

Webinar Transcript | Increasing Leadership Activities to Improve Multidisciplinary Responses in Criminal Justice

Welcome to the National Criminal Justice Training Center webinar, Increasing Leadership Activities to Improve Multidisciplinary Responses to Criminal Justice. My name is Greg Brown, and I will be moderating for you today.

Before we begin this webinar, there's a few items I need to go over. This project was supported by a grant awarded by the Office of Violence Against Women, US Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this program are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women.

Poll questions will be asked during the webinar. Let's launch our first poll question. The question is, which of the following best describes your role? All right, today, it looks like we have 35% of the audience as victims services/victims advocates. 15% of the audience is probation community corrections, 13% law enforcement, 19% CAC workers, social workers, or mental health workers, and about 17% other.

I'm pleased to introduce our presenters for today. Robyn Mazur is the director of Gender and Family Initiatives at the Center for Court Innovation. Robyn provides assistance and strategic planning advice to courts and communities. She also provides training to judges and community leaders across the US and internationally on issues related to domestic violence, sex assault, trafficking and barriers faced by justice-involved women and families.

Rebecca Hauser is the associate director of the Gender and Family Justice Programs at the Center for Court Innovation. Working from a perspective of social justice and grounded in collaboration, Rebecca assists jurisdictions nationally to enhance their court and community response to domestic and sexual violence.

And finally, we have Jim Henderson, who's an associate with NCJTC. Jim has worked for 17 years as a probation officer and has been a technical assistance provider for the Department of Justice on Violence Against Women through the Battered Women's Justice Project since 2008. Jim works from a systems perspective to enhance victim safety and defendant accountability.

My name is Greg Brown, and I will be moderating this webinar for you today. I'm a project coordinator or director-- or project manager-- I apologize-- with NCJTC. And I spent my prior career working on probation for about 31 years on MDTs specifically for sex offenders and domestic violence offenders in a Colorado jurisdiction. With that, Rebecca, the time is now yours.

So I'm happy to be with you all today and it's good to see Jim we haven't been able to be together in person for a long time, and we have fun training together.

So our learning objectives today. Today, we'll be talking about what the definition of a coordinated community response is, and we'll be learning from you how you define community and what's important to you in your community. We'll also be describing evidence-based practices in the context of a coordinated community response to domestic violence. And finally, we'll be describing leadership strategies for collaboration to enhance accountability, safety and well-being.

And with that, I am going to turn it back to Greg and over to Robyn, and we're going to ask some poll questions just to get a better sense of what's happening in your community.

Thanks, Rebecca. So our next poll question is, do you have a CCR in your community? Yes, no, or I don't know. OK, so 46% of the audience says yes, they do. 14% say no, that they do not. And 40% indicate that they don't know.

So our next poll question is, are you a member of a CCR if your community has one? Yes, no, our community does not have a CCR. All right, it looks like 37% are on that team, 43% are not, and then 20% say they do not have a CCR team. And I will turn it back over, I believe, to Robyn.

Thanks, Greg, and hi, everybody. And the poll questions were fantastic. That's really helpful for us, and it seems like there's an interesting split on our call today.

So we're going to now-- like I said in virtual world, we are going to try to recreate what we do in person. We want to do some chatting and some conversation with you all around what is happening in your community. And this is important, as you're going to see as we go on today, about how CCRs have developed, what they do, who participates in the leadership there.

But to make sure that we're all grounded in what we're-- our goals and what we're thinking in our vision, we wanted to start with this activity today. And we're going to ask you first, what do you care about in your community? So obviously, this is vis-a-vis the issues of intimate partner violence, sexual violence. What is happening in your community? What do you all care about in terms of how this is being handled in your community?

So a lot about children's safety, supporting people who have been traumatized, preventing domestic violence, making sure that there's safety for everyone, keeping folks safe and also accountable, and having the opportunity for people to get access to services and preventing domestic violence homicides, lethality assessment, child safety again. Oh, I saw elder abuse in there.

Housing, community access to resources and prevention, strong collaboration. Someone wrote immigration. Someone wrote tribal. Oh, my gosh. This is phenomenal. I think we have very professional folks on this call today. The best. Excellent answers. Resource, availability.

But I'm going to ask you to segue into the second question because the first question was like, what are you caring about? What are those the overarching goals? But the number two question is, in what ways do you see domestic violence, intimate partner violence, sexual violence harming your community? Generational trauma, dividing families, cycle of abuse, trauma, poverty, mental health impact on children, ACEs, repeat clients, substance abuse, mental health barriers for people, long-term impacts.

"All of these," someone just wrote. No accountability, increased vulnerability, incarceration. Yep. Toxic masculinity, combating that. Cultural bias. Wow. Survivors not being believed, homelessness. Oh, wow. Behavior change, generational trauma, compound trauma, sexual violence.

Wow, OK. This is a fantastic list, and you can keep it coming. We're going to come back to a lot of what you all wrote in the chat today, and so I appreciate you all sharing that with us.

So we're going to move on now to our next slide, which is really about thinking about all of the things that you just all wrote in the chat. Basically, how can we start working in a collaborative way in our communities to help address those harms? And the key word on this slide is "collaborative" because we need to do this work together. By having silos, we're not going to make change in our systems. So that's really where we're headed today.

And what is a Coordinated Community Response? So you heard me when Greg was-- when we first did the first poll, I said with the term CCR-- that's the shorthand, the acronym that people call Coordinated Community Response. But really, coordination takes many forms, right?

And true coordination requires planning, meeting, and institutional support and accountability. So this does not happen just by waving a magic wand. Actually, a Coordinated Community Response takes a lot of hard work and making sure that as many voices and communities within communities and the most inclusive aspects of your community are at the table.

So really, it can look in different ways, and it can take many different forms, but it has to be a commitment to some shared values on the issue of domestic violence, intimate partner violence. We were getting to that with our first question today about what do people care about and understanding of each other's roles.

We're going to talk more about that today, but you saw in our earliest poll question who's on the call today, a variety of different professionals, and a plan to improve the response of different institutions and agencies to domestic violence, intimate partner violence, sexual assault.

So a Coordinated Community Response is really thinking about systems as well as community-based agencies, people coming together at a policy level, right? So I want to start us off today's conversation by recognizing that CCR, Coordinating Community Responses, are not bringing together all of these folks to talk about cases specifically.

So you're not going to-- those are groups that exist in many communities, multidisciplinary teams, or other high-risk teams, other types of responses. And those are situations where people will talk about, for example, like, the Smith case. We're going to come and meet today about a specific family.

No. A coordinated community response is really looking at the policies, at protocols, and implementation operations and how systems and communities are working together to enhance the responses to domestic and sexual violence. So I just want to make sure we're all on the same page.

Yeah, and Jim, do you want to-- I was thinking about you and your Coordinated Community Response there in Ann Arbor, Michigan when you were starting out as a probation officer. And I remember that Judge Libby Hines talked about "cussing and discussing" and coming up with those shared values. And I want to just give you a chance to talk a little bit.

We'll talk in a minute about the mission and the shared goals that you came up with, but I'm wondering about how long it took for you all to really come together and understand who you were individually and collectively and the importance of that.

Interestingly enough-- thank you, Rebecca-- is really looking at our system-- if you go back far enough, there was a time when the police department and victim services did not like each other at all. And certainly, victim services weren't overly supportive of probation because they felt we dropped the ball and didn't do things.

So our first goal when we all met together was really just defining, what do we think our job responsibilities are? What I can and cannot do, what are the limitations within the law, and really understanding, oh, OK, the shelter does this not because they're trying to be a pain in the rear to the police department, but because of certain confidentiality laws, because there's some safety concerns.

And so we could understand we really are working on the same team. But really, what are our roles and functions? And is there room to move? Like, how are my roles and functions limiting your ability to do your job? And do I have room to move and modify that or don't I? And those were the things that you had to have some of those tough debates about that were really quite exciting.

When I think about a CCR, the other thing I wanted to say is I think macro and micro, right? We got all these big decision-making people there, but we have to have the worker bees coming to the table, too, and talking about how is this implemented in with my caseload, with the people that I work with? And so that can be really exciting.

Thanks, Jim. And this is really an important slide, too. And it's what Jim was just saying and what Rebecca-- we were all just saying. It's why is it important to coordinate, right?

And the number one component on this slide is enhancing safety, and you all identified that in the chat earlier. I saw that across the board, people talking about survivor safety, child safety. That's really the number one component here. Addressing community harms and increasing abusive partner intervention and engagement. So we know that while we need to ensure the safety of survivors and their children, we also need to make sure that we're doing work with the community and the abusive partners as well.

And also, creating survivor-centered responses, right? Making sure that the voices of survivors and those impacted by domestic and sexual violence are at the table, that their voices are part of the response, and making sure that in your community, it also has a survivor leadership component.

Increasing community awareness, right? This is always an important component of our work. I saw people in the chat room use the word "prevention," right? That's another component around community awareness. Our ultimate goal is to make sure that people understand intimate partner violence, sexual violence, what we're talking about, and try to eradicate it in our communities.

But then always here, increasing access to justice for litigants. I would also add to this bullet increasing access to resources. I saw quite many of you put in the chat things like housing, economic supports, other kinds of resources. So that is an important component.

And even in some of our communities where resources sometimes can be scarce, this is still an important component because you often don't even realize sometimes, because we often work in silos, that there are actually resources in communities. And getting people around the table and talking about that is one way to really improve the lives of families impacted by intimate partner violence.

Thanks, Robyn. So when we talk about a Coordinated Community Response, we can't do it without talking about the Duluth Model. The Domestic Abuse Intervention Project in Duluth was piloted in the 1980s, and they were the ones that created this concept of a Coordinated Community Response coming together.

Their approach was really looking at the criminal legal system and how that system could coordinate with community-based advocates to increase safety for survivors and accountability for people who are causing harm through IPV. They brought everybody together and really thought about, what can we do to enhance what we're doing?

Now, this model did not stay stagnant since the 1980s. It has evolved over time. You can see on here that one of the prongs is a restorative justice services. So when they were thinking about those folks who were repeat offenders causing harm, they realized those folks needed a lot of wraparound services, and they created restorative justice responses to it.

Now, Jim, when you look at this, if you were thinking about a Coordinated Community Response, who else would you want to add to this list?

Great. Thank you so much, Rebecca. You know what I really like about this? It's a great template, right? It says, all right, let's look at who they invited early on. But what's really unique about looking at all the people when they signed in, we have people from so many different states, right, with different policies, different procedures, different people who are going to be engaged in that case.

And then when we look at our cases, they require different things. So when I look at this, I try to think, who all would touch the file for either the offender or the alleged victim, all right? So you have the 9-1-1 operator, but then what if we call an EMT to the scene? Are they part of our-- are we working with them? How educated are they on domestic violence? How educated are they on strangulation? Do they know what type of medical treatments might be needed for a survivor?

When we look at if he goes to jail, all right, most jurisdictions were arresting, all right, what training do the people have that are sending them into jail? Are they going to see a pretrial officer? Is someone going to be making recommendations on if they should get bail or not? So really knowing, did police do an LAP, or a DA-LE, or some type of danger assessment? Was that passed on to the magistrate or the pretrial officer?

Right here, it talks about prosecutor, but we know in most of our jurisdictions, we're trying to engage in defense counsel, too, right? Because if the wrong person was arrested, we want to make sure that person's rights-- we want everyone's rights protected. Let's face it. We want everybody's rights protected, and we want to make sure that when the wrong party is arrested, that that person gets justice, is not convicted and put on probation.

So really thinking outside this box and going, OK, these were what these people created in the very beginning, but what does my community look like? Who are my other partners that I could engage in? It's pretty awesome to see some of the things people are doing.

Right. And you can see this does focus on the criminal legal system. Back in the 1980s, folks were trying to figure out, how can we get the police and our criminal legal system to take these cases seriously? And so this CCR really was a model for creating that sense of like these are serious cases, and we need to bridge these gaps.

You know what, Rebecca?

Since then, there have been-- yeah?

I want to say, since we were clearly driven by the criminal justice system, right, and that's kind of what the judicial oversight demonstration initiative was, but we knew there were so many offshoots, at times we would say, let's focus on health. And we'd bring in the ER doctor, some nurses, the EMT. And then we looked at different resources that were needed for survivors.

We even brought in our animal-- our Humane Society and trying to look at what we could do around pets, and what we could do about medical resources, and substance abuse intervention, and housing for victims. And then we did the same thing for offenders. All right, what are the wraparound services?

So those people may not want to come every month to your meeting, but we try to make sure that there were some a couple of times a year that we had these special meetings that really targeted different spheres of urgency or issues with our population.

Right. And some folks are looking at ways to have a coordinated response that does not involve or is not primarily focused on a criminal legal process. And so here's an example of a way to really expand that idea.

If we are looking to really restore and repair those community harms, to really think about some of those issues that came up in the chat around homelessness, around services for survivors, and also, for those abusive partners, how can we repair that harm that is committed that has impacted that survivor? And then how can we repair the collateral harms to our communities that this violence causes?

And you can see here the different ways that you can bring all these different types of services together. Youth intervention, community services, reparation boards, thinking about all the different therapeutic communities, mediators. We know that in many communities, mediators aren't allowed to take DV cases, but oftentimes, they're still handling those cases. They're getting to them because the DV hadn't been identified prior.

And so thinking about the different types of family services, victim crime compensation. All those things are really thinking as holistically as possible when you're answering that question of how can we repair the harms that have been caused by domestic violence.

And Robyn and Jim, do you want to talk about one way of thinking about how a CCR can respond?

Sure. Well, I hope everyone who's watching has seen this wheel before, right? The Power and Control Wheel, also a very famous-- one of the cornerstone components of when people are learning about the issues of intimate partner violence.

And you'll see around the circle the issue around physical and sexual violence, but there's also inside the different components. You'll see here economic abuse, coercion and threats, intimidation, emotional abuse, isolation. And here, we know that the Coordinated Community Responses can really make a difference, particularly on the issues around intimidation, right?

So the different community folks can work, for example, with courts or with others here to provide safe waiting areas so that survivors don't have to have as much contact with the person that uses harm against them, for example, in the courthouse. And then you'll see others here. But Jim, why don't you jump in and add your components here?

Well, I would go to the same thing, when you talk about-- some of us have courts where we have the ability to separate people. Some of us don't, right? But I'm being cognizant. Where do our victims sit? Where do our offenders sit? Who's watching to make sure he's not trying to intimidate her through court or send messages? Who's watching to make sure the family--

We had a specific time the offender was told that he had to be at the building and he wasn't supposed to come in earlier than that. And then when the court hearing got over, he remained there for at least 15 minutes while a survivor got to leave the courthouse. Our bailiff and probation was always there at every hearing, but we're kind of watching what's going on. And at times, we had the bailiff literally stand in a direct view of an offender who may have been trying to stare down a victim. And the judge couldn't call him out because she's in the middle of dealing with another case.

So just having a victim advocate there, present, probation present, a bailiff who's actually aware and paying attention to the surroundings and the environment made a huge impact.

The other thing, when I think about that Power and Control wheel, domestic violence is so much more than just physical threats, right? It's taking away my agency, my right to choice. And so when I'm working with an offender, I try to say, OK, there's the legal consequences and what reparations look like that was ordered by the court. But what are some of the other damages that we've done to our community, to our family, to our children? And what would reparations look like to those people?

And we can really talk with men and engage men. And part of knowing that is having those conversations at that coordinating council, right? And saying, what are some of the collateral consequences of violent and abusive behavior? How is that impacting our community, and what are some ways that men might be able to make reparations for that or to address that for future issues? So that was really kind of exciting, looking at some of the things we could do in that area as well.

Yeah, and that's so helpful, Jim. And also, thinking about-- obviously, this first bullet here on the slide is about if we're always in person in our courthouses. And we know that, unfortunately, for many of us, we're on Zooms like this in terms of cases, and the same concepts apply, using, for example, a Zoom waiting room or whatever video platform your community is using currently, making sure that having that level of coordination and communication so that safety can be virtual as well as in person.

The other components that I love on this slide show-- and I think Rebecca mentioned this-- about how holistic and the types of groups that you can be inviting to the Coordinated Community Response meetings, right?

The last bullet here is about workplace issues. We've heard some phenomenal work happening. I was talking to a site in Charlotte, North Carolina. They got Bank of America to work closely with them and do a lot of training on intimate partner violence and things for their HR and for their workforce, right? And those are thousands of people that work at Bank of America down there in North Carolina, so getting that message out--

So that's something really innovative that's outside of the kind of systems that we're usually talking to. But that's a really important way to coordinate and doing work around this issue and raising awareness, as well as connecting folks to important services.

And then obviously, providing DV training, right? When you all did the poll when we first started-- many of you on this call are victim advocates. Hopefully you're being asked to do training in your community. You're experts on this topic and sharing that expertise, and your knowledge is critical.

So you know, what, Robyn? You're actually making me think of some things when we first started. And some of the feedback we got back from survivors is that the court wasn't always inviting, and sometimes our staff weren't always very compassionate, right?

You think people get burned out in their jobs. You've got a lot of responsibilities, and people are coming up, asking for PPO paperwork. They're not asking or asking to withdraw things. And sometimes the clerks would get frustrated with people or not want to accommodate people as much as they could.

And when we did in-house training for all of our clerks, I know actually, we had some clerks who were victims themselves who had never disclosed that, or talked about that, and didn't know of the resources in the community. So it really created a more of a compassion and an understanding.

And especially in this day where not everybody wants to use a criminal justice pathway to protection, if victims are able to come in and use family court through an order of protection or a child custody arrangement, if we can treat people with dignity and respect and allow that to be a valid, safe option for them, which sometimes has less consequences to the offender, but it's what the victim feels safe and comfortable doing, we need to do that. So really, even training our own staff we fail at sometimes, I think.

Absolutely. I'm glad you added that in. And we moved on to another one of the spokes of our Power and Control Wheel here about responding to minimization, denial, and victim blaming, and some examples of how having an expansive and diverse group of people at the table are important.

Many of you, when we were doing the chat, referenced issues around substance use disorder and intimate partner violence. And we've been doing a lot of work with sites around the country that are starting to look at domestic violence, drug courts in Miami, in Kansas City, and in parts of Ohio, where the substance use disorder is not-- we're not saying it causes the abuse, right? But we recognize that there's a correlation and folks need access to that treatment, that substance use disorder treatment, in order to help with the domestic violence issues in their family and make sure that everyone is healthy.

So that is an example where communities got together. We're seeing this. They're sitting around the table, and they're like, how can we start to address this in a way that's really not minimizing or denying or blaming the abuse that's happening? We're not saying it's OK to do those things, but we're saying, how can we help families where this is being experienced?

Jim, do you want to jump in here, too?

Well, I think that there are so many different ways that that happens. And so I do agree when we look at the amount of men who have issues with substances, that we have to be careful in how it's addressed. Because men will look at it. It's just because I'm drinking. It's just because of this. And we know that drinking does not cause violence, but those of us who have a belief that I have a right to use violence-- I have a right to use coercive control. When I drink, I'm far more likely to use that and far more likely to use that at a more lethal or dangerous level.

So if I am that person, this needs to be dealt with very seriously. But you've got to be very careful in how that message-- I would much rather relate it to just my drinking and give my victim the false perception that I'm going to be safe because I quit drinking, where some people actually become more dangerous because drinking and drugs was my escape and the way that I dealt with stress, right? And now, I'm going to use physical force.

We need to be somewhat careful when we're inviting those people in. We're talking about the real life experiences of the offenders, of the victims of their children.

I think for my men, it is so easy to minimize and deny this, and people want to join in our community because it feels better for me to say this is about mental health, or this is about substance abuse and not about his choice. So just being focused on that, I think, can be tough.

Yeah, and that's really important. And we're going to talk more about risk and lethality, but I just want to be clear. We're talking about domestic violence risk and lethality and how that information is assessed and how it's shared. Sometimes there's confidentiality components in that. We'll get into that more.

But as we talked about these CCRs, the Coordinating Committee Response that we're talking about in today's presentation, are not case specific. So when people are talking about risk and lethality in these meetings, it's much more at a sort of policy level.

Like, hi, we're a community. We want to work to prevent domestic violence homicides in our community. Is there a way that we can share safely and respecting confidentiality of survivors information about risk and lethality? So it's having those global conversations about who's collecting the information, how can we share it, and how can we make an impact on these cases in our community.

Jim, do you to mention anything about abusive partner intervention programs here?

So I debated on this, if this would really be part of the CCR. But I think the way that we can talk to our men, when I want my men to join and get into a program quicker-- so part of our CCR was figuring out why is it taking men so long to even get into programming? And for us, it was taken three or four months before they'd get in there, and there was a lot of roadblocks.

Sometimes it was just waiting for it an admission day. Things needing to be mailed. And so we figured out how to streamline those through our meeting and said, all right, let's break down these barriers. And the other thing was just this resistance.

And so one of the things we started doing is talking to the men who are fathers. What do you want from your children when they make a mistake or when they do something wrong? We want our kids to admit it, not lie about it. We want them to take steps to make sure that doesn't happen again. And so we talk about how we can become role models to our kids, right?

We've already plead guilty or were found guilty. So now, it's time for me to saddle up, show the kids that I take responsibility for my actions, that mom didn't deserve that. They didn't deserve to see that. Dad got a timeout, right? I went to jail. We can use their language. Dad got a timeout because he did a bad thing, and now Dad's doing what he has to do to fix that so you don't have to be scared of Daddy anymore.

And we can really frame things in a way that allow men to feel proud about taking ownership and responsibility and that this system can really work to support men in that change process. But I think the CCR can help me become less punitive in a way and make things more engaging, and that's what we want. We want men to be engaged in a program and feel that it helps them and it helps their families.

Absolutely. Great points, and important for folks to keep in mind.

On our next slide, we also talk about one of the other components of the Power and Control Wheel, responding to economic abuse. And I think Jim made this point earlier, which is so key. And this is not a domestic violence 101 kind of training, so we didn't spend a huge amount of time going through the Power and Control Wheel and those other elements.

But I think Jim made a great point. It's not just physical abuse, right? There are many, many components to intimate partner violence, and one of them is economic abuse and the control of money, and access to money, and access to jobs and other resources that can be impacting a particular family.

And so another way that the Coordinated Community Response can work together is really identifying resources for survivors, like housing and shelter, access to public benefits, and economic empowerment programming, job readiness and workforce development.

And, obviously, this slide, right now, is talking about survivors. But, Jim, I don't know if you want to add in some components. We know more and more, we need to be holistic when we're talking about families. And we need to make sure that there's economic support for people who use harm as well.

Well, I think, we know that unemployment raises the risk of lethality. And it raises the risk of all types of criminogenic behavior. So we really want to figure out, how do we help men get, maintain healthy employment.

And that's, sometimes, difficult because if I have a domestic violence charge, it may have eliminated-- I had a guy just this week. He got fired from his Uber job because he has a DV case, and Uber doesn't want anybody with a domestic violence conviction. So I may be losing jobs, have that cut off. And so we can work with our community to better think, how do we work with them. Do we have-- like, Michigan. We have the Michigan Rehabilitation Services that can, sometimes, help people with criminal records.

The other thing I think, when I'm looking at economic abuse, is we've got to look at the ways that men really do use economic privilege to control their victims. And a lot of victims come home because of that. The scary thing, right now, is men are using crypto to hide their money, so then victims don't get, even, their share during a divorce.

And I know of a case right now, where the whole case got dismissed and dropped, but, specifically, not because the victim doesn't feel endangered or that the abuse didn't happen. But, because the husband was going to file for bankruptcy, she could get, possibly, half of \$900,000 in debt put on her while he hid all of his money in crypto. And so she had to, basically, cave to get some money and some support when she got out of the system. So we got to fix that.

I don't know the answer to that. Those are the types of things I would be taking to my coordinating council. And say, these are what some of the men are using as tactics. How do we fill the gap? What types of system changes? How do we assess for that?

Now one of the things that we did, if a person cut off a credit card or didn't take care of didn't pay their child support, probation monitored that. So I learned that these men were using this type of tactic even on probation. And we're like, hold on, George. Come here. You're supposed to be paying your child support. Why is that not being paid?

And what do we need to get that organized and get that paid for? And some probation departments feel that's not their job. That's a friend of the court's job. Well, if we're really doing a coordinated response to this, it's all of our jobs to figure out how do we stop them from using different tactics to maintain, and continue to control, their partners.

Jim, that's a great point. I just want to add on that one-- often, we'll see that a coordinated community response will start, for example, out of the criminal justice stakeholders. You may get the criminal court folks. You may get probation. You may get law enforcement advocates, both system-based advocates-- folks who work for, for example, a prosecutor's office-- and then those who are independent, nonprofit folks.

And you may get some abusive partner intervention program. For those of you who used to call them batterers intervention program, we're changing the language. Just so you know, keep track of our language change there.

But what you'll, sometimes, see is missing is adding in, for example, the civil legal service providers and not just the folks who do family law, for example. And now, I'm going to connect this back to our economic empowerment area here. Get the folks that are doing work in housing court. Folks who know about debt relief and bankruptcy.

We see many, many situations where survivors have been put into bankruptcy-- where their name and their social security number and, basically, identity theft, or putting somebody's financial information through the wringer-- done by an abusive partner. And so having connections in this broader sense, in this more holistic sense with other-- in that example, of thinking about attorneys who do that work who can assist survivors-- is a critical piece. So really thinking outside the box.

I was just talking to-- and I wanted to say Ohio, but I could be wrong. But this community, men could not have any public housing until they were done with a batterer's intervention program. So now they're trying to rush and make it a 6-week, or 8-week, batterer intervention program so men are homeless.

So that would be an example of a problem that we need to really talk with our partner. And figure out, is there a different way we can do this policy so treatments the way treatment should be and not shortened up because of a need in a roadblock.

And this conversation's making me think too. We've been, primarily, talking about male defendants, or people who are causing harm as male and the victim as female-identified. But I'm thinking, particularly, in economic abuse-- and in our prior one around minimizing, denying, and blaming-- a coordinated, community response can really work to identify ways to support victims in the LGBTQI community. Economic abuse can be used in that regard, especially to say, you know what? I am going to out you to your boss, and you're going to lose your job.

Or I can more easily stalk you at your job because you're not out, and people just don't know what our relationship is. So really thinking about the ways that the coordinated community response can come together and assist immigrant victims for whom economic abuse shows itself up in terms of access to visa and immigration paperwork and that kind of thing. So really thinking about an expanded view of who those survivors are and what their unique needs might be can be helpful as well.

And, Jim, it was good I heard-- what I'm hearing you say, too, is that even though CCRs talk about big policy, you're building those relationships. So then those personal, person-to-person calls can happen. When it's like, hey, I've got this specific person on probation. I know about your program. Let's connect and think about x, y, and z. So it's good to have the policy, but, also, start building those personal connections so that you can really change the way that you're working on the day-to-day.

Well, you know and too, we're doing our CCR right. I'm starting to find out what each of my partners do. And so, let's say, my batterers intervention partner program does not deal with trauma, and, maybe, funding-- or policy or statute-- denies them. And we feel we need to do a trauma.

I may, as a probation officer, just assume everybody does that. And now I'm at the table, I'm learning, oh, no they don't. And then if our community thinks that's important, we might need to invite a new member. How are we going to deal with the trauma of the people that we're working with if my existing partners don't have the skills, expertise, or the resources, or even the ability to do that.

Yeah, so true. So we want to talk about how a CCR can enhance evidence-based best practices. So we know that these are the five pillars, so to speak, of evidence-based practice-- risk assessment, programming, deterrence, procedural justice, and collaboration. We've talked a lot about collaboration, and, in a few minutes, we'll talk about the research behind the importance of collaboration.

But, Robin and Jim, you brought up risk assessments. So let's dive a little bit deeper into that, and think about the importance of coming together as a CCR to talk about risk assessment. There are so many people in our communities who may be using risk information, or a specific risk assessment, to inform the decisions that they're making, either with the survivor or with the abusive partner.

And so I think it's really a great opportunity at a CCR to spend some time thinking about, OK, what are we doing on this. Let's map out our system and really think about who's using what risk information at what point, and how is that information being shared. What might be some collateral consequences of that. And there's so many different tools that, for instance, are being used for abusive partner intervention programs or, specifically, for advocates to be using or probation or law enforcement. And they can be used, not all together, but each agency can be using different tools and really having that enhance their ability to respond to some of these needs and these risk factors.

So let's talk a little bit about-- here are Jackie Campbell's research on women who were killed, or almost killed by, their intimate partners. And so just looking at those lethality factors, if we had time, we could go through each of these in the same way we went through some of the pieces of pie on the power and control wheel. And really thinking about, how can our CCR respond to defendants or respondents owning a gun, we know access to a weapon is one of the number one lethality factors.

Interestingly, what Jackie Campbell found was that unemployment was her number one lethality factor. And that's something that we've just talked about in terms of economic support, thinking about job readiness, and all those kinds of things. But, Jim, I don't know if you want to talk about how your CCR, or in working with CCRs around the country, any innovative things they've come up with in terms of, really, responding to risk or lethality factors.

I think the two biggest ones that we have that we can do something about, that aren't static, are firearms and unemployment. So the first thing was really working with our whole team, how we are going to get firearms away. And that's a big huge issue in communities. We were lucky that we had a great police department.

And so at the scene, if I assaulted you, Rebecca, they would ask you are there any firearms in the home. You just called the police. You're upset. You tell them, and you give them permission to take them. Yes they could go and take the firearms right then.

Then, before I would get released from jail, the judge would ask me, or the magistrate would ask me, under oath. And I have to sign a paper if I had any firearms at my home. If I did, those had to be surrendered before I could be released. But we had to look at who all-- everybody had to ask this offender if he had firearms and had to ask the victim-- from the police to the pre-trial officer to the probation officer.

But even though we had a well-oiled system, sometimes, by the time they got to me, they still had firearms. So looking at that and doing deep searches at their home and having them sign for that and having those clear policies on how we're going to handle that. The other thing that I would say in Jacquelyn Campbell's, that didn't make it here, is when an offender threatens to kill himself is highly correlated with him killing the victim too, especially, for white men who've never been involved in criminal justice system before. So that's kind of interesting.

When a white man says he's going to kill himself, and he has a history of violence, and he's using that to manipulate the partner, it is a very high indicator that something could happen to that partner. So those of us who are working with women offenders who, then, we find out they may be victims of violence in their own lives-- rather, my victim's offender is a DV perpetrator who was arrested with resisted violence or maybe she's a drunk driver. But really being aware, when her husband is telling her he's going to kill himself, that's a huge red flag that she could be in danger too.

And then, we know with the stalking and strangulation, both really, really high risk for future homicide. And both of those have their own resource center. The Stalking Resource Center and Institute on Non-fatal Strangulation have just amazing resources for all of us.

Great. So again, I think having a CCR-- you said something about it's shifting the lens. Can we use our CCR and shift it away from a punitive thing? Like, how can we-- but really think about here are the lethality factors that we know of-- how can we provide resources to the abusive partner that are going to mitigate those lethality factors. And then how can we, as a CCR, work to make sure that we are not increasing the risk of lethality for that survivor? So how are we assisting that survivor in accessing the services that they need.

I wanted to just give a little bit of a plug for a resource center that the Center for Court Innovation just developed with the support of the Office on Violence Against Women. It's the Domestic Violence Resource for Increasing Safety and Connection. The website is www.dvrisc.org. Both of these have some practical strategies, talks about DV risk assessments, and those might be helpful tools if your CCR is thinking about addressing risk as one of it's-- as a focus for the CCR.

Again, when we're thinking about programming-- so we have risk assessment. We've assessed for risk. We think someone needs to go into programming. As Jim said, programming can't be part of an isolation.

I saw in the chat where someone said that they run an abusive partner intervention program that's an integral part of their CCR. That makes me really happy. Jim and I worked together on a national project to work with communities to enhance their responses to abusive partners around intervention and engagement strategies. And so really thinking about-- what are the resources available in your community. How are those services-- what wraparound services can they provide. Who else can be providing services.

I love what Lisa Nitsch says, that providing services to that abusive partner is a way to increase safety for survivors. Because these abusive partners are members of our community, and they are going back out into the world. They're only in this program for, maybe, two hours a week or something like that. Or they're in probation for two hours a week.

So it's our job to make them safer, healthier, thriving members of the community so that they're not causing further harm. And so I think those things don't need to be opposed to each other, but rather, they go hand in hand. So really thinking about the ways the CCR can come together.

In New York, when we were helping to develop the DV, the domestic violence and the integrated domestic violence courts, those judges held brown bag lunches where programs came in to explain what their services were, what the fees were. And so that everybody there-- the defense bar, the prosecutors, the victim advocates, civil legal attorneys-- everybody knew what the services were for abusive partners in their community. I don't know, Jim, if you have anything--

When you talk about observing programs too, I mean, when we've had that, we've done the same thing. So when the people came in, they actually presented their program in front of their competition. And so I had to say this is my model. This is why I chose this model to be the best for enhancing victim safety. This is why I think this model is the best for promoting offender behavior change.

But everybody got to ask questions. I mean, we're talking about child custody evaluators, sometimes child protection, probation, prosecutors. And then, after we do that meeting-- like Rebecca and I did this in one community-- we actually went with a victim advocate. And Rebecca and I and a probation officer, we went and we watched some programs and seeing, actually, what they're doing.

When we started our domestic violence court, I went to the same 40-hour training that our shelter offers all of their new hires. So I knew everything that the shelter offered as resources. And then I had the shelter come watch me do a pre-sentence investigation. They came and watched me do a victim interview. They came and watched us to a probation group reporting.

So they got to see, how does our policies and practices come out. And then give us feedback on, did we collude with the offender? Did we do anything that was harmful? So there were lots of ways of-- if a program's not letting you there, really, you need to have that discussion.

What are their concerns? How do we overdo those concerns? And you can talk with Rebecca and them later on how we set that up. But I should know what services are available at the shelter. I should have seen them.

The shelter should know what I do. The prosecutor should know what I do. Defense counsel should know what I do. It should not be a secret. We're all just working to make our society safer for everyone.

I'm going to turn it over to Robin to talk about the third component of evidence-based best practice, which is around procedural justice. And so Robin do you want to talk a little bit about that, and how a CCR could live out these components of procedural justice?

Yeah, thank you. So we're also changing the name around procedural justice. I know, you can't keep up with us on all these things. But we want to start calling it people-centered practice. And the reason that I'm saying that is when I talk about-- these are the four key components of that work. And you'll understand the change is really because it is people-centered.

So for those of you who have not heard about this concept before, just a quick primer for you. The concept is that ensuring that there's voice. That all of the people, the litigant's side, is heard in these cases. And, once again, this is really a systems kind of approach here.

Typically, people-centered practice, we're talking about different kinds of systems, and, quite frankly, has been used, not just in criminal justice or civil justice, but this can be used in hospital-based settings. These tenants are really important. I would argue that domestic violence agencies need to use these same tenants. So voice, people being heard. Respect, treated with dignity and respect.

Obviously, neutrality decisions are unbiased and consistent. And I want to always add in here about implicit bias and also about understanding, that people understand the responsibilities decisions and the reasons for those decisions. And this can be inclusive of everything to language access all the way to having signage with pictures and not just in legalese or words that people may not necessarily understand. So those are the tenants of what we call people-centered practice or procedural justice.

But you can imagine that these are important components. For as a coordinated community response, people are meeting together-- both system actors and stakeholders as well as community-based folks-- to think through, are we making sure that the folks that are interacting with our systems, and I would argue, again, the community-based work, as well, that we're meeting these areas and these tenants. And we have done really cool things with different sites to help identify potential gaps in these areas.

I participated in, what we call, a secret shopper program. It was not shopping, unfortunately. I love shopping. But no, it was actually going to courts in Olympia, Washington, where myself and two other teammates, we came-- the court administrator and the presiding judge knew that we were coming but didn't know what day we were going to be there.

And we flew in and, basically, pretended that we were litigants going through their systems. We asked questions like, where's the courtroom. It was not about legal analysis. We were not analyzing, did the judge or the attorney's-- with the legal case-- it wasn't like a "gotcha" about how they were proceeding on that.

But we were looking through their system for those four tenants that I just talked about on the previous slide. And we gave feedback to the court about that. And it was really things as important-- eye contact. We noticed that judges and clerks and attorneys were not giving eye contact and talking to the people that they were working with or the cases that they were hearing.

We noticed that the language-- there were no real signs in what people call plain English, which is English at a 3rd- to 6th-grade level. There were no signs in other languages besides English. So it was a really illuminating process, and we gave those recommendations and that feedback back to the court.

But once again, there can be a lot of different components here, including a court watch program that they've operated for many years in many cities. And one that we worked-- and not just cities, towns, communities. We worked in Seattle with some folks from the DV community doing that. And then the information about court process. This is a phenomenal project for a coordinated community response.

We've worked with communities all across-- some in Winnebago County and Illinois and others in Portland, Oregon-- where they actually developed videos in multiple languages and in plain English, which worked through the CCR. People worked on this together to come up with videos to explain how to get an order of protection, for example, and the process of the order of protection. And now those videos can play on different websites. The domestic violence agencies can play those in their agencies. The court plays them in waiting room areas, obviously, now with the pandemic, that it can be accessed online.

So those kind of programs and thinking about different projects that the coordinated response can work on, specifically with people-centered practice, are fantastic and really, really improve our systems and community-based programming. I don't know if Rebecca or Jim want to add to that. But it's one of my favorite topics.

No I'm really excited about the things that you were just talking about. And I think that we have to look at, our world is ever-changing. And some of our programs were set up for mainstream, traditional populations. And so we have to look at-- hey. You two. Bad dog.

Like I have a large Arabic population. So Ramadan affects the time of group, so really being willing to be mindful of that and change that. So really looking at, who are we representing, who are we seeing on our caseload, and do we have an understanding of their culture and religious beliefs. Can we invite people from that community to come in and educate us and look at our system. And how that affects people, I think, could be pretty powerful as well.

And I had something else I was-- oh, I know what I was going to say. Elizabeth talked about programming for indigent and some of our underserved populations. What we found is our most dangerous man, we were sending to jail and doing nothing with. And we had a really good success rate with men who completed our program and completed probation not coming back.

A very poor success rate of men who went to jail not coming back. I mean they are coming back all the time, which either could say, yes, we were locking up the right people. Or it could say, you're still not doing anything to help these people once they get out of jail.

So we wrote a grant, and created a program in our jail. And we called it a Batterer's Preparation Program, which was free, obviously. And it was taught multiple times per week, so it was more intensive-based on a dose response.

Then we found a large part of our population who are being victimized didn't trust the police, especially from our homeless shelter and our homeless population. Maybe they didn't always feel that they would be treated justly, or if the offense happened around-- maybe, you beat me up and stole my drugs. I'm not going to call the police and tell them what's happening.

So we got wrote a different grant and created a batterers intervention program that was ran through the homeless shelter. Where they could, as a requirement to receive services, from there, if somebody engaged in predatory behavior, they had to do that program. But it was, again, free as charged. We actually paid them to go to that.

We gave them one bus token for every week in a row they made it to class without missing. So people could brag on, I got 12 bus tokens, or I got 20 bus tokens. And so there's different ways we could try to say, can we engage our underserved community, and be more inclusive of everyone.

Jim, that's great. Exactly the component around access to resources that's not just survivor-focused. We are also talking about abusive partners, so I thank you for adding that in. We're going to go to the next slide, which is another one of the evidence-based practices that Rebecca talked about earlier, which is the research around the importance of collaboration.

So the Center for Court Innovation, our office, did some research with drug courts, actually. But we think that this is, obviously, you could extrapolate it and really think about the work we do in domestic violence, intimate partner violence responses. But, basically, they found that it was important to obtain the buy-in and participation of multiple agencies, everything that we've been talking about today. I would take this bullet, and add more to it, not just criminal justice. But they saw in their research, they needed to have multiple agencies, and that really improved the outcomes.

Research also showed better implementation outcomes if the front-line staff bought into the court. So once again, really thinking-- and I can't remember who said this. It may have been Jim or Rebecca, I can't remember now. But making sure that we include not just the top policymakers in your coordinated community response, not just your elected district attorney or prosecutor, but also the people working in the trenches on these cases.

Similarly, not just the director of your domestic violence agency, but the advocates doing the work. So you need both types of buy-in. You need the high-level person who's going to be able to sign off on things, but you also need the people who are in the trenches doing the work.

And then the evaluation of the programs in these drug courts found that there was a reduced recidivism when multidisciplinary teams were involved in the planning of the program. Once again, I think this is common sense. If you have multiple perspectives when you're developing a program as part of your Coordinating Committee response and having that collaboration, your outcome will be better because you're really being inclusive of all of those perspectives in your planning. I would say, here, I would add in the voices of survivors and those with lived experience need to also be in that planning.

And in this area, I just think so much of what we've done-- and in meeting and in educating the community under-- and we got really fixated on accountability, accountability, accountability. And part of that, people are losing their jobs, they're losing their housing. The collateral consequences are huge.

So I had a guy, longtime batterer, first time offender. He was actually doing quite well on probation. I caught him drinking once, but he took ownership. Did his three days jail, got out, got back in the program. Was doing what he needed to do.

About halfway through the batterer's intervention program, 26 weeks in, I get a phone call on a Saturday night from the victim who, actually-- let me say. I show up to work Monday morning, he beat me to work. That's always a red flag to me.

He wants to talk to me right now. I don't talk to people in the morning. I go listen to my phone messages first, then my email messages. Then I start meeting with clients.

So my first message is from the victim crying and bawling Saturday night. He did it again, he did it again. I can't take this crap. He's your problem now. I left him in Indiana.

All right, then the next call is from him crying. Jim, I messed up. So I call her, find out they went to our wedding rehearsal in Illinois-- or Indiana, I forget which state. I think it was Indiana.

And he got jealous and thought she was flirting with one of the guys in the wedding party. So he got mad. He's badgering her on the way home. He's badgering her on the way home.

Finally, she gets mad, and she goes, you're right. I do want to sleep with him, and I bet he'd be better than you. And he gets mad and hauls off, and he slams her in the face. The car goes through the intersection, comes in into oncoming traffic. She starts screaming, yelling.

She tells me she beat his rear end because when she got the car stopped, she's freaking out. She's pounding and pounding and pounding him. He jumped out of the car. She took off. She never got pulled over for almost getting in an accident.

So now I'm like, OK. He endangered her life, their 11-month-old baby's life, innocent people driving down a highway. Guess what? He's in the front lobby. He can go to jail.

I'm texting the office, don't let Mr. So-and-So go. We're going to come get him. She starts freaking out, yelling, screaming at me, like, why would you mess up my family like that? Why would you screw with me? I called you for help.

And what ended up happening is, if he went to jail, their house was in foreclosure. She's a stay-at-home mom because her kid has severe medical issues. If he goes to jail, they're going to lose their home. They're going to lose their health care. She's going to have no resources, and she's scared to death her baby's going to die.

And so now-- she became, what had been, a great ally and loved me in the system-- and she totally hated us. And so I had to call. I'm calling the shelter. I'm calling people like, can we pay her house payment while he's in jail? No, but she can come to the shelter for 90 days.

But that ain't going to help much. Can we pay the insurance, COBRA, while he-- no, but we can help her apply for Medicaid. Would she get the same experts and the same specialist under Medicaid? Probably not.

Is it a reality? Could this baby really die if she loses that? She goes, he could. So then you're like, holy crap.

If I hold him accountable, I could end up having a homeless victim, maybe a dead child, and he's going to get out of jail in six months. And now I have an unemployed, homeless man. So I create a more lethal offender and a more dependent victim. And I totally, maybe, kill a baby.

And so we had to really go and talk to all of our community and our community partners on the CCR about what justice really looks like. And so we got to realize we, sometimes, train victims not to participate in our system. I know, for myself, I grew up in a home where my mom had been battered for years.

They never did anything. They never arrested a perpetrator. They never did much to support her. When I got in the middle and got hurt, then they took us children away. Put us in foster care to protect us.

We were in and out of foster care a few times. The system threw a lot of money at our family. I mean, diagnosed me ADHD, put us in special foster care homes, got us private counseling, paid for our medication. And the last time we came back from foster care, they told my mother, if you let him abuse those kids again, you'll never get them back.

Now realize, she never hit us. She called the police and begged for help each time. They chose to never arrest him. But if she lets him abuse us, she won't get us back. We learned quickly to never call you again.

And so people can blame the victim, and say, they don't try for help, or they don't do this. But we have to look at, are the ways that we practice protection going to be more harmful to families than not. For us, I would rather put up with the 10 minutes of abuse by him, or 20 minutes of abuse by him, than six months, or a lifetime, of abuse by you.

But the statistics could say that they worked. We quit calling you, and if you meant to get us to shut up, not be calling the police, not be taking up their time, you were successful, we could go. But if you were really trying to make life safer for your citizens-- the women and children in your community-- you failed in our case.

So I think we have to really look at why we're sitting at the table. It's not about well-meaning people with well-meaning policies. It's about how are these policies and practices interpreted by the people you say you're trying to help. Do they find those as advantageous and helpful, and if not, how is our well-oiled system really becoming nothing more than a coordinated, crummy response? And it's still a CCR, but not really getting the goals that we want.

And I think, also, just as we've talked about CCRs, often, may not be-- I should say CCRs may not be representative of the entire community it is seeking to serve. So really thinking about, how do we create safety within our CCR to bring on partners who are doing community-based work with traditionally marginalized populations. How do we make those authentic and real connections so that we can serve everybody in our community? So that the community, in a coordinated community response, actually, is reflective of your entire community.

And that takes time. I know someone put in the chat, how long does it take to do these things, and how do we do this with turnover. And so we're going to be transitioning to really talking about leadership and development of a CCR because it does take time. It takes time to build relationships. It takes time to come to consensus, or alignment, around values.

There's been ancient hurts between agencies about how DV cases have been happened. There's been historical trauma and systemic trauma on how these responses have impacted certain communities. So it takes time, and it's really important to develop leadership. How do we develop our own leadership so that we can show up on these CCRs and really make impactful change? And how can we be leaders within our own organizations to bring what we're learning from the CCR back into our organizations and impact change?

In the chat, we'd love to hear from you about, what do you think the qualities of a leader are. So first of all, what we want to ask you are, who are the leaders in your community on domestic violence? So just think about that for a minute. Who are those people?

Great, so we're seeing family justice centers, your whole task force, confidential advocates, sexual assault officers, sheriffs, the victim witness folks, public health officers. Someone saying we don't have a leader, COSA advocates, community corrections, the survivors. Yes, thank you for sharing that. That's great.

Great I think that's really important. Cassandra put in there that survivors are the leader. And that gets back to how we can center survivor voices.

All right, so then when you typed people, you were thinking of a specific person when you put that in there. So what makes them a leader? Can you put in the chat some attributes of a leader? What do you think makes someone a good leader?

Listening, dedication, doesn't take things personally, empathy, influence. Oh, my gosh, they're coming in. Open and willing to listen, respectful, compassionate, communicates, passion, lack of ego, knowledgeable, human-- I like that, bringing in that authenticity. Willing to collaborate, mission-oriented, self-awareness.

Great. Oh, this is so good. I think we have a-- I don't know if someone got a sneak peek at our slides. Brené Brown's going to be so proud of you all because we have one of her slides around what makes a good leader. And that being human, I think, is that authenticity, being authentic, transparency.

Yeah, exactly, awkward, brave, and kind. Love it. OK, someone who accepts responsibility and failure. OK, great. So let's talk a little bit about the qualities of a leader and why leadership is important to our CCR.

So the next slide, again, and this is it. Like Rebecca said, it's like you all already knew what we had written here because you wrote a lot of these, who the leaders are. But I want to talk about this slide for a second with all of you because somebody wrote in the chat-- before we started our big chat where you all were doing some free thinking-- somebody wrote about the issue around turnover.

And I think this slide-- I'd like to stop here for a second and say that that is a huge issue with coordinated community response task force or however it looks like in your community. It, quite frankly, affects everything. I mean, right now, we're in this time-- what are they calling it, the Great Resignation. Lots of people are leaving their jobs for lots of different reasons. But that leaves us vulnerable to really not be able to carry this work forward.

Because if it rests on one dynamic leader, and that particular dynamic leader leaves, then we can potentially have 17 steps backwards. Or the project fails or it ends, the coordinated community response ends. So I just want to say looking at this list and everything that you all generated, I think what you always want to have is shared leadership. And you always want multiple people, if possible, who are leading the CCR involved in it, and it's not just dependent on one specific person in your community.

And if people have examples of that-- I don't know, Jim, if you want to talk about that. But this is really an area that we want to make sure that when you're talking about your leadership, that you're really thinking of a deep bench. And, actually, speaking of benches with judges-- that Rebecca was talking about when we first used to be working here in New York state with deviated domestic violence and integrated domestic violence courts-- we always, in the planning process, had the judge find the backup judge.

Because we knew, at some point in time, that judge was either going to be elevated, or they were going to leave the bench for whatever reason, and the whole project could tank. So we always wanted additional people, additional leaders, always in the pipeline. Jim, do you want to add to that?

The only thing I'd say is-- a, it certainly does help if a judge is committed to this. I was very lucky. I came into a system and had two amazing judges.

But I would also say, sometimes, our community partners that we haven't engaged in and are unlikely allies can become allies if we invite them to the table. At one time, our batterers intervention program and our substance abuse program did not get along at all. In fact, the substance abuse program wrote a letter to the judge, basically, saying that she would sabotage his sobriety by sending him to batterers intervention. And they were asking her not to send the guy there. And he has one of the most coercive, controlling men you ever met.

And so the judge-- that was at my first judge. And so she was more leaning not to send this guy there because of those letters from a well-respected director of a huge agency in our community. So for us to bring those people to the table, and we all just agreed-- A, none of us believe that violence against women is acceptable. None of us agreed violence to children should not be exposed, witnessed, or experienced violence. That substance abuse, certainly, was not helpful for anybody who is an addict.

And so we just started at the ask. But within a year-- I wouldn't even say that. I would say within six months, we went from a program trying to shut down the other program and really advocating against it, to being allies and them, actually, presenting at conferences together on collaboration. Them allowing batterers intervention and victim services to come and do groups at the residential substance abuse program. And them going doing groups at the batterer's intervention agency.

So we can find allies that are doing amazing work in our community by inviting them to the table and engaging them and talking to them about that process. So we were really amazed at the leadership role they did. And then, surprisingly enough, once we did this big training, one of their staff members was assaulted by her husband at the agency. And the agency handled it perfectly because it had all this training and was a part of that.

Great, but let's go back to a leader. And I think you've been talking about some of those qualities of a leader. And I do appreciate this quote from Brené Brown-- and it resonates with what a lot of the folks in the chat were saying-- that, "A leader is anyone who takes responsibility for finding the potential in people and processes and who has the courage to develop that potential."

And I think that's what's great about a CCR. We're talking about people and our human connection with each other as people working in the field of domestic violence. And we're also talking about processes, and I think both of those things can be frustrating. I know in our work, we've done some recent work with folks looking to enhance their CCR-- where we went through some goal setting and some belief statements and some visioning, and we'll talk about that in a minute.

But it allowed them to step back and remember the potential that they had when they came to the CCR-- like the potential that they thought of, like what they care about in their community. We care about safe communities. We care about children thriving in schools. We care about good economic resources in our community.

And when we see that DV harms those, it makes us-- it can be overwhelming, and it can be draining over time. So finding a way to be a leader in your CCR to revive that to spark up the fire.

I know we've had a lot of discussions with task forces over the years, like, how do you rekindle the flame of your CCR so that that spark doesn't go out. And how can we all encourage each other to really think about getting out of this, as Jim would say, the lowest common denominator that we often come into. Like, oh it's the least we can do to do this. But what is the most that we can do when we're thinking about DV and DV cases.

And with this, I just say, if you're in just a working position-- I was just a lowly probation officer. I wasn't the supervisor. I wasn't a judge. I'm not an attorney. But I had a voice.

And I went to that table, and I talked about the roadblocks that my clients were experiencing, both the offenders and the ones who were victimized. So I would really encourage you, whether you have a leadership role or not, you can be a leader at these meetings by bringing voice and agency and talking about real issues. And how do we fix this, and I need people bigger than me.

I talked about that case before where that guy assaulted his wife and where they'd lose a job. Well, the community came, and we were able to talk in there about increasing his attendance at batterer's intervention, doing AA. We did this whole wrap around sanction around him that included minimal jail time because jail was not going to be helpful for that family. And we had everybody's stamp of approval from that CCR. So every one of us can be leaders regardless of our position that we hold.

So now we're getting to some real building blocks in ways that you all-- and I think that was a perfect segue way from Jim. Regardless of the role or what position you have in your community, there are real strategies to help build this. And so starting off with, really, hosting a meeting and share the work. I can't stress this enough, and I'm sure Rebecca and Jim have had these experiences. I know I've had these experiences with both of them working with different sites.

You will go into a community-- you'll get a bunch of people around the table from a bunch of different community-based orgs. and from the different system players-- and they will not be able to really describe what each other does. They'll know, oh, there's Robin. She works at the Center for Court Innovation. But then if you say, what does Robin do at the Center for Court Innovation, they'll be like, we have no idea.

So important for a real building block for a coordinated community response is having the meeting and actually spending time sharing what each other does. What that role is, the kinds of services they have, who works there. It's this building block of the relationships and how this takes time and really making something lasting that Rebecca, I think, was talking about earlier as well. And really, one thing that we noticed that can really help build camaraderie and help people even understand more about each other's roles and the type of work that they do is actually hosting the meeting in different locations.

So, for example, one time you might come to my office, and I'm going to-- hey, this is our conference room, come on in. Well, actually, right now, in COVID, that may not work, but you know what I'm saying. In other times, come on over, actually, and let me come in and let me show you around, and this is what we do here. So that's a really important component just to baseline who's in the room, what do they do and sharing everyone's name and making sure that people know how to contact each other. So having an old-fashioned email, making sure there's an email list, phone list, so that people can get in contact.

Identify shared values-- this is one that, I think, a lot of CCRs skip over, and most of us skip over in our work. But, really, spending the time as a group because you're going to have lots of different perspectives in the room. And all of those perspectives-- I think Jim was just saying this before too-- are really important perspectives, but everybody comes with their lens. And putting that lens to the side for a minute and saying in terms of handling and responding and enhancing our response to domestic violence, intimate partner violence in our community, what are our values.

And making sure that there's time and space to do that and making sure that everybody's voice gets in there. That we're making sure that historically marginalized communities are at the table, and everybody's values are being shared at that point. And then that builds right into creating a mission and vision for the coordinated community response.

So having that, this is also a building block. So if the three, let's say, leaders of those CCRs all leave-- that would be crazy if they all left at the same time, but it's happened, I'm sure, somewhere. If people start leaving, if you have these shared values-- you have a mission statement, a vision statement-- that continues to really keep the structure of the group, even to withstand changes in personnel.

The next one is a personal favorite of Rebecca's and mine-- but Rebecca's really good at it, I'm doing it virtually-- is system mapping. This relates to number one here on the slide. In addition to people not always knowing what different organizations do and what people's roles in those organizations are, people, often, don't understand how all of these different systems fit together. Because, often, we go through our workday.

I know that I'm answering the hotline at this organization, for this DV agency. I may not know what's happening at the court or what's happening at the hospital in the ER, but all of these different agencies and pieces fit together because an individual, a survivor, a person who uses harm, is, potentially, coming into contact with all of those different organizations and agencies. And we need to have a broad view of that. So system mapping is critical, both the mapping of legal systems but, also, community-based systems.

Asset-mapping, similarly, we have so many communities that say we really don't have anything in our community. And in some communities, things are really stretched thin, totally true. But at the same time, I think I mentioned this earlier, there are things happening in most of our communities that if we really sit down and start talking about what we do have and come from a strengths-based approach of like-- OK, What do we have? Let's put that down, and figure out how we can work that.

And sure, we'll talk about what we don't have and what we need to move forward and try to get resources for, but let's start with strengths-based and what we do have here for our folks. And then, obviously, evaluating those responses, making sure there's time to constantly come back to the CCR group and say, hey, how's this going-- this is where some CCRs get stagnant. They've been meeting for 25 years, but they've never done any of these other pieces.

And now it just becomes like, hey, here's Robin. She's bringing cookies. It's great that she's here, but-- or I'm on Zoom, and you're seeing whatever-- but nothing's really moving the needle here. So having all of these building blocks and these components to your CCR and, ultimately, the leadership, will help for the long term. Jim--

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

--want to say anything? Oh, jump in.

No, I was just saying that that's great. And, recently, when we did the work around the shared values, we backed it up because we know that values come from what the beliefs are. So really thinking about what do you believe about people who are causing harm.

What do you believe about survivors? What do you think the role of a CCR is? Where are the strengths in your community? Just answering those general questions, then, helps you think about what are the values that we bring-- that I bring-- to this work in the CCR, can really help reinvigorate it and make it meaningful for folks.

And I know, Jim, you went through this process in Ann Arbor. So I'm going to share the mission that you all created in Washtenaw County and just wondered if you wanted to talk a little bit about that process. And to answer that question that was in the Q&A-- really, it took a while. You guys just didn't get together and all high-five each other and walk out 30 minutes later.

It changes depending on the size of your system. So when we first started, it was just Ann Arbor-- my judge, and another judge, me, and a prosecutor, local batterers intervention, victim services. We could make decisions quickly. We all were on the same page.

Well then, we became part of this oversight demonstration initiative. OVW asked us to apply for this large grant, and now we're going county-wide. And so now, you really had to have a mission statement because we're including so many more people. And so, you're right, it took two days-- and Libby likes to say-- where we cussed and discussed, really, what our mission statement was going to be.

And there's a saying now, stay in your own lane. Well what we needed to do is we needed to blur our lanes a little bit. Because, historically, probation's role is just on accountability. My job is offender accountability-- trail them, nail them, and jail them. Your job as an advocate, provide safety and support to the victim.

And we're saying, no, that's not how we're going to do business anymore. It's everybody's responsibility. So we came up with our first goal-- maximize the safety of victims and their children. If any policy or procedure did not do, that had to be dissected and looked at significantly.

Now realize, the probation manual was tight set in 1976, 12 years before domestic violence was even a crime in Michigan. No policies or procedures that were created in the Michigan probation manual was ever about victim safety ever. So we had to really reexamine what our policies were.

The second goal was to end community tolerance towards domestic violence because we believed, really, that men abuse because they can, because society has made it easy. Courts have been lenient. Police didn't always arrest. The church didn't preach from the pulpit the right messages.

And we wanted to change that culture and really look at how does that happen. How do we make this more than just about the courts and arrest? How can this be a community initiative?

Third was holding the offenders accountable for their violence. So then think about that as a paradigm shift. You're asking the judge, the prosecutor, and probation department to put our accountability as third on the list behind-- does our policy keep victims and their children safe? Does our policy send a message to the community that this is not going to be accepted? Does it send a message from the community that we support survivors, and that we expect men to change their behavior and be held to account for that?

And then you look after that, it was to ensure fair and equitable treatment for everybody in the criminal justice system. We weren't going to demonize men who used violence, but we were going to hold them accountable. But we were going to do that with respect, and we're going to treat them as citizens of the United States and as human beings. And, sometimes, people can get so fixated on accountability and so sensitive to victims issues, that it's easy to demonize the person who's done bad behavior. And we wanted to hold ourselves accountable that everyone has rights, and we will respect those rights and that we'll make sure that we address the needs of everyone in our community.

So it was an exciting time, but it wasn't as easy as you would think. You'd think we're all going to agree. And we have police officers, the probation officers, the judges, and we all had our own view of what we thought our mission should be. And it took a lot of work before we all signed on to this being our final thing.

Exactly, and I think it does take time to build that trust, for sure. I don't know, Robin, if you were going to say anything.

No. No, I love hearing about, Jim, that story because, really, it's a lot of communities have those same hurdles. So thank you.

Well it's interesting, when we were talking about the guy, again, who had punched his wife going down the street, all the probation officers, I'm like, what do I do? Like if I put him in jail, he loses his home. The kid loses insurance.

And a lot of the probation officers are like, you've got to do it. That's the shelter's problem. They're going to have to work and support her. You got to hold him accountable. He needs to go to jail.

And they were like, but that doesn't match our mission statement, and that does not provide justice. It needs to be more than just locking up. What is justice to the victim and the child? How is it just if a victim's homeless, and a child's dead? That's not justice.

And so it is, really, re-looking at our mission statement and using that to support policy change on that case when we went to court.

And I think it's a good way to be able to live out the value of accountability. We're holding ourselves, as a CCR, accountable to our values and to our mission. And it, also, is a way to just keep reinvigorating and having meaning to the CCR.

Because you can go back to it every year, or every two years, and say-- OK, how are we doing on these values? How are we living them out? How are we living out this mission? And then, how do we want to evaluate ourselves on that? What would it look like for us to live out this mission?

And it just continues to keep you on track, and focus your meetings. So that's great. As Robin says, I love system mapping. And so, again, here's a way to really think about system mapping in the context of leadership, really identifying each of the steps that a case may take through your criminal legal system, through your civil legal system, and then in your community-based responses.

Like if this case, if this DV survivor, never accesses a criminal or a legal system response, then thinking about who are the people in your community, as Jim said-- who are touching either that survivor or that person causing harm? Who are the leaders in each of those agency? And then, what are the resources at each of those agencies, either for the survivor or for that abusive partner or the person causing harm?

Again, that allows you, as a CCR, to continue to think about-- OK, we have this system map. Here are where our gaps are, and here's something that we can do that's going to help us live out our mission. So when we're thinking about how to expand our leadership and really think about inclusive leadership, someone else put in the chat about recognizing our biases, our implicit biases.

And I think I have experienced working with well-meaning-- myself included. I bring my closest friends together to strategize on something. And that may be an interesting thing to do, but it might not be representative of what our community needs. And so really thinking about what communities are underrepresented in your CCR.

As part of our DV risk project, we have this value of really working and engaging communities within communities. And so not separating out, oh, those survivors in our community are doing this. No, survivors are our community. People causing harm are our community. Law enforcement is our community.

We're all the community. And so when we leave someone out, we're hurting ourselves, and we're not ever able to, really, live out that mission.

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

Yeah, go ahead.

I was going to say, the other thing that we did, we had, at one time, we had all the religious leaders come in and did a whole panel for the whole community, really, just on the religious standpoint on domestic violence. So we had rabbis and people from the Muslim community, the Arab community, the Jewish community, a Christian community. And it was really neat to see all of these leaders in our community come together and say domestic violence is not right, and we're going to support victims. We're going to help hold men accountable.

But then, they, also, did some in-service for us. And when I do home visits, there certain rules and etiquette that I should think about when I enter into a Muslim's home or someone's home of different faiths, especially at different times of the year. Do I take off my shoes, do I not take off my shoes. How do I handle and respond to this.

And those are things we don't always think about. I just think every family is like me, and they're not like me. And different cultural norms can really be offensive to some families, and to be better engaged with that community, I think, is helpful.

And Robin, I know you've had experience working in Minneapolis and some other places that really did some innovative things. And I don't know if you want to talk about listening sessions and how impactful those were.

Absolutely. We can put, actually, into the chat-- we have some videos about this. But one of our mentor courts in Hennepin County, which is the Minneapolis area, the court was noticing that even though that area has one of the highest census data for Native Americans living in an urban setting, they were noticing, in part of their court demographics, that they were not seeing Native American folks accessing the courts. And there are, obviously, very good reasons why people wouldn't want to do that.

But they wanted to go out and say-- our court is open to you if you need us. And we want to come and listen to what you're thinking about the courts, and let us know how we can improve. And so it was, actually, the court folks-- and actually, now, she's the chief on the Supreme Court of Minnesota-- but other judges, as well as court staff, went out to tribal community orgs. and to different reservations. And, actually, they were speaking to folks and getting their input.

So it's not just saying-- hey, come to my meeting, and tell me what you think. But it's actually saying-- hey, I want to hear from you, and I'm going to come to you. And I really want to hear what your thoughts are.

And then we've also had sites in other communities, places in Portland and Chicago. Other communities where they've said-- hey, we really want to make sure we're reaching all communities within communities. We want to have different meetings and invited lots of people to the room and had meetings with people who work with the community with folks who are disabled, folks who are LGBTQ, all different race and ethnicities. Really saying-- hey, we're not seeing people in our systems, but we know these are members of our community. And we want to make sure that we're inclusive.

I would just say-- and I'll put it into the chat about the videos-- but, really, this is so critical. And if we're not being inclusive in our coordinated community response, we're just not going to make an impact on these cases.

Great, thanks. So, before we turn it over to the Q&A, we just wanted to hear from you. After being with us today, we'd love to hear from you. What's one person, or one agency, that you see as a leader in your community that you'd want to reach out to and have a conversation about how domestic violence is impacting your community?

Is there someone that you feel, like-- oh, I've always wanted to have a conversation with that person. Or I've seen them at other meetings. Is there someone that you'd like to reach out to that you see as a leader, and talk to them about the impact of DV on your community?

OK, elected county sheriff, judges, state's attorney, law enforcement, some more judges, victim witness coordinator, district attorney, mayor, housing-- that's great, housing and schools. Homeless coalition, landlords-- I like that-- homeless shelters, medical providers, council delegates, different types of court, tribal court, local tribal law enforcement and advocates, Underground Railroad, great, ministers.

OVW, we're all funded by OVW on this call. And OVW has a great resource safe haven that does great work on training around DV and sexual assault for religious leaders, church leaders, and rural councils. Yeah, great. Statewide council, spiritual and cultural elders, that's amazing, great. Thank you so much.

So we're going to move to the Q&A portion of today's webinar. So to get this started, I'd like to throw to each of you-- starting with Jim, then Rebecca, and then Robin-- do you all think there's a synergy that happens with the development and implementation of CCRs. And I know you've touched on this, but, maybe, some highlights or some personal stories or aha moments that you experienced working with or developing CCRs.

Well, I think for us, it became contagious. You got just one person excited, you pulled people in, the shelter was shocked. Victim advocates said we were excited and willing to really take change seriously and not just meet and read statistics. That we're actually interested in policy change that would make families safer.

From there, we got Michigan State involved, who did a free parenting class. And we had them reshape that so it could work with men who'd use violence. We worked with the school's social workers, who had had zero training in domestic violence. and knew nothing about it. Never even seen a power and control wheel.

They were just shocked to find out some of the homes that the kids were coming in. And, sometimes, they knew kids were taken out or removed from foster care because of family violence, but had no idea how their policies and practices impacted those kids. And so it was really amazing to see one person come to the table, get excited, and they're like-- hey, we need to have my husband come in. He's the school principal. They need to know this.

And then somebody else invites someone else, and it was really amazing. And it made you excited to do your job, to go to work, because you felt like, at least, for me, I felt like I could actually make a difference. Just as a little probation officer, I could be empowered by my community members, I could also empower them, and we could make change. And that felt great at the end of the day when you went home instead of burned out at the end of the day when you went home.

Well, I will just give an experience. When I started out at the center, I was part of the Brooklyn domestic violence court stakeholder meetings, which weren't a CCR, but it was a multidisciplinary team that came together. And there was just a lot of stressors about the day to day. As you can imagine, they had 9,000 misdemeanor cases a year.

So there was just a lot of stress around those types of cases. So those relationships became a little bit fractured. It was around, like, why didn't you use-- literally. The conversations were like-- why did you use a Sharpie instead of a ballpoint pen on x, y, and z form?

And when we just took a break, and, actually, we went to a conference, an OVW-approved conference, together and got out of the environment of this day-to-day stress of handling these cases, they were able to absorb information together. They went out for dinner together and started to appreciate each other as human beings. And then when we came back, we started doing what Robin said, which was-- hey, we've been talking to each other for a really long time. But we really don't understand the intricacies of how the prosecutor handles arraignments.

And so the prosecutor took us, literally, to the place where they handle the arraignments. And we all got to meet different staff and really see the process and see the paperwork. And it helped us, then, to understand-- OK, so that's what's happening there.

Oh, look, here's this office that I walk past all the time in the courthouse. It says "safe horizon" on it. Oh, my gosh, there are advocates in there. People didn't know that there were free GED classes happening on the 18th floor of the courthouse that they could send defendants to.

So there was all different types of things that we realized, and that really helped change those day-to-day frustrations that we have and really helped us to think bigger picture.

Thanks, Rebecca. How about you, Robin?

Well, I'd echo a lot, obviously, of what Jim and Rebecca said. I would just-- based on some questions that are coming in through the Q&A-- I can add some pieces. I mean, I would say that CCR, the synergy can be a lot of things. Somebody asked about sexual assault and DV CCRs as being separate. And one way to think about it is, there are a lot of cases where there's intimate partner sexual assault. Not all, but some.

And so is there a way-- maybe, these CCRs do operate separately-- but then how the liaisons-- I was trying to find the right word-- who go between the different CCRs. Or, maybe, there's a decision made by the group. No, no, no. We see enough of this overlap, and we need to bring these groups together and make this a larger CCR.

So that's like one of the components where it starts to be synergy, where you're really having the right people in the room. You can have these conversations. And you can also start to think about-- is there a grant that we could write in our community? Are there other resources that we should be utilizing.

And the question here-- can anyone develop a CCR? Where do I start? Yes. The first question would be, there may be one that exists in your community already, but it may not be as holistic or as inclusive.

So asking some of the domestic violence folks in the community, some of the system players-- hey, does something like this exist here? Do we have a task force? Do we have a coordinating council? People use different names for coordinated community responses.

And if not, it's, really, starting to find those leaders within the community and saying-- hey, can we just start? And someone, I think in the chat, wrote earlier, starting small. Can we just start to bring people together on Zoom, at a lunch hour, and start to talk about what we're seeing in these cases, and then start to build it out?

So the synergy is important. And you can see it take shape in lots of different ways.

Thank you guys. The next question is, what do you do if your judges are one of the main issues, and refuse to participate, and there is no one else to hold them accountable? Who would like to take that question?

What I can say, for that one, that person should contact Rebecca and I, and our emails are there. Judges are an interesting-- a lot of conversations have to happen with judges on this. Often, judges believe that possibly participating in a CCR like this could, potentially, invalidate their neutrality or impartiality.

However, as we've described today over and over, the coordinated community responses that we're talking about at today's webinar, are not case specific. And as long as the court, as all different sides are represented and invited to these meetings-- so I think Jim made this point earlier that the defense attorneys are invited. All different perspectives are invited to this table, it should not preclude a judge from being able to participate.

Now the situations where that's different is if you're running some multidisciplinary team or some other meeting where there are cases being discussed, those judges, often, cannot be present because of the issues around impartiality and the issues that they need to be mindful of. So we're happy to talk more about that. There's a little bit of interest, you can see, when it comes to a judge.

The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court judges used to do an amazing training for judges. So I don't know if that's still out there, if they went to Zoom or if it's been eliminated because we're not meeting in person. But I've seen judges that, definitely, weren't on board. Who would go to a training in Miami in January, but come back really changed. Judges do good when they talk to other judges, so if you can do that.

The other thing I would say, if we're doing this meeting as a team, sometimes, whoever's giving the reports to the judge-- like if I'm a probation officer, and I can write a report, I can give examples of what different community members are, why they're supporting a recommendation. And we can try to educate a judge that way.

Thank you, guys. So it looks like we're winding down a little bit. I want to ask one more question to each of you.

What would be one or two takeaways you would point out to our audience that you would want them to say? If I walked away with nothing else from this presentation, here are two things I want you to remember. And let's go ahead and start with Rebecca, go to Robin, and then to Jim.

OK, I'd want you to remember communities within communities and to understand that we are all the work that needs to be done to change things and make our community safe. Two, I would say be patient and forgiving with yourselves and others.

Creating a coordinating community response can be challenging. You all can do it. You could just start reaching out to your partners and say-- hey, let's get together. Let's talk about this, but be patient, and be forgiving because it can be a bumpy ride.

I agree with everything Rebecca said. I would add to that by saying, leadership comes in lots of different forms, and, like we talked about, always plan for change. So as you're building this, always thinking, what will this look like in 10 years, just so that you make sure that you can have some sustainability with the council or the CCR. And then, also, really think big and holistically.

Inviting people from your department of education, inviting people from hospitals. Really thinking big because the lives of the folks that you all are working with, they intersect with all of those different organizations, agencies, and systems.

Thank you, Robin. And Jim.

I have no idea how to follow these two amazing ladies, but here's what I will say. Energy is contagious. Bring your energy to the table, get some people who have some energy there, and remember, you can be that change agent. Regardless of what your position is, you don't have to be a judge to catch other people on fire.

And if people are on fire and having good discussions, people are going to want to join the cool group. They're going to want to be a part of your team. So I'm excited for the work you'll be doing and appreciate everyone. Thank you.

I want to thank Robin, Rebecca and Jim for today's presentation. Robin, do you want to give a plug for CCI, and give the best way to access CCI? Sure. We are at courtinnovation.org. You also see our emails with our pictures on the screen right now. And, also, another plug for our new Domestic Violence Homicide Prevention Resource Center, dvrisc.org. So thanks, everyone.

So thank you, all. This is going to conclude our webinar for today. I want to thank all of you guys for sharing your time and knowledge with us. And we hope you can join us for another webinar in the future, and have a wonderful day. Thank you all.