

Batterer Intervention Program
Advisory Committee
September 3, 2010

Jane, Don, Chiquita, Walt, Steve, Chris, Mark, Cynthia, Michael, Eric, Ashley, Priscilla, Hardy, Audrey, Roz. Phone: Vivian, Becky.

Agenda:

- Near final version of BIP Rules reviewed
- Eric & Ashley BIP Survey results
- Finalize Rules

Goal is to sign off of blue changes which were made by Sub since AC last met in April.

Approved changed in Definitions (4) & (6) corrected Statute in (6)

Changed (8) to match Statute

Separate (g) into (2), look back at original rules

(3) Chiquita has issue with “provide intervention” since intervention is in name. Do we need a definition of intervention? Jayne liked it as is. Rest of group was fine leaving it.

(12) See also notes from Becky Orf, definition of protection order from VAWA. She gave whole order but we may only need first part (see Cynthia’s note on written copy). Becky proposes using VAWA definition in (12) instead of what is listed. Don asked if we wanted to include anything about no intimate relationships “including orders from DOC”. Could just say advisory authority. Right now just defining an order, may have to include those conditions somewhere else. Cynthia suggested parking it and seeing how we are using Protection Order through the rest of the rules to see if we need to add LSA or MA to this definition.

Propose to make a reference that this is an order to address (ones listed in order) but not limited to... AC trusted Sub or Cynthia to add this order to rules.

(11) Becky - “Partner” seems we are intentionally ignoring male who battered woman who is now with male intimate partner. Realize not doing same sex batterers, but protections later in rules that bother her. Does it muddy waters if we change to person. If we now know in same sex situation, puts them in same sex program even if original batterer was woman. Scenario is so rare, not worth addressing at this time. Does it harm definition if change to person? Adding person maybe more inclusive.

**Need to address changes where say “she”.

Safety planning FAQ

Treatment of Information – AC ok with language after take out of duplication of wording

Work cooperatively – AC ok with change

(7) periodic review request – requesting instead of filling out RFA, any liability could trickle down to - needs to be clear liability language, thinks makes this fuzzy. We can't make the LSA or MA review them but we do have control over programs so this way providers are at least making themselves available. A BIP must also fully cooperate with this review.

See Cynthia's email: Original thought –

New thought – After intake participants shall be involved in the program for sufficient length of time to “provide the maximum opportunity for victim safety and change in participant behavior, usually a minimum of 36-48 weeks”.

Maybe change to change in batterer behavior instead of maximize victim safety. Heard because program is so long, will not order person into it and don't feel person needs that long of intervention.

Michael agrees with trying to decide on victim safety but also knows has to be specific with batterer with what is required for success regarding change. Still somewhat subjective which is hard but at same time “meeting programs standards...” Agreeing with Jane about “usually”. We started in this group with 52 weeks and have now gone down to 48. Leaving length in hands of BIP is leaving us open. Would like to see in rules about ending violent/abusive behavior. Changed attitudes/beliefs. Instead of weeks, why not hours – agrees with Chris that there needs to be a minimum. Some intensive programs have met 3 times a week, so if some what to get done sooner they could.

Steve – looking at challenge between holding offenders – if they are making progress in treatment and victim states “I will never feel safe unless the victim is in treatment.” There is a way of wordsmith to say enhancing victim safety. Sex offense is not time based. Challenge is when focused on a specific crime. By removing the rub (# of weeks) thinks might be getting more compliance with judges.

Jane – say focus is victim safety. Jane is uncomfortable with the range thinking programs already doing 48 weeks will start doing less when they are having success. She wishes we could base it on individualism, but we don't have most of our BIPs at the point they can establish that. Leaving it at 48 weeks until programs can decide or what the week number the AC decides on but she has a problem with the “usually”.

Chris – bumping into a lot of ignorance in DV, long-term of behavior that has been going on for years so thought that can send them to something short-term to fix it. We need an education piece for judges about length of intervention. DV is not taken as seriously as other offenses like sex offenses. Should be trying to say that we want programs to be goal based but we need to set bare minimum (# weeks can cover weeks of or you look for program shopping. **Put evaluations on agenda – at least offer FAQs about them. Risk

does not equal length. How do you do individualized treatment plans? Court does not buy that a guy is a perpetrator. How do we determine if a batterer is a perpetrator?

Cynthia – if don't put a time limit on it, people who don't know about DV are going to order what they think is right – only you are a “good” person and only hit her once, how about 12 weeks. Was trying to unlock the 48 weeks.

Don – does not feel it is enough to say victim safety and changed in participant behavior – often they see a change in the way they are victimizing their partner, not hitting her but controlling her through finances, etc. Amount of information in document cannot be provided in 12 weeks. Make it about the material we are trying to provide, not about the weeks.

Audrey – We have to find what is reasonable. You have to consider what reality is. What is the point of setting standards that no one is going to follow? If judge does not want a 48 week program, they are just going to send them to a 12 week Anger Management instead. Independent person in Marion Co are making judgments on length of intervention, not the judge. Would also agree with Jane about the range of weeks. Why not have a number or say at the discretion of the BIP. Thinks judges would go for that and if BIPs are holding them longer then a review of BIP would be necessary.

Hardy – going back to pg 1 (a)(b) – incorporate into length or intervention about what we are trying to achieve. Take out quality of opportunity, incorporate language of (a)(b), go on to say completion of the curriculum required by these rules which is ...will usually require at least.

Chiquita – get pushback about shortening, not lengthening. At least in Mult Co, BIPs are not able to make the determination when the batterer has made a change in behavior.

Eric wanted to know: Is it ok to disseminate the survey report to those programs and those who ask for it? Jane would like for it to go to victim advocacy programs. Eric does not have a concern about the report being put on the web. Unless anyone objects, Cynthia recommends posting it on the DOJ BIP page and Jane recommends sending it to listservs that include victim advocacy programs. Eric will make the addition in the comments that all of this is great, but can only be accomplished with funding.

Reviewed Cynthia's rewrite, Chiquita thought completion time should be stronger – noodled with it as a committee. Want judge to extend on the word of the BIP, not just # of weeks.

Audrey thinks more buy in when say minimum of 36 weeks.

Propose meeting date for Oct. Cynthia asked members to sit with language; are we really focused on # of group sessions or participant's behavior. Chiquita would go for a range if it was 36-120. Jane wanted to know if we could get some feedback from judges to see if

they would work with BIPs more. Becky was will to do one. Becky, Audrey, Chiquita, Jane & Eric will work on survey monkey.

Hardy: Also review pg 23 – MA length is shorter than the BIP program. May want to make a more robust notice and just a statement.