



**Batterer Intervention Program Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
January 26, 2024; 9:00 am to 11:00 am  
Remote video meeting**

**In Attendance:**

Amy Benedum, Saydyie DeRosia, Melissa Erlbaum, Chris Huffine, Eric Mankowski, Marci Nelson, Shannon Sivell

**Absent:** Vivien Bliss, Aaron Hartman, Maureen Lowell, Shannon Sivell, Vanessa Timmons

**Minutes:** Sherree Rodriguez

**Guests:** Phil Broyles, Tracey Coffman, Jon Hansen

**Welcome/Opening**

Phil Broyles requested to observe the meeting, with particular interest in women's standards changes. Mr. Broyles is Executive Director of Teras Intervention and Counseling, in Portland, and works with substance abuse disorder and batterer intervention treatment.

Jon Hansen and Tracey Coffman joined the meeting as representatives of Department of Corrections, (DOC) Oregon Community Corrections Division.

**BIP Work Conversation – DOC/Jon Hansen and Tracy Coffman**

Jon Hansen and Tracey Coffman shared their work related to Batterer Intervention Programs (BIPs). Prior to COVID, program review in DOC was done through the Correctional Program Checklist (CPC), which is quite labor-intensive, allowing for a maximum of 15-18 reviews per year. There are two staff to evaluate the state's BIP, sex offender, and substance abuse programs as a portion of their responsibility. The CPC tool created an adversarial process and was not helpful to providers. They now use the George Mason tool, allowing for a more personalized, more effective, and much less labor-intensive process. They completed 71 reviews in the last biennium.

The new process has an emphasis on risk, need and treatment as a way of evaluating program effectivity. The hope is to build bridges with the programs.

Summary of discussion:

- Concerns were raised about complications of the self-pay requirements of the system. There is significant evidence that this is not best practice, even for survivors as it tends to come out of family finances.
- Dosage requirements for high-risk participants is 300 hours, which is significantly higher than BIP OAR requirements. Funding is an obstacle.
- The quality of BIP services around the state varies greatly.
- Jon and Tracey advocate for virtual BIP options, especially for rural counties or those with culturally specific needs to access best practice expertise. However, one problem with this is that it could compromise coordinated community response. A demonstration project for this would be a helpful way to review and research the options.
- Jon and Tracey suggested a return visit to further pursue the conversation. The group agreed this would be helpful.



**Tri-County Work – Marci Nelson**

In 2017-18 Washington, Multnomah and Clackamas Counties worked to improve program evaluation. They created a review process for alignment with SB81 state OARs for batterer intervention, which could be used in all counties. The team is creating an online SB81 review without the need for paper documentation. Programs can upload their own documents. Related, the CPC review process was used by DOC before 2020, but because of the cumbersome nature of the process it was not one that most providers chose to participate in. For program reviews, language translation and other cultural barriers pose challenges. Review processes would benefit from a simplification of the standards, to further alleviate the burdensome nature of the process.

**Minutes Approval** – The AC approved the minutes of October 27, 2023, to post to the DOJ website.

*Future meeting emphasis:*

*February 23 – OAR review*

*April 26 – language specific services*

*Other meetings scheduled:*

*July 26*

*October 25*

*Meeting adjourned at 11:00 am*