

**Batterer Intervention Program Standards
Advisory Committee
September 25, 2014 9:00 am-12:00 pm
DOJ Civil Enforcement 2nd Floor Conference Rm, Vista Building**

Present: Don Chapin, Chris Hoy, Eric Mankowski, Shannon Sivell

By Phone and/or Video Conference: Vivien Bliss, Priscilla Marlowe, Becky Orf

CVSD Staff: Roz Finfrock

Approval of June 26, 2014 minutes – Correct last name of Kimberly Dailey – missing “e”; then approved as final.

Approval of August 13, 2014 minutes – Correct Kimberly Dailey’s last name – missing “e”; then approved as final.

Eric asked that the final minutes then be posted on the DOJ CVSD BIP website page. Roz will be working on getting all of the final minutes from 2014 and next meeting dates on the website in the next couple of days.

Demonstration Projects:

- a) Discussion of projects presented at August 13, 2014 meeting:
It was decided that the Advisory Council (AC) would review Allies in Change and Crossroads once protocols were developed so they are reviewed against the same criteria as all other program demonstration projects.

Questions were raised regarding Demonstration Projects that the AC reviews.

What is going to happen after we develop protocols?

Will they continue as a Demonstration Project?

Do they have to come back?

What about programs that do not qualify?

If we can continue to build on developing protocols, at minimum we can inform the Local Supervisory Authorities (LSA), who are interested in what the local programs are doing. A possible policy is to send a letter to the program notifying them of their status and sending a copy of this letter to the LSA.

Shannon received a letter from the Multnomah County Family Violence Coordinating Council. She will share it with the AC, and call the Director to set up a meeting which any AC member can attend.

- b) Development of protocol for reviewing demonstration projects.
Identify points where the project aligns and departs from the Standards.
Have the program report where they do/don’t align with standards.

Shannon suggested making a two-sided form comprised of the five or so Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) statements we are looking for so members can easily take notes during the presentation.

Address these questions on the form.

What tools are used to determine the participants of this project versus participants in standard/typical classes?

How do you intend to measure outcomes of the project?

What tools are you using to evaluate those outcomes?

The term “independent” used in the evaluation, refers to an objective outside evaluator.

Shannon & Roz will create a form to that aligns with the OARs – possibly include the additional questions above.

- c) Scheduling Yamhill Co program –Dr. Patricia Warford was not able to attend today’s meeting. The AC will propose two possible meeting dates for her presentation. Dr. Warford operates a BIP program in Yamhill Co. She initially approached Eric about a year ago to ask about the process of Demonstration Project review. She has been in contact since the AC has reconvened. Eric believes she was contacted by a researcher in Texas.

There was a brief discussion of documents submitted by Dr. Warford. Questions were raised regarding couples counseling compliance with court no contact orders, and how “situational” violence is evaluated. These questions were tabled until additional materials are submitted and an official presentation is made. Questions can be asked at the presentation if they are not addressed during the actual presentation. The chairs reminded the group not to discuss the proposed program or form any opinions in advance of the presentation (hopefully to be scheduled for January).

Committee Membership Expansion:

- a) Rural Advocate and Provider – maybe a provider from Pendleton or Klamath, contact from BIP Directory. *Chris Hoy* will reach out to the Community Corrections Directors for program contacts. There was discussion of the possibility of working with courts for use of polycom.
- b) Grande Ronde Advocate – *Shannon* will speak with Michele from the ORSATF regarding Warm Springs as well.
- c) DHS – no updates
- d) OJD – additional representation will not be pursued at this time, current representation from Becky & Audrey is adequate
- e) Results from DOC LSA survey – not available yet
- f) What about a Prosecutor or Deputy DA? A Defense Attorney? Becky has someone she is willing to contact – there was no objection from those present.

Discuss criteria for programs wanting to become a BIP – tabled until next meeting.

Chris Hoy believes the Clackamas Co evaluation tool got final approval and he will distribute materials to the AC for their review.

How to start a BIP – give OARs as a template

Update website. Include copy of the DP Evaluation Form; come back to this around the first of the year.

Discuss making BIP Rules enforceable – This will not be an agenda item for DOJ in 2015. AC would like to see a process by which judges can ensure the right offenders are routed to BIPs. There is need to work on bringing programs into compliance with OARs in general. There is concern that bad intervention is worse than no intervention, however (Chris Hoy) for risk management would rather have someone in a program vs no program.

Next Meeting – will schedule about 6 weeks out and 12 weeks out

Suggested agenda items for upcoming meetings

- Finalize DP Review Form

- Evaluation process

- Review of website – can we use “go to meeting with polycom?”

- Build relationships with LSA, Courts, Probation and Parole

Parking Lot Items:

Expanding BIP OARs – Women Who Use Force

Shannon said that at times we get stuck around “Does Batterer Intervention work?” Regardless of how each of us feels about that question, the AC is charged with making it work the best it can. It would be completely valid in the future to have a subcommittee to research/study the question.