be taken into account in lieu of the 60 hours. Kathleen said that she was opposed to changing that and she had read some of the earlier comments from other regulatory meetings and felt that 60 hours is not all that much. Brad agreed that 60 hours was not much. Patricia asked what the reasoning was for this, and whether it had anything to do with the rurals. Tim said he felt that 60 hours was not enough, but he also said this could work if the training and education was specific to domestic violence. Brad asked if this issue had ever been raised before. Walt said that if we allowed this, someone may not have any domestic violence training at all. Noel said that this is for the supervisors, and he said that he would be more comfortable if this was for a provider, but felt that 60 hours was very modest. Walt said that he didn't think the majority of providers had any problems with the current standards for CEU's. Kathleen said that a lot more trainings are available now, and that people are taking

advantage of trainings offered in California, so it isn't that difficult for people to get the training. Kathleen asked if everyone was in agreement to remove that item. Everyone agreed.

Discussion of 6(c) Kathleen said that it was even more important for rookies to get the training. Tim said that he felt providers would need even more training, being newer to the field. Tim and Walt said they felt this was not going to work. Patricia said she agreed but said that there was a lot of concern about the rurals being able to get the required training. Kathleen said that people out in the rurals did not have to have a degree. Walt said the same amount of training is required (for the rurals). Kathleen asked if everyone agreed to take this out as well. Noel said the only problem he still had was getting treatment providers out in the rural areas. Noel said he wondered if there might be some benefit to relaxing the requirements for treatment providers in the rural areas. He said that we could probably word that going into the next section with some sort of exception for the rurals, with a possible time limit saying we can allow that for the first year of certification. Kathleen said she agreed and that there was going to be discussion of the rural situation on the meeting agenda. She said we know from the last legislative session that it is really a concern, and so maybe some different language needs to be added that allows them time to get up to speed, and that would allow training to come to them. Kathleen said that she wasn't sure what that would look like in order to have quality training in the rurals, but she was certainly interested in hearing some ideas. Kathleen said that the legislature mandated through SB 75, 76, and 77 – she said she believed those were the numbers but could be wrong- an unfunded mandate that Rural Mental Health Clinics had to create some training. Kathleen said that today at the interim finance committee they are discussing the possibility of a pot of \$50,000 to go towards that. Kathleen said she didn't know if they will get that, but she knows that Rebecca Thomas did extensive work with Dale Capurro and Ray Kendall before she left the Committee in planning a pilot program. Kathleen said that Henna sent her an e-mail indicating that Rebecca had information that a program was actually starting in Ely. Kathleen said that when she talked with Rebecca personally, it was the Ely judges who were concerned. Walt said that he might have to recuse himself from some of those discussions because he was asked by Rural Mental Health to make a proposal to provide treatment out in those areas. Walt said his program had provided a proposal, and was waiting on the results. Henna asked if Walt provided the proposal in his own capacity. Walt said that he had. Henna said that when they got to that portion of the meeting, Walt would want to disclose that information and recuse himself. Patricia asked if what was being proposed was Rural Mental Health doing the training or becoming a provider. Kathleen said that it was for Rural Mental Health to be a provider in those communities. Patricia said she felt then what should happen is to delete this from 6 then in 7 expand sub (c) for the rurals. Patricia said maybe Henna could come up with the language. Kathleen said that in 9, one-third of the in-service training required could be by observing a video tape and more leeway was given with the 50 miles away from a program. Kathleen said that in 10 (3) where the next bold was, they were giving leeway with the in-service training. Kathleen said that offered them two different ways of having more flexibility if 3 was left in. Patricia said that was only for in-service and not for the formal. Kathleen said that the in-service is actually more difficult to obtain than the training itself. She said if the Rural Mental Health people are really working to create some programs, that will make training more accessible to them and one-third of their training can be via videotape. The in-service is really where they have the challenge because they have to drive significant distances to observe groups. She said that if the Committee considers number 3 and allows them some flexibility in terms of the in-service requirements that would give them more of a break than the formal training. Walt said that maybe expanding that to include some type of internet observation of different programs with the proper releases would be good. Kathleen said she would love to see that included. Walt said he felt

that all of the hour could be done via internet since it was not something that you were participating in. Tim said it would be important for the camera to capture both the facilitators and the group members at the same time as opposed to a switch back and forth. Kathleen said that the language from 9 from the person who is receiving in-service training meets with or connects with a supervisor via telephone for process time after the group. Patricia said the language "videotape" is a little outdated because a videotape would be something after the fact. Walt said that this would be live or delayed. Kathleen said that she wondered if everyone was talking about the same thing. The videotape training is that one-third of their 60 hours can be observing a videotape of group counseling. Patricia said Walt was talking about the internet and it could include live processing afterwards. Kathleen said that then we wouldn't need videotaping at all, and we could take that out. Brad asked if anyone had used the videotape training. Patricia said that maybe we should have both options. Tim agreed as there may be some places without the appropriate technology, so they would still need the videotaping. Noel said that really all that is needed is a visual and audio recording of a session, which could be videotape or internet. Noel suggested that "videotape" be taken out and have it read "a group counseling session which is visually and orally recorded". Tim said then add the requirement of discussion afterwards. Walt said that the recording should be of a certified male, female co-facilitated team. Noel said it needs to be "sessions" not just the same one 20 times. Kathleen said that it should specify a Supervisor from a certified program can provide them with tapes of weekly on-going group sessions if they do not have the technology to observe group sessions live. The Supervisor will then process with them after each tape. Kathleen told Henna that would go under 9. Kathleen said this should make it much more flexible for the rural areas. Walt wondered if an hour and a half observation time, then a half hour of processing time would equal two hours for purposes of obtaining the required time. Kathleen said that we should stick with the hour and a half logging to be consistent. Noel said that then we should add that the discussion with the treatment supervisor does not count toward the training hours. Walt said then he thought people would not be encouraged to do the discussions afterwards which he said was very valuable. Kathleen said that she felt that would be the Supervisor's responsibility if they were signing off on those people. She said that if the Supervisor is signing off that they have fulfilled the requirements that needs to include the processing time. Walt said that the processing time is not required by anyone at this time. Kathleen said that what we are trying to do is make it easier for the rurals to access the training they need, but we also want to make sure it is congruent with what people in urban areas have to do. So, if she had to observe a group for an hour and a half, then talk with the Supervisor, that is just part of training, but she would not count that as part of the hour and a half of observation. She said that she felt this spoke to accountability of the provider. Walt asked how they are being accountable across the board equally. Kathleen said she felt that was the Supervisor's responsibility and asked if Walt was saying we needed to spell it out in both areas. Tim said we could quantify the requirement by saying it is 40 one and a half separate groups of observation via this media which then becomes the 60 hours. Walt said his concern was the supervision piece. Right now you are just allowing people to sit for an hour and a half and it is not spelled out. Everyone just leaves after that. Walt said he felt that if we were going to reduce educational standards in the rural areas, it might even be more important to have the contact with the supervisor. He said that even if we had to increase that – if it was an hour and a half group with 15 to 30 minutes of time after of processing time by phone. That would give you 30 hours of sessions, and the rest in processing time. Kathleen said she had a problem with that because then they are cutting back on the number of groups they observe. She would want to have them observe all the groups then add in the process time with the supervisor. Walt said we could then include that additionally. Tim asked if it would be legitimate to expect them to complete the additional time as a

trade-off for using the distance media. Kathleen said that she felt that would be very flexible. She said that if we do this, it would no longer be impossible for people in the rurals to get the training that they need. Kathleen said she felt it was more than fair to require the 60 hours plus a minimum of half an hour on the phone which would have to be documented. Kathleen asked if Walt had a stock of videotapes. Walt said he did. Kathleen asked if the Committee would need to buy the tapes from Walt. He said no. Kathleen said that maybe we will want to send out something to the supervisors in the state asking them to send in tapes that the Committee could review. Walt said that he had people sign confidentiality agreements in-house. Kathleen said that language should be added that says people who are watching the groups have to sign confidentiality forms and the supervisor who is using the form has to sign a confidentiality agreement. Walt said that sometime ago the Committee had discussed allowing on-line trainings as long as they were live, but he wasn't sure if anything was finalized on that, and he wondered if that would also be helpful to the rurals. Tim asked if that went with 6 (c). Tim said that we could use the same media for the formal hours and the in-service groups then, make the same requirements with discussions. Patricia asked for clarification on if he was referring to actual training and not just group observation. Walt said that he was referring to training. Kathleen said that could be included under the rural section. Noel said he was thinking that all of this could be included under 1 section of exceptions for rural counties. He said that provisions dealing with in-service, and formal training, and put it all under one sub-heading that deals with all rural exceptions. Kathleen said they would do that so that from 7 down would be a different NAC piece. Patricia asked if they wanted to change the one-third to one-half or 100%. Kathleen said her preference would be to leave it. Patricia said she would like the requirements to read one-half. Noel agreed. A vote was taken. Kathleen and Walt were opposed to that idea. Noel asked if the Committee was going to get a final draft before they are asked to vote. Henna said that her understanding was that the final draft would be sent to the legislature, and we weren't there yet. Noel said there were a lot of issues at the last legislative sessions, so if we could give a little more flexibility to the rurals it would be worth our while.

NAC 228.115 Duties of supervisors of treatment. (NRS 228.470) The organization that operates a program shall ensure that each supervisor of treatment:

1. Meets individually at least once each month with each provider of treatment he supervises;
2. Is available by telephone to consult with each provider of treatment he supervises;
3. Reviews, at least once each month, a random sample of at least 10 percent of the records of the offenders who are receiving treatment from each provider of treatment he supervises, **and logs 10% of these files on a Committee approved form;**
4. Observes, at least once every 3 months, a group counseling session conducted by each team of two providers of treatment he supervises who conduct counseling sessions for the program; and
5. Prepares an annual report concerning the performance of each provider of treatment he supervises.

(Added to NAC by Com. on Domestic Violence by R213-99, eff. 8-1-2000)

Kathleen said that the change is on number 3. Noel said that the committee should take out "10% of" and just say "and logs these files on a Committee approved form" otherwise it could be interpreted that you only need to log 10% of the 10%. Everyone agreed. Jennifer asked if an approved form

already existed. Tim said he had a form that the Committee could use. Jennifer asked if he could submit that form before the next meeting so the Committee could approve it at that meeting

NAC 228.125 Changes to program; approval of committee. (NRS 228.470)

1. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 5, an organization that operates a program shall request, **in writing**, approval from the committee at least 15 days before making any change to the information submitted pursuant to NAC 228.100, including, without limitation:

- (a) An addition of a provider of treatment or supervisor of treatment;
- (b) A substantial change in the program;
- (c) A relocation of the program;
- (d) The discontinuance of the program; or
- (e) Any other change that relates to the certification of the program.

2. If the committee receives the request at least 30 days before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the committee, the committee will include the request on the agenda for that meeting. If the committee receives the request less than 30 days before its next regularly scheduled meeting, the committee will include the request on the agenda for the first regular meeting that is scheduled to be held more than 30 days after the committee receives the request.

3. Within 15 days after the committee renders its decision concerning the request, it will provide written notice to the organization of its approval or denial of the request. If the committee denies the request, the notice will include the reasons for the denial.

4. The certification of the program remains in effect until the committee provides notice to the organization in the manner prescribed by NAC 228.150.

5. If an organization that operates a program loses a provider of treatment or supervisor of treatment, the organization:

- (a) Shall notify the committee, **in writing**, of the loss within 10 days after losing the provider of treatment or supervisor of treatment; and
- (b) May replace the provider of treatment or supervisor of treatment immediately if the organization requests approval from the committee, **in writing**, within 10 days after replacing the provider of treatment or supervisor of treatment.

(Added to NAC by Com. on Domestic Violence by R213-99, eff. 8-1-2000)

Kathleen asked if there were any comments. Patricia asked if that was sufficient time, and if there would ever be a circumstance where someone wouldn't know 15 days ahead. Jennifer said she thought supervisors and providers were supposed to get approval at meetings which only happen 2 to 4 times a year, so if you are requesting a new provider or supervisor because one has left, how do you go about operating your program without a Committee approved provider or supervisor. Tim said that was a good point. Patricia said she thought the Committee has done that retro-active – that they have started working and the Committee has approved them after the fact. Kathleen said that this just gives us the information in writing. Tim said that if you lose a provider and you don't have any control over that you will need to replace them right away. Jennifer said that when she worked with Rebecca she had reviewed supervisors and providers and made her recommendations. After that, there were some put on the agenda for the meeting, so she said that she wanted clarification on the official process, and could the chair just make the recommendation or did it need to be officially put on the agenda, because someone may be waiting for six months to get that approval. Kathleen said

that when she was chair previously, it always went before the Committee, the chair did not make the decisions on their own. Kathleen said that a program can replace their provider immediately, but they have to notify the Committee that they have made a change. Then, when their packet is reviewed, the qualifications can be verified by the Committee. Patricia said that if you read 5 (b), it states that the program requests the approval within 10 days of replacing the provider. It doesn't say that they get approval within 10 days, they just need to make the request. She said as long as they let us know within 10 days. Walt said that with some programs, if they lose a provider, and they don't have a qualified provider, I wonder how long they have to put an unqualified provider in – he said that he knew this was a big issue. Kathleen said they had to be qualified before they can start working. Walt asked if there would be a particular time that a program could use an unqualified provider as sometimes providers that have all the training are hard to come by, especially in the rurals. He said it can take 4 to 5 months to get a provider all the necessary training. Patricia said that under number 4, it said that "certification remains in effect until the Committee provides proper notice to the organization in the manner prescribed by 150," so essentially we're saying that they remain in effect. Noel said that the regulations state that you will not provide treatment unless you have a supervisor who is qualified and a provider of treatment who is qualified, and right now that is what the regulations say. Noel said that if a program is operating without a qualified supervisor or provider, you are out of compliance. Noel said he didn't feel that there should be any rule that says you remain in compliance until the Committee tells you otherwise. Noel said he felt that number 4 was a real loophole. Tim suggested breaking out 1a from the rest of it, and said that would be separate from other changes to the programs. Noel said he could see the need for some flexibility, but doesn't necessarily think it should be so flexible as to say they are certified until we get around to saying your not, and if it was a matter of not having a certified provider or supervisor, that it would need to get fixed within maybe 30 days. Noel said that something needs to say that they are out of compliance and this needs to be fixed forthwith. Walt said one option could be that the supervisor would submit a plan of correction by a certain amount of time, and then that could be approved by the Committee which would allow some flexibility for the rurals. Kathleen asked how much time they would have to submit the plan of correction – possibly 45 days. Walt said they could spell that out in their plan, and that might be left open, then the Committee could be more flexible with the rurals. He said that if a program lost a provider in Ely, for instance, it could take six months to replace them. Kathleen said that she would like to see a timeline. Walt said that there seemed to be a gray area that people didn't know how to respond to. Kathleen said that Noel and Walt are correct in that, so the language can be changed to say "shall request in writing the change in supervisor, provider or whatever" then a plan for correction within however many days. Walt said he liked the 45 days. Jennifer asked if this would violate the current regulations which state that you always have to operate a group with male and female co-facilitators. She said it seemed that this was allowing groups to violate the regulations for 45 days. Noel said he felt it should say "an organization that operates a program that does not comply with Nevada Administrative Code is out of compliance and shall submit a plan of correction in writing within 45 days or their certification will be revoked. Noel said we don't want to hear from Dr. Hughes that someone has been a sole practitioner for 6 months and are still certified. He said there needs to be something that says you are out of compliance and must correct it or you are automatically bounced. Patricia said she felt that really should just go with the supervisor stuff, because relocating, or adding someone was different, so we needed to distinguish between the changes. Noel said he agreed because it is a substantial problem to not have the male female co-facilitator, or a supervisor that is certified. Walt said he agreed that a program should be out of compliance at some point and there should be a plan of correction. Walt said that one thing that needed to be weighed was that if

you had 15 or 20 people in a group and you come out of compliance because a facilitator quits, you can't distribute those people out without a real disruption in therapy, and bonds, and other things. Tim said a rural program may only have 2 facilitators that run 2 groups, and you would shut the program down if you didn't give them time to find someone else. Brad said that they are then out of compliance if they don't have the co-facilitators. Kathleen said that they are, but there is reality, then there is the regs. She said we have to have some balance with what works realistically. This holds people more accountable by giving them time to find someone that they need. Kathleen said she knows a program that has had multiple supervisors but has never submitted anything, so this might help when we review programs. Kathleen said she felt it was unrealistic to expect that programs won't lose someone, so they will need time to get back into compliance. Noel asked if a provision could be put in that says "if an organization that provides treatment falls out of compliance by loss of its only supervisor, or the only male or female co-facilitator, they shall notify the Committee within 10 days of a plan of correction specifying how the problem will be fixed within 45 days. Failure to do this will result in automatic suspension of certification." Tim asked if the Committee wanted to extend that to supervisors or just treatment providers. He asked if we wanted to have a program that operates for 45 days with no supervisor. Noel said that the reality is that sometimes it happens, and at least this way they tell us and we give them a chance to tell us how they are going to fix it. Patricia asked for clarification that the program would notify the Committee in 10 days, but the plan of correction is for 45 days, and wondered about the rurals. Henna said some extenuating circumstances could be written in. Noel said that the chair would have the ability to offer some more flexibility. Henna said that language could be added to say that if they don't meet the 45 day requirement, cause can be left to the discretion of the chair. Tim said another possibility would be that if the Committee had a list of qualified supervisors, that program could get in touch with one of those supervisors in the interim. Kathleen asked if Noel was wanting to change where it said 15 days to 10. Noel said that at least on that area because 10 days is enough time to notify us and have some plan of correction to get to us. Noel said that this would possibly be a new paragraph. Patricia said we could leave that to the drafter.

NAC 228.130 On-site inspection; annual renewal. (NRS 228.470)

1. The committee will, at least once each year, conduct an on-site inspection of each program to determine whether the organization that operates the program is in compliance with the provisions of NAC 228.010 to 228.225, inclusive.

2. An organization that has obtained a certificate for a program pursuant to NAC 228.100 must renew its certification within 1 year after obtaining the certificate. If the organization was issued a provisional certificate pursuant to NAC 228.102 before it obtained a certificate for a program pursuant to NAC 228.100, the certificate obtained pursuant to NAC 228.100 expires 1 year after the committee first issued the provisional certificate.

3. An organization that wishes to renew its certification must submit a completed application for renewal to the committee at least 60 days before the certificate expires.

4. The certificate will be renewed if the committee determines that:

(a) The application for renewal is complete;

(b) The organization which operates the program has satisfied the requirements of subsection 3 of NAC 228.100;

(c) The program has passed the inspection of the committee conducted pursuant to subsection 1; and

(d) The organization which operates the program has submitted:

(1) Proof of completion of the hours of continuing education required by NAC 228.210; and

(2) The annual reports required by NAC 228.115.

5. If a completed application and the documents described in paragraph (d) of subsection 4 are received by the committee on or before the expiration date of the certificate, the certificate remains in effect after the expiration date of the certificate unless the committee provides notice to the organization in the manner prescribed by NAC 228.150.

6. If a completed application and the documents described in paragraph (d) of subsection 4 are not received by the committee on or before the expiration date of the certificate, the certificate becomes delinquent and the committee will, within 30 days after the certificate becomes delinquent, send a notice to that effect by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the last known address of the organization as indicated in the records of the committee.

7. If a completed application or a document described in paragraph (d) of subsection 4 is deposited with the United States Postal Service, it shall be deemed received by the committee on the date indicated on the post office cancellation mark stamped upon the envelope containing the document if:

- (a) The envelope is properly addressed to the committee; and
- (b) That date is earlier than the actual receipt of that document.

8. The organization may renew the certificate within 90 days after the certificate becomes delinquent if the organization complies with the requirements set forth in subsection 4.

9. If a certificate is not renewed within 90 days after the certificate becomes delinquent, the certificate expires without further notice or a hearing and the committee will remove the program from the list of programs that it provides to the courts of this state.

10. If a certificate expires pursuant to subsection 9, the organization which operated the program may reapply for certification of the program pursuant to NAC 228.100.

(Added to NAC by Com. on Domestic Violence by R161-97, eff. 1-6-98; A by R213-99, 8-1-2000)

Henna said that there was no change to this regulation. This was a regulation that was discussed in the past, but no conclusive recommendations were made. She said she included it just in case there was something the Committee wanted to address. Tim said that there is a line on one of the re-certification forms asking if there had been an audit, but he didn't recall any documentation that the provider would have that would indicate whether there had been an on-site inspection. Jennifer said that we get reports from Dr. Hughes. Tim said the treatment provider does not receive those unless there is a discrepancy. Jennifer said that a copy of the portion that pertains to that provider is sent to them detailing where Dr. Hughes has found compliance issues, the provider is then required to respond with a corrective action plan. Tim said maybe this needs to be brought up at a different place.

NAC 228.140 Grounds for refusal to issue or renew certificate, for revocation or suspension of certificate or for placement of program on probation. (NRS 228.470) The committee may refuse to issue or renew a certificate for a program, revoke or suspend a certificate or place a program on probation with specified conditions for a specified period if:

1. The organization that operates the program has not complied with NAC 228.010 to 228.225, inclusive;
2. The organization that operates the program has obtained a certificate or any other license by fraudulent misrepresentation;
3. A staff member of the program has committed gross malpractice in his actions or omissions related to the program;

4. A staff member of the program, while at a facility of the program or while performing any work for the program, has been intoxicated or has used or possessed a controlled substance without a prescription;

5. A staff member of the program has engaged in violent behavior or a crime involving moral turpitude;

6. A state or other regulatory board has taken disciplinary action against a staff member of the program;

7. The organization that operates the program or a staff member of the program has engaged in unethical practice in the treatment of persons who commit domestic violence;

8. The organization that operates the program fails to request approval of a change in the program as required by NAC 228.125.

9. The organization that operates the program or a staff member of the program fails to comply with a stipulation, agreement, order, advisory opinion or declaratory order issued by the committee;

10. The program provides treatment to an offender after its certificate has expired; or

11. The organization that operates the program or a staff member of the program has engaged in any other unjust practice, method or treatment which the committee determines warrants such an action.

12. An organization that operates a program that fails to obtain certification after 2 consecutive attempts, is prohibited from reapplying for a period of 1 year from the date of the second denial.

(Added to NAC by Com. on Domestic Violence by R161-97, eff. 1-6-98; A by R213-99, 8-1-2000)

Kathleen said she loved this provision. Noel said he agreed and thought we needed to toughen up. Noel said that the previous item discussed concerning automatic suspension or decertification if failing to submit a plan of correction probably needed to be re-mentioned under this item as well. Patricia said that probably needs to be a new provision.

NAC 228.165 Group counseling. (NRS 228.470)

1. An organization that operates a program shall ensure that:

(a) The treatment provided to an offender by the program is provided in a group counseling session that:

(1) Is conducted by:

(I) Two providers of treatment, one of whom is male and one of whom is female; or

(II) A provider of treatment and a supervisor of treatment who is acting as a provider of treatment, one of whom is male and one of whom is female;

(2) Is conducted for the gender of the offenders in the group counseling session; and

(3) Except as otherwise provided in subsection 2, consists of not less than 3 offenders or more than ~~24~~ **15** offenders.

(b) If a supervisor of treatment determines that an offender cannot be treated in a group counseling session because the offender has a physical or mental limitation that is not related to the abuse of drugs or alcohol, the offender is referred to an appropriate provider of health care or other services.

(c) A supervisor of treatment who is making a determination pursuant to paragraph (b) has provided reasonable accommodation to the known physical or mental limitations of an offender with a disability who is otherwise eligible to obtain treatment in a group counseling session, unless the

supervisor of treatment can demonstrate that such accommodation would result in a fundamental alteration of the program or an undue financial or administrative burden.

(d) If an offender does not receive treatment by the program because of a determination made pursuant to paragraph (b), the supervisor of treatment notifies the court that sentenced the offender of that fact and advises the offender to do the same.

(e) Except as otherwise provided in subsection 2, a separate group counseling session is provided for an offender who is under the age of 18 years and for whom an adult session is not suitable.

2. The chairman of the committee may waive the requirements set forth in subparagraph (3) of paragraph (a) of subsection 1 or paragraph (e) of subsection 1 if he determines that it would be impracticable or impossible for an organization that operates a program to comply with those requirements.

3. As used in this section, "provider of health care or other services" includes:

(a) A physician or a physician assistant who is licensed pursuant to chapter 630 of NRS;

(b) A psychologist who is licensed pursuant to chapter 641 of NRS;

(c) A marriage and family therapist who is licensed pursuant to chapter 641A of NRS; and

(d) A clinical social worker who is licensed pursuant to chapter 641B of NRS.

(Added to NAC by Com. on Domestic Violence by R213-99, eff. 8-1-2000)

Kathleen said that this item was to change the size of groups from 24 to 15. Sandra Dietrich-Hughes stated that this was a concern for her. She said that she tried to maintain under 20, but it was difficult. She said she was already running 6 men's and 2 women's groups now. Tim said he agreed because it would be difficult for some programs. Tim said he did not like the number 24, but it might be difficult to find enough providers. He said he felt many service providers would have a difficult time with this. Noel asked if a time limit could be imposed for groups larger than 15 for possibly 6 months. Sandra Dietrich-Hughes said that the difficulty is that they are a non-profit organization so they cannot turn individuals away, but they need to be able to provide the services, and this becomes a financial burden to pay more providers. Walt said this seems to be an issue of how to provide optimal services. He said he didn't necessarily think 15 would work, but that maybe we could meet in the middle. Walt also mentioned that often you have 2-3 people absent at a time, so maybe 18. Tim said maybe 20 would be better. Kathleen asked if the Committee was in agreement on 20. No one objected.

NAC 228.170 Method and standards of treatment. (NRS 228.470) An organization that operates a program shall ensure that:

1. The program holds an offender accountable for accepting responsibility for his violence and for changing his violent behavior, including, without limitation, developing concern and empathy for a person who is a victim of domestic violence.

2. A provider of treatment:

(a) Evaluates individually each offender for whom he will provide treatment upon the admission of the offender to the program;

(b) Develops a written plan of treatment for the offender that includes, without limitation:

(1) Treatment relating to a history of domestic violence, child abuse, sexual abuse or the abuse of drugs or alcohol by the offender and treatment relating to the evaluation of the offender by the provider of treatment; and

(2) A mechanism for measuring the progress of the offender in the program, including, without limitation, his attendance and participation in group counseling sessions, completion of assignments, and behavior and attitudinal changes;

(c) Reviews, at least once each month, the written plan of treatment of each offender for whom he is providing treatment;

(d) Develops, in consultation with the offender, a written plan of control for the offender to deter the offender from engaging in violent behavior or behavior that is harmful to himself or other persons;

(e) Reports evidence of child abuse or neglect to an agency which provides child welfare services or to a law enforcement agency; and

(f) Reports evidence of abuse, neglect, exploitation or isolation of an older person to an entity described in NRS 200.5093.

3. A provider of treatment prepares a written report of the results of the evaluation conducted pursuant to subsection 2 that includes, without limitation:

(a) A profile of information relating to the violent behavior of the offender that includes, without limitation, descriptions of the violent behavior obtained from a victim of domestic violence by the offender, an agency of criminal justice or another provider of treatment, if applicable;

(b) Observations regarding the mental status of the offender, if the provider of treatment determines that it is appropriate to include those observations in the evaluation;

(c) An assessment of the degree to which the offender is likely to harm himself or other persons;

(d) The medical and psychological history of the offender, if the provider of treatment determines that it is appropriate to include that information in the evaluation;

(e) A description of any abuse of drugs or alcohol by the offender and the effect that the abuse had on the offender and his family; and

(f) The social and cultural history of the offender as it relates to domestic violence.

4. Upon the admission of an offender to the program, the program requires a written agreement that sets forth the responsibilities of the offender and the provider of treatment and includes the provisions set forth in NAC 228.175. The agreement must be signed by:

(a) The offender in the presence of a provider of treatment; and

(b) The provider of treatment who witnessed the signature pursuant to paragraph (a).

(Added to NAC by Com. on Domestic Violence by R213-99, eff. 8-1-2000)

Henna said that no changes were made on this regulation but it was discussed at past workshops and no conclusive recommendations were made. Noel asked if there was something in Dr. Hughes' recommendations about treatment plans and contract for services. Tim said that the discussion from Dr. Hughes was that the treatment plan and either consent to service or client contract were the same thing. Kathleen said that in the former workshop, Paul Reeves from Options wrote in that he felt that putting a treatment plan in the file for the offender was redundant because the providers have to submit a curriculum which constitutes providers mode of treatment. Sandra Dietrich-Hughes said that a treatment plan is different and that she does both a contract which is general, and a treatment plan which is specific. Kathleen said she didn't feel it had anything to do with the curriculum. Henna said that some other concerns from previous workshops with regards to this regulation were that the treatment plan and contract were the same, courts don't use them, they use client contracts. Walt said they needed to be careful about making it so general that it becomes an assembly line where you're just maintaining data and not individual characteristics of people involved. Walt said he felt that many issues should be addressed in the treatment plans. Walt said that as he recalled, Dr. Hughes was saying that hardly any of the providers were typing anything up for a treatment plan. Kathleen said that instead of saying nobody does that so we'll throw it out, we should try to work harder to help programs complete treatment plans and the contract is a completely different thing. The contract is the things they agree to do and not to do. Sandra Dietrich-Hughes said that a

treatment plan is very specific to the client and what they need to focus on. She said it doesn't have to be really complicated, it is something to follow with them through the program to see how they are meeting their goals. Tim said that in addition, the treatment plan along with the lethality assessment goes to victim safety. Walt said he thought that the lethality assessment should be part of the treatment plan. Sandra Dietrich-Hughes asked if maybe the Committee should address the confusion that seems to surround the difference between the contract and the plan. She said that if people are seeing them as the same thing, there must be confusion because she doesn't see them as the same thing. Noel asked if this was an area where an outline of a treatment plan or a form of some kind that the Committee could come up with. Brad said that the providers probably have enough examples that the Committee could easily use. Brad said that he also liked the lethality assessment being used as part of the treatment plan. Tim said that the lethality assessment is required by the regs somewhere. Kathleen said that we can gather up some treatment plans and contracts, but her sense is that this is about the work and doing it correctly. She said that the individual intake when the perpetrator comes in having them sign a contract, then completing a treatment plan before they go into group because that gives you a much better sense of who you are working with and how you are going to work with them and whether or not they are appropriate for group.

NAC 228.180 Protection of victim. (NRS 228.470) An organization that operates a program shall ensure that:

1. No staff member of the program:
 - (a) Blames a person who is a victim of domestic violence for the domestic violence; or
 - (b) Places a person who is a victim of domestic violence in danger as a result of any statement made or action taken by the staff member.
2. If a provider of treatment receives a request from a person who is a victim of domestic violence or who he determines is at risk of becoming a victim of domestic violence by the offender, the provider of treatment assists the person in developing and carrying out a plan for the safety and protection of that person.
3. Each staff member of the program maintains any information relating to a victim of domestic violence separate from any records or other information relating to an offender.
4. ***A provider of treatment shall send each victim a standardized form that informs the victim about:***
 - (a) ***The number of classes the batterer will be attending;***
 - (b) ***The cost of each class;***
 - (c) ***The time/place of each class; and***
 - (d) ***The authorized number of absences the batterer will be able to miss.***
5. ***The form created in subsection 4 will be shown to the batterer, explained to the batterer, and signed by the batterer before it is mailed to the victim.***
(Added to NAC by Com. on Domestic Violence by R213-99, eff. 8-1-2000)

Sandra Dietrich-Hughes said the only problem she with the above was that many of the batterers were no longer with the victim. Brad said this addresses victim safety. He said he liked all of 4 but would like it to include a form that is sent to the victim if the batterer does not complete or is terminated from treatment. Tim said he had a concern about 4(c) because sometimes the times of the groups vary, and we may end up endangering the victim if the batterer does not attend group. Noel suggested just including the frequency and duration of each class. Walt asked how this came

about. Kathleen said she thought it came from Dr. Hughes. Walt said the form may address that this program does not ensure victim safety. He said he didn't agree with putting program costs in there because maybe the form will say the cost is \$30, but it is really \$25 because of a sliding fee. He said that some of this seemed unnecessary for the victim to know other than to ensure her safety. Sandra Dietrich-Hughes felt that this might create a situation where the batterer who is the bread winner of the family may tell the victim that she is responsible for paying for the classes. Kathleen said that on number 5, the batterer is signing off on this and knows that the victim will receive a copy. She said that is like the myth of provocation. Sandra Dietrich-Hughes said she didn't want to give the batterer any more ammunition. Kathleen said that they don't need more ammunition. Kathleen said that this is indeed from Dr. Hughes and he is wanting programs to pay closer attention to victim safety. Brad said the victim also needs to know if the batterer is not in compliance with treatment. Walt said Dr. Hughes had requested programs stop sending out the safety plans. Patricia asked if Dr. Hughes had given any reasons for including the costs of the class. Walt asked if this would be something that would be sent by mail, because the batterer could be the one who gets the mail. Brad said we could make the notification by possibly phone call. Noel said it could be something that says shall make reasonable attempts by phone or mail to notify the victim if the batterer is discharged from the treatment program. Walt said that we would need some way to document it. Noel said this could raise some liability issues for treatment providers with a failure to warn. He said someone could get sued over whether or not reasonable efforts were made to notify a victim. Noel said you have to be very careful about imposing a duty to warn because breach of it can set you up to get sued. Brad said he felt you had to have knowledge of a very specific threat to constitute failure to warn, and this is just a general acknowledgement that the batterer is not in treatment. Kathleen said she wrote down, "shall make reasonable attempts to notify the victim if the perpetrator is removed from the group or stops attending." Noel asked if the treatment providers generally have the names and phone numbers of the victims. Tim said the batterers are required to sign a release of information that says the victim can be notified of certain things, but it has never included the time and place or the cost. Tim says the form also states that she can obtain counseling as well. Noel said he could understand instances where the batterer may not know current information about the victim. Walt asked if a waiver could be signed by the batterer if he states that he does not know the address of the victim. Noel suggested that under 4, maybe it should state "shall make reasonable efforts to send each victim a form if location is known." Kathleen stated that it will read, "shall make reasonable efforts" and we could use the waiver form if Walt wants to make one up for the Committee and we'll add it to the website. She stated that (c) would be changed to frequency and duration. She stated that as far as the cost, we could put a range in to accommodate the sliding scale. She said that Dr. Hughes was probably looking at national treatment stuff and is suggesting that these would best practice to put into our regs. Kathleen stated that the number of classes is determined by the judges. Noel said that the reasonable attempts part should be a separate sub-section.

NAC 228.195 Certificate of completion; discharge or termination; notice of potential for repeat of violent behavior. (NRS 228.470)

1. An organization that operates a program shall ensure that:
 - (a) The program issues a certificate of completion to an offender who:
 - (1) Successfully completes the program; and
 - (2) Complies with the provisions of the agreement set forth in NAC 228.175.

(b) The program issues a discharge to an offender who is unable to complete the program because he has moved from the area of service of the program or has been referred to another program.

(c) The program terminates the treatment of an offender who violates any of the provisions of the agreement set forth in NAC 228.175.

2. If the program issues a discharge to an offender or terminates the treatment of an offender, the organization that operates the program shall notify:

(a) The court that sentenced the offender of the discharge or termination and provide to the court a written summary concerning the behavior of the offender in the program and the number of treatment sessions the offender successfully completed, if any; and

(b) The offender that he is required to make a request to the court that sentenced him to reassign him to another program.

3. An organization that operates a program shall ensure that if, at the time that a discharge or termination of an offender is considered, the offender exhibits signs of violent behavior and resists treatment, a provider of treatment:

(a) Notifies each person who is known to be a victim of domestic violence by the offender, if possible;

(b) Provides to the court that sentenced the offender, and to each of the following persons he determines is necessary, a statement of the progress of the offender and the recommendation of the provider of treatment concerning whether the treatment of the offender should be continued or terminated:

(1) The parole and probation officer of the offender;

(2) The prosecuting attorney; and

(3) An agency which provides child welfare services; and

(c) Requests that the offender continue his participation in the program or refers the offender to another program.

(Added to NAC by Com. on Domestic Violence by R213-99, eff. 8-1-2000)

Henna said that this was something that was previously discussed, but no definite recommendations were made. Henna said that Dr. Hughes had suggested an amendment to sub-section 2 to reduce the reporting requirements required by the courts. According to Dr. Hughes these reports are time consuming and are too long for the courts. She said that he stated that most of the information needed by the courts is on the batterer intake form. Sandra Dietrich-Hughes said that her agency gives a one page form. Tim said his agency also only gives one page. Brad asked if these forms were on the website. Tim said no, it was an agency specific form. Tim said that Henderson Court requires that the agencies they refer to, use their form, but they are the only court that does so. Brad asked if every program used some form. Tim said that there is a requirement for a report to go to the court. Tim said that 228.195, 3(b) outlines what type of reports have to be submitted. Kathleen said the written summary can be completed on one form. Walt said it looked like the Committee already had a provision to notify the victim if the perpetrator was discharged from the program. Sandra Dietrich-Hughes said she wanted to ask about the permitted number of absences for the previous regulation. She gave some details about allowing 1 unexcused absence. Patricia stated that in the information that we are supposed to be sending to the victim, the authorized number of absences is supposed to be included, so there must be some number. Brad asked how the absences can be made up, i.e. extending the number of weeks. Tim said that if the perpetrator is in the hospital or incarcerated, they obviously will be absent. He said it is very difficult to work with truck drivers who

have varying schedules. Sandra Dietrich-Hughes said she only allows one unexcused absence. Noel said that maybe a provision should be put in that says unexcused absences must be made up to ensure the person completes a minimum of 1 ½ hours per week for 6 months. Patricia said that she has read that six months is not really a meaningful amount of time, and that really 12 months is needed to change behavior. Sandra Dietrich-Hughes said it sometimes depended on the motivation of the perpetrator. She said that when you are dealing with old patterns, more time is needed. Patricia said that many other states specify 1 year for a first offense, and since we are looking at the regs, maybe now is the time to change that. Tim said that his agency counts it in weeks, and however long it takes them to complete the 26 weeks or 52 weeks, is what they do. Walt asked if the Committee had any authority to increase the number of sessions. Noel said that for a first offender it states that they must complete 1 ½ hours per week for not less than 6 months. He said that it doesn't say not more than 6 months, so he felt we could put a provision in that states "unexcused absences must be made up to ensure that each offender completes the treatment which is not less than 1 ½ hours per week for 6 months for first offenders or 12 months for second offenders. Tim said that he wanted to have the language be changed from 6 months to 26 weeks, and 1 year to 52 weeks as he felt that was more specific. Walt said he felt that was already spelled out. Noel said he thought that NRS uses months. Patricia felt that the reg might not make it though LCB if they changed it from months to weeks. Patricia asked Henna if it was possible to refer to absences in terms of weeks instead of months. Henna said that she wasn't sure. Walt said it would make sense to specify in terms of sessions. Patricia asked if the regs said anything about the number of absences. Kathleen said that 2 and 4 were specified. Walt said that most of the providers have 4 unexcused per six months and 8 in a year. Kathleen said she thought Dr. Hughes was concerned about programs that allow excess absences. Patricia asked if the program providers felt that 2 and 4 absences were reasonable. Tim said he felt it would be interesting if this was imposed. Walt said they had used 4 and 8 based on what was written on some of the court orders. Kathleen suggested having 2 excused and 2 unexcused, which is still 4. Walt said that the only excused absences are ones that are documented. Patricia said she had a problem with writing excused and unexcused into the regs because there would be a risk of vagueness unless it was defined. Patricia said she felt it should be left up to the program providers. Tim said they actually get 3 absences, because they are terminated on the fourth. Walt said that was exactly how their program did things. Kathleen said that then 3 and 7 made sense.

Patricia said that in looking at number 7 of the suggestions from Dr. Hughes where he says that treatment providers can conduct sessions with one facilitator on an occasional basis. Kathleen said emergency basis. Patricia said it was the only suggestion of his that was not on there, so she wondered what the discussion on that was. Walt said that Dr. Hughes had concerns about when providers were sick or on vacation. Tim said that the supervisor would generally try to replace the missing provider with someone else, but if that wasn't possible, then that group would have to run that way. Kathleen said that on her paperwork, the word occasional had been crossed out, and emergency added. Everyone agreed that was a better choice of wording.

Workshop ended at 2:50

**STATE OF NEVADA COMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
(BATTERER'S TREATMENT CERTIFICATION COMMITTEE)**

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Wednesday, April 5, 2006 at 11:00a.m.

Location:

Office of the Attorney General
Grant Sawyer Building, Suite 4500
Las Vegas, Nevada

Video Conference Access:

Office of the Attorney General
100 North Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada

Please Note: The Batterers Treatment Committee may address agenda items out of sequence to accommodate persons appearing before the Committee or to aid the efficiency or effectiveness of the meeting. The Committee may convene in closed session to consider the character, alleged misconduct, professional competence or physical or mental health of a person (NRS 241.030).

***Asterisks (*) denote items on which Committee may take action.
Action by the Committee on an item may be to approve,
deny, amend, or table.***

1. *Call to order and roll call of members.

The meeting was called to order by Kathleen Brooks at 11:15.

Members Present

Kathleen Brooks
Tim Hamilton
Brad Simpson
Patricia Lynch
Noel Waters
Walt Dimitroff

Others in Attendance

Paul Edwards
Trudie Kibala
Mike Freda
Len DeFilippo
Julio Landero
Marina Funes

Attorney General's Office

Henna Rasul – Deputy Attorney General
Kareen Prentice – Ombudsman
Jennifer Kandt – Administrative Coordinator

2. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding the application for certification renewal from the following providers:

- a. Counseling Opportunities
1225 Westfield Avenue, Suite 8
Reno, NV 89509
(reviewed by Noel Waters)

Noel stated that the application appeared to be mostly complete, but he wanted to comment on a few items. He states that the Committee's checklist is somewhat problematic because it asks if the application was submitted in a timely manner, and the reviewer has no way of knowing that. There is also a question asking if the program has passed the annual on-site inspection. Mr. Waters said he does not have access to those reports. He said the application appears to be complete but fairly scant. The application indicates that they will continue the same program. They have evidence of CEU's and annual reports.

Motion: Noel moved recommended approval of the application for certification renewal for Counseling Opportunities.

2nd: Tim Hamilton

All in favor. Motion carried.

- b. Family Violence Intervention Program
1250 Lamoille Highway, #312
Elko, NV 89801
(reviewed by Edna Harris – recommendation to be submitted to Kathleen Brooks)

Kathleen said she was concerned because Mr. Hansen was running programs by himself and has an intern who has 18.75 victim hours and 7 perpetrator hours (estimated). Mr. Hansen is in compliance with his CEU's , but he is not in compliance in terms of his co-facilitator. Mr. Hansen indicated in the packet that there was another domestic violence group in Elko where his co-facilitator could observe groups, but the co-facilitator is currently working with groups. Kathleen said that in the past, the Committee has been somewhat lenient with this, but wants to ask that they submit a plan of action for correction. Wants the letter from the Committee to state that the program is out of compliance at this point in time and they need to correct. Noel asked if the application for renewal would then be continued until the next meeting. Kathleen said that it would.

Motion: Tim moved to table the renewal to the next meeting and request that Family Violence submit a plan of action for correction.

2nd: Brad Simpson

All in favor. Motion carried.

- c. State of Nevada Rural Mental Health
Battle Mountain Mental Health
10 6th Street
Battle Mountain, NV 89820
and
Winnemucca Community Mental Health Center
3140 Traders Way
Winnemucca, NV 89446
(reviewed by Patricia Lynch)

Patricia said that she agrees with Noel about the two questions on the checklist. It appears that the application is complete but she wasn't sure about the in-service training. Patricia went through some of the different trainings listed. Kathleen said that the FACES conference which occurs every year was approved for 7 CEU's. Patricia asked if one of the providers on the Committee could look at the CEU's in more detail. Kathleen suggested that this item be tabled until later in the meeting until Walt could look at the CEU's.

Motion: Tim moved to table until later in the meeting.

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried.

This item was returned to later in the meeting. Walt said that the program providers were lacking in CEU's. Patricia said that because of the unique situation with Nevada Rural Mental Health she did not want to deny. Kathleen asked if the recommendation was to approve them conditionally until CEU requirements are met. Patricia asked if legal counsel could advise if the Committee can grant conditional renewals, and asked what would be appropriate. Henna said that she wasn't aware of any conditional approval, but if it was something that had been done in the past, they could certainly follow. Henna said that there wasn't anything in the regulations that prohibit them from granting conditional renewals. Patricia said that they could continue pending the providers obtaining CEU's. Jennifer stated that the Committee had issued provisional certificates in the past, but was not sure the basis of those issuances. Patricia said that Jennifer was correct, but that the Committee was trying to stay away from provisional certificates as they were granted in the beginning when the Committee was trying to sort things out. Patricia asked if Noel recalled that the Committee was trying to either approve, deny, or continue, and stay away from the provisional certificate. Noel said that the Committee does have a provision in NAC 228.140 addressing grounds for placing a program on probation which he said would probably be the same as a provisional certificate. Noel said that there is not a lot of information on that in the NAC. Patricia expressed concern that since the program is struggling, issuing a denial would not help the program. Patricia recommended continuance pending completion of 8 CEU's.

Motion: Patricia moved to continue pending completion and documentation of 8 CEU's.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried. Walt abstained.

- d. Reno-Sparks Tribal Health Center
34 Reservation Road
Reno, NV 89502
(reviewed by Walt Dimitroff)

Walt said the program was approved last year and he was the supervisor of the program. Since then they hired Mike Freda as the supervisor, but they have not conducted any groups since that time. He said he recommends approval based on the fact that Mr. Freda meets the requirements for a supervisor.

Motion: Walt moved to approve the program.

2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried.

- e. Nevada Court Counseling Inc.
1016 N. Rock Blvd.
Sparks, NV 89431
(reviewed by Kathleen Brooks)

Kathleen said that she reviewed this packet in August at which time they did not have their CEU's in place. Mr. Edwards and Trudie Kibala did get their CEU's , however the packet is incomplete as there is no annual supervisor report. Mr. Edwards said that he did submit the reports. Kathleen said that she did not see it, and asked that she finish and then she would take comments from Mr. Edwards. Kathleen said that Mr. Edwards stated in his packet that they were no longer using a specific curriculum, but that they were using the curriculum listed in NAC 228.185. Kathleen said that when she looked at the list of topics, they did not all coincide with the NAC, so she was not comfortable with approving the packet. She said her recommendation was denial. Kathleen said that in the program's corrective action plan, Mr. Edwards outlines 228.175 sections C, D, H, I, K, L, and M. The program recommends that the perpetrators make a pledge regarding these requirements once a month. The pledge is contained in the intake assessment packet, however Kathleen said she found that to be lacking in terms of how they would want to be working with perpetrators. Kathleen said that she had gone to the corrective action plan which was on the agenda for later. Henna Rasul said she should hold off. Kathleen said she could table pending additional information as Mr. Edwards said that the supervisors reports are in the file. Jennifer pulled the file for Kathleen to look through. Kathleen said that in the packet, a topic for 4/21/05 was codependency which is a topic that the Committee does not support. On 7/26/05 the topic was meditation, which Kathleen said there is nothing wrong with, but is not part of the NAC. Kathleen asked if Mr. Edwards would like to address the Committee. Mr. Edwards said that in the NAC there are 23 topics, and that leaves 3 vacancies for fill-ins, which

is why they do the meditation and co-dependency. Mr. Edwards said that they have participants renew their pledge every month and they do cover all 23 topics over a 26 week period. Mr. Edwards said he thought co-dependency should be in the NAC because it has to do with risk behaviors. Kathleen said that viewpoint would be indicative of a lack of understanding of domestic violence because domestic violence is about power and control, and is not about provocation, and therefore issues of co-dependency do not belong in a perpetrator's group. Mr. Edwards said they will do whatever they need to do to be compliant. Kathleen suggested that their certification be continued until the next meeting. She said she wanted to see a different clear curriculum, and the Committee would issue a provisional certificate until then. She said that the Committee will not issue a renewal at this time.

Motion: Tim moved to table until the next meeting, and have Nevada Court Counseling submit additional information

2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried.

- f. ABC Therapy, Inc.
7 Water Street
Henderson, NV 89015
(reviewed by Noel Waters)

Kathleen indicated that the owner of the program was present. Julio Landero introduced himself as the owner and director of ABC Therapy. Noel said that this renewal was last on the agenda for August and there was a motion to continue pending receipt of additional information principally that of CEU's , as well as quarterly reports. Noel indicated that since then there had been considerable correspondence between the Committee and Mr. Fitzpatrick. The information provided is grounds for approval. Monthly and quarterly reviews were submitted. The one area that may be subject to further discussion is CEU's. Noel indicated that the program submitted requests to approve CEU's which are on the agenda for later in the meeting. He anticipates that these items will be approved.

Motion: Noel moved to approve the renewal subject to the approval of the CEU items under item 4 of the agenda.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

This item was returned to after all training was approved, and Noel indicated that this program is now officially renewed. Jennifer asked for clarification regarding providers and whether or not Rich Bohannon could now be used as a provider. Noel indicated that the approved trainings took care of Claudette and Rich Bohannon, Dennis Fitzpatrick, and Marina Funes. Kathleen asked if the packet indicated where they had their other CEU's from. Noel indicated that they were all previously approved programs. Noel said he also wanted the record to reflect that he had in the packet a letter from January 2006 requesting to approve

Marina Funes as Supervisor. Julio Landero said that had been a mistake, she wanted to be approved as a provider. Noel said the agenda clearly states that this is to be approval as a provider.

- g. American Comprehensive Counseling Services
2281 Pyramid Way, Suite 13
Sparks, NV 89431
(reviewed by Patricia Lynch)

Patricia said that the application had originally been submitted and continued pending further documentation. There were some CEU's missing that needed documentation. All CEU's were submitted since. The original application had been difficult to understand because of the various locations. This application was broken down by location which was easy to follow. Patricia recommended approval at all of the various locations.

Motion: Patricia moved to approve the renewal of ACCS.

2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried. Walt abstained.

- h. Community Counseling Center
205 S. Pratt Ave
Carson City, NV 89701
(Northern Nevada)
(reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Noel indicated that he served on the board of trustees for Community Counseling Center. Tim said he reviewed the packet which was fairly complete with a few exceptions. He did not see a copy of the certificate. Did not see documentation for the original 60 hours in-service for either the independent contractors or the supervisors and he would like to see those. Tim said he knows those probably exist, they just weren't submitted with the packet. He also did not see any annual reports on the performance of each provider, so he recommended that we continue pending additional information.

Motion: Tim moved to continue pending additional information.

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried. Noel abstained.

- i. Options
4528 W. Craig Rd. Ste. 150
Las Vegas, NV 89032
(reviewed by Walt Dimitroff)

Walt said that there does appear to be missing documentation for this renewal. There is missing CEU documentation for Perry Williams, Joan Burley, and Jackie Ellis. The group observation forms are not signed by the facilitators and some

are missing the supervisor's signature. There did not appear to be any method of record review that was documented. Walt recommended that the Committee continue pending additional documentation.

Motion: Walt moved to continue pending additional documentation.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

- j. Community Counseling Center
(Southern Nevada)
1120 Almond Tree Lane, Suite 207
Las Vegas, NV 89104
(reviewed by Noel Waters)

Tim recused himself due to the fact that he recently took over supervisory duties for the program. Noel said that the forms used by Community Counseling Center were very good and extensive. There was proof of CEU's for Brok Croy and Dr. Coleman. There was indication that the former supervisor had been replaced by Mr. Hamilton. The documentation did not show CEU's for Mr. Hamilton. Patricia said she has seen proof of Mr. Hamilton's CEU's in another packet. Kathleen said she never fully made the commitment to be supervisor for the program. There is no documentation for a supervisor before January. Walt said that Dr. Coleman had applied for a waiver of licensure and was denied. Kathleen said she thought the last supervisor was Sheri Demott. There was no annual performance report on the providers. Noel said he was not sure he actually needed to see a report card on the providers, but needs to see that it is done on a regular basis. Walt said that the Committee had developed a form, but that some providers are maybe still in transition. Noel requested proof of CEU's for the current and previous supervisors, and annual performance report on the providers. Based on that, he recommended that the application be continued.

Motion: Noel moved to continue the renewal pending further documentation.

2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried. Tim abstained.

- k. Safenest
2915 W. Charleston, Suite 12
Las Vegas, NV 89102
(reviewed by Patricia Lynch)

Kathleen recused herself, and asked Noel to continue the meeting. There was some discussion on whether there was a quorum. Noel said that because they are a non-elected board, as a matter of necessity they can proceed. Patricia said that they can reduce the quorum by the number of abstentions. Patricia said that Noel and herself have to advise their elected boards. Henna said to go ahead. Patricia said that this was the best renewal application that she had ever seen. She mentioned that Brad had suggested having some sort of format on the

website so the providers had something to make it easier to follow. Brad said a model format for application and information that needs to be provided. Patricia said that this application had the last certificate so that she knew that application had been timely. It appears that everything is complete. There are forms that she has not seen in any other packets, including an audit for completeness – which we may want to have the other providers adopt. They also have very nice evaluations at the end. There is a historical list of CEU's for every person from 2005 back to their original training and have a running tally of how many hours. Patricia said that as a reviewer, she felt this was an excellent packet. Brad asked if this could be discussed at the end of the meeting. Henna said that we shouldn't because it is not an agenda item. She said we can put it on the agenda for the next meeting.

Motion: Patricia moved to approve.

2nd : Brad

All in favor. Motion carried. Tim and Kathleen abstained.

Mr. Freda said he would like to see a model packet which he could distribute to their members. Noel said that this would be an item for further discussion at the next meeting, but that it sounds like everyone would like to see something like that.

3. * Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding the Corrective Action Plans for the following providers:

- a. Nevada Court Counseling Inc.
1016 N. Rock Blvd.
Sparks, NV 89431
(reviewed by Kathleen Brooks)

Kathleen said that Mr. Edwards responded to Mr. Hughes' concerns, but she still has difficulty with the pledge. The pledge is the content of written agreements between the offender and provider of treatment. It discusses that perpetrators be free from all forms of violence, etc. Kathleen said that she feels that many of these items need to be part of group work and not just part of a pledge, but part of each session. She said it is fine to have the power and control wheel on the wall, she thinks that is great to use that as a primer for the work that is being done, but said she is very opposed to having perpetrators repeat a pledge once a month as it is not part of a good treatment plan from her point of view. She suggested that the program be continued until the next meeting. She wants to see Nevada Court Counseling get some more information or training on what needs to happen within the group format. She suggested that Dr. Freda, Mr. Dimitroff or Mr. Hamilton could assist with that. She wants to see the pledge eliminated. Kathleen said that Mr. Edwards should weave the information that is in the NAC into the group as opposed to just having it repeated.

She recommended that the packet including the corrective action plan be continued. The Committee will send a detailed letter explaining what they are

looking for in terms of the program. Mr. Edwards said he would wait for the letter and comply.

Motion: Brad moved to continue.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

- b. American Comprehensive Counseling Services
2281 Pyramid Way, Suite 13
Sparks, NV 89431
(reviewed by Patricia Lynch)

Walt recused himself from this item. Patricia said that Dr. Hughes had minor concerns which were addressed by ACCS.

Motion: Patricia moved to approve the corrective action plan.

2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried. Walt abstained.

Tim asked if the corrective action plans were statements of what needed to be done, or if there was actual documentation. Kathleen said that sometimes paper documentation is needed and sometimes it is just a response committing to make the changes.

Patricia commented that initially some programs would disagree with changes that were suggested and that isn't seen anymore.

- c. Community Counseling Center
205 S. Pratt Avenue
Carson City, NV 89107
(reviewed by Kathleen Brooks)

Noel recused himself from this item. Kathleen said that Dr. Hughes gave this program a very good over all review. He had a few minor things he wanted corrected. She said Mary Bryan responded that they would not have the safety plan mailed to the offender's partner, and that the facilitators would not be writing minutes during group. Ms. Bryan agreed to be in compliance. The remainder of the review from Dr. Hughes was excellent. Kathleen recommended approval.

Motion: Patricia moved to approve.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried. Noel abstained.

- d. State of Nevada Rural Mental Health
Battle Mountain Mental Health
10 6th Street
Battle Mountain, NV 89820
and

Winnemucca Community Mental Health Center
3140 Traders Way
Winnemucca, NV 89446
(reviewed by Patricia Lynch)

Patricia stated that there were two main issues in Dr. Hughes report. One issue dealt with the client contract. The other issue was co-facilitators. The male co-facilitator had been unable to attend the group as he was trying to help set up a shelter. Patricia said that the co-facilitator expressed his concern with having providers available in the rurals, especially men. So, if the co-facilitator is not there they have no choice but to cancel, or run the group without the co-facilitator. Patricia mentioned the regulations may address using only one facilitator in an emergency, but opening a shelter is not an emergency. She recommended approval of the plan of correction but wants to have some contact in a letter explaining that we understand the difficulties but hope that it would not become common practice to miss the counseling sessions.

Motion: Patricia moved to approve.

2nd: Tim

Noel stated that he would like the response concerning the absence to be a little stronger as he thinks male, female co-facilitators are a big deal and it is specified in statute. Noel said he felt the Committee's response should indicate that we are sympathetic, but it should happen only in emergency situations. Kathleen said she concurred completely, but felt that this is where yesterday's discussion of training for the rurals would blend in. Kathleen indicated that Mr. Dummar has had many difficulties dealing with the mental health regulations and the batterer's treatment programs. Kathleen said that she would make a commitment to have contact with Walt if he were to secure the proposal from them so that they could look at where the challenges and barriers to service are. Walt said that he completely agrees to having the male, female co-facilitators, but said that if someone is sick or on vacation simply having someone sit in on the group who is male or female does not really make a difference as there is no history. Walt said that occasionally having a facilitator miss group is one thing, but to consistently miss on a regular basis is a real problem. Patricia said that the letter from Rural Mental Health expressed concern in that they did not want to be out of compliance, but had no choice at times. Patricia said she did not feel that they were trying to abuse the process, but were actually struggling. Kathleen stated that in a later letter to Jennifer, Mr. Dummar expressed frustration at what he was experiencing. Jennifer mentioned that in the letter from Mr. Dummar, he said that Rural Mental Health was considering stopping their groups altogether. Kathleen said that she responded to Mr. Dummar on this issue, did not hear back from him, but was hopeful that they would continue their groups. She said that even if they have to stop for a period, then continue, she would want them to be current.

All in favor. Motion carried. Walt abstained.

- e. Family Violence Intervention Program
1250 Lamoille Highway, #312
Elko, NV 89801
(reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim said that it appeared that FVIP addressed all items on Dr. Hughes' report. He recommended approval.

Motion: Patricia moved to approve.

2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried.

4. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding the following requests for domestic violence continuing education credits and/or formal training:

- a. Provider Application for CEU's
Innerlandscape
10 Haven Drive
Cedar Crest, NM 87008
6 Internet courses
(reviewed by Walt Dimitroff)

"Domestic Violence: Assessment, Treatment and Intervention"
7 CEU's

"Darkened Corners II: Domestic Violence and Elder Abuse"
8 CEU's

"Addiction: Science, Clinical Theory and Treatment"
8 CEU's

"Adolescents, Families, and Addiction"
7 CEU's

"Darkened Corners III: Child Abuse"
8 CEU's

"Sexual Abuse: Assessment, Intervention and Treatment"
7 CEU's

Walt said that the Committee has not approved internet courses previously as they are similar to correspondence courses where you can log on and complete courses on their own time. The company has been approved by many various boards. Walt said that he looked through all of the content and felt that the first course, "Domestic Violence: Treatment, Assessment, and Intervention" was a cursory course in Domestic Violence dealing with the cycle of violence, but did

not think there was much substance to the course, and did not feel that there was enough to the class to justify approval. Walt said he did not feel that the other classes had enough material relevant to providers to justify approval either. Walt recommended denial.

Motion: Walt moved to deny all of the above courses.

2nd: Tim

Kathleen said that she felt the subject of internet courses needed to be addressed in a workshop format because the Committee keeps coming to a crossroads on allowing people to obtain CEU's this way, but has not addressed how to best do that. She mentioned that Walt may do some video training at some point. Walt said that the training would actually be live where you could participate and ask questions. Kathleen said these types of courses have never been approved by the Committee, and that the Committee has always made people attend a class to obtain CEU's. Noel asked if the Committee made any distinction on formal training versus CEU's. Kathleen said that in light of what Walt said, one would want more specific and thorough training for the 60 hours especially if you are just starting out. Brad asked if the board kept a listing of appropriate trainings. Kathleen said that the Committee does keep a listing. Jennifer said that there is a log of approved and denied trainings. Brad asked if the log was on the website, and Jennifer indicated that it was. Walt said that there are several omissions on the log, so that it may need to be looked at further. Jennifer asked that if anyone knew of any omissions to please let her know, as she does not have the history having only started working for the Committee in November.

All in favor. Motion carried.

- b. Provider Application for 15 perpetrator CEU's
Bob Hoglund Inc.
1700 East Elliot Road
Suite 3, B-20
Tempe, AZ 85284
(Reviewed by Tim Hamilton)
"Helping People Take More Effective Control of Their Lives"

Tim said that the packet lacked a syllabus which would tell him exactly how much time would be spent on each item. He recommended continuing pending receipt of a syllabus.

Motion: Brad moved to continue pending receipt of a syllabus.

2nd: Patricia

Kathleen asked if the training was related to domestic violence. Tim responded that it was.

All in favor. Motion carried.

- c. Provider Application for 7 perpetrator CEU's
Lori Runyan
Health Smart
P.O. Box 2516
Carson City, NV 89702
(reviewed by Walt Dimitroff)
"Living and Working with Maltreated and Neglected Children"

Jennifer told Kathleen that the Committee did not receive a waiver from this entity. Henna advised that they could talk about the training itself, but no details on the people involved. Walt said that this training was very similar to a training the Committee approved last year, and that it was a very good training. He indicated that this was a very extensive training, and he recommended approval. He said that the Committee has a two year clause concerning submitting the same trainings, but felt this was significantly different enough to recommend approval.

Motion: Walt moved to approve the training for 7 perpetrator CEU's.

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried.

- d. Individual Application for 40 CEU's
Marina Funes
ABC Therapy
1340 European Drive
Henderson, Nevada 89052
"Domestic Violence Treatment Provider"
(reviewed by Noel Waters)

Noel said that this was an individual application for 40 hours of CEU's based on a 40 hour program that was presented at the relationship training institute in California the week of May 12, 2005. He indicated that David D. Wexler was the main presenter, and appears to be solidly in the domestic violence arena. He did not see anything that looked questionable about the nature of the training. Noel said that Walt indicated that Dr. Wexler is a widely known authority. Noel recommended approval.

Motion: Noel moved to approve "Domestic Violence Treatment Provider" put on by the Relationship Training Institute for 40 hours. (8 victim, 32 perpetrator).

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried.

- e. Individual Application for 7 perpetrator CEU's
Marina Funes
ABC Therapy
1340 European Drive
Henderson, Nevada 89052

“US Journal Training on Domestic Violence”
(reviewed by Noel Waters)

Noel indicated that this training was held September 15-17th at the Las Vegas Hilton. The conference was for a total of 19 hours of which 7 were being requested. Noel said he went through the workshop materials and they seem to all be relevant for those 7 hours. Noel recommended approval.

Motion: Noel moved to approve the “US Journal Training on Domestic Violence” for 7 CEU’s.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

- f. Provider Application for CEU’s
Safenest
2915 W. Charleston, Suite 12
Las Vegas, NV 89102
“Safety, Survival and Substance Abuse”
(reviewed by Walt Dimitroff)

Tim and Kathleen recused themselves. Noel took over the proceedings. Walt said that he thought the curriculum was appropriate to Domestic Violence and recommended 15 formal victim CEU’s.

Motion: Walt moved to approve for 15 formal victim CEU’s.

2nd: Patricia

Brad indicated that he had seen Patricia Bland’s presentation and said it is an excellent victim oriented training and recommends it. Jennifer asked Walt to clarify specification of formal victim CEU’s. Kathleen said that the credits could be used as formal training or CEU’s. She apologized and said that the Committee would need to go back and specify whether the CEU’s fulfilled victim or perpetrator requirements because it would need to be put down on the listing for people who are looking for formal hours. Jennifer stated that the Committee had 4 different types of applications for CEU’s:

- Individual Application for CEU’s
- Provider Application for CEU’s
- Individual Application for Formal Training
- Provider Application for Formal Training

Jennifer asked that since none of the applications on the agenda were for formal training, did the Committee still specify victim or perpetrator hours. Kathleen said that yes they did. Individuals can submit trainings or providers can submit trainings. Kathleen indicated that those CEU’s can be applied to formal training or just for basic CEU’s. Jennifer said that the list that exists only specifies victim vs. perpetrator hours for a select few trainings on the list from the last 5 years. Kathleen said that typically the Committee has designated the hours and we could revisit the minutes to break those down. Patricia said that sounded like an administrative function.

- g. Individual Application for CEU's
Byron Galloway
Great Basin Counseling
525 Roberts, Suite 102
Reno, NV 89502
"Co-Opting Batterer's Into Treatment"
(reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim said that the minutes from September indicated that this packet had been previously reviewed by Rebecca Thomas and some additional items were requested by her. She wanted to have handouts, class materials, and pre- and post- tests before she made the recommendation. Tim said that the handouts and class materials are still missing, but that the pre- and post- tests were inserted. Tim asked if it was appropriate to continue or deny. Kathleen said that she would recommend denial.

Motion: Tim moved to deny as proper documentation had not been given to determine applicability.

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried.

Kathleen said that they could re-submit if they desired.

- h. Individual Application for CEU's
Claudette and Rich Bohannon
ABC Therapy
1340 European Drive
Henderson, Nevada 89052
"Domestic Violence Counseling Strategies: from Resistance to Real Change"
(reviewed by Noel Waters)

Noel said this training was presented by Scott Barella at California State University at Northridge on November 6th and 7th, 2005. He said it appears to be all perpetrator related.

Motion: Noel moved to approve for 8 perpetrator CEU's.

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried.

- i. Provider Application for CEU's
University of Nevada, Reno Police Services
"Violence Against Women Investigations Training"
(reviewed by Walt Dimitroff)

Walt said that the training had a significant amount of training pertinent to domestic violence presented by Lori Fralick and Brad Simpson. He indicated that the training covered stalking and appeared to be a very fine presentation. Walt recommended approval.

Motion: Walt moved to approve for 8 perpetrator CEU's.
2nd Patricia.

Patricia added that she was not familiar with this particular training, but this is part of the Violence Against Women Grant that the University gets, and said that past trainings have been excellent.

All in favor. Motion carried. Brad abstained.

- j. Provider Application for CEU's
Safenest
"Domestic Violence in the Faith Community – A Call to Action"
(reviewed by Walt Dimitroff)

Kathleen and Tim recused themselves from this item and asked Patricia to take over the meeting. Walt said the training appears to be very well written.

Motion: Walt moved to approve for 9.5 perpetrator CEU's
2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried. Kathleen and Tim abstained.

Mr. Freda asked for clarification the item, and said that because of bad weather, they were having trouble with the phone line.

Kathleen asked Walt to specify how many hours Dorris had requested for that training. Walt said that she requested 9.5 CEU's.

5. *Discussion, recommendation and action regarding approval of supervisors and providers

- a. Las Vegas Municipal Court
Request to Approve Nancy Kennehan as a Supervisor
(reviewed by Noel Waters)

There were some comments made about Noel reviewing a significant number of items. Jennifer said she wanted to apologize for how some things were handed out. She said she had given all of the ABC items to Noel, which turned out to be a significant number of requests. Also at various times when meetings were scheduled and there were people who indicated that they would not be attending, she did not give items to those individuals. At the end, she felt that Noel and Walt had more than their fair share of items to review.

Noel indicated that there was correspondence back and forth concerning using this individual. Noel said he felt that all of the requirements have been met for this individual. He recommended approval as a supervisor. Kathleen asked what her degree level was. Noel said that she is a licensed clinical social worker, and has a Master's degree in social work.

Motion: Noel moved to approve Nancy Kennehan as a Supervisor.

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried.

- b. Las Vegas Municipal Court
Request to Approve Jose Villack as a Provider
(reviewed by Noel Waters)

This request dates back to June of 2005. Noel indicated that one of the initial concerns was that his degree was out of the University of Mexico. Noel indicated that he did not want to deny a medical doctor as a provider simply because the degree was obtained in Mexico City. Noel recommended approval as a provider.

Motion: Noel moved to approve Jose Villack as a provider.

2nd: Brad

Kathleen said that his name seemed familiar and asked if he used to work somewhere else. Julio Landero said that he used to work for ABC Therapy.

All in favor. Motion carried.

- c. ABC Therapy
Request to Approve Marina Funes as a Provider
(reviewed by Noel Waters)

Noel said that because the training was approved in item 4, he would recommend approval. He also commented that Marina had a medical degree from the University of Mexico.

Motion: Noel moved to approve Marina Funes as a provider.

2nd: Patricia

Kathleen asked for clarification on the CEU's. Kathleen said that she has 39 perpetrator and 8 victim, she assumed the remainder were in the packet. Noel said that there was 60 hours of in-service training documented over 40 dates between March 1, 2005 and July 16, 2005. Noel said she has completed 74 hours of continuing educating.

All in favor. Motion carried.

6. *Discussion, recommendation and action regarding American Comprehensive Counseling Services adding a site at Washoe County Detention Center (reviewed by Patricia)

Kathleen asked Walt to leave the room for this item. Patricia asked if Walt could stay in room in case she had any questions on this item. Patricia said that in the packet reviewed earlier, with the breakdown of ACCS locations, WCDC is already listed. She asked if that would mean that we have already approved this. Patricia said she is a little confused as to why this is a separate item. Kathleen asked if they came to visit the Committee. Walt said that he had sent in the information to have the program approved as the former chair had requested that the information be submitted to the Committee for its full approval. Walt said he didn't think it had been officially approved as it had so many continuances. Walt said that they did present quite some time ago. Patricia asked if legal counsel thought it was appropriate to approve them, or were they approved in the renewal item. Henna said if this was something that was previously approved she did not see the point of doing it again. Kathleen said that Patricia is saying that since this location was in the renewal packet, and we approved the packet, she is asking Henna if we have already approved it. Henna said the Committee could vote and make things more clear. Jennifer said that for the record, on the August 19th meeting, this item had been reviewed by Kathleen and tabled, but the minutes did not reflect why and this meeting was the meeting where there was not a tape, so the record could not be checked. Henna said she recommended that the Committee go ahead and vote on this making it clear for the record.

Motion: Patricia moved to approve.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried. Walt abstained.

7. Comments from Kathleen Brooks, Committee Chair.

Kathleen thanked the new members of the Committee and thought some good ideas surfaced from these meetings including getting a packet together for treatment providers to use as a template for the renewals which she would like put on the agenda for the next meeting. Kathleen asked if anyone would like to add anything. Walt said that he felt it was nice having Jennifer on board and felt she was doing a wonderful job. He said he has heard from many of the other providers that they are happy to have Jennifer.

8. *Date, time, and location of future meetings:

Kathleen said the Committee has 4 meetings per year but did not think they would reach that goal. Henna said that the Committee is required to have at least 2, but that the Committee could have as many meetings as necessary. Kathleen indicated that 3 would be ideal. Jennifer pointed out the calendar that the Committee created separated renewals into 4 groups. The Committee has typically tried to meet February, May, August, and November. She said that this meeting included business from November and February. Jennifer indicated that

if the Committee would like to combine the May and August renewals and meet in August, that could be done. Henna said that the Committee really needs to meet before June to address the regulation changes. Henna said that because of language that came out in the last legislative session, the Committee's regulations have to be changed.

Tuesday, May 23, 2006 in Reno at 10:00 a.m.

Tuesday, August 22, 2006 in Reno at 10:00 a.m.

Thursday, November 9, 2006 in Las Vegas at 9:30 a.m.

9. Public Comment.

Mike Freda commented that in the minutes approved from September 21st, on page 3 it said that Mr. Cambell who is the attorney from Great Basin Counseling pointed out to the Committee that the name of Great Basin should be stated as Great Basin Counseling Inc. Great Basin LLC is no longer in existence and went out of business when the assets were sold to Ms. Boe Pluhar. He stated that the new organization owned by Ms. Boe Pluhar is a new entity. Mr. Freda asked if that was true, why they did not have to submit an initial application for certification as a DV provider which has been done in the past particularly when Basic Recovery Associates sold their program to somebody else, they had to submit a new application. The second thing from those same minutes is that Ms. Boe was approved for a total of 49.5 batterer hours and 8 victim hours, so it doesn't seem that it meets the requirements of 30 victim and 30 batterer hours, nor was there any mention about the 60 hours of group observation as well. Noel responded by saying that this is not a minute correction item, but seems to be something to come back to at a future meeting. He indicated that we could have it placed on the agenda for the next meeting to address those items. Noel requested that Mr. Freda send a letter to the Committee detailing what he just said so that it could be put on the agenda for the next meeting. This is a new substantive topic that would need to be addressed as an agenda item. Mr. Freda said he would submit a letter. Kathleen said that the Committee would put this item on the agenda if we get a letter.

Adjournment.

**STATE OF NEVADA COMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
(BATTERER'S TREATMENT CERTIFICATION COMMITTEE)**

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Tuesday, May 23, 2006 at 10:00a.m.

Location:

Reno City Hall
3rd Floor Conference Room
One East First Street
Reno, Nevada

Please Note: The Batterers Treatment Committee may address agenda items out of sequence to accommodate persons appearing before the Committee or to aid the efficiency or effectiveness of the meeting. The Committee may convene in closed session to consider the character, alleged misconduct, professional competence or physical or mental health of a person (NRS 241.030).

***Asterisks (*) denote items on which Committee may take action.
Action by the Committee on an item may be to approve,
deny, amend, or table.***

1. *Call to order and roll call of members.

Meeting called to order by Kathleen Brooks at 10:25 a.m.

Members Present

Kathleen Brooks
Tim Hamilton
Brad Simpson
Patricia Lynch
Noel Waters
Walt Dimitroff
Traci Dory

Others in Attendance

Dr. Michael Freda
Leah Boe
Gail Faulstich
Robin Sweet (portion of meeting)
Travis Jordan (portion of meeting)
Wyatt Halnell (portion of meeting)
Lauren Houston (portion of meeting)
Byron Galloway

Attorney General's Office

Henna Rasul – Deputy Attorney General
Jennifer Kandt – Administrative Coordinator

2. Update by Robin Sweet on batterer's treatment program study.

Kathleen welcomed Robin and told the Committee that Ms. Sweet was here to give an update on the AOC's work on a batterer's treatment program study.

Ms. Sweet thanked the Committee for having her to the meeting. She said that SB77 from the last legislative session required that the court administrator submit a report to the legislature each biennium regarding the effectiveness of bi-weekly, court ordered counseling. She indicated that a study has not yet been done on the effectiveness of weekly counseling, so both will be done at the same time. They will review rural and urban courts for weekly counseling then only the rural courts for the bi-weekly counseling. Ms. Sweet said that they just found out last week that they were denied for a grant to complete the study. The legislature put this requirement in, but did not give the AOC any funding. She said that they would be applying for the AG's grants soon. In the interim, they have done some research on what has been done in some studies. Ms. Sweet said that they are currently trying to assemble an oversight committee that would include providers, judges, and the Nevada Network. The oversight committee would review the survey questions, and the interim report to the legislature which would summarize where they are and what they've done. They hope to get started with the actual data questions by July of this year. In 2008, the oversight group would review the final report. Ms. Sweet said the plan was to send AOC staff out to the courts quarterly to identify specific cases and follow them for three years. After three years, they should have gone through the process. She said the effectiveness of treatment will be based on recidivism. Ms. Sweet indicated that only about 3% of cases qualify for bi-weekly treatment.

Walt asked if anyone was currently enrolled in bi-weekly counseling.

Ms. Sweet said that they were not there yet in the study as they have spent so much time trying to get grants and an oversight committee.

Brad asked if the study was going to address all cases that came into the court, or only convictions.

Ms. Sweet said that the study would address only court ordered batterer's treatment. She said that she thought the study might identify components that would possibly need to be looked into further so that they could go to the legislature in 2009 and say that a particular area may need further study. She said that if the legislature does want further studies, they will need to put the funding in place. Ms. Sweet said that the grant she applied for was for almost \$300,000.

Walt asked if additional members were needed on the oversight committee.

Ms. Sweet said that Kathleen offered Tim Hamilton.

Walt said he wouldn't mind serving on the oversight committee.

Tim asked if a method for collecting recidivism data had been determined.

Ms. Sweet said that they envisioned that they would have their names and certain demographic data on them, and then they will go back to all of the courts in that area to see if they have any cases on that person.

Tim said that then it would only be through the legal system and not through any other means of data collection.

Ms. Sweet said that she was not aware of any other means and asked if there was something else available.

Noel said that he had just been involved in a study on recidivism in drug court attendees and said that they studied 247 drug court graduates to see how many were rearrested, and there was about 20% under-reporting in terms of re-arrest simply because they were behind on data. He said this was for felony type offenses, and doesn't necessarily give you good feelings about the criminal history repository data accuracy. Noel said he would anticipate that the rates would be even higher for misdemeanor re-arrest rates for domestic battery. He felt there would be under-reporting, and felt they would be better off going through the courts and asked for Brad's opinion.

Brad said that if the repository didn't have the data, the only other option he saw was to run their names through NCIC and triple I records to see if they have been arrested in-state or out of state. He said those still have to be sent to the FBI by the states and the courts, so it is a reporting issue.

Ms. Sweet said that her daughter had been a victim of domestic violence in several cities by the same man and said that it is important to check all the courts which will be a very difficult process. She said that the alternative way of doing this, which they are trying to avoid, is to have the courts fill out the form. The concern with that is changeover, or people don't care about how it is done. So, they are trying to have the AOC staff go to the courts and do it, but the issue becomes money.

Brad asked if they were basing this study on any other models of research that have been done on recidivism and treatment.

Ms. Sweet said that they have to an extent, but cannot get some of the demographic information. She said that one study she looked at had staff call the victims and had them do a survey.

Walt asked if recidivism was going to be based on re-arrest for the same crime.

Ms. Sweet said that it would be based on re-arrest for the same or similar crime.

Walt asked if this was going to be a comparison study between rural and urban to measure the difference of weekly vs. bi-weekly counseling.

Ms. Sweet said she hoped it wouldn't become that, but suspected that it would be a component because urban areas cannot offer bi-weekly counseling, and some rural areas offer weekly counseling.

Walt said that he didn't know of any providers that were providing bi-weekly counseling at this point, and wondered how they are going to do the logistics.

Ms. Sweet said that if bi-weekly counseling is not being used, then they certainly couldn't study it.

Brad asked if it would be possible for the Batterer's Treatment Committee to get a copy of the research model once things get going.

Ms. Sweet said that she did not have a problem with it, and that she would like to have some input on the oversight committee. She said she also wouldn't mind coming back regularly to the meetings to share where they are. She stressed that she wanted the oversight committee to be well rounded, but is having a problem because this is an election year, and judges are very busy campaigning. They would really like to have a rural judge on the committee.

Tim asked if they will continue to do the research on the weekly counseling even if there are no participants in the bi-weekly treatment.

Ms. Sweet said she wasn't even aware that no one was doing bi-weekly treatment yet, but she would have to get back on that.

Walt said there was also a good possibility that Rural Mental Health may provide services in some of those areas, so that may affect the study as well.

Patricia brought up the users group headed by Mike Freda, and thought he might be of some help.

Dr. Freda asked if the Council for the Prevention of Domestic Violence was part of the oversight committee.

Ms. Sweet said that some members of the Council would be on the oversight committee.

Dr. Freda said that the Council had just sent a survey to all of the rural judges.

Patricia said that the Council is having a meeting in July in Winnemucca, and said that part of what the legislative committee is asking is to have people come in and talk about rural issues. They are hoping to get judges, victim support groups, and batterer's treatment providers.

Kathleen thanked Robin for her attendance and said that the Committee would like to have her come again.

3. *Review, amend, and approve Minutes of meetings.

a) April 4, 2006 Regulation Workshop

Motion: Brad moved to approve the minutes. 2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried.

b) April 4, 2006 Meeting

Motion: Patricia moved to approve. 2nd: Traci

All in favor. Motion carried.

c) April 5, 2006 Meeting

Motion: Patricia moved to approve. 2nd: Walt

All in favor. Motion carried.

Brad asked that future minutes be broken into more paragraphs instead of full pages of single-spaced typing.

4. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding regulation changes proposed in workshops held on August 17, 2004, November 18, 2004, and April 4, 2006.

Kathleen said that at the last meeting, the Committee worked on the regulation changes.

Henna said that she looked into the fees further, and that the Committee cannot assess fees in NAC unless you are given that authority in NRS, so that portion of the regulations had been removed. NAC 228.107 and NAC 228.108 will both be stricken.

Patricia asked if the Committee may be able to approach a legislator or the Attorney General to add it to their packet in order to allow the Committee to assess fees.

Henna said that as far as this year, she thought it was too late to add it to the Attorney General's bills.

Patricia suggested that possibly the Committee could find a friendly legislator to amend the NRS.

Jennifer suggested that if the Committee was going to amend their NRS, that they may also want to consider changing the batterer slot to something else as the Committee has never been able to fill that slot.

Patricia suggested the slot be changed to a rural judge.

Kathleen said she needed to hold herself accountable for the fact that she did not get the changes to Henna as she had promised. She said she discussed making the regulations temporary.

Henna said that at this point there was not enough time to have them become permanent regulations because there is still a process to go through. She said they still needed to be approved by the Committee, then submitted to legislature where they become proposed regulations. After that, the Committee has to have a hearing which requires a 30 day notice. She said that it just wouldn't happen in time because the cut-off is July 1st. She suggested doing temporary regulations, but said that it can be a lot of work, because then you have to go through the whole process again.

Kathleen said that the upside of the temporary regulations is that the legislation mandating the bi-weekly counseling will sunset, so it might work out better. She said that by the next meeting she will have something typed up for the Committee with all of the changes discussed.

Brad asked if the Committee wanted to try to put a BDR forward, or if they wanted to open this up. He said he always gets nervous opening things up.

Patricia said she did too, but thought the fees were very important, and thought it was also a good idea to change the batterer slot.

Brad said the fees and the slot should be included in one BDR. He said he has had very bad luck taking things to the legislature concerning domestic violence. He asked if someone wanted to draft a BDR, or if they should approach Barbara Buckley.

Patricia said she would be great, or Sheila Leslie.

Noel said he would be willing to do a BDR authorizing adoption of administrative fees with amounts set by regulation. He said the other question would be the composition of membership. Noel said time is of the essence to get a legislator to announce it, but as a practical matter, a legislator can introduce a bill at any time during the session. He said he could definitely do the BDR but needed some input on who the member should be.

Patricia said she felt someone from the judiciary would be ideal and gave some reasoning behind it.

Tim asked about a Native American representative.

Patricia said that they have their own tribal courts, so that probably wouldn't be a good idea.

Walt said he liked the idea of a judge and gave some reasoning behind it.

There was discussion on how involved the judiciary can be in things like this.

There was further discussion on judges and the AOC's study on recidivism. Kathleen indicated that Dr. Hughes was going to be sending her some recent studies, and she would have Jennifer forward them to the Committee members.

Kathleen said they needed to get back on track, and asked if they were considering a rural judge only.

Noel said he didn't think it was necessary to specify rural. He said there was discussion in the past on having a member from the Treatment Providers Association.

Kathleen said she felt that was essentially adding another provider. She also thought that the Nevada Treatment Providers Association was focused in the North, and thought the position should be more expansion.

Brad asked what kind of recruitment was done in the past to get a batterer onto the Committee.

Kathleen said that everybody tried to recruit someone, and they also had a few that they thought might join, but could never get anyone to make the commitment. There was discussion on how difficult it would be to fill that slot.

Motion: Noel moved to approve drafting a BDR to amend Chapter 228 to authorize the imposition of administrative fees upon providers and to amend the existing statute to take out the provision for a batterer and replace it with a person who is appointed by the attorney general with a recommendation of the Judge's Association. He said he would e-mail it out to everyone to take a look at it before sending it out.

2nd: Patricia

Jennifer asked if they would have to have a meeting to officially approve it.

Henna said they should, but it could be done by telephone.

Noel asked for an e-mail reminding him to draft the BDR.

All in favor. Motion carried.

Kathleen said that they would also have the changes for the regulations on the August meeting agenda.

5. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding the application for certification renewal from the following providers:

a. Family violence Intervention Program

742 D. Street

Elko, NV 89801

(reviewed by Kathleen Brooks – Continued from April Meeting)

Kathleen said she felt the information she received from the supervisor was no more clear to her than the last meeting. She said she got a list of dates and information that the person in training completed the Network Advocacy Program, which is not on the list of approved ways of getting formal CEU's. She said she felt FVIP is in the same position as it was in at the last meeting. Kathleen said she wanted to give them one last letter, indicating that they need to comply in terms of the person in training. She said the person in training cannot receive her in-service training by attending groups with the supervisor, but must observe groups with both a male and female co-facilitator. She said there is another group in Elko where this person could observe. She said that this person also needed to complete the remainder of her CEU's, as she only has 15 from the Nevada Network training. If the group does not comply, the Committee will go forward with a denial hearing.

Tim asked if they would go to Provisional status in the interim.

Kathleen said that if they do not have the information to us by August then their certificate will expire. Kathleen said they did receive a list of dates the facilitator observed groups, but Kathleen felt she was actually in group with the Supervisor. Also, her CEU's are not complete. She had an online course, which is not approved.

Walt asked if the Committee knew the time frame that the provider had been out of compliance.

Kathleen said she wasn't sure.

Noel said that NAC 228 says that if the application is submitted 60 days before it expires, it will be renewed if it is otherwise complete. If the completed application is received by the Committee on or before the expiration date, the certificate remains in effect until after the expiration date unless the Committee provides notice. If the application is not received before the expiration date, the certificate becomes delinquent and the Committee will within 30 days after the certificate becomes delinquent, the Committee will send them notice by certified mail return receipt requested. The organization may renew their certificate within 90 days after the certificate becomes delinquent if the organization complies with the requirements of subsection 4 which means that they have come back into compliance. Otherwise, the certificate expires without further notice, and the Committee will remove them from the list of programs. He said they are now

delinquent and we will give them 90 days to fix it, although we've already given them time to fix it. Then, the certificate will expire without further notice.

Henna said that sounded correct.

Tim moved to submit a letter to FVIP that they are delinquent and they have 90 days to comply.

Jennifer said that in the past, she thought the Committee had denied the application, then Henna does a denial letter giving them 90 days to correct. If they don't correct, they go to a denial hearing.

Tim amended his motion: He moved to submit a letter to FVIP telling them their application has been denied, and they have 90 days to comply.

2nd: Brad

Kathleen said again that the program has to have a supervisor and a provider. The provider has to be fully trained before he or she may participate in group. She stressed that participating in group is not the same as observing group. All of the CEU's for formal training, 30 perp, 30 victim, have to be approved by the Committee.

All in favor. Motion carried. Walt abstained as he has a competing program in Elko.

- b. State of Nevada Rural Mental Health
Battle Mountain Mental Health
10 6th Street
Battle Mountain, NV 89820
and
Winnemucca Community Mental Health Center
3140 Traders Way
Winnemucca, NV 89446
(reviewed by Patricia Lynch – Continued from April Meeting)

Patricia said that from the last meeting, the program providers were lacking 8 CEU's. She said that David Dummar does have all of his, and Corene Watson has 7, but she also has a class on Critical Incident Stress Management which trains counselors. She also attended a DV class in Reno on March 22nd for 6 hours which would put her over the 8, and is also attending a 5 hour course on May 6th. They are also going to the Network workshop. Patricia noted that in the letter, it appears she has completed the training, but she only has one certificate from her. Patricia said this group has been struggling, and we are trying to keep them afloat. There were also concerns about having one treatment provider at times. Patricia said that possibly we could request that they send us the certificates from the trainings.

Walt said that the trainings would need to be on the certified training list.

Kathleen said she is relieved to hear that David is trying to keep the groups going, and thinks they need to submit the trainings for approval. Kathleen said that the provider needs to know the process for approving training, so maybe the Committee's letter to them can state the process and we would need the certificates as well. She said otherwise she is satisfied with the program because they work hard to be in compliance.

Patricia asked what the motion would be as it looks like she has already attended the training.

Walt said he is concerned that they don't have an understanding of what kind of hours are needed. He said it seems as if it written in a way that they are not clear on the DV CEU process and what trainings to attend. He said he is not sure why they would submit CEU's that they don't have certificates for. Walt said he felt it was very important to have the program in Winnemucca, but wondered if it might be helpful to have a Committee member go out there and bring them up to speed.

Kathleen said that in the past they have always attended the Network conference, so this has never been an issue before. She said she wants Jennifer to submit a letter explaining that procedure for the trainings attended.

Tim said that Alfred Hughes is possibly going to put on a training on how to comply with the regs, and perhaps the CEU process could be added to his curriculum.

Brad said it seems like providers are needing a model to work with that asks them to list the CEU's, and spell it out.

Traci and Kathleen discussed critical management classes and whether the Committee approves those types of classes.

Motion: Brad moved to approve the renewal on the condition that the Committee receives the certificates from the trainings.

All in favor. Motion carried.

- c. Nevada Court Counseling Inc.
1016 N. Rock Blvd.
Sparks, NV 89431
(reviewed by Kathleen Brooks – Continued from April Meeting)

Kathleen indicated that they have all of their CEU's. She recommended approval.

Motion: Kathleen moved to approve.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

d. Options

4528 W. Craig Rd. Ste. 150

Las Vegas, NV 89032

(reviewed by Walt Dimitroff – Continued from April Meeting)

Walt said that additional information had been requested from Options. There was missing CEU documentation for Sara Williams, Joan Burley, and Jackie Ellis. They provided the additional CEU's that were missing, and the people who did not have CEU's were going to be discontinued from facilitating groups until they got their CEU certificates. Walt recommended approval based on the information provided. He said that Perry Ellis and Joan Burley had discontinued facilitation because they did not receive their CEU's. They also indicated that they will be going to the Alternative Sentencing training coming up.

Kathleen asked if we had documentation that all of their providers have the proper training (i.e. 60, 60).

Jennifer said she did not know of any list the Committee kept that indicated who had been approved from which program and when. She said that it would probably be a matter of digging through files from past years, although she wouldn't even know which year a provider had been approved, and would have to request files from storage to do that. She said that is why she and Tim were suggesting some changes to the renewal application to make people submit that documentation, and she could start a list of some kind from this point forward. Kathleen requested that Jennifer find all of the materials to see if all of their providers have the proper training.

Brad asked if it would be beneficial for the Committee to have a database which would show who the providers and supervisors are, as well as all of the training they have completed. He suggested an Access program.

Noel said that in the past the Committee has talked about the fact that they are certifying programs and not individuals. He said that this keeps coming back because people move from one program to another and we have to dive back into files to see whether they have the qualifications. If someone was approved as a supervisor in 2002, we would still need to know whether they have gotten their CEU's for every year since then.

Kathleen said that she has been audited by other boards for her CEU's, and has to retain that information, so she would expect no less of these professionals. She said she is in agreement with both Tim and Brad that the Committee do the beginning work, then hopefully get the database.

Brad said he didn't feel this would be very difficult to set up in Access with the name of the provider, whether they have been certified before, the list of trainings, facilitators.

Walt said it is very easy and that is how he keeps track of things in his agencies. He said it is invaluable and cheap. He said that is one place he feels hobbled because he sees a bunch of names, but really has not access to whether they are approved or not. Walt indicated that he had to ask Jennifer about the Supervisory status of another provider, because he wasn't sure whether they had applied or not.

Motion: Walt said he wanted to amend his recommendation to continue pending additional documentation regarding the status of the rest of the staff at Options until we can do some further research.

Jennifer asked whether it was preferred that she pull files from storage and do research to piece it together, or if she could request the information from Options.

Kathleen said she felt Options should have that information, as all programs should and that requesting it from them would be appropriate and easier. Pending that documentation then they should be approved.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried. Kathleen abstained.

- e. Community Counseling Center
(Southern Nevada)
1120 Almond Tree Lane, Suite 207
Las Vegas, NV 89104
(reviewed by Noel Waters – Continued from April Meeting)

Noel said they he did not bring the paperwork with him, Jennifer gave him the file. She said that Tim had actually submitted the paperwork prior to the last meeting, but it did not get to her until after the meeting as it had gone to the Carson City office.

Brad asked what was needed by Community Counseling.

Noel said it was CEU documentation for the current and the previous supervisor, as well as annual performance reports on the providers.

Jennifer said that there was a letter indicating that the agency did not have access to the previous supervisor's information.

Noel said that he didn't know how to correct that type of problem, but he didn't feel it was something that was going to repeat as the current supervisor is up to date, and the program is up to date.

Brad said he felt comfortable approving the renewal application even though they do not have information regarding the past supervisor.

Noel said he didn't see a way to fix not having that information, and if there was a problem, it has now been fixed with the new supervisor. So, he recommended approval.

Motion: Noel moved to approve the renewal.

2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried. Tim and Kathleen abstained.

Brad said this was another indication that a database would be appropriate.

Kathleen said that Jennifer and Tim had been working on a remedy which would be discussed. There was more discussion on Access.

- f. S.A.F.E. House, Inc.
921 American Pacific Drive, #300
Henderson, NV 89014
(Reviewed by Patricia Lynch)

Patricia asked Jennifer whether she had completed the checklist attached to the application.

Jennifer said that she had simply written "yes, per Jennifer" next to the submitted on time box. She said that at the last meeting the Committee had said there was no way for them to know whether they were submitting on time or not, and asked her to make some indication on the form.

Patricia said then she still needed to look further at it. She verified everything in the application and said that she recommended approval.

Motion: Patricia moved to approve.

2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried.

- g. Las Vegas Municipal Court (ASED)
Regional Justice Center
P.O. Box 3970
Las Vegas, NV 89127
(Reviewed by Walt)

Walt said that everything seemed to be in order except for documentation about substitute domestic violence instructors who have not been in the classroom a sufficient amount of time to evaluate. Walt said he wasn't clear as to whether these substitute domestic violence instructors had met the requirements.

Kathleen said that to be consistent she felt the Committee should send the same letter that is being sent to the other programs saying that they need to provide the Committee with the background information on the providers that are either new or in training.

Walt said there was a notation next to some names saying approved 4/5/06, which led him to believe the substitutes are not approved.

Jennifer said she knew that Rebecca had approved some of them before she left, and the Committee had approved some of them at the last meeting.

Walt recommended that the renewal be continued pending documentation of all training for Cora Stephenson, Howard Meadows, and Irene Jameson. He said all of the providers attended the ASED training in Vegas.

All in favor. Motion carried.

- h. LRS Systems
2077 E. Sahara
Las Vegas, NV 89104-3829
(Reviewed by Kathleen Brooks)

Kathleen said she is recommending denial. She said the packet was submitted with Renee Vincent as the supervisor. The Committee had previously interviewed another supervisor who was denied. Kathleen said she went through the list of supervisors in the file, and it appeared that none of the supervisors prior to Ms. Vincent had met the regulations. She said that Ms. Vincent had not supervised a program of domestic violence for 2 years, or at least there was no documentation of that. Kathleen said that she had 32.5 CEU's that she did not believe the Committee approved nor were they relevant to domestic violence. She said there was no indication that she had her in-service 60 hours of observing group. Kathleen said Ms. Vincent cannot be the supervisor of that program. She said that she looked back at previous supervisors and saw that one of them had done home study which is not approved by the Committee. She found that 3 or 4 of the providers did not have their CEU's. Kathleen also said that the Supervisor's Annual Performance Report was not included, which may have been overlooked. She said that she did not see that any of the previous supervisors had the appropriate qualifications. She said she felt they knew better. Kathleen recommended denial.

Jennifer asked if they would still have 90 days to correct the deficiency.

Kathleen said they would.

Motion: Noel moved to deny and give them 90 days to correct.

2nd: Tim

Kathleen said she would like to make it very clear in the letter that the chair is very concerned that it appears that none of the previous supervisors have ever fit the criteria according to the regulations, and maybe we should provide them with a copy of the regulations.

Tim said he thought the Committee should go back and look through the files to make sure that was the case.

Kathleen said that she went through the file yesterday.

Jennifer said she thought what Kathleen looked through was from 2004-2005.

Kathleen said we could ask them for the original documents.

Brad asked if the program was ever audited.

Kathleen indicated that it had been.

Noel said someone should probably notify Dr. Hughes, so he doesn't waste a visit with someone we just found delinquent.

Jennifer said she didn't think she could remove someone from the list of providers until they have had the opportunity for a denial hearing.

Noel said he felt Dr. Hughes should be made aware of what was going on.

Walt recommended sending copies of the minutes from meetings for Dr. Hughes to look at. Everyone agreed.

Kathleen said she would provide further information to Jennifer.

All in favor. Motion carried.

6. * Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding the Corrective Action Plans for the following providers:

- a. Nevada Court Counseling Inc.
1016 N. Rock Blvd.
Sparks, NV 89431
(reviewed by Kathleen Brooks – Continued from April Meeting)

Kathleen said she needed to have this item continued again until the next meeting. She said they did remove some of the items from their curriculum, but thought the curriculum was still outdated. She said she would like to provide them with a detailed letter concerning their curriculum. She said it appears out of date. Kathleen said she would like Jennifer to pull their original file to look at what they submitted when they became certified.

Motion: Patricia moved to continue to the next meeting.

2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried.

7. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding the following requests for domestic violence continuing education credits and/or formal training:

- a. Provider Application for 15 CEU's (8 victim, 7 perp)
Las Vegas Municipal Court
P.O. Box 3970
Las Vegas, NV 89127
6th Annual Domestic Violence Workshop
"Inner Healing of the Mind, Body, and Soul"
(reviewed by Noel Waters)

Noel said that he thought the packet itself was complete with all kinds of resumes, biographies, and an index. He said that a lot of it seemed to be related to victim issues. He said he didn't have a problem with anything except the last day. From 9-10 is "The Healing Process: Mind, Body, and Soul" which is put on by the assistant coroner of Clark County. He said he didn't know how that related to domestic violence CEU's. There is a panel discussion which he said he thought was fine. On Thursday afternoon, he said he has a problem with one hour on avoiding burnout in the workplace, one hour on inner peace through ethical practice in the workplace, one hour on when trauma hits close to home, and finally music therapy. Noel indicated he was not sure that was appropriate for CEU's. The application is for 15 CEU's, 7 of them perpetrator, but none appeared to be perpetrator related.

Tim said the last 3 or 4 hours sounded like vicarious traumatization.

Noel said maybe he wasn't plugged into the psychotherapeutic aspects of some of these issues.

Kathleen said she thought Noel knew what he was talking about.

Traci asked who the target audience was.

Noel said the audience was therapists, psychologists, psychiatrists, drug and alcohol counselors.

Brad said it sounded like they were covering everything therapists would need for their CEU's, but wasn't sure all of it sounded appropriate to batterer's treatment.

Noel said he didn't see anything that was perpetrator related. He recommended 11 victim hours, and that was including the keynote address by Oscar Goodman.

There was some discussion on whether the Committee should include the keynote speaker.

Tim asked if the Committee was not approving vicarious traumatization for batterer's treatment because he thought it had been approved in the past.

Kathleen said that the way it is presented in this training was not applicable to DV.

Kathleen said that they could always appeal and give us more information on how it is specific and applicable to DV.

Motion: Patricia moved to approve the training for 11 hours of victim training and CEU's.

b. Provider Application for 15 CEU's

Bob Hoglund

1849 East Guadalupe Road

Suite C-101, PMB 120

Tempe, AZ 85283

"Helping People Take More Effective Control of Their Lives"

(reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim said that he received materials re-submitted by Bob which is just a list of topics. He is recommending that this be tabled again, as maybe he was not specific enough in terms of what he wanted. In order for the Committee to award CEU's, they have to know the time frames in which everything occurs. He is asking for 15 CEU's but there are no times on anything in his presentation.

Motion: Tim moved to table again and request further information about specific time frames on his agenda.

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried.

8. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding current status of Consent Decree with Great Basin.

This item was heard after item 3.

Byron Galloway, Leah Boe, and Gail Faulstich all introduced themselves to the Committee.

Kathleen told the Committee that per the terms of the Consent Decree, she and Tim showed up at Great Basin Counseling unannounced to attend group. She said that Henna had given them a letter to give to Great Basin which explained why they were there. She said that everyone at Great Basin was very cordial. Kathleen indicated that Byron gave them some files to look at. The group, facilitated by Byron and Leah, started and ended on time. She said they were satisfied with what they saw at Great Basin. Kathleen said that Great Basin asked for feedback in terms of group content, and Kathleen said she would do that in writing.

Kathleen also indicated that Great Basin asked to be kept abreast of approved training. Kathleen asked Jennifer if the list of approved training was on the website. Jennifer said it was, and that she has also been e-mailing trainings out that are on the agenda, or that she receives notice of.

Kathleen said that she recommended that the Committee continue with the Consent Decree.

Gail Faulstich said that it was her understanding that Great Basin could apply to the Committee to have the Consent Decree dropped after a year.

Kathleen said that was correct, but said that it may not be in Great Basin's best interest to do that, as the Committee had just started to catch up. Kathleen said that the Committee planned to be more consistent with monitoring the program.

Gail Faulstich and Leah Boe said they welcomed the visits.

Kathleen said she was not sure what the motion should be, but that their observation was that Great Basin was currently compliant.

Henna said that the Committee would mull over the information provided to them, and Kathleen and Tim would have to recuse themselves from whatever recommendation was made.

Kathleen asked if the Committee wanted anymore information at this time. She suggested that possibly the Committee put Great Basin on the agenda for the next meeting and offer the typed out material that she and Tim will put together.

Motion: Noel moved to approve the oral report on the monitoring of Great Basin, and to continue the Consent Decree for further consideration and monitoring.

2nd: Traci

All in favor. Motion carried. Kathleen and Tim abstained.

Noel said he thought there would probably be another visit between now and the next Committee meeting.

Kathleen thanked Great Basin for their time, and for making them feel so comfortable.

Ms. Faulstich and Ms. Boe said that the Committee was welcome anytime.

Byron Galloway said it was nice to have feedback from other providers.

9. Budget report by Kareen Prentice, Domestic Violence Ombudsman.

Jennifer said that the report prepared by Kareen indicated that there was basically about \$30,000 left until the end of June.

Noel asked if Dr. Hughes had any outstanding invoices.

Jennifer said she wasn't sure, but said she thought his invoices were usually around \$8,000.

Walt asked if this amount included the \$100,000 that the Committee possibly found.

Jennifer said that may be a bit of an issue, and Kareen would probably need to explain that further. She said that even though there was an account with \$100,000 in it, it was possibly not something the Committee could spend.

Henna said that from what she understood, the Committee only had a certain spending authority, and could not go above that. Henna said they are still trying to figure out what the money can be used for. She said the rollover money actually went into a common account that could also be used by the Council.

Jennifer said she thought the money was for BTC, the Council, and the Ombudsman. She said that it was explained to her that court assessments for BTC were projected to be about \$75,000 for the year, but we only have a spending authority for \$69,000, so the extra money would go into this rollover account.

Henna said this will all be figured out, and the Committee's spending authority can be raised if there is an increase in need. She said that Kareen would best be able to give a detailed explanation as far as what has been done,

what the Committee can do, and how to go about doing it. She said that right now the Committee had \$30,423.67 after expenditures in April. She gave some explanations on the breakdown on the forms.

Patricia asked if the Committee could request that the authority be raised. She said if the Committee approved Dr. Hughes, they will go above the \$69,000.

Henna said the Committee can ask Kareen to have that authority raised, and she can look into that further. She said that Kareen will have to talk to the CFO, and possibly the Chief or AG. She said the Committee could possibly put that onto the next agenda.

Jennifer said she wondered if the court assessments were only \$75,000, could the spending authority be raised above that.

Henna said she didn't think that mattered because of the rollover account. She said she has been looking at legislative history to see exactly what has gone on in the past with respect to the creation of the Ombudsman position, how it was created, how the BTC was funded, etc. She said she is also looking at the documentation that the office has on these issues because it is not clear from what exists at this point. She said she and Kareen are looking into it.

Patricia said that she knows that originally the account was not under the Batterer's Treatment Committee, but somewhere else, and then it was moved. She said that the legislature was very strong on having the perpetrators pay in order to fund the Committee so that it can carry itself.

Noel said it definitely should carry itself based on the number of DV arrests.

Patricia said she felt that the Committee should raise the spending authority to cover whatever the budget is.

Henna said that other expenses need to be taken into account as far as a possible raise for the renewal of Jennifer's contract.

Kathleen said the Committee is possibly interested in getting a fund for victims in item 13.

10. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding proposal from Dr. Hughes to provide additional site visits.

Jennifer said there was some discussion at the last meeting on whether the \$24,000 was per year or for the term of the contract. Jennifer said she wanted to make it clear that the \$24,000 was per year. She said this proposal basically doubles the amount of his contract.

Patricia asked if the trainings he is proposing to do are part of this fee.

Jennifer said it did not include the trainings, and if the Committee was interested in that he could submit a separate proposal for that.

Noel said he thought the trainings would probably run something close to his daily rate.

Walt asked if the Committee had the funding to do this.

Jennifer said that could be an issue, as the spending authority would need to be increased.

Brad said that the Committee had the money, but couldn't spend it.

Noel asked if the Committee was legally locked into the \$69,000 until the next biennium.

Henna said she wouldn't say that the Committee is locked into it, but she was looking into whether that could be increased afterwards, as she wasn't very familiar with budgetary process. She said she is hoping to have an answer for the Committee by July when the Committee meets for the BDR. Possibly a line can be added to the agenda for Kareen to answer budget questions.

Jennifer said the Committee could still look at Dr. Hughes' proposal and make a decision, then go forward with trying to increase the spending authority.

Brad said that the one day training sounded great, but with what the Committee is doing with regards to what the Committee is doing in terms of forms, that they may not need that.

Patricia said she felt that the trainings would be nice, but maybe could come up with something else instead of paying Dr. Hughes to do the trainings.

Brad said the Committee could come up with something that would make it easier for compliance by programs.

Patricia said at this point she felt they just needed to look at the site visit proposal and make a decision.

Motion: Patricia moved to approve the additional site visits provided the Committee can come up with the funding.

2nd: Noel

Noel said that essentially the Committee did not have enough money in the existing budget to pay for this, so this has to be contingent upon getting the additional funding to cover the increased costs. He said it looked like the

Committee was going to have leftover money this year. He said he felt it was very important to have annual visits to every site.

Jennifer said it she wanted the Committee to know that the Committee was without an assistant for some time, and that could account for a small amount of leftover funds.

Henna said that the \$30,000 would probably reduce in amount prior to July, however, if there was leftover that would be added on to the next year.

Noel asked if the leftover reverted to the AG general funds, or did the Committee get to keep the money.

Jennifer wondered if the spending authority could be reduced if the Committee does not spend all of the funds.

Henna said she did not believe the spending authority would be reduced.

Kathleen said she wanted to protect what she considers the Committee's money, and wondered why the Committee's money kept disappearing. She said it was very important to get clarification before July 1st.

All in favor. Motion carried.

Brad asked that the Committee receive clarification on what they have, what they can use, and what rolls over.

Henna said she met with budget people in the AG's office, and asked about increasing the spending authority. She said she was told the Ombudsman has that authority. She said she asked how they came up with the \$69,000, and was told that it was based on prior years. Henna said that she and Kareen were going above the budget people in the office to get clarification on the budget and how it is being run. She said she thought it was getting muddled up with other things it should not be getting muddled up with. She said she wished she had clearer answers, but that Kareen would really be the one to explain everything.

Kathleen said she wants Kareen to know that the Committee voted to approve the additional spending for Dr. Hughes, and we will need spending authority increased.

Henna said she did let the budget people in the office know that there was talk of increasing Dr. Hughes contract amount, so they know it is a consideration.

Walt asked if the Committee could request that some of these budget people come in to explain some questions, such as, where did the \$100,000 go, how do we increase the spending authority, etc.

Jennifer said Kareen would probably be the best person to talk to.

Kathleen asked if Dorene handled the Committee's money.

Henna said she did not.

Kathleen said that was good to know.

Henna said the Committee could have anyone come in to talk to them.

Walt said the whole process seemed nebulous, and he couldn't wrap his mind around it.

Brad said he would like to have an understanding of what they can and can't spend and why they can or can't spend it.

Henna said that they are looking into things very carefully.

Kathleen said she thought she would call Rebecca to get some budget history.

Henna said that Kareen is aware of their concerns and is looking into things. Henna said she would be looking into the legislative history, and would hopefully have some answers for the Committee.

11. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding Committee forms and proposed model renewal packet.

Kathleen said she was handing the meeting over to Tim and Jennifer who worked on the forms. Tim said that some of the forms from his standard recertification packet were used as a model, and that Jennifer generated some additional forms as well that were extensions of forms the Committee already had.

Jennifer said she looked at the packet Tim submitted and used it as a model of what the Committee would like to see, and made changes to the forms the Committee already had, and created some additional forms as well. Jennifer said that reviewers seem to have difficulty with looking at packets and knowing which providers and supervisors have been approved. She said that she was not aware of how that was being tracked, other than going back into previous files trying to find out when a provider was approved. So, she and Tim discussed that information be attached for each provider, supervisor every year. She said this would not create additional work for providers as they would simply copy the same information every year. Jennifer went through the proposed forms page by page and Committee members suggested various changes.

Tim said he felt there could be a problem with people who have been approved in the past, submitting documentation of their observation hours.

Walt said he has providers from 1998, but he has kept track of everything with an Access program.

Noel said that if a program was approved in the past, they may just have a letter from the Committee stating that the program was approved, and that could be sufficient documentation. Noel said we just want to be able to verify that they have been previously approved.

Jennifer said that part of the problem is not knowing exactly who has been approved.

Noel said he felt that it would be appropriate if a program submitted a letter from a certain date saying the program was approved and indicating that they were the supervisor at that time. From here forward, the Committee would want that info.

Henna said this could be an issue with notice.

Patricia said the Committee did not want to get into detrimental reliance.

Noel commented that he thought the new forms were very good.

Tim said he was still unclear as to how a program documents annual inspection by Dr. Hughes.

Jennifer said the report gets sent to her and is sent out to those programs with violations asking the program to submit a corrective action plan. Jennifer said she could attach the last site visit report to each renewal application she gives to Committee members to review so that they know what issues Dr. Hughes had with the program on the last visit.

Noel said that would be great, and everyone agreed that would be very helpful. Noel asked Dr. Freda to comment on what he thought of the new forms.

Dr. Freda said he thought the forms were very helpful, and only had an issue with the fact that some of the information required, his agency would no longer have as they were one of the first programs certified. Dr. Freda said he felt that from here on out there would not be a problem with gathering and keeping track of all of this information.

Walt said he was volunteering to help Jennifer with developing an Access program which might in the future help with reducing some of the paperwork.

Everyone agreed that was a great idea.

Motion: Patricia moved to approve the proposed model application for renewal packet as amended.

2nd: Noel

All in favor. Motion carried.

12. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding search for new Committee members.

Patricia asked if all of the slots were filled at this point. Kathleen indicated that they were.

Jennifer clarified that this item was on the agenda because Noel and Patricia would be vacating in November. She said she wanted to get the Committee's approval to request that the D.A.'s association recommend someone, and to solicit applications from all of the municipal lawyers in the state of Nevada.

Patricia said that this issue came up with the Prevention Council, and actually there is a nominating committee and the Attorney General appoints someone, but the D.A.'s still felt they wanted to recommend someone. She said there was not a municipal lawyers association in Nevada.

Noel asked if the statutes required that the Attorney General appoint someone.

Henna read the statute indicating that the Attorney General does make the appointments to the Committee.

Noel said that means that the AG does what he wants to do.

Jennifer said that the AG does make the appointments, but last time the Committee was searching for new members, the Committee presented him with applications, and he made the decision from there. So, she said that we probably needed to solicit applications from municipal lawyers and DA's.

Noel indicated that the AG may want to do things differently and that was his right not the Committee's. He said he felt that we should let the AG know that there are several positions opening in November and ask him how he would like to handle those appointments.

Henna said she was sure he wouldn't mind if we had a few applications available for him, and of course he has the option to appoint whoever he wants to appoint.

Jennifer said that last time there was openings, she prepared a media blast requesting applications, which he approved. She recommended that we send the AG a letter telling him the positions that are opening, and how he wants to proceed.

Henna said the letter should remind him how this has been handled in the past.

Noel said he liked that better, and wanted to make sure that we proceeded how the AG wants to proceed.

13. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding commemorating Edna Harris.

Kathleen said there was another idea submitted about training Rural Mental Health providers, but needed to make sure that the regs would allow that.

Henna referred to NRS 228.460, and said that she has been looking into this statute to see what the intent was because there are no breakdowns in percentages as far as where the money is to go. She said that through the course of history, the budget people have created a certain spending authority and let the Ombudsman do certain things with the remaining money, although not pay herself. Henna said she can do law enforcement trainings, but did not think that Kareen had spent very much on that. Henna said she did not believe the Ombudsman had been using court assessments for carrying out the duties of her office. She said the statute left a lot of room for interpretation.

Henna said that since Kareen is the one given the function of taking care of all of this money, that this be something the Committee discusses with her. Henna said that this could be discussed when they discuss increasing the spending authority for Dr. Hughes' additional expenses.

Patricia said that she was concerned about the Committee getting into direct victim assistance with this proposal, and thought that could be problem. She said that since Edna was a treatment provider, perhaps the Committee offer some sort of scholarship for training for people out in the rural areas. She said that she felt that would really tie into what this Committee is doing. The scholarship could cover travel to get to a training.

Brad said that when this was done for the Southern Nevada Task Force, there were issues about how to give money out. They developed an application process which allowed the Task Force to account for how it was used, and show that it was used for the intended purposes. Brad said he would e-mail Jennifer the application process used by the Task Force.

Noel asked if the training scholarship should be restricted to the rural areas.

There was discussion on the expenses of trainings for everyone, and the importance of expense verification.

Noel said that if the Committee ever started getting \$35 per conviction, they would have a lot of money.

Patricia said that the Committee would need to decide whether they wanted to create a subcommittee, have the Ombudsman, or allow the chair to make decisions on awarding the funds.

Brad recommended that it either come through the Committee or through the Ombudsman, and said it may be easier to come through the Ombudsman office with an application form which could be reviewed by the Committee.

Noel said he didn't have a problem with the chair approving.

Kathleen said that the Committee needed to decide whether they wanted to go with the proposed victim assistance, provider scholarship, or something else.

There was discussion favoring provider scholarship.

Motion: Noel moved to create a line item in the Committee's budget for \$1,000 per year subject to budgetary constraints and limitations to the Edna Harris Treatment Provider Assistance Fund to be used for scholarships for training providers to include travel, expenses, and tuition for training. The applications should be reviewed by the chair, and subject to approval by the Committee at a later date.

2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried.

Kathleen asked Jennifer to write a letter to Edna Harris' family.

14. Comments from Kathleen Brooks, Committee Chair.

15. *Date, time, and location of future meetings:

Tuesday, August 22, 2006 Reno, Nevada

Thursday, November 9, 2006 Las Vegas, Nevada

16. Public Comment.

17. *Adjournment

Motion: Brad moved to adjourn.

2nd: Traci

All in favor. Motion carried.

**STATE OF NEVADA COMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
(BATTERER'S TREATMENT CERTIFICATION COMMITTEE)**

MINUTES OF MEETING

Tuesday, August 22, 2006 at 10:00a.m.

Location:

Reno City Hall
3rd Floor Conference Room
One East First Street
Reno, Nevada

Please Note: The Batterers Treatment Committee may address agenda items out of sequence to accommodate persons appearing before the Committee or to aid the efficiency or effectiveness of the meeting. The Committee may convene in closed session to consider the character, alleged misconduct, professional competence or physical or mental health of a person (NRS 241.030).

***Asterisks (*) denote items on which Committee may take action.
Action by the Committee on an item may be to approve,
deny, amend, or table.***

1. *Call to order and roll call of members.

Meeting called to order by Noel Waters at 10:20.

Members Present

Tim Hamilton
Traci Dory
Noel Waters
Brad Simpson
Walt Dimitroff
Patricia Lynch

Public Present

Michael Freda
Karen Goodwill-Freda
Nancy Kennehan
Dorothy Hearon
Hank Stone
Alfred Hughes

Attorney General's Office

Henna Rasul
Kareen Prentice
Jennifer Kandt

2. *Review, amend, and approve Minutes of meetings.

a) May 23, 2006

Traci noted correction needed on page 10, paragraph 6 to correct spacing in Tim's name.

Motion: Brad moved to approve minutes with correction. 2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

3. Budget report by Karen Prentice.

Kareen said that Teri Sulli regretted not being able to attend the meeting, but has taken the entire month to do the Attorney General's budget. Kareen went through the expenses for July 2005-July 2006. She said that it goes through August because expenditures in July sometimes do not show up until August. She said that \$57,863.76 was spent. Kareen said that Teri Sulli approved the work program in July, and that the interim finance committee would be reviewing it on September 12th. She explained the expenses listed on the work program, and asked if any members had any questions.

Noel asked if any problems were anticipated with the interim finance committee.

Kareen indicated that Teri Sulli did not feel that there would be any problems.

Kareen then went through the 2007 expenses.

Brad asked whether any action needed to be taken on the budget.

Noel said that no action was being taken at this time.

4. Comments from Dr. Alfred Hughes, site reviewer.

Dr. Hughes introduced himself and said that he had been working for the Committee for 4 years, but had only met some of the Committee members. He said that he had spoken with Kathleen on the phone about some issues, and she indicated that the meeting date was August 22nd. He said that he had already made his travel arrangements to be in the north during this time frame and thought it would be a great opportunity to come and meet everyone.

Dr. Hughes indicated that Jennifer had e-mailed him minutes from previous meetings and was surprised at how much the Committee does. He said that he felt there was a great breadth with Committee business in terms of looking at training, rural issues, legislation, etc. He indicated that he read through the minutes from the regulation workshop and noticed that his name was mentioned for making suggestions, some of which were accurate, and some which were not. He then said he would like to spend some time answering questions.

Walt said he felt there was some redundancy with regards to forms at their site. He said that his agency was written up for things he felt were redundant. For instance, they would send monthly progress reports, and there was another requirement in the standards that was very similar and made things confusing. Walt said he felt there was a disparity between what he knew about the

standards and then how they were being written up. Walt said he thought some clarification might be helpful.

Dr. Hughes said that one of the errors in the regulation workshop was the section discussing termination of perpetrators and sending reports to the referral section of the courts. He said the written report is supposed to be done right after the intake and is very comprehensive, but judges do not want to see it, they just want to know that the perpetrator is complying with what they are supposed to do in a compliance report.

Dr. Hughes discussed aspects of the absentee policies of programs and adhering to 90 minute group sessions. He said he did not feel administrative duties and breaks should be part of the 90 minutes. He also discussed that treatment plans and contracts are different with treatment plans being more specific, and discussed the components of a treatment plan. He said that he felt that the treatment plan should be thought of in relation to other things in the regulations and then decide whether it adds to a program.

Walt said that many treatment plans he sees are redundant and not specific to a client's needs, but satisfy the regulations and create paperwork. He said that it would be helpful if the information that went to the courts indicated whether the client needed additional services. He discussed efficiency of paperwork in further detail and suggested making things more client specific.

Dr. Hughes said Georgia judges had very efficient forms and discussed specifics of the form and how it could be used to serve as a compliance report and a referral for additional services. He said the courts decide whether to enforce the recommendations.

Brad asked if that would require the Committee to make changes to the regulations.

Walt said it would, and that he does not know anyone who does an adequate intake to meet the requirements of the regulations for the state because they are so expansive.

Tim agreed.

Walt said that doing a complete intake would probably cost \$600-\$1000 and that most providers are charging \$60-\$80. Walt said his agency does a summary write up with recommendations and send it to the courts. He said that some reconstruction of the standards would need to occur.

Dr. Hughes said he had spoken with Kathleen about some suggestions to the regulations, and said that if the Committee was going to be changing its regulations, then this may be the time to address some ideas for additional changes.

There was further discussion of the treatment plan versus the contract.

Walt discussed the use of monthly progress reports which are sent to the courts.

Tim said a minimal number of judges in the south act on unfavorable progress reports.

Brad said he felt there was an advantage to programs such as the Las Vegas Municipal Court that are actually tied to the court system.

Noel asked Dr. Hughes to comment on several aspects of the site reviews.

Dr. Hughes said that it is the Committee's job to do what they want with the site reviews, and said that he is very rigid in his interpretation of violations and discussed specifics of his interpretations. He said he felt it was the Committee's responsibility to decide which violations actually warrant a reprimand or corrective action plan.

Walt asked about programs with continued violations.

Dr. Hughes said that continued violations have occurred in only a few instances and that over the past four years most programs have been adhering better to the standards. He said that usually programs either have problems with case management (written material) or the group process, but not both.

Noel asked if any members of the public had any question or comments for Dr. Hughes.

Dr. Freda said he agreed that treatment plans needed to be more specific because if a client is asked to sign a contract with certain information, they may not agree to sign it. He said that a treatment plan might indicate a providers opinion that a client attend a substance abuse treatment program, the client isn't necessarily going to agree with that due to added time and expense. He also said that he felt what is sent to the courts should be condensed, and should indicate that a substance abuse evaluation was performed and the results, and anything else that may be pertinent to the client. He said that he felt many people are going through the programs and not addressing substance abuse.

Brad asked if the regulations required substance abuse evaluation as part of the intake.

Walt and Dr. Freda indicated that it is required in the regulations, but that not every provider was doing the assessment.

Brad asked if every provider was qualified to do substance abuse assessment.

Dr. Freda said that brought up another problem in terms of the Committee approving courses related to substance abuse. He said that Noel has been very

good about fighting for those types of trainings which is important because providers are required by the regulations to perform substance abuse assessment.

Walt said that on a qualifications basis, a person can facilitate a domestic violence group without having a licensure to do substance abuse treatment evaluation which would be inconsistent with the regulations.

Dr. Hughes said that a provider could always indicate that a possible dependency on alcohol exists and recommend further assessment by a professional. He also said that some component of drug and alcohol abuse should be included in the domestic violence assessment.

Dr. Freda said he wanted to address "change in attitude". He said that the regulations stipulate that the providers are supposed to contact the victim twice during the perpetrator's program. He said many programs are not contacting the victims which he feels is one of the best ways to assess a change in attitude. He said that the site reviews never ask about contacting the victims nor numbers regarding substance abuse treatment.

Dr. Hughes said he does not ask about the victim contact because his interpretation of the regulations sees that as an elective procedure where programs "may" contact victims. He discussed the controversy surrounding victim contact, and specifics concerning victim liaisons in the state of Georgia.

There was discussion concerning referrals, sentencing, treatment, and anger management.

Patricia asked Dr. Hughes about length of time perpetrators are required to attend treatment, and whether he felt it was adequate.

Dr. Hughes said he had mixed feelings about the number of weeks a perpetrator should attend group based on research. He discussed details about a particular study on the matter.

There was further discussion concerning length of treatment time, consistency of programs, and absentee policies.

Noel thanked Dr. Hughes for his comments. He commended Dr. Hughes for the effort he puts into his reports. He then asked about any advantages or disadvantages with giving providers advance notice of a site visit.

Dr. Hughes said this was another area where he was torn. He said that the people who may know where all of the paperwork is are not always available when he shows up. On the other hand, if a scheduled visit occurs, you may not get an accurate picture of the agency and group sessions.

Jennifer asked if Dr. Hughes typically looked at training and qualifications for supervisors during a site visit.

Dr. Hughes said he tries, but is limited by what is provided to him, and sometimes he does not get requested information sent back to him. He also said that he often does not get information from Supervisors who have been supervisors for extended periods of time. He said he does ask to see CEU's from the past 1 ½ years, current licenses, annual reviews, and supervision schedules. He said that some of the information the Committee actually has, and said that he may discuss in the future having recertification materials and corrective action plans forwarded to him, so a better evaluation can be given. He also mentioned that in the last meeting, there was discussion on whether providers should be required to keep old documentation because there was a problem with going through old files, etc. He said that he felt it is the responsibility of the providers to keep those documents, however the NAC only requires providers to keep documentation for 2 years, so if the Committee wants providers to keep that information, then the NAC would need to be modified.

Walt said it sounded like we were duplicating efforts as review of a packet includes review of training. There was discussion of the new database, and the possibility of being able to provide documentation to Dr. Hughes through the database.

Noel again thanked Dr. Hughes.

5. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding regulation changes proposed in workshops held on August 17, 2004, November 18, 2004, and April 4, 2006.

Jennifer said that Kathleen had not yet given them to Henna to review.

Noel asked if there was any estimate on when Henna would get the rough drafts from Kathleen.

Henna said she didn't know.

Jennifer asked if they were going to have to be temporary at this point anyway.

Henna and Noel said that they were, and Henna said that maybe riding out the legislative session was not such a bad idea.

Noel said that maybe it would be a matter of necessity at this point.

Patricia said she wanted to make the Committee aware that the next meeting would be her and Noel's last. She said that since they had been a part of the workshops, it might be important for a vote to take place before they leave the Committee.

Jennifer said that Kathleen has been very busy, and maybe someone would like to volunteer to assist her with the regulations.

Tim said he would like to help.

Noel said that he felt it would be important to consider this at the next meeting because they have put a lot of work into this.

6. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding the Committee's authority to request original training and observation documentation for providers and supervisors as part of the renewal process.

Noel said he wanted to refer to legal counsel on this item.

Henna said this was an item put onto the agenda by Kathleen, and that the information Henna provided was meant to be educational as the position of the Attorney General's office.

Noel asked if everyone had a chance to look at the information Henna had sent out, and asked if anyone had a comment on this item. He said that the gist of it was that it would be difficult to require people to resurrect hours of old training documents when the regulations don't require that.

Brad said he felt that was one of the reasons to create a database, so that the Committee would not have to continue to ask for that documentation.

Jennifer said that the creation of the database was one of the reasons for requesting prior documentation. She said that there were 26 boxes and 4 filing cabinets full of documents which would be difficult to sift through to find all original documentation. She said that going through the last year or two from this point forward may be more manageable in terms of the database.

Tim said that he felt one of Kathleen's concerns was that she wanted to know whether a program's records are public information.

Henna said that any information they provide to the Committee is public information. She also said that the regulations do not give any auditing authority or procedures.

Noel said that if the same people had been approved during the last renewal period, they would be confident with the training. He said that part of the database is to keep track of any changes with providers to programs.

Jennifer said that for some of the renewals she tried to provide the list of providers from the previous year. She said that hopefully in the future, the assistant will be able to just print out a list of the approved providers at a

particular program. She said that may happen over the next year or two, as it will take time to develop.

7. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding Bill Draft Request.

Noel said that this BDR was a result of discussions during previous meetings and regulation workshops. He said this BDR was to change the composition of the Committee and to allow the Committee to charge fees. The change to the composition of the Committee was to remove the batterer position and allow for a representative from a municipal court judge nominated by the State Judge's Association, but still appointed by the Attorney General. Noel said that he looked at some different licensing boards, and came up with the proposed fee schedule.

Tim said that some boards also charge to evaluate CEU's.

Noel said he did not put that into the BDR, but that it could be added.

Patricia asked if the fees had to be statutory, or if they could be addressed in the regulations.

Noel said he wasn't sure.

Henna said she would have to look into further.

Jennifer said she had seen where a board's NRS says that the board can charge a reasonable fee for certain services and then lays out the specific fees within the regulations.

Patricia thought she felt that would be preferable since it is simpler to change the regulations. She also wondered if the fees were too low.

Walt said he felt the fees were reasonable.

Noel said that he would like to ask legal counsel to research the specifics of addressing fees within NRS vs. NAC.

Henna said she would like to also suggest that the Committee consider amending NRS 228.470 section 4 which allows for selection of a chair. She said adding a vice chair might be beneficial when the chair is unavailable for meetings, and many boards have that provision.

Patricia said it should say chair and vice chair instead of chairman.

Noel asked if there were any other comments.

Patricia moved to approve the bill draft request with the discussed amendments, and ask legal counsel to research exactly where to address fees.

2nd: Traci

All in favor. Motion carried.

Jennifer asked if Henna will then be sending the BDR to a legislator.

Patricia said at this point the Committee would need to find a legislator because the Attorney General's deadline has already passed. Patricia said she felt they could find a friendly legislator.

Noel said that he would speak to legal counsel about finding someone who could assist the Committee with moving this forward.

8. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding Committee renewal forms.

Jennifer said this item was on the agenda because of the issue that came up regarding requesting original documentation, so the Committee needed to address whether the renewal forms should be changed. She said the intent of requesting the documentation was to create the database.

There was discussion on the specifics of the forms.

Noel said that it sounded as if the Committee could only request original training hours for providers and supervisors not previously approved. He suggested changing the forms to require documentation for new applicants, and requesting it from current personnel.

There was further discussion on the importance of the database.

There was discussion about moving the request for staff changes from the 3rd to the 1st page of the renewal application.

Tim discussed that the Supervisor's annual report form the Committee is using should satisfy the annual evaluation report that Dr. Hughes looks for.

Jennifer said that Dr. Hughes had e-mailed her asking if the Committee had changed its forms, and if the new report form satisfied the requirement of the NAC. She said that she had responded that they changed the forms, but there wasn't discussion on whether they coincided with the NAC or not.

Tim said maybe it would be as simple as sending him the new form telling him that it is what the Committee planned to use to satisfy the annual evaluation on each of the providers. Tim said that in the past, he had used the Supervisor's Annual Performance Report, which had been designated to fulfill the requirement and still had requests for an annual evaluation even with that form present.

Noel said he felt that this form certainly fulfilled the requirements of the NAC, and that we should tell Dr. Hughes that this form is what we are looking for in regards to 225.115.

Noel said he didn't think a motion was needed for this item.

9. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding use of live video observation to provide onsite supervision between Elko and Wendover.

Walt said that he is doing live video observation to satisfy his supervisory responsibilities in Elko. He said they have set up a laptop with camera, and have releases from everyone. He said he wanted to expand this to Wendover, and thought it might encourage more rural communities to have supervision with reasonable costs.

Traci asked if he saw any problems with it.

Walt said the only issue is that once they had to start group late because they had a difficult time getting the connection. He said for the most part it has gone very smoothly.

Brad said he didn't feel it was a problem as long as it was live, and not video-taped, and thought it was a good use of technology to support the needs of the community. He asked if there was any legal issue with this.

Henna said she did not see an issue.

There was some discussion on using broadband, releases, and security.

Noel said he felt that it was the responsibility of the supervisor to take into account any professional liability considerations.

Tim said that he thought it would be good for the Committee to consider some criteria for using this media to protect the Committee.

Henna said that she didn't feel it necessary in order to protect the Committee, but that it may be a good idea to set standards that the Committee would expect.

Patricia recommended making the standards broad, and not locking the Committee into certain technology.

Brad suggested accepting this type of supervision, and having Walt come up with the guidelines.

Noel said that the Committee could approve secure sight and sound communication between the supervisor and group for observation purposes.

Motion: Brad moved to approve live video observation for Elko and Wendover with Walt to develop Committee criteria for such activities.

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried. Walt abstained.

Jennifer asked if the criteria Walt was developing would be addressed in NAC or simply as a policy matter.

Noel said that he felt the NAC was sufficiently broad to allow this, and wouldn't need change.

10. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding the following requests for domestic violence continuing education credits and/or formal training:

- a. **APPEAL** - Provider Application for 15 CEU's (8 victim, 7 perp)
Las Vegas Municipal Court
P.O. Box 3970
Las Vegas, NV 89127
6th Annual Domestic Violence Workshop
"Inner Healing of the Mind, Body, and Soul"
(reviewed by Noel Waters)

Noel said that he reviewed the additional items submitted. He said that he was possibly hasty with the "Burnout in the Workplace" session, which he now sees was relevant to therapist burnout. He said that he thought that ethical practice in the workplace was also relevant to CEU training. He also thought "Therapy for the Therapist" was relevant. He said he was still not organic enough for the last session, "Music Therapy: Closure and Inner Healing", and wanted to defer to the other Committee members who might have more expertise on the matter because he still had a difficult time relating that to domestic battery CEU's. He said the other issue is that the application is for 15 CEU's and he can't get 15 hours unless he adds the 8:00-8:30 registration period each day, which is usually not approved.

Nancy discussed the importance and relevance of music therapy in group. She discussed specifics concerning the research and presentation.

Committee members and Dorothy Hearon further discussed music therapy in support of the training.

Noel said he would then withdraw his concerns about the music therapy, but still does not get 15 hours.

Dorothy Hearon said that at the last meeting, the Committee approved 11 hours and stated that the last 4 hours of the training was in question, and is now supporting those 4 hours.

Noel said that just meant he was wrong at the last meeting. He said that customarily the Committee does not approve registration time as part of the hours, but sees how that could be a significant because of needing 15 hours annually.

Motion: Noel moved to approve the training for 15 hours (8 victim, 7 perp), but making it clear that registration times are not typically approved.

2nd: Patricia said that she would second, and wanted to avoid any issues with detrimental reliance.

All in favor. Motion carried.

Tim noted that no other licensing board would accept the break times.

- b. Provider Application for 15 CEU's
Bob Hoglund
1849 East Guadalupe Road
Suite C-101, PMB 120
Tempe, AZ 85283
"Helping People Take More Effective Control of Their Lives"
(reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Motion: Tim moved to approve for 15 hours (7victim, 8perp).

2nd: Traci

All in favor. Motion carried.

- c. Provider Application for 6 CEU's
Patricia Lynch
Reno City Attorney's Office
1 East 1st Street, 3rd Floor
Reno, NV 89501
"2006 Battered Immigrant Victim Summit"
(reviewed by Brad Simpson)

Brad said that there were no tests, but none were given. He said that everything was well put together and complete.

Motion: Moved to approve for 6 victim hours.

2nd: Traci

All in favor. Motion carried. Patricia abstained.

- d. Provider Application for 16 CEU's
Nevada Association of Batterer's Intervention Programs
3650 Warren Way
Reno, NV 89509
(1st Western Regional Domestic Violence Conference)
(reviewed by Brad Simpson)

Brad said that there were many items missing which he explained in detail. He said that he felt the training looked relevant, he just wanted to see the missing information.

Motion: Brad moved to table pending additional information.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried. Walt abstained.

- e. Provider Application for 5 CEU's
Nevada Association of Batterer's Intervention Programs
January 6, 2006
(reviewed by Kathleen Brooks)

Jennifer read comments provided by Kathleen which indicated that the application was very incomplete and would be best reviewed by a treatment provider.

Motion: Noel moved to table pending the missing documentation.

2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried.

- f. Provider Application for 15 CEU's
Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence
220 S. Rock Blvd, Suite 7
Reno, NV 89502
"13th Annual Statewide Domestic Violence Conference (Henderson)
(reviewed by Noel Waters)

Noel said this sounded like an excellent conference. He said that they requested 15 hours, but he was able to add it up to 16. He recommended approval. He said that the Committee could break down formal training hours on a case by case basis based on attended workshop sessions.

Motion: Noel moved to approve for 16 hours.

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried.

- g. Application for 5 CEU's
Options
4528 W. Craig Rd., Suite 150
N. Las Vegas, NV 89032
"The Abused Woman: A Survivor Therapy Approach"
Video Training
(Reviewed by Walt Dimitroff)

Walt said he reviewed the training by Lenore Walker and thought it was a very good training, but noted that the Committee had never approved any video or

correspondence training in the past. Based on that fact, he recommended denial until such time that the Committee could make a decision on video or correspondence training. He said it was a very informative training discussing battered woman syndrome and survivor therapy.

Brad asked if the regulations prohibited video training.

Noel asked legal counsel for an opinion on the matter.

Henna said from her reading of NAC 228.210, the regulations don't specifically include or exclude it.

Noel said for purposes of the Open Meeting Law, how Henna would recommend the Committee address this issue.

Henna said she would recommend the Committee either follow what they have done in the past regarding this type of training or hold off until this could be discussed further.

Jennifer asked if this matter should be placed on the next agenda.

Henna said the Committee could definitely put this on the next agenda.

Walt asked if this should be tabled until further discussion.

Henna said she felt it would be better to table the item than to deny it until the issue is resolved.

Walt said that video and correspondence trainings have always been denied in the past.

Noel said that correspondence, video, or internet training has never been approved.

Henna said the Committee should be consistent with how they handle this type of training until they make some decisions concerning this.

Noel said he wanted this to be put on the next agenda, and address the matter. He said he didn't feel the regulations necessarily needed to be changed, but that the Committee could discuss this as a policy matter, and create criteria for approval.

Mr. Stone commented that in terms of the Open Meeting Law, the meeting had been properly noticed with this item on the agenda, so he is not clear why this Committee with a quorum present, could not address these issues at this time, and why it needed to be tabled.

Noel said that the Committee hadn't established a policy regarding these trainings, and he is not willing to make decisions on a case-by-case basis.

Tim said that he thought this training had a 30 page workbook and a video.

Walt said a booklet and video was submitted. He said he wanted to table this item, and at the next meeting discuss this further with possible criteria for video training.

Motion: Walt moved to table the item with a broader agenda item discussion of internet, correspondence, distance learning policies and procedures.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

Brad said that he would suggest that the Committee look into other licensing agencies that allow for distance training and look at their procedures and policies.

Kareen mentioned a course concerning DV for physicians which was entirely on-line and said there is a movement toward that type of training.

Brad said that would make it a lot easier for rural providers to get training.

Noel said it would come down to whether the trainings were equivalent in substance to a face-to-face training.

Patricia discussed the fact that attorney's can obtain CEU's online, and thought the Committee should definitely address this issue.

Jennifer said that she gets quite a few complaints from providers on the number of training options available.

- h. Provider Application for 22.5 CEU's
ACCS
738 Prater Way
Sparks, NV 89431
(reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim said it was an excellent training. He recommended approval pending a receipt of the scheduled hours.

Motion: Tim moved to approve pending receipt of scheduled hours.

2nd: Traci

All in favor. Motion carried. Walt abstained.

11. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding the application for certification renewal from the following providers:

a. Options

4528 W. Craig Rd. Ste. 150

Las Vegas, NV 89032

(reviewed by Walt Dimitroff – Continued from May Meeting)

Walt said he attempted to review the packet with the additional information but is still is confused. He said he wanted to table this item and contact Paul Reeves regarding the pending status of the providers, because he doesn't know where they are in terms of training hours. He said he has no accounting of the formal training hours and how many they have left. There is mention that they will attend some upcoming trainings, but without knowing how many hours they have, he said he has no way to know how many hours they still need. Walt said most of them submitted CEU's for the past year, but there are 5 therapists that are classified as pending. Walt read an e-mail sent to Jennifer from Paul Reeves which said that he was able to survive in the short term with the number of certified providers he currently has, but would be submitting training for approval which would certify the counselors in question, and that the lack of training was partly the result of the Committee not approving many training options. The e-mail stated that he would have a moratorium on the counselors in question for a reasonable period until the Committee approves further courses. Walt said the first packet was poorly put together, and this packet was poorly put together. He said he did not know how many hours they needed, and whether the training Paul Reeves was referring to would satisfy that commitment. He said they planned to adopt the new forms, which may help with their packet. Walt recommended continuing this until an accounting of the hours they need and a plan to get there is submitted. With that, he said he would be more comfortable with approval of the program.

Mr. Stone said that Paul was asking for the program to be approved without the pending facilitators, and once the facilitators had received further training, they could be added to the approved facilitator list.

Noel said that technically one supervisor and one facilitator was the minimum standard to approve a program. Noel asked if the program should be approved if every other aspect of the application is ok, and they have a trained supervisor and at least one trained facilitator. He said that anyone not trained would not be allowed to facilitate, and that he was a little concerned about tabling this item if other aspects of the program are ok.

Walt said he did not know if there were enough approved facilitators to facilitate their existing groups because he does not have group times or names of people who facilitate those times. He said that from reading the supervisor evaluation forms that some of the facilitators that are in pending status are already

facilitating. He said that one of the facilitators that was an evaluation form, was not even on the list of providers.

Mr. Stone said that individual was no longer with the organization.

Walt said he was not comfortable approving the program without a plan in place for these facilitators.

Motion: Patricia moved to table this to the next meeting subject to Options providing full, complete, and accurate training information.

Walt said he wanted to know how they would identify a moratorium with the counselors they have now, and how they plan to cover the existing groups with the existing therapists.

Jennifer asked if part of what Walt was needing included dates and times that they are offering groups.

Walt said he wanted to know how many groups they are facilitating and whether or not they can identify the therapists facilitating those groups, and whether they can cover them with the existing list.

Jennifer said that she wanted to make the Committee aware of the conversation that she had with Mr. Reeves. She said that she received the chart from them which indicated the years in which they were certified, and saw that five of the facilitators were listed as pending. She said she called Mr. Reeves to clarify whether he was using these facilitators who were not fully trained. She said that he told her that it was correct that these people were not fully trained and that they were being allowed to participate in groups. She said that Mr. Reeves indicated that he had more than enough facilitators to cover his program and that he was requesting the Committee approve the program without those providers. She said that then she received an e-mail from him discussing a moratorium on those providers, but he had not mentioned that in their conversation.

Walt said he did not want to deny the program, but wanted further information.

Mr. Stone asked for clarification regarding exactly what the Committee needed, so that the program could provide that to the Committee. He said the Committee has verification of CEU's for all of the approved providers, and asked what else he needs for certification of renewal assuming the program is not using any of the pending providers.

Walt said he wanted to ensure that he has adequate facilitators to cover the existing groups.

Mr. Stone said he did not know of anything in the regulations requiring that for certification, and said that he would hold off adding any more groups until the pending people are approved.

Walt said that the program also indicated that certain individuals had obtained CEU's who hadn't. He said his other concern is that the supervisor reports indicate that the program is using untrained people to facilitate groups.

Mr. Stone said that those facilitators are being allowed to participate in groups and being evaluated for their participation.

Walt said that there are only two facilitators listed on the forms and uncertified providers are one of the two in several groups. Walt said that is why he needs further clarification.

Mr. Stone said he was not clear on what Walt needed further clarification on.

Noel said that for each of the people listed as pending, the Committee needs demonstration of their credentials and training as specified in the NAC.

Tim said he hears Walt also asking for who is providing service to the specific groups currently being held.

Noel said he wanted to emphasize that the program is not allowed to use any of the pending facilitators to facilitate groups.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

- b. Las Vegas Municipal Court (ASED)
Regional Justice Center
P.O. Box 3970
Las Vegas, NV 89127
(Reviewed by Walt Dimitroff– Continued from May Meeting)

Walt said that all deficiencies were addressed.

Motion: Walt moved to approve.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

- c. ABC/ Via Milagro
7 Water Street, Suite A
Henderson, NV 89015
(reviewed by Patricia Lynch)

Patricia said that documentation was missing for 4 providers who attended the Alternative Sentencing training, which was just approved today.

There was discussion on tabling on approving pending receipt of the documentation.

Motion: Brad moved to approve pending receipt of the documentation of training.
2nd: Walt
All in favor. Motion carried.

- d. ACCS
738 Prater Way
Sparks, NV 89431
(reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim said that it was a well organized packet.

Motion: Tim moved to approve.

2nd: Traci

All in favor. Motion carried.

- e. Mesa Family Counseling
1000 S. 3rd Street, #F
Las Vegas, NV 89101
(reviewed by Traci Dory)

Traci said that the application was not complete. She said that only one month of the 10% audit form was submitted (for June). There was some discussion on whether they had passed a February 2005 site inspection. Jennifer said she would research. She discussed specifics on CEU's for the Supervisor and Provider, and said that they both had completed their CEU's. She said there was only one 10% audit form.

Jennifer said that the 10% form was just approved at the last meeting.

Tim said he had seen several ways to document the 10% audit.

There was discussion on the fact that she would be observing her own group based on a two person program.

There was discussion on some inaccuracies and inconsistencies on the number of clients served.

Tim said that he thought we should definitely see proof of the 10% audit.

Noel said they need to clarify the client numbers on the renewal forms.

Motion: Traci moved to continue the application pending further documentation.

- f. Ridgeview Counseling
3650 Warren Way
Reno, NV 89509
(reviewed by Noel Waters)

Noel said the application was sufficient. He recommended approval.

Motion: Noel moved to approve the application for renewal.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

- g. Family Counseling Service
575 Plumb Lane, Suite 100
Reno, NV 89502
(reviewed by Brad Simpson)

Brad recommended approval.

Motion: Brad moved to approve the application for renewal

2nd: Walt

All in favor. Motion carried.

- h. Reciprocity Agreement with South Lake Tahoe Women's Center
2941 Lake Tahoe Blvd.
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
(Reviewed by Kathleen Brooks)

Jennifer read Kathleen's recommendation to approve the reciprocity agreement as they are certified in California to provide batterer's treatment.

Motion: Patricia moved to approve.

2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried.

12. * Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding the Corrective Action Plans for the following providers:

- a. Community Counseling Center (Southern Nevada)
1120 Almond Tree Lane #207
Las Vegas, NV 89101
(reviewed by Patricia Lynch)

Patricia said that there were problems because they did not have a supervisor for a period, but have since hired Tim Hamilton. She said it looks like they have addressed all deficiencies.

Motion: Patricia moved to accept the correction plan.

2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried. Tim abstained.

- b. ABC Therapy – Henderson and Las Vegas
7 Water Street, Suite A
Henderson, NV 89015
(reviewed by Patricia Lynch)

Patricia said it appeared that all deficiencies had been addressed, and discussed some specifics concerning some of Dr. Hughes' comments. She said that they were very receptive to making the corrections.

Motion: Patricia moved to accept the corrective action plan.

2nd: Walt

All in favor. Motion carried.

- c. Safenest – Boulder City
509 Avenue G
Boulder City, NV 89005
(Reviewed by Traci Dory)

Traci said it appeared that there violations were minor. She discussed specifics concerning the report and corrections.

Motion: Traci moved to accept the corrective action plan.

2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried. Tim abstained.

13. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding Edna Harris Memorial Fund.

Noel said that he thought the Committee had already approved this.

Jennifer said this was being revisited as there was discussion on the possibility that it could constitute a conflict of interest. She said that basically the Committee would be paying for people to attend the very same trainings that they either approve or deny. She said that this item is on the agenda for discussion again for the Committee to decide whether they feel that this could present a conflict of interest.

Walt, Patricia and Noel said they did not feel it was a conflict.

Tim said that if this only applied to pre-approved training it would alleviate any possible conflict.

Patricia said she felt it was very relevant to provide training to the rurals and did not see a conflict.

Kareen asked who would approve the people to go to the training.

Jennifer said the Committee approved the Chair or Ombudsman to make that decision.

Henna said that if the Ombudsman made the decision that would alleviate any conflicts.

There was further discussion on whether there was a conflict. Noel said he did not feel there was a conflict.

Brad said the Ombudsman would need to see all the pre-conference material before making a decision.

Walt asked if a provider could sue if the Committee approved to send people to a training and didn't approve them to go to another training, therefore creating a preferred training.

Legal counsel was asked for an opinion.

Henna said she did not feel there was a conflict.

Jennifer said that Brad sent her material for an application procedure but she had not done anything with it as she wanted to wait for the Committee's opinion on a possible conflict of interest first. She said she would work on the application procedures for the next meeting.

14. Comments from Kathleen Brooks, Committee Chair.

Noel asked if Kathleen expressed any comments.

Jennifer said Kathleen had expressed concerns about the date of the next meeting which would be discussed shortly.

15. *Date, time, and location of future meetings:

Thursday, November 9, 2006 Las Vegas, Nevada 9:30A.M.

Jennifer said that Kathleen requested that she see whether the Committee could meet the 7th or the 2nd. If not, she would keep the 9th.

Patricia said that the 7th was election day, so that would not work.

Several people said that the 2nd would not work, so the Committee decided to keep the meeting on the 9th. The Committee members decided to hold off on scheduling future meetings until the new Committee members were appointed.

16. Public Comment.

Dr. Freda asked if the meeting would be video-conferenced. Jennifer said that she was going to try to arrange that.

17. *Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.

**STATE OF NEVADA COMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
(BATTERER'S TREATMENT CERTIFICATION COMMITTEE)**

Minutes of the Meeting

Monday, October 2, 2006 at 1:00p.m.

Via Teleconference with Public Access At:

Attorney General's Office
5420 Kietzke Lane, Suite 202
Reno, Nevada, 89511

Please Note: The Batterers Treatment Committee may address agenda items out of sequence to accommodate persons appearing before the Committee or to aid the efficiency or effectiveness of the meeting. The Committee may convene in closed session to consider the character, alleged misconduct, professional competence or physical or mental health of a person (NRS 241.030).

***Asterisks (*) denote items on which Committee may take action.
Action by the Committee on an item may be to approve,
deny, amend, or table.***

1. *Call to order and roll call of members.

Members Present

Kathleen Brooks

Noel Waters

Patricia Lynch

Walt Dimitroff

Traci Dory

Attorney General's Office

Rob Bony – Deputy Attorney General

Jennifer Kandt – Assistant to the Committee

Meeting was called to order by Kathleen Brooks at 1:08 pm.

2. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding contract for Jennifer Kandt, administrative assistant to the Committee.

Rob noted for the record that Jennifer had signed a waiver per the requirements of the Open Meeting Law. He said that a quorum is present and action can be taken.

Kathleen asked Jennifer to discuss the terms of the contract.

Jennifer said that increase from \$16 an hour to \$20 an hour was based on the fact that the previous assistant had been making \$21 an hour, and wanted to ask for something comparable to the prior assistant. She also noted that she is not a state employee and does not receive any benefits.

Kathleen asked why Jennifer did not ask for the amount that the previous assistant was making.

Jennifer said she wasn't sure why she didn't ask for that amount, but that \$20 was the amount she discussed with the Ombudsman, and the amount that was written into the work program.

Kathleen said that working with Jennifer had been wonderful. She said that Jennifer had excellent follow-through and documentation, and has been a real asset to the Committee. She said that she highly recommended that the Committee increase her salary to at least the \$21 an hour, and that the Committee extend her contract.

Noel Waters said he concurred with Kathleen's remarks. He said that Jennifer had been a great help to the Committee, especially in terms of keeping everything organized. He said that he appreciated the work she has done. Noel asked Rob if the contract might be held up if the amount of the contract is increased to \$21 an hour.

Rob said that it might actually hold up the process because of the spending authority that had been written into the work program.

There was discussion on approving the contract as is, and possibly increase the salary at a future date after speaking with the Ombudsman.

Motion: Noel moved to approve the contract as outlined in the contract summary to extend the existing term of the contract and increase the hourly rate.

2nd: Traci

All in favor. Motion carried.

Rob said that this vote should allow the contract to go forward with the Board of Examiners so that there is not a disruption in services.

Walt said that he thought Jennifer had done a fantastic job, and seems very innovative with the new technologies. He said he was in complete agreement to keep her, and said she was a wonderful asset to the Committee.

Kathleen asked if Jennifer is supposed to get an evaluation.

Rob said he was not sure.

Jennifer said she couldn't recall anything in her contract that talked about an evaluation, but that her contract does have a 30 day termination notice which could be exercised if the Committee became dissatisfied at any point.

Kathleen said she was thinking of the evaluation as another way of telling Jennifer thank you and that she is doing a great job.

Jennifer thanked Kathleen for her comments.

Patricia said she thought Jennifer was doing a great job.

Traci said Jennifer had been very helpful, especially since she was a new board member. She said Jennifer had been very helpful in explaining things, and thanked her.

3. Public Comment.

No public present.

4. *Adjournment

Motion: Patricia moved to adjourn the meeting.

2nd: Traci

All in favor. Motion carried.

STATE OF NEVADA COMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

(BATTERER'S TREATMENT CERTIFICATION COMMITTEE)

MINUTES OF MEETING

Thursday, November 9, 2006 at 9:30a.m.

Location:

Office of the Attorney General
Grant Sawyer Building, Room 3315
555 E. Washington Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Video Conference Access:

Office of the Attorney General
Mock Courtroom
100 North Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada

Please Note: The Batterers Treatment Committee may address agenda items out of sequence to accommodate persons appearing before the Committee or to aid the efficiency or effectiveness of the meeting. The Committee may convene in closed session to consider the character, alleged misconduct, professional competence or physical or mental health of a person (NRS 241.030).

***Asterisks (*) denote items on which Committee may take action.
Action by the Committee on an item may be to approve,
deny, amend, or table.***

1. *Call to order and roll call of members.

Meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Kathleen Brooks.

Members Present

Kathleen Brooks
Noel Waters
Tim Hamilton
Traci Dory
Brad Simpson
Patricia Lynch

Public Present

David Brady
Nancy Kennehan
Paul Reeves
Dennis Fitzpatrick
Renee Vincent
Frank Karr
Gail Faulstich
Leah Boe-Pluhar

Attorney General's Office

Henna Rasul, Deputy Attorney General
Karen Prentice, Domestic Violence Ombudsman
Jennifer Kandt, Administrative Coordinator

2. *Review, amend, and approve minutes of meetings.

a) August 22, 2006

Traci addressed two errors.

Motion: Noel moved to approve the minutes as amended.

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried.

b) October 2, 2006

Traci addressed two errors.

Motion: Noel moved to approve the minutes as amended.

2nd: Traci

All in favor. Motion carried. Brad abstained.

3. Budget report by Kareen Prentice.

Kareen said that IFC approved the work program as submitted. She explained details of the expenses.

Brad asked if the Committee operated on a state fiscal year.

Kareen said that the fiscal year is July 1-June 30.

Patricia asked about a letter that had been sent out to prosecutors asking that the \$35.00 fee be charged.

Kareen said that the letter went to all judges, the AOC, and all district and city attorneys.

Patricia asked if there had been much response.

Kareen said that there had been responses, but mostly from the judges who were already doing things correctly. She said that they also got calls from a few judges who had no idea there was a fee, but were concerned. She said the letter was effective.

4. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding regulation changes proposed in workshops held on August 17, 2004, November 18, 2004, and April 4, 2006.

Kathleen said that this item would have to be tabled one more time, and that she promised to have the regulations to Henna in time to be on the next agenda.

Motion: Brad moved to table.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

5. Update on status of Bill Draft Request.

Noel said that he thought he had sent out the BDR for the last meeting.

Jennifer said that at the last meeting, the BDR was approved and there was talk of getting a friendly legislator to move it forward.

Noel and Henna discussed e-mail correspondence and who was supposed to move it forward. Noel indicated that he had not lined up a legislator, but thought that Bonnie Parnell in Carson would be a good source.

Kathleen said that the Committee finally had a perpetrator who might be interested in being on the Committee.

Tim said that he would let the individual know what the criteria was for being on the Committee.

Kareen said that a resume, letter of interest, letter of recommendation, and proof of successful completion of a program would be needed.

Kathleen said that if there was an individual interested maybe the Committee could hold off on the BDR to change the slot from a batterer to a judge.

Patricia asked about the assessment of the fees.

Jennifer said that the assessment of fees was part of the BDR, but that a Committee member needed to volunteer to find a legislator to go forward.

Traci and Brad indicated that their jobs barred them from lobbying.

There was discussion on how much longer Noel was officially on the Committee.

6. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding application forms for the Edna Harris Memorial Training Fund.

Kathleen said that there were concerns about conflict of interest with regards to who would get the training money and exactly how that would work. She said that she felt it was a conflict of interest for the Committee to pay for training for providers. She said she wanted to see this meet one of the other criteria of the Committee to provide money to victims of domestic violence.

Patricia said she disagreed because this Committee regulates batterer's treatment and that is what Edna did.

Kathleen said that if the Committee had extra money they were supposed to provide dollars to victims. She said that early on the Committee discussed how they could assist victims, but never had any money, and now the Committee has a little money and could do what is expected. She asked who would decide which providers would get the money.

Patricia said that it would be Kareen, and that there would not be a conflict because Kareen frequently gives money in the form of scholarships, etc.

Jennifer said part of the discussion with Kathleen was that if there were two programs in Elko, for instance, and the Committee decided to pay for training providers at one of those programs, and the other program ended up being denied certification because they weren't able to obtain CEU's, could that program argue that the process was unfair because the Committee paid for the training at the other program.

Kathleen said that the Committee is supposed to be providing some type of funding for victims and could use the money to help victims travel out of state to get to safety.

Brad said he would have concerns with providing money for direct service to individuals. He said that he had concerns about taking money from this group to give to an individual as opposed to a group that already offers services.

Kathleen discussed how the Network gave funds, and scholarships that could be given through Kareen. She said she strongly urged the Committee to consider that the Committee is supposed to provide money for victims.

Patricia said she wanted to review the statutes. Patricia said that in looking back at the minutes, the Committee decided this was not a conflict.

Jennifer mentioned that this item is really on the agenda looking at the application forms, so maybe this discussion was inappropriate.

Motion: Noel moved to table this item until discussion at the next meeting on what the Edna Harris funds are to be used for.

Patricia said that a motion to reconsider this item would have to be made because this matter was already decided. She read the statute and said that assisting victims was a duty given to the Ombudsman and not the Committee. She said that the Ombudsman had the authority over the account to spend money on the Committee, the Council, etc. The Committee statutes allow for the Committee to provide legal services in a divorce. Patricia said that this is the only committee in the state dealing with batterer's treatment, so she felt it was appropriate for Committee to ensure proper training by helping people become providers. She also said that this fund was intended to honor Edna, and Edna dealt with batterer's treatment. She said the Committee should not get into the victim services field, especially given the last legislative session.

Kathleen said that she didn't see why it would be a problem to provide money to victims because it is listed in the statute.

Patricia said that it was under the Ombudsman.

Kathleen said that the Committee could ask the Ombudsman to set up a fund for victims to apply.

Patricia said that was not one of the Committee's duties, but providing legal services in a divorce was one of the Committee's duties.

Kathleen said that this was the Committee's money that just goes through the Ombudsman, and the Committee is supposed to do certain things with that money, but that they had never given anything to victims.

Patricia said giving money to victims was not under the Committee.

Kathleen said she disagreed.

Patricia said that was what the statute said.

Henna said that when the funds come in they are disbursed and don't belong to just the Committee or the Council. She said they are disbursed under the guidance of the Ombudsman.

Kareen said that there is \$10,400 available to assist victims or victim programs and that \$1200 was given to the Network last year. She discussed various other programs that money was given. She also said that the Council was given around \$30,000 per year, but that they had previously been funded by the STOP grant, and now their funds will come out of the court assessments.

Noel said he was concerned about the distribution of funds because the Council seems adept at finding headlines while the Committee is doing gut work.

Patricia said she was on both the Council and the Committee and agreed with Noel's statement.

Noel said that he was concerned that all the money would go to one group, while all the work would go to the other group. Noel said he didn't think the Committee could do anything in regards to the Edna Harris Fund because there wasn't a consensus on what to spend the money on, but said the form was marvelous.

Motion: Noel moved to approve the form subject to reconsideration at a future meeting.
2nd: Brad

Kareen said she had some changes to the form which were administrative.

Patricia asked if the reconsideration was just for the form or for the substance.

Kathleen said the motion was to approve the form and reconsider at the next meeting. She asked for a vote.

Initial vote: Noel, Kathleen, Tim, Brad approve; Patricia and Traci opposed.

Patricia said that she felt the Committee was already under attack during the last session, and would be looked at unfavorably if they started providing funds for victim services, which she believes the Committee is precluded from doing, but would refer to legal counsel. She said that the legislature was already looking at victims going overboard, and if this board started giving money to victims, then it would make things worse.

Brad said he would reconsider his vote and voted nay.

Kathleen clarified that there were 3 nay votes.

Noel withdrew the motion.

Motion: Noel moved to approve the form subject to editorial correction as necessary.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

Kathleen said she was still going to ask that on the next agenda, the Committee reconsider the issue. She said she would be more open to having the training be specific to rural areas.

There was discussion on the reports mandated by the legislature.

Kathleen said that she wanted this issue on the next agenda as she still felt it was a conflict of interest.

Patricia said that it was not a conflict and that counsel had ruled it was not a conflict. She said that she will not be at the next meeting, and that this board had ruled it did not want to reconsider this issue at the next meeting.

7. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding Committee's policy on continuing education and formal training via distance media.

Jennifer indicated that she printed out policies from several other boards concerning this matter.

Kathleen said she would like to see resolution on this issue. She discussed time constraints with Committee members viewing trainings via video. She said that she didn't know how the Committee would be able to monitor trainings unless they were live. She also said that there are some considerations already given to rural areas concerning video training. Kathleen said that she felt there were plenty of domestic violence trainings available, so she didn't see the need to use distance media.

Patricia discussed the requirements of the social work and marriage and family therapist boards. She said that if a provider had put together a good program, then she felt it should be able to be repeated, especially if it was interactive and independently verified.

Brad said that usually courses are pre-approved through the marriage and family therapist board.

Kathleen said she liked that the social work board prohibited home study courses that were not interactive.

Tim said it would be important to clearly define what interactive is.

Jennifer asked if online courses are considered interactive.

Tim mentioned that CCSN offers interactive courses on the internet that are considered interactive. He said that he hadn't ever taught those types of courses, but thought that the professor would put information online that the student would access and then be tested on.

Public comment from Gail Faulstich indicated that she had taught some web-based courses and discussed details of the interaction.

Kathleen said she was worried about how the Committee would monitor these courses.

Patricia said that Brad had mentioned pre-approving courses.

Noel discussed the difference between getting formal training credits and continuing education credits. He said there was nothing to prevent attendees from snoring during a conference. He said he would be willing to accept half the formal training credits via distance media, but thought it would be relatively easy for a person to attend a conference with trainings being more available now.

There was discussion on making special provisions for the rural areas. Kathleen said that the Committee had already voted on changing the regulations to allow people in the rural areas to obtain half of their training via distance media, but that she had not yet submitted the changes to Henna.

Kathleen said she felt that people could access their CEU's in person.

Tim asked if it may be time for comments from the public.

Kathleen said no.

Patricia said that maybe the Committee should just vote because they all seem to be in agreement on the rurals, but possibly not outside the rurals.

Brad asked if someone in Pahrump obtained CEU's via distance media then came to work in Vegas if it would change their status.

Kathleen said she didn't think that would be an issue. She said that she would like to see the requirements stay as is for urban providers in regards to both CEU's and formal training. She said the Committee is not prepared to be able to review the trainings to ensure it is appropriate.

Jennifer said that Walt said he felt the trainings that were submitted to him for review were relevant to DV.

Kathleen said that meant a program didn't follow the regulations which are in place and hadn't been changed.

Jennifer said the program was requesting that the CEU's be reviewed. She said they were on the last agenda and were continued until a policy could be made concerning distance media.

Kathleen said that there was a policy which is the regulations which already state how the training is to be obtained.

Patricia said that if trainings were going to have to be reviewed for the rurals, then they could be used by the urban people as well.

Henna said that the Committee should focus on NAC 228.210 and see if the language is clear enough to a provider which types of CEU's are approved by the Committee.

Tim referred the Committee to the minutes from the previous meeting.

Kathleen said that the minutes reflect Henna indicating that the Committee should be consistent with what they have done in the past. Kathleen said that unless the Committee wanted to pay someone to review the materials, then they should be consistent and deny training by distance media.

Patricia said she disagreed and discussed how technology is changing to allow this type of training in other boards and thought the Committee needed to be vigilant but also make trainings accessible. She said she would like to hear from the public on the matter. She said that in order to be credible as a regulating board, the Committee needs to be able to provide these types of options. Patricia said that this is where the Committee got hammered in the last legislative session.

Kathleen said that was because of the rural areas.

Brad asked if it would be feasible to contact other boards about their policies.

Kathleen said she had a question about the public talking and then she wanted to separate the videos from interactive training. She said she would not want to agree to videos because they are too difficult to monitor.

Henna said that she wanted to address what she stated at the previous meeting. She said that this has been an issue that has come up many times in previous meetings. She said that she did say the Committee needed to be consistent until this was addressed further, but that also, the Committee is not limited by its regulations. She said the regulations do not prohibit this type of training. She said the public comment could be done at any time.

Kathleen said that she liked Brad's idea about a Committee member going to various boards and coming up with a written policy that could be discussed at the next meeting which clarifies how the Committee could monitor these trainings.

Traci said she didn't mind going online to review a training, or watching a training. She said that she agreed with Patricia and that she didn't mind reviewing the trainings as she didn't see the difference between reviewing a paper training versus an interactive one.

Public comment: Paul Reeves discussed the difficulty in getting people the formal training. He said that almost all trainings are approved on the back end which creates a problem. He said that California has a 40 hour course that is an interactive program which once completed, certifies a counselor. He discussed the difficulties and costs associated with getting the 60

hours of training. Paul said that two years ago, the Committee didn't even approve 60 hours of formal training. He said it takes about two years to get a counselor certified.

Kathleen said that in the last two years the Committee had been working very hard to approve the trainings. She asked Tim to comment on his experience getting people trained for the 60 hours.

Tim said it takes a long time to get a counselor up to speed. He said that in order to get the CEU's they were having to take time off of work or school and often go out of town.

Public comment: Paul Reeves discussed further difficulties with getting licensed therapists. He said there are great trainings out there specific to DV. He said that he felt it was detrimental to not allow this type of training and that this would free up counselors to take vacation from work to attend trainings. He also indicated that there were over 250 accredited Universities on one website offering online Master's degrees in Psychology which is the wave of the future. He said that the 15 CEU's are fairly easy to obtain but that it was nearly impossible to get the 60 hours. He asked what Walt had said about the trainings submitted.

Jennifer read Walt's comments as follows for The Abused Woman: A Survivor Therapy Approach: "As I mentioned at the August meeting, this is a good training with a lot relevant information for DV therapists. However, in the past, the Committee has not approved correspondence training. I think we need a set of guidelines for correspondence training which is in line with other boards and specifically meets our current training requirements. If the Committee approves correspondence training, I would recommend approval of this training for five victim CEU's. For the 40 hour Batterer's Intervention DV Certification: "This training also appears to meet the guidelines for training approval but again is a video training in correspondence format. If the Committee approves video correspondence training, I would recommend that this training be approved for all 40 CEU's – 15 victim and 25 perpetrator.

Brad asked if the training was approved in California.

Public comment: Paul Reeves answered that if someone in California completes that training, they are issued a certification.

Brad said that maybe other states could be looked at for approval of trainings. He said that he completes many trainings on the computer.

Public comment: Nancy Kennehan discussed the financial difficulties and time difficulties in getting someone certified. She said there are people who have been waiting over a year for trainings. She said that she felt that the Committee may actually save time in reviewing trainings because if one class is approved, the Committee will not need to keep reviewing it.

Public comment: Dennis Fitzpatrick asked the Committee to consider approving internet courses that have already been approved by other states. He said he would like the Committee to consider allowing the internet training for both formal training and CEU's.

Noel asked if Dennis could clarify which types of boards he was referring to.

Public comment: Dennis Fitzpatrick indicated he was referring to other Domestic Violence boards in other states.

Brad said that the Committee should look at other states and that Nevada would always be a rural state if they don't consider using technology.

Kathleen said it sounded like the Committee needed more information and more investigation to come up with a policy.

Tim said he wanted to clarify that a written policy would address criteria within the state of Nevada for video training, computer-based training, interactive criteria, and other domestic violence boards in other states.

There was discussion about the trainings Walt had looked at, and Traci and Brad indicated that if Walt reviewed these trainings and said they were appropriate, they didn't have a problem approving them for others to use.

Kathleen said that she understood the difficulties addressed by Mr. Reeves and Mr. Hamilton in getting people formal training, but she still wanted to keep the CEU's live. She asked if the Committee wanted to consider possibly 30 of 60 hours to be done via distance media. Kathleen indicated that she wanted some class work to remain.

Tim indicated that if half the hours are approved, it should be evenly split between victim and perpetrator units.

Noel said that the problems that exist in allowing this are verification and resource management because of the review time involved. He said that he felt the Committee could approve various forms of remote learning. He agreed that he could approve classes that had been approved by other domestic violence boards in other states. He discussed that classes need to be limited by time, interactive, and the success needs to be measured.

Brad said that he had sat through conferences where he didn't learn anything, but had benefited from the interactive on-line experiences.

Noel said that there is benefit to meeting with a group of peers and discussing, getting feedback, and networking. Noel said he could agree to half the formal and half the CEU's.

Tim suggested asking the program auditor to audit some of the classes.

Kathleen said she was hearing that half of the formal training could be done via distance media. She asked Jennifer if Walt reviewed all 45 hours of the tapes submitted.

Jennifer indicated that she could not answer that, and read his responses again. She said that she would assume he reviewed the courses thoroughly based on his comments.

Kathleen said she didn't have 45 hours of time to do that. She said that maybe Dr. Hughes could review some of the classes.

Public comment: Paul Reeves said for the classes he submitted, every piece of information that is required by the NAC, including copies of certificates, pre and post tests, etc. was included in his package.

Kathleen asked if Mr. Reeves was aware that the Committee normally wants an individual to be sitting in a classroom for 60 hours.

Public comment: Mr. Reeves indicated that his reading of the regs didn't specify that, he only read one hour was equivalent to one CEU. He said the regulations didn't address anything about sitting in a classroom. He said that the Committee may want to consider a tiered approach to training based on the education of the individuals.

Kathleen said that people with Ph.d.'s don't necessarily know anything about DV.

Brad said that he was willing to give Mr. Reeves his card and asked him to e-mail him materials on different trainings available.

Public comment: Leah Boe-Pluhar said she agreed on the difficulties involved in getting people trained. She said that she supported on-line training for a portion of the hours, but also saw the benefit of being in a classroom.

Kathleen asked Noel to present a motion that would be specific to the formal training.

Motion: Noel moved that as a matter of policy, the Committee clarify existing rules on approved training to allow in principle, training that is obtained through teleconference, video, internet, virtual private network, online training or home study training if the training is approved by other regulatory boards like the Committee, i.e. other domestic violence certification bodies or is approved by the Committee either through the employment of a contractor or Committee member and if the training is time limited in that it needs to be completed within a reasonable period of time consistent with the number of hours involved, if it is interactive requiring responses and program learning measurement between instructor and pupils, and if learning success is objectively measured at the conclusion of the course. And to the extent that the course allows acceptance of formal training hours for up to ½ the hours required for victims i.e. 15 hours and ½ the hours required for batterer's i.e. 15 hours.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

Kathleen said she wanted to keep the 15 CEU's in classroom style.

Brad said that he had a problem with that because it is difficult for people to go to them, and that he'd been to too many conferences that he could have slept through.

Kathleen said that she felt there was plenty of good training available and would like to see the CEU's remain live.

Traci said she liked the idea of distance media. She said that class work was often easier than working online. She said the online classes require more in terms of reading and tests.

There was discussion on signing in and out of classes and not being accountable.

Tim asked what the downside to distance learning was.

Noel said that he felt there was good opportunity for networking and sharing with peers at conferences that you can't do online. He said it can be difficult to find the time to attend face to face conferences.

There was discussion on allowing half the credits via distance media. There was further discussion on technology, availability, and assurance of quality.

Kathleen said that it seemed that the Committee was divided.

Motion: Patricia moved to allow distance media for the 15 CEU's.

Brad: 2nd

Brad and Patricia in favor. Traci Undecided. Noel, Tim, and Kathleen opposed.

Motion did not carry.

Motion: Noel moved to allow up to ½ of CEU's via distance media on the same terms and conditions assigned to the formal training with the provision that the policy is periodically reviewed.

2nd: Patricia

Brad said he recommended accepting CEU's that have already been approved by batterer's treatment licensing boards in other states. There was discussion on a possible library to check out materials.

There was further discussion on the fact that this motion had the same provisions as the motion for formal training.

Brad, Noel, Patricia, Tim, Traci in favor. Kathleen opposed.

8. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding eligibility request of provider with crime of moral turpitude.

Traci asked if Mr. Brady received a full pardon.

Mr. Brady indicated that he had received a full pardon.

Traci asked if all of his rights had been restored, including voting and carrying office.

Mr. Brady said that the only thing he was not able to do was to bear arms.

Noel asked Mr. Brady if there was anything that he wanted to add.

Mr. Brady discussed the details surrounding his crime of moral turpitude, and the changes he has made in his life following the incident.

Brad asked if there had been any other arrests or convictions since this crime.

Mr. Brady indicated that there had not been any further arrests or convictions.

Patricia asked if there was any opposition to the request for pardon.

Mr. Brady said no.

Noel said that if there had been a full and unconditional pardon granted, that it is no longer a crime of record that can be considered for professional licensure purposes in general.

Brad moved to allow David Brady to move forward with an application for licensure.

2nd: Traci

All in favor. Tim and Kathleen abstained. Motion carried.

9. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding the following requests for domestic violence continuing education credits and/or formal training:

- a. Provider Application for 5 CEU's
Options
4528 W. Craig Rd., Suite 150
N. Las Vegas, NV 89032
"The Abused Woman: A Survivor Therapy Approach"
Video Training
(Continued from August Meeting -Reviewed by Walt Dimitroff)

Jennifer said that she had read Walt's recommendation earlier in the meeting, and said that it was for 5 formal victim training hours.

Kathleen said that given that the Committee had approved distance media, this could be approved.

Motion: Brad moved to approve the credits.

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried.

- b. Provider Application for 40 Formal Training Credits
Options
4528 W. Craig Rd., Suite 150
N. Las Vegas, NV 89032
"Batterers Intervention DV Certification"
(reviewed by Walt Dimitroff)

Kathleen said given Walt's recommendation the Committee could approve 15 victim and 15 perpetrator.

Motion: Noel moved to approve the credits.

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried.

- c. Individual Application for 16 Formal Training Credits
Dana Brown
LRS
2077 E. Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, NV
San Diego Relationship Training Institute
May 12-13, 2006
(reviewed by Kathleen Brooks)

Kathleen recommended approval of 16 formal training credits (8 victim; 8 perp).

Motion: Tim moved to approve.

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried.

- d. Individual Application for 21 Formal Training Credits
Renee Vincent
LRS
2077 E. Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, NV
"Sex Offenders and Victims"
March 6-7, 2006
(reviewed by Kathleen Brooks)

Kathleen said she was recommending denial of all 21 units because they were mostly relevant to sex offenders and victims. She said that the only courses that seemed relevant to DV were "Abusive Personalities" and "Domestic Violence: New Perspectives on Assessment and Treatment".

Renee Vincent indicated that this was a weeklong course that she attended in person. She said she could submit further documentation.

Noel asked Kathleen why she did not think "Assessing the Risk of Juvenile Violence" was relevant especially considering providers needing to do lethality assessments.

Kathleen said that further information would be needed to substantiate the relevance to DV. She said that some of the items may possibly be relevant and she wanted to table the item and would reconsider if further information was given. She said that although sexual violence can be part of domestic violence, treatment of sex offenders and DV perpetrators was different, so she didn't feel any of the sex offender items would be able to count.

Motion: Noel moved to table the item until further information was provided substantiating the relevance to DV.

2nd: Traci. All in favor. Motion carried.

- e. Individual Application for 6 CEU's
Marcia Lee
Options
And Sandra Dietrich-Hughes
Safe House
"U.S. Journal 12th Annual Counseling Skills Conference"
September 14-16, 2006
(reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim said he was missing handout materials and pre and post tests. He said that the Wexler materials are good, and would recommend approval pending receipt of the missing items.

Motion: Tim moved to approve the training pending receipt of handouts and pre and post tests.

2nd: Traci

Brad said that many trainings do not provide pre and post tests even though they are appropriate trainings.

Tim suggested that the pre and post tests be submitted if available.

All in favor. Motion carried.

- f. Individual Application for 15 CEU's
Wayne Hansen
Family Violence Intervention Program
742 D. Street
Elko, NV
"Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Training"
Nov. 29- Dec. 1, 2006
(reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim recommended approval pending receipt of handouts and pre and post test materials.

Motion: Noel moved to approve pending receipt of handouts and pre and post test materials.

2nd: Traci

Brad said most classes do not have pre and post test materials.

All in favor. Motion carried.

Noel commented that the forms maybe need to have a different type of checklist to indicate whether or not some of these items are available.

- g. Individual Application for 9 Formal Training Credits
Nora Sanders-Johnson
LRS
2077 E. Sahara Street
Las Vegas, NV
(reviewed by Patricia Lynch)

Patricia said that she had some issues with the reading of the materials because she was concerned with some of the language including the need for couples training, and a 35 year old study about women being just as violent as men. She said that she didn't feel comfortable with some of what she read, and wanted it to be reviewed by a treatment provider. Tim volunteered to look at it.

Motion: Noel moved to continue pending review by a treatment provider.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

- h. Individual Application for 6 Formal Training Credits
Nora Sanders-Johnson
LRS
2077 E. Sahara St.
Las Vegas, NV
"Advanced Ethics"
November 7, 2005
(reviewed by Brad Simpson)

Brad said that the Nevada Centers for Application of Substance Abuse Technology was the instructor for the course on Advanced Ethics. He said no resume was provided, and that a handwritten syllabus was provided. He said he did have an article from the American Psychological Association Journal and instructional materials, but no tests. He said this was an ethics course for formal training and that ethics is usually mandatory for all counseling professions to maintain licensure. The certificate indicates that credits were granted to numerous professional bodies in California and Nevada including MFT, social workers, drug and alcohol counselors, etc. Certificate was included for attending 6 hours of ethics training.

Kathleen said that unfortunately the Committee does not typically approve ethics as the Committee asks that CEU's be specific to domestic violence.

Brad said that all ethics training he has had refers to the treatment of all clients regardless of whether they are batterers or victims. He said that his personal feeling was that these would be applicable to either group in dealing with clients. He said that for formal hours he would not mind splitting it 3 victim and 3 perpetrator. Brad said that as a board he thought the Committee needed to work on the issue that not all of what is required on the application is provided at trainings.

Brad recommended approval.

Motion: Patricia moved to approve.

2nd: Tim

Traci, Patricia, Brad, Tim in favor; Kathleen and Noel opposed.

Noel said that he felt there needed to be more substantiation and that while he understood the importance of ethics in terms of treatment providers, it was something required of other licensing boards and doesn't think it should substitute for victim or perpetrator training.

Kathleen agreed stating that ethics courses are required for licensure and thought that domestic violence could remain separate from other issues.

Brad said he understood their point, but still thought that since ethics deals with mandated reporting, it is still applicable to domestic violence.

10. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding the application for certification renewal from the following providers:

a. Options

4528 W. Craig Rd. Ste. 150

Las Vegas, NV 89032

(reviewed by Walt Dimitroff – Continued from May and August Meetings)

Jennifer read Walt's recommendation as follows: "Mr. Reeves has provided the additional information requested, specifically an accounting of the current facilitators and the groups in which they facilitate. It appears that all groups are covered by fully trained facilitators and Mr. Reeves also provided documentation of the training status of the pending facilitators. At this point it appears that if the correspondence training were approved, then the pending facilitators would meet the training requirements set forth by NAC. My recommendation is to renew Options application for recertification."

Jennifer said that the pending providers should probably be added to the February agenda for formal approval.

Motion: Noel moved to approve certification renewal.

2nd: Traci

All in favor. Motion carried.

Kathleen indicated that if the pending facilitators have the appropriate training, they can facilitate groups, but for the next meeting, those facilitators should be on the agenda.

b. Mesa Family Counseling

1000 S. 3rd Street, #F

Las Vegas, NV 89101

(reviewed by Traci Dory – Continued from August Meeting)

Traci said the additional information had been submitted. She recommended approval.

Motion: Brad moved to approve.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

c. Counseling Opportunities

3710 Grant Drive

Reno, NV 89509

(reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim said the application was complete and he recommended approval.

Motion: Traci moved to approve.

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried.

- d. Great Basin Counseling Services
525 Roberts Street, Ste. 102
Reno, NV
(reviewed by Brad Simpson)

Brad said that all of the paperwork was in order. He recommended approval.

Motion: Patricia moved to approve.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

Leah Boe-Pluhar said that they will be making some changes to the program and plan to submit documentation for approval of Gail Faulstich as Supervisor for the February meeting.

- e. State of NV Rural Mental Health
Battle Mountain and Winnemucca
(reviewed by Noel Waters)

Noel said that most of the application was good, except for the Supervisor's continuing education hours. He said that he felt Mr. Dummar was ambiguous about whether he would be continuing as supervisor. Noel said the application indicated that Mr. Dummar may want to hand over supervisory duties to Ms. Watson, but the Committee would need proof that Ms. Watson is qualified. He said if Mr. Dummar was going to continue as supervisor that he would need to submit proof of his CEU's. He said there is also a new co-facilitator who does not appear to have training. He said that other than the training deficiencies, the application was complete. Noel recommended continuing pending further documentation.

Motion: Tim moved to continue pending further documentation.

2nd: Brad

There was discussion on helping them remain certified as a rural agency.

All in favor. Motion carried.

- f. LRS
2077 E. Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, NV
(reviewed by Kathleen Brooks – **Denied** at the May Meeting)

Kathleen said that LRS has hired Dennis Fitzpatrick as the supervisor. She said that as long as he stays in the position, the program is fine. She said that Renee Vincent's materials do not meet the criteria for approval as a supervisor at this time. She said that she did not feel there was the supervision of a domestic violence program for two years. She said that she has a Masters Degree but not the 60 and 60. Kathleen said that the Committee needs to re-interview Frank Karr, and if he qualifies then he could possibly be the supervisor. She said she was not clear on who had obtained CEU's and who hadn't. She said that Nora Sanders-Johnson, Dana Brown and Josephina Natara had their CEU's, but that she did not have documentation of everyone else. Kathleen said that she needed more clarification on CEU's to approve the program. Kathleen recommended continuing until February.

Motion: Tim moved to continue.

2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried.

Dennis asked if Kathleen was wanting documentation of the original 60 and 60.

Kathleen said she did not need the 60 and 60, but she wanted to see where everyone obtained their 15 CEU's. She said she also needed dates and notes of supervision as there was only one set of notes.

11. * Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding the Corrective Action Plans for the following providers:

- a. Safe House
Henderson, NV
(reviewed by Brad Simpson)

Brad said that Safe House completes a lethality assessment with their clients which appears to address the extent to which an individual may harm themselves or others. He said in regards to a report to be submitted by a parole and probation officer, Ms. Dietrich-Hughes indicated that very few clients were under supervision of a parole or probation officer, and when this is the case, a waiver is signed so that Ms. Dietrich-Hughes can communicate with the parole officer.

Noel said that they are supposed to get copies of an arrest report not a P and P report.

Kathleen said that we didn't have that in this state.

Noel said that the offender would bring in the incident report to the counselor.

Brad said that according to NAC it was any report prepared by a parole and probation officer. Brad said that Dr. Hughes noted that they are not completing psychological evaluations. Ms. Dietrich-Hughes said their agency does not do psychological evaluations but does include them in the file when provided. He discussed aspects of form changes. He also mentioned that Dr. Hughes asked that an issue concerning collusion with one of the co-facilitators be addressed. Ms. Dietrich-Hughes indicated that individual had been terminated. He recommended approval with a request for Safe House to provide a copy of the new progress tracking form once completed.

Motion: Tim moved to accept the corrective action plan.

2nd: Patricia

All in favor. Motion carried.

- b. Las Vegas Municipal Court
(reviewed by Traci Dory)

Traci said that it appeared that they had corrected the deficiencies noted in Dr. Hughes' report. She recommended approving the corrective action plan.

Motion: Tim moved to approve.

2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried.

- c. Safe Nest – Mesquite
(reviewed by Patricia Lynch)

Patricia discussed details concerning Dr. Hughes' report and the response by Safe Nest. She recommended accepting the corrective action plan.

Motion: Traci moved to accept the plan.

2nd: Brad.

All in favor. Motion carried. Kathleen and Tim abstained.

- d. Safe Nest – Las Vegas
(reviewed by Patricia Lynch)

Patricia discussed details concerning Dr. Hughes' report and the response by Safe Nest. She recommended accepting the corrective action plan.

Motion: Brad moved to accept the plan.

2nd: Traci

All in favor. Motion carried. Kathleen and Tim abstained.

12. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding approval of new providers.

- a) Michael Kennedy
Las Vegas Municipal Court
(reviewed by Noel Waters)

Noel said that Mr. Kennedy seemed to satisfy all the requirements. He said that part of the requirements include that the provider be supervised by a qualified supervisor of treatment, never been convicted of a crime of moral turpitude, free of violence, etc. Noel said that he felt there should be somewhere for the applicant to make that statement and sign a declaration.

Jennifer said that it might be a good idea to create a form for this purpose.

Tim said that his agency had a form in place and could give it to Jennifer.

Noel said that he recommended approval as a provider.

Motion: Traci moved to approve Michael Kennedy as a provider.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

- b) Ron Mackey
Las Vegas Municipal Court
(reviewed by Noel Waters)

Noel said that 17 hours of perpetrator training was from an online source. He said that these specific courses had not been approved by the Committee. He discussed details concerning

the location of some of the trainings, and indicated that there was not enough substantiation to approve. He recommended denial based on the perpetrator formal training hours.

Motion: Brad moved to deny the request.

2nd: Tim

All in favor. Motion carried.

13. Comments from Kathleen Brooks, Committee Chair.

Kathleen thanked Noel and Patricia for their time on the Committee. She said it would be a great loss to the Committee to have them go. She presented Noel and Patricia with plaques commemorating their service. She said the Committee would miss Noel's wisdom, guidance, and calm, cool direction. Kathleen said that Patricia had been a great help to the Committee, and had been a member since the beginning.

Patricia said that even though she could be a little dynamic, she knew that everyone's heart was in the same place and they were all trying to go the same direction.

Kathleen said that this year she hoped would be her last year on the Committee. She said she hoped that someone would step forward to be chair. She said she helped to create the Committee, but was looking to resign at the end of 2007.

Jennifer said that the D.A.'s Association had recommended Russell Smith to fill Noel's slot, and that General Chanos had made the appointment. She said that the Nevada League of Cities recommended Shauna Hughes, and General Chanos had made the appointment.

14. *Date, time, and location of future meetings:

The Committee decided to either February 6 or 8 depending on the schedules of the new members. Future dates would be decided at the February meeting.

15. Public Comment.

Patricia offered to talk to the city attorney elect in Reno to see if the meeting space could be made available for the Committee for future meetings. Patricia said that she felt that there had been great growing pains with the Committee, but she was happy to see the progress and thought it had become a very professional board. She thanked the board members and said she had enjoyed working with everyone.

Noel thanked everyone on the board, and said he felt the Committee did very important work. He said that he hoped someday people would get more recognition for the hard work they put forth being a member of the Committee.

16. *Adjournment

Motion: Noel moved to adjourn.

2nd: Brad

All in favor. Motion carried.