

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

RURAL ISSUES SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

Wednesday, August 8, 2012 at 3:00p.m.

Via Teleconference

Public Access: 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
Kareen Prentice
Sue Meuschke
Cheryl Hunt

Members Absent

Attorney General's Office
Jennifer Kandt, Admin.
Public

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) January 26, 2012

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Cheryl

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

4. *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 spoke with Dr. Wright who is a psychologist in Lincoln County. Jennifer said that the judge in Lincoln had requested that Dr. Wright look into the qualifications to become certified to provide treatment, and that he possibly had a woman with domestic violence experience that he could partner with. Jennifer said that she explained the requirements and that there was concern about how they would get the required observation and formal training hours as he didn't think they would be able to travel to obtain those hours.

Jennifer also stated that she had not obtained any further information regarding charges and dispositions from the courts.

5. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding updates on substance abuse research and further course of action regarding research and/or meetings.

Jennifer stated that she had talked to SAPTA and that it appeared that the bottom line was that substance abuse treatment is available in the rural areas because there are federal dollars to assist with the services.

There was general consensus that looking further into the substance abuse model would not be helpful unless federal dollars became available for batterers' treatment.

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

Jennifer stated that she had provided a copy of the regulations because at the full Committee meeting Neil Rombardo had suggested that the Committee change the regulations to allow any exception to the certification requirements in order to assist the rural communities, and that Sue had requested that the Rural Issues Subcommittee look more closely at putting more concrete parameters around the exceptions.

Sue stated that she would like parameters around the exceptions because she does not want to see any treatment that is over video or through the mail, and

said that it seemed that there needed to be more specifics in place to maintain consistency.

Cheryl stated that the Committee really needed to be careful with setting a precedent with any type of exception.

There was discussion surrounding allowing only one provider, but that concern had been raised about the safety of the provider especially if the provider was female.

Jennifer stated that there was some discussion at the previous Committee meeting about allowing one on one counseling as there was already an allowed exception to having 3 clients in a group. There was further discussion about where that exception would be allowed and concern that rural areas currently running a certified program in a rural area would discontinue their current service in favor of the rural exception. There was also some discussion on allowing one provider if that provider met the qualifications of a supervisor.

There was some discussion on one on one treatment and if any statistics existed for batterers' treatment done in a one on one setting.

There was discussion that possibly allowing all of the observation and formal training hours to be done on-line in rural areas would be beneficial, and further discussion on using existing language within the regulations to define rural areas.

Kareen mentioned the language around certification of programs in other states and suggested leaving it up to the judge to decide on one on one situations and put it back onto the judge to makes these decisions.

There was discussion that judges would possibly then use providers teaching anger management courses.

Cheryl suggested allowing for a certain number of years for the providers to become trained.

Kareen suggested a pilot project with a rural judge and a provider without any training and see how it works. There was general consensus that starting a pilot project in a rural area in which the provider completes on-line training and observation, then has a certain number of years to complete the additional training could be feasible.

Sue stated that she thought it could be possible to have the exceptions be one person with all observation hours done via distance media. There was further discussion that no one had ever utilized distance media for observation hours even though it was currently allowed for up to one-half of the hours.

There was general consensus that doing a pilot project in Lincoln County might be the best option as the judge in Lincoln County really would like to see

batterers' treatment available in his area, and because there is a psychologist interested in doing the work. Additionally, Kareen stated that the STOP grant was funding a prosecutor in Lincoln County to prosecute domestic violence. Kareen stated that she would contact counsel to inquire about the pilot project, and stated that it would be a good idea to reach out to Safe Nest or SAFE House about setting up a webcam for the observation hours.

There was discussion regarding researching counties and communities that have licensed psychologists, marriage and family therapists, and licensed counselors, and researching their office hours.

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

There was general consensus that items 4 and 6 be discussed at the next meeting and that the meeting be held September 19th at 3 p.m.

8. Public comment.

<p>Note: <i>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)</i></p>

9. *Adjournment (for possible action).

Motion: Sue moved to adjourn. 2nd: Cheryl

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.