

VICTIM ADVOCACY AND SERVICES UNIT ADVISORY COUNCIL

Regular Meeting Minutes

1:30 P.M. TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 2026

Office of the Attorney General

313 NE 21ST ST.

Oklahoma City, OK 73105

To the extent not otherwise provided below, the Council may, at its discretion, discuss or change the sequence of any agenda item. Possible action includes, but is not limited to, approval, authorization, adoption, rejection, denial, amendment, taking no action, or tabling the item for disposition at a later date or time.

1. CALL TO ORDER

a. ROLL CALL AND ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM

- i. The meeting was called to order by Ann Lowrance, in accordance with the Open Meetings Act, at 1:31 P.M. Members present included Ann Lowrance, Ashley Henson, Kristie Chandler, Lauren Garder, Whitney Anderson, Meagan McCurley, Kelsey Samuels, Matt Levey. Non-members present included Susan Laib, Greg Winningham, Anthony Hernandez-Rivera, Miguel Mojica, Sharla Colbert-Dunbar, and Myel Solorzano Sutton.

b. ASSURANCE OF COMPLIANCE WITH OPEN MEETING ACT

- i. Myel Solorzano Sutton announced that the meeting was in compliance with the Open Meetings Act. An agenda was posted at the principal office of the Oklahoma Attorney General's Office on April 20th, 2026, at 11:15 A.M. and on the Oklahoma Attorney General's Office website on April 17th, 2026, at 11:43 A.M.

2. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON APPROVAL OF REGULAR MEETING MINUTES FROM MARCH 17, 2026

- a. Kelsey Samuels motioned to approve the meeting minutes from March 17, 2026. Ashley Henson seconded the motion. Motion passed with two abstentions.

3. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON REPLACING VASU ADVISORY COUNCIL CULTURALLY SPECIFIC PROGRAM REPRESENTATIVE

- a. Myel Solorzano Sutton reported that no recommendations have been received to fill the culturally specific representative vacancy on the Council.
- b. Ann Lowrance asked the Council if the original intention for the role was for OAG certified providers only, or if they are open to any culturally specific DVSA program. Myel reported that originally, the language was geared toward a certified provider; however, with the Council not being bound by statutory language, they would be open to accepting recommendations for any culturally specific DVSA representatives.
- c. Ann Lowrance requested that members submit their recommendations to Myel before the next Advisory Council meeting.

4. SUBCOMMITTEES WORK UPDATES

a. CHAPTER 1 SUBCOMMITTEE

- i. Subcommittee Chair, Ann Lowrance, reported that the Chapter 1 subcommittee met and conducted a section-by-section review to identify areas requiring updates. Overall, the subcommittee found that minimal revisions are needed for Chapter 1.
- ii. Ann requested that any other subcommittees identify and share proposed additions or revisions within their respective chapters with the Chapter 1 subcommittee, so corresponding updates can be incorporated as needed.

b. CHAPTER 15 SUBCOMMITTEE

- i. Subcommittee Chair, Kelsey Samuels, reported that the group met and continued reviewing and discussing feedback received from certified DVSA programs. The subcommittee has developed a set of questions for the new VASU AAG, and Myel will provide updates as they become available.

c. CHAPTER 25 SUBCOMMITTEE

- i. Subcommittee Chair, Lauren Garder, reported that the group met and continued discussions regarding BIP agency closures and the transfer of clients, for the purpose of developing language for Chapter 25.

d. CHAPTER 30 SUBCOMMITTEE

- i. Subcommittee Chair, Whitney Anderson, reported that the group recently convened and identified several updates needed for Chapter 30. The group also noted that SB1810 includes references to labor trafficking and emphasized the need to develop corresponding language in a timely manner.
- ii. Kelsey Samuels noted that SB1810 does not clearly specify an effective date. VASU staff will seek guidance from the VASU AAG regarding interpretation of the bill's final sentence to determine its effective date.

5. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON OAG CERTIFIED PROGRAM FAQs

a. CONTINUED FROM MARCH MEETING - PROGRAM APPLICATIONS RECEIVED FOR ALREADY SERVICED AREAS AND UPDATES TO CURRENT APPLICATIONS

- i. Myel Solorzano Sutton presented the updated DVSA application requirements for Council review. She explained that the new requirements apply only to new or existing programs seeking to provide services in areas already served by a certified OAG program. She also noted that the language developed for the DVSA application will be mirrored in the AVHST application.
- ii. It was reported that all AVHST, BIP, and DVSA initial applications, as well as additional/change of location applications, will be updated to incorporate the new requirements.

- iii. Miguel Mojica presented the updated requirements for the BIP applications and highlighted key differences between the BIP updates and those for AVHST and DVSA applications.
- iv. Following the presentation, Lauren Garder recommended several revisions, including: requiring direct contact with the Executive Director of the existing OAG-certified agency; adding a requirement for applicants to specify whether proposed services are duplicative of those already available in the community; and mandating that correspondence from certified OAG programs be submitted on official agency letterhead. VASU staff, Myel and Miguel, acknowledged these suggestions.
- v. Stephanie Lowery reported that once a new DVSA program is certified and incorporated into the funding formula, FVPSA-allocated funds will be removed from the formula and transitioned to a competitive grant model. She noted that further discussion will be needed when this change occurs and encouraged EVO to remain aware as this transition is anticipated.
- vi. Ann Lowrance suggested that EVO may consider advocating for the funding formula to be moved into standards and criteria, as this would allow for more efficient review and updates compared to statute.
- vii. Council members emphasized the importance of OAG staff maintaining awareness of community relationships with proposed service providers during the application review process.
- viii. Kristie highlighted the importance of ensuring that training and expertise are carefully evaluated, noting that some organizations may represent themselves as DVSA providers without the depth of experience required. She referenced observations from community engagement, as well as findings from fatality review boards, which indicate that victims often seek support from informal networks such as family, friends, or churches rather than certified DVSA programs. She emphasized that the field is built on decades of specialized training and experience, and that these standards should not be diluted. Lauren Garder added that this work reflects significant investment in training and capacity-building, and expressed concern that approaches such as “no wrong door” can sometimes lead to duplication of services rather than true partnership, potentially undermining the intent and integrity of the work.

b. STEPHANIE LOWERY INTRODUCTION TO FVPSA CONCERNS REGARDING SECURITY CAMERA USAGE IN CERTIFIED PROGRAMS’ INTERNAL COMMUNAL SPACES

- i. Stephanie Lowery reported that FVPSA administrators across the country meet monthly, and during a recent meeting, the topic of internal and external cameras in shelters was discussed. She noted that external cameras for security purposes were generally viewed as acceptable, while internal cameras raised concerns. She noted that the FVPSA statute does not explicitly prohibit internal cameras; however, some administrators

interpret the law as implying restrictions based on confidentiality requirements.

- ii. Stephanie further explained that FVPSA has strict confidentiality requirements, similar to VAWA, and differs from VOCA in that shelters must allow voluntary services without imposing additional eligibility requirements. Concerns were raised that internal cameras may conflict with these principles. Ashley (DVIS) shared that their program utilizes internal cameras in communal living spaces (not private areas), and that clients are informed of their presence. She noted that, in their experience, many clients report feeling safer.
- iii. Kristie Chandler shared that their program also utilizes internal cameras in communal spaces (not private areas), noting both benefits and concerns. She explained that cameras can assist with monitoring safety incidents (e.g., falls) and that some survivors express comfort with their presence. However, she emphasized the importance of balancing safety with the voluntary and non-restrictive nature of shelter environments, referencing past challenges during the transition to voluntary services. She also noted their cameras are live-feed only and do not record. Additional discussion included considerations around survivor-to-survivor harm, the role of staff in de-escalation, and increasing expectations from insurance providers regarding safety measures.
- iv. Council members discussed whether internal cameras could unintentionally create a heightened sense of danger or stress for survivors, potentially undermining feelings of safety within shelter environments.
- v. Kelsey Samuels shared that her program does not use internal cameras in shelter spaces, noting this practice has been longstanding. She reported that cameras are used externally and in donation areas, and highlighted potential legal risks, including subpoena attempts, associated with recorded footage.
- vi. Greg Winningham, representing the Attorney General's Office, shared that the discussion raised important legal considerations, including liability and potential evidentiary issues. He noted that even non-recording or short-term recording systems may create obligations if incidents lead to litigation. He also cautioned that camera placement could raise confidentiality concerns, particularly if protected communications are inadvertently captured.
- vii. Kelsey Samuels emphasized the strength of confidentiality protections, noting that her program has successfully filed motions to quash subpoenas when necessary.
- viii. Kelsey requested clarification on whether there is formal guidance from the Attorney General's Office on this issue. Stephanie Lowery noted that while FVPSA does not explicitly prohibit internal cameras, federal administrators have indicated that such use may conflict with confidentiality expectations and have encouraged programs to interpret the law cautiously. She also clarified distinctions between live-feed and recorded systems.

- ix. Ann Lowrance suggested that the Council may consider developing or including additional guidance within confidentiality standards to address the use of cameras in shelter settings and to provide clearer directions for programs.

6. DISCUSSION AND UPDATES ON BIP PILOT PROGRAM WORK

- a. Sharla Colbert-Dunbar reported that VASU has selected two pilot programs for the state: ARRIVE, Inc. for Oklahoma County and DVIS, Inc. for Tulsa County. She further reported that VASU has met with both pilot sites and confirmed that the Urban Institute will serve as the third-party evaluator. The target start date for the pilots is June 1, and VASU is currently working with both sites to ensure alignment and finalize implementation details.
- b. Kelsey Samuels inquired about evaluation metrics and whether comparisons will be made with existing BIP programs. Miguel Mojica responded that current discussions with the Urban Institute are focused on traditional BIP models and that, beyond basic data already being collected, deeper analysis of existing programs has not yet been conducted. He noted that VASU now has approximately one year of data and anticipates further evaluation moving forward.
- c. Ann Lowrance asked about the evaluation methodology, emphasizing that recidivism alone is not an adequate measure of success and suggesting the use of additional domestic violence assessment tools. Miguel Mojica noted that the Urban Institute will assist in developing methodology and interpreting data. In response to a question about follow-up timelines, Sharla Colbert-Dunbar reported that data will be collected monthly and shared with the courts on a bimonthly basis, with the goal of generating meaningful data within the first six months.
- d. Kelsey Samuels emphasized the importance of evaluating existing programs, noting that while BIPs are often criticized as ineffective, there has not yet been a comprehensive effort to assess and compare outcomes. Miguel Mojica acknowledged this and stated that there are plans to conduct comparative reviews in the future.
- e. Kelsey Samuels raised concerns regarding pilot eligibility language. Lauren Garder noted that current criteria may be exclusionary, particularly for individuals without strangulation or felony domestic violence charges and highlighted that responsibility for wraparound services now rests with the pilot programs rather than the courts.
- f. Kelsey Samuels also inquired about how community supervision structures may impact access to wraparound services. Matt raised questions about participant engagement and accountability in Oklahoma County and whether domestic violence intervention courts improve compliance with and delivery of wraparound services compared to non-specialized court settings.

7. NEW BUSINESS Not Known or Which Could Not Have Been Reasonably Foreseen Before the Posting of the Agenda *in Accordance with 25 O.S. § 311(9)*

- a. None reported.

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a. Myel Solorzano Sutton reminded Council members that next month's meeting has been re-scheduled for May 12th instead of the original date of May 19th.
- b. Stephanie announced the FVPSA and DVSA state funding application are now open.

9. ADJOURNMENT

- a. Matt Levey motioned to adjourn. Kristie Chandler seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 2:44 P.M.

Next Advisory Council Meeting: May 12, 2026 at 1:30 p.m.
Oklahoma Attorney General's Office
313 NE 21st St.
Oklahoma City, OK 73105

Should you have a disability and need an accommodation, please notify the Victim Advocacy and Services Unit in advance at (405) 521-3921.