

SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD (SOMB) MINUTES

Friday, February 16, 2018

SOMB Members

Allison Boyd
Amy Fitch
Angel Weant
Jeff Jenks
Jeff Shay
Jesse Hansen
Jessica Meza
John Odenheimer
Kandy Moore
Korey Elger
Marcelo Kopcow
Mary Baydarian
Merve Davies
Missy Gursky
Norma Aguilar-Dave
Richard Bednarski
Rick May
Robin Singer
Sharon Holbrook
Tom Lerversee

Amanda Gall
Ariane Frosh
Bobbi Ponis
Camilla Christensen
Colton McNutt
Dale Jenkins
David Nahum
Debbie Baty
Dena McClung
Erica Klingberg
Gary Reser
Hannah Dann
Jodie Goter
Laurie Kepros
Nicole Leon
Pat Harris
Rick Ostring
Robin Steranka
Sarah Yoder
Susan Walker
Tami Floyd

Absent SOMB Members: Brie Franklin, Carl Blake, and Leonard Woodson

Staff: Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky, Raechel Alderete, Michelle Geng, Marina Borysov, Kelly Hume, and Jill Trowbridge

SOMB Meeting Begins: 9:06

INTRODUCTIONS:

Introductions were made by all in attendance.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

Missy Gursky noted some concerns from providers that local prosecutors are asking for specific risk assessment tools to be used in order for the evaluation to be complete. She mentioned that the Standards give the clinicians the option to choose the assessment tool that is most applicable for the client, and that there is not one particular tool that is required. Missy asked if this concern is something the Sex Offender Management Board (SOMB) should address. Judge Kopcow noted that this will be addressed at the Executive Committee level.

Laurie Kepros asked if there will be a presentation on last's years Lifetime Supervision report. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded that this presentation was stopped, but could be reinstated as long as this presentation is not used as a platform to investigate other issues related to the Department of Corrections and Probation. Laurie encouraged the SOMB to reinstate this yearly presentation.

Laurie Kepros suggested the SOMB find a way to recognize those treatment providers and clients who have creatively contributed to public safety. She also suggested the SOMB develop policy in the areas of variances, grievances, and ethics when discussing client cases.

Susan Walker asked the SOMB to recognize a group of offenders who are working to help provide housing for those being newly released from prison.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Merve Davies announced his retirement from the SOMB, and noted that the April meeting will be his last meeting after 12 years of service on the Board.

John Odenheimer gave an overview of the January 30th SOMB Joint Judiciary presentation with public testimony first, followed by the SOMB testimony given by Joe Thome, himself, and Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky. John gave a brief update of the proceedings. He noted that Carl Blake, Angel Weant, Lenny Woodson, and Allison Boyd also testified, and noted that Jesse Hansen, Jeff Jenks, and many of the SOMB staff were present. John indicated that the hearing went well, the Joint Judiciary was attentive, and noted that the presentations were good.

Kelly Hume noted that a brief report of the polygraph data collection project was given at the Joint Judiciary hearing. She gave a quick update of some of the statistics and outcomes, and indicated that this report will be available shortly.

Kelly Hume also indicated that the 2018 Legislative Reports are available, and to see Jill Trowbridge for a copy. Kelly noted that she is working on the 2019 report, and asked for any suggestions or recommendations for topics of concern. She noted she will be including the use of pornography, alternate treatment modalities such as MRT and MST, human trafficking offenders and how that looks in treatment, and how implementation processes are addressed.

Marina Borysov announced the upcoming SOMB trainings that are currently booked to include the Introduction to the Standards and Booster training, and two Policy Update trainings scheduled in Golden and Ft. Collins in March. She also noted the call for papers for the 2018 SOMB Conference is now closed, and indicated that the committee will review these proposals and will make decisions within the next couple of weeks. Marina also noted that the conference registration will open in April.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky mentioned that there is no charge for the conference registration for SOMB members but noted that lodging is not included. He also indicated the need to replace Merve Davies' (Department of Public Safety appointed position) seat on the SOMB, and noted that the process is to solicit nominations. Chris stated that the Nominating Committee will be convened to interview the nominees who will give their recommendations to the Executive Direct of the Department of Public Safety for final decision.

Michelle Geng announced the Victim Representation within the Community Supervision Team (CST) training scheduled on March 22nd at Ft. Logan from 9:00 – 11:00 am.

Motion to approve the January minutes: Norma Aguilar-Dave; 2nd **(Question #1)**

10	Approve	0	Oppose	5	Abstain	Motion Passes
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

APPROVE AGENDA:

Approved by consensus

SECTION 6.000 POLYGRAPH STANDARDS REVISIONS (Public Comment/Final Ratification) –

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky and Jeff Jenks (Handout Provided)

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky reviewed the public comments submitted from the handouts provided. He indicated that only comments that pertained to a particular Standard were included, and noted that no personal opinions

were included. Chris mentioned that many of the public comments were centered around the use of shall versus should, and the suggested use of the American Polygraph Association (APA) Model Policy language.

Jeff Jenks clarified the language in Section 6.151 (Test scoring results), and noted that the best practices model policy was used. He also indicated that some of this language will be updated in the future.

Jeff Jenks clarified the language in Section 6.162 (Raw data and numerical scores) and indicated that hand scoring is typically used due to visual and audio nuances during the test for which the computer cannot account. He mentioned that due to these nuances, it is still advisable to not include this raw data in the written report.

Board Discussion:

Tom Leverage questioned the research in Section 6.152 (Prohibition against mixed results). Jeff Jenks indicated that there is no research to specifically determine mixed results, but noted that this language does follow best practices. He went on to clarify that if an offender has a deceptive response to one question but not others, then this test is considered deceptive with no opinion on other questions.

Tom Leverage asked a general question regarding those sections that indicate that the SOMB Standards are in conflict with the APA model policy. Jeff Jenks responded that APA Model Policies are recommendations, and noted that if the state standards differ from these, then it is recommended to use the state standards. He indicated that in most instances, they would not be diametrically opposed. Jeff went on to mention that most of the Colorado examiners have a high level of experience and do not need the detail as outlined in the APA Model Policy. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky indicated that the APA Model Policy is in the Appendix for further clarification.

Jessica Meza expressed concern with the difference between the APA Model Policy and the SOMB Standards. She specifically indicated the need for closer alignment with the APA Model Policy in Section 6.151 (Test scoring results) as the SOMB standards are too limiting with the use of No Significant Reactions (NSR) and Signification Reactions (SR). There was continued discussion regarding the SOMB test result categories versus the additional result categories listed in the APA Model Policy. Jessica expressed her desire to use the APA Model Policy language in this section. Jeff Jenks responded the SOMB is taking a more cautious approach, and continued to clarify the use of NSR and SR. Jessica asked if the indicative of non-deception or indicative of deception can be removed from the standards. Jeff responded no, and explained that this information is important and needs to be indicated on the report. Jessica asked to have a reference to the APA Model Policy in Section 6.151. Jeff agreed to add that reference.

Audience Discussion:

Susan Walker reviewed a letter done by Dale Jenkins on behalf of Advocates for Change, CSOR, and Colorado Cure.

Dale Jenkins noted the following:

Commented on the differences between the APA Model Policy versus the SOMB standards regarding post-conviction offender testing. She reiterated the need for the SOMB Standards to follow the APA Model Policies, and indicated the dates the APA policies were put in place.

Section 6.100 (Adherence to recognized standards) – She indicated that the adherence of state standards along with the APA and the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) is not included in this section, and noted this should be added.

Section 6.140 (Authorization and release) – She encouraged the SOMB to read through the authorization and release statement, and went on to read this release clause. Dale indicated the negative consequences to the offender of this current release statement, and noted this requires further review.

Section 6.151 (Test scoring results) Item D. – She noted that this statement is brief and should be reviewed and compared to the APA Model Policy.

Section 6.161 (Content of the examination report) – She mentioned that the results should be qualified (with the use of an interpreter, use of sign language, on medications, etc.) and reviewed with caution.

Section 6.170 & 6.171 (Peer reviews/Quality assurance reviews) – She quoted Kelly Hume’s research which indicates the large number of polygraph examinations an examiner does over the course of a year, and questioned the number of times the examiner peer and quality assurance reviews are done in that year. Dale suggested to use the APA Model Policy regarding these reviews.

Section 6.172 (Quality control reviews) – She noted her concern regarding the discussion point that notes that the offender is responsible for these costs if they initiate the review.

Dale Jenkins expressed her concern with the current language not being consistent with the APA Model Policy and suggested the SOMB review the ASTM and the state polygraph standards. She also thanked Kelly Hume for her help with research. Dale then suggested that the polygraph authorization form be reviewed and/or revised before make a final decision with these standards.

Board Discussion:

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky reviewed the suggested revisions as follows:

- Sections 6.221 and 6.230 - Remove citations 10 and 11 from Page 8 as they do not apply to those sections;
- Section 6.151 - Add APA Policy Model citation to this section

Jessica Meza asked if there is a consistent release form that polygraph examiners use. Jeff Jenks responded that each agency has their own release of liability forms. He also indicated that all examiners use APA scoring types and techniques as recommended by the APA. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that the SOMB cannot suggest the use of a specific release as it constitutes “legal advice”, which exceeds the SOMB purview.

Motion to Ratify Polygraph Standards as amended: Jessica Meza; Allison Boyd 2nd (**Question #2**)

17	Approve	0	Oppose	1	Abstain	Motion Passes
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

BREAK: 10:34 – 10:51

FOLLOW-UP REGARDING LAST MONTH’S VARIANCE (Action Item) – Michelle Geng, Raechel Alderete, and the Application Review Committee (ARC)

Michelle Geng provided follow-up to the variance from last month. She indicated that this variance was for an adult under appeal, and the ARC did not realize that this was a juvenile adjudication. Michelle contacted the probation officer involved with this case and informed them that this was a “juvenile adjudication”. She indicated that the probation officer immediately discharged the client from adult treatment and found a juvenile treatment provider.

Raechel Alderete responded to the statement that there is never a variance for juveniles. She indicated that even though the Juvenile Standards have a lot of flexibility, there is still a high degree of collaboration and consultation with the Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT), and noted there are Standards that cover these situations.

Board Discussion:

Judge Kopcow asked if a juvenile who is treated as an adult in court and is convicted, what treatment they receive. Raechel responded that the determination is made by the court, and not by age. She mentioned that if the client is adjudicated, they receive juvenile treatment and are under the purview of the Juvenile Standards, and if convicted, they will receive adult treatment and are under the purview of the Adult Standards. She also

noted that when an adult is being treated as a juvenile, this individual will not be put in a treatment group with 12-year-olds. Raechel indicated that in these situations, the Young Adult Protocol will be used. She indicated that there are many factors to take into account regarding these situations, and noted that she and Michelle train on this topic.

Missy Gursky mentioned that from a treatment agency perspective, they need to make sure these individuals are under the correct Standards and are placed in the appropriate treatment group. She noted that when an adjudicated 25-year-old client is placed in a "mixed" group, that the treatment provider running that group is certified in both Adult and Juvenile treatment.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky asked what the Application Review Committee (ARC) is going to do to address this going forward. Missy responded that ARC will ask for more details before the variance is officially submitted. She also mentioned the need to have the provider be physically present or to be available via phone when reviewing the variance.

Jessica Meza referenced a SOMB white paper, dated 6/5/14, on the Applicability of the Adult or Juvenile Standards of Individuals for Meeting the Definition of a Sex Offender which addresses this issue. She suggested the SOMB look at this for language that will help clarify confusion. Jessica noted that Judges want to know what is the best treatment modality for each individual. Missy Gursky responded that the evaluation is a key component in messaging to the judge as to what treatment or intervention would be appropriate.

Tom Leversee indicated that legal designation and developmentally appropriate treatment are not always in sync, and noted that there are some treatment agencies that can adapt to these needs. Raechel responded that in these cases the proper treatment is being done according to age to address risk-needs-responsivity.

Allison Boyd asked whether victims could be notified of a variance, even though this is not a critical stage that would require victim notification. She noted the importance of notifying all parties when a variance is processed.

Tom Leversee asked if the evaluation would be done by an approved adult or juvenile evaluator in cases in which a 15-year-old that is convicted in adult court. Missy responded that in a post-plea situation, an approved adult provider would be used, but finding an evaluator with both approval statuses would be best.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky also indicated that if the provider is not of that status (adult, juvenile, or both), then it would also be appropriate to consult with the appropriate expert.

Laurie Kepros suggested incorporating this white paper into the introduction to these standards and/or into the appendices to clarify and be consistent with statute.

Judge Kopcow indicated that the variance request has been withdrawn.

SEX BEHAVIOR DISCLOSURE PACKET (Decision Item) – Michelle Geng (Handout Provided)

Michelle reviewed the new Sex Behavior Disclosure packet which focuses on risk-need-responsivity, client accountability, and building the therapeutic alliance.

Michelle highlighted the following:

- Used the language "How many" victims under age 18 – Michelle noted that research indicates that the use of the term "how many" is more productive to ensure disclosure.
- Jesse Hansen suggested adding "intimate partner" to pages 25-28 to identify how many were victims were intimate partners.

- Michelle indicated that this packet is now more diverse to include female offenders and electronic behaviors. There is also a tally sheet provided for polygraph examiners.
- Michelle noted that there are sections with instructions to the therapist for their use only, and sections with instructions for the clients to complete.

Judge Kopcow asked if this packet is available in other languages. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded that the SOMB staff will look into this, specifically a Spanish translation.

Board Discussion:

Allison Boyd suggested changing the “child pornography” definition to “child sexual abuse images” and to remove the second sentence of the definition on page 30

Angel Weant noted that this document is a vast improvement of what was available before. She indicated that this is the transaction between the therapist and the client to work through a therapeutic approach, and includes protective factors. Angel thanked the committee and the approach of this new document.

Kandy Moore agreed with Angel, and noted this document will be much better in helping clients get through treatment.

Jeff Jenks also thanked the committee and the work that was done on this document, and expressed approval of the tally sheet.

Audience Discussion:

Dale Jenkins asked Michelle Geng how this new document impacts clients who may have also been victimized, and indicated that some of these questions may be problematic for them. Michelle referred to Section 3 of the Adult Standards regarding adjunct treatment that informs providers to be aware of prior traumatic issues. She indicated that this packet is more beneficial to the therapeutic alliance. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky also noted that this packet will not place judgement on the behavior, but asks emotionally neutral questions that will help the providers intervene in the most appropriate way.

Jodie Goter suggested adding sadism and masochism, auto-erotic asphyxiation, and role playing to the consensual sexual activity section of Part 1. Michelle Geng responded that there is a section in the Adult Standards that include other paraphilias.

Susan Walker noted that when using this document, a client can be prosecuted for any disclosures made. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded that this is already handled through the client mandatory disclosure statement.

Amy Fitch made a motion to approve the Sex Behavior Disclosure Packet with the following revisions:

- Add “intimate partner” where appropriate to pages 25 – 28;
- Revise Definition on page 30 to: Child sexual abuse images are any visual depiction of sexually explicit conduct involving a minor (persons less than 18 years old). Images of Child Sexual Abuse are also known as child pornography.

Motion to approve Sex Behavior Disclosure Packet as revised: Amy Fitch; Merve Davies 2nd **(Question #3)**

17	Approve	0	Oppose	1	Abstain	Motion Passes
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

LUNCH: 11:39 – 12:27

Amy Fitch announced that she is leaving the SOMB, and indicated that this will be her last meeting. She noted that her replacement will be Amanda Gall.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky praised the work Amy has done while serving on the SOMB, and expressed his appreciation for her balanced perspective.

There were many great acknowledgements from the SOMB members which indicated that she will be truly missed.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE (Presentation) – Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky reviewed the bills that most affect the work of the SOMB.

- SB 18-017 – The bill for Indeterminate sentences for determinate offenses has been postponed indefinitely.
- SB 18-026 – The Make Sex Offender Registration More Effective bill passed the Senate Judiciary and needs to pass the House Judiciary. Chris highlighted the aspects of this bill and encouraged all to look this up online for further information.
- HB 1040 – The Inmate Treatment Incentive Plans bill, for persons with mental health disorders in the criminal and juvenile justice system, directs the Department of Corrections to incentivize the community based mental health professionals to provide treatment in the correctional facilities.

Chris noted that Gabby Reed keeps the SOMB staff informed of the status of many of the bills and issues presented to the Legislature. He also mentioned that there will be monthly updates of the current bills while the Legislature is in session (through May 9th).

Board Discussion:

None

Audience Discussion:

Susan Walker asked why the Department does not support any specific bill. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded that the State Departments do not decide what bills are supported, and indicated that directive comes from the Governor's office.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STANDARDS (Action Item) - ODVSOM Staff

Raechel Alderete, Michelle Geng, Marina Borysov

Raechel Alderete indicated that when revisions to the Standards are approved, then these changes are emailed to our stakeholders and are incorporated in the online live document. She also indicated that revisions are incorporated in the introduction and booster trainings where appropriate. She noted there has been discussion in the Best Practices Committee regarding the best way to implement these changes, and asked the SOMB members for ideas and suggestions.

Jesse Hansen noted that there are multiple avenues to achieve implementation, and indicated that training is the least effective way to implement. He mentioned that research shows that ongoing coaching and mentoring are the most effective ways to educate on new ideas. Jesse indicated that the Domestic Violence Management Board (DVOMB) is currently using task forces and round-tables to solicit feedback. He also noted that there needs to be systems support for strong implementation, and mentioned that the DVOMB is still exploring ways to implement.

Raechel Alderete noted that the SOMB staff will continue with field trainings, and mentioned that SOMB members may be asked to assist in round-table discussions. She also indicated that informing clinical supervisors of changes, who in turn may be asked to relay these changes to their supervisees.

Marina Borysov reiterated that implementation is a science, and noted there are multiple steps in the process. She noted that the SOMB is making the field more aware through training, but indicated there has been no hands-on training, coaching, or mentoring to reinforce what was learned. Marina indicated that the use of round-

table discussions will help work through challenges and questions raised. She empowered the SOMB as subject matter experts to become the change agents to help reach our treatment providers, supervisors, and field personnel in their area of expertise.

Board Discussion:

Allison Boyd asked if there is a synopsis of the areas of substantial change that have been made. Raechel responded that notification emails that are sent usually have a summary of the changes made, and she noted that the SOMB is relying on people to read that information.

Angel Weant noted that her office does a lot of program implementation, have consulted with NIRN, and indicated there is science around implementation. She noted that sustainability is in the skill building, that skill building is in the mentoring and coaching, and then the follow-up piece with evaluation to make sure everyone understands and uses the new innovations properly. Angel indicated her willingness to offer information of their successes and failures in implementation (i.e., SBC – strategies for behavioral change).

Missy Gursky indicated that the amount of changes to the current Standards is enormous, and it might be hard to learn all of the new information. She also noted that each time a provider attends training, they are losing billable hours. Missy indicated that an online or video training could be helpful, especially in rural areas.

Tom Leverage mentioned that practice differs from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, and questioned how to disseminate these changes. He suggested bringing systems and agencies together to help disseminate the huge amount of changes to the Standards, and noted that clinical supervisors will be the key people to help with this.

Amy Fitch mentioned that when the Legislative session is done, there is mandatory training for all attorneys and prosecutors. She indicated they train in three ways using continuing education credits - by using a booklet, train the trainer sessions, and webinar sessions. Marina Borysov asked how many prosecutors receive this training, and how long does it take to train everyone. Amy responded that they train approximately 600-1000 individuals, and it takes about two months to train all of them.

Rick May noted that he is not seeing ownership of the Standards by the treatment providers, and indicated that out of about 400 treatment providers, only about 30-40 are really involved in the current changes. He mentioned that the others just follow-suit, and indicated the need for buy-in from all concerned. Rick suggested key people from those not currently involved to build ownership and accountability, which will then be relayed to their staff.

Korey Elger mentioned that when implementing new programs Human Services went to each county to implement changes in programs. She also indicated that cross-walking the old information versus the new was a helpful visual aid, and noted that a 3-hour time limit appeared to be the optimum length of time for instruction.

Raechel thanked all for their input, but noted that unfortunately that due to a lack of resources, they are asking for help from SOMB members to be change agents. While visiting 64 counties is not feasible at this time, there is the possibility of asking the EPIC unit in DCJ for assistance, and of further discussions with NIRN.

Judge Kopcow suggested that as part of the annual SOMB Conference to use a short survey asking what learning type a registrant would need to fully understand the changes to the Standards. He noted that this could be conditional in order to receive their registration confirmation.

Merve noted that he has created training videos for the Look that are broken down into 6 minute segments. He mentioned that making personal calls to invite people to attend trainings works well.

Audience:

Some of the audience discussion regarding implementation of the new standards are highlighted below:

- Susan Walker: Postcards with a Standard of the Month; Invite people for a meal; Regular trainings; Influential individuals – presentations; Telethon – call people to see where they are with the new standards; Competition with small prizes; Share with two colleagues; True/False exercises
- Laurie Kepros: Identify the topics (i.e. polygraph, contact with own children, etc.) and not the section number when emailing, setting up trainings, and round table discussions. Have each person in a group teach one standard to the group.
- Dale Jenkins: Videos and webinars with a pass/fail situation, and noted they will be helpful for those in remote areas of the state. After-training monitoring and oversight should be done to ensure the new standards are being practiced correctly.
- Gary Reser: Find ways to motivate and message that things are different. Have treatment providers help with the training.
- Debbie Baty: Have video-taped trainings on the website, in small sections (1-2 hour modules). The training should be fun, and engaging.
- Dena McClung: The SOMB should apply for a grant to help with resources to create videos and webinars, and to also hire other professionals to help with the training. Have a time of debriefing and evaluation to ensure the material is learned and applied properly.
- Jodie Goter: The need to have consistent practices statewide.
- Tammy Floyd: Looking forward to having the changes implemented in the field, as some providers are not up-to-date with the current practices and policies. She discussed that the treatment provider contract should include an accountability of the provider clause indicating they are using the new SOMB guidelines.

Raechel Alderete thanked all for their input and comments, and noted that the SOMB staff and the Executive Committee will take this information and have continued discussion.

SOMB COMMITTEE UPDATES (Presentation) – Committee Chairs

Application Review Committee (ARC) – Missy Gursky, chair: Noted that the ARC is current on all applications, they have 4 complaints being reviewed, and 1 variance in process.

Adult Standards Revisions Committee – Missy Gursky:

- Section 2.000 – Evaluation Section – She indicated that this section is complete and is on the website. She also noted that the committee has completed their objective, but mentioned the committee may reconvene to include any missing information.
- Section 3.000 – Offense Specific Treatment – She indicated that this section has been completely overhauled, to include more flexibility and individualized treatment. She noted that the revisions are complete, but mentioned the committee may reconvene to include any missing information.
- Section 5.000 – Community Supervision Teams (CST) - Angel Weant – Angel indicated that a behavioral monitoring section was added, giving guidance around the use of polygraph within the CST, revised disclosure language, and adding the TEAMS model. She noted that Judicial has just begun training on

this model which incorporates a more collaborative effort, defining roles, and delineating expectations within those roles.

- **Section 5.700 – Contact with Victims/Minor Children/At Risk Adults - Missy Gursky** – Missy indicated the committee is working on the Community Support Person section, discussed different types of contact with own minor children, victims, and potential victims. She also noted the Child Contact Assessment (CCA) is being worked on by a subcommittee that will make recommendations to the 5.700 Committee for approval. Missy noted the CCA handbook will be worked on after the assessment has been approved. The committee has agreed to keep the exclusionary criteria after thoughtful discussion. Missy mentioned that the 5.700 Committee still has work to do, and noted they meet on the 1st Thursday from 1:00 – 4:00 pm at 710 Kipling, 3rd floor.
- **Section 6.000 – Adult Polygraph Committee – Jeff Jenks** – Jeff indicated that this committee has completed its objective. He noted that much of the language does not mirror the APA policy due to the fact that the SOMB standards have incorporated input from all outside sources and best practices.

Human Trafficking Committee – Michelle Geng and Rick May: Michelle indicated that the white paper is almost complete, and noted the next meeting will be on February 26th from 10:00 – 11:30 at Rick May's office.

Community Notification Workbook Committee – Michelle Geng: Michelle indicated this committee is revising the Community Notification workbook, and noted it will be finalized within the next few months.

Juvenile Standards Revisions Committee – Raechel: Raechel indicated that this committee is not currently meeting. She noted that last year there were many changes which included the insertion of many crosswalks. Raechel mentioned that this is a living document with revisions made as best practices dictates. She noted that this committee will reconvene in the spring.

Training Committee - Merve Davies: Merve mentioned that this committee puts on about 70 trainings per year for the SOMB and DVOMB. Raechel mentioned that the 2018 training calendar is completed, and she indicated that Michael Seto will be coming in June. She also noted that David Prescott will be presenting on feedback informed therapy in the fall. Raechel indicated that Marina Borysov will be taking over the training coordination, and mentioned that there have been over 30 proposals submitted for the conference.

Best Practices Committee – Tom Lerversee: Tom noted that the current committee was formed in response to HB 1345 which requires this committee to be made up of at least 80% treatment providers. He mentioned this committee reviewed the role of where they will be needed according to the strategic plan, and noted that the Best Practices Committee can initiate recommendations to the standards. Tom indicated that this committee relies on Kelly for research before making recommendations. He noted that this committee is not designed to oversee all the other committees, but will make recommendations when asked.

Victim Advocacy Committee – Allison Boyd: Allison mentioned that the purpose of this committee is to ensure the SOMB and the Standards remain victim-centered. She noted that the focus this past year has been working with various adult revisions, working with the 5.700 Revisions Committee, and noted they will be involved with the section that addresses contact, clarification, and family reunification. Allison highlighted the Victim-Centered Approach section which is new in the Standards and other projects they have been involved with. Allison asked for suggested speakers or topics for the Sexual Assault Awareness month SOMB presentation in April.

SVP Assessment – Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky: Chris indicated that this committee completed its work last year. He noted that the new SVP Risk Assessment was implemented on 1/1/18 with the help of the Office of Research and Statistics, based on Colorado statistics. Chris indicated that the field should be using this new instrument now, and noted that the committee is waiting for feedback.

Circles of Support and Accountability – Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky: Chris noted that this is a Colorado based non-profit organization, which has been funded at various point through the Department of Corrections and the State Judicial Department. He indicated that he is not aware of the status of this organization due to its newly revised structure.

Family, Education, Engagement, and Support Committee - Bobbi Ponis: Bobbi discussed that this committee was established three years ago at the request of family members and representatives of agencies who are involved in the movement of offenders. She mentioned this committee has been creating a resource guide (Resource Guide for Families of Adults Accused, Charged, or Convicted of Sexual Offenses in Colorado) for families of offenders from their arrest to serving sentence. Bobbi went on to describe the various aspects of this resource guide. Bobbi indicated that the working documents will be placed on the Advocates for Change website, and noted that this committee meets on the 1st Friday of each month from 9:00 – 11:00 am.

Executive Committee – Judge Kopcow: Judge Kopcow noted this committee meets monthly as per Legislative mandate and discuss items under their purview. He noted that this committee meets on the 4th Wednesday of each month from 12:00 -2:00 pm.

Sex Offender Registry Legislative Workgroup – Jeff Shay: Jeff indicated that this workgroup met one time in December 2017. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky mentioned that this workgroup is discussing the issues of registration and incapacitation.

SOMB Meeting Adjourned: 2:37

Results By Question

1.) Motion to approve January minutes (Multiple Choice)

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	67%	10
No	0%	0
Abstain	33%	5
Totals	100%	15

2.) Motion to approve as amended (Multiple Choice)

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	94%	17
No	0%	0
Abstain	6%	1
Totals	100%	18

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

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	94%	17
No	0%	0
Abstain	6%	1
Totals	100%	18

Session Name: New Session 2-16-2018 11-58 AM

Date Created: 2/16/2018 8:32:38 AM Active Participants: 19 of 24

Average Score: 0.00%

Questions: 3

Results Detail

Name	Q1	Q2	Q3	Total Points	Score
Answer Key	-	-	-	0.00	-
Aguilar-Dave, Norma	1	1	-	0.00	-
Baydarian, Mary	-	-	1	0.00	-
Bednarski, Rick	-	1	1	0.00	-
Boyd, Allison	1	1	1	0.00	-
Holbrook, Sharon	3	1	3	0.00	-
Davies, Merve	1	1	1	0.00	-
Elger, Korey	3	1	1	0.00	-
Fitch, Amy	-	1	1	0.00	-
Gursky, Missy	1	1	1	0.00	-
Hansen, Jesse	1	1	1	0.00	-
Jenks, Jeff	1	1	1	0.00	-
Leversee, Tom	1	1	1	0.00	-
May, Rick	1	1	1	0.00	-
Meza, Jessica	3	1	1	0.00	-
Moore, Kandy	1	1	1	0.00	-
Odenheimer, John	1	1	1	0.00	-
Shay, Jeff	-	3	1	0.00	-
Singer, Robin	3	1	1	0.00	-
Weant, Angel	3	1	1	0.00	-
Participant List Averages	-	-	-	0.00	-