



**Batterer Intervention Program Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
April 24, 2026; 9:00 am to 11:05 am
Remote video meeting**

In Attendance: Carrissa Bessich, Sarah Greenwood, Jon Hansen, Mikisha Hooper, Jen Hopkinson, Scott Hyde, Kim Kennedy (*for Shannon Sivell*), Maureen Lowell, Eric Mankowski, Hilary Levine (*for Keri Moran-Kuhn*), Jesus Rome

Guest: Elle Biesemeyer (Oregon Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence Policy Intern)

Absent: Amy Benedum, Vivien Bliss, Chris Huffine

Minutes: Sherree Rodriguez

Welcome/Opening - Eric Mankowski opened the Advisory Committee (AC) meeting. The group introduced themselves, welcoming new members Carrissa Bessich and Jesus Rome.

Minutes – AC members approved the minutes for January 23, 2026.

Division 87 Standard Review

The group discussion centered on which Batterer Intervention Program (BIP) Oregon Administrative Rule standards may be aspirational vs. those achievable for providers. The intent was to identify areas of conflict and potential solutions to the conflict. An artificial intelligence summary of the standards with this question is shown below, provided by Jon Hansen. The group discussion started from this point.

Aspirational (ideal but often resource-dependent)

- Full community-coordinated response
- Co-facilitation model
- Culturally specific services and diverse workforce
- Extensive facilitator training hours
- Comprehensive cultural resource libraries
- Post-release services at little or no cost
- Deep community engagement, councils, ongoing cross-training
- Preventing all forms of facilitator/system collusion

Achievable (operational, measurable)

- Orientation, intake, documentation systems
- Written policies (confidentiality, attendance, fees, conduct)
- Session structure requirements
- Reporting requirements to Local Supervisory Authorities (LSA) and courts
- Accountability Plans
- Clear termination/release criteria
- Staff ethics and safety policies
- Background checks



Tentative Agreement was expressed on the following items:

Aspirational

Male/female teams for providers

Training hour requirements need to be pared down or re-worded; distinguishing levels of training might be helpful.

Coordination is too broadly defined, particularly related to a coordinating council and reporting to that council.

Achievable and necessary:

Safety and privacy for victims

A summary of core standards

Other areas discussed, but not agreed upon, include:

- What constitutes aspirational, especially considering the lack of enforcement authority of the group
- Use of “encourage” or “shall” to define the delineators
- The expectation of coordination between BIPs and survivor advocacy groups, possibly with a memorandum of understanding and/or a liaison between the two. Any expectations should be explicit.
- Remove standards that have no follow up built in.
- Multi-disciplinary teams for BIPs could be created.
- *Training related:*
40-hour training for providers during the first year, for one facilitator in an organization could be required; other training could be phased in. The two-year option for facilitators in training is not working well. Retain in standards what training is intended to accomplish. Training should be able to measure risk and dosage. Class size should not be predetermined. Culturally appropriate aspects should be incorporated into initial training.
- Possibility of advocating for LSA’s to provide some aspirational resources.
- A library is an excessive expectation.

ACTION STEPS

- Sherree will work with Eric to summarize the minutes.
- Chris, Jon and Scott will draft a one-page demonstration project proposal for July.
Maureen requested to be included in email conversation with the group.

Future meeting agenda items

BIP standards revision and demonstration project proposal - July

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 am.

Scheduled meetings: July 24, October 23