

**STATE OF NEVADA
NEVADA COUNCIL FOR THE PREVENTION OF
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

Minutes of Meeting

January 13, 2009

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

Committee Members Present

Sue Meuschke
Mike Sprinkle

Committee Members Present Via Teleconference

Toni Downen
Valerie Cooney
Ellen Ewing
Andrea Sundberg
Tammy Whatley
Linda Lilleboe

Committee Members Absent

Brett Kandt
Suzanne Ramos

Public Present

Katy Hanson

Attorney General's Office Staff Present

Karen Prentice, DV Ombudsman
Henna Rasul, Deputy Attorney General
Gabriel Caballero, DV Assistant

- 1. *Call to order, roll call of members, and introduction.**
Sue Meuschke called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. A roll call was performed and quorum was established.

2. *Review and approval of minutes from November 17, 2008

Sue Meuschke indicated all of the committee members should have received a copy of the minutes from the previous meeting. Valerie Cooney noticed that she had been absent but was not listed as such. Tammy Whatley mentioned a typographical error on page four, third paragraph, second sentence. A word was removed from the sentence.

There were no other changes or amendments. Tammy Whatley made the motion to approve the minutes as amended. Andrea Sundberg seconded the motion. The motion carried.

3. *Review, discussion and possible action on health care outreach efforts.

Ms. Meuschke indicated this discussion had been tabled last time owing to time constraints. Prior to the meeting everyone was sent the current language on the RADAR cards which need to be revised and reprinted, since they are almost out.

Valerie Cooney had brought a typo to the Committee's attention; otherwise she thought the card looked good and did not know what changes would be recommended. Ellen Ewing thought it was pretty thorough. Andrea Sundberg thought that as well. Karen Prentice mentioned there had been some discussions that it was too big and maybe should be made smaller. Valerie Cooney asked how it compared to other types of similar cards used in the state and other areas. Ms. Prentice responded she had only seen one RADAR card, and this was it.

Sue Meuschke indicated she thought it was similar to another card they know about, a pocket card the Family Violence Prevention Fund had developed. It is not a RADAR card, it is more of an information card for victims rather than health care professionals.

Valerie Cooney asked about the size of the card. Sue Meuschke said it is 7 x 4, double-sided. She mentioned Linda Lilleboe had suggested they reduce the size of the card; that is one of the reasons they brought it to the committee.

Mike Sprinkle asked who the target audience for the card is. It is for health care professionals. Valerie Cooney stated the card should not be too small; it should be readable. She thinks it is quite thorough.

Sue Meuschke indicated they would move forward with getting it printed. Mike Sprinkle made a motion that the committee adopt the RADAR card "as is". Ellen Ewing seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Sue Meuschke then asked Toni Downen if she was doing Domestic Violence Training with health care providers. Ms. Downen responded that she was. The curriculum contains things that they have taught in the past. These things discuss how to talk to victims, how to find them help, and informs them of places where they can go for help. Ms. Meuschke offered her a copy of the list of materials from the NNADV library. She indicated she would like that, since she can set up any length and size class she wishes to have.

Mike Sprinkle stated in the past one of the commissions they were looking at was EMS. The State EMS Director recently contacted him to help do some lobbying work down at the legislature this year. He was invited to the next EMS Committee meeting. It is not specifically about DV yet, but he plans to attend one of the meetings and let the committee know there are persons working in this field. There is not yet a time or date set for the meeting.

Sue Meuschke indicated they will keep health care on the agenda so Toni Downen can make a report. There might also be some other issues they need to address.

4. *Review, discussion and possible report regarding Boards and Commissions - Update on Cosmetology Board

Ms. Meuschke reported they are scheduled for the Cosmetology Board meeting on February 9, 2009, at 9:00 a.m. in Las Vegas. Valerie Cooney clarified this pertained to the "Cut it Out" program. Sue Meuschke indicated they would have five to ten minutes to see if they will support the initiative. She would ask the Board to provide a list of names of Cosmetologists, so they can do some sort of a mailing outreach to them. They will be asked if they want to be involved in what the committee is doing, and will also be asked what it is that they want to do.

Anyone who wants to go may do so. Karen Prentice, DV Ombudsman, indicated she plans to attend the meeting. Ms. Meuschke then provided the address for the Nevada State Board of Cosmetology meeting room. Valerie Cooney asked who the Deputy Attorney General for that Board is. Karen Prentice stated the Deputy Attorney General for the Cosmetology Board is Sarah Bradley. Sue Meuschke indicated they had been in touch with the Deputy, to let her know what they were doing and that the Attorney General was interested in this.

Valerie Cooney suggested the development of a RADAR card for other professions. She thinks that Cosmetologists come in contact with a lot of victims. Sue Meuschke mentioned there is already a program in place, and they can help distribute the materials. The purpose of attending the Cosmetology Board meeting is to gain their support so they can do

outreach to local cosmetologists and salons and make sure they have materials available. It is also important that they are comfortable making referrals.

Valerie Cooney asked if the board had to make some type of approval of any efforts they might make. She asked if the presentation to the Board was to be informational, or if we were requesting some action from them. Sue Meuschke responded that it is informational, and obviously we would like their support. The Board has access to a list of all of the Cosmetologists who are licensed in the State of Nevada, so if the Board would provide the committee with that they could do some mailings.

Kareen Prentice stated if anyone was interested in going to Las Vegas to attend the meeting they should contact her to coordinate the travel. For the record, Henna Rasul stated that at this time, Linda Lilleboe had rejoined the meeting.

Sue Meuschke asked Linda Lilleboe about the RADAR card, indicating she thought Linda might have some ideas about ways to do it differently. Ms. Lilleboe responded that, coming from a health care background, they do skills fairs and she thought the majority of the hospitals in Nevada also did. This year they had a request from suicide prevention, to come in and do a presentation to the nurses and staff. In the state of Florida where she came from, nurses were required to do Continuing Education Credits. She had printed out the requirements, which included the RADAR program. She then stated that in Nevada nurses are only required to take one state-mandated Continuing Education Course, which is on Bio-Terrorism. She wondered if the council had ever approached the State Board of Nursing to make DV a required CEU for the State of Nevada.

Sue Meuschke responded that had been done in the distant past. They had convened with health care advocate and policy folks, and had discussed mandatory education issues. The decision was not to impose mandatory DV education at this point in time, but to develop it and encourage people to take part. There was resistance on the part of some persons about being told what kind of education to get. There were also some infrastructure issues with regard to providing that kind of training to people, whether they would be creating this new industry. They can certainly revisit those discussions.

The other avenue Ms. Lilleboe considered was providing skills fairs to health care professionals. They did in the past have someone who came and provided the classes. It seems to be what most facilities do, and the committee might be able to design a program to offer to them. It could include the RADAR card to be provided to staff, and some of the CEU's from the Florida program. Sue Meuschke responded that would be great.

Ms. Meuschke asked if it was the responsibility of the Committee to do this, or should they contact the Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence to develop a speakers bureau for DV issues. Valerie Cooney asked what the NNADV currently has in terms of educational information being available to health care providers. Ms. Meuschke responded they had a leadership team of health care providers and advocates that meet in a quarterly basis, and they go out to universities and hospitals and do trainings. They do not currently have nurses on their committee, but they could begin to recruit again. They have a whole health care packet they send out, which provides information regarding screening, and contains other assorted information as well. Valerie Cooney suggested the role of the Committee would be to encourage and facilitate the implementation of skills fairs around this subject. The committee should facilitate the Network's work around this issue.

Linda Lilleboe mentioned she had found an article from the Office of Health Care Research and Quality where they did hospital surveys. That might be a good foundation. Ms. Meuschke responded they had done a variety of surveys, and that JAYCO requires hospitals to have those policies. Ms. Lilleboe stated there are many critical access hospitals in the State of Nevada which are not all JAYCO accredited.

Mike Sprinkle was wondering if they should follow down the same road as they did with Cosmetology, and make a presentation to the State Board of Nursing, with the support of the council and the Attorney General. He agreed the outreach could be passed on to the Network.

Toni Downen stated she covers the education of five hospitals in Las Vegas, and they start their skills fairs next month. They can actually plan out something like the RADAR card and hand it out at the skills fair to get everything started. Mike Sprinkle said it was great that they have her, but there are other areas within the state that do not have someone to address these issues. Perhaps the State Board of Nursing could put an emphasis on every facility that employs nurses, so that this kind of training might come down the pipe and be considered important for everyone to participate in.

Ms. Meuschke responded the Nursing Board does have a position paper encouraging and supporting screenings for domestic violence, and they can go back and talk to them. Valerie Cooney stated maintaining contact with these groups is a good idea. Because there is turnover on the boards continued communication with the board is preferable.

Linda Lilleboe is the CEU provider for the hospital where she works. She has some contacts at the Nursing Board, and stated she would be glad to

contact them to get a feel for what they think. Andrea Sundberg suggested doing a survey of clinics and hospitals, to ask if they have protocols, and if so, what they consist of. A survey might net them some valuable information. Linda Lilleboe suggested contacting the Nevada Hospital Association, and named some typical questions from the Delphi Instrument survey. She indicated they really need to reach out to the smaller, rural hospitals. She thought they should take two approaches, one, reach out to the Nevada Hospital Association, and, two, construct a survey. She thinks a survey is always a really good idea; they do not have a clue what is going on in the rural communities and hospitals. It would be mainly hospitals since emergency rooms are where domestic violence victims are most often seen.

Valerie Cooney asked again about whether or not a survey was done in Nevada. Ms. Meuschke responded that, yes, surveys had been done, they could do them again, and that apparently Linda Lilleboe had a survey instrument she wished to use for that purpose. Sue Meuschke then asked who would do the survey. Mike Sprinkle mentioned that someone would need to front the money to send the survey out. Valerie Cooney stated if the survey is going to come from the council in order to achieve the desired response, perhaps the item should be placed on the agenda for the next council meeting.

The agenda item would be a query as to whether the council wishes to proceed with the survey the committee has discussed. They would be attempting to generate some useful information around what is and is not being done in terms of domestic violence. Linda Lilleboe mentioned this could be tied in with the skills fair; that could be one of the questions on the survey.

The committee discussed whether or not they had the ability to follow through and put together a survey of that nature. They would have to have the money for postage and the personnel to correlate the information once it comes in. Karen Prentice responded that the committee that decides to do the survey would assist with putting together the information that comes from the surveys. Linda Lilleboe offered to help put the survey together; they could look at the postage costs. Possibly they could focus on smaller hospitals. Ms. Meuschke stated she was only reminding the committee to be cognizant of the financial situation at this time, because everyone is limited as to what they can do.

Mike Sprinkle stated he thought the information they gather will transcend the committee, and that the entire council could benefit from the information. The involvement of the entire council adds extra validity to what they are trying to do. Valerie Cooney suggested having a subcommittee of two, Linda and Toni, to help develop the survey. They

could identify the hospitals targeted. Karen Prentice would assist in getting this out to the particular individuals in the hospitals. In terms of collating the data, they would then make the determination of whether or not Linda or Toni would require additional assistance.

Linda Lilleboe said a helpful thing with the survey is that they will not be going in a direction no one can use. She suggested giving the hospitals different options with the survey. She also stated they could get the hospital list based on census information. Karen Prentice stated she and Katy Hanson had the information from a previous project.

Sue Meuschke asked Linda Lilleboe if she had any issues regarding the RADAR card; she indicated there had been a motion to just reprint it "as is". Ms. Lilleboe said she would like to do is check the card and make sure nothing is changed. She would like to compare the RADAR card with the one she had from 2007. Sue Meuschke requested she do this as soon as possible. Henna Rasul, Deputy Attorney General, asked her if she would like to have the committee rescind the motion they had previously made. The committee decided to rescind the other motion, and give Linda Lilleboe time to review the documents.

Toni Downen asked for and received permission to distribute the RADAR cards at the health fair. She will copy the cards and hand them out as flyers. Sue Meuschke mentioned there might be some RADAR cards available in Las Vegas through S.A.F.E. Nest. Toni Downen was familiar with that organization. Sue suggested she contact them to obtain some cards. Karen Prentice offered to send her a few. Ms. Downen stated that she would come in contact with about 300 health care professionals during the health fair.

After Linda Lilleboe's review of the RADAR card, under the agenda item, Mike Sprinkle rescinded his earlier motion, and made a motion to accept the RADAR card with the TTY phone number included. Tammy Whatley seconded the motion. The motion carried.

5. *Review, discussion and possible action on Statewide Fatality Review Models.

Ms. Meuschke indicated their task at the end of the last meeting was to review the models from Utah, Delaware, and Montana. She invited discussion of the models. Mike Sprinkle stated he was most impressed with Delaware's model, the way they put together their report. It was more comprehensive, and they had more statistics. One of the models had brought members into review boards for specific issues only, and he thought that working on all aspects together would constitute a more cohesive team. Delaware had the best report in terms of the layout. However, without really knowing too much about the statistics in Nevada,

he assumes that Nevada would not have the high numbers that Delaware had.

Ms. Meuschke made three observations. In the Montana model, they actually involve the community in the review, and they only go to three or four per year. Their report is a little thinner because it does not encompass all of the homicides. They go to communities, sit down with the folks, and they have a discussion. Delaware and Utah are more similar to desk audits. They get the list of folks and they review it out of context, they are just looking at paperwork to identify what happened. The report from Delaware is comprehensive, but she was not impressed with their recommendations. Mike Sprinkle said he was not specifically looking at their recommendations, and there were certain aspects of the report he did not agree with, but he had liked the format. Tammy Whatley indicated it was the Delaware report that had people come in on an "ad hoc" basis for a specific case. Mike Sprinkle indicated that did not detract from how he felt about the format of the Delaware report.

Ms. Meuschke solicited further feedback. Andrea Sundberg indicated she had liked the report from Montana, because of the idea of going into the communities, and getting the totality of the picture as a great way to identify where there are gaps existing in different communities. She had liked the style of the Delaware report and the statistical information, but she tended to prefer the more comprehensive individual case analysis. Tammy Whatley agreed with her; she preferred the Montana report as well.

Ms. Cooney referred to the fatality review discussion from the previous meeting to get an idea about what their involvement would be. She noted they had had a lengthy discussion. Mike Sprinkle indicated from past discussions he recalled they had talked about making it a more broad based statewide issue, referring to the Washoe County review team. He questioned if it would really be within the purview of what they are trying to set up, to go into individual communities, as opposed to a more statistical analysis of what is going on throughout the entire state

General Masto asked why the two have to be mutually exclusive. She did not see why they would not want to keep statewide statistics on fatalities, and at the same time support local communities moving forward in setting up their fatality review teams. Ms. Meuschke responded that the Montana model did not support the creation of local review teams, but rather creates a review team that goes to local communities. It involves the community in the review, but does not create a team. By way of example, in Battle Mountain they might have one homicide per year. Creating a team to look at one homicide per year is not practical.

General Masto indicated she wanted an explanation of the distinction between statistics and setting up a review team, and why they could not do both. Mike Sprinkle further explained he had not been trying to imply the committee had to choose between those two things, he stated the possibility of doing both does exist. However, during their initial conversation last fall with the full council, it was his understanding that after the person from Washoe County came and presented the topic, they had discussed that it might be more comprehensive to look at something that was more broad-based throughout the entire state.

This would be as opposed to taking an entire statewide review team, as Ms. Meuschke suggested, and going to one community because they had one act during the entire year. She questioned whether they are trying to set something up where they gather data from across the state, or whether they are trying to do something similar to what Washoe County's review team is doing, and to look at individual acts of homicide related to domestic violence.

General Masto stated it seemed to her just the way Nevada is structured already, it makes no sense for the committee to duplicate what is occurring in Washoe County already. However, there are rural areas of the state where it probably doesn't make sense for them to set something up if they are only dealing with one fatality. Perhaps the committee should set something up that represents rural areas, and also supports the larger counties.

At the same time, the Council would want to know statewide what the statistics are on fatalities. They should have that information and monitor it. Ms. Meuschke responded that they were talking about the same thing. They had looked at the Delaware report as a committee. Their fatality review takes information about domestic violence fatalities in the State of Delaware and brings it to a statewide body that reviews that information. The report they compile has a lot of charts and graphs, and gives the reader pictures of who is involved and gives a statewide view of all of the homicides happening. From a report perspective this is much more comprehensive than the report that Montana does, which is about the two or three communities they went to.

She thinks the issue is do they want to convene a group of people on a statewide level to look at all of the information they can possibly find about all of the domestic violence related deaths in the state, knowing that they are not going to be doing a fatality review, (since that looks at all of the people involved in the case, and you could not do that by just looking at statistics). They could put together a report that documents the number of homicides, who the perpetrator was, their relationship with the victim, and all of the demographics. They are able to show how many of the

victims had protection from abuse orders, etc. That is what the Delaware folks did. The Montana group went to the community and looked at all of the interaction to try to understand where the process failed.

Mike Sprinkle asked about the focus of this review team. Is It on individual cases of domestic violence fatality, or are they trying to put something together that is comprehensive for the entire state. For example, if Tonopah has a domestic violence fatality, can they deduce something that might apply to them in their local community from our statewide evaluation? Valerie Cooney stated it seems the local approach is the practical one. They need statewide and regional data. Sue Meuschke said they could create a team that did both. The team could pull together as much data as possible. One of the first reports they could have is the gaps in data, which you cannot know because that information does not exist in a statewide database. They would know how many people were murdered in Nevada that were domestic violence related, you could possibly find that out. But then they would not be able to get a lot of other data. But a subset of this team could go and do individual reviews in a community to add a context to the report. She stated they can know what is going on in Clark County, but then they have to figure out if that translates into what is going on in Battle Mountain or Tonopah, etc.

General Masto stated the first step is to gather the data, take a look at it, and see where the trends are. The next logical step is to implement a response to the data. For example, if the data shows that Clark County bears the brunt of the trends, they should focus on that initially. They would go in and see if they can mirror what Washoe County has done, and get Clark County up and running in terms of doing their own fatality review.

The next approach is to review what else the data and trends tells them. They could focus on some other rural areas and decide how to address their trends and problems. Sue Mueschke indicated that would be another way of doing it. Mike Sprinkle thinks it could be a very proactive thing and is very excited about it; he is also seeing that it would take several man hours to carry out. They can get a lot accomplished, but it is going to take a considerable amount of time to do it. Sue Meuschke indicated the first step is collecting the data, and understanding where the data might lead, because there is not anything statewide.

General Masto asked about the report that comes out showing Nevada as leading the nation in terms of homicides. Since there is no statewide data, she questioned the information source. Ms. Meuschke responded that data comes from the FBI. General Masto asked if we could start with that information – break it down, find out if it is accurate, find out if there is more. That would be a good first step. Karen Prentice mentioned they

would probably find out more information is there, because the report only pertained to firearms. Sue Meuschke mentioned the UCR has aggregated data. She suggested the committee start there and find out how and where they got the information. Part of what a fatality review does is try to understand where the system failed. What did not happen that could have prevented this homicide; or, what happened that promoted the homicide. So it is a very specific individual kind of process.

You know the number of homicides, and the demographics of those involved, who contacted a shelter, who contacted law enforcement, who had a protection order, etc. But she did not know how that data is obtained from UCR, because it is not connected. General Masto indicated her office will use their law enforcement connections to find out the basis for the data. From one law enforcement agency to another they should be able to get that information.

Mike Sprinkle asked who they are looking at to be on the review team. He proposed they go outside the council because all of them do not have time to participate. Tammy Whatley mentioned involving other fields for the purpose of bringing their different expertise into the process. Ms. Meuschke stated they will recommend to the council that they look at supporting a model that will go out and recruit folks from all over the state, and they will come up with a list based on looking at what other states have used, in order to identify who should be invited. The committee would then ask the Attorney General to invite those folks to participate.

Ms. Meuschke asked the committee members to come back to the next meeting with a few more concrete ideas about where they might want to take fatality review. They can take the opportunity to review Delaware and Montana. They can look at every other state as well since practically every other state has a fatality review. They can move forward from there.

6. *Review, discussion and possible action on children/teen outreach efforts.

Upon Sue Meuschke's suggestion, Valerie Cooney made a motion to table this agenda item. Andrea Sundberg seconded the motion. There was no further discussion, and the motion carried.

7. *Review, discussion and possible action of a work plan for education and training.

Upon Sue Meuschke's suggestion, Valerie Cooney made a motion to table this agenda item. Andrea Sundberg seconded the motion. There was no further discussion, and the motion carried.

8. *Schedule future meetings and agenda items

Sue Meuschke suggested setting the next meeting date six weeks out. The committee agreed on March 10, 2009, at 3:00 p.m. The two agenda items which had been tabled at this meeting will be the first two agenda items for the next meeting.

9. *Public Comment

There was no public comment.

10.*Adjournment

Tammy Whatley made a motion to adjourn; Valerie Cooney seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 4:11 p.m.

**STATE OF NEVADA
NEVADA COUNCIL FOR THE PREVENTION OF
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

Minutes of Meeting

March 10, 2009

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

Committee Members Present

Sue Meuschke
Mike Sprinkle

Committee Members Present Via Teleconference

Toni Downen
Valerie Cooney
Suzanne Ramos
Ellen Ewing

Committee Members Absent

Brett Kandt
Andrea Sundberg
Linda Lilleboe

Public Present

Katy Hanson

Attorney General's Office Staff Present

Kareen Prentice, DV Ombudsman
Henna Rasul, Deputy Attorney General
Kathryn Menke, DV Assistant

- 1. *Call to order, roll call of members, and introduction.**
Sue Meuschke called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m. A roll call was performed and quorum was established.

2. *Review and approval of minutes from January 13, 2009.

Sue Meuschke ascertained that committee members received the previous minutes and had time to review those minutes.

Valerie Cooney commented that the previous minutes were well-done and very thorough, although she thought that the minutes could have used a bit more abbreviations.

Valerie Cooney made the motion to approve the previous meeting's minutes. Suzanne Ramos seconded the motion. The minutes from the January 13, 2009 Education Committee meeting were approved.

3. *Presentation by Kathy Pulliam-Jordan regarding abuse by Professional Therapists.

Susan Meuschke stated that the committee would move directly to agenda item #4.

4. *Review, discussion and possible action on health care outreach efforts.

Ms. Meuschke stated that Linda Lilleboe was not present at this meeting to report on the survey, but asked Toni Downen if she would like to give an update on training. Toni received all of the materials for the Valley Health System, and she is handing these materials out to all of the new employees who are nurses. Ms. Downen stated that everyone is excited about having some place that they can go when there is a problem with a patient.

Ms. Meuschke informed the committee that the RADAR cards have been reprinted, thanks to a donation from United Health the cover the cost.

Kareen Prentice and Ms. Lilleboe have been working with the Girl Scouts to plan events for Child Abuse Awareness month in April.

Mike Sprinkle has not heard anything from EMS.

Ms. Meuschke will follow up with Linda Lilleboe as to the progress of the survey.

Mike Sprinkle asked how the RADAR cards were distributed—does someone request them or do we just send them out? Ms. Meuschke replied that RADAR cards were mailed early this year to all of the hospitals with information that they could order more. RADAR cards can be made available for those that request them.

5. *Review, discussion and possible report regarding Boards and Commissions.

i. Update on Cosmetology Board

Sue Meuschke reported that the meeting with Cosmetology Board on February 9 went very well, and the Board would be happy to do anything for us. We had asked about getting a list of schools and cosmetologists so we can do a mailing. They are also offering to have their Cosmetology Board investigators, while they are doing their compliance checks, take materials out and distribute them at that time. The executive director of the Cosmetology Board is a former Law Enforcement chief from California, and domestic violence is an issue that he is quite interested in, so he is eager to get involved in getting DV information to cosmetologists. We are setting up a meeting with him to see what else we can do. Ms. Meuschke thanked Ms. Downen, Ms. Sundberg, Mr. Zentz, and Ms. Prentice for being present at this successful meeting.

There was a question as to what the next step will be. Ms. Meuschke answered that there are a couple of things that will be happening simultaneously: 1) We will be getting materials from the national associations, 2) We will be arranging a media event—a press conference with the Attorney General to announce the initiative, 3) We will be doing some preliminary training with some folks that are able to go out to salons and talk to professionals and let them know what is expected of them in this program, which is basically just to do a good referral and to have materials. We will do a training of trainers, and these folks will go out and work with the professionals. After we do the launch, we will do more of training. Hopefully there will be folks in the salon who will want to be doing that as well.

One of the things that came up at the meeting was that the instructors at the cosmetology schools need CEU's. We are going to work on a program for them so that they can get CEU's. We are also planning to get a table at their international trade show in Las Vegas in June. There is a lot of work going on. Ms. Meuschke welcomed more ideas about projects with the Cosmetology Board.

Linda Lilleboe had volunteered to go to the Nurses' Board. This will be discussed further at the next committee meeting.

6. *Review, discussion and possible action on Statewide Fatality Review Models.

Valerie Cooney stated that the Fatality Review project is something the Attorney General has already indicated that she wants to pursue and asked if the AG office is looking for recommendations from the Education Committee as to how approach this. Ms. Meuschke stated that this was correct. Ms.

Cooney asked if the committee is going to be making determinations about the period of the review (the number of years covered under the review) and whether we want a statewide vs. a regional type of review.

Kareen Prentice stated that the AG has asked for a recommendation. Ms. Prentice stated a model or a hybrid of a model may be chosen for Nevada's situation, and the Education Committee can make a recommendation at the next council meeting.

Ms. Cooney stated that she read the reviews of models and focused on Delaware and Montana because that was basically the substance of this conversation during the last committee meeting. Ms. Cooney liked each of the approaches for different reasons, and she observed that the Montana model enables one to go into communities and to examine a case based upon the characteristics of that community. Ms. Cooney noted that to follow this model, it would be a challenge depending upon the period of time covered, and we would just have to focus on the most recent events, i.e. do we have the manpower and financial wherewithal to engage people in those types of interviews in that kind of time? Ms. Cooney stated that Delaware report had nice graph, and she liked the way it was presented because it is easy to read and has a statistical type of approach.

Mike Sprinkle asked if this team (Education Committee) is going to be a part of the council, or are we just helping formulate a recommendation and this is just something that is going to be separate through the AG's office and she will appoint members to present recommendations?

Sue Meuschke stated that she thinks this committee can make recommendations.

Ms. Cooney stated that it seems that the Attorney General and some other designee that she may appoint would be key players in this, and it seems rather absurd that we would make a recommendation about what other people would do on something that we have never done before (if we're not going to be involved in it).

Ms. Prentice stated that she met with the AG in January to discuss Ms. Prentice's goals and the AG's goals for the upcoming year. Kareen has a list of things that are specific to AG's goals. The AG has two goals: one of the goals for Domestic Violence is to put together a Fatality Review team, and Ms. Prentice is collaborating with the AG for that goal, which is a shared goal between Ms. Prentice and the AG. Kareen stated that she recently attended a NAAG conference in February and the man who runs the Montana model was there. Ms. Prentice got an opportunity to discuss the Montana model with this man. He recommended to a state that hasn't done a statewide fatality review to consider bringing him in to talk to us about how to

implement the Montana model. He is currently helping Louisiana and other states with their fatality reviews. Kären Prentice stated that the committee can also work with Dr. Websdale of the national group, who could provide an overview of what all states are doing with their fatality reviews and why it is important for Nevada to engage in this process and what we can learn from it. Dr. Websdale would present philosophical reasons (why we do a fatality review) and then the staff from Montana could talk about how to go about beginning a fatality review. Ms. Prentice has proposed to the AG bringing both gentlemen in for a summit in late summer/early fall to discuss the fatality review. We could gather the interested parties in Nevada, approaching the AOC and the maybe talking to the STOP Grant people since they have court funds available, and our NRS does state that you can have a judge or the courts involved in a fatality review. That would be a financial thing. This is all something that Kären Prentice would be doing. She asked the committee for recommendations, thoughts and ideas regarding the fatality review, and the committee and Ms. Prentice can inform the AG at the Prevention Council meeting.

Ms. Cooney stated that she now understood what was asked of the committee after listening to Ms. Prentice's information, but it seemed that we may be "putting the cart before the horse" with asking the committee for a recommendation at this point. Ms. Cooney stated having the summit before making recommendations makes more sense.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that it seems that we are past the philosophical point, since the Attorney General wants to conduct a fatality review. The focus should be on how to implement the fatality review, since we do not need to be convinced as to why we need to. Ms. Prentice stated that many people in Nevada may not be apprised of the reasons to conduct a fatality review. Mr. Sprinkle stated that he had a couple of conversations about a fatality review, and both times he heard the comment "Why aren't we approaching the people from Washoe County that already have one?" Mr. Sprinkle stated that perhaps we should consult with an organization that already has a protocol in place for a fatality review.

Ms. Cooney stated that the approach would be to talk to a person doing this on a national level (Dr. Websdale) in order to get an overview, then to make a decision and maybe at the same time we would want to have the guy from Montana to tell us about their approach—Montana being rural like we are. She stated that a summit would be a good starting point, adding that the committee could read all of these reports and not know really what to do next.

Ms. Meuschke stated that a framework had been put together from the previous conversations: review the reports of the models; speak with representatives at the local, state, and national levels at a summit meeting—then decide how to approach Nevada's fatality review. Ms. Meuschke

thought that what the AG wanted also to know is that if this project makes sense to the committee. Ms. Meuschke said that she is hearing that the committee believes this it is a good idea. Suzanne Ramos stated that she thought a summit discussing how to get started a fatality review would be a good idea. Ms. Cooney stated that a statewide fatality review would also contribute to statewide statistics and asked if Clark County had conducted a fatality review. Ms. Meuschke stated that Clark County did have a fatality review, but it ended.

Ms. Ramos reported that Washoe County just started their fatality review again after a short hiatus. Ms. Cooney asked if there is a statute that requires this kind of review and it has to be overseen by a judge or a governmental agency. Ms. Cooney, Ms. Rasul and Ms. Prentice stated that we have a statute that permits a fatality review, but does not require it. The committee agreed to tell the AG that they like the idea and to have Kären move ahead and put together a summit.

Ms. Ramos said that planning the summit would be an excellent time to invite folks to come and bring their statewide statistics. It may be an opportunity to ask folks from law enforcement, from prosecution, from the courts to talk about what the trends are.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that we also may get feedback from those agencies as to what they would like to see because it's not going to benefit only us. Suzanne stated that "us" includes all of those entities.

Mr. Sprinkle made a motion that the Education Committee recommends to the Attorney General to continue research in regards to establishing a statewide fatality review team and the possibility of putting together a summit of interested entities including outside resources at the national level and also the state level (to be determined by the Attorney General) as well as local and state entities within the State of Nevada which may be interested in this. Valerie Cooney seconded the motion. The motion carried.

7. *Review, discussion and possible action on children/teen outreach efforts.

Ms. Prentice just signed with UNLV. UNLV is submitting a VAWA grant for a sexual assault response team and to do more sexual assault peer education at UNLV. CASAT (Center for the Application of Substance Abuse Technologies) at UNR would like a letter of recommendation from the Attorney General's office. UNR wants to do an evaluation of different teen dating violence issues. Kären Prentice and Katie Hansen met with the Frontier Girl Scouts in Las Vegas last week. They met with Wendy Wilkinson, the president of Southern Nevada DV Task Force and with Sarah of the Girl Scouts. Saturday, April 25 at 1:00 at Girl Scout Headquarters in Las Vegas is

the launch date for the Southern Nevada DV Task Force “Peace Begins at Home” patch. The Frontier Girl Scouts of Las Vegas have a lovely facility that this will take place at. The speakers have been lined up. The AG will be there. Karen invited anyone in the South would to come, volunteer and/or man a booth at this event. The Frontier Girl Scouts are adding resources to their curriculum for Las Vegas and Clark County. The patches will be ordered. Karen will send the address of the Girl Scout Headquarters in Las Vegas to committee members. Suzanne stated that the Elko Girl Scouts just met to plan the launch of their “Peace Begins at Home” patch. The Reno Girl Scouts are planning a similar event in October 2009.

Sue Meuschke has been in touch with Planned Parenthood about connecting with their youth educator in order to determine if there is a domestic violence component in their curriculum, and how to add one if it is not present. There was a question as to whether 4-H groups have been approached. While volunteering at the Cooperative Extension, Toni (?) has met some people in 4-H and has thought of talking to them about including a DV class in their curriculum. The committee thought that this was a good idea.

8. *Review, discussion and action of a work plan for education and training.

Ms. Meuschke moved that we get rid of this item since the committee has a work plan. The committee agreed.

9. *Schedule future meetings & agenda items.

The Education Committee noted that 4/22/09 is the tentative date for next Council meeting (*transcriber's note: this meeting was cancelled. The next council meeting will be in Hawthorne on July 16, 2009*). The committee decided to present their recommendation for the Fatality Review at the next Council meeting.

The Education Committee set the date for the next meeting for July 7, 2009 at 3:00 p.m.

Ms. Prentice reminded Committee members that the Prosecuting Advisory Council in conjunction with the Battered Women’s Justice Project is conducting Strangulation training on June 9 in Las Vegas. Karen will send out notice or a flyer on this.

Ms. Cooney is conducting a training with CASA (Court Appointed Special Advocates) April 2 in Carson City from 8:00 a.m. to 3:45 p.m. According to Ms. Cooney, the topic is co-occurrence of DV and child abuse/neglect.

April 24 the Nevada Network for the Prevention of Domestic Violence is conducting a training on Plural Families and Domestic Violence in Las Vegas.

10. *Public comment.

There were no comments from the public.

11. *Adjournment.

Sue Meuschke made a motion for adjournment. The motion was seconded by Valerie Cooney. Motion was carried. Meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

**STATE OF NEVADA
NEVADA COUNCIL FOR THE PREVENTION OF
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

Minutes of Meeting

July 7, 2009

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

Committee Members Present
Sue Meuschke

Committee Members Present Via Teleconference
Valerie Cooney
Suzanne Ramos
Mike Sprinkle
Andrea Sundberg

Committee Members Absent
Ellen Ewing
Toni Downen

Public Present
None

Attorney General's Office Staff Present
Kareen Prentice, DV Ombudsman
Gabriel Caballero, Administrative Assistant

- 1. *Call to order, roll call of members, and introduction.**
Sue Meuschke called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. A roll call was performed and quorum was established.
- 2. *Review and approval of minutes from March 10, 2009.**

Andrea Sundberg made the motion to approve the previous meeting's minutes. Suzanne Ramos seconded the motion. The minutes from the March 10, 2009 Education Committee meeting were approved.

3. *Review, discussion and possible action on health care outreach efforts.

i. Review Delphi Instrument for Hospital-based Domestic Violence programs.

Ms. Meuschke stated that Linda Lilleboe wanted the Education Committee to review this instrument, revise it, shorten it then send it to hospitals to get some clarity around what people in the hospitals are doing about DV. Ms. Meuschke then reported that Ms. Lilleboe has resigned from the Council.

Mr. Sprinkle said that he thought some of the questions on the survey would garner important information and that the committee should go through with the process outlined by Ms. Meuschke. Ms. Meuschke asked if there were any volunteers to revise the survey. Andrea Sundberg stated that she did not receive the survey, but she would work on revision of the survey. Ms. Sundberg stated that her Master's thesis pertains to surveys, so she would like to use her current expertise on this project. Ms. Prentice also stated that she would be happy to do the revising and word processing if Ms. Sundberg would let her know what needs to be revised. It was decided that Ms. Prentice will send the survey to Ms. Sundberg, and they will work on it together. Ms. Meuschke asked that a draft of the revised survey be provided at the next Education Committee meeting.

Ms. Sundberg asked Ms. Meuschke what sort of barriers has the committee come up against when attempting health care outreach. Ms. Meuschke replied that with surveys, the response is usually very small. What Ms. Meuschke would like to do when the committee has the revised survey would be to ask if the Health Division would be willing to be the disseminators of the survey since there would be a better response from the hospitals to the Health Department. Ms. Meuschke continued that in the past, with surveys, the committee has received a 20% response rate which they thought was okay—but a larger return rate would be much more desirable.

4. *Review, discussion and possible report regarding Boards and Commissions.

i. Update on Cosmetology Board "Cut It Out" Program

Ms. Prentice reported that she has done a couple of trainings at the Network, and the Network has even done more trainings. The first training was done at

a large school in Las Vegas and was done $\frac{1}{2}$ in the morning and $\frac{1}{2}$ the next morning, covering 170 students. A training was also done at the Las Vegas office of the State Board of Cosmetology. Train-the-Trainer classes were also done in the North and South. Three attended the South Train-the-Trainer class. In the North, eight persons attended. It has been a struggle to set up a press conference day with the AG since she has some conflicts in her schedule, but Ms. Prentice will keep working on this. Four thousand bags were ordered and stuffed with materials. Included in the bags were a statewide brochure, a letter from the State Board of Cosmetology executive director and its president, and a small brochure that is part of the national initiative. These bags are going to be distributed by the investigator to every one of the salons in Nevada. Once the press conference is scheduled and the "Cut It Out" event is officially kicked off, the bags will be in every investigator's car (600 for the North, 1400 for the South). Ms. Prentice stated that she will be going out to do trainings again later in the year or in the beginning of next year.

Ms. Meuschke stated that she has done two Train-the-Trainer trainings as a part of her organization's outreach, one in Hawthorne and the other in Yerington since it is not convenient for persons in these rural communities to travel.

Ms. Prentice stated that a goal was made to perform these trainings at all 19 cosmetology schools in Nevada.

Ms. Ramos asked if the training was getting out to salons. Ms. Prentice answered that hopefully, after the press conference is held, the informational packets (bags) going out to each salon will generate interest and participation in the "Cut It Out" trainings.

Ms. Meuschke asked if there were any other boards and/or commissions the committee would like to address. No one could think of another organization to approach at this time.

5. *Review, discussion and possible action on children/teen outreach efforts.

Ms. Prentice reported that a lunch event was held with the Girl Scouts in the South. The AG, Judge Frank Sullivan, and Sue Meuschke were there. Judge Sullivan was quite a hit with the Girl Scouts. A sergeant from the Metro Police department was there, along with Safe House, Safe Nest and *** Crisis Center booths set up. The Network had a station, so did the AG (we had a bunch of materials out). The DV Task Force (Wendy Wilkinson) had a booth—they were also the funder for the program. There were about 50 Girl Scouts and their parents in attendance. Ms. Prentice will participate in a

phone conference next week with the director to see if she would like to do another event in October.

Ms. Cooney asked where this function took place. Ms. Prentice answered that the event happened at Girl Scout Headquarters which is a very nice facility.

Ms. Cooney asked if the movement in Clark County is achieving the same momentum as it has in the North. Ms. Meuschke stated that even though the momentum is picking up, one of the difficulties (particularly in Las Vegas) is getting people to travel to the Girl Scout Headquarters, but her understanding is that hopefully the leaders will be taking this out to the various meeting sites, and this is the reason the Girl Scouts in Clark County want to plan another event for October. Ms. Prentice agreed that Girl Scout Headquarters is in a pretty remote location, and it is sometimes difficult to get the girls and the leaders there.

Ms. Meuschke asked who would be willing to spearhead the effort to reach out to the Boy Scouts. Ms. Cooney tried to recall if, during a Council meeting, Russell Smith had mentioned contacting the Boy Scouts. Ms. Meuschke stated that had also heard a similar comment from Brett Kandt. Ms. Meuschke stated that she wanted to mention the Boy Scout connection, and that nothing had to be decided at this meeting, but this subject will be discussed at the next meeting. Ms. Cooney commented that it would be a worthwhile effort to educate Boy Scouts about DV prevention while they are still young. Ms. Meuschke said that one thing the committee would need to do before talking to the Boy Scouts would be to look at the curriculum that is currently being used and decide if it needs to be revised/tailored to present to Boy Scouts. Ms. Prentice contributed that she is aware that Russell Smith has looked into the Boy Scouts' badge process, and that it is not similar to the individual patch process that the Girl Scouts has. Ms. Cooney pointed out that perhaps websites for national mens' organizations (example: "The White Ribbon" group) DV training/awareness could be researched for information and insight on how to address this with Boy Scouts. Ms. Sundberg spoke about a group whose focus is on prevention of sexual violence, but who are also becoming involved with DV prevention, called "Men Can Stop Rape".

Ms. Cooney volunteered to research what men's groups are doing in the arena of outreach/education to youth (including Boy Scouts) on DV prevention.

Ms. Prentice reported that the AG, in conjunction with Girl Scouts, Reno Rodeo Foundation, Washoe County District Attorney's Office, Washoe County Sheriff's Office, Reno Police Department, and the Washoe County School District, held a "sexting" conference in May. The AG moderated this conference. At the "sexting" conference, Ms. Prentice spoke of teen dating

violence and cyberbullying. A representative from MySpace also led a very interesting discussion. A young woman discussed sexting and teen dating violence. Ms. Prentice stated that she approached the young woman and invited her to apply for membership in the prevention Council. About 80 parents and their teens attended. Since this conference was a success, the AG is looking into doing it again in the future. Ms. Prentice also led a seminar on cyber bullying and teen dating violence at Girls' State. The seminar was planned to last one hour, but lasted two hours due to many pertinent questions and contribution of thoughts by the audience.

6. *Schedule future meetings & agenda items.

Ms. Meuschke reported that will not be able to attend the Council meeting in Hawthorne on July 16 and asked Ms. Cooney to give the Education Committee report at that time. Ms. Cooney agreed to do so.

The Education Committee set the date for the next meeting for Tuesday September 15, 2009 at 3:00 p.m.

Agenda items for the September 15 meeting:

#3 Review, discussion and possible action on health care outreach efforts.

- i. Review Delphi Instrument for Hospital-Based Domestic Violence Programs.

#4 Review, discussion and possible report regarding Boards and Commissions

- i. Update on Cosmetology board "Cut It Out" Program
- ii. Ideas of other boards and commissions to approach.

#5 Review, discussion and possible action on children/teen outreach efforts.

- i. Girl Scout Patch.
- ii. Boy Scouts (Valerie Cooney's update)

7. *Public comment.

There were no comments from the public.

11. *Adjournment.

Andrea Sundberg made a motion for adjournment. The motion was seconded by Valerie Cooney. Motion was carried. The meeting was adjourned at 3:27 p.m.

**STATE OF NEVADA
NEVADA COUNCIL FOR THE PREVENTION OF
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

Minutes of Meeting

September 15, 2009

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

Committee Members Present
Sue Meuschke

Committee Members Present Via Teleconference
Valerie Cooney
Ellen Ewing
Toni Downen
Andrea Sundberg

Committee Members Absent
Suzanne Ramos
Mike Sprinkle

Public Present
None

Attorney General's Office Staff Present
Kareen Prentice, DV Ombudsman
Henna Rasul, Deputy Attorney General

1. *Call to order, roll call of members, and introduction.
Sue Meuschke called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. A roll call was performed and quorum was established.

2. *Review and approval of minutes from July 7, 2009.

Ellen Ewing made the motion to approve the previous meeting's minutes. Toni Downen seconded the motion. Andrea Sundberg abstained because she was unable to review them. The minutes from the July 7, 2009 Education Committee meeting were approved.

3. *Review, discussion and possible action on health care outreach efforts.

i. Review Delphi Instrument for Hospital-based Domestic Violence programs.

Kareen Prentice reported she and Andrea Sundberg had discussed getting the survey out in time for Domestic Violence Awareness Month in October and wanted to have it done by Healthcare Day on October 14, 2009. Contacts at the Health Division will be approached to obtain good email addresses for distribution of the survey to hospitals. Toni Downen suggested that the best person at a hospital to send the survey to would be Performance Improvement or the Education Department if the hospital has one.

Andrea Sundberg stressed the importance of reaching emergency room personnel because they are working directly with the clients. It was suggested by Sue Meuschke that one of the survey questions be geared toward obtaining contact information of the person in charge of ongoing training and education. Kareen Prentice and Andrea Sundberg will work on revising the survey and will send out to the Committee for review before sending it out to the hospitals.

4. *Review, discussion and possible report regarding Boards and Commissions.

i. Update on Cosmetology Board "Cut It Out" Program

Kareen Prentice updated the Committee on the "Cut it Out" program including recent press events in Reno and Las Vegas; the training at one of the schools in Reno; and an upcoming poster presentation at the Nevada Public Health Association Conference. The Cosmetology Board has sent out 2000 packets in the North and the initial mailings were complete.

Additional mailings will be sent in January or February to ensure that everyone gets the information. Sue Meuschke stated that there are 18 schools and that they are making contact with all of the schools in the

state to organize trainings. Hopefully they will be able to schedule training or information sessions with more salons soon.

Kareen Prentice stated that the Cosmetology Board is considering requiring continuing education credits for the instructors at the schools and, if that happens, then the instructors could receive credit hours for domestic violence training.

ii. Ideas of other Boards and Commissions to Approach

The topic of continuing education credits led to a discussion about continuing education for nurses and Emergency Medical Technicians. Toni Downen will put together some information that can be presented to the Nursing Board and bring it back to the next meeting so that the Committee can determine what resources can be offered to the nurses.

At the next meeting, Valerie Cooney or Mike Sprinkle will report on strategies for approaching EMTs about domestic violence training.

5. *Review, discussion and possible action on children/teen outreach efforts.

i. Girl Scouts Patch.

Kareen reported that October 24, 2009 is the next Girl Scout event at Frontier Girl Scout Headquarters in Las Vegas. The Attorney General will attend. There will be activities and speakers and the girls will be able to earn their Girl Scout Patch that day.

ii. Boy Scout Patch

Valerie Cooney had nothing new to report on efforts with the Boy Scout program, but would have some information before the Council meeting on October 28, 2009. She is planning to contact local Boy Scout leaders and do some research to see if anything has been done on a national level.

6. *Schedule future meetings & agenda items.

The next meeting will be on November 3, 2009 at 3:00 p.m. Agenda items will include:

- #3 Review, discussion and possible action on health care outreach efforts.
 - i. Review Delphi Instrument for Hospital-based Domestic Violence programs (Revised survey).

- #4 Review, discussion and possible report regarding Boards and Commissions.
 - i. Update on Cosmetology Board "Cut it Out" program.
 - ii. Ideas of other boards and commissions to approach.
 - a. Toni Downen's report on approaching the Nursing Board.
 - b. Valerie Cooney and/or Mike Sprinkle's report on approaching EMTs.
- #5 Review, discussion and possible action on children/teen outreach efforts.
 - i. Update on Girl Scouts Patch
 - ii. Boy Scouts programs

7. *Public comment.

Valerie Cooney said there will be training on domestic violence and child abuse in Elko on November 7, 2009. This is a free training geared towards CASA volunteers, Guardian ad litem, and DCFS employees in the Sixth Judicial District.

Sue Meuschke stated that the Network is doing a regional training on the subject of stalking at the Airport Plaza in Reno on November 4, 2009.

Andrea Sundberg reported that there will be a Sexual Assault Awareness Prevention Conference in Las Vegas November 9-10, 2009. Primary speakers will discuss the trafficking of teens for prostitution, and prosecution of cases where the victim has mental health or developmental disabilities and other difficult cases. Fifteen other presenters will be doing break-out sessions over the course of the conference.

8. *Adjournment.

Andrea Sundberg made a motion for adjournment. The motion was seconded by Valerie Cooney. Motion was carried. The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

**STATE OF NEVADA
NEVADA COUNCIL FOR THE PREVENTION OF
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

Minutes of Meeting

November 3, 2009

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

Committee Members Present

Sue Meuschke
Mike Sprinkle

Committee Members Present Via Teleconference

Valerie Cooney
Toni Downen
Suzanne Ramos

Committee Members Absent

Ellen Ewing
Andrea Sundberg

Public Present

None

Attorney General's Office Staff Present

Kareen Prentice, DV Ombudsman
Henna Rasul, Deputy Attorney General
Lorraine Webber, Assistant to the NCPDV

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

Sue Meuschke called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. A roll call was performed and quorum was established.

2. *Review and approval of minutes from September 15, 2009.

Suzanne Ramos made the motion to approve the previous meeting's minutes. Toni Downen seconded the motion. Mike Sprinkle abstained because he did not attend the September 15th meeting. The minutes from the September 15, 2009, Education Committee meeting were approved.

3. *Review, discussion and possible action on health care outreach efforts.

i. Review Delphi Instrument for Hospital-based Domestic Violence programs.

The committee discussed changes to the survey. Other than some grammatical changes, the only substantive change was regarding question #9 submitted by Brett Kandt. He submitted two versions. The first version was:

Do you have policies and procedures in place to ensure that any victim of sexual assault is provided emergency medical care and/or forensic examinations at county expense, regardless of whether the victim files a report or cooperates with any law enforcement agency, as required by state law?

The second version was:

Do you have policies and procedures in place to ensure county payment for emergency medical care and/or forensic examinations provided to any victim of sexual assault, regardless of whether the victim files a report or cooperates with any law enforcement agency, as required by state law?

There was some discussion as to whether the question belonged in this survey. Mr. Sprinkle stated that based on how it was presented at the Council meeting, he thought the intent of the question was to find out if victims were being charged for exams. Ms. Meuschke added that it was also to determine whether or not the exams were given regardless of whether the victim was cooperating with police or filing a police report. Mr. Sprinkle asked what the Committee is planning to do with the information gathered with this question. Ms. Meuschke thought that the grants management unit wanted to make sure that folks are in compliance with the VAWA certification.

After discussion, the committee agreed to adopt the first version with some changes suggested by Mr. Sprinkle. The revised version read:

Do you have policies and procedures in place that provide any victim of sexual assault emergency medical care and/or forensic examinations at county expense, regardless of whether the victim files a report or cooperates with any law enforcement agency, as required by state law?

- a) Yes - Please provide policy.
- b) No.

There was discussion as to what to do if a hospital answers no this question. It was suggested that someone can then contact the hospital and inform them about the law.

The question was also renumbered as number 8 in the survey. Question number 9 will be the former question 8 (Do you have anything else you would like to share with us?).

Ms. Prentice reported that she had contacted the Nevada Hospital Association and was instructed to contact the Director of Operations to request emails for all of the hospitals. Ms. Meuschke explained that if the survey is done through Survey Monkey, we may not be able to link the answers to a specific hospital. There was also some concern about how the hospitals would provide their policies through survey monkey.

Mr. Sprinkle questioned why the committee is doing the survey. Is it to gather statistical data or to find out if hospitals and ERs are doing the things they should (or should not) do? Ms. Meuschke said the purpose was to get some sense of what kind of education is needed statewide.

Ms. Prentice will do some research and find out if a paid Survey Monkey account will allow the committee to get the information it needs *and* correlate the answers to specific hospitals.

A motion was made by Mr. Sprinkle to accept the survey as amended. Ms. Cooney seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion carried.

Mr. Sprinkle then made a motion that Ms. Prentice and Ms. Meuschke be given the authority to decide the most financially efficient and the best form for sending out the survey. Ms. Cooney seconded the motion. The motion carried.

4. *Review, discussion and possible report regarding Boards and Commissions.

i. Update on Cosmetology Board “Cut It Out” Program

Ms. Prentice reported that she, along with Maria from NNADV and Vincent Jimno, Executive Director of the Nevada Board of Cosmetology, are presenting two sessions on meaningful collaboration and sustainability at the Nevada Coalition Against Sexual Violence Conference November 9-10.

ii. Ideas of other Boards and Commissions to Approach

Mr. Sprinkle stated that he visited the State EMS division in person and spoke to Richard Fenlason. While there, he obtained an agenda with the names of the people on the Nevada State Health Division Committee on Emergency Medical Services. The next meeting of that committee is scheduled for January, 2010 and Mr. Sprinkle made a formal request with Mr. Fenlason that the Education Committee be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

The committee discussed what to present at the meeting. Mr. Sprinkle thought initial and continuing training on domestic violence was the biggest need. Because the curriculum for all emergency service workers is nationwide, it would be difficult to change it. Mr. Sprinkle thought the best option would be to have continuing education in Domestic Violence and that it should be as basic as DV 101 since there is no training in domestic violence for emergency service workers. The committee then discussed the best way to accomplish that. Ms. Downen suggested a Train the Trainer program. Mr. Sprinkle stated that the committee needed to decide how far they wanted to go with this. Do we want to just educate the powers that be within the EMS community that a deficiency exists, or do we want to go as far as developing a curriculum? At a minimum, the committee needs to address the gap in DV training. The next step would be guidance in how to fill that gap.

Ms. Meuschke asked what the role of the Committee on Emergency Medical Services is. Mr. Sprinkle explained that the committee is comprised of volunteers appointed to come up with EMS policy for the state. Typically, committee members are directors from the EMS agencies from Las Vegas and Reno. Ms. Cooney asked how many hours of CEUs emergency medical service workers needed. Mr. Sprinkle stated that EMT Basics needed 32 hours every two years. Paramedics were required to have a minimum of 40 hours every two years, 30 of which were required to obtain various certifications.

It was decided that the goal of the presentation at the January meeting would be to alert them to the issue and open up a dialog in order to determine how the Education Committee can work with EMS to develop and disseminate the necessary information.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that he will follow up with the EMS division and make sure that the Education Committee's presentation is on the agenda. Ms. Downen, Mr. Sprinkle and Ms. Meuschke volunteered to do the presentation.

Ms. Downen reported on approaching the nursing board. She is waiting for a return phone call from Debbie Uber. Ms. Meuschke asked the committee what they would like to do with the Nursing Board. Ms. Downen suggested there was a need for strategies that nurses can use for talking about domestic violence with victims. She will have more information once she gets an opportunity to talk to Debbie Uber.

5. *Review, discussion and possible action on children/teen outreach efforts.

i. Girl Scouts Patch.

There was nothing new to report for the Girl Scouts Patch program.

ii. Boy Scout Patch

Ms. Cooney has done some research and identified the Nevada area Council, and has obtained contact information for the CEO and its executives. She reported that there are several existing badges for Boy Scouts which our subject matter may fall into such as like family life, citizenship and community, communications, public health, crime prevention, and disabilities awareness. There is also the ability to obtain a local badge. Ms. Cooney plans to make contact with the principles in the North and see what additional information she can obtain.

6. *Schedule future meetings & agenda items.

The next meeting is scheduled for January 12, 2010 at 3:00 p.m. Agenda items will include:

- #3 Review, discussion and possible action on health care outreach efforts.
- i. Review Delphi Instrument for Hospital-based Domestic Violence programs (Results from survey).

- #4 Review, discussion and possible report regarding Boards and Commissions.
 - i. Ideas of other boards and commissions to approach.
 - a. Update on approaching EMS Board.
 - b. Update on approaching Nursing Board.
- #5 Review, discussion and possible action on children/teen outreach efforts.
 - i. Boy Scouts programs

7. *Public comment. None.

8. *Adjournment.

Mike Sprinkle made a motion for adjournment. The motion was seconded by Valerie Cooney. The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.