STATE OF NEVADA
NEVADA COUNCIL FOR THE PREVENTION
OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
VICTIM ADVOCATE PROTOCOL COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting

Monday, May 21, 2012, at 9:00 a.m.

Office of the Attorney General
5420 Kietzke Lane, Suite 202,
Reno, Nevada 89511

Committee Members Present
None

Committee Members Present Via Teleconference
Elynne Wernikove-Greene
Barbara Aupperle
Suzanne Ramos

Committee Members Absent
Lori Fralick

Public Present
None

Attorney General's Office Staff Present
Kareen Prentice, Domestic Violence Ombudsman
Karen Cruz, Assistant to the NCPDV

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

   Elynne Wernikove-Green called the meeting to order at 9:01 p.m. Roll call was taken and quorum was established.

2. **Public Comment.**

   There was no public comment at this time.

3. **Discussion, recommendations and possible action regarding Victim Witness Advocate Model Protocols. (For possible action.)**

   Ms. Green stated she feels the Committee needs to look at diverse recommendations because this area has extreme rural to urban communities and

also look for standardized information about confidentiality and how systems-based advocates can work with community-based advocates in terms of best practices. Her ultimate goal is to host a one-day workshop in October 2012 when the Southern Nevada Domestic Violence Task Force partners with Brett and the NVPAC. The workshop will first have law enforcement talking about best practices to build a domestic violence case and their recommendations; second, have a local prosecutor (and possibly multiple prosecutors from the north or rural areas and from Las Vegas) talking about what they need to build a case to make it happen in court; and, finally, have a national speaker talk about best practices models across the country and what other people are doing (both systems-based and community-based advocates). She then wants to have the Committee make its recommendations for the State of Nevada.

Suzanne Ramos stated Ms. Greene's idea sounds good. She further stated that the prosecutors need to make sure that they all follow the same best practices (e.g., with misdemeanors, the city attorney's offices and the district attorney's offices do them differently). Ms. Greene suggested that this is where some of Brett's funds can be used to bring in a group of prosecutors to be used as a panel for the workshop as opposed to one presenter, because the funds are specific to prosecutor training.

Ms. Greene stated that the Committee has an amazing model started by a domestic violence detective in the investigative services who brought in both community-based and systems-based advocates, along with a prosecutor, where they run a support group for very high-risk victims who are in the final stages to give them support to get them through the court process. She believes that would be a good model to present during the workshop as to how we can all work together.

Ms. Greene states she thinks that this is something that we need to see – that it is that not just the advocates and not just law enforcement and not just prosecutors. It is team work. She said that the model she is referring to is working out really great – they don't have very many women right now but they are getting the support they need to get through the court process as a lot of them are giving up.

Ms. Greene said this is her idea on how the Committee would end this process, so how it gets there is what needs to be figured out. She said that Brett mentioned in the last meeting he may have some funding, and she was going to ask Southern Nevada Domestic Violence Task Force to fund travel so the Committee can actually have face-to-face meetings.

Ms. Ramos asked if Ms. Greene has some sample best practice protocols from other jurisdictions, to which Ms. Greene said that she has been trying to research this and has been pulling articles about the topic. Ms. Greene suggested that the

Committee can conduct research to see if other jurisdictions have come up with some best practice models that they can share with the Committee. She felt that some of the information gathered by other jurisdictions may not be published on the internet, but, if the search can be narrowed down, the other jurisdictions may send copies.

The Committee Members agreed that the first step will be to conduct research to find out what is actually out there. Ms. Ramos suggested that Duluth may have some information and they should be contacted. Ms. Greene stated she will contact Duluth right away and send any samples that Duluth may provide to the Committee Members.

Ms. Ramos also suggested that, if there is more than one agency or jurisdiction that needs to be contacted, the jurisdiction contact information be distributed among the Committee Members to share in the research. Ms. Greene agreed and said she will get started on the research and will provide information to Committee Members if more than one jurisdiction needs to be contacted. Ms. Greene suggested, and the Committee Members agreed, that the Committee take two weeks to conduct the research and then meet again in three weeks.

4. Schedule future meetings & agenda items. (For possible action.)

The next meeting has been scheduled for Monday, June 18, 2012 at 9:00 a.m. to look at what materials have been gathered. If there are none, the Committee will have to create their own during this meeting. Once the Committee has the research, it will have its first face-to-face meeting. Ms. Greene suggested that the Committee use some of the time during the Rural Road Trip for the face-to-face meeting, but still plan a north and south meeting, to which the Committee Members agreed.

5. Public Comment.

There was no public comment at this time.

6. Adjournment. (For possible action.)

Suzanne Ramos made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Barbara Aupperle seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 9:16 a.m.