

COLORADO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

October 13, 2023

Attendance:

Domestic Violence Board Members Present:

Andrea Bradbury, Honorable Bradley Burbach, Erin Gazelka, Glory McDaniel, Jackie List, Jeanette Barich, Jessica Fann, Karen Morgenthaler, Lori Griffith, Michelle Hunter, Nicole Collins, Nil Buckley, Raechel Alderete, Sandra Campanella, Stephanie Fritts, Tally Zuckerman, Yolanda Arredondo

Domestic Violence Board Members Absent:

Tracey Martinez, Jennifer Parker

Staff Present:

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky, Jesse Hansen, Jill Trowbridge, Taylor Redding, Rachael Collie, Yuanting Zhang, Reggin Palmitesso-Martinez

Guests:

Anne Tapp, Annette Brown, Barbara Shaw, Chela Elliott, Courtney Sutton, Diane Keeling, Gail Prim, Jody Orback, Jordan Bruner, Dr. Matt Lunn, Michelle Larson, Dr. Patrick Brady, Patricia Murphy, Russha Knauer, Sharon Griffin, Wellesley Bush

Introductions:

The meeting convened at 9:04AM.

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

Jesse Hansen (ODVSOM Staff) introduced himself and noted that Taylor Redding will control the WebEx portion of the meeting. Jesse Hansen asked all attendees to sign-in if they haven't already done so, and noted that this meeting was being recorded.

The in-person DVOMB members introduced themselves.

Taylor Redding (DVOMB Staff) introduced the online DVOMB members and guests.

The DVOMB staff, and in-person guests introduced themselves.

Jesse Hansen (ODVSOM Staff) indicated to Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Chair) that a quorum of 14 was present.

Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Chair) asked if there was consensus to approve the October agenda.

There was consensus from the DVOMB members to approve the October agenda.

REVIEW AND VOTE ON SEPTEMBER 2023 MEETING MINUTES: (Attachment #1)

The following corrections to the September 2023 minutes were indicated:

- Add Jeanette Barich (DVOMB Member) as not being able to attend the 11/3 DVOMB Meeting.
- Michelle Hunter (DVOMB Member) asked to correct spelling errors with her name.
- Nicole Collins (DVOMB Member) asked to correct the dates of the 2024 ODVSOM Conference to 7/9 – 7/12/2024.
- Tally Zuckerman (DVOMB Member) asked to correct her question on page 5 to “what are the barriers to start treatment for offenders while incarcerated?”



Erin Gazelka (DVOMB Member) moved to approve the September 2023 meeting minutes as amended. Jeanette Barich (DVOMB Member) 2nd the motion.

There was no additional discussion on the motion.

Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Chair) asked Jesse Hansen (ODVSOM Staff) to prepare the vote.
The Session ID: 719835

Karen Morgenthaler (DVOMB Member) joined the meeting at 9:16 am.

The motion passed with 12 votes to approve the September 2023 meeting minutes, 0 votes to object, and 3 votes to abstain.

| Responses | |
|-----------|-------|
| Percent | Count |
| Yes | 80.0% |
| No | 00.0% |
| Abstain | 20.0% |
| Totals | 100% |

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Staff Announcements:

Jesse Hansen (ODVSOM Staff) Announced:

- Jesse Hansen indicated that the November meeting will be held on 11/3/23 after a poll of the DVOMB members and the Executive Committee. He noted that the Board Appreciation meeting will be held in January, due to the December Board meeting being cancelled.
- Jesse Hansen reviewed the following information and indicated that he will send this to the Board:
 - HB23-1178 (IV) Order Reunification Treatment that is predicated on cutting off the relationship between a child and protective party.
 - (c) “If a court issues an order to remediate the resistance of a child to have contact with an accused party, the order must primarily address the behavior of the accused party, who shall accept responsibility for the accused party’s actions that negatively affected the accused party’s relations with the child, and a mental health professional approved by the Domestic Violence Offender Management Board shall verify the accused party’s behavior before the court orders a protective party to take steps to improve the relationship with the accused party.”
 - Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Chair) asked Jesse Hansen if he knew this bill was being enacted. Jesse Hansen responded no, he did not. He noted that he is consulting with the Attorney General’s office regarding the DVOMB’s purview and guidance with this.
- There was a moment of silence for the loss of Christine Sandoval, a Parole officer who passed away while making an arrest of a parolee.
- Dr. Matt Lunn (DCJ Director) gave a brief update of his vision for the Division of Criminal Justice going forward, which includes increasing collaboration across government and non-profit partners, and to be a great resource and a hub for people to reach out to. He noted to check Linked-In for current updates and highlights, and he indicated he would love to meet everyone.

Taylor Redding (ODVSOM Staff) Announced the following upcoming training:

- Training Events:
 - 2023 Training Calendar:
 - DVI01 – 1/29/2024
 - DVI02 – 2/20/2024

- DVI03 – 3/04/2024
- 2023 ODVSOM Conference Dates: 7/9 – 7/12/24 at Beaver Run
- It was noted that the next Roundtable will be held on 12/11/23 in Boulder
- Lunch and Learn – 12/6/23 – given by Karen Morgenthaler on Case Conceptualization
- The next Lunch and Learn will be in February 2024

Carolina Frane (ODVSOM Staff) announced that Stephanie Fritts, Sandie Campanella, and Carolina Frane presented a training to the Montrose Police Department on 10/6/23 on Ending Violence Against Women sponsored by the Montrose District Attorney’s Office.

Board Announcements

Tally Zuckerman (DVOMB Member) requested the following information on behalf of a stakeholder:

- Asked about the costs for offenders and discharges for those with the inability to pay
- Asked about providers using a sliding scale of payment for offenders
- Asked if providers are required to report to the DVOMB the fees they charge to ensure clients are not being overcharged
- Asked about the guidelines for the use of vouchers
- Asked for more treatment information for indigent offenders with the inability to pay
- Asked for a study of costs, clients’ inability to pay, and unsuccessful completion rates

Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Chair) responded that the Executive Committee will discuss the requested questions to include them as a future agenda item.

Nil Buckley (DVOMB Member) reminded all that the El Paso County Domestic Violence Summit will be held on 10/25 – 10/26/23, and she noted the theme is “I Love You to Death.” She indicated that this summit will address why this work is being done, and noted that Jesse Hansen and Dr. Rachael Collie (DVOMB Staff) will present on the lethality risk factors at the summit. Nil Buckley indicated that there will be an offender panel and a victim panel, and noted that she will be presenting on female offenders. She indicated that the Summit location is at the Pinery North venue, and mentioned the cost is \$130. Taylor Redding (DVOMB Staff) indicated that she will put the registration link to the Summit in the chat.

Public Announcements

None

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

None

Board Discussion:

None

Public Discussion:

None

REVISIONS TO SECTION 5.08 REGARDING OFFENDER CORE COMPETENCIES (Discussion Item):
(Attachment #2) – Erin Gazelka (DVOMB Member), and Jeannette Barich (DVOMB Member)

Erin Gazelka (DVOMB Member) discussed the changes to the Standards core competencies in regard to the DVRNA. Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) noted that the core competencies were developed in 2010 when moving to the RNR model. He reviewed the problems in Section 5.08 regarding to the core competencies. He indicated that some of the core competencies are redundant and mentioned that the number of competencies are onerous to rate on an ongoing basis. Jesse Hansen noted that the Standards Revisions Committee analyzed the competency

documents available (Adult Sex Offender Managements Competencies, and the Juvenile Best Practice Guidelines for those engaging in abuse) in order to revise the current Standards.

Erin Gazelka (DVOMB Member) and Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) reviewed the following core competency revisions:

- Reduced the number of core competencies from 18 to 11 with 3 major categories:
 - Domestic Violence and Criminal Experience areas
 - Self-management/Self-care
 - Survivor Impact to Community Safety
- The core competencies will now correspond with the DVRNA which will determine progress in treatment based on a risk, needs, and responsivity manner
- There was inconsistency with providers and Probation regarding the lack of guidance as to how to use the competencies.
- Erin Gazelka (DVOMB Member) indicated that the use of the current charts (Likert Scales) is cumbersome and stressed the need to utilize the DVRNA to determine if risk is being reduced and if treatment plans are being individualized.

Jeanette Barich (DVOMB Member) indicated that these changes in Section 5.08 will make the provider paperwork more streamlined, and she mentioned that these Standards will be in line with the DVRNA. She noted that it was a long process making the revisions which included robust discussion from stakeholders.

Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) and Erin Gazelka (DVOMB Member) reviewed the revised competencies #1 - #11 and clarified some of the revised language. Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Member) indicated that this document is for review and discussion, and noted that it will be voted on at a later date.

Michelle Hunter (DVOMB Vice-Chair) asked who is using the LSI assessment. Erin Gazelka (DVOMB Member) responded that the LSI is not prominently used now due to the availability of other assessment tools. Michelle Hunter responded that the LSI is used for interstate clients and that the CTAP is used for all others. Erin Gazelka noted that as the DVRNA is being validated that it will indicate criminogenic risk, and she noted that she is not sure who uses the LSI versus the CTAP. Michelle Hunter indicated that she would look at the LSI and CTAP and how they capture criminogenic risk. There was continued discussion regarding the use of the CTAP and LSI assessments, and when these are typically done in order to capture criminogenic risk. Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) indicated that the core competency revisions to the Standards should fall in line with these instruments.

Karen Morgenthaler (DVOMB Member) commented that there are no requirements to share the LSI. Erin Gazelka (DVOMB Member) responded that the report is not required to be shared, but indicated that the scores are shared with those concerned.

Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) indicated that some of the old competencies did not capture self-management or self-care, and mentioned that Competency #6 was added to capture that.

Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) and Erin Gazelka (DVOMB Member) continued to review the competencies. He noted that this will come back to the Board for a vote to send out for public comment in November, with the hope of voting on these revisions at the January Board meeting.

Yolanda Arredondo (DVOMB Member) arrived at 9:57 am.

Board Discussion:

None

Public Discussion

None

THEN AND NOW: CHANGES IN THE MOVEMENT TO END DOMESTIC VIOLENCE – (Presentation):
(No Attachment) – Jessica Fann (DVOMB Member) and Jackie List (DVOMB Member), Panel Members -
Anne Tapp, Jennifer Walker, Jennifer Eyle, Jackie List,

Jessica Fann (DVOMB Member) introduced the panel who consisted of Anne Tapp, Jennifer Walker, Jennifer Eyle, and Jackie List.

Please describe your first 5 years as victim advocates:

- Anne Tapp discussed her background and when she started working with DV victims.
- Jennifer Eyle discussed her background and past experience working the DV victims.
- Jennifer Walker discussed her background and past experience working as a victim advocate.
- Jackie List discussed her background and past experience working as a victim advocate.

As your career evolved what major changes have you experienced that impacted the work you do?

- Anne Tapp discussed the State coalition and partnerships with professionals in the victim advocacy field have helped increase awareness along with more resources for survivors of domestic violence.
- Jennifer Eyle discussed that legislative changes have boosted offender treatment on the criminal side of domestic violence, but have disempowered survivors. She noted that what is needed are legal remedies that focus on family law matters, dependency and neglect cases, and giving survivors more victim services options. Jennifer Eyle also indicated that the various aspects of trauma are not totally understood by the legal system (judges, attorneys, etc.)
- Jennifer Walker agreed with Jennifer Eyle regarding the legal ramifications and reviewed a case that she was involved with where the victim was able to move on. She noted the need for advocates to understand the needs of the victims and what they are going through.
- Jackie List agreed with the previous comments and discussed how the thinking has changed with law enforcement regarding mandatory arrest to being more considerate of each victim. She discussed the time when she worked with law enforcement and noted how they are starting to understand the needs of the victim.

What is happening in your communities, and based on this, how does this impact victim advocacy?:

- Anne Tapp noted that the victim responses have not changed much and indicated that she has learned a lot from survivors regarding personal trauma and systems shortfalls. She mentioned that there is increasing partnerships with law enforcement, and indicated the need for more funding for specialized programs, Anne Tapp mentioned that the victim advocacy field has learned to recognize marginalized populations and their specific needs. She also noted the need for more resources that help survivors rebuild their lives, to include housing for survivors.
- Jennifer Eyle noted that much of the attention has been shifted to coercion control and less on interpersonal violence. She indicated that outside of Colorado, coercion control is a criminal offense, and she noted she is not sure that is necessarily the way to go. Jennifer Eyle mentioned that that legal system is working on the intersection with child welfare and domestic violence and their response. She reiterated the need for more training for judges and judicial officers, and in civil cases and the use of experts in victim services.
- Jennifer Walker noted that the non-profit agencies are nimble and a gap-filler, but noted that the funding being tenuous, it is hard at times for those agencies to be nimble. She noted the need to look at housing, child care, and various services for survivors.
- Jackie List indicated that her agency has reduced the work to a 32-hour workweek, given staff more time off to help the staff maintain their energy and sanity.

Board Discussion:

Sandie Campanella (DVOMB Member) noted that Boulder County Law enforcement supports the non-profit agencies that help the survivors and thanked all for their presentation.

Stephanie Fritts (DVOMB Chair) also thanked the panel and noted that the legal system is beginning to understand the needs of domestic violence offenders and the victims.

Public Discussion

None

REVISION REGARDING LANGUAGE AND INTERPRETATION SERVICES (Discussion Item):

(Attachment #3) Jennifer Parker (DVOMB Member) and Raechel Alderete (DVOMB Member)

Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) reviewed the current language in the Standards regarding language and interpretation services in Section 5.00, the Evaluation Section. He indicated that the Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Belonging (DEIB) Committee looked at this section with the lens of needed interpretation for non-English speaking clients at the point of client referral.

Raechel Alderete (DVOMB Member) indicated that Statewide there are changes in the Standards for providers who offer language and interpretation services in order to ensure proper treatment matching.

Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) indicated that the Committee discussed that it would be best to keep the revisions at a more general level and then give more detail in an appendix.

Nicole Collins (DVOMB Member) asked who pays for interpretation services if a client needs an interpreter as part of the court order. Erin Gazelka (DVOMB Member) responded that it unclear, and is on a case by case basis with no clear parameters. She mentioned that sometimes the fee is split with the Department of Corrections (DOC,) or DOC pays the entire fee, or that the client is responsible for interpretation costs. Nicole Collins mentioned that it may be hard for providers to take on clients with language needs when there are no clear funding sources. Erin Gazelka indicated that the therapy takes longer for those using interpretation services, and asked if there are enough providers willing to do what is right.

Nil Buckley (DVOMB Member) discussed a case she has that needs interpretation (Burmese client), which is very challenging. She noted the challenges of how to put these clients in group therapy when the evaluation has not been concluded, and the needs of consent for the client and others in group therapy. Nil Buckley asked for support from the Board regarding these cases, and she indicated the barriers faced when treating those with special language needs.

Raechel Alderete (DVOMB Member) responded that the Committee is taking these instances into consideration. She noted that review of the proposed language in the Standards will help answer some of the questions. Raechel Alderete indicated that through training, further discussion, through a possible appendix might help providers offer services for these clients. She noted that the DVOMB is not responsible to vet the interpreters, and to be aware that they may not understand domestic violence issues when interpreting.

Raechel Alderete (DVOMB Member) asked all to reach out to her, Jesse Hansen, or Carolina Frane, with any questions regarding this proposed language. She invited all to attend the DEIB Committee meetings, and indicated the next one is scheduled on October 27, 2023, from 9:00 am – 11:00 am.

Board Discussion:

Karen Morgenthaler (DVOMB Meeting) commented that sometimes the Probation Department pays for this interpretation, and that sometimes she pays.

Public Discussion:

Gail Prim (Audience Member) noted that the Probation Department can typically find an interpreter to assist in domestic violence evaluation, but noted it is difficult to find one who has the time to meet 1-2 times per week with client recommendations.

BREAK: 11:13 – 11:30 am

LOOK WHO'S STALKING: IDENTIFYING AND CORROBRATING ALLEGATIONS OF STALKING (Presentation): (Attachment #4) Dr. Patrick Brady

Dr. Patrick Brady (University of Colorado) gave a presentation on stalking. Some of the highlights of this presentation are as follows:

- About Me
- Stalking Defined – A course of unwanted conduct
- Most common stalking behaviors reported by victims in 2019
- Stalking Defined – Substantial emotional distress
- Substantial Emotional Distress May Present As:
 - Changing routine/appearance
 - Adopting self-protective behaviors
 - Seeking professional help
 - Issues with physical health
 - Increased anxiety, depression, suicidal ideation
 - Frustration, irritability, helplessness
 - Academic/workplace performance issues
 - Increased substance abuse
 - Nervousness, feeling “on guard”
 - Difficulty eating or sleeping
- Stalking Defined – reasonable person
- At What Point Does It Become Stalking
- Articulating Fear
- Context is Critical
- Characteristics & Statistics of Stalking
- Most victims experience stalking before age 25
- Most common stalkers are acquaintances and intimate partners
- Partner Stalkers are the most dangerous
- Partner stalking victims are more likely than non-partner stalking victim to
 - Be stalked both in-person & through technology
 - Be pursued for longer durations
 - Experience more frequent
- 70% of staling victims do not involve the police
- Intimate Partner Stalking victims are more likely to contact the police
- Most stalking situation involve female victims of male offenders
- Same sex stalker are not always intimate partners
- Most stalking victims are pursued using some form of technology
- Most victims perceived stalkers were motivated by
 - Entitlement
 - Power & Control
 - Rejection

- Why they Stalk – Revenge
- Why they Stalk – Committed or planning to commit crime
- Identifying the Course of Conduct
- Stalking is often:
 - Misidentified
 - Under-reported
 - Overlooked
 - Minimized
- Despite meeting legal criteria, less than half of staking victims did not consider their experience to be stalking
- % of Stalking victims who contact the police – 30%
- Stalking is overlooked by the police
- Risk factors for intimate partner homicide
- In 85% of attempted and 75% of completed intimate partner femicides, stalking occurred in the prior to the attack
- Abuse is about gaining and maintaining power & control
- Abusers escalate to violence and homicide when coercive controlling behaviors are....
- Stalking can occur before and after assaults
- Stalking is masked within other crimes
- Identifying stalker tactics: Are they acting sly?
- Surveillance behaviors
- SLII behaviors reported by victims/observed by officers
- Surveillance behaviors identified in police reports
- Spyware
- SLII: Life Invasion
- Life invasion behaviors in police reports
- Spoofing
- Call, e-mail & text spoofing
- SLII: Intimidation
- Strictly Stalking – Video
- Intimidation behaviors in police reports
- SLII: Interference - Sabotage
- Sabotage and attack behaviors in police reports
- Moving Forward
 - Stalking is a lethal risk factor that domestic and sexual violence perpetrators use to coerce compliance
 - Cyberstalking only becoming more common – what are we doing to prepare?
 - Corroboration
 - Course of conduct
 - Emotional elements
 - Researcher – community partnerships
- Resources
 - SPARC
 - Aequitas
 - SHARP – Stalking and Harassment Assessment and Risk Profile
 - Narrative Report & Risk Profile
 - Safety Planning Suggestions

Board Discussion:

Rachael Alderete (DVOMB Member) thanked Dr. Brady and commented that she would like to reach out to him to discuss this topic in more detail.

Public Discussion:

None

Further Discussion:

None

BREAK: 12:37 – 1:07 pm

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RISK AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

(Presentation): (Attachment #5) – Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) and Dr. Rachael Collie (ODVSOM Staff)
Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) reviewed that Dr. Rachael Collie (ODVSOM Statistical Analyst) previously presented the validation results of the DVRNA, and noted those findings will be published in the upcoming Legislative Report. He mentioned that the DVRNA has been validated, and noted there are areas that will need improvement going forward. Jesse Hansen indicated that Dr. Rachael Collie will present on the proposed changes to the DVRNA.

Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) clarified that the data being presented was gathered before the Provider Data Management System was in place and before providers were entering data into that system.

Dr. Rachael Collie (DVOMB Statistical Analyst) reported the following proposed changes to the DVRNA:

- Goal and Purpose
- DVRNA Timeline
- Current Extended Validation Study
- Overall: Placements & Recidivism
- DV Recidivism X Placement Level
- DV Recidivism X Placement Level Survival Analyses
- ROC: DVRNA Score & DV Recidivism
- Conclusions

Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) presented the following information regarding the offending domains:

- DVRNA Proposed Changes
- Current Limitations of the DVRNA
- Questions Posed
- Domain Subitems Related to DV Recidivism (17 of 47 items)
- Preliminary First Look: Survival Function for DV-Related Recidivism by Placement Level
- Preliminary First Look: ROC Curve
- Scoring Criteria for Dynamic Factors
- Dynamic Scores
- What About the Other DVRNA Risk Factors:
- Next Steps
- The Road Ahead

Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) and the Standards Revisions Committee suggested the following:

- Standards Revisions Committee:
 - Finalize changes to the Core Competencies for Board review

- Request authority to revise Section 4.0, 5.0, and other impacted areas of the Standards
- DVOMB
 - Review proposed changes and grant Standards Revision Committee the authority to review and make recommended changes to all Sections of the Standards.
 - Approve a pilot project for 2024 to test the DVRNA=R with independent samples for validation, specifically with the dynamic portion of the tool.

Board Discussion:

A DVOMB member asked how this pilot project would impact the treatment providers. Erin Gazelka (DVOMB Member) responded that this pilot assessment is briefer and makes more sense. She noted it will be used alongside the traditional DVRNA evaluation in order to better determine lower risk and higher risk.

A DVOMB member asked if the pilot project will split out Level C. Erin Gazelka responded that level B and C will be deleted, and will be replaced with levels 1, 2, 3, and 4, with a clearer distribution across the four levels.

Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) he noted that the current cut-off scores are arbitrary, and noted that Probation uses a three-level risk determination system. He mentioned that Probation's three-level system does not affect the treatment providers treatment intensity that would be based on the four-level risk factor system being introduced. Jesse Hansen indicated that the pilot program will help determine what treatment factors will be reducing recidivism.

Rachael Collie (DVOMB Statistical Analyst) indicated that the pilot will determine the distribution of the likelihood of recidivism by risk. She noted the need to gather the treatment data for a longer period from the DVRNA to capture the most accurate risk data available.

Erin Gazelka (DVOMB Member) noted that the addition of a fourth level will enhance the distinctions of risk.

Jeanette Barich (DVOMB Member) asked if there is there any additional information on Domain C (mental health), specifically C1 (diagnosis) and C2 (personality disorder.) She indicated that supervisors and clinicians more often use domain C1 for clients with depression or PTSD, and will not use C2 (personality traits) unless there is additional testing. Jeanette Barich asked if providers are asked to practice outside the scope of their profession when they are not able to assess for personality traits. She also asked for clarification of the use of the Danger Assessment.

Dr. Rachael Collie (DVOMB Statistical Analyst) noted that Domain C1 and C2 teases out the actuarial tools used in order to not discriminate for those who recidivated and those who did not. The data in C1 and C2 will better capture a mental health diagnosis versus a personality trait so the appropriate treatment can be given. Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Member) clarified that the C1 and C2 Domains will capture the data and can show that the treatment was reconciled.

Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) mentioned that the pilot is not set in stone, and will be given to those providers that are a part of the project to gather feedback and data to fine tune the tool. He mentioned that the dynamic portion of the instrument would not be scored by the Probation Department, but indicated that they would score the static portion..

Nil Buckley (DVOMB Member) expressed her appreciation of this danger assessment and suggested adding language that asks the victim to be willing to engage in the administration of this assessment. She also indicated that this may cause confusion with the victim advocates and will be an additional layer of work for the providers. Nil Buckley indicated that she will be willing to pilot test this danger assessment. Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) clarified the reason for using and testing this assessment.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky (ODVSOM Program Manager) responded that the DVRNA was designed to address recidivism, and noted that the Danger Assessment pilot project is geared toward the victims. He noted that typically a treatment provider would treat the offender according to the information received on the risk assessment, and the lethality or danger assessment information would be given to the victim advocates for their work with the victims. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that the pilot may determine what is lethality, what is recidivism, what is static risk, and what is dynamic risk, and to review and analyze the outcomes. He thanked Jesse Hansen and Rachael Alderete for this work, and indicated that no one in the country is doing anything like this pilot project. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky indicated that this danger assessment will drive changes to the DVRNA which will drive the objective risk assessment for all parties involved in a criminal case.

Jessica Fann (DVOMB Member) volunteered to be a part of the pilot project and thanked all involved in creating this.

Jeanette Barich (DVOMB Member) asked how the Adverse Childhood Experience (ACES) will be used, and if the providers have to report that information on this document in addition to all the other evaluations and assessments. Jesse Hansen responded that the document presented today, may not be what will actually be added to the DVRNA in the Standards. He indicated that the ACES data needs to be gathered now, to see if it corresponds directly with static and dynamic risk factors. He noted that if no practical data is gathered from the ACES, then it will not be added in the final iteration.

Karen Morgenthaler (DVOMB Member) commented that she agrees with Nil Buckley regarding the Danger Assessment and also volunteered to be a part of the pilot project.

Public Discussion:

None

Michelle Hunter (DVOMB Vice-Chair) asked if there was consensus to move forward with the Danger Assessment Pilot Project as presented. There was consensus from those in attendance.

Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) noted that an application for providers (team-based) to join the pilot project will be sent out soon.

APPENDIX 1 – TELETHERAPY REQUIREMENTS (Discussion): (No Attachment) – Lori Griffith (DVOMB Member

Lori Griffith (DVOMB Member) reviewed that based on feedback received, that Teletherapy is not working as well as anticipated. She asked that the Board revisit the Standards and Guidelines and revise the Teletherapy Standards as needed. Lori Griffith indicated that this modality has become the “norm” and not the exception to treatment. She noted that teletherapy hinders high-risk clients in that they are not receiving the face-to-face treatment that they need. Lori Griffith noted that in Section 7 – Monitoring Sobriety was supposed to be an incentive for clients, and now it is being used as a sanction. She suggested looking at monitoring sobriety based on the Multi-Treatment Team (MTT) or Sobriety assessments.

Board Discussion:

Erin Gazelka (DVOMB Member) noted that she agrees with Lori Griffith, she would not approve the teletherapy option to treatment. She noted that many providers are continuing to use teletherapy as the norm. Erin Gazelka noted that face-to-face therapy is the better modality, and indicated that clients complain to their supervising agency to get a waiver to use teletherapy providers when they don't want to go to face-to-face therapy.

Michelle Hunter (DVOMB Vice-Chair) expressed opposition to teletherapy.

Rachael Alderete (DVOMB Member) noted that there are similar concerns on the SOMB side, and asked if there is additional training needed or if a sub-committee needs to discuss this further.

Sandie Campanella (DVOMB Member) indicated a case where the offender was committing a crime while playing video games, while in teletherapy. She noted there are times when teletherapy is useful, but it does not protect the victims. It should be the exception and not the rule.

Carolina Frane (DVOMB Staff) responded to Raechel Alderete that Appendix I is written as guidance, so the decision is up to the MTT regarding teletherapy use. Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) noted that there is a statement in Section 5 of the Standards that the providers are to follow Appendix I regarding teletherapy.

Nil Buckley (DVOMB Member) agrees with Lori Griffith and Sandie Campanella, and noted that there are gray areas in the way the language is written in Section 5 and Appendix I. She noted that she has seen first-hand that this information is being violated. Nil Buckley indicated that teletherapy is not always giving the client the risk-needs-responsivity treatment that they may need.

Jeanette Barich (DVOMB Member) noted that treatment is a mess due to teletherapy, and that clients are treatment shopping for agencies that offer telehealth. She indicated that teletherapy is a privilege and should not be considered an expectation. Jeanette Barich indicated that providers and clients are feeling entitled to teletherapy.

Jessica Fann (DVOMB Member) noted that there could be stronger language, and she expressed concern with victim safety due to teletherapy. She indicated that telehealth groups were controlled better at the beginning than they are now. Jessica Fann indicated that strengthening the language and finding ways to monitor those in teletherapy is needed. She mentioned that in her agency there are individuals who police the teletherapy group sessions while the provider is running the group.

Raechel Alderete (DVOMB Member) indicated that there are a number of issues regarding teletherapy, such as weak language in the Standards, lack of training, and she questioned if there is possible data that supports or negates the use of teletherapy. Raechel Alderete noted the need to have the Standards not be too prescriptive that would deter from the individualized treatment protocol.

Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) indicated that the Standards Compliance Reviews will now incorporate the use of teletherapy in their review process. He noted that the reviews are correcting those who might be using this modality in a way that is not in compliance with the Standards. Jesse Hansen indicated that the Provider Data Management System does collect this information, and he indicated that they know which providers use teletherapy, which clients receive teletherapy, and which treatment groups are conducted via teletherapy. He indicated that the data will be used when working on revising the Standards.

Lori Griffith (DVOMB Member) noted the need to revise the Standards to be a little clearer, and indicated that the compliance reviews will help monitor the treatment providers in their usage.

Carolina Frane (DVOMB Implementation Specialist) noted that the DVOMB staff and ARC are aware of provider violations across all the Standards and address those the best way they can. She reiterated that the language in Appendix I is very loose and that it needs to be tightened up a bit.

Yuanting Zhang (DVOMB Statistical Analyst) noted that she has some data regarding the use of teletherapy which indicated that only 15% of client received individual therapy, with 44% using group teletherapy. She indicated that she can run the data by outcomes, but her instincts indicate that individual teletherapy is better and easier to manage than group teletherapy.

Public Discussion:

Sharon Griffin (Audience Member) indicated that there are fewer clinicians who want to work in person in all areas therapy.

Further Discussion:

None

Michelle Hunter (DVOMB Vice-Chair) asked if there is consensus to send this back to the Application Review for discussion. There was consensus from all DVOMB members present.

2024 DVOMB ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE REPORT (Review & Discussion): (No Attachment) – Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff)

Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) indicated that framework of the 2024 DVOMB Annual Legislative Report will be as follows:

- Section 1 – Literature Review on dynamic risk factors related to Domestic Violence, along with a write-up of the DVRNA evaluation and study. There will be a summary of the data from the PDMS for the period of January 2023 to July 2023.
- Section 2 – Policy Recommendations – Will discuss cannabis use implications as to how it impacts interpersonal violence. Will also highlight the 2020 Restorative Justice White Paper due to a couple of new articles that have come out.
- There may be a new Section related to the new Statute – waiting to hear back from the Attorney General's office.
- Work of the Board and Committees for the past year

Board Discussion:

Nicole Collins (DVOMB Member) noted the need to stay away from the cannabis issue as the Probation Department was advised that courts need to make a specific finding when prohibiting from using marijuana.

Erin Gazelka (DVOMB Member) noted that there is a Legislative Task Force looking at this issue regarding when cannabis use is appropriate. She noted the serious nexus between violence and high potency THC is very concerning. Erin Gazelka indicated that the DVOMB should highlight that concern in the Legislative Report. Jesse Hansen noted that the data pulled show that mixed or high-potency THC causes a high likelihood of violence.

Dr. Rachael Collie (DVOMB Statistical Analyst) noted that Section 2 is a great place to put the cannabis information or data in the Legislative Report.

Jesse Hansen (DVOMB Staff) noted cannabis data will be mentioned to inform the Legislature that this is happening.

Public Discussion:

None

Further Discussion:

None

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:25 pm

Respectfully submitted by,

VOTES

Question #1

MOTION TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER MINUTES AS AMENDED

The motion passed with 12 votes to approve the September 2023 meeting minutes, 0 votes to object, and 3 votes to abstain.

| Responses | | |
|-----------|--------|----|
| Percent | Count | |
| Yes | 80.00% | 12 |
| No | 0.00% | 0 |
| Abstain | 20.00% | 3 |
| Totals | 100% | 15 |

APPROVED