

SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD (SOMB) MINUTES

Friday, May 19, 2017

SOMB Members

Visitors

Allison Boyd
Amy Fitch
Angel Weant
Brie Franklin
Carl Blake
Jeff Jenks
Jeff Shay
Jessica Curtis
Jessica Meza
John Odenheimer
Kandy Moore
Kim English
Leonard Woodson III
Marcello Kopcow
Mary Baydarian
Missy Gursky
Norma Aguilar-Dave
Richard Bednarski
Rick May
Tom Leversee

Abbey Grant	Jo Stack
Adrienne Nuanes	Joe Thome
Bobbi Ponis	Karmen Carter
Brian Turk	Kimberly Howard
Brittany Freeman	Kimberly Kline
Carolina Thomasson	Lauren Rivas
Cathy Rodriguez	Lisa Nelson
Christen Jamsa	Natasha Kindred
Colton McNutt	Nicole Leon
David Nahum	Pat Harris
DeAnn Major	Patrick Duran
Dena McClung	Phillippe Marquis
Francisco Hinojosa	Rick Ostring
Gale Page	Roger Kincade
Gary Reser	Sera Bennett
Jalice Vigil	Susan Stewart
Jeff Geist	Susan Walker
Jesse Hansen	Tony Kovalski
Jim Lanum	Valerie Estrada
	Wellesley Bush

Absent SOMB Members: Alli Watt, Kandy Moore, Korey Elger, and Merve Davies

Staff:

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky	Raechel Alderete	Michelle Geng
Kelli Reynolds	Marina Borysov	Jill Trowbridge

SOMB Meeting Begins: 9:08

INTRODUCTIONS:

Introductions were made by all Sex Offender Management Board (SOMB) members and visitors present.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

Angel Weant offered the Denver Adult Probation to give a presentation to the SOMB in October with respect to specific populations and family engagement.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Carl Blake announced that there will be changes to Section 4.000 in the Juvenile and Adult Standards that will mirror the DORA changes regarding licensing classifications.

Leonard Woodson mentioned that the Department of Corrections (DOC) hosted its 2nd annual Community Advocate meeting specifically associated with sex offenders, and noted this is a great place to meet with directors and program supervisors. He indicated he will inform the SOMB when the next meeting will be. Lenny also announced that Michael Dunlap will be retiring from the DOC at the end of May.

Tom Leversee mentioned that the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers (ATSA) has released new practice guidelines for the assessment, treatment, and intervention of adolescents who engage in sexually abusive behavior.

Raechel Alderete discussed that the technical difficulties in registering for the SOMB conference and trainings have been corrected, but noted that manual registration is still an option. She also asked SOMB members and stakeholders to think about recipients for the various awards to be presented at the conference, and mentioned the deadline for nomination submissions is June 2nd.

Marina Borysov mentioned that sponsorship opportunities are available for the conference to include items for attendee bags, assistance with program printing, sponsorships, and noted that vendor tables are still available.

Marina Borysov also mentioned to please RSVP when planning on attending any SOMB meetings.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky announced that the June SOMB meeting is cancelled due to a limited number of agenda items, and noted that the SOMB staff is busy preparing for the conference.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky announced that Kelli Reynolds will be leaving the SOMB to move to New York, and acknowledged her hard work and dedication to the SOMB.

Susan Walker mentioned that the City of Englewood is in the process of repealing the current residency restrictions, and noted there will be a community presentation again before the final decision is made.

APPROVAL OF APRIL MINUTES:

Motion to approve the April Minutes: Kim English; Amy Fitch 2nd (Question #1)

15	Approve	0	Oppose	2	Abstain	Motion Passes
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Approved by consensus

TRAUMA INFORMED CARE (Action Item) – Jill Levenson (Handout Provided)

Dr. Jill Levenson, a widely known academic researcher and sexual assault treatment provider from the Ft. Lauderdale area, presented to the SOMB on Trauma Informed Care (TIC). She indicated that trauma informed care is a framework for service delivery to create and model trust, safety, and collaboration. Dr. Levenson went on to mention that TIC is based on knowledge, evidence, and research which understand how pervasive early adversity is and how it impacts individuals. Some of the highlights of this presentation are listed below:

- TIC is comprised of 4 major components: Realizes trauma impact, Recognizes the signs and symptoms of trauma, Responds by integrating knowledge about trauma, and Seeks to resist re-traumatization. Dr. Levenson noted that TIC has not been tested to know if it works, and mentioned that because TIC is individualized and responsive, that it is difficult to test.
- TIC is interpersonal violent offender treatment. Dr. Levenson indicated that TIC is an evidence-based practice using interdisciplinary and cross-theoretical research.
- Higher ACE scores are indicative of a higher number of arrests, sexual deviance, sexual violence, and substance abuse.
- People who have experienced trauma are at risk to be: suicidal, have depression, have anxiety, have substance abuse, and obesity.
- Early Adversity Impacts Brain Architecture when exposed to chronic stressors which causes the brain to release hormones to adapt, and will change the architecture of the brain.
- Early adversity impacts the core cognitive schema, and individuals may develop mal-adaptive beliefs and behavior.
- TIC is individualized, assessment driven, relationally focused, and helps individuals understand behaviors. Two of the main TIC goals are case conceptualization and trauma informed responses in building healing relationships and to model with care and empathy through the use of respect and kindness.

- TIC is a clinical paradigm shift for Probation/Parole/Corrections with an emphasis on safety and security that helps individuals with relational skills, self-regulation skills, and is process oriented.
- Risk-Needs-Responsivity fits the TIC responsivity piece, and is a navigational strategy for an individual's life.
- Dynamic Risk Factors through the trauma informed lens are: Relational and self-efficacy deficits, attachment disorders, disruption and distorted schema, self-regulation difficulties, and have maladaptive coping skills.
- TIC reframes goals from offense-specific (relapse prevention) to offense related (self-regulation).
- TIC is a shift from consequences, labelling, medication, to a focus on trying to understand client behaviors, and create a custom treatment experience.
- Dr. Levenson indicated that every person who comes in contact with a client needs to be trained in trauma informed care.

Board Comments:

Jessica Meza asked if there is an assessment that can be used for the court to help these clients. Dr. Levenson indicated that the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) website has a paper titled "What Judges Should Know About Trauma" that will help the court understand TIC.

Tom Leverage noted the need to better communicate the goals of TIC, and to adopt this approach without losing accountability and safety.

Audience Comments:

Susan Walker commented on Dr. Levenson's training from Thursday, May 18th which discussed the "labelling" of individuals. Dr. Levenson responded that the offense is something an individual has done, but not who they are, and noted that a negative identity makes treatment harder.

An audience member asked Dr. Levenson what impact Judicial Stress Syndrome has on a client to recidivate. Dr. Levenson responded that court proceedings for the client and the family are very stressful and traumatic. She indicated that there is a heightened state of anxiety and of a perceived threat.

An audience member asked Dr. Levenson how TIC fits with the Good Lives Model. She responded that TIC fits with how people are helped, and noted that TIC addresses the lower level of need not addressed in the Good Lives Model.

Bobbi Ponis asked Dr. Levenson how abuse at a young age causes emotional stagnation. Dr. Levenson replied that any abuse or maltreatment that hinders good development will cause emotional development.

Dr. Levenson mentioned a book she authored called "Trauma-Informed Care, Transforming Treatment for People Who Have Sexually Abused", which will be coming out in June 2017. She also indicated a training to be held in Chicago on June 9th that will have live streaming, and mentioned to contact Raechel Alderete for information for this event.

BREAK: 10:45 – 11:03

SVP ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT (Action Item) – Kim English and Peg Flick (Presentation)

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky outlined the new high risk sex offender assessment instrument that Kim English/Peg Flick developed, and indicated that it was decided to maintain 3A of the existing instrument.

Kim English gave background information of the new risk assessment instrument with an objective to develop and validate a large sample of court cases using electronic data from Judicial's ICON/ECLIPSE data system, and to develop a potential automatic scoring system to reduce burden on staff.

Kim listed the Sexually Violent Predator (SVP) Crimes as indicated by statute: 1st Degree Sexual Assault, 2nd Degree Sexual Assault, Unlawful Sexual Contact, Sexual Assault on a Child, Sexual Assault on a Child in a Position of Trust. She indicated that SVP's are to register with law enforcement every 90 days and are subject to community notification and internet posting. Kim indicated that Colorado Law requires the Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) to develop a risk instrument to identify SVP eligibility for the court to use when making the final determination. She went on to list the requirements included in this document that designate an individual as a SVP.

Kim also noted that the most current revisions to this instrument were done in 2010/2011, at which time Section 3A and 3B (risk scale) were added. She reviewed Section 3B of the current SVP instrument. She went on to mention that Section 3B was not capturing the prior sex offense convictions, to include at least 1 felony or 2 misdemeanor crimes, factual basis sex crimes, internet based sex crimes, and out-of-state sex crimes, but excluded deferred judgments, failure to register, and juvenile adjudications. Therefore, 3A was added. She also noted that the Risk Assessment Instrument needed to be revised to include those individuals most likely to recidivate. Kim reviewed a study done and gave data on recidivism measures with various variables. She noted the result indicated a 10% recidivism rate for the combined new sex and violent crime filings with 4% sex being sex crimes.

Allison Boyd asked why the study used 8 years. Kim responded that 8 years was necessary to reach at least 10%, and indicated that 5-6 years is the norm.

Kim English explained the variables used when building the model included the best performing set of variables, and indicated that the variables are weighted. She noted that the model was developed using 2/3 of the sample data and validated using 1/3 of the sample data. Kim noted that the 4 most prominent variables of predicting recidivism are adult history, juvenile history, the earliest sex offense age, and revocations.

Judge Kopcow asked if a case is filed and dismissed would this be considered a filing. Kim replied that yes that is correct.

Kim went on to explain the use of the "area under the curve" (AUC) to assess the statistical data accuracy (accuracy vs. error). She mentioned that the model produces weights which are applied to the selected variables, and that the model was converted using a scoring system with the cumulative scores being risk categories. Kim reviewed the risk category chart, and indicated the highest risk category is at a 60% chance of recidivism within a small group of individuals (37 people of 3100).

She mentioned that the next steps are to approve the new risk scale, to operationalize it, to possibly work with the Judicial Branch to automate it, or just update with a new on-line form. Kim noted that law enforcement asked to have 3 risk categories (high, medium, low) included in this instrument. She also mentioned that the current statutory requirements do not allow for a usable recidivism measure to build an accurate scale.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky reviewed the SOMB concerns about the legislative directive and limitations, and noted that the Legislature has been made aware of these issues. He mentioned that to automate this process, it will have to be initiated through a legislative process. Chris mentioned that at the last Sunset review, there was not the political will to make this change, and suggested that it would be advisable to present a number of options to the Legislature that will not only address the statutory mandate, but would also open the door for future changes. Chris reiterated that this is a stop-gap measure to be in compliance with the Legislative mandate.

Judge Kopcow agreed that the SOMB does not like the SVP label, but noted that there is a need to be in compliance.

Board Comments:

Tom Leversee asked if this instrument can be implemented if the definition of recidivism (crime types) is changed in statute. Kim responded yes, and noted that the current SVP assessment is not in compliance.

Amy Fitch asked if the relationship criteria will continue to be used, and if an assessment will be developed to capture non-SVP crimes. Kim English responded that the relationship piece will remain, and noted that only the 3B piece (risk instrument) is being revised. She indicated that no other risk instrument is to be created.

There was consensus to move forward with the changes presented by Kim English.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE (Presentation) – Chris L., Department of Public Safety – (Handout Provided)

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky reviewed the two pertinent bills and their status as outlined by Gabby Reed.

Brie Franklin briefly discussed the Sexting Bill (HB 1302) and gave background and insight to this bill. She noted that this legislation was needed to address the juvenile sexting cases. Brie indicated that there was collaboration with many stakeholders, and noted that this will be revisited in 3 years to include data collection. Raechel Alderete noted there is training on this, which schools are requesting, and indicated she will inform the School Safety Resource Center of the changes made in the Juvenile Standards. She also mentioned that this training/collaboration includes sexting nude images, and noted the increase in sexual harassment texts with emojis using body parts.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky mentioned that Senate Bill 87 (Determinate Sentence for Indeterminate Sex Offenses), and Senate Bill 141 (Low-Risk Sex Offender Community-Based Treatment) were both postponed indefinitely.

He also noted that there was Legislature discussion prohibiting the use of polygraph as a treatment tool working with sex offenders. He indicated that this bill was not introduced, but noted that there was a request for more information from a member of the Legislature. Chris mentioned that the SOMB put together a data collection plan in January which will include data collected from polygraph usage, and the Legislature could address the concern for needed data by passing a bill mandating the data collection. He also noted that the Adult Standards Polygraph Revisions Committee has been working to make the necessary changes to the Standards per the Legislative mandate and consistent with the Best Practices recommendations.

LUNCH: 11:57 – 12:49

REGISTRATION OF JUVENILES WHO COMMIT SEXUAL OFFENSES (Action Item) – Juvenile Standards Revisions

Committee: Carl Blake and Raechel Alderete

Carl Blake noted that the Juvenile Standards Revisions Committee has begun drafting a paper that outlines all the relevant information regarding juvenile registration. He noted that this information will be submitted to the legislative task force in June to allow for preparation of a bill for the next legislative session. Carl mentioned that the purpose of this discussion is to inform the SOMB of the status of this project.

Raechel Alderete stated that this document is not ready yet for review by the SOMB, and noted that this is more of an educational paper, and gives clarity of the Adam Walsh Act regarding juvenile registration. She also indicated that this information will be shared with school personnel and others in this field.

Carl Blake noted that the task force (for proposed legislation) has been informed that if the SOMB is going to review and approve this document, then it will not be finalized quickly. He indicated that when presenting information for future legislation to make sure all information is research based, and that it includes the appropriate information.

Board Comments:

Allison Boyd commented that if the SOMB will be sanctioning this, then it needs to be reviewed and approved by the SOMB before being given to the Task Force. Raechel Alderete responded that this would be presented to the SOMB for review and approval before being given to the Task Force.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky suggested that due to the short lead-time, a literature summary of the research could be emailed to the SOMB for a quick review and approval so the task force can submit it to the Legislature. He noted then when the proposed recommendations are finalized, that the SOMB would make a more in-depth review before endorsing this paper, and indicated that this would most likely happen at the August SOMB meeting.

Tom Leverage mentioned that the SOMB can agree with findings and conclusions without moving forward with recommendations.

Allison Boyd asked for victim representation on this task force, and asked that victim centeredness be included.

Carl Blake mentioned the committee meets on the 4th Monday of each month from 2-4 pm at the Division of Criminal Justice, and noted that all are welcome to attend.

SEX TRAFFICKING AND THE ADULT STANDARDS (Presentation) – Cara Morlan, 18th Judicial District Attorney's Office, Sheila Pomeranz, Aurora Mental Health and Scott Stack, 18th Judicial District Probation Department

Michelle Geng gave a brief background regarding sex trafficking and the lack of guidance in the Adult Standards for this population. She indicated that these offenders are very different than other sex offenders.

Each presenter introduced themselves and gave a background of the sex trafficking influx in their respective fields.

Some of the highlights were:

- Cara Morlan indicated that in 2012, 6 cases were filed in Arapahoe County and noted that by 2015 there were 35 cases filed. She mentioned that all of the Denver metro counties have district attorneys that specialize with sex traffic offenders, while the smaller jurisdictions do not. Cara indicated that these jurisdictions are looking for direction through the Standards.
- Scott Stack noted that the 18th Judicial District Probation Department currently has 10 officers for all sex offender type cases. He indicated that the sex trafficking population fails quickly in treatment, and mentioned they are looking for treatment options to increase success rates.

- Sheila Pomeranz of Aurora Mental Health indicated that sex traffickers do not work well in traditional treatment programs. She noted that when they are placed in a traditional group setting, they recruit new victims. Sheila suggested that separate treatment groups should be used for these offenders.

Cara Morlan went on to explain some of the challenges faced dealing with human trafficking offenders, such as trying to use accurate evaluations to determine what type of treatment is needed (80% do not need traditional sex offense specific treatment). She also noted that many times these crimes are considered “financial crimes”, and therefore no treatment is ordered by the court. Cara described that human trafficking is modern day “sexual slavery”, and noted that many are children on the run with no family support except from those involved in the provision of prostitution. She also mentioned that those involved in supporting and trafficking in prostitution still need sex offense specific treatment as they have no empathy, and have skills to entice children into this way of life.

Cara also discussed that sex history assessments are not up-to-date and do not elicit true answers. She noted that these offenders need to be evaluated or assessed not just within the previous 6 months, but multiple times before getting to the truth, as the offender does not feel that he or she has done anything wrong. Cara suggested the following questions be incorporated in the evaluations to get to the truth:

1. Was there additional information recovered from the offenders’ phone devices not stated in the affidavit?
2. Has the defendant or co-defendants made any additional statements?
3. Has the victim provided any additional disclosures?

Cara mentioned other factors when looking at an individual:

- Are the risk assessments appropriate?
- Does the offender need the Sex Offender Intensive Supervision Program (SOISP) or regular probation?
- What types of treatment works with this offender?

Scott Stack noted that due to the quick failure rates of this population, they reached out to Aurora Mental Health for help in treating these offenders. He noted that they are working to find ways to successfully treat these offenders, and noted some success when removing them from the sex offender treatment groups.

Sheila Pomeranz mentioned that these offenders typically are more astute and find ways around treatment success. She noted that they have had a group of the women from sexual slavery in a treatment group together for a few months, and noted that their behaviors seem to be changing. Sheila also noted that this group of women had children, so there was some accountability in protecting their own child.

Cara Morlan indicated that the human traffickers many times will continue to commit the same behaviors while in treatment and under community supervision. She noted that they are very smart, will seek out any opportunity, and indicated that when being treated in the community, they need an extremely high level of supervision.

Board Comments:

Jessica Meza asked what the SOMB can do to help with the treatment needs of this population and those of the younger offenders. Sheila Pomeranz responded that they are trying to find out what treatment works, but indicated that there has not been the opportunity to work with these individuals very long.

Michelle Geng noted that there is not a lot of research as to how to assess and treat these offenders.

Tom Leversee asked how much research and literature is available that addresses risk and needs. He also asked how offense-specific treatment is defined for these people. Cara Morlan responded that currently these individuals are recommended to attend boundary classes, and indicated that there is no support to keep them from going back to prostitution (no housing, no job skills, no family, etc.). She also noted that if an offender’s crime is reduced to a non-sex offense, they should still be recommended for treatment based on their evaluation and treatment needs.

Missy Gursky mentioned that this is an issue that has been dealt with for many years. She indicated that her agency has a number of sex traffickers that have successfully completed their program by looking at the individual needs and risk levels of the offender and treating them accordingly.

Angel Weant asked what the criminogenic needs are that need to be individualized to treat this population properly. She asked Scott Stack how they fail. Scott responded that they do not admit they are sex offenders, they recruit while in the treatment group, or they may pick up other crimes while in a treatment group. He indicated that there is a power struggle and noted that these offenders have more of a criminal mindset rather than other sex offenders. Angel agreed there needs to be mindful assessments of information to

identify treatment and supervision, and asked Scott if the LSI and SOTIPS assessments address the anti-social criteria. Scott responded that they use the LSI, VASOR, SOTIPS, and noted that the offenders score high and are put in sex offense treatment, but indicated that the group dynamics are different.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky agreed this has been around for a long time, noted that the current standards are not addressing the specific risk assessments and treatment needs of this population, and mentioned there has not been a lot of experience dealing with this population. He noted that the SOMB could give guidance in determining risk and treatment, and indicated that modification of the sex history packet along with language revisions could be an attempt to address these shortcomings.

Carl Blake mentioned that these individuals are very complex, and noted that many times they are a victim. He indicated that there is a universal tool for assessing victimization and risk that gives more information which leads to a more individualized treatment plan. Carl also indicated that a group setting may not always be the best modality, and mentioned the need to gather a lot of information to help create the individualized treatment needs. Cara responded that her needs from the SOMB are that the individuals are assessed properly, that treatment is left up to the treatment providers, and is looking for some direction from the SOMB.

Rick May mentioned that when doing the evaluations to give as much background information to the evaluator as possible.

Michelle Geng noted that there are a large number of women returning to their trafficker upon release from prison. Cara Morlan responded that this is a survival tactic for these women, and noted that there are not many programs that address their specific needs.

Magistrate Curtis asked if there is any data regarding racial statistics of convictions. Cara Morlan responded that there may be research based on racial over or under reporting, but noted that in the 18th Judicial District all offenders are treated equally.

Michelle Geng mentioned a couple of books named "Renting Lacey" and "The Slave Next Door" that explain the culture and process of human trafficking.

BURNS CASE (SIBLING CONTACT) VARIANCE PROCESS AND FORM (Decision Item) – Michelle Geng and Carl Blake

Michelle Geng gave background regarding the minor sibling contact variance process and form, and indicated that it was previously decided by the SOMB to use the variance process to enable treatment providers to treat clients that are allowed sibling contact.

Carl Blake summarized the changes made to the introduction section of the Variance Form.

Judge Kopcow asked if the Application Review Committee (ARC) has agreed to review these variances when the cases arise. Carl Blake responded that they are willing to review these, and indicated that if a Standard change is made, that the process will be cumbersome.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that ARC will assess and report back to the SOMB in 6 months or 1 year regarding the use of a variance for these cases, and will indicate if there should be changes made to the process at that time.

Jessica Meza gave a motion to approve the variance form as revised.

Motion to approve the Variance Form as revised: Jessica Meza, (Question #2)

14	Approve	0	Oppose	0	Abstain	Motion Passes
----	---------	---	--------	---	---------	---------------

Angel Weant noted concern with the wording "when there is no specific court order" in the 1st bullet point on page 2 of the variance policy.

After further SOMB discussion, the following revisions will be made to the Policy Statement:

1. Insert the proper citation language
2. Change the first bullet point to "there has been a court order"
3. Correct the inconsistencies between the policy and the variance form

Motion to approve the Policy Statement as amended: Angel Weant, Rick May (Question #3)

14	Approve	0	Oppose	0	Abstain	Motion Passes
----	---------	---	--------	---	---------	---------------

BREAK: 2:30 – 2:43

JUVENILE STANDARDS RELATED TO DENIAL (Presentation) – Kelli Reynolds and Carl Blake

Kelli Reynolds mentioned that there is limited research on juvenile denial, and indicated that the 2 or 3 articles available are more anecdotal which are helpful, but do not shed much light into juvenile denial. She indicated that there has not been a significant link between juvenile denial and recidivism. Kelli did note that juveniles taking responsibility for their actions and for their crime leads to positive outcomes in treatment. She also mentioned that there has not been any updated information to the Juvenile Standards Appendix since 2014.

Carl Blake reviewed Section 3.130A of the Juvenile Standards that indicates the treatment content areas, and noted that juveniles can successfully complete treatment without being totally accountable for their behavior. He mentioned that the expectation is to work through the accountability piece with juveniles even though they may not admit to every aspect of their behavior due to juvenile perspectives. Carl noted that the Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) should discuss alternative treatments that do not minimize accountability, but understand the reason why juveniles may not be fully aware of their accountability.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky indicated that denial is not a separate component, but that it can be addressed as part of treatment. He mentioned that denial is the acceptance of responsibility, which is an internal vs. external locus of control of a situation, and the goal is that the juvenile is accepting full responsibility.

Board Comments:

Jessica Meza mentioned that juveniles are being revoked due to Section 3.130-A. 7 of this standard, and does not want juveniles to be removed from treatment due to denial or lack of behavioral responsibility.

Tom Leversee responded that the MDT is empowered to individualize treatment, and mentioned that there is no prescriptive directive to revoke due to denial.

Jessica Meza indicated that the child in question was in revocation proceedings based on Section 3.130A. 7, and noted the confusion that has ensued. She asked if this section could be written differently so as not to be misconstrued. Carl Blake responded that the introduction to this Standard indicates that these are “general areas” for the MDT to look at when creating the treatment plan, and noted that there are other aspects of treatment that will indicate if the juvenile would be willing to accept responsibility at a future date. Carl reiterated the flexibility for the treatment provider in the Standards, and questioned that the section is not being read and understood in its entirety.

There was continued discussion regarding the juvenile acceptance of responsibility and the continuation of treatment.

Raechel Alderete referred to Section 3.150 A & B which addresses the outcomes that treatment providers are to look at when considering discharging a juvenile from treatment, and noted that accountability is only one piece of improving overall health. She noted her concern that the MDT is only focusing on one aspect.

Allison Boyd noted that this has previously been discussed, and noted that this component is very important for victims. She indicated that the concept that juveniles can successfully complete treatment without accountability for their behavior is wrong and is not doing juveniles a favor if not taken seriously.

Carl Blake responded that the MDT is misapplying the Standards, and that he would be willing to speak with that team, and to also discuss further with the SOMB to see if there is a broader way to identify this.

Jessica Meza asked for removal of the last sentence in Section 3.130 A. 7 (discussion point) and for better clarification of the issue of “can a juvenile complete offense specific treatment and still be in denial”?

Judge Kopcow asked Jessica if she is making a motion for further SOMB research and discussion of this section. Jessica asked if there is a white paper or document for juvenile offenders that spell this out more clearly.

Angel Weant responded that there is no “yes or no” answer to this topic as it is a responsibility issue with many risk factors that need to be considered on an individual basis.

REVIEW PUBLIC COMMENT RECEIVED ON STANDARDS SECTION 4.000 REVISIONS REGARDING CREDENTIALING (Decision Item) – Michelle Geng

Michelle Geng reviewed the public comment with the audience, and indicated that if there are no concerns from the SOMB, then this will be ratified as stat8

ed. The public comment received was to use the number of service hours of practice vs. the 10-year requirement. Carl Blake responded that this decision was made up of 3 renewal cycles (3 reviews by ARC), and noted that that ARC still reviews the level of treatment experience. Missy Gursky noted that their supervisor must also approve and sign-off on this individual.

Tom Leversee noted that the change is moving from a quantity based model to a competency based model, and indicated he is not in favor of a change to service hours.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that it will be cumbersome to track the hours for ARC, and mentioned the use of the absolute threshold of 10 years is easier to review.

No motions were made to change this language. Section 4.000 on credentialing was ratified.

SOMB Meeting Adjourned: 3:25

Session Name

New Session 5-19-2017 2-30 PM

Date Created

5/19/2017 8:44:57 AM

Active Participants

18

Total Participants

24

Average Score

0.00%

Questions

3

Results by Question**1. Motion to approve April minutes (Multiple Choice)**

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	88.24%	15
No	0.00%	0
Abstain	11.76%	2
Totals	100%	17

2. Motion to approve variance form (Multiple Choice)

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	100.00%	14
No	0.00%	0
Abstain	0.00%	0
Totals	100%	14

3. Motion to approve policy as amended (Multiple Choice)

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	100.00%	14
No	0.00%	0
Abstain	0.00%	0
Totals	100%	14

Session Name

New Session 5-19-2017 2-30 PM

Date Created

5/19/2017 8:44:57 AM

Active Participants

18

Total Participants

24

Average Score

0.00%

Questions

3

Results Detail

Last Name	First Name	Q1	Q2	Q3	Total Points	Score
Answer Key		-	-	-	0.00	-
Aguilar-Dave	Norma	1	-	-	0.00	-
Akins	Brie	3	1	1	0.00	-
Baydarian	Mary	3	-	-	0.00	-
Bednarski	Rick	1	1	1	0.00	-
Blake	Carl	1	1	1	0.00	-
Boyd	Allison	1	1	1	0.00	-
Curtis	Jessica	-	1	1	0.00	-
English	Kim	1	1	1	0.00	-
Fitch	Amy	1	-	-	0.00	-
Gursky	Missy	1	1	1	0.00	-
Jenks	Jeff	1	1	1	0.00	-
Leversee	Tom	1	-	-	0.00	-
May	Rick	1	1	1	0.00	-
Meza	Jessica	1	1	1	0.00	-
Odenheimer	John	1	1	1	0.00	-
Shay	Jeff	1	1	1	0.00	-
Weant	Angel	1	1	1	0.00	-
Woodson III	Lenny	1	1	1	0.00	-
Participant List Averages		-	-	-	0.00	-