

**Batterer Intervention Program  
Advisory Committee  
October 3, 2011      10:00-12:00  
Civil Enforcement – Vista 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room**

**Members in Attendance:** Cynthia Stinson, Walt Pesterfield, Vivien Bliss, Steve Berger, Hardy Myers, Jayne Downing, Chris Huffine, Michael Davis, Priscilla Marlowe

**Members by Phone:** Eric Mankowski, Becky Orf

**Guests:** Ashley Boal (PSU), Stacey Ayers (DHS)

**Welcome & Self Introductions**

- Welcome from Cynthia, brief overview of today's agenda items.
- Rule language has been sent to legal counsel for review; will send over final language after today's meeting.
- Stacey Ayers from DHS will be joining the Advisory Committee.

**PSU BIP Project – Ashley Boal & Eric Mankowski (survey handout)**

- Eric gave background information on the research proposal. The original survey was designed 10 years ago and has been repeated 3 times (last survey was in 2008). The surveys were used to develop a directory of BIPs and to help implement OARs. Previous surveys indicated a lack of adherence to the rules. A new survey is needed to update the BIP directory and to discover the reasons for lack of adherence.
- Ashley: The 2008 survey focused on the practices and services of Oregon BIPs. The new survey will deliver more in depth information in two phases:
  - 1) We will gain characteristics of BIPS in relation to the standards; there are less open ended questions, clarified wording and it's easier to maneuver through.
  - 2) A subset of programs will be contacted for a more in-depth phone interview to discuss any issues they have in complying with the standards, areas of discrepancy, difficulties in compliance, etc.
- Cynthia asked the committee for approval to move forward with the survey in partnership with PSU. No objections.

**Discussion/Edits to New Survey:**

- Q1: Could a third option be added: "I would be interested in an interview instead of a survey." There was concern that each BIP isn't being offered an interview, and also that some might rather have an interview than complete a survey.
- Q3: Some BIPs have more than one location and/or work in more than one county. There was discussion regarding how in-depth the survey should be if a BIP has multiple locations and/or provides group sessions in multiple counties. A decision was made to keep the question simple. Example: Do you serve groups in multiples counties; how many and which ones? From there more specific questions could be asked in an interview.
- Q16: It would be hard to answer based on the choices given.
- Q18: Make another box for child welfare.
- Q20: Some BIPs use goals (not a specific number of weeks) to determine when someone completes the program. Use Minimum Completion language instead.
- Q25: Discussion whether to take out "after intake" language. The concern is that a lot of people come for intake and then never return. After talking about other options the decision was made to leave as is.

- Q35: Not clear if survey is asking for specific victim advocacy training or just training by a victim advocacy program. Need to clarify that it is specific victim advocacy training.
- Q36 & 38: Divide out Resource Centers/VA/Shelter training.
- Q36 & 38: Some of these are not “correct” answers (Emerge, Duluth, Local BIP training) and shouldn’t be mentioned specifically. Change language to capture these answers without actually stating the names. Example: “In-state training by an out of state provider”, etc.
- Q43-46: Should be contact with a non-profit program (not victim advocacy program).
- Q49 & 50: What does liaison mean? Some might think this means any kind of contact, not just in-person contact.
  - ▶ Change language: “Does your program have a person **who is designated to act** as a liaison...”
  - ▶ Add question (new Q50) asking what activities their liaison is engaged in, with check boxes to choose from.
  - ▶ Current Q50 becomes Q51.
- Add Q: Please list the other BIPs in your county.

### Survey Conclusion:

- Ashley hopes to send out the survey November 1<sup>st</sup> (she is currently waiting for approval from the ethics group).
- The survey will be open from November 1<sup>st</sup> to December 7<sup>th</sup>.
- Phone interviews will start in 2012 after looking through the survey data.
- Please e-mail any further questions/suggestions to Ashley at [aboal@pdx.edu](mailto:aboal@pdx.edu).
- Please look over the cover letter that accompanies the survey and e-mail Ashley with any concerns.

### Finalization of Draft Rules:

#### Section 137-085-0065: Length of Intervention

- (5)(a) Number of sessions
  - ▶ BIPs have no way of knowing if a participant is compliant and cannot report on participant risk. Change final sentence to read:
 

“...At a minimum the report should address, and the recommendation be based upon: compliance with all program requirements, **reporting any known violations of** court orders and conditions, identification of risk factors...”
  - ▶ Add language that this report is in addition to any required monthly reports.

**NOTE:** Need to add language regarding monthly reports (before the 32-36 session report).

Change 137-087-0030 Interface Standards (2)(e): **“Submit monthly status reports to the LSA or MA about participant attendance, content of participation, any known violations of court orders, any known changes in risk factors since intake, and program exit summary.”**

Cross reference 137-087-0060 Admission Policies and Procedures (2)(c)(A)(B)(C) (page 18).

- (5)(b): Discussion regarding “as approved by the LSA” language at the end of the paragraph, and whether or not to keep or delete. Final decision to keep language since deleting would give the BIP authority to extend sessions, which they don’t have.
- (5)(d): “If the participant, as determined above, continues in the program after completion of 36 sessions, the BIP is encouraged to provide an updated **summary** report to the appropriate authority after completion of each addition 18 sessions. **Monthly status reports should continue to be submitted.**”
- Use “summary” report language throughout this section.

**Administrative Rule Process/Timeline:**

- Cynthia gave rule timelines for both December 30<sup>th</sup> and January 31<sup>st</sup> effective dates.
- Concern was raised about trying to hold hearings during the holidays, and also the lack of time for the committee to get feedback from constituents in order to meet a December deadline.
- The decision was made to move forward with the January 31<sup>st</sup> effective date.
- The committee will keep November 1<sup>st</sup> as the deadline for final language so there is plenty of time to discuss with community partners.

**Other Rule Change:**

- Language needs to be added that current participants are not subject to the new changes in the rules. A “starting date” needs to be added for when participants will be subject to the changes. Cynthia will work on this and e-mail the committee with tentative language.