

SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD MINUTES

Friday, April 17th, 2015

Board Members

Alli Watt
Allison Boyd
Amy Fitch
Angel Weant
Brie Akins
Bill Hildenbrand
Carl Blake
Jeff Geist
Jeff Shay
Jessica Curtis
Jessica Meza
John Odenheimer
Kandy Moore
Kim English
Marcelo Kopcow
Mary Baydarian
Merve Davies
Missy Gursky
Nancy Jackson
Rick May
Tom Leversee

Visitors

Deb Baty
Allison Brittsan
Mathias Antony
Roger Kincade
John Kincade
John Rogers
Susan Morris
Valerie Estrada
Nichole Meyers
Linda Martin
Pat Martin
Anthea Carrasio
Lisa Nelson
Mathew Goldberg
Taralyn Clark
Gale Page
Steve Parker
DeAnn Major
Susan Walker
Tanya Ahamed
Beverly Casey

Visitors

Tom Casey
Dr. Chris Renda
Katie Lykins
Laura Saurini
Suzanne Juarez
Alane Holsteen
Jalice Vigil-Kelly
Jodie Goter
Laurie Rose Kepros
Pat Harris
Roberta Ponis
Wellesley Bush
Shayna Miller

Absent Board Members

Pam Bricker

Jeff Jenks

Richard Bednarski

Mimi Scheuermann

Staff

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky
Cathy Rodriguez

Harmony Fox
Jesse Hansen

Lucy Klos
Raechel Alderete

Roxanne Hotchkiss

Board Meeting Begins:

Introductions –

Future Agenda Items – No future agenda items.

Announcements – Jesse Hansen reviewed the Family Engagement Survey results. Handout provided. Additionally, he noted that the Sex Offender Management Board (SOMB) is in the middle of the 2016 legislative report development process. Time for suggested policy areas will be available at the next board meeting.

Raechel Alderete noted that the SOMB Annual Conference registration will be posted soon.

Tom Leverage noted the 30th National Adolescent Perpetration Conference is taking place in Denver in May 2015.

Marcelo Kopcow updated the SOMB about House Bill 15-1060. This House Bill requires domestic abuse and sex offense cases to appear before the court for protective orders before they are allowed to be released on bail.

Carl Blake noted that the Family Center variance has been terminated as it is no longer necessary.

Jeff Geist reviewed the public speaking rules.

Approve Agenda – Agenda is approved.

Sexual Assault Awareness Month, Child Abuse Prevention Month, and National Crime Victims' Rights Week (Presentation) – Victim Advocacy Committee – Ali Watt provided a presentation.

Break

Juvenile Registration Notice and Adult Discharge Notice (Action Item) – Continuity of Care Committee – Handouts were provided.

John Odenheimer commented that it was his experience that individuals who were in and out of different treatment programs did not always have official records of this. He identified cases where he found that probation would receive these documents, but that the documents were not forwarded to the Courts for various reasons. These new documents would provide that record in perpetuity.

Tom Leverage commented that in the situation where an individual moves from a secure facility and then may have some aftercare, and then potentially parole. Later the courts may ask the treatment provider for their professional opinion as to whether this person is ready to be released from registration. In some cases this may be years later. This time gap can create a condition where the therapist does not really know how the client has done over the past few years and can only base an opinion from years before, and upon the client's successful completion of treatment since. In the cases where the client has moved and no good records were kept this can create a complication.

Carl Blake noted that Department of Youth Corrections (DYC) is drafting documents based on this situation. They are trying to create a series of documented recommendations to allow a Judge to see the overall progression more clearly based on current recommendations. It is already a part of the Juvenile Standards that a provider must make a recommendation, whether they are or are not recommending this individual for release from registration.

Marcelo Kopcow asked why there was a difference between the way the Adult and Juvenile Standards were written differently.

Cathy Rodriguez commented that there is no statute for adult sex offenders to require this final recommendation.

Laurie Kepros commented that these proposed documents were drafted to get a record in the court documents of treatment and recommendations.

Allison Boyd asked why these documents need to be under seal.

Laurie Kepros commented that under seal allows the parties involved access to the information, but that due to some of the potentially very personal information provided in these documents it should not be open to the public.

Amy Fitch commented that sending these documents to the right parties does not require you to know the individual, but rather the office in general, which makes mailing the documents to all the required parties less burdensome.

Rick May asked about discharge summaries and why they cannot go straight to the court records to save time in this process.

John Odenheimer commented that as a committee member he learned that probation was not sending the documents to the Court. These proposed documents are an attempt to assure that the correct information goes to the Court.

Missy Gursky noted that this would cause a significant amount of additional work for treatment providers, who are already taxed with their time.

Angel Weant commented that she would need to contact her legal staff to identify if probation even could forward this document because they are not the original authors of the document.

Laurie Kepros commented that her understanding of the legal obligation would allow probation to disseminate this document to the required parties.

Jeff Shay commented that, at least, the current jurisdiction of law enforcement should be added as a required party to this document.

John Odenheimer asked if additional research is needed to understand what documents are required and what documents are actually ending up in the court files.

Jeff Geist asked the SOMB to take these documents back to stakeholders and gather additional comments in order to return to the SOMB for further action.

Lunch

Victim Advocacy Panel Summary and Follow-up Discussion (Action Item) – Victim Advocacy Committee – Allison Boyd commented about the focus of the Victim Advocacy Panel and identified the goals that were determined based on this panel. One goal was for to have victim representation within teams. She commented that the victim's perspective is being more represented in the new SOMB Guiding Principles being developed. Also opportunities that request input from the victim is being addressed within the Standards, for those victims who are wanting to participate in that process.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that one of the basic needs is to make sure that the victim's perspective is being addressed at all phases throughout the entire process. He also asked what additional implementation methods could be used to ensure this is actually happening.

Allison Boyd responded that she would like to speak more with her contact in Connecticut to see how best to bring forward methods that have been proven to be productive for both offenders and victims. She also explained that a victim representative is a more broad term, which does not necessarily have a confidential relationship. On the other hand, a victim advocate may be perceived to be confidential.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky commented that there are cases where the victim does not want to partake in the process at all, and in this case it is important to have someone on the team present to represent victims as a whole and to give the general perspective of victims, versus cases where the staff personnel is representing a specific victim's individual perspective.

Angel Weant asked what the definition is and what the job details are of a victim representative and a victim advocate.

Amy Fitch noted that even though the victim representative should represent the individual victim they also need the ultimate goal of community safety in mind to make sure that this goal is also being achieved, through being sensitive to the victim's perspective.

Jeff Geist identified that the action needed to be taken by the SOMB now is to follow up with the contacts in Connecticut to see if they have new information on how best to practically keep the victim's advocate's goals in mind. Another goal is to clearly define the roles for victim representatives and victim advocates.

Jesse Hansen commented in the 2014 Legislative report the SOMB did a Provider Census. This has given the SOMB some data as far as incorporating victim advocates, what are the various programs and what are they doing related to victims services, and incorporating victim clarification. This data is available to the Victim Advocacy Committee. Additional information about implementation would be a good research area.

Alli Watt commented that through the Victim's Rights Act, therapy can be provided and it can be identified who the victim's therapist is in cases where this information is necessary.

Kandy Moore commented that she has often encouraged victims and victim's therapists to communicate some for the best outcome of all parties. She noted that when the victim's therapist is needed to be identified, another option is to ask the victim themselves, if appropriate.

Family Engagement Panel Summary and Follow-up Discussion (Action Item) – Family

Engagement Committee – Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky summarized the events and goals of the Family Engagement Panel. Some goals were the provision of information to families in a sensitive and timely manner. Additionally, having an ongoing conversation between the families and the SOMB to encourage a continued collaboration that can best aid in knowing what the family needs are.

Roberta Ponis commented about the lack of an offender specific voice within the SOMB, which could be an aide in the feeling of being disenfranchised. A possible action was suggested that the SOMB have an open forum for the public to be able to speak directly to the SOMB. Various other organizations, such as DOC, already have similar models that could be taken for direction.

Susan Walker noted her involvement in the Circles program. She relayed a feeling of inability to connect with the Community Supervision Teams (CST). She stressed that the entire process requires a tremendous amount of personal communication from all parties.

Carl Blake commented that NYC has implemented structured family orientations and has put together a family handbook that goes over everything from vocabulary terms, to what to expect during each phase, what different titles people have, and who to go to with which problems. He recommended the SOMB look into a similar type guide that could be used as an entry level guide that would cover the basic terms and expectations.

Chris Renda noted her support for this idea. Specifically, she added that this could be additionally helpful for those families who are less willing to be as active within the process, but then still allow them to be able to

understand the process and be educated on how they could be involved in a way that is more appropriate for them.

Break

Treatment provider Panel Summary and Follow-up Discussion (Action Item) – Treatment Provider Panel –

Due to a tape recorder problem, no information related to this discussion is available for the minutes.

Supervision Officer and Caseworker Panel Summary and Follow-up Discussion (Action Item) – Supervision and Caseworker Panel –

Due to a tape recorder problem, no information related to this discussion is available for the minutes.

Overview of DORA Mental Health Boards (Presentation) – Jacquelin Arcelin, Department of Regulatory Agencies – Handouts provided.

Amy Fitch asked if the ARC's decision if a case violates SOMB Standards is considered final or is this also looked at within DORA.

Jacqueline Arcelin responded that because the SOMB is the expert on the Standards and Guidelines, there would not be a case of disagreement. There are times when there is not an SOMB violation but is a mental health practice act violation, but the SOMB ARC would address that in their reporting to DORA.

John Odenheimer asked why the number of DORA mental health complaints have increased.

Cindy Reinhardt responded that they are not sure the exact cause for the increase.

Allison Boyd asked how many cases are against SOMB therapists.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky commented that his best estimate is 30-40 SOMB complaint cases go through DORA each year.

Cindy Reinhardt added that they currently have 4 cases in Ongoing Investigations (OI).

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that the threshold for a cases to go to OI is higher than for the board.

Cindy Reinhardt noted that cases can be dismissed at the board level before reaching OI.

Jacqueline Arcelin commented that they meet with Domestic Violence and SOMB staff every other month to ensure communication between the groups. She added that other than the duration of cases she is not aware of any significant concerns.

Cindy Reinhardt added that her experience has also always been good communicating between offices.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky commented that the issue of dual regulation has been brought up on previous SOMB panels. Cindy Reinhardt commented that she will often attempt to reach out to the provider in a case, when appropriate, to help them understand the process.

MEETING ADJOURNED.