

COLORADO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD

MEETING MINUTES September 13, 2024

CDPS is committed to the full inclusion of all individuals, and we are continually making changes to improve accessibility and usability of our services. As part of this commitment, CDPS is prepared to offer reasonable accommodations for those who have difficulty engaging with our content. As an example, documents can be produced in an alternative file format upon request. To request this and other accommodations, or to discuss your needs further, please contact me at 303-653-7819 or via email at jill.trowbridge@state.co.us.

Attendance:

Domestic Violence Board Members Present:

Andrea Bradbury, Hon. Bradley Burback, Erin Gazelka, Glory McDaniel, Jeanette Barich, Jennifer Parker, Jessica Fann, Karen Morgenthaler, Lori Griffith, Michelle Hunter, Nicole Collins, Nil Buckley, Sandra Campanella, Stephanie Fritts, Tally Zuckerman, Tracey Martinez, Yolanda Arredondo

Domestic Violence Board Members Absent:

Raechel Alderete

Staff Present:

Brittinie Sandoval, Caroline Frane, Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky, Jill Trowbridge, Rachael Collie, Taylor Kriesel, and Yuanting Zhang

Guests:

Benjamin Hastings, Kristin Kubacki, Sade Lee, Kristina Carrera

Introductions:

The meeting convened at 9:09AM.

Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Chair) introduced herself as the Chair and welcomed the Board and guests.

Jesse Hansen (Program Staff) introduced himself indicated the meeting is being recorded. He also stated that Taylor Kriesel would control the Webex portion of the meeting, so if you are experiencing issues on WebEx, please reach out to her. Jesse asked all attendees to sign-in if they haven't already done so.

The in-person DVOMB members introduced themselves.

The DVOMB staff introduced themselves.

Taylor Kriesel introduced the online DVOMB members.

Taylor Kriesel introduced the online guests.

Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Chair) read aloud the Board meeting rules and expectations as well as the anti-harassment and discrimination conduct policy.

Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Chair) indicated that a quorum was present with 14 members present. She asked if there was consensus by the Board to approve the agenda for today.

REVIEW AND VOTE ON JULY AND AUGUST 2024 MEETING MINUTES: (ATTACHMENT 1 & 2)

Jennifer noted that she was at the July meeting, but her name was not reflected.

***Andrea Bradbury (DVOMB Member) moved to approve the July 2024 meeting minutes as presented.
Jeanette Barich (DVOMB Member) 2nd the motion.***

Stephanie asked if there was further discussion in addition to the correction noted by Jennifer? Tally Zuckerman identified herself as being present in July, but the minutes did not identify her name as well as Glory McDaniel.

Staff indicated they would make those corrections. Stephanie asked if Andrea and Jeanette accepted those amendments to their original motion. They agreed and there was no further discussion on the motion.

Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Chair) asked staff to prepare the vote.

The Session ID: #675377

Question #1

The motion passed with 13 votes to approve the July 2024 meeting minutes, 0 votes to object, and 1 vote to abstain.

Responses	Percent	Count
Yes	92.86%	13
No	0.00%	0
Abstain	7.14%	1
Totals	100.00%	14

Jessica Fann voted "Yes" in the chat.

Andrea Bradbury (DVOMB Member) moved to approve the August 2024 meeting minutes as presented. Glory McDaniel (DVOMB Member) 2nd the motion.

There was no discussion on the motion.

Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Chair) asked staff to prepare the vote.

The Session ID: #675377

Question #2

The motion passed with 12 votes to approve the August 2024 meeting minutes, 0 votes to object, and 2 votes to abstain.

Responses	Percent	Count
Yes	80.00%	12
No	0.00%	0
Abstain	20.00%	2
Totals	100.00%	14

Jessica Fann voted "Yes" in the chat.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Staff Announcements:

Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) announced the following:

- The vacant ODVSOM Program Manager position application is now posted and is open for two weeks.
- Teletherapy Working Group would not be meeting during the month of September and would likely meet in October when language has been drafted and made ready for review.
- A survey was sent out to Approved Providers and a total of 42 Providers responded. He thanked those who responded to the survey and that the results would be featured in the upcoming legislative report.
- The University of Colorado is conducting a study examining inflammation and health with intimate partner violence. He shared that the recruitment flyer would be shared.
- The third cohort of about 40 people received training for the DVRNA-R as part of the pilot. This cohort consisted of mainly probation officers and case managers from diversion. He noted that there are approximately 75 people now involved with the pilot and he expressed gratitude for their partnerships.

Taylor Kriesel

- Training Events

- DV101: September 18
- DV102: October 1
- DV103: November 4
- Core Competencies Training: September 9 with the Denver Domestic Violence Task Force
- Lunch and Learn: October 2nd
- Advanced Series Training: LGBTQ+ Training (August 19-20 in CO Springs)
- Conference
 - Recorded Sessions available until Nov 7, 2024
 - Reimbursement forms due to Jill by no later than next Friday
- Traveling Board Meeting
 - Timeline to Alamosa
 - Location Pickup in Denver
 - Location Pickup in Colorado Springs
 - Timeline to Denver

Caroleena Frane (DVOMB Staff) announced the following:

- The Provider Data Management System allows for Approved Providers to identify any additional specialties they outside of their approvals with the DVOMB. This has been a feature and staff use this to help treatment match when circumstances require specialization. These specialties have not been made publicly available because the Application Review Committee does not verify these self-identified specialties. We are happy to report that these specialties will be listed on the Approved Provider List and can be searched due to a new disclaimer.
- Announced the Domestic Violence Summit located in Colorado Springs will be held on October 2nd and 3rd. She shared information on how to register.
- She also shared a virtual conference was being held by the New Mexico Coalition Against Domestic Violence titled, “Unmasking the Tactics of Digital Abuse”. She shared information on how to register.
- She shared an upcoming training related to Acudetox called POCA. She shared her experiences in how it helped her clients and for self-care.

Tracey Martinez (Board Member) arrived online.

Brittinie Sandoval (DVOMB Staff) announced the following:

- The deadline for submitting documents and materials to the Application Review Committee for review was September 30th, 2024.

Board Announcements:

None

Public Announcements:

None

Future Agenda Items:

None

APPEAL PROCEEDING REGARDING COMPLAINT 2023-10-18-6, (ATTACHMENT 3)

Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Chair) introduced this item as a discussion and voting item concerning a complaint against a DVOMB Approved Provider. She asked the Board members and staff to re-introductions to introduce themselves. She then asked for any Board member who need to recuse themselves from this item to do so now. The following Board members were recused from the appeal proceeding and exited the meeting room:

- Jeanette Barich
- Lori Griffith
- Nil Buckley
- Jessica Fann

Stephanie indicated that the Board is required by law to have a complaint process. A decision of the ARC can be reviewed by the full Board, known as an appeal, requested by a complainant or the responding Provider. Once an appeal has been requested, the ARC provides all of the materials considered in the decision to the parties involved as well as the Board for review.

The purpose of an Appeal is to allow for due process and a reasonable opportunity for parties to give the Board their perspective on the issues related to the appeal. The goal of the Board is to approve and list professionals who provide services in accordance with the Standards. The Board has empowered the Application Review Committee (ARC) to make decisions based on its policies. The Board has oversight over ARC and serves as the Appellant Body for Appeals related to the decisions of the ARC. ARC members count towards the quorum but will abstain from the appeal vote. The DVOMB is a Type 2 Board and therefore appeal processes are subject to the Board's policies and procedure, and not the Administrative Procedures Act.

The Board will only consider information specific to the findings outlined by the ARC in the finding letter regarding the modified disposition. The Appellant may bring one representative. This Appeal proceeding is scheduled for 1 hour and 30 minutes in length: 20 minutes for a verbal presentation by the appellant; 20 minutes for presentation by the ARC Chair; and 20 minutes for questions and the remaining time is reserved for discussion by the Board. There are no questions allowed by any party except the Board. No one may speak until acknowledged by the Chair. We would request all audience members present refrain from speaking or posting anything online regarding the appeal. Applicable time periods may be modified upon request, by either the parties or a Board member, followed by a motion by a DVOMB member and a vote on the motion for a time extension.

The DVOMB does NOT have the authority to impose fines, remove someone's license, or make changes to a legal sanction in either the criminal or civil courts related to someone convicted for a domestic violence offense. The DVOMB's authority regarding Approved Providers is in relation to their status as a Provider and their listing on the Approved Provider List.

In accordance with the Administrative Policies, the DVOMB must vote on the disposition by the ARC regarding case. They must vote in one of the following three ways:

- Accept the decision of the ARC of dismissing the complaint.
- Reject the decision of the ARC of dismissing the complaint.
- Modify the decision of the ARC of dismissing the complaint.

One final reminder. Please keep in mind confidentiality issues as this is an open meeting. Use initials when referring to any client or mental health information. Thank you.

Stephanie then directed Mr. Hastings to begin with the first 20 minutes.

Mr. Hastings introduced himself and indicated he was here about a Standards violation which occurred during his treatment at Lifelong around 2022 and 2023. He indicated that he submitted all of the documentation to the staff.

Mr. Hastings alleged that there was no treatment plan review, and that he did not have evidence of something that never happened. He stated that the treatment plan completed on September 7th was really the original treatment plan. He indicated that he and Ms. Spraker were not in agreement about several issues with the original treatment plan. As a result, Mr. Hastings argued that was not a treatment plan review, but how she addressed the initial complaint was saying the treatment plan was re-reviewed.

Mr. Hastings referenced a conversation with another Approved Provider who is alleged to have mentioned a possible violation of the Standards. He then described that he brought up the fact that he considered himself a self-defending victim and the idea of contraindicated treatment. Mr. Hasting's then stated that his understanding was that they [presumed to be Ms. Spraker] had a staffing and decided to discharge me, without having that review. Mr. Hastings then stated his interpretation of the Standards was that "there's not really that many reasons why they [Approved Providers] can discharge you before that treatment plan review period. I haven't seen anything in the standards."

Mr. Hastings then referenced an email from December 28th, 2022 about a discussion regarding the self-defending victim provision in the Standards. He spoke about wanting to schedule individual sessions to discuss the issue of being self-defending victim.

He referenced the response from Ms. Spraker and went on to describe how he did not believe he was given sufficient opportunity to discuss the self-defending victim issue more in-depth. He then referenced an alleged violent kidnapping regarding his son. His concern was that shortly after this exchange, he was kicked out of treatment without any warning and there was not a treatment plan review. He alleged that they [presumed to be Ms. Spraker] made up things that he chose not to address in his complaint, but he alleged that information was fabricated on his discharge report that he broke the law. Mr. Hastings indicated that he "did not break any laws, and that leads into a whole other side."

Mr. Hastings argued that the category of imminent danger and the other concerns listed did not apply to him regarding plans and imminent threats. Mr. Hastings continued to state that he did not break any laws when describing a situation when he was referencing a television show to what he considered to be similar to his perceived case.

Mr. Hastings then stated that the Standards address self-defending victims and he alleged that he was discharged by Ms. Spraker instead of her gathering more information.

Stephanie then directed Ms. Spraker to address the Board with the next 20 minutes.

Ms. Spraker introduced herself and thanked the Board for hearing the discussion. Ms. Spraker clarified the dates and when the first treatment plan review occurred. Ms. Spraker indicated that Mr. Hastings discharge came prior to the first treatment plan review based on the consensus of the MTT. Ms. Spraker articulated that there were several conversations staying after group meetings for further discussion in an effort to address the self-defending victim issue and to inform the treatment plan. As a result of these conversations, the treatment plan was reviewed between Mr. Hastings and I, informally during this time and as part of treatment.

Ms. Spraker referenced the emails as her defense in offering different option to Mr. Hastings what steps he needed to take if he wanted to proceed in treatment. She quoted "if you will be moving forward in treatment and moving away from self-defending victim focus, then please do numbers two and three." She described what actions he needed to take in numbers two and three referenced in the email and then indicated Mr. Hastings only addressed part of this request. She further indicated that Mr. Hastings continued to focus on himself in ways that were not supportive of his amenability in domestic violence offender treatment. Ms. Spraker stated that she and Mr. Hastings met to review the discharge document together and discuss any questions. She indicated that Mr. Hastings reported understanding the agreement and that he cannot engage in treatment due to his beliefs. Ms. Spraker offered Mr. Hastings additional support when requested by Mr. Hastings to which he never responded.

Stephanie then directed Karen Morgenthaler (ARC Chair) to address the Board with the next 20 minutes.

My name is Karen Morgenthaler and I am speaking as the Chair of ARC, which is the Application Review Committee. I will be discussing the ARC's process, decisions, and rationale. The scope of my presentation will be focused on the ARC process. I am unable to address any legal issues. Those would need to be discussed by the board with its legal counsel if there are such questions.

The current members of ARC will be abstaining from today's vote but are available for comment and questions. Those members are:

1. Michelle Hunter - Representing Colorado Department of Corrections
2. Jennifer Parker - Representing Mental Health Professionals and DV Providers
3. Detective Sandra Campanella - Representing Law Enforcement
4. Erin Gazelka - Representing Mental Health Professionals and DV Providers

There are two non-Board member positions on the ARC. These members are:

5. Jeannine Anderson
6. Melissa Hall

Another Board member, Lori Griffith, attended the November and December 2023 ARC meetings as part of the ARC's discussion regarding Appendix I and Teletherapy requirements. Lori Griffith did not participate in that agenda item and did not have access to the complaint materials.

Another Board member, Jessica Fann, will also be recusing herself from this appeal proceeding.

The Board's Administrative Policies, located in Appendix D, outline the requirements and process used by the ARC for matters pertaining to complaints, Standards Compliance Reviews, and appeals. To date, the ARC followed these procedures.

A complaint was filed with the DVOMB against Ms. Spraker on October 18, 2023 by Mr. Benjamin Hastings who is a client that received domestic violence offender services by Ms. Spraker. The complaint alleges that Mr. Hastings was discharged from treatment before a treatment plan review and the Mr. Hastings believed he was a self-defending victim and was not allowed the ability to engage in individual sessions to discuss this further with the Provider. Mr. Hastings also requested an outcome as part of the resolution of his complaint that entailed monetary compensation and that Ms. Spraker be no longer allow to provide services. It is important to note that the DVOMB's authority does not allow for monetary fees or restitution. Additionally, sanctions for violations to the Standards will typically require remediation prior to removal from the Approved Provider List.

The ARC reviewed this complaint on November 2nd and determined that the complaint fell under the purview of the DVOMB and that the complaint substantially alleged violations. The ARC voted to request a response from Ms. Spraker and to review the complaint to identify the specific Standards that could have been violated. ARC requested materials from Ms. Spraker on November 6th, 2023 and Ms. Spraker provided a response and collateral information later that afternoon.

On December 14, 2023, the ARC reviewed Ms. Spraker's response to the alleged violations and the collateral information provided. The alleged violations implicate Standard 4.07, 4.09, 5.05, 5.07, and 5.09. The ARC considered all of the materials submitted of what could have been potential violations. Ms. Spraker's response to the ARC indicated the following:

Mr. Hasting's treatment plan was completed on September 7, 2023, reviewed with the client, re-reviewed with the client, and ultimately signed by the client on October 19, 2022. Ms. Spraker supplied the discharge summary which documents that the client was discharged on January 19, 2024 for non-compliance with the treatment contract, failure to progress with treatment competencies, and that Mr. Hastings believed he was a self-defending victim and not appropriate for treatment.

Ms. Spraker's case notes include email correspondence in which Mr. Hastings was offered opportunities to address victim blaming behaviors and acknowledged engaging in mental and verbal abuse. Case notes indicate that Mr. Hasting regressed in and around the time of November 2022.

Ms. Spraker's response sufficiently addressed each of the allegations related to Standard 4.07, 4.09, 5.05, 5.07, and 5.09. The allegation regarding a Treatment Plan Review not being conducted by Ms. Spraker took steps consistent with a Treatment Plan Review prior to a discharge in an attempt to stabilize the client. These actions include:

- a) Stay after group treatment to check in with Mr. Hastings and developing a plan in order for Mr. to move forward in treatment.
- b) Mr. Hastings was instructed to:

- (1) Look further into self-defending victim and decide if you will be moving forward in treatment. If you will be moving forward in treatment and moving away from self-defending victim focus, then please do #2 and #3.
 - (2) Review Categories of Abuse and Abusive behavior and circle the behaviors you engaged in with your co-parent at any point in the relationship (romantic and after the relationship ended and was co-parenting).
 - (3) Write a plan of what you are willing to commit to in treatment moving forward with a focus on your behaviors, actions, and uses of power and control should you choose to move forward in treatment.
- c) These specific actions are important because a Provider is not able to ethically treat a client if they believe they do not need treatment.
 - d) Clients can be discharged unsuccessfully for reasons listed in Standard 5.09 at any time during the treatment process. It is clear in the documentation provided that Ms. Spraker followed the Standards and offered Mr. Hastings alternatives prior to discharge and the discharge was agreed by the MTT.

After reviewing this information, the ARC voted to dismiss the case and issued its disposition on December 14, 2023. Upon receiving the dismissal letter, Mr. Hastings requested the ARC reconsider its decision to dismiss the complaint. In the course of that work, staff requested Mr. Hastings to provide any additional documentation or evidence that speaks to the following in accordance with the Administrative Policies:

1. The documentation relied upon by the ARC was in error;
2. There is new documentation relevant to the decision of the ARC was not available at the time for consideration;
3. The ARC lacked sufficient grounds to support the decision made;
4. The ARC failed to follow the DVOMB Standards or policy in making its decision.

Mr. Hastings supplied emails in which he expresses distrust and dissatisfaction with the process along with a response with additional information. On February 8th, 2024, the ARC considered the information supplied by Mr. Hastings and then re-reviewed the documentation supplied by Ms. Spraker.

The documentation supplied indicates that a Treatment Plan was developed and signed by Mr. Hastings on October 19, 2022 and the self-defending victim issue became the focus of the review with Mr. Hastings on December 28 which qualifies as a Treatment Plan Review with Mr. Hastings. The Standards do not prescribe exactly how a Treatment Plan Review needs to be administered and grants flexibility to Providers.

Regarding the issues concerning Mr. Hastings identifying as a self-defending victim, Standard 4.07 (II) requires Providers to consider alternative treatment or intervention options. It does not require any specific treatment outcome and gives Providers discretion on how to handle those cases in considering the following criteria when indicators suggest that the offender's risk and criminogenic needs related to domestic violence and issues of power and control are not supported with the following mind:

The individual acted out of fear, self-defense, and self-preservation in the current incident; OR The individual's behavior was situational and not used as a method of coercion, control, punishment, intimidation or revenge; OR The individual has suffered a pattern of domestic violence by their partner; OR The act or behavior was pre-emptively used to escape or to stop future abuse; OR The individual's criminal history did not involve threats to person(s), animal(s), or property.

The ARC does not take positions regarding clinical decisions made by Approved Provider when examining Provider compliance. The role of the ARC is to determine if there are violations to the Standards. Given that there is communication documenting Ms. Spraker attempting to work with the client in that regard and considering the clients perspective in individual sessions about the self-defending victim issue, Ms. Spraker meets the requirement of Standard 4.07.

On February 9th, 2024, the ARC responded to the Request for Consideration by upholding the original decision. Upon being notified, Mr. Hastings requested this decision be appealed on February 12th to the full Board. Staff corresponded with Mr. Hastings and Ms. Spraker to schedule the appeal being heard today and requested materials/information be provided to staff in accordance with the Administrative Policies.

The DVOMB Administrative Policies grant Approved Providers the option to appeal the decision of the ARC after the process for requesting reconsideration. To do so, they must meet the following criteria:

1. The documentation relied upon by the ARC was in error;
2. There is new documentation relevant to the decision of the ARC was not available at the time for consideration;
3. The ARC lacked sufficient grounds to support the decision made;
4. The ARC failed to follow the DVOMB Administrative Policies.

Recommendations:

- A. The ARC has reviewed these materials and disagrees with the arguments by Mr. Hastings seeking to sanction Ms. Spraker and to remove her from the Approved Provider List. Ms. Spraker appropriately responded and supplied information to the ARC demonstrating that she followed the requirements in the Standards and attempted to work with Mr. Hastings prior to discharging him unsuccessfully. As a result, the ARC determined that this complaint should be dismissed. Per the Administrative Policies; however, complaints that have been investigated and subsequently deemed to not have violated the Standards should be codified as unfounded.
- B. ARC recommends the Board uphold the findings of ARC and modify the disposition from dismissed to unfounded.
- C. This complaint was also submitted the Department of Regulatory Affairs (DORA) in complaints 2023-8161 and 2023-8162; both of which were dismissed.
- D. Please note that there is no requirement for the decision of DVOMB to be consistent with that of the decision of DORA. This is codified in Colorado Revised Statute -916-11.8-103(4)(a)(III)(D) which states:

“Notwithstanding any action taken by the department of regulatory agencies against a treatment provider, the board may take action against a treatment provider including, but not limited to, removing a treatment provider from the approved provider list. The board may determine the requirements for a treatment provider’s name to be placed on the list after his or her name has been removed from the list pursuant to this subsection (4)(a)(III).”

Stephanie Fritts (Board Chair) indicated the next step in the appeal proceeding is Board discussion and questions for 20 minutes. Would any Board member like to make a comment or ask a question?

Andrea Bradbury (Board Member) asked Mr. Hastings if he could share if he had attended treatment prior to Lifelong. He responded that he had attended treatment prior to attending with Lifelong. Andrea then asked he had completed treatment prior to Lifelong to which Mr. Hastings responded that he did complete but that he had broken the law to get his son back and that he had transferred to multiple different agencies.

Stephanie Fritts asked Board members to limit questions and statements to the materials submitted related and relevant to the complaint. She asked if there were any other questions from Board members?

Hearing none, Stephanie reminded the Board of the three options available to the Board and requested a motion. As a point of order, she noted that there are only a few Board members who could make a motion due to abstentions of the ARC members.

REVIEW AND VOTE ON MARCH 2024 MEETING MINUTES: (Attachment 1)

Judge Bradley Burback (DVOMB Member) moved to modify the decision of the ARC from dismissing the complaint to unfounded in accordance with the DVOMB Administrative Policies.

Glory McDaniel (DVOMB Member) 2nd the motion.

Stephanie asked if there was any further discussion on the motion. Ms. Spraker asked how a dismissal was different from a finding of unfounded. Jesse responded indicating that a dismissal is used in the complaint process when allegations fall outside the purview of the Board or when the complaint is not sufficiently alleged. In this case, the complaint was within the purview of the Board and it met criteria to be investigated. Once a complaint is investigated, the only two outcomes are founded or unfounded per the Administrative Policies. The

motion to modify the decision of the ARC simply corrects the finding of the ARC to be consistent with the Administrative Policies.

There was no discussion on the motion.

Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Chair) asked staff to prepare the vote.

The Session ID: #675377

Question #3

The motion passed with 7 votes to approve the motion to modify the ARC's decision from dismissed to unfounded, 0 votes to object, and 5 votes to abstain.

Responses	Percent	Count
Yes	58.33%	7
No	0.00%	0
Abstain	41.67%	5
Totals	100.00%	12

BREAK: 10:29 - 10:45AM

APPENDIX: OVERVIEW FOR WORKING WITH LANGUAGE INTERPRETATION SERVICES (ATTACHMENT 3)

Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Chair) indicated that this is a discussion and voting item and referred Jennifer Parker (Board Member) and Caroleena Frane (Program Staff). Caroleena provided context for the purpose of the Appendix and the considerations made by the DEIB Committee. She also noted that program staff accidentally sent this out for public comment prior to the vote by error. She indicated that if any modifications are made to the language, program staff can send out a correction notice. In either scenario, the public comment period would still continue so as to allow stakeholders the opportunity to make comment on the proposed language.

Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Chair) asked if there was any discussion by the Board or members of the public? Hearing none, she requested a motion.

Nicole Collins (Board Member) arrived online.

REVIEW AND VOTE ON THE APPENDIX FOR WORKING WITH LANGUAGE INTERPRETATION SERVICES FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:

Erin Gazelka (DVOMB Member) moved to approve the Appendix for Working with Language Interpretation Services to Public Comment.

Tally Zuckerman (DVOMB Member) 2nd the motion.

There was no further discussion on the motion.

Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Chair) asked staff to prepare the vote.

Question #4

The motion passed with 17 votes to approve the Appendix for Working with Language Interpretation Services to Public Comment, 0 votes to object, and 0 votes to abstain.

Responses	Percent	Count
Yes	100.00%	17
No	0.00%	0
Abstain	0.00%	0

Totals	100.00%	17
--------	---------	----

2025 POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE REPORT (ATTACHMENT 5)

Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Chair) indicated that this is a discussion and consensus item and referred it to Jesse Hansen (Program Staff). Jesse provided context to the work and preparation for the upcoming annual legislative report and specifically highlighted Section 2.0 related to policy recommendations. He shared that the Board has used this section has been used to signal policy changes and updates that are beyond the authority or purview of the Board. Jesse summarized the following recommendations and the rationale for including these in the upcoming report.

Item 1 - United States v. Rahimi

The report would summarize the United States v. Rahimi case and describe any implications.

Item 2 - Kayden's Law and Reunification Requirements

This statutory language requires a DVOMB Approved Provider to verify behavior of an accused party prior to ordering any reunification proceedings can commence in a civil case. This statute falls outside of the DVOMB and the DVOMB is unable to provide guidance to Approved Providers which is contributing to the issue.

Item 3 - Reduction in Offender Services Dollar

Anecdotal reports suggest there have been reductions in offender service dollars and Approved Providers have reported issues with collecting payment and the ability of clients to pay for services. This item was supported, but there was conversation about making sure Judicial stakeholders are consulted and involved in the formulation of recommendation, if included in the report.

Item 4 - Parole Domestic Violence Specialized Caseload

Parole launched a domestic violence specialized caseload in the past year. The pilot is currently on hold, but there was interest and support in highlighting the pilot for visibility to the legislature.

BREAK: 11:40 - 12:04AM

LUNCH AND LEARN: HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH - DOMESTIC VIOLENCE TREATMENT WITH HISPANIC CLIENTS (ATTACHMENT 6)

Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Chair) indicated that this is a presentation and review item and referred it to Caroleena Frane (Program Staff) to introduce the presenter. Claudia Valadez provided a presentation on her experiences working with Hispanic clients and some unique ways she approached treatment with her client in a culturally responsive way.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:55PM.

Respectfully submitted by,

Jesse Hansen, DVOMB Program Manager

Name	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Nil Buckley	1	1	Recused	1
Bradley Burbach	3	1	1	1
Nicole Collins	NP	NP	NP	1
Andrea Bradbury	1	1	1	1
Jessica Fann	1	1	Recused	1
Lori Griffith	1	1	Recused	1
Stephanie Fritts	1	3	1	1
Jennifer Parker	1	1	3	1
Karen Morgenthaler	1	1	3	1
Michelle Hunter	1	1	3	1
Sandie Campanella	1	1	3	1
Glory McDaniel	1	1	1	1
Yolanda Arredondo	NP	NP	1	1
Tally Zuckerman	1	1	1	1
Erin Gazelka	1	3	3	1
Jeanette Barich	1	1	Recused	1
Tracey Martinez	NP	NP	1	1
Raechel Alderete	NP	NP	NP	NP
Total	Yes = 13 No = 0 Abstain = 1 Total Present = 14	Yes = 12 No = 0 Abstain = 2 Total Present = 11	Yes = 7 No = 0 Abstain = 5 Total Present = 11	Yes = 10 No = 0 Abstain = 0 Total Present = 11

Q1 Motion to Approve the July minutes as revised.

Q2 Motion to approve the August minutes.

Q3 Motion to modify the decision of the ARC from dismissing the complaint to unfounded in accordance with the DVOMB Administrative Policies.

Q4 Motion to approve the Appendix for Working with Language Interpretation Services to Public Comment.

