



State of New Hampshire Guardian ad Litem Board

Public Minutes

September 20, 2013

Legislative Office Building Room 101

Members Present: Alan Cantor, Susan Duncan, Chris Keating, Ann Larney, Master Henrietta Luneau

Members Absent: Representative Deanna Rollo, Senator David Pierce, David Villiotti

A quorum was present.

Chairwoman Duncan called the meeting to order at 1:01pm.

1. Public Comment

- a. No public was present.

2. Review Minutes

a. August 16, 2013 Full Board Public

- i. A. Larney made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. M. Luneau seconded. Vote: 5-0 Motion passes.

b. August 16, 2013 Full Board Non-Public SEALED

- i. A. Cantor made a motion to approve the minutes. A. Larney Vote: 4-0-1 M. Luneau abstaining. Motion passes.

3. Board Actions & Updates

a. Late Reports

- i. A response was received from Jennifer Rackley regarding her name appearing on the court list of late reporters.
 - 1. Discussion Included:
 - a. The court arbitrarily assigns a due date
 - b. The court also says in the order that the GAL will not begin work until the retainer and stipulations are received.
 - c. Removing her name from the Board's list of late reporters due to the documentation provided.
 - 2. The Board agreed to send a letter to GAL Rackley and the GALs who over the summer submitted documentation about the late report listing being inaccurate.
 - a. The letter will acknowledge that the Board has found there is no consistency with reporting amongst all courts.
 - b. The Board will remove their names from the Board listing but cannot remove their name from the court list as the Board does not have the authority.

b. Training

- i. The Board reviewed a proposed statement regarding training.
 - 1. Discussion Included:
 - a. There are 53 people currently on the notification list.
 - b. The Board agreed not to send to currently certified GALs.
 - 2. S. Duncan made a motion to send the statement to the people on the notification list and post it on the GAL Board website. A. Cantor seconded. Vote: 5-0 Motion passes.

2. C. Keating made a motion to approve the course. A. Larney seconded. Vote: 5-0 Motion passes.
- ii. Contempt of Court: A Lesson in Legal History 2.5 CEU's
 1. Discussion Included:
 - a. The GAL needs to hear both sides.
 2. A.Cantor made a motion to approve the course. A. Larney seconded. Vote: 5-0 Motion passes.
- b. Edrea Grabler
 - i. Fitting the Pieces Together 12.5 CEU's
 1. Discussion Included:
 - a. Collaborative Law is all family law related.
 2. M. Luneau made a motion to approve the course. A.Cantor seconded. Vote: 5-0 Motion passes.

5. Non-Public Session

A. Cantor moved to go into non-public session for the purposes of discussing a matter which, if discussed in public, would likely affect adversely the reputation of a person or persons who is not a member of this body pursuant to RSA 91-A:3, II(c). A. Larney seconded. A roll call vote was taken: A. Cantor, Aye, S. Duncan, Aye, C. Keating, Aye, A. Larney, Aye, M. Luneau, Aye,

C. Keating made a motion to go back into public session. A. Larney seconded. Vote: 5-0 Motion passes.

6. Rules

- a. Chapter 400
 - i. Discussion Included:
 1. Removing re-certification process.
 2. Separating Re-instatement and Renewal as two different sections of the rules.
 3. Combining the application and supplemental application into one and minimizing the amount of information needed.
 4. Application:
 - a. Rather than a separate piece of paper put the information on the application.
 - b. At the rules only work sessions it was brought up that the renewal application is too long.
 - c. What are the pros and cons of having some answers on a separate piece of paper rather than providing space on the application?
 - i. The separate piece of paper information is confidential and would make it easier for the redaction of a Right to Know Request.
 - d. Does the GAL's recent employment history matter to the renewal process?
 - i. Wouldn't it matter if a GAL was terminated from a position?
 - e. The renewal applicant has already met the requirements of becoming a GAL. What else is needed besides the renewal fee and proof of completing the CEU requirement?
 - f. Does the Board need to know recent education?
 - g. If the applicant's address has changed and they did not notify the Board they would be violating the rules.
 - h. Having one question asking about since your last certification has there been sanction, fined, penalized, held in contempt, etc.
 - i. Does the Board need to know how many cases the renewal applicant has had over the past three years?

- i. What will the Board do with the data?
 - ii. It does not affect the requirements to being a GAL.
 - j. Creating a separate form for the confidential information pertaining to professional ethics and other information.
- 5. Re-instatement is different from renewal.
 - a. For one reason or another the GAL's certification lapsed and therefore they need to apply for re-instatement.
 - b. A renewal is completed before the certification expires.
- ii. The Board agreed to have the renewal and re-instatement application reworked based on today's discussion and review at next rules meeting.

M. Luneau made a motion to adjourn. S. Duncan seconded. Vote: 5-0 Motion passes. Meeting adjourned.