

**Batterer Intervention Program Standards**  
**Advisory Committee**  
**May 5, 2014 9:00 am-11:00 am**  
**CVSD Training Room**  
**APPROVED**

**Present:** Steve Berger, Audrey Broyles, Don Chapin, Jayne Downing, Dr. Chris Huffine, Hardy Myers, Shannon Sivell

**By Phone:** Vivien Bliss, Eric Mankowski

**CVSD Staff:** Roz Finrock

**Introductions** – The AC members did self-introductions.

**Moving Forward** –The group reconvened after a break of almost two years (July 2012). Shannon would like to focus on smaller, attainable goals rather than the larger goals the group had looked at in 2012. Where this group can be of assistance to the community:

- Template assessment tool for local agencies to utilize in evaluating their program(s)
- Review/recommend demonstration projects
- Improve training/communication with local programs and agencies
- Field questions/complaints from local agencies
- Point of contact for public inquiry

The group decided to meet more frequently to discuss adoption of forms and policies being used in different areas of the state.

**Assessment Tool** – Chris distributed copies of the “BIP Summary Report” form created by agencies in the Portland Metro area, after the latest revisions of the Rules in 2012. Chris was interested in comments regarding the form.

- Don was concerned regarding representation of programs involved in creation of the form. He feels it is harder to get buy-in on something once it is already created than input prior to it being finalized.
- Steve advised that the form was introduced to the Oregon Association of Community Corrections Directors (OACCD) and has since been adopted statewide. OACCD has representation from all 36 counties.
- Chris clarified that when the form was created, it was not with the intent for its use to be mandatory statewide, rather as a resource so programs don't have to start from scratch. The form can be modified for each jurisdiction, such as the number of weeks to be completed.
- Audrey did not think a specific form needed to be mandated. For court cases in Marion Co they are given information at the review hearing and then a more lengthy report. That has been working well.
- The suggestion was made to distribute the form widely, state that it is not mandatory but a place where programs can start if they are looking for guidance on creating something.
  - Post it on the DOJ website and/or email it to DV service providers and BIP providers.

There is currently not a list serve of BIP providers; however about a year ago PSU tried to create one when they updated the BIP Program Directory. Shannon asked Eric to forward it to her and Roz so that DOJ could create and maintain a BIP list serve.

**BIP Compliance Form** – Another item the AC wanted to accomplish was to create a form to determine if a BIP was in compliance. Laura Ritchie, (Multnomah County) created one. Chris will forward to Shannon for discussion at the next meeting. There is some confusion regarding whether BIPs are evidence based and compliant at the local or state level.

Department of Corrections has been approaching the evidence based issue on a dual track model while most organizations do it simultaneously. Corrections uses the Correctional Program Checklist (CPC) which lists components that an evidence based program will have – not just DV programs. Sometimes it is not appropriate for batterers because they have committed misdemeanors.

**Demonstration Projects:**

Eric received a call from a program last fall to see if he would be able to review a demonstration project. According to the Rules, the AC is tasked with the authority to review and approve demonstration projects.

There was mention by members that there are a number of programs starting couples programs, Don said in Lincoln Co programs are even running couples programs when there is a no contact order in place. There was small discussion around if there was evidence that batterer intervention worked and if it worked for all batterers.

Approval of Demonstration Projects will be added to the agenda for the next meeting. We will also discuss what a review or evaluation process should look like.

**Becky's recap of Washington State Institute for Public Policy "What Works to Reduce Recidivism by Domestic Violence Offenders?"** – The 2012 WA State Legislature directed the Institute to update its review on national and international literature on the effectiveness of DV treatment programs. They had previously found that treatment had little or no significant impact on repeat DV recidivism. The Institute identified and tested 11 rigorous evaluations, none in WA, on if there was a cause-and-effect relationship between DV treatment and DV recidivism. Six of the evaluations were done with Duluth model treatments. There was no effect found on DV recidivism with the Duluth model.

The other five non-Duluth model treatment programs showed a reduction by 33% in recidivism. However the treatments were so varied in their approaches that the Institute could not identify a group-based treatment that met WA's requirements.

Eric commented that the study was inadequate. It used techniques that are antiquated and not widely used. He disagrees with the results and tried reaching out to the Institute to see if they would broaden their scope of research. Edward Gondolf also disagrees and his responses were made available to the researchers. This article is only a small portion of the work that has been done on DV recidivism.

Becky wonders if the AC should think about doing a day conference to address general questions from judges, providers, anyone else who reads these types of studies and take them for fact without doing more research. There was agreement that more education is needed on the subject. Comments were made regarding the WA article speaking about the Duluth model but not talking about the curriculum. Most research articles talk about the model but not the curriculum. The model and the curriculum are two separate things. A coordinated community response is important.

### **Trends:**

Some conversation regarding concerns that BIPs may lose credibility if everyone is sent to them even though there is evidence to show that treatment does not work for a segment of the population. It would be better to differentiate the batterers and show different options for those where batterer intervention treatment would not work. Steve and Eric shared some information from Gondolf presentations – post 3 years is when most decrease in violence is seen, 50% decrease in recidivism even taking into account things like alcoholism and mental illness. While one size does not fit all, one size fits most.

Edward W Gondolf's Books: Batterer Intervention Systems: Issues, Outcomes, and Recommendations & The Future of Batterer Programs: Reassessing Evidence-Based Practice

Most providers are not getting trained; Allies in Change offers two trainings a year but only has 3-4 people attend from outside the metro area. It is believed that most providers are not meeting the training criteria. What is the state of training providers around the state? Are probation officers doing assessments? Corrections uses the ODARA (Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment) and public safety check list, LS/CMI (Level of Service/Case Management Inventory). ODARA standards are identified statewide but a lot of DV crimes are misdemeanor. Many counties end up cutting services for misdemeanors due to funding so the assessments tools may not get done either.

Funding is an issue for most programs and providers. Providers are not practicing batterer intervention for the money; they are doing it out of the goodness of their heart. A conference would go a long way here as well too.

Nationally the trend has been for states to move away from batterer intervention. Some counties in WA have already done so.

### **Approving Programs:**

Becky is aware of two counties in Oregon where probation approves the BIP while some are enforced by the DV Counsel. It might be a good idea to see how each county is doing their approvals. AC members know that the following counties have DV Counsel involvement: Clackamas, Deschutes, Jackson, Lane, Lincoln (DV, DA & Judge), and Marion. At on2122221e point all of the DV counsels were called to determine if they were involved in approving BIPs. A map was created with this information but things may have changed since then.

**Structure of the AC** –Shannon asked for recommendations of those who may be interested in joining the committee.

**Recommendations –**

DHS – Cheryl O’Neal (already on other CVSD AC)

Native American Tribe – Desiree Coyote, Umatilla (already on other CVSD AC)  
Someone from Warm Springs

Rural County representation –

OACCD – Chris Hoy, President of OACCD

DOC – Jeremiah Stromberg, DOC Assistant Director for Community Corrections

**Chair or Co-Chair:**

Shannon offered up the opportunity for another member to chair the committee. No one immediately accepted so Shannon stated that she could stay on as chair to basically facilitate meetings but acknowledged she did not have expertise in the subject matter and would like a co-chair.

Eric was nominated & seconded as a co-chair. He will talk with Shannon regarding the specifics of the role before making his final decision.

Mention was made about the Governor’s DV Counsel not coming into fruition at this time. The AC would like to make the Counsel aware of the AC so any concerns and recommendations regarding perpetrators came to the AC for review.

Hardy would like the AC to find out what is happening around the state with regard to: referrals, enforcement, etc. We will get some idea once when we know which of the DV Counsels are involved. This will also give newer members some historical perspective.

**Next Meeting:**

The group will meet in the next 6 weeks and then 6 weeks after (evaluate after June meeting.)  
Send materials no more than a week in advance.

**Agenda**

- Members discuss processes in their line of work
- Program evaluation tool
- DV Counsel tool – BIP compliance form/tool
- Create Demonstration Project evaluation/approval tool
- What is going on in the state/nationwide? How do we communicate things with partners – 1 hour

**Next Steps:**

Provide dates/times for meeting

Create a list serve of BIP Providers

Advise providers AC has begun meeting again and ask if they have questions they would like AC to address

Update BIP website page to include the BIP Summary Report