

Virginia Sexual and Domestic Violence Program Professional Standards Committee

Approved Meeting Minutes

Shelter for Help in Emergency's Community Outreach Center
Charlottesville, VA
September 24, 2018

Members Present:

Jennifer Bourne, Director, Clinch Valley Community Action Agency
Cathy Easter, Executive Director, Safe Harbor
Linda Ellis-Williams, Director of Programs, YWCA of Central Virginia
Debbie Evans, Division Chief of the Sexual Assault Center & Domestic Violence Program, City of Alexandria Department of Community & Human Services
Caroline Jones, Executive Director, Doorways for Women & Families
Mary Carter Lominack, Executive Director, Shelter for Help in Emergency
Rebecca Weybright, Executive Director, SARA Charlottesville

Members Present Remotely per §2.2-3708

Teresa Christin, Executive Director, Avalon

Absent Members:

Kandy Freeman, Assistant Executive Director, Madeline's House
Regina Pack Eller, Executive Director, Family Resource Center
Kristina Vadas, Manager of Victims Services, DCJS
Kristi VanAudenhove, Executive Director, VSDVAA

Others Present:

Courtney Meyer, Professional Standards Coordinator, DCJS
Kat Monusky, Prevention Director, VSDVAA (representing Kristi VanAudenhove)

Welcome & Remarks

The meeting started at 10:15 am without a quorum present. Caroline Jones welcomed everyone and asked each member to introduce themselves.

Approve Minutes from August 2018 Meeting

Ms. Jones presented the August 22, 2018 minutes for members to review. There was not a quorum present, so the approval of the August 22, 2018 minutes will be tabled to the October meeting.

September Online Comment Period Update

Ms. Jones asked the Professional Standards Coordinator, Courtney Meyer, to share an update on the comment period with the committee. Ms. Meyer shared how there are fewer comments being received than expected. Ms. Meyer also shared a few themes from the comments such as concerns being raised about the number of training hours being too much and concerns about conducting background checks on staff and volunteers. Ms. Jones asked the committee to please share the link to the comment period with SDV programs close to them.

Leadership Roles

Ms. Jones acknowledged all the changes the committee has recently endured with members leaving and changes to the Chair and Co-Chair positions as well as the addition of new members. Ms. Jones held a general discussion with the committee regarding their leadership styles and comfort level with voicing their thoughts and opinions to the committee.

Application Process & Implementation Stages

Ms. Jones discussed how today she'd like the committee to focus on how to apply, why apply, when/how frequent, who reviews/decisions, and what to submit—online/site review. Ms. Jones had the committee review thoughts about the application process and implementation from past meetings that Ms. Meyer had compiled for the committee. Before breaking into smaller groups, the committee decided to discuss the following bigger picture items:

- a) *Tie accreditation to funding.* The committee discussed how during the old accreditation process that, for some grant programs, 25% of funding was tied to accreditation. The committee wanted to know whether DCJS and other state funders anticipate tying accreditation to funding in the future. There was concern from the committee about recommending to state agencies to tie accreditation to funding because of previous experiences with the old accreditation. The committee agreed to recommend not tying accreditation to funding in the first wave in order to give programs a grace period while working towards accreditation.
- b) *Tiers: Yes or No.* The committee discussed whether they would be using tiers as a stepping stone or a way to measure. The committee discussed how the tiers could be set-up in the application. A committee member suggested that we could have two tiers instead of three, the first being core services and the second is going beyond the core services and doing something more. The committee agreed to have two tiers.
- c) *Timeline for Implementation.* Ms. Jones discussed taking the next two to four meetings to flush out the application and implementation processes. A committee member asked if we've looked at the application process for Washington (state) and what states the Action Alliance had looked at when creating the old application process. Another committee member responded that the Alliance had looked at Wisconsin or Michigan. Ms. Jones asked Ms. Meyer to look into the application process for Washington, Michigan, and Wisconsin. Ms. Jones suggested that the committee work on the following over the next few meetings: refining standards and measures, implementation, and marketing and roll out phase.



- Apply/Application
 - Monitoring
 - Fees
 - When/Frequency
 - Why apply?
 - \$
 - Prof Standard
 - Differentiating
 - How updated?
 - Grievance
 - Who to?
 - Application—is it complete?
 - Review
 - Site Visit
 - Monitoring
 - Role of PSC Ongoing
- >What’s coming
 - >When
 - >What does it mean?
 - >Why apply?
 - >\$
 - >Prof Standard
 - >Differentiating

The committee broke into two small groups, one group discussed the ‘Who to?’ and the other group discussed, ‘Why apply?’. After an hour, the committee reconvened. The ‘Why apply’ group reported back on their discussion. The group shared that they think programs would apply to become accredited to have credibility with their locality and private funders, be prepared in case of opportunity (such as a new source of funding), support state-wide competency so they are not all working in vacuums, professionalize the SDV response, be among the best service providers for survivors, have third party oversight, customized professional development via peer guidance and network of professionals, and the opportunity for recognition of their core work and where they shine. The group also discussed not having fees associated with applying to prevent barriers and that the length of accreditation would be three years. A committee member noted that the code states how fees for accreditation shall be used to support any administrative costs of the department. The group also raised questions around how many agencies would be applying and how to handle communities partnering to meet core services.

Then, the ‘Who to’ group reported back on their discussion. For the application, the group decided the application would initially go to the Professional Standards Coordinator to review for completeness. The Professional Standards Coordinator would also send reminder e-mails to ensure applications are received by the due date. For reviewing the application, the group discussed how the committee needs to figure out its role for the application and implementation phase. The group brainstormed three options for the committee’s role: only write the standards and measures, review accreditation applications, and/or be the grievance group. The group discussed how the applications could be reviewed by the committee, another group of SDV folks, or a professional consultant. The group discussed how site visits could complicate the process time wise, the visits could be done all in the first year, during the third

year, or not at all. If it is determined that site visits will be part of the process, the group did not think doing all the site visits in the first year would be practical. For maintaining accreditation, the group decided the Professional Standards Coordinator would provide technical assistance for the accreditation process and connect programs to resources (e.g. VSDVAA). The group also discussed staggering application times through a random draw, regionally, or other method. The group also discussed how VSDVAA could provide technical assistance related to programmatic content.

As a whole, the committee discussed at what point could programs lose accreditation since there would need to be a commitment to upholding the standards. The committee also discussed what the time frame would be for a program to fix things when a program is not in compliance with a standard.

Next Steps

Ms. Jones discussed the timeline for the next few months with the committee. At the October meeting, the committee will review comments from the comment period, tier what is already done, come back to the application and implementation phases to discuss the committee's role, and discuss a timeframe for the roll-out. At the November meeting, the committee will discuss the implementation and roll-out/marketing phases. Since the December meeting was scheduled two weeks after the November meeting, Ms. Jones decided to cancel the December meeting. At the January meeting, the committee will begin filling in the details of the accreditation application. The committee discussed the possibility of rolling out accreditation to the SDV field in May or June 2019.

Closing Remarks

The meeting adjourned at 3:45pm.

Actions before next meeting

Cathy Easter and Linda Ellis-Williams will provide the Advisory Committee with an update on the comment period at the committee's September 26th meeting. The Professional Standards Coordinator will compile all the comments from the comment period for the committee to review in October. The Professional Standards Coordinator will send all SDV programs a 'Thank You' for participating in the comment period and to stay tuned for the next steps. The Professional Standards Coordinator will also look at other states accreditation application, review, and complaints processes.

Public Comment

There was one member of the public present who did not have any comments.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, October 24, 2018

10am-4pm

Shelter for Help in Emergency in Charlottesville, VA