

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

MINUTES

Thursday, November 8, 2012, 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, welcome new members, establish quorum.

Members Present
Max Bunch
Lt. Robert Lundquist
Sue Meuschke
Neil Rombardo

Members Absent
Tim Hamilton

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

Members Present (cont.)

Cheryl Hunt
Traci Dory
Meri Shadley
Carol Ferranti

Other Attendees

Richard Carillo

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

a) August 23, 2012

Changes were noted to the attendance listed in the minutes.

Motion: Traci moved to approve with recommended changes. 2nd: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

4. Updates by Domestic Violence Ombudsman Kareen Prentice.

a) Budget

Kareen provided expenses from the previous 3 months, and discussed budget amounts.

b) Court Assessments

Kareen stated that Jennifer Kandt, Lisa South, and herself had met with representatives from the Administrative Office of the Courts, and there was general consensus that there appeared to be a problem with Washoe County collections. She said that the Attorney General had agreed to set up the Washoe County meeting in the near future. Additionally, she said that they would be focusing on Storey County as there were no collections from Storey County from the previous year. There was discussion on the AOC assessment collection form, and the possibility of the \$35 domestic violence assessment being added to that form.

c) Match

Kareen reminded everyone to complete the match forms.

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

Jennifer stated that at the last meeting it had been requested that the original standards be forwarded out to Committee members to determine whether there was any intent for the term indigent to include those who pay a reduced fee or only those who pay no fee.

Sue pointed out that the standards clearly defined indigent, and there was general consensus that the Committee include that definition within the regulation changes.

Lt. Lundquist questioned whether an agency could satisfy the 5 percent requirement and then not be required to accept any further indigent clients. He said that because the regulation states that the program cannot deny participation solely based on inability to pay, that they would then be required to exceed the five percent.

Meri stated that she would think that if there were not any more slots open to indigent clients, then that would be another reason to deny the treatment.

There was further discussion that part of the notes of the definition included a reference to one percent, but that the regulations stated a five percent requirement. Additionally, there was discussion that no reference to percentage was needed in the definition.

Motion: Sue moved to accept the definition within the standards and include it within the proposed changes to the regulation. 2nd: Traci

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

6. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding ideas for increasing treatment in the rural areas. This item will include updates from the Rural Issues Subcommittee.

Jennifer stated that the subcommittee had met, but that there had not been any decisions or recommendations to come out of that meeting. She said that the subcommittee has two additional meetings scheduled.

7. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding possible changes to NAC 228 including addition of dual relationship and/or professional conduct language and general timeline for regulation changes.

Jennifer stated that she prepared a proposed timeline for the regulation changes, and detailed the timeline. There was general consensus that the timeline would meet the needs of the Committee.

Jennifer also indicated that there was a suggestion for a possible simple change regarding the dual relationship language, and there was further discussion on whether it was in the appropriate location or whether additional language would be needed.

Jennifer stated that she had sent some items to Neil to review, but that due to his schedule, it may not have been reviewed.

Neil indicated that he had not yet had an opportunity to review the documents due to a trial that was recently settled, but that he would go back and review.

Jennifer said that she drafted the proposed change to put the burden on the program to insure that the provider refrains from dual relationships.

Carol questioned whether anything needed to be included about the penalties for violating the provision.

There was further discussion that violating the provision would already be included in grounds for refusing to issue or renew a certificate or to revoke certification.

Neil questioned what would happen if a provider violated the provision but the program took action. He asked if the Committee would then decide if they felt the action taken was appropriate.

Henna stated that the Committee should also consider that there are personnel issues versus certification issues, and that just because an agency has taken up personnel discipline, it doesn't necessarily preclude action against certification.

There was discussion on whether the proposed change was included in the proper section, and Sue requested that the Committee have more time to review the regulation and the proper section. There was also discussion on the fact that the Committee does not certify individuals, only agencies. Additionally, there was discussion that the Committee requires that agencies ensure that their providers have not been convicted of any crimes, but that the Committee does not do any background checks on staff.

There was general consensus that Committee members look closely at the possible change, and Neil stated that he would look closely at the regulation.

8. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding Committee's process for review of online continuing education providers.

Jennifer stated that this item was on the agenda at the request of Carol. She also said that she had provided the training review form that the training subcommittee had created when they previously discussed this issue and had also provided the training application form.

Carol stated that she had concerns about the very first item on the form which is the resume of the instructor as these online courses don't necessarily seem to have an actual instructor. She also said she was concerned that some of these providers seemed to be online CEU mills.

Sue said that one of the things the training subcommittee discussed was that there needed to be a way to approve online training. She said that while there may not be an actual resume of the instructor, there should be knowledge of where the information is coming from, and it is at the discretion of the Committee member to decide whether it is coming from a reputable provider. Additionally, she said that while the checklist will not have every item checked as "yes", that the Committee member will be able to decide whether overall it appears to be a worthwhile course.

Carol stated that she was still uncomfortable with not having a standard such as a national accreditation agency that would be approving these online providers.

There was further discussion that there was a national accreditation for university and high school online courses, but that there may or may not be one for continuing education. Additionally, it was noted that "live" training providers were not required to be accredited, and that it would be very difficult to require accreditation of local training providers.

There was general consensus that Committee members look closely at all training submissions, and that if there are any questions or concerns, they can always ask for more information.

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

- a. *Application for 8 training credits*
Nevada Attorney General-Prosecution Advisory Council
“Effectively Investigating and Prosecuting Domestic Violence”
October 4, 2012, Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Neil Rombardo)

Neil stated that he was a member of the Prosecution Advisory Council, but that he did not have any financial interest in the training, so did not feel that there was any conflict. He recommended approval of 8 victim service credits.

Motion: Sue 2nd: Lt. Lundquist

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

- b. *Application for 8 training credits*
Options
“Intake Evaluation/Assessment.”
September 15, 2013, Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Lt. Lundquist)

Lt. Lundquist recommended approval of 8 perpetrator credits.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Traci

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- c. *Application for 7.5 training credits*
Dennis Fitzpatrick
“Teaching the Domestic Violence Class Part 1”
Distance Media
(Reviewed by Neil Rombardo)

Neil recommended approval of 3.75 victim hours and 3.75 perpetrator hours.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Carol

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- d. *Application for 10 training credits*
Ana Mata
“Domestic Violence and Substance Abuse”
Distance Media
(Reviewed by Judge Bunch)

Judge Bunch recommended approval of 3 victim and 7 perpetrator credits.

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

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- e. *Application for 15 training credits*
Ana Mata
“Spousal Partner Abuse”

*Distance Media
(Reviewed by Judge Bunch)*

Judge Bunch recommended approval of 7.5 victim and 7.5 perpetrator credits.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Neil

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- f. Application for 2 training credits
Mary Leonard
"Substance Abuse Treatment and Domestic Violence"
Distance Media
(Reviewed by Sue Meuschke)*

Sue recommended approval of 2 perpetrator credits.

Motion: Cheryl moved to approve. 2nd: Carol

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

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

- a) Amber Suarez – Provider
Diagnosticare
(Reviewed by Meri Shadley)*

Meri stated that there may be a problem with the observation hours, and recommended that the item be continued pending additional documentation.

Motion: Sue moved to continue pending additional documentation. 2nd: Neil

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

- b) Michelli Kaltsas - Supervisor
Ready for Change
(Reviewed by Traci Dory)*

There was discussion regarding the MFT licensure, and whether her status as an MFT intern met the requirements set forth in NAC. There was general consensus that the MFT intern license would be sufficient to meet the qualifications. Traci recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Neil

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- c) Ana Mata - Provider
LRS and New Beginnings Counseling Center
(Reviewed by Carol Ferranti; Continued from August Meeting)*

Carol recommended approval.

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

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

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

a) *Options*

North Las Vegas, NV

(Reviewed by Lt. Lundquist)

Lt. Lundquist recommended approval.

Motion: Carol moved to approve. 2nd: Sue

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

b) *Mesa Family Counseling*

Las Vegas, NV

(Reviewed by Sue Meuschke; Continued from August Meeting)

Sue recommended approval.

Motion: Neil moved to approve. 2nd: Cheryl

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

c) *Diagnosticare*

Henderson, NV

(Reviewed by Meri Shadley)

Meri stated that the request for approval of the co-facilitator was continued, and that there did not appear to be another co-facilitator in the application.

Jennifer stated that a hearing needed to be set for this item, as there had been a pending complaint and law enforcement investigation that led to an arrest of the owner of the agency.

There was discussion on the timing of the hearing, and consensus that the date be set for December 18th at 10 a.m. in Las Vegas.

Motion: Sue moved to set a hearing regarding certification of Diagnosticare. 2nd: Meri

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

d) *Winnemucca Batterers Intervention Program*

Winnemucca, NV

(Reviewed by Cheryl Hunt)

Cheryl recommended approval.

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

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

e) *Ready for Change*

Pahrump and Henderson, NV

(Reviewed by Traci Dory)

Traci recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Neil

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

- f) ACCS
Sparks, WCSO, Reno, Gardnerville, Carson City, and Elko, NV
(Reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Jennifer stated that Tim recommended approval.

Motion: Neil moved to approve. 2nd: Sue

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

- g) Great Basin Counseling Center
Reno, Sparks, Fernley, and Carson City, NV
(Reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Jennifer stated that Tim indicated the staff had not completed the required continuing education credits. He recommended that the renewal be continued pending verification of completion of the required hours.

Motion: Sue moved to continue. 2nd: Neil

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

- h) The Ridge House
Reno, NV
(Reviewed by Cheryl Hunt)

Jennifer indicated that a renewal application had not been received and that a letter had been sent to the agency advising them that the certification would expire without further notice if the required documents were not received within 30 days. She stated that no action was needed by the Committee.

12. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding the following requests for additional program locations for the following agencies:

- a) Ready for Change
5600 Spring Mountain Road
Las Vegas, NV 89146
(Reviewed by Traci Dory)

Traci recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Carol

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

13. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding certification of the following agency located in another state:

- a) Live Violence Free
South Lake Tahoe, CA
(Reviewed by Carol Ferranti)

Carol recommended approval.

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

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

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

A date for the hearing was set for December 18, 2012 and the next meeting was set for February 28th, 2013.

15. 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)*

16. *Adjournment (for possible action).

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

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.