

SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD (SOMB) MINUTES

Wednesday, July 12, 2017

SOMB Members

Alli Watt
Allison Boyd
Angel Weant
Carl Blake
Jeff Jenks
Jeff Shay
John Odenheimer
Kandy Moore
Korey Elger
Leonard Woodson III
Marcello Kopcow
Merve Davies
Missy Gursky
Tom Leversee

Absent SOMB Members: Brie Franklin, Mary Baydarian, Richard Bednarski, Jessica Curtis, Kim English, Amy Fitch, Norma Aguilar-Dave, Rick May, Jessica Meza

Staff:

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky, Raechel Alderete, Marina Borysov, Kelly Hume, Joe Thome

SOMB Meeting Begins: 9:00

INTRODUCTIONS:

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

Adult Polygraph Standards Section 6.000 (Action Item) – Jeff Jenks and Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky (Handout Provided)

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky discussed and previewed the Adult Polygraph Standards Section 6.000 revisions, and indicated that the SOMB will vote on these changes at the next SOMB meeting in August. Chris made note of the external evaluation that was done in 2014, and read some of the findings of this review. He also discussed and explained the Sunset Review process related to polygraph. Chris went on to describe the SOMB's action plan as a result of the external evaluation that incorporated the use of risk-needs-responsivity in the Standards, victim voice in the treatment and management of offenders, and noted that the SOMB explored whether and how to adjust the role of the polygraph including the sex history polygraph. He indicated that the Juvenile Standards Revisions Committee revised the Juvenile Polygraph sections in 2014. Chris noted that the Best Practices Committee was charged with reviewing polygraph research and making recommendations to the SOMB concerning the Polygraph Standards based on this research. He indicated that as a result of the Best Practices Committee recommendations, the Adult Standards Polygraph Committee was convened in August of 2016, and noted that the first set of Polygraph Standards revisions were approved by the SOMB in February 2017. Chris mentioned that the Legislature has indicated that all the revisions to the Adult Standards need to be completed shortly, and mentioned that the hope is to have all the polygraph revisions completed by year end. Chris and Jeff Jenks reviewed and discussed the proposed and approved changes to the items listed on the polygraph summary sheet.

Board Comments:

Merve Davies gave praise to the Polygraph Committee for the great job that has been done incorporating the research-based changes into the Standards.

Audience Comments:

Steve Parker asked about ethical issues encountered of Licensed Professional Therapists being involved in the polygraph process. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded that the regulatory agencies that oversee the licensure of the therapists and the need for therapists to follow the Standards has been addressed over the years. He also noted that some therapists struggle with the ethical issues presented using polygraph.

Mona Murch discussed a survey that was being given regarding Community Supervision Teams (CSTs) and polygraph usage. She asked if treatment providers, evaluators, and probation officers would identify some specific tests and/or exams that have had a significant effect with the treatment needs of the client. Mona indicated that the results of these surveys will be helpful in showing the community the benefits of using polygraph.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky indicated that there will also be revisions to the Sex History Packet and the amount of information that may be provided.

Audience Member (DOC) asked if the Standards are addressing the different needs of a client on Parole vs. Probation. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded that the language is being clarified in the Standards; however, he noted that the media can sometimes be selective in their presentation of information. He suggested that agencies need to respond when information is misrepresented. Jeff Jenks responded that while he is aware of the risk differences of clients on Parole vs. Probation, he indicated that treatment providers should look at the Standards to see what specific section would be applicable to a client's particular risk and needs for community safety.

Adult CST Standards Section 5.000 (Action Item) – Angel Weant and Jeff Geist (Handout Provided)

Angel Weant and Jeff Geist reviewed and discussed the summary of changes to Sections 5.000 through 5.621. Angel mentioned that some of the items addressed while revising 5.000 included incorporating strengths-based language, reordering sections to create better flow, and the deletion of repetitive language throughout. Jeff Geist discussed and explained the incorporation of the TEAMS model which will replace the containment model.

Allison Boyd discussed the changes to the Standards with the inclusion of a Victim Representative as a part of the supervision team.

Board Comments:

Judge Kopcow asked regarding early discharge when statutorily permissible if this gives probation the ability to make a request of the court for early discharge. Angel Weant responded yes, that a hearing would be required of all involved parties, and noted that Probation would have to request this hearing.

Audience Comments:

A member of the audience asked if in the family integration section if there will be definitions to guide in determining who would be an ideal candidate for family involvement. Jeff Geist and Angel responded that yes there is language that helps determine the most appropriate family support members. Angel indicated that it is beneficial to have family support that is truly "involved and engaged".

SOMB Meeting Adjourned: 10:47