

Oklahoma Domestic Violence Fatality Review Board

313 N.E. 21st Street, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73005

(405) 522-1984 | FAX (405) 557-1770

MEETING MINUTES

March 24, 2021

Meeting Venue: *The Virtual Meeting was hosted on the WebEx Platform*

MEMBERS

Bardin, Tania (NAAV) [A]	Harrison, Shelly (NAAV) [P]	Sweger, Don, (OACP) [A]
Blanton, Melissa (OAG) [P]	Hawkins, Scott (OSA) [P]	Wilson, Janet (ONA) [P]
Coffey, Sara (OOA) [P]	Jelley, Martina (OSMA) [P]	Warren, Mike (OSC) [P]
Combs, Brandie (OSDH) [A]	Kuester, Laura (OCADVSA) [P]	Woods-Littlejohn, Brandi (OSDH-IPS) [P]
Edstedt, Marissa (DHS) [P]	Mueller, Karen (OBA) [P]	
Garder, Lauren (ODMHSAS) [P]	Pasley, Brandon (OCADVSA) [P]	
Glandon, Donna (OJA) [P]	Sharif, Asma (OCME) [P]	
Green, Beth (OSBI) [P]	Smith, Jeff (DAC) [P]	

I. Call to Order and Confirmation of Compliance with Open Meeting Act

Chair Beth Green presided over the regularly scheduled meeting of the Oklahoma Domestic Violence Fatality Review Board, held virtually hosted on the WebEx virtual platform on March 24, 2021. Notice of the meeting was posted with the Oklahoma Secretary of State and the date, time, place and agenda for the meeting in addition to meeting handout was posted on the web site of the Office of the Attorney General more than twenty-four (24) hours in advance, on March 22, 2021 at 2:37 p.m. Board Chair Beth Green called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

II. Roll Call, Establishment of Quorum, and Introduction of Members

Katy Fortune, Board Program Manager, called the roll. Quorum was achieved at roll call with fourteen (14) members present. Others present included Anthony Hernandez-Rivera, OAG Research Assistant. Donna Glandon joined the meeting at 9:03 a.m. and was present when her name was called for Roll Call. Scott Harkins and Janet Wilson joined the meeting at 9:06 a.m. Mike Warren joined the meeting at 9:20 a.m. Marissa Edstedt lost her connection at 9:31 a.m. but was able to reconnect by phone at 9:32 a.m. and by web video at 9:37 a.m. Sara Coffey left the meeting at 9:58 a.m. Quorum was maintained throughout the meeting.

III. Discussion and Possible Action on Approval of Minutes from February 24, 2021 regular meeting*

Jeff Smith moved to approve the minutes of the February 24, 2021 regular meeting. Marissa Edstedt seconded the motion. The motion was approved by roll call vote (16 Aye, 0 Abstain, 0 Nay).

IV. Discussion and Possible Action on Regular Meeting scheduled for Wednesday, May 26, 2021*

Katy Fortune, Board Program Manager, informed Board members the Virtual Conference on Crimes Against Women was scheduled to take place over a two-week period in May, on May 17-21 and May 24-26. Ms. Fortune advised the dates of the second week of the conference overlapped with the date of the May Board Meeting scheduled for May 26, 2021. Ms. Fortune advised she and Research Assistant Anthony Hernandez-Rivera were scheduled to attend the conference. Ms. Fortune advised she did not know if any other Board members were scheduled to attend the conference but if so, the Board could either vote to cancel the meeting or hold the meeting as usual, since the meeting was scheduled for the

Supported by the Office of Attorney General

final day of the conference. Scott Hawkins advised he would not be attending the conference. No other Board members will be attending the conference. Ms. Fortune stated she and Mr. Hernandez-Rivera can still attend and facilitate the Board meeting in the morning since the conference will be virtual if the Board wants to proceed with the meeting as scheduled. The Board agrees to hold the regularly scheduled May Board Meeting since no Board members are scheduled to attend the conference. No action was taken.

V. Discussion and Possible Action on Mock Case Review to be conducted by the National Domestic Violence Review Initiative*

Katy Fortune, Board Program Manager, informed the Board she had a virtual meeting with Dr. Neil Websdale, Director of the National Domestic Violence Fatality Review Initiative, about several things, including mock reviews. Ms. Fortune advised that part of the VAWA grant that funds the Board includes conducting Mock Fatality Reviews as part of the goals and objectives of the grant. Ms. Fortune advised that one of the technical assistance pieces NDVFRI offers is conducting mock reviews and that they offered to conduct one with the Board. Ms. Fortune advised this could be done as part of a Regular Meeting but it may be better suited for a Special Meeting since the time required for a Mock Review is around 4 hours. Ms. Fortune provided the Board a brief summary of the Mock Review process. Ms. Fortune advised she thinks it would be beneficial in refreshing the Board's perspective on reviews and informing new members on how reviews could be done in different ways. Beth Green stated she would prefer to have a Special Meeting due to the loss of review time last year due to the pandemic. Several Board members were in agreement. General discussion was held about the best way to determine how to schedule the Special Meeting. Discussion was held on whether the Mock Review would be held in person or virtually. Ms. Fortune advised that it would be held virtually since the NDVFRI technical assistance team was not traveling due to the pandemic, but it could be done again in person at a later time. Ms. Fortune advised the NDVFRI also offered technical assistance conducting the in-depth community reviews the Board discussed potentially doing at the last meeting. There was general discussion about what in-depth community reviews were and guidance was provided for the NDVFRI website. The general consensus was that the Mock Review would take place during a Special Meeting and Ms. Fortune or Mr. Hernandez-Rivera would send out some type of poll to collect the Board members' availability to schedule the meeting. No action was taken.

VI. Presentation: DVFRB Codebook Protocol and Codesheets – Katy Fortune and Anthony Hernandez-Rivera*

Katy Fortune, Board Program Manager, and Anthony Hernandez-Rivera, OAG Research Assistant, presented information via PowerPoint on DVFRB Codebook Protocol v.4.2 and Codesheets. Ms. Fortune shared that IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) is the statistical software used by the DVFRB to collect the variables. She said that SPSS is used both for the database to enter all the variables collected by the Fatality Review Board and to run statistical analysis and reports on the data in the database. She reported that staff enters the variables for all of cases that have been reviewed by the Board as well as some cases that have been read by staff. Ms. Fortune reported that staff is currently trying to catch up on entering the variables for the cases that have been read by staff. She shared some of the history of the database, reporting that it initially was built by staff at the Criminal Justice Resource Center based on the Washoe County, Nevada database and the CDC Intimate Partner Violence database variables. She shared the process of determining the revisions to the Codebook that started in 2017 and were finalized in November 2019 and said there are currently 248 variables staff attempt to collect data for. Ms. Fortune provided information about the three documents staff use when collecting variables: the Codebook Protocol v4.2 and the two code sheets, the Short Form and the Long Form. She reviewed what

the Codebook Protocol contains and provided a short summary of what each page in the Codebook contains for each variable. Ms. Fortune explained what the Short Form is and provided a brief overview of how coding works. She explained that the Short Form can be used when staff is familiar with all the variables and all the codes associated with the variables in the Codebook to code the cases much more quickly, but since she and the research assistant were still learning the Codebook and the codes they still use the Long Form. Ms. Fortune attendees they were provided a copy of the Long Form to review when along with the agenda and turned the presentation over the Anthony Hernandez-Rivera to review the Long Form.

Anthony Hernandez-Rivera, OAG Research Assistant, explained the Long Form is almost like a survey and you can write or circle how you want to code the variable. He stated there are eight sections making up 248 variables in total. Mr. Hernandez-Rivera reviewed the first section, Victim Information, and said it has 41-45 different variables. He stated that the different sections are not further categorized but he categorized them for the purposes of the presentation because the kinds of variables gathered do fall into subcategories for each section. He shared the second section captures the Perpetrator Information, which is similar to the variables in the victim information section but on the perpetrator side. He said the number of variables in this section sums up to 47. Mr. Hernandez-Rivera said the third section is for Other Case Information Variables and tries to capture relationship-specific dynamics between the victim and the perpetrator and shared examples of the kinds of variables in the sections and that the number of variables in this section adds up to 17. He said the fourth section in the Long Form captures Incident and Death Information Variables which tries to measure event-specific details about the homicide, and shared examples of variables captured in this section. He said this section totals up to 54 variables and is one of the longer if not the longest sections in the form. He stated the fifth section captures protective order history between the perpetrator and the victim as well as between the individuals and any other third parties. Mr. Hernandez-Rivera said this measures 18 variables. He said the sixth section part of the Long Form is only filled out if the homicide event is classified as an intimate partner homicide (IPH), is made up of 24 variables, and measures intimate partner-specific dynamics between the victim and the perpetrator. He said this section is also very important and specifically pertains to the work of the Board because it also attempts to record the availability of and contacts the victim and perpetrator had with state systems and domestic violence/sexual assault service providers. Beth Green asked if this section would be completed if the intimate partner was involved in the event but was not the homicide victim; for example, if a child was killed and the intimate partner was uninjured, was injured during the event, or the perpetrator attempted to kill them and was not successful. Ms. Fortune and Mr. Hernandez-Rivera indicate the limited guidance would seem to indicate yes, and from a research and statistical standpoint it would be useful information to have, especially in other types of cases such as triangle homicides. Mr. Hernandez says the seventh section captures information related to the status of the case in the criminal justice system, either state or federal, and provided examples of some of the variables. He said this section is comprised of a total of 19 variables. He said the eighth and final section, made up of 20 variables, is the danger assessment of the long form, which captures danger indicators of domestic violence leading up to the homicide. He said it attempts to capture in a finer way the frequency and severity of the domestic violence and provided examples of some of the variables in the section. Beth Green asked if the danger assessment is captured if there are male victims, since it specifies use for primary female victims only. Janet Wilson discussed the ethics of using it only for female victims. There was general discussion about being more inclusive with its use, which would further allow for data collection to validate its use with additional genders. There was additional general discussion about intersectionality and the lack of

variables and the difficulty in collecting information to fill in the null variables around mental and medical health care, socioeconomic status, and other social determinants of health.

Ms. Fortune discussed the NDVFRI's uniform reporting system project and their decision, with the Office on Violence Against Women's support, to postpone work on the project until mid-2022. Ms. Fortune said the Board may want to consider holding off on revising the Codebook, especially since Oklahoma is one of the teams participating in the project and given that the most recent revisions to the Codebook were completed just a couple of years ago. General discussion was held and general consensus was there is no reason to revise at this time with the NDVFRI project and Oklahoma's participation. There was general discussion on the process of Board involvement for Codebook revision and general consensus was reached that the Board did not need to vote for the Codebook to be revised or to approve revisions to the Codebook.

VII. Consideration of Motion to Adjourn to Executive Session*

Pursuant to 25 O.S. § 307B for the purpose of case review

- a. Mike Warren moved that the Board go into Executive Session to review cases. Jeff Smith seconded the motion. The motion was approved by roll call vote (16 Aye, 0 Abstain, 0 Nay). The Board adjourned to executive session at 10:04 a.m.
- b. Review and discussion of case #**190078**.
- c. Follow-up and discussion of case #**180022**.
- d. The Board came out of the executive session at 10:44 a.m.
- e. Chair Beth Green called for Board action as a result of Executive Session.
- f. No action was taken.

VIII. New Business in Accordance with 25 O.S. § 311(9)

There was no new business.

IX. Announcements

There were no announcements.

X. Adjournment

Jeff Smith made a motion to adjourn. Mike Warren seconded the motion. Chair Beth Green declared the meeting adjourned at 10:44 a.m.