

**BIP Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**April 9, 2010**  
**CVSD Conference Room**  
**10:00-1:00**

**Members Present:** Cynthia Stinson, Hardy Myers, Jayne Downing, Carol Krager, Eric Mankowski, Chris Huffine, Steve Berger, Walt Pesterfield, Michael Davis

**By Phone:** Vivien Bliss, Becky Orf, Chiquita Rollins

**Guests:** Susan Ranger

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes from January 20, 2010 were approved by the AC with no changes.

**Review of Rule Changes:**

Section 137-087-0000

In the first paragraph, line 5 add “or recommendations”. We will likely end up with recommendations for same sex/female batterers instead of completely separate rules. With no objection from the AC, the change was accepted.

Section (h) was added and what existed was re-lettered and moved down. There were no concerns with the addition from the AC.

Section 137-087-0005

Added definition of Demonstration Project. As rules subcommittee made way through remainder of document it was clear Demonstration Project needed to be defined. There was a question raised whether a group within a larger BIP needed to be defined as a demonstration project. Definition was modified and added/modified accepted by AC.

Modified definition of Mandating Authority. Subcommittee took out DA and added “DHS”. Should we be specific to Child Welfare within DHS? There are groups with DHS that are not mandating authority. All mandates in the past have been through Child Welfare. For clarification definition states “DHS Child Welfare”.

Section 137-087-0015

1(E) “safety planning” was added. Would there be questions by a BIP about how much safety planning they should do with a victim? We could also do a FAQ for BIPs regarding what we mean by safety planning and tools.

2(I) had a weak encouragement to address safety planning with victims but the subcommittee felt this was different than what they added in 1(E). 1(E) was intended to give some information to the victim but acknowledge that the programs are not victim information providers so would not be seen as the expert in safety planning.

Members of the AC said they would like safety planning information to be developed in conjunction with a VAP. They suggested that the information given to victims be in regard to *development* of a safety plan. Everyone was in agreement that safety planning was important and should be done in conjunction with a VAP. Language was slightly reworded.

Safety planning has a component of a safe address where a provider can contact the victim or for mailing purposes. Section 2(a) that states “A BIP shall prepare and distribute to victims and partners when possible...” concerned a few AC members that the partner (abuser) would have access to the victims’ address. Cynthia stated she would like to take this back to subcommittee and look at specific references so we are sure we have consistency.

#### Section 137-087-0025

In 1(d), took out the word “address” and inserted “discuss” – change approved by AC.

#### Section 137-087-0050

1(g) & 1(h) discusses responsibilities as a mother but not as a father. Subcommittee added a new 1(i) to address responsibilities as a father. Existing text was re-lettered and moved down.

Intake procedures need to have stronger language about what shall be required.

Reword (c)

Subcommittee looking at information victim safety data requested by someone outside of the BIP – collecting data that does not compromise the victims’ safety.

#### Section 137-087-0065

In the edits that came from Hardy, AC member recommended deleting “participation” from end of edits for sentence to make sense. Change approved by AC.

#### Section 137-087-0070

In 2(b), deleted “participation” from end of edits to be consistent with change in 0065 approved by AC.

(7) Leaves of Absences - add “specifically time limited”.

Is there a short time such as two weeks that there does not need to be approval? Chris proposes longer than two weeks, easy to skip one group (meeting every 2 weeks). Importance of the language is that there is mutual knowledge/consent of the absence so there is not a risk issue. If the MA is the court, they don’t always get back to the programs in a timely manner. Members of the AC felt they could use the default answer for those court ordered, absence approved if don’t hear back from them. Cynthia wants to bring this back to the subcommittee as well. There is some strong communication that needs to be communicated with the MA. It was suggested that anything less than two weeks the BIP could have authority to approve. Becky does not want to place burden on

the court. There needs to be consultation on agreed upon procedures due to how things are handled in various areas.

#### Section 137-087-0080

In 2(a) should we include Elder Abuse information? And disabilities? Carol will forward language on Elder Abuse from Senior & People with Disabilities. Add EPDAPA Notification? When says by juvenile court, should it be made more general to say by a court? If so, 2(b) would need to be updated as well.

What is meant in 2(d) by “good standing”? Based on historical notes we were not able to determine during this meeting. Cynthia decided further discussion was needed within the subcommittee. Members of the AC suggested that the subcommittee may want to consider language that states if there is ever a conflict between the facilitator and MA, the conflict does not preclude services being offered to batterers.

In the section speaking to 40 hours of training for facilitators, Jayne would like the group to consider that some part of that training be provided by the non-governmental agency in the area so the connection is made with between the two agencies. In the Marion Co model, it is listed that half of the training would be done by a local program if possible.

Roz will schedule another Rules Sub meeting so they can finish going through the remaining sections of the Rules to bring back to the AC at the next full AC meeting.

#### **Fatality Review:**

Carol passed out statutes allowing Domestic Violence Fatality Review Teams; ORS 418.712, 418.714, 418.718. Chiquita stated that she does not know of any counties that are proactively doing reviews under the law after each DV case. The law does require a review with a “shall”, is states “may.” Clackamas is looking strongly at implementing the law after every DV case. The law does expand what kind of information can come into the review. Steve asked if there was a contact from Mult Co that would be willing to present to the Criminal Justice Commission & Community Corrections Directors. Chiquita is that contact and Cynthia committed to putting her on the BIP AC agenda for the fall quarter as well as a presentation by DHS to hear how they do their review. Carol added that a BIP can be involved in the DHS DV review if it is relevant to the case.