

SEXUAL OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD

EST. 2011

Brad Little
Governor



Certification/QA Sub-Committee
December 11, 2020
Idaho Department of Correction
Zoom

Members present (subcommittee):

Dr. Michael Johnston, Chair
Jeff Betts, Vice Chair
Paula Garay, Member
Melissa Hultberg, Member
Brian Marx, Member

Others Present:

Emily MacMaster, Deputy Attorney General
Nancy Volle, Program Manager
Jamie Lundy Shepherd, AA2

Guest:

Call to Order

Dr. Johnston called the sub-committee meeting to order at 8:07 am

Certification and QA Sub-Committee:

- Mr. Marx moved that the subcommittee convene in executive session at 8:10 am to: Consider records that are exempt from public disclosure [I.C. § 74-206(1)(d)] chapter 1, title 74, Idaho code see I.C. § 74-106(9). The purpose of the subcommittee executive session is to consider applications for SOMB certification and to advise the board. It was seconded by Mr. Marx. The vote was Dr. Johnson, Chair, aye; Mr. Betts, Vice Chair, aye; Ms. Hultberg, Member, aye; Ms. Garay, Member, and Mr. Marx, Member, aye.
- Mr. Marx motioned to exit the Sub-Committee meeting at 9:30 am, it was seconded by Ms. Hultberg and all remaining members present voted aye.

Regular Meeting Minutes
December 11, 2020
Idaho Department of Correction
Zoom

Members present:

Dr. Michael Johnston, Chair
Jeff Betts, Vice Chair
Melissa Hultberg, Member
Paula Garay, Member
John Dinger, Member

Brian Marx, Member
Ryan Porter, Member
Matt Thomas, Member
Moira Lynch, Member

Others Present:

Emily MacMaster, Deputy Attorney General
Nancy Volle, Program Manager
Jamie Lundy Shepherd, AA 2

Guest:

Shelly Osborne
Brad Rayburn

Excused

Karin Magnelli, Deputy Attorney General
Carlos Ponce, Member

Call to Order

Dr. Johnston called the full board meeting to order at 9:48 am and the motion was seconded by Ms. Hultberg.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Marx motioned at 9:48am that the Board convene in executive session under I.C. §74-206(1)(d) to consider records that are exempt from public disclosure as provided in chapter1, title 74, Idaho Code (see I.C. § 74-106(9)). It was seconded by Mr. Dinger. The vote was: Ms. Hultberg, Member, aye; Dr. Johnston, Chair, aye; Mr. Marx, Member, aye; Ms. Garay, Member, aye; Mr. Thomas, Member aye; Mr. Betts, Vice Chair, aye and Mr. Dinger, Member, aye; Ms. Lynch, Member, aye.

Mr. Marx motioned at 9:51am to come out of executive session. It was seconded by Ms. Lynch and all remaining members present voted aye.

Board Business:

1.) Motions-Certification Applications (Action item):

- ❖ **SOMB 1:** Initial application for Associate Level Adult Psychosexual Evaluator with Conditional Waiver. Mr. Marx motioned to approve the Associate Level Adult Psychosexual Evaluator certification with Conditional Waiver for December 2020. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion and all remaining members present voted aye. **Motion carried.**

2.) Renewal Application Approvals:

- ❖ Ms. Volle advised the Board the following applications for renewal certification were approved:
 - a. December 2020-2: Senior Adult Treatment Provider
 - b. December 2020-3: Senior Adult Psychosexual Evaluator
 - c. December 2020-5: Senior Adult Psychosexual Evaluator
 - d. December 2020-6: Senior Juvenile Psychosexual Evaluator

3.) Meeting Minutes (Action item):

- Mr. Marx motioned to approve the November 13, 2020 minutes with the update from Ms. MacMaster. It was seconded by Ms. Hultberg and all remaining members present voted aye. **Motion carried.**
- ❖ Brad Rayburn and Shelly Osborne joined the open meeting as guests via Zoom.

4.) Budget:

- Reviewed current budget for the SOMB.
- Dr. Johnston would like to attend training in February 2021. Details of the training will be added to the January 2021 agenda as an action item.

5.) Supervisory Certification Discussion:

- There is a need for Supervisory level of Certification. Ms. Volle discussed needing more structure in order to create guidelines.
- Ms. MacMaster addressed the availability of Supervisors. She said it is a question of “who.”
- Ms. Volle went over the required supervision standards for all the certification levels. She asked if the Board wants to stay with the supervision requirements currently in our standards. Dr. Johnston

agrees with current supervision standards and added we need to always be mindful of protection of the public. The numbers were created based off best practice at a national level by CSOMB. He also reminded the Board that the restrictions were lowered a few years ago. He agrees with the issue of “who” and stated there needs to be a standard to define the level. He is thinking of specialized categories but doesn’t want to make it harder. An example would be retired supervisors.

- Mr. Rayburn said he has found when carving out a niche’, most will take supervision seriously. He has found some are not comfortable with certain supervisors. It could be a personal issue, work dynamic, etc. He suggested this be considered.
- Ms. Garay likes the idea of separate categories and the idea of allowing supervision without an active case load. She said there is a need to align with what other Boards are doing. Dr. Johnston recommends basing it on work product and then incorporating specialized training for supervision.
- Ms. Hultberg and Dr. Johnston discussed incentives to encourage people to supervise. Ms. Volle added for treatment providers, individuals that are employed within agencies have the most success with finding supervisors, as the senior providers in those agencies are willing to provide the supervision required.
- Dr. Johnston asked if independent categories should be created based on work product, continued education and if they have the skills or just have an additional category that demonstrates skill but no active workload? Ms. Osborne said it is the Evaluator Supervision that is not parallel and adding 2-3 more supervisors would make a difference. Mr. Betts said other Boards do not require supervision for Evaluators because it’s time intensive.

6.) Tiered Registration Discussion:

- Ms. Volle said she received a response from California (CA). They are providing her contact information from the Department of Justice to discuss California’s new registry.
- Mr. Dinger asked for information on how the crimes are placed in certain tiers. Ms. Volle said she has a PowerPoint with the last proposal that she will send to Mr. Dinger. Dr. Johnston advised it is based on 5 tiers but is unsure how they came up with this. It was based off the Adam Walsh matrix which is 3 tiers. Mr. Marx suggested it needs to be based not just on crime, but also risk level.

Adjourned at 11:54 a.m.

Submitted by: Jamie Lundy Shepherd, AA2 SOMB