

SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD (SOMB) MINUTES

Friday, October 21, 2016

SOMB Members

Allison Boyd
Amy Fitch
Angel Weant
Brie Franklin
Carl Blake
Jeff Jenks
Jeff Shay
Jessica Meza
John Odenheimer
Kim English
Korey Elger
Leonard Woodson III
Marcelo Kopcow
Mary Baydarian
Merve Davies
Missy Gursky
Nancy Jackson
Norma Aguilar-Dave
Pam Bricker
Rick May
Tom Leversee

Visitors

Angela Bryan	Nicole Leon
Bart Cox	Pat Harris
Cassi Sattazahn	Roger Kincade
Christine Rinke	Samantha Story
Colton McNutt	Sherry Hoang
Deb Baty	Steve Parker
Gary Reser	Susan Walker
Greg Brown	Thomas Casey
Greg Hisscock	Tim Johnson
Jo Stack	Tom Nelson
Jodie Goter	Valerie Estrada
Joe Thome	Wendy Diesemeier
Katharina Booth	
Laurie Rose Kepros	
Layla Sadighi	
Mable Banks	
Margaret Ochoa	
Maytal Schmidt	
Millie Villafane	
Mona Murch	

Absent SOMB Members: Allie Watt, Jessica Curtis, Kandy Moore and Richard Bednarski

Staff:

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

SOMB Meeting Begins: 9:07 am

Introductions:

Introductions were made by all members and visitors present. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky introduced Joe Thome, the new Deputy Director of the Division of Criminal Justice.

Future Agenda Items:

Lenny Woodson mentioned that the Department of Corrections will have a Lifetime Supervision Criteria recommendation to present in January 2017.

Announcements:

John Odenheimer announced that the practice of emailing certain informational materials to the SOMB will continue to be coordinated through the staff, and to please refrain from commenting on these emails. He also reminded all SOMB members and staff that emails are a public matter and that these are not confidential. Judge Kopcow mentioned that when he sends emails regarding a specific case, it is ok for SOMB members ask questions as long as they are not regarding an SOMB pending issue. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded that the SOMB will keep a record of all emails and these will be available if requested.

Allison Boyd announced that October is Domestic Violence Month and to keep in mind the issue of domestic violence and how it impacts the SOMB.

Kelli Reynolds mentioned that the registration for juveniles who commit sexual offenses research will be updated in the Legislative Report and an update on the Report will be addressed at the November SOMB meeting.

Carl Blake stated there has not been much SOMB involvement in the Mental Health task force exploring juvenile registry issues and recommended the SOMB create a sub-committee regarding juvenile registration legislation. Judge Kopcow responded that this will be discussed in the Executive Committee. Amy Fitch suggested that the Juvenile Standards Revisions Committee handle the Mental Health sub-committee as requested by Carl Blake.

Raechel Alderete announced that the "live" revisions to the Juvenile Standards are now on the website and that the SOMB staff is working on a quick reference to assist in finding the latest revisions. She mentioned that the SOMB staff is looking at improving the website and asked that any feedback be directed to Marina Borysov. Raechel also mentioned the Developmentally Disabled/Intellectually Disabled resource document update recommendation has been discussed by the Executive Committee and will be addressed at a later date due to a lack of time and resources. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky suggested reaching out to DeeAnn Majors for input and expertise on this topic.

Judge Kopcow mentioned that he and Angel Weant spoke at an event of Municipal Judges and city attorneys regarding sex offender management from the judicial standpoint. Angel responded that she enjoyed the event and that the audience was very receptive.

Michelle Geng announced that there were no 20 day comments to the Adult Standards Section 1.000 and that they are ratified by the SOMB.

Approval of September Minutes:

Motion to approve the September Minutes: Jeff Shay; Merve Davies 2nd (Question #1)

18 Approve 0 Oppose 1 Abstain Motion Passes

Approval of Agenda:

The agenda was approved by consensus.

SVP Assessment Instrument Direction for the Committee (Decision Item) – Kim English and Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky outlined last month's discussion regarding the Sexually Violent Predator (SVP) Assessment Instrument direction. He mentioned that the Executive Committee decided on a 2-step process:

- Whether the committee and Office of Research & Statistics (ORS) should move forward with a new model; and if approved,
- The Office of Research and Statistics will continue to develop a new model.

Chris reiterated that the SOMB needs to make a decision at this meeting to move forward with preliminary guidance and to address the 3A Sex Offense History portion of the model. He also mentioned the concerns to be addressed at the November or December SOMB meetings regarding the SVP recidivism measure and the SVP lifetime designation without the chance of removal. Chris then went on to give a brief outline of the current SVP Assessment Instrument.

Judge Kopcow reiterated the fact that the courts continue to make the final decision regardless of the SVP instrument scoring. He suggested reading through People vs. Brosh (2012).

Board Discussion:

Merve Davies commented that this will only be a stop-gap measure, and while being supportive of making the change, would like the SOMB to encourage the Legislature to correct the flawed legislation.

Amy Fitch presented a motion to move forward with a new assessment instrument.

Tom Leversee stated that the SVP statutory requirements are in conflict with the SOMB's ability to develop an evidence based risk assessment instrument. He stated that due to this conflict he is not in agreement to move forward with changes. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded that if there is no decision to move forward with a revised risk assessment, then the current one will remain in place.

Kim English responded that this proposed revision is to improve on the actuarial risk assessment scale with a much more accurate risk scale and indicated the SOMB can be influential by moving forward with this instrument.

Audience Discussion:

Susan Walker stated her concern that the SOMB will revise the assessment and will not address the shortcomings with the legislation.

Motion to Develop a New Instrument: Amy Fitch; 2nd (Question #2)

19 Approve

0 Oppose

0

Abstain

Motion Passes

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky mentioned the decision item to keep 3A in the new instrument or work toward removing it once the instrument is revised. Kim English responded that it would be necessary to keep 3A in it until the new instrument is created as it affects the sex history variables of the new actuarial scale.

Board Discussion:

Amy Fitch stated that after conferring with stakeholders, they indicated that 3A is a clear indicator of risk and she is in favor of keeping 3A in the new instrument.

Korey Elger asked if keeping 3A in the document, will it make the new instrument more valid. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded that it will not influence the validity of the new instrument one way of the other.

Kim English discussed that 3A is strictly a policy component based on research that will affect the actuarial scale and will help determine which variables to put in the scale. She also mentioned that 3B will be just as accurate.

Allison Boyd echoed Amy Fitch's comments and reiterated that the courts are using their discretion in designating an SVP. She also indicated that 3A should be kept in the new assessment.

Angel Weant also communicated with stakeholders and stated that given that the Supreme Court has provided direction to judges in these matters is in support of keeping 3A knowing that prior offenses are key indicators of risk.

Carl Blake asked Kim English if it would be possible to move 3A into 3B and weight it to give the greatest accuracy and capture all the previous offenses. Kim responded that if 3A is eliminated, the ORS will add sex history crimes to the 3B weighted analysis but it will not capture the data in the same way as 3A. It would be possible for someone with a prior sex crime to not meet criteria if 3A were eliminated.

Merve Davies noted that what is being captured in this population may not be detected in an actuarial scale and stated that 3A should be kept in the assessment.

Rick May responded that he has concerns that an actuarial instrument may not be the best instrument to make an SVP recommendation and protect the community.

Audience Discussion:

Laurie Kepros brought up the idea that previous offenses committed many years prior may not be as high a risk based on research that states that an offender who has successfully lived in the community for 5 years without a re-offense and is concerned that the courts could misuse the history. She went on to cite the mandate for the SOMB in creating an assessment that can predict an offenders level of risk and does not feel 3A does this. Laurie noted that the SVP designation stigmatizes an offender which causes isolation.

Susan Walker noted her opposition to 3A.

Board Discussion:

Nancy Jackson mentioned her confusion as to whether 3A is evidenced based or not and asked for clarification of the research.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded to Laurie Kepros and Nancy Jackson that the 5 year offense free factor is not a factor if they recidivate, and noted that the role of SVP designation is not to reduce risk but to provide notification to the community. He also reminded all that the SVP designation is a statutory mandate and one we have to work with. Chris went on to state that there is no one stand-alone risk factor, but sex offense history is one of the strongest risk factors there is.

Korey Elger asked if there is any data as to the court designation where they deviate from the assessment tool. Judge Kopcow responded that he does not have that information. Angel Weant noted that she will try to find out.

Jessica Meza asked Kim English if 3A is not included, will prior sex history be included in the 3B actuarial section. Jessica noted that 3B will have the most current researched based assessment indicators.

Amy Fitch presented a motion to include 3A in the instrument: Amy Fitch, Allison Boyd 2nd

There was continued discussion regarding the prior sex offenses, the length of time since these offenses, and if it affects current risk.

Audience Discussion:

Gary Reser stated that out of 1500 offenders studied through his agency, only five had the SVP designation, and that they all hit on the 3B section and not the 3A section, with no judicial overrides.

Motion to Keep 3A in the Instrument: Amy Fitch; Allison Boyd 2nd **(Question #3)**

11 Approve	9 Oppose	0 Abstain	Motion Passes
-------------------	-----------------	------------------	----------------------

BREAK: 10:26 – 10:44

Provider Credentials/Education (Action Item) – Application Review Committee

Carl Blake reviewed the Application Review Committee’s (ARC) provider survey regarding required provider credentials. He mentioned that after review of the survey, there is consensus for ARC to attempt to create a mechanism for non-licensed providers to move to a full operating level. Carl also noted that this may include being in good standing for a certain number of years and may require specific hours of training. He asked if the SOMB will support the ARC to create this process.

Board Discussion:

Amy Fitch asked what the educational difference is between licensed and unlicensed. Carl responded that it depends on the educational background of the provider in which some have license eligible degrees, and that some do not but have decades of experience. He noted that a minimum of a Bachelor’s degree in a behavioral health field is required.

Mary Baydarian agreed that they need to be licensed and is aware of the lack of resources in rural areas but that the requirements need to be strict.

Missy Gursky mentioned the survey results were mixed with strong opinions, and that these should be given to the SOMB for review.

Carl responded that ARC would create the criteria to include these providers and then the SOMB would decide whether to include them in the Standards.

Amy Fitch would like to see the results and the committee model, but felt the education piece might have more value than experience.

Allison Boyd asked if the ARC would consider including enhanced supervision experience in the criteria.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that the current criteria are very stringent and that he will send out the results of the survey to SOMB members.

Merve Davies mentioned that he would prefer that ARC bring back a process to the SOMB before making a decision.

Lenny Woodson asked for clarification of the Supervisor and Full Operating Level status. Carl Blake responded that a license is required for the Supervisor level which means they can supervise others and that criteria will not change. He also mentioned that the licensure requirement may be lifted for Full-Operating Level status and that would mean that a treatment provider would not have to be supervised.

Audience Discussion: None

There was SOMB consensus for ARC to move forward with criteria for this issue.

Responsivity to Treatment (Presentation) – Jesse Hansen, Steve Parker, and Missy Gursky (Handout Provided)

Jesse Hansen and Steve Parker gave an in-depth presentation of the Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR) principles and how it affects populations in the Criminal Justice System. Steve Parker stated that RNR is not a treatment modality but is a system or structure that can be used in many different areas. The presentation focused on the Responsivity principle.

Board Discussion:

Angel Weant encouraged all to apply the three principles of RNR and noted that all are good at the risk principle, but there may be less adherence to needs and responsivity.

Steve Parker noted that if the therapeutic alliance is strong it can have an impact on recidivism.

Jessica Meza mentioned that she tries to be culturally sensitive with clients and referrals, and to understand the different nuances between cultures.

Missy Gursky mentioned that the evaluator should speak the same language as the client whenever possible. She also noted the need to be aware of cultural inequality and encouraged evaluators and treatment providers to build the therapeutic alliance. She reiterated the fact that treatment providers need to take the time to learn the culture of the client. Missy also commented that the client needs to know that it is a therapeutic safe environment and have a level of trust with the evaluator and treatment provider.

Tom Leversee discussed that treatment providers need to be aware of the desire of the client to protect one's self-image and cultural identity and that they may be seen as unmotivated or resistant to treatment.

Steve Parker mentioned that one trust factor is to have a conversation early on with the client as to what the role of the therapist is and what information is shared and not shared.

Audience Discussion:

Susan Walker brought up the issue of the special needs populations and that they were not addressed in this presentation. Steve Parker responded that these populations need to be separated from the general population and was not addressed at this time.

LUNCH: 12:03-12:47

Adult Standards Section 2.000 Review of Public Comment (Decision Item) – Missy Gursky and Michelle Geng

(Handout Provided)

Michelle Geng outlined the revisions to this section and that these were open to public comment for 20 days. She reviewed these comments and modifications, and noted that most of the public comment has been incorporated into this section.

Board Discussion:

Tom Leversee asked what the specific statute is that addresses if an evaluator recommends treatment.

Allison Boyd responded that treatment shall be required to the extent appropriate and mentioned the Hernandez case law that this applies to non-sex offenses.

Judge Kopcow read the statute 16-11.7-105: *"Each adult sex offender and juvenile who has committed a sexual offense sentenced by the court for an offense committed on or after January 1, 1994, shall be required, as a part of any sentence to probations, commitment to the department of human services, sentence to community corrections, incarcerations with the department of corrections, placement on parole, or out-of-home placement to undergo treatment to the extent appropriate to such offender based upon the recommendations of the evaluation and identification made pursuant to section 16-11.7-104 or based upon any subsequent recommendations by the department of corrections, the judicial department, the department of human services, or the division of criminal justice in the department of public safety, whichever is appropriate."*

Audience Discussion:

Laurie Kepros discussed the Hernandez case which refutes mandated sex offense treatment for a non-sex offense conviction. She asked the SOMB to take this into account while modifying the standards.

Greg Hisscock mentioned that the "if available" language be added throughout 2.600 and in the table for consistency. Missy Gursky agreed that this should be added.

Gary Reser made the suggestion to use the 2011 Standards and white papers to update them with these incorporated.

Board Comments:

Missy Gursky responded that this information they added, which includes the Burns case criteria, will be added to the Standards.

There was continued discussion regarding how to include this information and it was decided to insert a "reference" in the discussion points of each standard which points to the specific white paper, etc. that will be added as an appendix.

Amy Fitch mentioned that the Hernandez case findings are fact specific and did not agree with Laurie Kepros' assessment that no sex offense treatment is allowed for a sex offense conviction. Allison Boyd agreed to Amy Fitch's comments regarding the Hernandez case and that the Standards need to be written to include the majority of situations and not the rare occurrences.

Mary Baydarian would like to re-insert what type of treatment is needed "If any" or clarification with other language into 2.000.

Amy Fitch responded that the Standards should not reflect language that is contradictory to the Statute.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky suggested adding "for those sexual history offenders see appendix" as an option.

Judge Kopcow asked the evaluators if there was a time when they did not recommend offense specific treatment. The responses were varied and that there was usually some type of treatment needed.

Jessica Meza discussed that the interpretation of this statute needs to be clarified and sees the need to rethink the language a little more.

Michelle Geng stated that the Adult Standards definition of boundaries is not an "offense specific" treatment.

Allison Boyd proposed a motion to approve 2.000 Standards with Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky's suggestion to reference the white papers, and add the Review Victim Impact Statement to open bullet

Motion to Approve Adult Standards Section 2.000 as amended: Allison Boyd; Amy 2nd (Question #4)

17 Approve

2 Oppose

0

Abstain

Motion Passes

Adult Standards Revisions Regarding Burns Case (Decision Item) – Michelle Geng and the Executive Committee

(Handout Provided)

Michelle Geng gave a brief discussion of the revisions to the 5.000 Adult Standards. She is looking for approval of the SOMB member comments as indicated. Michelle read the Burns specific language that will be included in the standards.

Judge Kopcow clarified the "pursuant to local procedures" language.

Michelle read through the SOMB feedback on:

- 5.201 – the right of the treatment provider to refuse treatment
- 5.310 – regarding the CST to place protective measures – may not be included
- 5.700 – to consult with the non-offending parent when contact has been allowed.

Board Discussion:

Carl Blake responded to 5.201 and discussed the committee decision to shorten the language in 5.201 and then expound with more specifics in Section 3.000. He suggested the following language in 5.201: *"A treatment provider has the right to not accept a referral based on the providers determination that he/she cannot meet the needs of the client. For more information, please refer to section 3.XXX."* Carl Blake will email Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky this language.

Allison Boyd requested revised language in 5.753, when clarification is "requested" to when clarification is "approved".

Merve Davies requested changing visual time to "viewing time" through the Standards.

Audience Discussion:

Greg Brown suggested that the SOMB feedback (in red) be inserted in Section 5.310 H just before "In such cases".

Tim Johnson responded to the Burns language and cited People vs. Barber and People vs. Dunlap findings that state that the Colorado Supreme Court is not bound by the Federal Circuit Court. He suggested the SOMB use proactive language to 5.610 that will give guidance to treatment providers. He suggested the following language in Section 5.725 *"There may be instances when a court has issued an order expressly allowing contact or restricted contact between the offender and his/her own child(ren). It is the duty of the treatment provider and CST to report to the Court any contraindicated contact between an offender and his/her minor child(ren)."*

Mona Murch asked if clarification is going to be optional. Michelle Geng responded that no, there will still be the need for the offender to complete the written clarification as part of their treatment program.

Board Comments:

Amy Fitch made a motion to adopt Adult Standards Section 5.000 with Burns language modifications along with Carl Blake and Allison

Boyd's revisions to 5.701 and 5.753 respectively. She also suggested adding Tim Johnson's alternative proactive language.

Tim Johnson will email this language to the SOMB members for further review. There were additional discussions regarding the current revisions proposed by Tim Johnson.

Amy Fitch revised her motion to approve the Burns language revisions to include only Carl Blake, Allison Boyd, and Greg Brown's recommended changes and not to include Tim Johnson's language.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky mentioned that when approved, these revisions will be open for 20 day public comment and brought back to next month's SOMB meeting.

Motion to Approve Adult Standards Burns Revisions as amended: Amy Fitch; Carl Blake 2nd **(Question #5)**

18 Approve

1 Oppose

0

Abstain

Motion Passes

Raechel Alderete reminded all that the Burns decision also applies to the juvenile population.

BREAK: 2:23 – 2:40

Adult Sex Offense History Standard Discussion Point (Decision Item) – Allison Boyd (handout provided by Allison)

Allison Boyd discussed the alternate language which includes proposed additional language from stakeholders and the SOMB regarding the inclusion of when an offender invokes their right to not self-incriminate during sexual history polygraphs.

Board Discussion:

Jessica Meza noted that she would like time to review this document and to take back to her stakeholders. She also requested that language be added that references evidence based research. Jessica indicated that she is not prepared to vote on this issue today.

Korey Elger questioned if the "substantial penalty to increase treatment based on failure to disclose" language opens the door for an appeal. Judge Kopcow responded to review the Roberson case decision as it covers this issue.

Carl Blake asked where this language would be imbedded the Standards. He asked that the first two paragraphs are sufficient and that the remaining language be removed.

Tom Leversee mentioned that this document could be more concise and reference more evidence based research.

Amy Fitch mentioned her concern that this wording is a little outside the purview of the SOMB. Judge Kopcow responded that SOMB is designed to give direction but to not give legal advice.

John Odenheimer suggested having the standard and the discussion point together in the same document for review after discussion today. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky pulled up Standard 3.160 I-2 on the screen where this proposed discussion language will be inserted.

Kim English agreed that the first two paragraphs are clear.

Angel Weant noted her concerns about specific polygraph statements in this document regarding the lack of information indicating an offender is high risk. She suggested adding "Polygraph Disclosures" at the end of the document and that there should be more team guidance as how to proceed when these situations occur.

There was continued discussion between SOMB members to keep the language short and concise.

Audience Discussion:

Dale Jenkins mentioned that increasing supervision for not answering sex history questions is not part of the recommendations for which the Best Practices Committee is striving.

Susan Walker concurred with Tom Leversee's comments and suggested other revisions to the language to include the removal of the word "containment".

Steve Parker asked where the science is behind the statement "an offender who refuses sex history questions are considered higher risk". He also mentioned that if a client does not answer questions on the Sex History polygraph, then the DOC still has to pay for these polygraphs.

Greg Brown of Boulder defended the use of polygraph. He mentioned that the court and the prosecuting attorney has a role in the sex history disclosure issue and that the current language in the Standards and discussion point is too broad and needs to be more clear and consistent. Greg suggested that the 5th Amendment questions need to be answered by the Courts and the Standards need to reflect current law. He also mentioned that the Colorado Sex Offender Standards need to be the best they can be as other states are looking to Colorado for guidance and direction.

Christine Rinke responded that the public was not given the opportunity to review and respond to this proposed discussion language to Standard 3.610 I-2. She also mentioned the need for additional guidance in this Standard for assessing risk and managing needs. Christine aired her dissatisfaction with this entire Standard and that it does not capture the intent of the SOMB or current case law.

Mona Murch reiterated that the SOMB is empowered create guidelines for offenders to disclose sexual history in such a way that does not self-incriminate.

Katarina Booth reiterated the need for sex history information for the management and treatment for sex offenders.

Board Discussion:

Carl Blake suggested revised language to this document and recommended the discussion point include the first 2 paragraphs and the last paragraph of Allison's document.

Judge Kopcow suggested adding this to next month's agenda after there has been time for public review and input. He asked to have all suggested language back to Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky by 11/14.

This discussion has been tabled until next month with no decision made.

Juvenile Standards Revisions – Definitions (Action Item) – Carl Blake and Raechel Alderete (Handout Provided)

Carl discussed the revisions made to the Definitions Section and mentioned that some were deleted as they were already included in the applicable section.

Raechel Alderete also noted that due to confusion around the DD/ID Definitions as to who would qualify to see the Adult Standards for clarification, and also asked if there needs to be additional specific language.

Board Discussion:

Korey Elger suggested adding the "State" Department of Human Services for clarification.

Amy Fitch suggested the Developmental/Intellectual Disability definition to change "mental retardation" to what is in DSM5. Missy Gursky responded that she will look this up.

Carl Blake noted that the suggested changes and revisions will be made and will bring back to next month's SOMB meeting.

Adult Polygraph Standards Revision Committee Appendices Changes (Update) – Jeff Jenks and Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky (Handout provided)

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky gave an update of the revisions to the Appendices of the Adult Polygraph Standards from the Polygraph Committee and the Best Practices Committee. He noted the removal of the polygraph sanctions grids, the deletion the ATSA Ethical Guidelines in both the Adult and Juvenile Standards which are outdated, and the insertion of the new ones in the Adult Standards only as they are not appropriate for the Juvenile Standards. Chris also mentioned that a Model Suitability Policy criteria resource from the American Polygraph Association will be added to this appendix.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky mentioned he will email out the Model Suitability criteria for all to review and will bring back the requested revisions to the SOMB as soon as possible.

SOMB Meeting Adjourned: 3:58

Session Name

New Session 10-21-2016 12-10 PM (1)

Date Created

10/21/2016 8:44:40 AM

Active Participants

20

Total Participants

24

Average Score

0.00%

Questions

5

Results by Question**1. Motion to Approve the September Minutes (Multiple Choice)**

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	94.74%	18
No	0.00%	0
Abstain	5.26%	1
Totals	100%	19

2. Motion to Develop a New Instrument (Multiple Choice)

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	100.00%	19
No	0.00%	0
Abstain	0.00%	0
Totals	100%	19

3. Motion to Keep 3A in the instrument (Multiple Choice)

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	55.00%	11
No	45.00%	9
Abstain	0.00%	0
Totals	100%	20

4. Motion to approve Section 2.00 as amended (Multiple Choice)

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	89.47%	17
No	10.53%	2
Abstain	0.00%	0
Totals	100%	19

5. Motion to approve the Burns language as amended (Multiple Choice)

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	94.74%	18
No	5.26%	1
Abstain	0.00%	0
Totals	100%	19

Session Name

New Session 10-21-2016 12-10 PM (1)

Date Created

10/21/2016 8:44:40 AM

Active Participant Total Participants

20

24

Average Score

0.00%

Questions

5

Results Detail

Last Name	First Name	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Total Points	Score
Answer Key		-	-	-	-	-	0.00	-
Aguilar-Dave	Norma	-	1	2	2	1	0.00	-
Akins	Brie	1	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Baydarian	Mary	1	1	2	1	1	0.00	-
Blake	Carl	1	1	2	1	1	0.00	-
Boyd	Allison	1	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Bricker	Pam	1	1	2	1	1	0.00	-
Davies	Merve	1	1	1	-	1	0.00	-
Elger	Korey	1	-	1	1	1	0.00	-
English	Kim	1	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Fitch	Amy	1	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Gursky	Missy	1	1	2	1	1	0.00	-
Jackson	Nancy	3	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Jenks	Jeff	1	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Leversee	Tom	1	1	2	1	1	0.00	-
May	Rick	1	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Meza	Jessica	1	1	2	2	2	0.00	-
Odenheimer	John	1	1	2	1	1	0.00	-
Shay	Jeff	1	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Weant	Angel	1	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Woodson III	Lenny	1	1	2	1	-	0.00	-
Participant List Averages		-	-	-	-	-	0.00	-