

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

MINUTES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011 at 10:00 a.m.

Via Video Conference:
Office of the Attorney General
Grant Sawyer Building
555 E. Washington Avenue, Room 4500
Las Vegas, Nevada
and
Office of the Attorney General
100 North Carson Street
Mock Courtroom
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 establishment of quorum.

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Members Absent</u>	<u>Attorney General's Office</u>
Tim Hamilton	Judge Bunch	Henna Rasul, DAG
Carol Ferranti	Cheryl Hunt	Jennifer Kandt, Admin. Coord.
Sue Meuschke		Kareen Prentice, Ombudsman
Lt. Robert Lundquist		<u>Public</u>
Traci Dory		Michael Freda
Robert Auer		Craig Merrill
Meri Shadley		

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

a) November 18, 2010 Meeting

Motion: Lt. Lundquist moved to approve the minutes. 2nd: Carol

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

b) November 18, 2010 Regulation Hearing
Motion: Traci moved to approve the minutes. 2nd: Sue
Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

3. Updates by Domestic Violence Ombudsman Kareen Prentice.

a) Budget

Kareen presented the expenditures for the previous quarter.

b) Court Assessments

Kareen stated that she was still trying to figure out how to make sure the courts are submitting the \$35 fee that is required. She said she will be doing a targeted letter to each judge and include the collection amounts so that each court can compare their amounts. Kareen also stated that she would be making an appointment with the controller's office to try to determine where the problems are with collections.

c) Match

Members were reminded to fill out their Match forms.

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

a) Application for 8 training credits

John Whitney

"Stalking: Multidisciplinary Perspective"

November 4, 2010 Las Vegas, NV

(Reviewed by Sue Mueschke)

Sue stated that she noted 6.5 eligible hours, and she recommended approval of 3.5 victim credits and 3 perpetrator credits.

Motion: Traci moved to approve. 2nd: Bob

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

b) Application for 2 training credits

John Whitney

"Officer, We Can't Hear You!"

October 12, 2010 Reno, NV

(Reviewed by Lt. Lundquist)

Lt. Lundquist stated that this appeared to be a valuable training, but that there were only 3 slides that pertained to domestic violence. He also stated that there was no course evaluation form and no information provided on the instructors. He recommended that the item be continued pending additional information and a timeline on the domestic violence content.

Motion: Sue moved to continue pending receipt of additional documentation and information. 2nd: Carol

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- c) Application for 16 training credits
John Whitney
“NCASV 9th Annual Sexual Violence Prevention and Intervention
Statewide Conference ”
November 8-9, 2010 Sparks, NV
(Reviewed by Judge Bunch)

Jennifer stated that Judge Bunch recommended approval for 8 victim and 8 perpetrator credits.

Motion: Bob moved to approve. 2nd: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- d) Application for 5.5 training credits
NNADV – Judy Henderson
“Building Collaboration and Enhancing Services in Our Community:
Domestic Violence, Trauma, and Mental Health”
November 19, 2010 Minden, NV
(Reviewed by Cheryl Hunt)

Jennifer stated that Cheryl recommended approval for 5.5 victim credits.

Motion: Carol moved to approve. 2nd: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Sue abstained.

- e) Application for 21 training credits
Sandra Dietrich-Hughes
“NICP: Advanced Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault”
December 2010 Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Judge Bunch)

Jennifer stated that Judge Bunch recommended approval for 10 victim and 11 perpetrator credits.

Motion: Bob moved to approve. 2nd: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- f) Application for 4 training credits
Dr. Alfred Hughes
“Review, Interpretation, and Implementation of the Nevada Administrative
Code for Domestic Violence Intervention Programs”
March 18, 2011
(Reviewed by Lt. Lundquist)

Lt. Lundquist recommended approval for 4 perpetrator credits.

Motion: Bob moved to approve. 2nd: Carol

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- g) Application for 3 training credits **-APPEAL**
Michael Freda
“Experiential Exercise for Perpetrators”
October 16, 2010 Reno, NV
(Approved for 1.5 credits November 2010; Reviewed by Traci Dory)

Traci stated that this course was previously taught with the same powerpoint presentation for 1.5 hours. She questioned what material was added to justify the additional 1.5 hours requested.

Dr. Freda indicated that he gave participants additional time for hands-on exercises. He indicated that the training started at noon and went until 3pm with a 10 minute break.

Traci stated that there was not an agenda with times listed, but with the information provided by Dr. Freda, she would recommend approval of 3 credits.

Motion: Bob moved to approve. 2nd: Carol Ferranti

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

h) Application for 2 training credits - **APPEAL**

Michael Freda

“Addictions and Domestic Violence”

October 16, 2010 Reno, NV

(Denied November 2010; Reviewed by Sue Mueschke)

Sue stated that the information contained in the packet gave very little information on domestic violence. She said it was very detailed information on the history of drugs and drug use. Additionally, she stated that there was not an agenda detailing times.

Dr. Freda stated that providers are required to assess offenders on drug and alcohol use, so they need basic information to make those assessments. Additionally, he stated that he spoke a great deal about how the drug use affected the treatment of offenders and the effects on the victims.

Sue stated that she would need to see further information on the domestic violence component of the training to make a decision. She recommended that Dr. Freda submit an agenda which detailed the times for the training, and some type of outline that would provide further detail and documentation on how domestic violence was tied into the training.

Motion: Traci moved to continue subject to receipt of further documentation and detail. 2nd: Carol

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

5. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding requests for new providers and supervisors:

- a) Jose Florido, Provider
Las Vegas Municipal Court
Las Vegas, NV

(Continued from November 2010 Meeting; Reviewed by Traci Dory)

Traci stated that Jose Florido was awaiting approval of the stalking training under item 4a, and that he needed that training to be approved for 7 victim hours, but the training was only approved for 3.5 victim hours leaving him short on the required number of victim credits. She recommended approval of Jose Florido contingent upon completion of the remaining victim credits within 90 days.

Motion: Sue moved to approve contingent upon completion of remaining victim hours within 90 days. 2nd: Carol
Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- b) Patricia Guzman, Provider
ABC Therapy
Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Cheryl Hunt)

Jennifer stated that Cheryl recommended approval.

Motion: Traci moved to approve. 2nd: Bob
Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- c) Jim Burdick, Provider
Community Counseling Center
Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim recommended approval.

Motion: Lt. Lundquist moved to approve. 2nd: Sue
Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

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

- a) Safe Nest
Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Bob Auer)

Bob recommended approval.

Motion: Traci moved to approve. 2nd: Carol
Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Tim abstained.

- b) Community Counseling Center
Carson City, NV
(Reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim recommended approval.

Motion: Carol moved to approve. 2nd: Bob
Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

7. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding request for additional program location for the following agencies:

- a) Sierra Counseling Center
1475 Terminal Way, Ste. B
Reno, NV
(Reviewed by Carol Ferranti)

Carol recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Traci
Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- b) New Beginnings Counseling Centers
2700 E. Lake Mead Blvd.
North Las Vegas, NV 89030
(Reviewed by Carol Ferranti)

Carol stated that she was concerned that the agency already appeared to be utilizing this location. Jennifer stated that the regulation states that the agency is required to notify the Committee of any changes to their program within 10 days. They are also required to submit an abbreviated application form to the Committee for an additional location, but that she did not think there would be anything to prohibit them from utilizing the additional location prior to review at a meeting.

There was discussion that there appeared to be some discrepancy with exactly where the program was operating, and Jennifer was asked to contact the agency to get clarification.

Motion: Bob moved to approve contingent upon clarification of various locations.

2nd: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

8. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding report to the Legislative Counsel Bureau in accordance with NRS 228.470 (2)(e).

Jennifer stated that she had completed the initial draft which had not yet been submitted to the Attorney General for approval. She stated that after the Committee offered input, she would forward to the Attorney General, and then she would submit to the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

Traci pointed out several changes to the report.

Kareen questioned whether the recommendations included in the report were indeed recommendations that the Committee wanted to make for legislative changes.

Sue stated that they were on-going recommendations and there was general consensus that they remain in the report.

Motion: Sue moved to approve the report with the changes recommended by Traci.

2nd: Bob

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

9. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding foreign degree evaluation policy.

Jennifer stated that she was asked to draft a policy regarding foreign degree evaluations and that she based the draft policy on the one provided by the Nevada State Department of Education. She also said that the list of evaluation service providers was the same as the list from the Department of Education.

There was discussion on whether the policy would require a change to the regulations, and Henna advised that the policy was only requiring individuals to prove that they meet the qualifications already required by the regulations, so a change to the regulations was not necessary.

Motion: Sue moved to approve the policy as written. 2nd: Bob
Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

10. Update from the Training Subcommittee.

Sue stated that the Training Subcommittee was continuing to meet to evaluate training criteria and requirements.

11. Update from the Forms Subcommittee.

Sue stated that the Forms Subcommittee had met and was starting with evaluating the renewal application forms and how to streamline the forms and process.

12. Update from the Rural Issues Subcommittee.

Jennifer stated that she had been unable to get a mutually agreeable time for this subcommittee to meet. She stated that the subcommittee wanted to invite John McCormick to attend the meeting, and it had been difficult finding a time for everyone to be able to meet.

Kareen stated that the Prevention Council was going to be holding a meeting in a rural jurisdiction (Ely) and wanted to have an agenda item regarding batterers treatment on that agenda and have Tim attend the meeting.

13. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding annual election of Committee chair as required by NRS 228.470.

Motion: Sue moved to re-elect Tim as chair of the Committee for another year. 2nd: Traci.

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Tim abstained.

14. Discussion regarding future agenda items.

Carol suggested an agenda item around gathering data from the treatment provider agencies and utilizing Alexis Kennedy from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas to work on a project surrounding the data collection.

Sue stated that she would like to invite Alexis Kennedy to the meeting in which that item would be discussed.

15. Discussion regarding future meeting dates currently set for:

May 13, 2011, 10:00 a.m.

The May 13th meeting was tentatively changed to May 26th.

August 23, 2011, 10:00 a.m.

November 15, 2011, 10:00 a.m.

16. Public Comment.

Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020). Public Comment will be limited to 3 minutes per person.

17. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 11:00am.

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

FORMS SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

Thursday, March 17, 2011 at 9:30a.m.

Via Teleconference

Public Access: Office of the Attorney General
5420 Kietzke Lane, Suite 202
Reno, NV 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.

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Members Absent</u>	<u>Attorney General's Office</u>
Sue Meuschke	Carol Ferranti	Jennifer Kandt
Tim Hamilton		

Public
Craig Merrill

2. *Review, amend and approve minutes of meeting:

a) February 3, 2011

Tim moved to approve the minutes. 2nd: Tim

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

3. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding batterers treatment program renewal application forms and process for renewal of licensure.

Sue thanked Jennifer for making the changes to the forms, and Tim and Sue commented that the revised form looked very good.

There was discussion on the addition of the financial information section, and Jennifer stated that she added that section as a reminder for programs to use the sliding fee scale.

There was further discussion on indigency and how it is determined. Sue requested that Jennifer contact the courts to obtain whatever financial worksheets they may use in regards to obtaining financial information from offenders. There was general consensus that this would be an item to discuss with the full Committee.

The subcommittee addressed the revised forms page by page.

There was discussion on the signatures and whether they needed to be original signatures. Sue suggested that the annual performance report be signed by the provider and supervisor, and be original signatures. Sue suggested that the quarterly observations not require any signatures, but have a checkbox at the bottom to indicate that the supervisor has discussed the observation with the provider. Sue stated that she felt the signature on the second page of the application should also be an original signature.

Craig asked whether an annual performance report was needed if you are an agency with just two people.

Tim stated that quarterly observations would not be done, but that an annual performance report on the provider should probably still be completed.

There was discussion about defining current year continuing education, and eliminating the requirement to list last year's continuing education. Sue requested that language be added that states that NAC does not allow for credit to be given for taking the same course two years in a row.

Sue asked what other forms needed to be looked at by the subcommittee.

Jennifer stated that she would attempt to revise all the forms for cohesiveness in how they look, and try to have several more ready to be looked at by the subcommittee at the next meeting.

Craig stated that the observation form used to document observation hours only has a spot for one provider to sign, and that it might be better to have more room for signatures.

Sue requested that Jennifer make the changes to the renewal application and send it out to providers for comments. Sue said she would help with sorting through any comments provided.

4. Discussion regarding future agenda items and future meeting dates.

Sue stated that at the next meeting she would like the subcommittee to look at a final draft of the renewal application at the next meeting. Additionally, Sue said a list of the other forms needing review could be added to the agenda, and the subcommittee could look at as many as possible.

The next meeting was set for June 30th at 9:30a.m.

5. Public Comment.

Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020). Public Comment will be limited to 3 minutes per person.

6. Adjournment.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING FOR GRANTING WAIVERS
OF PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE REQUIREMENTS
FOR PROGRAM SUPERVISORS

MINUTES

Wednesday, May 25, 2011 at 10:30a.m.

Location: Office of the Attorney General
Grant Sawyer Building
555 E. Washington Avenue, Room 4500
Las Vegas, Nevada
AND
Office of the Attorney General
100 N. Carson Street
Mock Courtroom
Carson City, Nevada

Please Note: The Batters 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

Tim Hamilton
Sue Meuschke

Members Absent

Attorney General's Office

Jennifer Kandt, Admin.

Public Present

Leah Boe

2. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding minutes from the following meeting:

a) August 19, 2010 Waiver of Licensure Subcommittee

Motion: Sue moved to approve the minutes. 2nd: Tim

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

3. Interview for waiver of professional licensure.

a) Leah Boe

QUESTION 1. In the batterer intervention program you propose to supervise, how will you demonstrate respect for the plight, right and individual differences of victims as well as respect the individual differences and rights of the perpetrator?

Ms. Boe indicated that she does full assessments on each individual coming into her program. She said she follows all statutes in regards to topics. She said she also provides victim service information. Ms. Boe stated that she treats everyone fairly and with respect, and that she makes all appropriate referrals.

QUESTION 2. What is your ideal of a model intervention program?

Ms. Boe stated that she has a very good intervention program. She said she takes bits and pieces from various treatment models, and that she keeps current on all research and studies.

QUESTION 3. How do you propose to cooperate and communicate with interrelated agencies?

Ms. Boe said that she does all of the reporting for her agency, and said she is very accessible. She said she corresponds with the courts, parole and probation, and service providers.

QUESTION 4. How have you contributed to public awareness about the issues of domestic violence? Either individually or as an agency.

Ms. Boe stated that she previously did elder abuse trainings. She speaks and asks questions at all trainings. She said she talks with hospitals. She also said she talks to judges in a "soft way" as not to "butt heads" with judges.

QUESTION 5. How do you demonstrate ongoing evaluation of your program? And how do you incorporate new information into your batterers' intervention?

Ms. Boe said she does chart audits every month. She stated that she does all reporting and looks at studies and new treatments and then brings those in to add to the existing treatment standards.

QUESTION 6. Situational question: How would you handle a referral who comes from a culture which condones the use of violence to remedy family conflict?

Ms. Boe said she would try to get the batterer to understand different perspectives, and would hope that he would get feedback from other participants. Ultimately, she said it could be difficult to change his beliefs, but hopefully he could begin to change his beliefs.

QUESTION 7. What professional code of ethics will you follow in your program? What is your affiliation with that group?

Ms. Boe stated that she is a licensed drug and alcohol counselor and a licensed social worker. She said she also has applied for MFT licensure and will follow the code of ethics for all of those organizations.

QUESTION 8. How would you deal with the following situation: you receive a call on your voice mail a few minutes before group begins from the wife of a group member. She says her husband is threatening to kill her cat.

Ms. Boe stated that she would contact the victim outside of group so that the offender would not be aware that she is contacting the victim. She also stated that if she thought the victim was in immediate danger, she would contact the police. Additionally, she stated that she would discuss it with the batterer.

QUESTION 9. Another situational question: A batterer who has graduated from your program leaves a message on your voice mail that he re-offended the previous evening by hitting his wife; she did not call the police. What would you do?

Ms. Boe stated that her agency offers free after care and that any graduate from her program can attend groups for free. She stated that she would contact the courts to let them know that he re-offended and that she would also contact the victim to offer her support services.

QUESTION 10. What training have you received in diversity? How will your program handle people of different ethnic, racial or cultural backgrounds?

Ms. Boe said that she attends classes offered locally that might offer cultural diversity training. She stated that part of the intake questionnaire for her agency includes questions on whether there are any religious or cultural beliefs which may impact treatment.

QUESTION 11. What training have you received which most influenced your work with batterers?

She said she attended an excellent training in Pacifica, California that dealt with local diversity and California statutes dealing with batterers treatment.

QUESTION 12. Situational question: How would you handle a batterer who complains to the court that after a month of attendance, he does not like you or your group?

Ms. Boe stated that hopefully she would notice the attitude before the client went to the court. She said that she had an incident where she sat down with a client outside of the group setting and asked what could be done to help the client succeed in the classes.

QUESTION 13. Another situational question: A batterer comments in your group that he's found out his ex is seeing another man and he feels like slashing her tires. How would you handle the situation?

Ms. Boe said she would talk through the situation with the batterer, and if it appears to be a real threat, she would contact the victim to safety plan. She said that she tends to believe the batterers when they state that they are going to do something.

QUESTION 14. What do you expect a graduate of your program to come away with after participating for 28 weeks?

Ms. Boe stated that she hopes the batterers do not reoffend after the program, and she hopes that they learn the skills taught in group. She said she hopes that they understand the cycle of violence. She said the ultimate goal is that they don't reoffend and that they come to aftercare if needed.

4. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding recommendation to the full Committee on the waiver of professional licensure for the following individuals:

a) Leah Boe

Tim stated that she felt the answers to questions number one and two were light on content.

Sue agreed that she started out light at first and then seemed to offer more with her answers.

Tim and Sue agreed that Ms. Boe did not say anything about evaluation of the program in question number five. There was general consensus that the answers to questions number six and seven were good, but that the answer to number eight presented problems due to her statement that she would contact police which could violate victim confidentiality and put the victim at risk. Additionally, Sue and Tim stated that they agreed that her telling the offender would be a big risk to the victim.

Tim and Sue agreed that Ms. Boe's answers to questions number twelve and thirteen were better than average.

There was discussion that in general, she seemed to be aware of victim safety issues, but there were a couple of problems with some of her responses.

There was discussion that confidentiality issues seem to be problematic for many providers and that a training on confidentiality could be very beneficial. Additionally, there was discussion that maybe these questions should be available to interviewees prior to the interview.

Tim stated that based on her overall interview, her reputation in the field, and her training, he would recommend approval.

Motion: Sue moved to recommend approval for the waiver of licensure for Leah Boe.
2nd: Tim

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

5. Public Comment.

Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020). Public Comment will be limited to 3 minutes per person.

6. Adjournment.

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

MINUTES

Thursday, May 26, 2011, at 10:00 a.m.

Via Video Conference:
Office of the Attorney General
Grant Sawyer Building
555 E. Washington Avenue, Room 4500
Las Vegas, Nevada
and
Office of the Attorney General
100 North Carson Street
Mock Courtroom
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 establishment of quorum.

Members Present

Tim Hamilton
Carol Ferranti
Sue Meuschke
Lt. Robert Lundquist
Traci Dory
Robert Auer
Meri Shadley
Judge Bunch

Members Absent

Cheryl Hunt

Public
Ann Pongracz
Judge Melissa Saragosa
Dr. Michael Freda
Craig Merrill
Frank Karr
Dennis Fitzpatrick
Penny Jackson
Frankie Holtz-Davis
Ron Lawrence

Attorney General’s Office

Henna Rasul, DAG
Jennifer Kandt, Admin. Coord.
Kareen Prentice, Ombudsman
Catherine Cortez Masto, AG

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

a) February 15, 2011 Meeting

Motion: Traci moved to approve. 2nd: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

3. Updates by Domestic Violence Ombudsman Kareen Prentice.

a) Budget

Kareen presented the expenditures and authority remaining.

b) Court Assessments

Kareen said that she appreciated the efforts of Judge Saragosa to improve the Court assessment collections. She also stated that she would work with Jennifer and John McCormick to try to improve collections methods.

c) Match

Kareen requested that all members complete the match forms included in their packets.

4. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding determining indigency and ability to pay for batterer's treatment services in accordance with NAC 228.106. This item will include comments from Judge Melissa Saragosa regarding general issues the domestic violence court encounters surrounding payment for services.

Jennifer stated that this item was on the agenda as a result of various discussions surrounding these issues. She said that payment for services and indigency is the reason most judges call the Committee. She also stated that Judge Saragosa contacted her and stated that she would be willing to come to a meeting to address the Committee with some issues.

Judge Saragosa stated that there were several issues her court was seeing regarding payment and indigency. She stated that agencies do not seem to have a consistent approach to indigency and that there is no standard sliding fee scale. She stated that agencies are required to accept at least 5% of their clients as indigent, but for the purposes of the court, approximately 85% of the clients are considered indigent.

She stated that she does not feel that agencies are doing an adequate or consistent job of evaluating the need for a sliding fee scale up front. She stated that some agencies allow defendants to attend the entire program without paying fees, and without a plan for how those fees will get paid, which results in the case being left open. She said other agencies require \$150 fee upfront to get the evaluation done, and the agency will not allow them to start classes without the fee. She said that her court had worked hard to schedule appointments right from the courtroom, so that defendants knew exactly when and where they should show up. Judge Saragosa stated that defendants will be most successful if there is a plan and they know what to expect up front, but there are so many variations. She stated that she thought it was not in the best interest of the client to be delayed treatment, and hoped that the Committee could work toward addressing that issue.

Judge Saragosa said that she is also having issues with agencies accepting hearing impaired clients because of the extremely high costs associated with hiring the interpreters.

Jennifer stated that she had been contacted by an agency and an attorney regarding this issue. She said that she informed the agency that they were required to accept the client and that it was their responsibility to pay for the interpreters, and that they would be in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act if they didn't.

Judge Saragosa stated that agencies are turning away the hearing impaired clients because they do not want to pay for the interpreter services.

Judge Bunch suggested that the Committee send out a notification regarding the federal law, and then the Committee could take action against any agency that denies treatment to these clients.

Penny Jackson stated that she runs a very small agency that makes very little money from batterers treatment due to the fact that they don't pay very much and that she has to hire two people to run the groups. She said that there would be no way that they would be able to pay for interpreters and asked if there were any funds that could assist programs with paying for these services.

Judge Saragosa stated that she was not aware of any assistance funds that would help a for profit business. She also said that non-profit organizations had different requirements on hiring interpreters.

There was further discussion on the possibility of allowing exceptions for hearing impaired in terms of doing longer sessions every other week, or having several agencies contribute to the costs for the interpreters.

Judge Saragosa also stated that there seems to be confusion on whether an agency can charge for no-shows. She said that some agencies do not terminate on the fourth absence and they allow the clients to continue to rack up fees for no-shows. Additionally, she stated that there seems to be inconsistencies and misunderstandings about whether clients need to start the program over if they are referred back to the court. Judge Saragosa said she did not feel that the administrative code required the defendant to start over, and stated that she felt that was a judicial determination.

Dr. Freda commented that his agency requires indigent clients to complete 5 job applications per week in order to maintain the indigent fee schedule. He said it is very difficult when clients come to group with their cell phones, cigarettes, and Big Gulps then claim they have no money to pay for the session. He said that they need to pay something as part of the accountability. He also said it is frustrating when the courts complete somebody when they haven't paid their fees. Dr. Freda also stated that their agency no longer charges for no-shows as the fees just rack up. He said that in regards to starting the program over, you could have a client who takes 2 to 3 years to finish the program because they are not putting into practice things they

need to be learning and doing. He discussed successful completion, and stated that successful completion involves much more than just attending the classes, so he varies his recommendations on starting clients over, based on a variety of circumstances. He also said that his agency also dealt with the hearing impaired issue six years ago and it would have cost his agency \$260 per session for the interpreters.

Craig Merrill stated that he does not turn any clients away due to indigency. He also said most of clients state that they are out of work, but it is very difficult for an agency to document their financial situation.

Sue stated that she did not feel that these issues would be confined to batterers treatment, and that research could be done with the drug and alcohol counseling and how they deal with these issues. She also said that research could be done with other states to see if any innovative approaches have been successful. Sue said that there are many competing interests involved in this process.

Dennis Fitzpatrick said that the Committee should look at California, which does not mandate that programs accept indigent clients. He also stated that Arizona has state funded programs. Dennis suggested that the Committee sponsor one agency where hearing impaired clients are accepted with one teacher and have the class done with Powerpoint.

Judge Saragosa stated that she has 4 or 5 hearing impaired clients, and had conversations with an agency about having all the clients in one class at one agency, but there seemed to be issues with getting everyone together at the same time. She also stated that she wanted the Committee to be clear that she was not suggesting that she felt that any client should be able to complete the program for free, but was suggesting guidelines for sliding fee scales. Judge Saragosa stated that she almost never closes a case before payment has been made to the agency. She said that agencies could request a Civil Request of Judgement for non-payment of fees.

Sue asked if there were any possibilities of meeting with the judiciary as a whole to discuss the issues surrounding payment and non-payment, and there was discussion that would need to go through the Administrative Office of the Courts. Judge Bunch commented that there was currently not an education coordinator which would make things more difficult.

Bob stated that he felt some of these issues may go beyond the scope of the Committee as these issues are not related to the qualifications and competency of the providers, but is an operational issue that would be intervening in how a service provider charges fees.

Penny Jackson requested clarity on absences and whether they were required to refer back to the courts to start the program over.

Jennifer stated that the NAC outlines the maximum number of allowable absences and requires agencies to refer the offender back to the court after exceeding the allowed absences, but it is up to the judge on whether the individual will need to start over or be allowed to count the number of completed classes and continue treatment.

5. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding request from Dennis Fitzpatrick to combine Domestic Violence and Chemical Dependency Classes for the first 13 sessions.

Dennis Fitzpatrick stated that the Department of Justice reports that 61% of domestic violence offenders also have a substance abuse problem. He stated that domestic violence offenders are very difficult to treat when they are currently abusing drugs or alcohol. Dennis said that domestic violence providers are not trained to assess alcoholism or drug addiction. Lastly, he stated that in most cases, clients cannot afford to pay for both classes. He said that he felt it would be beneficial to allow the classes to be combined for the first 13 sessions. Dennis stated that he felt that both providers should be approved domestic violence providers, and that one of the domestic violence providers would be required to be a Licensed Alcohol and Drug Counselor, and that this arrangement would require coordination with the Board of Examiners for Alcohol, Drug, and Gambling Counselors.

Ron Lawrence stated that he is a substance abuse provider, and felt that it would be beneficial for the systems to come together.

6. Comments and concerns from Ron Lawrence regarding the Committee on Domestic Violence regulations.

Ron Lawrence stated that he is the Executive Director for a substance abuse agency, and is also on the Governor's Board for Co-Occurring Disorders. He said that his agency previously had a certified domestic violence program which was losing money. He said that there is a problem with mentally ill clients in the criminal justice system, and mental health issues need to be addressed. Ron also indicated that his agency runs an excellent anger management program, but felt that at least 50% of those clients could actually benefit from a domestic violence program. He said that his agency wants to have a batterers treatment program, but it is too cost prohibitive with the training requirements. He suggested having levels of training, and said that California has less stringent training requirements in terms of only requiring 40 training hours.

Sue questioned why a domestic violence program was cost prohibitive to run, but not a substance abuse program.

Ron stated that grant funding was very restrictive for agencies in terms of not being allowed to use any grant funds for batterers treatment. He said that their agency accepts fees from substance abuse clients, but that they also get a significant amount of federal grant money. He said that there is never enough money to pay for two facilitators and a supervisor.

Meri stated that she felt that all substance abuse counselors should be trained in domestic violence and questioned what it was that Ron was requesting from the Committee.

Ron said that he would like the Committee to consider dropping the 60 hour training requirement down to 40 as he did not think that people who were already in the treatment field needed to sit through hours and hours of observation, and that they needed to be taught domestic violence models and theories instead.

Tim stated that he felt that the code was intended to bring a therapist to a minimum level of understanding of domestic violence, and he did not feel that it should be reduced, but instead thought it could be increased.

Dr. Freda said that the 60 hours of group observation could be reduced for an experienced therapist, but that the 60 hours of formal training in domestic violence was at a minimum. He suggested that the Committee consider an intern program for individuals looking to be trained as providers.

Tim stated that the Committee could continue these discussions further at future meetings.

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

a) Application for 2 training credits - **APPEAL**

Michael Freda

“Addictions and Domestic Violence”

October 16, 2010 Reno, NV

(Denied November 2010; Continued February 2011; Reviewed by Sue Meuschke)

Sue stated that she reviewed additional documentation submitted by Dr. Freda, and would recommend approval of 1.75 credits.

Motion: Lt. Lundquist recommended approval of 1.75 credits. 2nd: Traci

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

b) Application for 16 training credits

Walt Dimitroff

“Working with the Unmotivated Group Client: Enhancing Alliance, Cohesion, and Change”

March 18 & 19, 2011 Reno, NV

(Reviewed by Judge Bunch)

Judge Bunch recommended approval of 16 credits.

Motion: Bob moved to approve. 2nd: Meri

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- c) Application for 15 training credits
Dennis Fitzpatrick
“Criteria for Selecting Videos for the DV and CD Class: Examination of 54
Appropriate Videos and How to Answer Popular Culture Memes”
February 10 & 13, 2012 Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Judge Bunch)

Judge Bunch recommended approval of 15 credits.

Motion: Bob moved to approve. 2nd: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- d) Application for 5.5 training credits
NNADV – Judy Henderson
“Collaborating for Safety: Coordinating the Military & Civilian Response to
Intimate Partner Violence”
March 31, 2010 Fallon, NV
(Reviewed by Judge Bunch)

Judge Bunch recommended approval of 5.5 credits.

Motion: Traci moved to approve. 2nd: Bob

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Sue abstained.

- e) Application for 6.5 training credits
Dennis Henson
“Emotional Manipulation”
May 13, 2011 Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Meri Shadley)

Meri recommended approval of 6 credits.

Motion: Sue moved to approve for 6 credits. 2nd: Judge Bunch

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

8. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding requests for new providers and supervisors:

- a) Frankie Holtz-Davis, Supervisor
Counseling Services Plus, Inc.
Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim stated that Ms. Holtz-Davis had completed additional training, and now met the requirements to supervise a batterers treatment program. He recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- b) Leah Boe, Supervisor
Great Basin Counseling
Reno, NV
(Reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim stated that Ms. Boe had completed the waiver of licensure interview which was recommended for approval and that she met the qualifications to supervise a batterers treatment program. He recommended approval.

Motion: Traci moved to approve. 2nd: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- c) David Dummar, Supervisor
American Comprehensive Counseling Services
Carson City, NV
(Reviewed by Carol Ferranti)

Carol stated that Mr. Dummar had previously supervised a program, and that he appeared to meet all of the qualifications.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- d) Michael Caughlan, Supervisor
American Comprehensive Counseling Services
Reno, NV
(Reviewed by Cheryl Hunt)

Jennifer stated that Cheryl provided a recommendation which stated that she did not see where Mr. Caughlan had two years supervisory experience in domestic violence. She recommended that the item be continued pending additional documentation of the supervisory experience.

Motion: Sue moved to continue. 2nd: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- e) Rodney Smith, Provider
American Comprehensive Counseling Services
Reno, NV
(Reviewed by Traci Dory)

Traci recommended approval.

Motion: Bob moved to approve. 2nd: Meri

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- f) Bridgette Deboar, Provider
American Comprehensive Counseling Services
Reno, NV
(Reviewed by Lt. Lundquist)

Lt. Lundquist recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Traci

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- g) Allison Hilborn, Provider
American Comprehensive Counseling Services
Reno, NV
(Reviewed by Lt. Lundquist)

Lt. Lundquist recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Carol

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- h) William Gallego, Provider
ABC Therapy
Henderson, NV
(Reviewed by Bob Auer)

Bob recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Traci

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- i) Martha Reyes, Provider
SAFE House, Inc.
Henderson, NV
(Reviewed by Carol Ferranti)

Carol asked whether observation hours from 2009 would qualify, or if there were any time restrictions for the observation hours.

Jennifer stated that the observation hours did not have any timeline requirements.

Carol recommended approval.

Motion: Bob moved to approve. 2nd: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

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

- a) New Beginnings Counseling Center
Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Traci Dory)

Traci recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Meri

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- b) Healing Our Future
Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Cheryl Hunt)

Jennifer stated that Cheryl recommended approval.

Motion: Traci moved to approve. 2nd: Carol

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- c) LRS Systems
Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Sue Meuschke)

Sue recommended approval.

Motion: Lt. Lundquist moved to approve. 2nd: Traci

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- d) SAFE House
Henderson, NV
(Reviewed by Carol Ferranti)

Carol stated that the agency was short on the continuing education hours. She recommended that the item be continued pending receipt of proof of additional continuing education hours.

Motion: Sue moved to approve pending receipt of additional hours within six months.
2nd: Bob

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- e) Sierra Counseling Center
Sparks, NV
(Reviewed by Lt. Lundquist)

Lt. Lundquist recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Carol

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- f) Nevada Court Counseling
Sparks, NV
(Reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim stated that the supervisor was short on continuing education credits. He recommended that the item be continued pending receipt of proof of additional continuing education hours.

Motion: Sue moved to continue. 2nd: Meri

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- g) Counseling Services Plus
Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Bob Auer)

Bob asked Jennifer whether the site review report had been received by Dr. Hughes, and asked whether it was favorable.

Jennifer stated that she had received the report very recently, but did not recall what their violations were. She said that the report would be sent to the agency with a request for a corrective action plan within 45 days. She said the corrective action plan would then be on the August agenda.

Bob recommended approval of the renewal application pending a successful site review report.

Lt. Lundquist suggested that the Committee continue the item just in case there were any issues with the inspection.

There was further discussion that it might be beneficial to wait for the results of the site review inspection and response to that inspection.

Bob stated that his recommendation remained unchanged.

Motion: Sue moved to continue pending response to the results of the site review. 2nd: Traci

Vote: Tim, Meri, Sue, Traci, Carol, Lt. Lundquist in favor. Bob opposed. Judge Bunch abstained. Motion carried.

- h) Las Vegas Municipal Court
Alternative Sentencing
Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Bob Auer)

Bob recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Carol

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

10.*Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding request for additional program location for the following agencies:

- a) Healing Our Future
1500 E Sahara Ave
Las Vegas, NV 89104
(Reviewed by Cheryl Hunt)

Jennifer stated that Cheryl recommended approval.

Motion: Traci moved to approve. 2nd: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- b) New Beginnings Counseling Centers
3376 S Eastern, Suite 148
Las Vegas, NV 89169
(Reviewed by Traci Dory)

Traci recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

11.*Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding the following request for certification of program located in another state:

- a) Life Stone
7300 South 300 West, Suite 101
Midvale, UT 84047
(Reviewed by Meri Shadley)

Meri recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Carol

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

12. Update from the Training Subcommittee.

Sue stated that the Training Subcommittee is continuing to look at distance learning providers, and also developing a list of training topics for consideration.

13. Update from the Forms Subcommittee.

Sue said that the Forms Subcommittee is attempting to streamline and improve the forms used by the Committee, and was nearly finished with the revisions to the renewal application.

14. Update from the Rural Issues Subcommittee.

Jennifer stated that the subcommittee had requested some information from John McCormick regarding domestic violence charges, and were inviting him back to discuss and clarify the information. Jennifer stated that she had also been asked to provide a report on some discussions she had with LRS regarding the possibility of offering treatment in Pahrump. She also said that she had received a call from the judge in Pioche who stated that he had a large number of outstanding cases because there were no treatment services in the rural areas, and he asked what could be done. Jennifer said that she then contacted Tim about the possibility of the providers in Mesquite traveling to Pioche, but that she had not heard further on whether that could work.

Tim said that the providers had agreed to offer the services, but that he was waiting for management to decide on payment for those services. He also said that he was going to be contacting the judge to discuss the issue further.

Judge Bunch said that there are two judges in Ely, one in Caliente and one in Alamo that could potentially send to the same providers. He said Tonopah was probably too far to add to the group.

15. Discussion regarding future agenda items.

There was discussion and general consensus that the Committee discuss a standardized sliding fee scale, the hearing impaired issue, and the substance abuse issue.

Sue requested that someone from the ADA be available to answer questions regarding ADA and reasonable accommodations.

16. Discussion regarding future meeting dates currently set for:

August 23, 2011, 10:00 a.m.

November 15, 2011, 10:00 a.m.

Judge bunch said Mondays, Tuesdays, and Wednesdays are very bad for him. Meetings were rescheduled for August 25th, and November 10th.

17. Public Comment.

Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020). Public Comment will be limited to 3 minutes per person.

Craig Merrill stated that he offered services to Nevada Urban Indians, but said that they often do not have 3 clients so he has had to cancel classes and asked if there was a waiver process.

Jennifer stated that there was an exception, and that it was at the discretion of the chair. She requested that Craig call her to discuss the recommended course of action.

Dr. Freda stated that he would have a problem with combining substance abuse and domestic violence classes because the methods of treatment are so different. Dr. Freda said that domestic violence treatment providers are required to do a substance abuse evaluation on offenders and refer to substance abuse counseling if needed.

Dennis Fitzpatrick said that one of the problems with the domestic violence providers doing a substance abuse evaluation is that they are not qualified to do them as they are not Licensed Alcohol and Drug Counselors, which is one of the reasons for the proposal. Additionally, he hoped the Committee would look at other states in terms of dealing with indigency and payment for services.

18. Adjournment

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

RURAL ISSUES SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

Wednesday, June 22, 2011 at 9:30a.m.

Via Teleconference

Public Access: Office of the Attorney General
5420 Kietzke Lane, Suite 202
Reno, NV 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.

***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.

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Members Absent</u>	<u>Attorney General's Office</u>
Cheryl Hunt		Jennifer Kandt, Admin.
Sue Mueschke		
Kareen Prentice (Chair)		<u>Public</u>

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

a) March 30, 2011

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Cheryl

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

3. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding submitted reports and information from John McCormick.

There was discussion on the report provided from John McCormick listing the various courts and domestic violence charges for each court. Jennifer stated that John had indicated that this report included charges, but that there was not information available on convictions, and that they are working on a report which would include convictions.

Sue questioned whether the numbers included on the report were cases that actually made it to the courts. Sue said that the information provided was probably not that helpful in terms of knowing whether there would be enough need for batterers treatment services in a particular community. She said that the number of convictions would be needed to make those determinations.

Cheryl stated that she did not think the courts would have the police data on the arrests if the case had not made it to the courts, so that she would assume this data was only cases that made it to court.

There was general consensus that more information was needed from John McCormick to explain the data and how it is obtained. Kareen also said she wanted to request further clarification on the 8th Judicial district. Additionally, the subcommittee members stated they would like more information on when the information on charges would be available.

Sue stated that based on the information provided, Lyon County had over 200 charges, so it would appear that Lyon County could support a provider. There was discussion that currently Lyon County residents would probably be attending treatment in Fallon, Carson, or Reno.

Sue said that she would like the subcommittee to look further into other states and how treatment is provided through the prison systems and possibilities for treatment to be offered in Nevada prisons and in the communities surrounding the prisons. Sue stated that there is currently no requirement to attend batterers treatment on a third offense (felony), but that they could look at the possibility of changing those requirements.

Kareen suggested inviting Traci Dory to a meeting to discuss batterers treatment in the prison system.

Sue suggested having someone call the courts and or prosecutors in Pahrump, White Pine, Lincoln, Pershing, and Mineral.

4. Report from Jennifer Kandt regarding discussions with various agencies on offering batterers treatment services in rural areas.

Jennifer presented her report detailing her discussions with LRS and stated that basically, LRS had indicated they would be willing to consider offering treatment in rural areas through distance media, or if only one facilitator was required.

Sue stated that the Committee has heard testimony detailing that batterers treatment through distance media does not work.

There was further discussion on the possible use of webcams and or the college video-conferencing system. Sue stated that she did not know if for profit agencies were allowed to use the video-conferencing system free of charge. Kareen stated that she would look into the costs involved.

5. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding coordination of the Rural Issues Subcommittee with Prevention Council for rural meetings.

Kareen stated that there were going to be meetings in Ely on August 10th and 11th. There was discussion on whether there should be an agenda item for batterers treatment and what that agenda item would focus on.

There was discussion that conversations about batterers treatment in the rural areas might tend toward distance media, and it would be important to have a treatment provider there who could talk in detail about methods of treatment and effectiveness.

Kareen suggested having Tim Hamilton be on the agenda to discuss batterers treatment and the theories behind it, and a brief discussion of the regulations.

Sue stated that if there were going to be discussions on batterers treatment at the meeting, that the information provided by John McCormick on charges could be distributed at the meeting.

6. Discussion regarding future agenda items.

There was general consensus that the following agenda items be discussed at the next meeting:

Invite Traci Dory or representative to discuss batterers treatment in the prison systems

Coordination for Prevention Council town hall and rural meeting

Invite John McCormick for further discussions on rural data

Update on providers in rural Nevada

7. Discussion regarding future meeting dates.

Next meeting was set for July 26, 2011 at 9:30a.m.

8. Public Comment.

<p>Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020). Public Comment will be limited to 3 minutes per person.</p>

9. Adjournment.

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

TRAINING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

Friday, June 24, 2011 at 9:30a.m.

Via Teleconference

Public Access: Office of the Attorney General
5420 Kietzke Lane, Suite 202
Reno, NV 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.

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Members Absent</u>	<u>Attorney General's Office</u>
Sue Mueschke		Jennifer Kandt
Traci Dory		Kareen Prentice
Tim Hamilton		

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

a) January 14, 2011

Motion: Tim moved to approve. 2nd: Traci

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

3. *Discussion, recommendation, and action regarding preferred topics or specific courses for formal training.

Tim stated that he liked the outline of topics required by California.

Sue said if the Committee was going to look at becoming more stringent in the topics required, that they could possibly look at reducing the number of hours from 60 to 40 as California does.

Tim said he thought that there could be more differentiated subjects as opposed to reducing the number of hours because he felt that there are extra areas that could be incorporated such as more training on post trauma stress issues.

Traci asked about how the use of a shelter based trainer would be used as it is in California.

Tim said that logistically it might be hard, but practically and functionally it would be a good idea.

Sue stated that she had pulled out some of the California laws from the Sonkin training, and requested that Jennifer create some type of document that would compare the training requirements of California against Nevada. Sue said the requirements are very different, so the comparison might be difficult. She said that Dr. Hughes training was very helpful, and it could possibly be a required course.

Jennifer said she had some brief conversations with Henna regarding requiring particular trainings, and it was her understanding that Henna did not think it would be appropriate to require a particular training from a particular agency, but that requiring particular subject matters would be fine. Jennifer said that Henna indicated that ultimately, the Committee still had control over which courses would actually be approved, but there shouldn't be anything to prohibit agencies from applying for course approval.

Sue requested that Jennifer invite Henna to the next meeting so she can further answer questions for the subcommittee.

Tim said he looked at some of the Sonkin training, and he thought it looked very good, and wanted to actually take the course.

Jennifer said she spoke with Dr. Sonkin about possibilities for Nevada having an on-line course and Dr. Sonkin had indicated that if we did not want a lot of changes to his existing on-line course, he could make the changes and offer the course charging participants the fee and no cost to us. Or, he said if we were wanting significant changes, we could contract with him to create the training, then we would own it, but there would be no interaction with him during the course.

Tim said he felt that the interaction would be an essential component of the training, and Sue agreed.

There were questions regarding whether the Committee could own and require a course, and further discussion that Henna would need to provide some guidance on what the Committee could do.

Sue said she had just gotten information from Men Stopping Violence on a 3 day training in Georgia, but that arrangements could be made to bring trainers to our

area. She said she also had a link to training on Women who use Violence, and she would forward to subcommittee members.

Tim said he like Emerge and Evolve more than Duluth.

Jennifer questioned whether the Ombudsman training fund could be used to bring trainers out to Nevada on an annual basis.

Kareen said she thought that could absolutely be done, and that fees could be collected via the Prevention Council. Kareen said she would look at the training budget and see what looked feasible.

Sue asked Jennifer to look into whether Dr. Wexler would be willing to travel to Vegas to put on a training.

There was discussion that the subcommittee look at RTI, Men Stopping Violence, Evolve, and Emerge. Tim said he could forward manuals from Evolve and Emerge to Jennifer to forward to Committee members.

Sue said that it had been brought up at a previous Committee meeting that someone with experience in running other types of group treatment, may not need to observe the 60 hours, and that the requirement could be waived.

Tim stated that he did not feel that 60 hours was all that much time, and that internal power dynamics may not play as large a role in other types of group treatment as it does in domestic violence.

4. Discussion regarding future agenda items.

There was general consensus that the next agenda include a comparison of California/Nevada training requirements and an agenda item for bringing training to Nevada. The agenda item would need to include a training budget from Kareen, and require discussion from Henna.

There was discussion on making sure Henna was able to come to the next meeting to answer questions on the process involved in bringing trainers out, what type of solicitations would be required, and whether this board should be choosing the trainers.

5. Discussion regarding future meeting dates.

The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for August 4, 2011.

6. Public Comment.

<p>Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020). Public Comment will be limited to 3 minutes per person.</p>

7. Adjournment.

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

FORMS SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

Thursday, June 30, 2011 at 9:30a.m.

Via Teleconference

Public Access: Office of the Attorney General
5420 Kietzke Lane, Suite 202
Reno, NV 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.

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Members Absent</u>	<u>Others in Attendance</u>
Sue Mueschke, Chair Tim Hamilton	Carol Ferranti	Jennifer Kandt, Admin.

2. *Review, amend and approve minutes of meeting:

a) March 17, 2011

Motion: Tim moved to approve. 2nd: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

3. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding batterers treatment form revisions.

Tim recommended a grammatical change on the training application.

Sue stated that she read through Mr. Fitzpatrick's suggestions, and felt that the suggestion to allow for more than one provider to be on the training log, was a good suggestion, but that she did not agree with the others. Additionally, Sue requested that Jennifer add language on all the forms stating that incomplete

applications would not be reviewed, and that applications should be filled out in their entirety. Sue recommended that the training application form be revised so that the name and address of the course instructor is requested on the front page. She requested that the course syllabus requirement include language regarding dates, times, and specific learning objectives.

There was some discussion regarding how providers determine indigency, and how they will report that on the renewal application. There was further discussion that determination of indigency would be discussed at the next full Committee meeting.

There was discussion that the recommended changes be made to all the forms, then put approval of the forms on the next full Committee agenda.

Motion: Tim moved to have requested changes made, then bring forms to full Committee for approval. 2nd: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

4. Discussion regarding future agenda items and future meeting dates.

Next meeting was set for October 13, 2011 at 9:30. Jennifer stated that there were still several forms that needed to be changed, and a confidentiality form that needed to be created.

5. Public Comment.

<p>Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020). Public Comment will be limited to 3 minutes per person.</p>

6. Adjournment.

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

RURAL ISSUES SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

Tuesday, July 26, 2011 at 9:30a.m.

Public Access: **Via Teleconference**
Office of the Attorney General
5420 Kietzke Lane, Suite 202
Reno, NV 89511

Please Note: The Committee on Domestic Violence may 1) address agenda items out of sequence to accommodate persons appearing before the Committee or to aid the efficiency or effectiveness of the meeting; 2) combine items for consideration by the public body; and 3) pull or remove items from the agenda at any time. 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)

Public comment is welcomed by the Committee, but at the discretion of the chair, may be limited to five minutes per person. A public comment time will be available before any action items are heard by the public body and then once again prior to adjournment of the meeting. The Chair may allow additional time to be given a speaker as time allows and in his/her sole discretion. Once all items on the agenda are completed the meeting will adjourn. Prior to the commencement and conclusions of a contested case or a quasi judicial proceeding that may affect the due process rights of an individual the board may refuse to consider public comment.

***Asterisks (*) denote items on which the 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, establish quorum.

<u>Members Present</u> Kareen Prentice Sue Mueschke	<u>Members Absent</u> Cheryl Hunt	<u>Attorney General's Office</u> Jennifer Kandt, Admin.
		<u>Public</u> Traci Dory

2. Public comment.

Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020)

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

a) June 22, 2011

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Kareen

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

4. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding submitted reports and information from John McCormick.

Kareen stated that this item would need to be tabled as John McCormick was not in attendance. She requested that Jennifer invite him to the next meeting.

5. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding batterers treatment options within the State of Nevada Department of Corrections (Traci Dory).

Traci stated that batterers treatment was not currently provided by the prison system because there were no requirements for batterers treatment in prison. She also stated that there were some anger management and victim empathy classes offered by psychologists. Traci indicated that there were 7 psychologists at High Desert in Las Vegas, 2 psychologists in Lovelock, 5 psychologists at Northern Nevada Correctional Center in Carson, and 1 psychologist in Ely.

Sue stated that the original idea was that if the people operating batterers treatment out of the prisons could also offer the treatment in the community, it might be more economically feasible for them.

Traci stated that she did not think there would be any funding available to offer batterers treatment since it was not a requirement, and that by statute, the psychologists within the prison system are not required to be licensed.

There was discussion that Las Vegas and Carson City did not need treatment providers, so we would be looking at Ely and possibly Lovelock.

Traci said she would talk to the people in Ely about possibilities and report back to the subcommittee.

6. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding information obtained from rural courts and updates regarding treatment providers in rural areas (Jennifer Kandt).

Jennifer provided a report on phone calls and discussions held with courts, district attorneys, and mental health providers regarding domestic violence convictions and batterers treatment options in White Pine County, Mineral County, Pershing County, and Lincoln County. She said that she had not

contacted Nye County because she had recently been in discussions with an agency planning on opening a batterers treatment group in Pahrump. Jennifer stated that it appeared that the State of Nevada Rural Mental Health (Ely) was providing "anger management" classes that were operated by a male/female co-facilitation team, and that the State of Nevada Rural Mental Health was previously certified to offer batterers treatment, so they should know the qualifications needed and the requirements for certification. Jennifer stated that she had called the person in Carson City whom she was told oversaw the anger management classes, but she said that he had not yet returned her call.

Sue requested that Kareen and Jennifer obtain information on the oversight body for Rural Mental Health and find out who the DAG is who represents them.

There was further discussion that Jennifer keep the subcommittee up to date on any further information or phone calls from these areas.

7. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding coordination of the Rural Issues Subcommittee with Prevention Council for rural meetings.

Kareen stated that there would be a town hall meeting in Ely on the 10th which would be a more informal setting for people in the community to address members of the Prevention Council. She also said that the Prevention Council would have a meeting in Ely on the 11th which would have a formal agenda.

Sue suggested that Ely Mental Health be invited to the town hall meeting and the Prevention Council meeting, and that the subcommittee also attempt to make an appointment to meet with them while in Ely on those days.

Jennifer stated that originally the subcommittee had hoped Tim Hamilton would be able to attend the Ely meetings, but that he was unavailable. Jennifer also stated that at the previous meeting it was suggested that the subcommittee have an idea of costs and feasibility for using the video-conferencing system of the college. She said that Great Basin College in Elko stated that there are not any charges associated with using the video-conferencing, but they are not supposed to allow for profit groups to use it.

Sue stated that if the use of video-conferencing is brought up as a means to do batterers treatment, she would be prepared to state that she has heard plenty of testimony indicating that would not be an effective means of treatment.

8. Discussion regarding future agenda items and future meeting dates.

There was general consensus that Items 4, 5, and 6, and a review of the Prevention Council meetings, be on the next agenda. The next meeting was set for October 20th at 9:30a.m.

9. Public comment.

Traci stated that in looking more closely at Ely, there was 1 psychologist, 1 mental health provider, and 1 psychiatrist. She said she would have further conversations about their training and qualifications in terms of batterers treatment.

Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020)

10. Adjournment

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

FORMS SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

Thursday, October 13, 2011 at 9:30a.m.

Via Teleconference

Public Access: Office of the Attorney General
5420 Kietzke Lane, Suite 202
Reno, NV 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.

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Members Absent</u>	<u>Others in Attendance</u>
Sue Mueschke, Chair Tim Hamilton	Carol Ferranti	Jennifer Kandt, Admin. Kareen Prentice, Ombudsman

2. *Review, amend and approve minutes of meeting:

a) June 30, 2011

Motion: Tim moved to approve the minutes. 2nd: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

3. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding batterers treatment form revisions.

There was general consensus that the forms looked good and should go before the full Committee. There were no suggestions for changes.

Motion: Tim moved to approve the forms and put them before the full Committee for approval. 2nd: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

4. Discussion regarding future agenda items and future meeting dates.

There was general consensus that the subcommittee had completed their work, and no further meetings were needed.

5. Public Comment.

Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020). Public Comment will be limited to 3 minutes per person.

6. Adjournment.

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

RURAL ISSUES SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

Thursday, October 20, 2011 at 9:30a.m.

Public Access: **Via Teleconference**
Office of the Attorney General
5420 Kietzke Lane, Suite 202
Reno, NV 89511

Please Note: The Committee on Domestic Violence may 1) address agenda items out of sequence to accommodate persons appearing before the Committee or to aid the efficiency or effectiveness of the meeting; 2) combine items for consideration by the public body; and 3) pull or remove items from the agenda at any time. 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)

Public comment is welcomed by the Committee, but at the discretion of the chair, may be limited to five minutes per person. A public comment time will be available before any action items are heard by the public body and then once again prior to adjournment of the meeting. The Chair may allow additional time to be given a speaker as time allows and in his/her sole discretion. Once all items on the agenda are completed the meeting will adjourn. Prior to the commencement and conclusions of a contested case or a quasi judicial proceeding that may affect the due process rights of an individual the board may refuse to consider public comment.

***Asterisks (*) denote items on which the 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, establish quorum.

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Members Absent</u>	<u>Attorney General's Office</u>
Kareen Prentice		Jennifer Kandt, Admin.
Sue Meuschke		<u>Public</u>
Cheryl Hunt		Traci Dory
		John McCormick, AOC
		Walt Dimitroff

2. Public comment.

Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020)

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

a) July 26, 2011

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Kareen

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Cheryl abstained.

4. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding submitted reports and information from John McCormick.

John stated that they were working on conviction numbers and having better disposition rates for FY2011, but stated that he did not have access to that information yet. He also stated that the Domestic Violence data was specialized and would not be included in the annual report. He said that he could request a data run, but needed to wait until after their annual report was finalized.

There was discussion regarding data on arrests maintained by DPS and included in their annual report.

5. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding batterers treatment options within the State of Nevada Department of Corrections (Traci Dory).

Traci reported that they do not have group sessions in Ely as it is a maximum security prison, so all the classes are done through workbooks which Traci provided. Traci said the other locations have group classes if inmates sign up.

Sue stated that it appeared that the DOC would not provide any opportunity to assist with providing batterers treatment in the rural areas.

Walt asked about the need for batterers treatment in the prison system. He stated that in the jail, inmates often inquire about the possibility of continuing treatment in prison, but that they don't get credit for the courses in prison as they are not certified. Walt further inquired if there would be a desire to train people within the prison so that they could become certified.

Traci said there would probably be a lot of questions regarding how they would get training, who would supervise them, how they would get continuing education, etc. Traci said she would follow up with the psychologists to see if there is a need or desire for certification and that she would get back to Walt.

6. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding information obtained from rural courts and updates regarding treatment providers in rural areas (Jennifer Kandt).

Jennifer stated that she had been asked to look into conviction numbers for Tahoe Justice Court and Incline Village, and John McCormick volunteered to look into conviction numbers for those courts to see if there would be enough clients to support a program.

Walt said that they had to close the agency in Fallon as they went from an average of 20 clients to 4 clients, so they could not support two therapists. Walt said that there appeared to be a reduced number of convictions because the attorneys tell the clients that if the victim does not show up, the prosecution will not move forward.

Cheryl stated that the attorneys should not be telling their clients that, but they do, and that without the testimony of the victim, it is difficult to get a conviction.

Sue asked whether law enforcement was gathering other evidence at the scene.

Cheryl stated that law enforcement was collecting evidence, but that without the victim's testimony, it is just hearsay, and that the victim needs to be able to tell what happened. Cheryl said that victims often don't cooperate with prosecutors which she stated was frustrating for prosecutors.

There was discussion regarding confusion surrounding Crawford versus Washington, and Sue stated that Brett Kandt had done quite a bit of training with prosecutors regarding this decision and how to move forward with evidence based prosecution without the victim.

7. Update on Prevention Council meetings held in rural Nevada.

Kareen stated that meetings were held in Ely in August and that batterers treatment issues came up at both meetings as Ely does not have a certified program. She said that a judge from Pioche spoke to Prevention Council and stated that he would like to see a certified program in Ely. She also reported that the victim advocate from the county said she would like to see exceptions made in the rural areas and suggested that in counties where a certified program does not exist, to require the offender to undergo a mental health evaluation.

John stated that if there was any desire to move forward with any changes to NRS, he would like to participate in the discussion.

8. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding possibilities for increasing treatment options in rural areas.

Sue requested that Jennifer create some type of spreadsheet that would document all of the ideas that have been raised to increase access to treatment in rural areas. Sue also requested that the document include exceptions that already exist in rural areas.

9. Discussion regarding future agenda items and future meeting dates.

There was general consensus that items 6,7,8 be included on the next agenda. The next meeting was set for January 26th at 9:30am.

10. Public comment.

Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020)

11. Adjournment

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

TRAINING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

Thursday, October 20, 2011 at 10:30a.m.

Public Access: **Via Teleconference**
Office of the Attorney General
5420 Kietzke Lane, Suite 202
Reno, NV 89511

Please Note: The Committee on Domestic Violence may 1) address agenda items out of sequence to accommodate persons appearing before the Committee or to aid the efficiency or effectiveness of the meeting; 2) combine items for consideration by the public body; and 3) pull or remove items from the agenda at any time. 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)

Public comment is welcomed by the Committee, but at the discretion of the chair, may be limited to five minutes per person. A public comment time will be available before any action items are heard by the public body and then once again prior to adjournment of the meeting. The Chair may allow additional time to be given a speaker as time allows and in his/her sole discretion. Once all items on the agenda are completed the meeting will adjourn. Prior to the commencement and conclusions of a contested case or a quasi judicial proceeding that may affect the due process rights of an individual the board may refuse to consider public comment.

***Asterisks (*) denote items on which the 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, establish quorum.

Members Present
Sue Meuschke
Traci Dory
Tim Hamilton

Members Absent

Attorney General's Office
Jennifer Kandt
Kareen Prentice
Henna Rasul

2. Public comment.

Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020)

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

a) August 30, 2011

Motion: Tim moved to approve. 2nd: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

4. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding preferred topics for formal training.

Tim presented a sample breakdown of formal training hours which maintained 30 victim related hours and 30 perpetrator related hours. Tim stated that he was not involved in the initial decision to equally split the hours between victim and perpetrator topics, but that he felt the equal split made sense.

Sue stated that she felt many topics crossed over into both categories, and that some were neither victim nor perpetrator, but were process issues. She said that group facilitation, and ethics and collusion would pertain to running groups and that there should also be DV101 with power and control, tactics, victim safety. Sue stated that she wasn't sure why substance abuse and domestic violence would only be under batterer issues. She said that she wasn't sure that categorizing training hours as batterer or victim was the best method. She also stated that she felt that a section on intake, assessment, and confidentiality needed to be included.

Tim stated that he felt that intake, assessment, and confidentiality was too basic and that anyone with licensure wouldn't need more training on those topics.

There was further discussion regarding some of the issues that come up during waiver of licensure interviews and how most applicants struggle with the questions regarding confidentiality.

Sue stated that she would like to make further changes to the breakdown that Tim drafted.

There was discussion on the possibility of adding a section on Nevada laws surrounding domestic violence.

5. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding observation hour requirements.

Sue stated that there was a request to reduce the observation hour requirements for people already in the field of counseling, as there were some who felt 60 hours was too onerous.

Traci stated that she felt the 60 hour requirement was fine as it was.

Tim stated that he agreed and even thought that 60 hours might not be enough.

Jennifer said she thought that part of this request came from rural areas who question how to get the 60 observation hours when there may not be a program in their area, or they may not be welcome to observe at another agency.

There was discussion regarding the ability for those programs to get the observation hours via distance media. There was also discussion regarding the similarity of sexual abuse and batterer groups. There was also discussion that observing drug and alcohol groups would not be a good option as the power dynamics are different.

6. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding bringing domestic violence training to the State of Nevada. This item may include proposed budget from Kareen Prentice, Domestic Violence Ombudsman. This item will also include discussion on legal issues surrounding selecting and requiring training.

Jennifer stated that at the previous meeting Kareen had indicated that there was \$1900 available to conduct a training, but that it would be better to wait until training topics were in place before releasing an RFP.

There were questions on who would select the training program, and how the process would work. Henna stated that a solicitation would need to be done and proposals would need to be reviewed.

There was further discussion regarding the possibility of having an on-line training, and whether that would be a viable option for Nevada. There was discussion that further research would need to be done on various options. Kareen stated that an on-line POST training had been developed with a company in Idaho for a cost of \$20,000.

Jennifer stated that she had also previously talked with Daniel Sonkin about the possibility of developing an on-line training for Nevada and that he had indicated that if we did not need significant changes, that he could make the changes and offer the course to Nevada residents. Or, we could contract with him to develop a course that we would own and maintain.

There was general consensus that the training topics needed to be finalized prior to moving forward with this item.

7. Update from the Rural Issues subcommittee.

Kareen stated that John McCormick attended the meeting and would be working on information on the number of cases and convictions. She also stated that Traci Dory had reported that there were no options for batterers treatment within DOC. Kareen also reported that Walt Dimitroff had attended the meeting and reported that he submitted an application for a program in Pahrump, and that he

was closing the program in Fallon as he had gone from an average of 20 clients to average of 4 clients.

Jennifer stated that Walt had stated that if victims were unwilling to testify, then prosecutors were not moving forward with the cases.

Tim stated that was a problem in Las Vegas as well.

Sue requested that this issue be brought to the attention of the Criminal Justice Subcommittee of the Prevention Council.

8. Discussion regarding future agenda items and future meeting dates.

There was general consensus that the subcommittee continue to look at preferred topics, and continue discussion on training observation, but that no further discussion was needed on observation hour requirements at this time. Next meeting was set for January 26th at 10:30a.m.

9. Public comment.

Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020)

10. Adjournment

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

MINUTES

Thursday, November 10, 2011, at 10:00a.m.

Via Video Conference:
Office of the Attorney General
Grant Sawyer Building
555 E. Washington Avenue, Room 4500
Las Vegas, Nevada
and
Office of the Attorney General
100 North Carson Street
Mock Courtroom
Carson City, Nevada

Please Note: The Committee on Domestic Violence may 1) address agenda items out of sequence to accommodate persons appearing before the Committee or to aid the efficiency or effectiveness of the meeting; 2) combine items for consideration by the public body; and 3) pull or remove items from the agenda at any time. 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)

Public comment is welcomed by the Committee, but at the discretion of the chair, may be limited to five minutes per person. A public comment time will be available before any action items are heard by the public body and then once again prior to adjournment of the meeting. The Chair may allow additional time to be given a speaker as time allows and in his/her sole discretion. Once all items on the agenda are completed the meeting will adjourn. Prior to the commencement and conclusions of a contested case or a quasi judicial proceeding that may affect the due process rights of an individual the board may refuse to consider public comment.

***Asterisks (*) denote items on which the 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, establish quorum.

Members Present
Tim Hamilton
Lt. Robert Lundquist
Sue Meuschke

Members Absent
Carol Ferranti

Attorney General's Office
Henna Rasul, Senior DAG
Jennifer Kandt, Admin. Coord.
Kareen Prentice, Ombudsman

Members Present

Traci Dory
Robert Auer
Cheryl Hunt
Judge Bunch
Meri Shadley

Public

David Gordon, AOC

2. Public comment.

Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020)

David Gordon, the Academic Training Coordinator with the Judicial Education Unit from the Administrative Office of the Courts stated that the Limited Jurisdiction Judges Education Committee has requested that the Attorney General's Office address the issues surrounding domestic violence counseling in the rural communities. Mr. Gordon requested that a representative of the Committee attend their next training in Pahrump on January 25, 2012. He said that he believed many of the judges will have questions regarding how they can hold perpetrators accountable for counseling requirements when it is not available in their jurisdictions.

There was discussion that Tim Hamilton, Jennifer Kandt, and Kareen Prentice would attend.

3. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding review and approval of minutes of the following meeting:

a) September 1, 2011

Several corrections were noted to the meeting attendance.

Motion: Judge Bunch moved to approve with the noted corrections. 2nd: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

4. Updates by Domestic Violence Ombudsman Kareen Prentice.

a) Budget

Kareen stated that through October 31st the Committee had expended \$6065.00.

b) Court Assessments

Kareen stated that the court assessment document was current through September. She said that there were no collections for July and stated that she was going to have Lorraine call the Controller's Office to see if that can be figured out.

Jennifer stated that Suzanne Ramos had set up a meeting with the Washoe County Court administrator to look at collection issues, but that the meeting had been cancelled and not yet rescheduled. She also stated that she was researching communication between the AOC and the Attorney General's Office regarding recommendations for increasing collections.

Kareen said that she had sent a request to Keith Munro to change the location of the court assessment fee within NRS for the next legislative session.

c) Match

Kareen reminded Committee members to fill out their match forms to assist with the STOP grant funding.

5. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding standardized definition of indigent for the purposes of NAC 228.

Jennifer stated that the packets contained information from programs regarding their definitions of indigent as well as the Supreme Court's definition.

There was discussion that setting out a fee schedule would probably not be within the scope of the Committee, and Tim asked legal counsel if the Committee had authority to define indigent.

Henna advised that the Committee could certainly define indigent, but they could not set limits as to the fees agencies could charge.

Judge Bunch stated that he thought NAC 228.106 seemed to give the authority for defining indigent to the programs.

Tim said that if there was not a definition for indigent, then programs could not determine whether they were servicing 5% of indigent clients.

There was discussion on the definition of indigent in NRS 439B which dealt with public health and safety, and whether that definition could be applied to the Committee. There was further discussion on whether the Committee could simply reference 439B in NAC as the definition of indigent.

Bob stated that he felt that determining whether a client was indigent for the purposes of assigning a public defender would be different than the standard used for health care purposes

Legal counsel said she would research whether the Committee could reference this NRS within NAC228 since they are not clearly related, and she would report back to the Committee.

6. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding changes to Committee forms.

Sue stated that the Forms subcommittee had approved the forms and recommended that the Committee adopt the new forms.

Motion: Judge Bunch moved to approve. 2nd: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

7. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding requirements for out of state program compliance as detailed in NAC 228.104.

Lt. Lundquist said that he requested discussion on this item after he had reviewed an out of state program and realized that they did not have to meet the same requirements as agencies within the state, and he felt that the Committee should possibly allow the

same exceptions to the rural areas which may actually be doing more than the out of state programs.

It was noted that current rural exceptions were as follows:
Providers in rural areas do not need a bachelor's degree.

Providers and supervisors in rural areas are allowed to complete up to ½ of the observation hours via distance media.

Providers and supervisors throughout Nevada are allowed to complete up to ½ of the formal training via distance media.

Providers and supervisors in rural areas are allowed to complete up to 10 hours of continuing education via distance media.

Supervision in rural areas has been allowed to be completed via live webcam.

Jennifer stated that the NAC for out of state programs technically only apply to residents in other states who are sentenced in Nevada courts, but that Nevada residents are probably attending some of these out of state programs.

Sue stated that she thought the Committee really needed to look at what exceptions would actually increase the availability of treatment in the rural areas and that eliminating male/female co-facilitation for instance, may not necessarily result in a treatment program when the real barrier may be how many clients are actually sentenced to treatment.

Lt. Lundquist stated that he felt this item was more directed at how we can assist rural communities and not really so much about the out of state programs. He said that possibly the meetings in Pahrump may help in figuring out some of the solutions to lack of treatment availability in rural areas.

Jennifer said that there seemed to be variances between communities in terms of what exceptions might be helpful, and that exceptions in certain areas would not make a difference. She said that there was a fully certified program in Fallon that just shut down because the program went from having an average of 20 clients per week to an average of 4 clients, and a group cannot be financially viable with 4 clients.

8. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding supervisory experience detailed in NAC 228.110 1(c).

Jennifer stated that this item was listed for discussion as there are questions as to how individuals obtain two years supervisory experience if they have not been approved as a provider.

Cheryl stated that she brought this up at the last meeting based on her review of a new supervisor.

Meri suggested having the requirement be two years supervisory experience in human services and two years experience working in the field of domestic violence. Meri also stated that other fields often require a supervision training, and there was further discussion on whether the Committee would require a supervision training.

There was further discussion on whether there should be a requirement that the individual also have been a provider for a certain period of time.

Sue suggested that the Training Subcommittee look closely at the current requirements and the requirements for similar boards and then make a recommendation to the full Committee.

Motion: Meri moved to have the Training Subcommittee look at this issue. 2nd: Traci
Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

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

- a) Application for 5.5 training credits
NNADV
“Working with Men and Engaging Male Allies to Stop Violence and Build Community”
October 6, 2011 Incline Village, NV
(Reviewed by Cheryl Hunt)

Cheryl recommended approval.

Motion: Lt. Lundquist moved to approve. 2nd: Bob
Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Sue abstained.

- b) Application for 2 training credits
NNADV
“Boys Will be Men: Raising Our Sons for Courage, Caring, and Community”
October 6, 2011 Incline Village, NV
(Reviewed by Carol Ferranti)

Lt. Lundquist stated that Carol recommended approval.

Motion: Bob moved to approve. 2nd: Cheryl
Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Sue abstained.

- c) Application for 8 training credits
Options
“Remembering the Victim”
October 1, 2011 Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Cheryl Hunt)

Cheryl recommended approval.

Motion: Judge Bunch moved to approve. 2nd: Lt. Lundquist
Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- d) Application for 5.5 training credits
Dennis Henson
“Cognitive-Behavioral Approaches to Treating PTSD: Empirically-Based Treatment Techniques”
September 16, 2011 Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Judge Bunch)

Judge Bunch recommended approval.

Motion: Lt. Lundquist moved to approve. 2nd: Traci

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Tim abstained.

- e) Application for 1 training credit
Stephanie Liester
“Assessing Violence Risk: A Review and Clinical Recommendations”
Distance Media – American Counseling Association
(Reviewed by Judge Bunch)

Judge Bunch recommended approval.

Motion: Lt. Lundquist moved to approve. 2nd: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Tim abstained.

- f) Application for 7 training credits
Dorothy Wilbanks
“The Couples Conference”
April 1-3, 2011 Newport Beach, CA
(Reviewed by Meri Shadley)

Meri recommended approval.

Motion: Traci moved to approve. 2nd: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- g) Application for 4 training credits
Dr. Alfred Hughes
“Ethical Considerations for Domestic Violence Intervention Programs and Adopted Modifications to the Nevada Administrative Code”
January 20, 2012 Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Traci Dory)

Traci recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- h) Application for 16 training credits
Relationship Training Institute
“Staying Ahead of the Curve”
November 4-5, 2011 San Diego, CA
(Reviewed by Judge Bunch)

Judge Bunch indicated that he calculated 15 hours that would be eligible for credits due to break times, lunch, etc.

Motion: Sue moved to approve for 15 hours. 2nd: Bob

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- i) Application for 6.5 training credits
ACCS
“Practical Considerations for Work with High-Conflict Clients: Attachment and Neurobiological Perspectives”
August 12, 2011 Reno, NV
(Reviewed by Lt. Lundquist)

Lt. Lundquist recommended approval.

Motion: Judge Bunch moved to approve. 2nd: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- j) Application for 40 training credits
Great Basin Counseling
“40 Hour Core Domestic Violence/Batterers Treatment Training”
September 19-23, 2011 Reno, NV
(Reviewed by Bob Auer)

Bob recommended approval.

Motion: Lt. Lundquist moved to approve. 2nd: Cheryl

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

10. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding requests for new providers and supervisors:

- a) Gretchen Nelson, Supervisor
The Ridge House
Reno, NV
(Reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- b) Fran Zito, Provider
The Ridge House
Reno, NV
(Reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Jennifer indicated that this item had been withdrawn at the request of The Ridge House.

- c) Michelli Kaltsas, Provider
Ready for Change
Pahrump, NV
(Reviewed by Sue Meuschke)

Sue recommended approval contingent upon the actual supervisor of the agency signing the forms.

Motion: Bob moved to approve. 2nd: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- d) Andre Pierre Harris, Provider
Ready for Change
Pahrump, NV
(Reviewed by Sue Meuschke)

Sue recommended approval contingent upon the actual supervisor of the agency signing the forms.

Motion: Bob moved to approve. 2nd: Cheryl

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- e) Colin Hodgen, Provider
Great Basin Counseling
Reno, NV
(Reviewed by Bob Auer)

Bob recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- f) Donna Keller, Provider
Great Basin Counseling
Reno, NV
(Reviewed by Bob Auer)

Bob recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- g) Alexa Waldmann, Provider
ACCS
Sparks, NV
(Reviewed by Lt. Lundquist)

Lt. Lundquist recommended approval.

Motion: Traci moved to approve. 2nd: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

11. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding the site reviews and resulting corrective action plans from the following agencies:

- a) ABC Therapy
Las Vegas, NV
(Continued from the August Meeting; Reviewed by Traci Dory)

Traci recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Bob

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- b) Diagnosticare
Henderson, NV
(Reviewed by Meri Shadley)

Meri recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Traci

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

12. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding the application for certification renewal from the following agencies:

a) Nevada Court Counseling – REQUEST FOR RECERTIFICATION
WITHDRAWN
Sparks, NV

b) ABC Therapy
Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Traci Dory; Continued from August Meeting)

Traci recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

c) Great Basin Counseling
Reno, NV
(Reviewed by Bob Auer)

Bob recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Traci

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

d) Options
Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Cheryl Hunt)

Cheryl indicated that the on-line continuing education course taken by the providers had expired. She recommended that the item be continued pending re-submission of the course, or submission of proof of additional training.

Motion: Lt. Lundquist moved to continue. 2nd: Sue

Vote: all in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

e) Winnemucca Batterers Intervention Program
Winnemucca, NV
(Reviewed by Carol Ferranti)

Lt. Lundquist stated that Carol recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Cheryl

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

f) ACCS
Sparks, NV
(Reviewed by Lt. Lundquist)

Lt. Lundquist recommended approval.

Motion: Cheryl moved to approve. 2nd: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- g) Diagnosticare
Henderson, NV
(Reviewed by Meri Shadley)

Meri recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Traci

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

13. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding request for initial certification from the following agencies:

- a) Ready for Change
Pahrump, NV
(Reviewed by Sue Meuschke)

Sue recommended approval.

Motion: Traci moved to approve. 2nd: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- b) The Ridge House
Reno, NV
(Reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim recommended approval.

Motion: Bob moved to approve. 2nd: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

14. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding the following request for renewal of certification of program located in another state:

- a) South Lake Tahoe Women's Center
South Lake Tahoe, CA
(Reviewed by Carol Ferranti)

Lt. Lundquist stated that Carol recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Bob

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

15. Update from the Training Subcommittee.

Sue stated that the Training Subcommittee had been looking at formal training and looking at subject matters for the formal training. She also said that the subcommittee was looking at how to make sure that that type of training is available. She said the subcommittee decided not to make any changes to the observation hour requirements, but was looking at how to bring more training to Nevada. Sue said the next Training Subcommittee meeting was set for January 26th.

16. Update from the Forms Subcommittee.

Sue said that they had hoped to formally request that the Forms Subcommittee be dissolved, but that Jennifer stated there was one more form for the subcommittee to review. The next meeting had not been set.

17. Update from the Rural Issues Subcommittee.

Kareen stated that John McCormick attended the meeting and answered questions regarding some reports he had created. She also stated that Traci Dory had attended the last meeting and reported there were probably no options for utilizing the Department of Corrections' counselor for batterers treatment as they would not meet the current standards and do not seem to stay in the rural communities very long. Kareen also reported that Jennifer and John McCormick were going to be researching numbers for Tahoe to see treatment programs are needed in the Tahoe area. She also said that there is on-going discussion on increasing treatment options in the rural areas, and that Jennifer has been asked to create a list of every option or exception ever discussed.

Judge Bunch suggested that Kareen reach out to the judges prior to the Pahrump meeting to request that they do research in their own areas on number of convictions, current treatment options, and what exceptions might be helpful in their areas.

18. Discussion regarding future agenda items.

Tim stated that discussions within the various subcommittees may generate future agenda items.

19. Discussion regarding future meeting dates.

Future meeting dates were set for:

February 16, 2012

May 17, 2012

August 23, 2012

November 8, 2012

20. Public comment.

Kareen reported that Henna has been promoted to a Senior Deputy Attorney General.

Tim suggested that all members of the Rural Issues Subcommittee attend the Pahrump Judges meeting.

<p>Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020)</p>
--

21. *Adjournment (for possible action)

Motion: Judge Bunch moved to adjourn. 2nd: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Meeting adjourned.