

**National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006**

Jim Gerace, Vice President, Corporate Communications, Verizon Wireless:

Good afternoon everybody. Hi, I'm Jim Gerace. I'm responsible for Corporate Communications for Verizon Wireless; and with Denny, 11 years ago, we launched the Hope Line Project, something I'm very proud of. I'm also Board member of Jersey Battered Women Services – you may know it as JBWS. I'm very happy to see JBWS staffers and Board members here with us today. It's my pleasure to spend some time with you this afternoon, as your lunchtime emcee.

We heard from some of the most exceptional people in the field of domestic violence prevention and recovery, and some of the leading corporations and public entities who are committed to making a difference in this issue. And we're only halfway through the day. Leading off this afternoon's activities is Patrick Gaston. He is the President of the Verizon Foundation. Patrick.

Patrick Gaston, President, Verizon Foundation:

Thank you Jim, and thank you also for your leadership on these issues, and a thank you to each of you in this room. You know, I've spent this morning being inspired by the wisdom and the hope that was expressed in every presentation that I heard, and clearly there's not a person in this room who's not willing- who's willing to accept the status quo; and there's great power in this collective of knowledge, vision and dedication, power enough to help to make real change in preventing domestic violence and helping victims to recover. Earlier today, my colleagues Dan Mead and Denny Strigl spoke about the aspects of Verizon's commitment and focus on the issue of domestic violence.

Behind Dan and Denny and me there is an entire corporation taking a stand for this issue, from our senior leadership, our chairman, Ivan Seidenberg, public affair leaders, Tom Tauke and Kathy Brown, to each one of you and all our employees, all our 250,000 employees. As Denny and Dan discussed, Verizon has pioneered ways of empowerment and support for domestic violence victims through our Verizon Wireless Hope Line Program, through HR programs, and now through the Verizon's Online Education technology and volunteer initiatives through the Foundation. That's why all of us at Verizon are proud to host this summit and engage you in this dialogue, which we are looking forward to continuing today. Our commitment is real, and we're putting substantial investments in programs that make a real difference on this issue, that touch people's lives, where they live. Just since October 1st this year, Verizon Foundation has granted one million dollars to 93 domestic violence organizations in 21 states. By the end of 2006 we expect our philanthropic investments on this issue to exceed 4.5 million dollars this year.

Questions and the statistics show we are only scratching the surface. As we go through the rest of the workshops today, I hope we can keep opportunities in mind to work together to identify how we can harness our power to create real and permanent change, empower women to break the cycle, enable the protection of children and assure that we will fulfill our corporate and personal responsibility to prevent domestic violence.



**National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006**

I now have the great pleasure of introducing one of the true champions of this issue, a man whose name is legend in baseball and whose name is legend in the area of preventing domestic violence. Joe Torre was asked- was named the manager of the New York Yankees on November 2, 1995, and becoming the 31st manager in Yankees history, he joins Casey Stengel, Yogi Barra and Dallas Green as the fourth manager to wear both the Yankees and the Mets uniforms. Joe led the 1996 Yankees to their first World Series Championship since 1978. He accomplished this feat again in 1998, and in 1999, solidifying the Yankees claim to the title Team of the Decade. He was named Man of the Year by the Sporting News and Co-Manager of the Year by the Baseball Writers Association of America. In his 17-year playing career, Joe played for Milwaukee, Atlanta, St. Louis and the Mets.



In 1971, Joe was the National League MVP as a member of the Cardinals. He made his managerial debut on May 31, 1977, when he became the first player/manager in the Major Leagues since 1959. Joe is the only person ever to be named both the MVP and Manager of the Year. In the off-season, Joe is most comfortable on stage, motivating audiences, explaining the challenges of the sport, and stressing the importance of team work. He is the author of Joe Torre's Ground Rules for Winners, 12 Keys to Managing Team Players, Tough Bosses, Setbacks and Success. In 2003, he founded the Joe Torre Safe at Home Foundation, dedicated to the prevention and awareness of domestic violence. One of the programs, Safe at Home, is Margaret's Place, a resource for high school students that help them to understand the causes, the root causes of domestic violence, protect themselves and cope with the stress that domestic violence places on families and individuals. Verizon is committed to supporting Joe Torre's Safe at Home Foundation. Committing to working with you Joe, we look forward to partnering with you and working with Margaret's Place in the coming year in New Jersey. And just as he is in baseball, Joe Torre is indeed a hero, to the domestic violence movement and to so many people in this country. And I'm proud to present to you Mr. Joe Torre.

Joe Torre, Manager, New York Yankees and Founder, Safe at Home Foundation:

Thank you, Patrick. Thank you.

Jim Gerace:

Well welcome Joe.

Joe Torre:

Thank you, Jim and Patrick.

Jim Gerace:

Well while you're here amongst friends and the doors are closed, can you tell us who your favorite Yankee is?

Joe Torre:

It's whoever knocks in the winning run for me, I guess.

National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006

Jim Gerace:

Okay. Domestic violence is a pretty difficult subject to talk about, and it's certainly more difficult to talk about than baseball. What motivated you to speak up?

Joe Torre:

I don't know if it's complicated but when I met my wife, Ali – Ali would you stand, everybody see her?

Joe Torre:

When I met my wife Ali 25 years ago, she being one of 16 children had no trouble conversing with people. I am the youngest of five. And I really didn't talk a whole lot, you know, and it really wasn't until – you know, the curse that I could get from Ali was, "You know, we have to talk", and then – and that was the worst that could possibly happen to me. But over the years together, obviously, she's changed me, in that regard.

And then something really changed me, back in 1995 because Ali was pregnant with our daughter and I had just lost my job with St. Louis, and we moved to Cincinnati, where we were going to – we were living between opportunities. I didn't know where I was going to go to work. So in December, early December of '95, Allie said, "Do you want to go to this symposium with me?" Life Success. And I said sure, I mean, she was 8 months pregnant, I'm not going to say no. So she says, "Well only if want you", you know, "Do you want to go?" I said, "If you want me to go, I'm going; if you're going, I'm going." So we went. And it started on Thursday, ended on Sunday. Long story short I find myself like a day and a half later standing in front of perfect strangers, crying my eyes out, talking about my feelings. And, you know, it wasn't necessarily geared toward me but whatever you wanted to do going into this seminar, you were taken care of. They split you up in groups and you weren't allowed to be in a group with your mate.

And so it was quite emotional and it got to the point where I wind up calling my sisters- because I'm the youngest of five; there's 8½ years between me and the next oldest; there's four older siblings- and talked to my one sister, asked about my dad abusing my mom, and she said, yes this went on and that went on and this went on. Well, I knew things were going on when I was younger. It was never talked about. There was whispering in the house between my sisters and brothers and my mom, and in an effort to keep it from me, to protect me, which is- was the reason. But in hearing the whispering I'm figuring I did something wrong and I figured I was guilty of something.

And I was a very nervous kid growing up – I didn't like school, I was afraid to answer questions wrong and I didn't have a great deal of self-esteem. And if I'd come home in the afternoon from school, walk home from school, I'd see my dad's car in front of the house, I'd go to a friend's house until the car would disappear because he worked nights – he was a police officer and he worked nights. So it was a very uncomfortable home, when my dad was home. So I was starting to connect the dots, so to speak. And once, in my one book that I wrote in I guess it was '96/'97, you know, sort of exposed the fact that I had this type of upbringing. I felt freer to talk about it because



National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006

now I sort of understood what – why I had certain feelings. And my older sisters were obviously a little more guarded about talking about it, because it was something we never shared with anybody. If my mom was with us today, she would have a real tough time with my starting the Safe at Home Foundation. But basically when Ali asked me what do we want to do charity wise, and I said, “Well I want to do something really to keep my mom’s memory around.” And we started the Safe at Home Foundation a few years ago.



And then we decided on which area we wanted to go after. You know, we wanted to name a shelter after my mom; but again we’ve always felt, since I was a nervous child growing up, we wanted to go somewhere and do something to educate children, or to just have them understand that, as I did, thought I was alone, and then all of a sudden you start talking about it and you realize you’re not alone. So we started out raising money to raise awareness. In fact after our first gala or two, I know my brother said, “What are you doing with the money? What are you doing with the money?” Well we were trying to formulate, you know, we wanted to do the right thing. So we first off did some TV spots to raise awareness. They were very powerful spots; in fact, one of the spots won an Emmy. It showed this man over this woman, and didn’t actually show him hitting her, but as he was raising his hand, the camera panned to the other room and this little girl was sort of up against the door jam, listening. And it sort of brought back memories of things I heard and didn’t necessarily witness, but I heard and then saw the results. So it was, as I say, very powerful. And then we decided that the educational part of it was a Margaret’s Place, which was a safe room for children.

We partnered with Safe Horizons, because they had a program and we liked the educational part of it. And right now, we have 10 Margaret’s Places. There’s one in the Brooklyn Family Justice Center, and 9 schools, 9 middle schools in Brooklyn, the Bronx, Manhattan, and now we just opened four Margaret’s Places in Westchester. In fact, I was at a function a few days ago and I was mentioning to Jim- when I was telling someone about our foundation, that my banquet was coming up and everything. I said, “We just opened four Margaret’s Places in Westchester.” And he says, “Really, Westchester.” He says, “Do we have that problem?” And I said, “Okay”; and I said, “Yes, the problem exists, even though a lot of people don’t want to share it or acknowledge the fact.”

So it’s been very satisfying, if that’s the proper word, because you realize that you’re making an impact, you’re talking to people. Initially when we put a video together for our first gala, I had a camera crew from Anheuser-Busch follow us into a school. And Anheuser-Busch was gracious enough to put a video together, pro bono, for our foundation. And I was talking to children. I said, “We’ll talk about baseball in a minute.” I said, “I just want to explain what this camera crew here is all about.” And as I’m explaining my childhood growing up, I look over the crowd and there’s probably six or eight or nine youngsters nodding. So I realized at that point in time that we were sort of approaching it in the right way. And that’s how I got involved.

National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006

Jim Gerace:

That's a good segue. I wanted to ask you more about Margaret's Place and why you chose children to target here.

Joe Torre:

Well, Jim, if you're going to end the cycle in domestic violence – and our Margaret's Place is a comprehensive program for intervention and prevention – and if you're going to end the cycle of domestic violence, you got to go to the next generation, the one's who possibly would say, "My dad did it, I guess it's all right to be this bully and rough people up." So it's just the educational program. It's complicated- there's no question. You educate children and what do they do with the education? Do they take it home?

I was alone through this thing and I never shared it with anybody. In each Margaret's Place we have a Master's level counselor, and if the child wants to talk about it, fine; if the child wants to sit and read a book or read some information on it, fine – answer some questions, leave a folder, play a game, whatever he or she wants to do – or happens to want to share it with one of his or her peers that happen to be in the room at the same time.

So, to me it's a matter of understanding that you're not the only one going through this, and the fact that if you talk about it here, you may find someone safe to talk about it, like an uncle or an aunt, or someone that maybe isn't living under your roof. As I say, it's not a perfect science but the children, we feel, are at an age where they can understand. And of course when you get into the middle schools and the high schools, then you're talking about the dating violence that goes on.

And as sports people we sometimes send mixed messages too. We'll tell our football players to go out there and be aggressive on Friday night, and they happen to go out on a date after the game and the aggressiveness is not where you're supposed to carry it. So it's very complicated. But I think raising the awareness, having people understand it's not the right thing to do, and just letting them know. And there may be abusers out there that aren't aware of the scars they're leaving on their children, because they're abusing their spouse. They may not be recognizing the fact that it's affecting their children.

Jim Gerace:

Joe, as the manager of the Yankees, you're in a prominent leadership position. Do you have any strategies or hints for the business leaders in this room on how they might bring up the subject in their business place?

Joe Torre:

Well I think having an Awareness Program, because again it certainly affects the corporate world. Whether it be a worker at home who's getting abused and happens to take time off from work because they don't want to come and show the results of being abused, or it's someone who maybe is roughing people up, or even to the point of controlling matters to the point of having that be a form of abuse also. So I think any education that we can put forth, in the corporate world is key.



**National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006**

Since it's been such a secret for a long time, there are people that just turn their back on it, even though they know there's something out there but not knowing what to do about it. But I think if there is somewhere you can send someone or have a program within the operation that will educate and have people understand that we know this is going on and if this applies – well, you know, there are changes that have to be made.

Jim Gerace:

Have you seen any change since you've been talking about this issue?

Joe Torre:

Well I've seen people change. I mean, I could sit there and talk on camera with someone – and I've done that in promoting our gala coming up or a golf tournament – and then somebody will get me aside and say, "You know, my dad was the same way" and all of a sudden pull a check out and give me a check. Or I'll walk by a cameraman and he'll give me a twenty dollar bill. And it's touched so many people. And so that's what I see is that people who have had this deep, dark secret are I think sort of – I don't want to say relieved, but they find a friend or someone they can talk about it with and volunteer it. And I think the more we talk about it, the more they'll share; and I think the more you share, the less brave the abuser is going to be, now that he knows that it's not necessarily going to be kept under wraps.

Jim Gerace:

Do we have any questions from the audience?

Karen Jeffreys, Project Coordinator, Rhode Island Coalition Against Domestic Violence:

Mr. Torre, what do you think is the responsibility of Major League Baseball to more of the players giving the recent violence? There was a pitcher last year, I think it was Boston, and there was that incident that happened. How do you think Major League Baseball should respond? What you're doing is fantastic. What do you think the industry of sports – like they are like a corporation – what is their responsibility to work with their players, to educate them and make sure that if they are an abuser, they need to get help or some consequences and accountability?

Joe Torre:

Well there's no question. I think there are a lot of people living in the Dark Ages, and baseball really had gone for years without wanting to really change a whole lot and stay out of people's business. Now I've always said to my players, "I don't interfere with people's business but if there's something I can help you with, whether it be on the field or off the field; I may not be able to solve it but if I can talk to you about it, that's fine." Cincinnati and San Francisco really are the only ones that have had sort of an awareness there – right, Ali?

Ali Torre:

Yes. Believe me, I approached Major League Baseball several times. They support the Boys and Girls Club and we have been in discussion with them as far as partnering and working with them in their After School programs, developing an educational program for them. So that's kind of in the works right now.



**National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006**

Joe Torre:

But as I say, they're in the Dark Ages so to speak because they sort of like things the way they are and they want to not necessarily acknowledge what's going on. But right, the kid, Myers, in Philadelphia who he just slapped his wife right there on the street in Boston, certainly needs to understand the behavior. And again, not just the confrontation itself but the fact that whether we like it or not in public life we're role models for people; and you can't do one without the other. You can't say, "Yeah, your mom and dad should be the role model." But whether you like it or not you are a role model and you certainly have to behave with that understanding in mind. And there may be something you feel like doing, but you have to understand that there's more responsibility involved.

Judy Postmus:

Hi, I'm Judy Postmus from Rutgers University.

Joe Torre:

Hi, Judy. Congratulations, Rutgers University.

Judy Postmus:

Thank you, we're all very proud. I just wanted to ask you a question. We know the research talks about the relationship between children who witness violence and the potential – or becoming a risk factor for becoming victims or batterers in adulthood. But we also understand that children are very resilient as well. So I'm curious, in your life, what accounted for your resiliency to come out of that family dynamic?

Joe Torre:

You know, that's a great question. I know children are resilient, but I was blessed with an ability to play baseball, and believe me, I told you about not having a great deal of self-esteem; well I found my self-esteem in the game, where I just was able to become something special.

But it also manifested itself that if I didn't have a good day, I felt I let everybody down and I was responsible for losing, personally responsible for losing – and I was not very social. And I remember in St. Louis – because that's where I sort of matured baseball wise, and you talk about my late 20's, early 30's. That's why I see Jeter, 20-years-old, I said, "This kid can't be real – you know, he's had this, all the responsibility and respect and all this stuff at 20-years-old.

But I remember having a terrible day in Chicago one day, and we were supposed to go over to one of the player's houses for dinner, and I said, "I'm not going" because I had whatever I didn't do on the field, because I just wanted to be by myself because I didn't feel very good about myself. And the other players who there was more to than me, they said, "No, you're going with us" and they basically dragged me off. And I did and it was fine. But it was sad for me to have this kind of a life; where if I had a good day, say I'm going out and selling insurance or something, I'd go out there and have a good day and you'd feel good. It would be the same thing. So there was something that was left over from those days that certainly affected me into



National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006

my childhood, and I think it was just the fact that I was fortunate to have a talent to do something, and basically buried myself in it.

Jim Gerace:

Anybody else? This woman.

Janet Fifer:

Thank you. I'm Janet Fifer from Fifer Power Seminars. I just want to comment, first of all, on this issue of resiliency with children. I think children are very resilient in the fact that they can pick up the pieces of their life and move on. But I think we have to be careful that whatever experiences our children have had when they were young, if those issues aren't addressed and resolved, they manifest themselves in some way when they become adults. So it may appear on the surface that a child has kind of moved beyond that, but they may be carrying around the scars – they're affecting them in other aspects of their life. So I just wanted to comment on that. But I also would like to know a little bit more about Margaret's Place and specifically, what kind of a structure do you have within the schools, and what is presented there for the children and what is the ultimate result that you're looking for?

Joe Torre:

Okay, I'll tell you. I'll share my fee here for today, which is the usual fee, with Ali. She will answer that question.

Ali Torre:

I would like to turn this over to Bea Hansen. We researched for about a year and we went throughout the New York Metro Area to look at service providers in the area that really specialized with children, and Joe's daughter, Christina, actually met with Bea Hansen and Safe Horizon, and they were wonderful to work with. We also worked with the Family Violence Prevention Fund and they were wonderful for us as a startup. Bea is very familiar with the Safe Harbor Program, which is what we adopted and kind of renamed to Margaret's Place.

Bea Hansen, Chief Program Officer, Safe Horizon:

I'll just be incredibly brief. We have a social worker who's been trained and they're the coordinator of Margaret's Place. As Joe was saying, there are 10 different programs and we're helping with the replication in Westchester and then hopefully in New Jersey we'll have one soon too. But the whole idea is that there's peer leadership development that happens there. So we're working with the kids to develop leadership amongst each other because as we all know, as teenagers or pre-teens that you care a lot more what your friends say than what somebody who's an adult says. So peer leadership is a real important part of it. We also do some work in the classrooms where we're talking about domestic violence and healthy relationships within the classroom, and then we have a space that we call a safe harbor, which is really a space in the school for kids to come. And it's not a punishment, but it's a real privilege for kids to come. There are some kids who don't feel safe in the lunch room, so they come and eat lunch there. There are kids who have acting-out issues in school that the teachers talk to the coordinator and have them come to the Safe Harbor Room where we can provide counseling



**National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006**

and also some peer leadership work that happens there. So if people want to know more about it, I can talk to you later about it.

Jim Gerace:

Joe, what is your hope for the future on this issue?

Joe Torre:

Well, we talked about it Jim. It's very complicated. The future is to make enough of an impact, and continue to make an impact, because right now we're in the New York area and we're hoping to go into Connecticut and shortly in New Jersey, to spread the word. We're eventually going to go national, but again we're very reluctant to go anywhere unless we can keep the message consistent everywhere.

And again, we're not only looking to go in schools but we're looking to have eventually some free standing rooms where they can be visited by more than just children. We just feel that education is the way we wanted to go after this problem, as opposed to putting a Band-Aid on something. Now for sure, we certainly need caregivers. In fact, you know, we have numbers, hot line numbers to have people go certain places. But we just feel that if there's anything that we can do, education wise – and as Ali pointed out, we researched for a long time before we wanted to really associate what we thought we wanted to do with something that was in operation, as Safe Harbor is right now, and Safe Horizon, that we wanted to do that. So we're just going to research everything. As I mentioned the other day going to this function and saying, oh, we don't have that problem here. I think making people aware that these problems, whether you're inner city or living in a mansion someplace, this is a problem that needs to be addressed and needs to have a little more understanding, and hopefully in time that the education will get to the abuser and have him understand this thing is not a secret anymore.

Jim Gerace:

You do great work Joe, and I thank you for spending some time with us today.

Joe Torre:

Well thank you.

Jennifer Lewis-Hall:

Great, wouldn't you say? It has been an awesome day. So this is really the workshop session portion of our day. And the next three sessions are essentially designed to build on the foundation that we set this morning. We are integrating some very practical information in this component this afternoon and we hope it's going to leave you really inspired as you go forth and continue to really get behind the efforts in your own communities, agencies and companies, with prevention efforts. At the end of the three session workshops, we're going to have what we call a Read Out Session, and each of the panels is going to provide an Action Plan.

And in our first workshop session today we're going to delve into a couple of things: current trends and opportunities in education and awareness. This panel is going to give a brief presentation and then be able to take your



National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006



questions, and they will transition from one to the next. I want to begin with introducing them. Karen Jeffreys is Project Coordinator for the Rhode Island Coalition Against Domestic Violence. She leads the initiatives that significantly increase awareness and alter public opinion, just about what we're talking about today. She's been actively involved in fighting for social and economic justice for 20 years and is considered certainly an expert in organizing and public policy. Lisa Lederer is President of PR Solutions, a Washington, D.C., firm that serves national advocacy groups associations, as well as the foundations for social justice. She focuses on health, education and women's issues, and she has served the Family Violence Prevention Fund since 1993, and was part of the team that developed the very successful campaigns, *There's No Excuse for Domestic Violence*, and *Coaching Boys into Men*. We're very lucky to have her here as well. And Brian O'Connor, who flew in from the West Coast, is Public Communications Manager for the Family Violence Prevention Fund, a former marketer for global brands such as Gatorade and Kodak, and a former reporter as well. He now focuses on developing messages and materials to help parents and teens talk about dating violence and stopping violence before it starts. His goal is to inspire men to talk to the boys in their lives about violence against women and girls, and fostering healthy, intimate relationships. I definitely look forward to hearing that as well. So without further ado, welcome panelists, and we look forward to hearing from you.

Karen Jeffreys:

Good afternoon. Hearing this morning's talks made me realize how fortunate I feel to have worked for the last 10 years in this movement. It's pretty amazing to have had that privilege, to be in this movement for the last 10 years.

The encouraging trend that I've really seen over the last 10 years is the recognition of our movement, of us as advocates, to see in that public relations and communications is crucial to ending domestic violence, that in order to end domestic violence we have to change social attitudes, and we have to build up social intolerance towards the issue. Now you may be thinking, that's a no-brainer, of course the movement knows that. But, and Lisa's actually going to talk about that in a few minutes, it really isn't necessarily true. Our movement has done a fantastic job of providing services to victims. We have done a fantastic job of changing laws and policy. In the public awareness arena – that is sort of what we call at our office, the last frontier. And I do not mean this as a criticism towards our movement, because it's what Angela said this morning, we have been busy saving lives. So it's not like we haven't thought about this, but it is just an arena that we are now tackling.

And I would like to say kudos to the Family Values Prevention Fund because they've been in the forefront for a long time, telling us about this – when I say us, I mean us in the movement who are out there at the local programs, at the State coalitions – about the importance of public awareness and about trying to change attitudes. So thank you all for really pushing us. But having said that, we just recently surveyed our counterparts at all the state coalitions and we found out that over half – 52% of the State coalitions spend less than 10% of their time on public awareness. That's problematic, in my opinion, if we're really talking about that public awareness is what's going to change

National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006

attitudes. The good news is that we heard from people that they care about this – and it was really an issue of time, money and resources. So we're back to that age old question of time, money and resources.

In Rhode Island I think we are a good model – again we are the smallest state – but we are a good example of how when we were able to devote time, money and resources to this issue, we were actually able to change public attitudes and change how the media covers domestic violence.



Now I would like to give a revisionist story and say when I was hired in 1996, that the coalition had this big vision and we were going to do all this great stuff and we had this plan for changing attitudes, but that's not true. We got a grant. Seriously, we got a grant, and my director hired me – she didn't know what she was doing and I didn't know what I was doing. We just knew that we wanted to do things differently about how domestic violence was covered in our state, how people were educated about it. Luckily, I have a colleague who's from Boston. Her name's Charlotte Ryan. She wrote a great book called Prime Time Activism. Her expertise is how movements, such as the Civil Rights Movement, the Women's Movement, have used media, have used communications to change an issue. So I get this job and the first thing I do is call her, and I said, "Charlotte, guess what? I got this job. What do I do?" She said, "Calm down, take a deep breath, it's going to take you five to seven years to do what you want to do – it's going to take you five to seven years to build within your state the ability to do good communications, to have relationships with reporters, to change public attitudes."

And I said, "Charlotte, I'm on a one-year grant." And she said, "Karen, it's going to take you five to seven years to do what you want to do." Ten years later, she was right. Not that we didn't see changes in Year One, not that we didn't see changes in Year Two. But literally about the 5th, 6th, 7th year was when we really started seeing the changes. And the good news I'd like to report about what came out of Rhode Island, because she actually, being a academic and an activist, she actually evaluated us as we were moving along, which was fantastic. And one of the first things she did, because one of the first projects we undertook was trying to change how domestic violence gets covered.

We went into the project thinking we needed to change the reporters, and we walked out realizing we needed to change ourselves. We realized it wasn't the reporters, that they didn't care or that they were being malicious, they were just uneducated about our issue- and really whose fault was that? I mean, if you're breathing in Rhode Island, we've trained you, literally – nurses, everybody – but we had not been training the journalists. So that was number one, and I'm actually going to show you a clip in a few minutes about that. Second, we've actually been changing public attitudes, and in your binder there are articles under the Reference section. Because in 1997, we surveyed Rhode Islanders. 43% of Rhode Islanders basically said that women cause their own abuse – this was in 1997. Now, we didn't think they were ignorant or mean spirited, we just realized they didn't understand the issue, and that's when we started aggressively following the lead of the Family Violence Prevention Fund and all the stuff that they had taught us, got out our public message through doing public awareness campaigns. We just re-surveyed this past summer. In 2005, 73% disagree with that now – 95%

**National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006**

of Rhode Islanders said domestic violence is their business, that if a family member, a friend, a colleague, a co-worker was in an abusive situation, it is their responsibility to get involved. And that's the good news, and that is why public awareness makes a difference.

I want to just end with two clips, because I want you to see what now Rhode Islanders see when they watch TV, when there's a situation around a murder.

In 2002, we had three murders in the span of five weeks – unprecedented in Rhode Island; that is the most murders ever in that short a time. Now prior to 2002, these murders would have been covered one, not as domestic violence; second there would have been no connection between these murders, and there would have been no looking at the system. Not even using the words, domestic violence.

So what we did was we held a press conference with all our partners, back to what Casey was saying this morning about who we need to work with in the community. We said, yes these are individual tragedies, but this is about a system. Any time a murder happens, a system has failed to either keep a victim safe or hold a batterer accountable – always. I can guarantee you if a murder happens in your town, we have – the system has somehow failed to keep a victim safe or hold a batterer accountable. So we framed it that way, and the media accepted that frame. And so I just want to end my piece with just watching these two clips, one from Channel 10, which is the biggest station in Rhode Island, and Channel 6, because I want you to see that it wasn't just that one TV got it right and that's great, but how we framed it is how it got covered. And just think about in your area how murders are covered. And I hope you say this is a better way for these messages to get out, and know that now in Rhode Island a quarter of a million people who are watching these two channels got a very different story about what happened in these murders.

<Video clip plays>

And the good news is of the Seven Point Plan, we've already passed three of the pieces, and one of them being we're the 11th state that now has stalking as a first time offense, as a felony, and second was this Homicide Prevention Bill to take guns away from batterers. And until we had done this press conference, we had had six years of not getting the Bill passed. And that's the power of the media, and that's the power of communications.

Lisa Lederer, President, PR Solutions:

Thank you. So my role is to talk a little bit about the history and public opinion and public outreach and public education and how it's gotten us to where we are today, because it is the foundation still for what we're doing. And in the 1980's the public conversation was really about the criminal justice system response to domestic violence, and by that I mean police. If domestic violence was covered in the news it was on the crime blotters, it was occasionally on the women's pages, and that was important work and I think sometimes we talk about it as if it was too narrow, but the police were not responding properly, they were coming to homes where there were calls and they were leaving again without doing anything because it was a private



**National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006**

family matter and they didn't know what their role was and what their rights were and what their responsibilities were.

But that was the public conversation and it was really a very narrow public conversation, focused on crime. In 1993, the Family Violence Prevention Fund did the first ever Public Opinion Research Survey, a series of focus groups and a poll on domestic violence. We started by trying to look back and see what other people had found and what was the existing knowledge on this issue. And there were occasionally there was a question thrown in to a survey on something else, but there was really nothing out there, at the time, which was startling. And we did a survey and released the results at a briefing in Congress, tied in to a hearing where we were able to get Esta as one of the witnesses, and began talking about a public response that was beyond the early legislation that became the Family Violence Prevention Act.



And what we found in the focus groups and the survey was that people were well aware of domestic violence. It was happening in their families, it was happening in their neighborhoods, it was happening in their schools and communities, but they didn't name it, they didn't know what it was, and they didn't deal with it. And if you drilled down a little bit, in the focus groups in particular, you found that people didn't deal with it because they had no idea what to do and what they should do. And that was similar to what Karen said – I think the Fund looked at itself and said, well maybe we're not telling them what to do and maybe we should get out there with some solutions. And the solution that we started with, or one of them was what became There's No Excuse for Domestic Violence, a public education campaign where the fund reached out to the Advertising Council and to a lot of business partners and the movement and other partners to put together a public education campaign that would take the issue out of the shadows and sort of bring it to light for the public, with the hope that as we did that solutions would become more public and you'd have the business community and Congress and State Legislatures and governors sort of coming forward and doing their part to help solve the problem.

So we had a nice trajectory where we looked at releasing some public service announcements in 1994 and we would have Phase One going for a couple of years and then on and on. And then the OJ Simpson case happened and sort of knocked our trajectory out of the water because the public had kind of a national conversation about domestic violence; and it had obviously good things about it in that there was a huge increase in awareness, and there were bad things about it in that there was some real misinformation that was going out there. But our goal was to keep the good information going, speed things up, and stay ahead of the curve with constructive, positive messages that would give people things they could do and ways they could solve it. At the same time we pushed very hard on passage of the Violence Against Women Act, not just because it was urgently needed and the funds that flowed from it have made a huge difference and saved lives, but also because it gave us another way to talk about the problem and to talk about solutions, and that was really important to be able to talk to reporters and talk to the public and talk to leaders about a policy solution and things that could make a difference.

**National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006**

So There's No Excuse for Domestic Violence, our goals with the campaign were to change social norms, a lot of what Karen talked about and I think everyone knows sort of to convince the public that it's not tolerable, it's not a private matter, that it's your problem too and you need to get involved. We started – it's sort of a truism in the communications field is that you start where people are. So if people are over here, you don't sort of start the conversation over here because they don't engage. So we began talking about it as a crime – because again, that's what people could hear and that's what they could understand. And I was going to read just the headlines from the very first news release we did on the Public Opinion Survey in 1993 was, Many More Americans Have Witnessed Domestic Violence Than Muggings and Robberies Combined, Survey Shows. So we sort of started where people were and began passing on information.



In '94 our headline on Public Opinion Research was, American Women See a Strong Link Between Spouse Abuse and Violent Crime. So again we were talking about the connection between violence in our homes and violence on our streets. And our goal was also of course to take it from a private issue to a public issue. And I want to show you the first three television spots for There's No Excuse for Domestic Violence. The first two were in '94, and the last one came a year or two later.

<Video clip>

<Video clip>

<Video clip>

So the spots got a huge amount of pickup. As you would imagine, in the climate of the OJ Simpson trial, media was looking for responsible messages and solutions, and the public was, and fortunately the timing worked out so that we were there to show them. I think it's really important that we did a media campaign – and there it is – where we reached out and just the work that Karen was doing in Rhode Island, we were helping programs around the country do and we were doing at the national level. So we would challenge editorial boards to do editorials on policy solutions and tell people what they can do to make a difference. Our goal was to shape the perception of opinion leaders who could pass the law and fund the programs that would make a difference and help solve the problem.

We also spent a lot of time talking to producers of television shows and movies. We had our spots and our posters shown on ER and Beverly Hills 90201. You know, if a character would go to a clinic or an Emergency Room, there would be a nice shot of the poster. And once we started doing that, they began calling us about their storylines to check them – is this right, is this responsible? And we would sort of be, well, you know, not so much, and we were very free with our advice and we felt like it made a difference.

Obviously we didn't reach everybody and there are lots of really bad things out there, in popular culture, but some of it we were able to improve and we made ourselves very available to do that. And we also really worked with the movement and the service providers, creating news letters and talking points and materials, and all the public service announcements we did, and Brian's

National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006

going to show some more, had local tagging capability. So people could get information at the end about their own shelter, their own hotline. And that made stations more likely to run them but it also – it served a purpose to get to survivors and victims in various communities. And last, very quickly, just some of the impact we've had. The headline that we used in 2005, unlike the other two I gave you where we were talking about crime, was Public Concern About Domestic Violence is Rising Sharply, New Poll Finds, as More Women Say They've Been Abused. So women were coming forward, they were naming it, they were recognizing it. And all across the board people were doing something about it, and corporate America was getting onboard. Debbie Lee runs a wonderful, wonderful health program at the Family Violence Prevention Fund, and we saw hospitals and clinics and healthcare providers all around the country talking to patients in ways they hadn't before- and judges. So all that made a huge difference. But we realized we could only get so far until we got men engaged and involved, and then we began doing that.



Brian O'Connor, Public Communications Manager, Family Violence Prevention Fund:

Hello. And so that's what I'm going to talk about, specifically a campaign that began at the Family Violence Prevention Fund as the Men's Campaign, which was then titled Coaching Boys Into Men. It's interesting because we realized that in order to move the needle from a social norms standpoint and really have people really be outraged about when this goes down. We talked a bit about public awareness and making it okay for someone to come out and say that they are a victim and that they're experiencing violence. And what we also did was we evolved that to, we need to make it not okay for jokes about women and disrespect of girls and rumors or innuendo, and that's really about changing social norms, and then we can really graduate to changing peer culture.

And with that said, I'm going to talk about the, from a PSA standpoint what we did. For about a decade before we even started our campaign, there were certainly some male pioneers out there in the movement, and so it's more from a public service announcement campaign, a way in which to engage the general public – we realized that to move the needle we wanted to engage men on a deeper way. These four points up here were our guiding lights in thinking about the campaign, that men play a critical role in setting social norms. Women lead most of the efforts to prevent domestic violence; so men haven't been engaged. And we really wanted to, as it was mentioned earlier, invite men into the conversation, not to indict men. As you saw in the previous spots, there were men who were the batterers. And men who were good men and non-violent men really had reaction to that and said, "I don't see my place here to help because all I do is see men as the bad guys and men as the batters."

So in thinking about public service announcements and thinking about engaging the public, we need to also think about certainly it's messaging, it's the audience, it's who's actually saying it. But it's also about tone, and the look and the feel of how you're speaking to your audience – and we can talk about segmentation a bit later as well. We knew that we were going to move from the There's No Excuse campaign into a campaign that was going to bring men further into the fold. We conducted research, as we had those guiding

**National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006**

lights and we had some of our hypotheses, but we knew that we really wanted to make sure we got the messaging right. And in partnership with the Waite Family Foundation, we did national research – it was quite comprehensive and there should be a summary of what the research results were. But we thought actually going in that men were going to talk to other men. And what we found out really quite frankly was that men were not going to talk to other men, men weren't going to at work walk up to one of their co-workers and say, "Hey, how are things going at home, how's everything with your wife?" and really kind of push the issue. Men weren't going to necessarily go out on the weekend with their friends and have a drink and this is going to be the topic of conversation – let's talk about how violent you've been or are with your wife.



But what we did recognize was that men would talk to kids. And within the research there were a list of action points that we pulled on – what was your willingness to get involved? And we realized too that men talking to young kids and mentoring is a much less threatening proposition than having men talk to other men.

I think what's important to note at the last two points is that with 13% of men saying they didn't know how to help, and 21% of men saying they do not actively support efforts to get involved because no one has asked me to get involved. It was really eye opening, because that also shows such a deep willingness on the part of men to get involved. As I mentioned, this was- the men's research informed a campaign that we titled Coaching Boys Into Men, developed- it was developed a program to change social norms around men influencing young boys. And the key insight, which I'm just going to read from this slide is that men understood the influence that they had on boys, and accept the importance of teaching boys how to treat women with respect and love. With that said, I want to run the first spot that was from our Coaching Boys Into Men campaign, and then I'm actually going to stop that, tell you how that went over, and then I'm going to continue and play the most recent spots in the campaign. They really speak for themselves, they show an evolution of the messaging and the tonality that we were talking about.

<Video clip>

What we saw with that spot was we actually got quite a bit of pickup, but we also wanted to really have more strategic targeting of the campaign. We rely on a donated media and within that world, working with the Advertising Council. You know, when Comedy Central comes back to you and says, "Okay, well you can't really have a standup comic there talking, telling jokes the whole time, and then you cut to a commercial and it's something like that." So we went back and said, well when we looked at that spot we still saw there was a guy in there who was the batterer and we recognized that it still had some of the previous remnants of the previous campaign, and we went back and said, "Okay, we really want to build up men as the hero." With that said, let's play the next two spots.

<Video clip>

<Video clip>

National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006

So that was our most recent spot which launched earlier on this year. And as Lisa mentioned it's available for localized distribution. It's tagable, you can put your organization's name on there or if you wanted to publicize a recent event. So we can certainly talk further about that. We recognized that the Coaching Boys Into Men campaign, as a broad general public announcement campaign is gaining a lot of traction.



And we also knew that when people are coming back to us now saying, "Okay, what more can I do? I've talked to my son, I've talked to my nephew, I've talked to my brother, what more can I do?" And here are a few programs that we're going really deeper with the message. We've gone wide and we're talking about going deeper, working with the National High School Athletic Coaches Association and Warm to Kids to develop a coach's play book. We knew that within the world of men, so to speak- again talking about critical mass- where we can identify a critical mass of men who have strong access and influence with young boys, and we identified athletic coaches. And they've been onboard and working with us to develop a coach's training program as well this past year, in partnership with the Waite Institute for Violence Prevention.

And where we're moving to, as Esta mentioned this morning, is working internationally as well. Right now we have on the docket planned for next year is a program with UNICEF where we're going to adapt the Coaching Boys Into Men Play Book and work- we're going to adapt it and make it football based or soccer based and we're going to pilot it in Angola, Trinidad, Cote d'Ivoire, and Norway. We went really wide, and it's something that has just taken off and with the groundswell we've been able to go even deeper.

Jennifer Lewis-Hall:

Excellent. Excellent, excellent information. But I wanted to know, and any of you can address this from what you have found – culture, religion, race, does it matter in crafting your messages?

Lisa Lederer:

I think it does. I think at the Fund we've always tried to come out with some general messages that connect together specific audiences, and that way you get the repetition. If you're not Nike and you can't buy a huge amount of airtime for repetition that way, it's important to get lots of people using the same message but creating messages that can be tailored.

Jennifer Lewis-Hall:

Who have you found is the most conducive to the messaging these days and times when you don't have trials that you see, that are very visible, like the OJ Trial?

Karen Jeffreys:

I think also we really went after the bystanders, because some of the campaigns have been geared towards victims, and not that we don't try to target victims, but we really wanted to reach all Rhode Islanders who are bystanders, because the majority of them are not victims but they know victims. And when we did this recent survey we found that over half of Rhode

National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006

Islanders know or have known a victim of domestic violence. And so they are the people we were targeting to get involved.

Jennifer Lewis-Hall:

So completely different messaging. Any questions at all from the audience, before this panel goes?

Carla Horton:

I'm Carla Horton from the Northern Westchester Shelter in Westchester County, New York, and Karen, I know you mentioned your one-year grant. Was that the one that you used to make the manual that we were able to buy from the Rhode Island Coalition?

Karen Jeffreys: Actually that, the one-year grant was really just to get us started. We did that in about a year. She's talking about a handbook we did for journalists, and that was about year two, year three.

Carla Horton:

Because that we kind of followed the bouncing ball, and I thought it was probably the best 40 bucks we'd ever spent. And here's how we used it, because a couple of Augusts ago, Glamour magazine did that whole beautiful display, about 80, 90 pictures of victims of domestic violence- every race, creed, color - and in their article they did this most horrific thing where they had one of their so called experts say, "she should just put the violence down like it was a drug, little by little." Well we went a little bananas with that, and by following the suggestions that you had, which had been in the back of our minds, we responded with a letter to the editor that said, really the reputation of everything that so called expert had to say could be found in the captions themselves of the picture where we just counted them, 1, 2, 3 out of 4, 4 out of 5, 6. And they all said things like estranged ex-husband, whatever, whatever. And so that particular book alone has really been a big benefit to small to medium non-profits like us who will never have the kind of money that you had to make that available, and we're very grateful.

Jennifer Lewis-Hall:

I'm going to actually let Brian have the last word, and I'm saying that because we've had a lot of interest in bringing boys into this dialogue. So tell us a little bit about how we can really bring our men into this discussion. I think it's profoundly important.

Brian O'Connor:

Well the first thing I'll say too is what we've recognized with Coaching Boys Into Men and about engaging men is that we've engaged a lot of women - so women who have also been able to engage the men in their lives. So it's all about making sure that when we talk about it's your business, it's everybody's business. So engaging men isn't departing from really working with women - I want to make that perfectly clear.

And another thing is the messenger really matters. And so when it comes to working with boys, what we've recognized there cultural issues that you should take into account. And certainly like location and casting, of course is pretty obvious but placement, too. Glamour Magazine, who reads that? You



**National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006**

can do a lot with a universal or similar message, depending on how you target it. That's really important. And so when it comes to teens and young people, certainly technology is going to play a role in that and we can talk more about that later, at the end of the day.

But when it comes to working with boys and what we've learned from our coaches program is really that it's not telling the coaches what to say but really having it be organic and giving coaches the tools and the confidence to recognize that if this does come up on their team, or wherever, that they feel confident enough to even just talk about it. You're not going to be perfect, you'll make some mistakes, you might fumble over your words – parents too. But even just talking about it is a huge step. It's not coming from the Family Violence Prevention Fund when you're talking to your kid, it's coming from you, and that's what we've recognized.



Dr. Jean Agris:

I'm Dr. Jean Agris. I'm with the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. And we've been thinking about try to work on the prevention end, which I think is what all of you are thinking about in terms of raising awareness and doing educational work, and worried about spending the kind of money that you would need to get, to get really saturation in terms of public education campaigns. Do you know of promising projects that are worksite based, that are working on prevention, using or thinking about education and awareness?

Lisa Lederer:

Esta may want to add to this because there are a lot- I think a lot of them out there. Harman International did a really impressive training and education for employees. Like many companies they were prompted to do it after there was an incident. Marshall's has made a long-term commitment and I'm sorry, Kim may want to jump in too. Marshall's has made a long-term commitment and has been doing all sorts of employee and customer education, for more than a decade. Home Goods has started a program. There are lots of others- obviously Verizon goes without saying.

Karen Jeffreys:

I just want to make a pitch for building fields, because you have 50 state coalitions who have access to a lot of work places, and we need to build the field so that people in the States can go to their workplaces and have these wonderful materials and put it out. So as a funder, I would just urge you to think about also not just supporting the top, but supporting the grassroots and building the field.

Jennifer Lewis-Hall:

We have a great session on tap for you. And we are going to talk about a very, very hot topic, if not as I was researching and working with Verizon on this, one of the hottest topics of all for the service providers and those who look to fund them. So that's why this is so key – measurement, measurement, measurement and outcomes, and how important that is for grant makers as well as grant seekers. Joining us today Bea Hansen is Chief Program Officer for Safe Horizon, the nation's leading victim's assistance organization, really reaching an astronomical number of folks – 350,000 victims each year. Safe Horizons is at the forefront of helping victims of crime and abuse, including domestic violence, of course rape, sexual assault,

**National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006**

homicide, trafficking, stalking and child physical and sexual abuse. Corinne Graffunder is Chief of the Program Implementation and Dissemination Branch in the Division of Violence Prevention at the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. She coordinates projects and research to support a variety of violence prevention areas, and this includes inmate, partner, violence, sexual violence, suicide, and youth violence. And Eleanor Lyon is Director of the Institute for Violence Prevention and Reduction, and an Associate Professor in Residence at the University of Connecticut School of Social Work. She has more than 20 years directing research projects related to violence against women and is currently co-directing the Family Violence Prevention Services at Outcomes Project. Each panelist again is going to give their particular synopsis and then we're going to open up questions to the floor. I certainly think you will enjoy this session as well.



Bea Hansen:

And so it's great to be able to come here together, and I want to thank Verizon for putting this together so we can talk both as other grant seekers, like myself, as well as grant providers. So I want to go over just a little bit about Safe Horizon. Our Mission is there. We really provide a range of services to help people rebuild their lives. We operate 24 domestic violence crime victim and rape and sexual assault hotlines; our crisis intervention services in police precincts, court buildings, community offices, prevention programs in schools like the Margaret's Place that Joe Torre talked about, accountability programs for batterers and mental health services for severely traumatized victims of domestic violence and other kinds of victimization.

Really, outcome evaluations will help us understand really the impact of the work that we do. Some of the challenges – and there's many challenges and that's kind of my focus here is to identify some of those. One is really identifying realistic outcomes, and what are really realistic outcomes for the services that we're providing. Funders often say, you know, well we want the outcomes to be that victims are living independently or that the victims of domestic violence are getting out of a house where there's abuse going on, which may or may not be realistic outcomes for the services that we're offering. These are often long-term outcomes.

A survivor, a victim of domestic violence actually leaving the home and living independently is not something that happens over a course of a single phone call or a couple of visits to one of our service providers, it's a long-term outcome, and often the funding that we get is for short-term intervention. So there's a dilemma there.

Another challenge is really defining specific and measurable outcomes. So we asked the question, is feeling safe? And we talked a lot about that today; about we want to make sure that our victims feel safe. Well there's really no specific cookie cutter response. If we asked everybody here, what are the specific, measurable things that you need to feel safe in your life, we'd probably get many different definitions. So how do we as service providers define outcomes that are measurable and specific? The other thing is evaluating short-term and anonymous services. How do I evaluate the effectiveness of a person coming into one of our court offices one time? How does Sheryl evaluate the effectiveness of an anonymous call to the National DV Hotline? How do you measure whether or not those things are effective?

National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings November 13, 2006

Another thing is how do we create any sort of standardization? It's very, very difficult. The services that we offer differ. We offer legal services, we offer counseling services, we offer hotlines, and we offer accompaniment services. So those services vary and the needs of our clients vary. So how do we create standardization with those varying levels of services that are needed by lots of different folks?



For an organization like Safe Horizon, we have multiple and government locations. We're in 80 different sites across New York City. Twenty-six of those sites are police precincts, and if you've ever seen the infrastructure in a police precinct, trying to get a case management system in there where you can get an Internet connection took us years to do. So the infrastructure in a lot of the places where we're located, especially if we're co-located in government offices, may be very difficult to access the infrastructure for technology.

Another issue is following up with clients. Most of the clients that we serve are people who are in danger right at that moment. So there are big debates within whole field of domestic violence of do you follow up with somebody who calls your hotline or comes in for service? Is it safe? How do you determine whether or not it's safe to do that kind of follow up work? And then the last thing is that our agency resources are limited to direct services to clients. Very, very few of us are lucky enough to have specified funding for outcome evaluation. Most service providers don't get enough money to do the work they're doing. Government does not support 100% of the budget for direct services to victims of domestic violence. So we're often put in a position where we are, in addition to trying to get the full dollar for each of the dollar we spend on services, we also are trying to do outcome evaluations. This is a real opportunity for some partnership with corporations and to gain visibility for both service providers and corporations. I'll talk about that in a minute.

Some of the assets are assets that Safe Horizon, as well as other service providers, brings. We have a lot of clients that we serve and it's a very diverse population, from urban to suburban to rural, range of religions, range in terms of race and ethnicity; we serve diverse numbers of clients. We offer a broad range and spectrum of services. I talked about before – shelter, legal services, counseling services. We have a lot of experience engaging clients and working with clients. We know their needs and we know the services that are needed for our clients. We have years of informal outcome assessment that many of us have done; I don't want to minimize that. And then also an incredible passionate and committed group of people in terms of doing this work, and passionate and committed to making changes to provide the best possible services for clients. So I'm going to do a little bit of teaching.

One of the methods that we use at Safe Horizon is a logic model. And what a logic model is, is for any given problem that you have, it really describes the relationship between the resources that you're putting in, what the program does or the activities of the program, and then what the results of the services are. So those are the outcomes.

So I'm going to give you a very quick example. All right, let's take a presenting situation like a headache. So if you have a headache, the

**National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006**

resource that you have for a headache is an aspirin, right? The activity that you do is you take the aspirin, and then the result is that hopefully the headache will go away. So we know and so that the input and the activity and outcome have to directly relate to each other. Hopefully after you take the aspirin you're going to be able to go back to work, but maybe you don't have a job before. Hopefully, after the headache, after you take the aspirin you'll feel healthy – but you may have a lot of other health issues. I just wanted to put that together to show this – the importance of looking at the relationship that what we're measuring in terms of outcomes is directly related to the inputs and the activities.



So let's take a domestic violence example. So you have a woman who calls a Domestic Violence Hotline and she wants to leave her abuser. So our input is that we have a 24 Hour Domestic Violence Hotline. So then there's a range of activities, and it's on the slide of things that we provide. And then the outcome is that the person is linked to shelter. So this is an extremely short-term service. So we're looking at the outcome, linking the person to shelter, based on the input and the activities. During the activities we're providing crisis support. At Safe Horizon we're responsible for linking people to shelter in the city; so we have the technology and the ability to do that. But we don't know, did she go to the shelter? Because maybe she changed her mind. We linked her to the shelter but maybe she decided she didn't want to go. Maybe she didn't feel safe enough to go, maybe she didn't have the car fare to get to the shelter, maybe something else happened. So we don't know if she's safe, we don't know if she's independent, we don't know if she got to the shelter. But we do know that we linked her to the shelter, we do know that we provided the support and the information that she needed at the moment when she didn't know where to go. She called the hotline with no idea of what resources were available. We were able to give her a concrete connection to the shelter for safety. She also knows that we're there 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and we also are able to provide her with direct linkages to other services. So how are we making those connections between the input, the activities, and the outputs?

Just another quick example. So we have a woman who's a victim of domestic violence. She's 26-years-old, she's been in a relationship with her abuser for 7 years, she's left, she has a 5-year-old son, and now her 5-year-old son is starting to act-out. He's throwing things at her, he's yelling at her. And so the mother wants to talk to somebody who has some experience with domestic violence. So she goes into a community program office. So then we have activities that we're providing there that are directly linked to the inputs. So what we're doing in terms of the activities is discussing their goals, doing some safety planning and assessment, assessing what that person's concrete needs are, providing some supportive counseling, and then referring to another place to provide more in-depth counseling for that child, or maybe we can provide it ourselves. But that's what we're doing in that initial assessment.

So we have the outcomes that are listed there, that the mother feels heard, listened to and understood, her current safety needs are addressed, and the mother is linked to resources for her child. So those are the things that we can measure, and we can look at our activities and are our activities and our outputs related and are we- are the activities providing us with the outcomes

**National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006**

that we're looking for? Again, we don't know what's going on, ongoing with this child. We don't know if the child's behavior has changed or anything. This is the initial one-time contact with that child and that mother.

So I just want to end by just talking about a few things in terms of going forward. I know Eleanor and Corinne are talking about this in much more detail. But in terms of evaluating outcomes, a few things. We want to make sure that we're being realistic. Again, and we talked about that the expected change has to be specific and measurable, and it really has to be based on the efforts of the program, that there needs to be some sort of standardized assessment or intake based on the services. So everybody who has to be assessed – and in terms of intake, we have to make sure that their intake is talking about the services that we offer, that if we're doing an intake on somebody that it's based on the activities and the outcomes that we're looking for. I think the flip of that though is we need to also look at stuff that's individualized and tailored to the needs of our specific clients – and that's often a rub that we get is how do we do standardization and then how do we meet the individual needs of clients at the same time? Having consistency; so providing training and supervision – and again that takes funding to do too, so that no matter what service provider you're talking to or what counselor in your program that you're talking to or whatever advocate, that we've got some consistency in terms of service provision; that the technology is there for case management, for data analysis, and that we have systems to do that – computers that work, and some sort of quality assurance mechanism so that we're sure that, for example, if you've got 20 people working on a hotline, is everybody entering the data, is everybody doing it in the right way, and being able to do that sort of quality assurance work.

And then the last thing again is specific dedicated funding for outcome evaluation. And again I think this is really an important place where we can have some partnerships with service providers, and corporations, can provide some real visibility in terms of looking at how do we really measure the things that we're doing, and what the outcomes are, and I think will really help us be able to evaluate the systems that we're operating and work together better to make changes that we need to make for the lives of victims of domestic violence.

Eleanor Lyon, Director, Institute for Violence Prevention and Reduction, and Associate Professor in Residence, University of Connecticut School of Social Work:

I'm delighted to be here, and I've worked with several of you in the room; and I think 'with' is a critical part of that statement because good outcome evaluation is a partnership, just like all the rest of the work that we do. It might seem obvious but for some time programs didn't understand why they would want to be evaluating their services. And it's obvious to hold ourselves accountable and to make program improvements, but I think the Rhode Island example and some of the other examples from the communications panel provided clear, succinct outcome measures that were very effective and very powerful in describing the work that they had done.

All research is about answering questions, and for evaluation there are primarily two types of evaluation that answer different kinds of questions –



**National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006**

process evaluation which answers the question about the degree to which a program is actually operating in the way that it is intended to, and the outcome evaluation question is, what has occurred as a result of the program? Process evaluation essentially asks the who, what, where, when and how kinds of questions. But outcome evaluation really focuses on outcomes which are changes – what changed as a result of the program? Sometimes you try to ask, how much?



I think that Bea described very well some of the challenges of outcome evaluations with domestic violence programs, the issues of measurability, being realistic. I think that's the one that we might want to emphasize and agree upon that very often funders, people who provide funding and who want some outcome measures don't have realistic expectations about the outcomes that they're expecting from programs. There are a lot of considerations in design and measurement of outcomes. A lot of them have to do with different kinds of sources of information. So that programs can be very creative, they can draw on community resources as well as their own records. Telephone surveys, they can have focus groups. So there are qualitative as well as quantitative kinds of outcome measures that programs can use, and some of them are not terribly expensive. Each, of course, has strengths and weaknesses.

Probably the primary set of considerations – these are crucial – is when will the data be collected? That's very challenging in a shelter program. A woman comes in, you might say, well what you want to do is have a beginning point and then the end point. Well the beginning point is challenging because the woman is in crisis; and so that's not the time to ply her with a whole series of questions about her background.

And sometimes people leave before they have an opportunity to do a quote "formal exit", with a shelter staff member. And so getting a later measurement point is also a challenge for programs; thinking about who is considered a client for outcome measurement purposes. If you have five minutes of contact with someone, are you really expecting a dramatic change in an outcome sense to have occurred as a result of those five minutes of contact?

Programs will be challenged by whether they include everyone or use a sample. Who will collect the information and how is another challenge for programs, particularly shelter programs? You don't want the people who are completing outcome measurements, for example, to feel any sense of coercion because they're handing something back to the person who has provided them with a service. It's also important to include survivors' voices as a part of the outcome measurement process, including them in planning, making sure that the entire process of collecting information is respectful. What one of my coworkers sometimes refers to as "my people", the researchers- she says, well you people do this and that; once we have an opportunity to talk to folks sometimes, we want to ask too many questions. So trying to make sure that the information is actually needed and not just information that's available because you happen to have someone there and they're available to answer the questions.

National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings November 13, 2006



Confidentiality is central. Protecting the safety of the women who are providing the information about the services is clearly the most important issue there. I want to share in just a moment a specific project that tried to work on some of these issues. It is the Documenting Our Work Project. It was initiated in 1998 by the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence and brought together advocates, program folks, state funders, and many others who were involved in the work. So one of the things that I want to say is that programs are actively concerned or actively interested in being held accountable, in learning more about the impact of their programs, and so have been working on these issues for quite some time, despite limited funding, despite limited resources- so despite all the challenges that we're talking about. And so these were some of the reasons that folks outlined and agreed upon as reasons for documenting our work. And Bea has essentially covered many of them. They are the advantages, and particularly thinking at a national level, having consistent measurements – that's been a problem that programs thought about these issues, defined issues in dramatically different ways. One of the things to highlight on this slide is that problematic outcomes were being developed.

And just to reiterate what Bea said, when you define success as the percentage of women who left their partners after leaving the program, then that's problematic. That may not be something that they have control over. There are a whole host of reasons why that's a problematic outcome measure, and yet you still see it across the country. So one strong message to people who are funding and who want to see outcomes – avoid that one. Also programs, sometimes funders have a notion that they should define success as the percentage of women who received a particular service, whether or not that woman wanted it or needed it. So in criminal justice contexts they sometimes say – the percentage of women who received a protective order, well sometimes women don't consider that a route to their safety; there may be other reasons why a protective order is not something that they want to consider at the particular time. So those were the reasons for documenting our work.

We developed a whole host of evaluation tools over the course of the years. These are the ones on the services. We also developed evaluation mechanisms for collaboration in the community, just general measures of how the program is viewed by members of the public; also internal use kinds of measures and systems change activities, all of which programs engage in. All of the tools developed are survivor centered, focus on the needs and experiences of survivors, and demonstrate that programs really are interested in honest feedback. They are voluntary and they were developed to be and intended to be used internally, by programs. We did a pilot of all of the forms and made changes as a result. Just to give you a quick example from the shelter, I think that this is important as an indication that despite what we might assume, leaving their abusive partner is not the primary interest for many women when they go into shelter – less than half. You don't see it up there. Those are the top seven needs that women had when they came into shelter, and less than half checked that they wanted help with leaving their abusive partner. So safety issues, educational issues, and resources used were primary.

**National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006**



We also asked questions that were open-ended. So data can be invaluable – what would you do without a shelter? And when we reviewed these answers we found ourselves in tears sometimes – they were really poignant, they fell into those three categories that you see up there. We were also able to talk about what help women received. And this is important just to illustrate. This is based on the women who said they wanted a particular service. So you can see that safety – all of the women who said that they wanted safety felt that they got it – 98%, all that they wanted. Just as an example of the contrast, you see there that 48% of the women said that they got all the help they wanted with budgeting and handling their money. Again, that’s of the women who said they wanted help with that issue. If you were to gauge the program’s success by looking at the percentage of all the women seen in the shelter who wanted that, it was 24%. So it makes a huge difference; it doubles when you gauge it by for whom is this relevant? Here are the outcomes, and you can see these are changes that women reported that they experienced as a result of their experience in the shelter. I have to say that we learned a lot. This is from a pilot. We have changed the two outcomes that have an asterisk. So that we realized that we had fallen prey to the same thing that we warned people against in assuming that women were able to control whether or not they were safe. And so that has now been changed to, I know more ways to plan for my safety. So it’s an informational one. That is something that the program can have an impact on.

This is related to two emerging national outcome measures that are going to be used by the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act program, within several years – it’s in the process of rolling out. These are two, the two outcome measures that will be asked of programs across the country- those two, as a result of contact with the Domestic Violence Program, and they will need to set a target goal, and it’s about 65% at this point; domestic violence survivors will have strategies for enhancing their safety and they will know more about community resources. We’re rolling that out. Those were selected because those two outcome measures are manageable by programs, they are simple, they are already being collected by many programs, and they have been established by expensive, controlled experimental design, longitudinal studies, to be connected to beneficial impacts for women, in the longer term. So just want to echo, the message for those who are funding, if you’re going to ask extensive outcomes, provide sufficient resources for programs to be able to do it, involve programs in creating what’s going to be required, make sure that they are doable, make sure that the outcomes are issues over which clients have control, and understand that change is a process. Particularly in something complicated like domestic violence it may require much longer term support and access to resources.

Corinne Graffunder, Chief of the Program Implementation and Dissemination Branch in the Division of Violence Prevention at the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control:

So I’m going to pick up from there and add a little bit to what’s already been said, and perhaps put a few new ideas on the table as well. I thought I’d start in a hot minute talking about CDC as a grant maker, because I still find that many people, including people in the movement are even surprised that CDC’s a player in this arena, and then I’m going to touch on outcome and measurement, particularly focusing on implementation, because that’s an area that I do the bulk of my work in. It’s not the bulk of what CDC does, but

National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings November 13, 2006

in the time allotted I can't talk about everything that we do, but I can give you information afterwards. And then lastly wanted to touch some on tools and technology.

For CDC as a grant maker, this is the format, this is the model that we tend to use, starting down here at defining the problem and going up there to widespread adoption. And so we have worked in all of these areas, directed to violence against women, looking at full portfolios of work in each of these areas that are looking at how do we measure this better, how do we document success, what does success look like? And just to give you an example, for instance, all the way at the bottom box, we are currently working on – back in the late '80's there was the National Violence Against Women Survey that's never been repeated and now there's plans to actually repeat that survey, and actually also hopefully to create – if funding becomes available – to create an ongoing surveillance system so that we would have routine data collection.

One of the really interesting things that's being done as kind of an early sub-study in the pilot phase is there's actually a study looking at whether or not, or how context may change the outcome of responses; and so there's actually a three-arm study being conducted looking at if the questions are framed in a criminal justice context, what response rate do you get, what kinds of responses do you get? If it's framed in a health context, what kinds of responses? And then there's a third context that I'm not remembering right now. But anyway, so it should be enlightening in helping us understand how better to measure the outcomes that we're interested in. What I'm going to focus the rest of today on is furthest out box – which is the widespread adoption box, and that's because that's what the work of my branch is, and that's the work that we are most heavily involved in, on a routine basis.

Now being at CDC, which is a scientific organization that's a databased organization, most of my colleagues believe that we go from this develop and test prevention strategies just to this assure widespread adoption by some miracle occurring, and that as long as we write our papers, right? As long as you publish in journals, reputable journals, as long as you put stuff out on websites, as long as you make information available, that that's going to change and affect practice. And we know, we fundamentally know, that that is not true. I mean journal articles help create the base, they create the credibility. You have those longitudinal studies. They are a part of the answer, but they're not the whole answer. So what we focus on is we focus on implementation and trying to more fully understand, as funders, what we can do differently to build, support and measure implementation and what effective implementation looks like. So one of the things that everyone has said is first you have to define what it is you're trying to do. Right? You have to be able to define it.

What we define as our outcome of interest is actually that number one bullet up there, preventing first time perpetration and first time victimization. That's it for us, that's the gold ring. However, as Karen said in the previous session, we know that the work that we need to do to affect any of the systems and any of the outcomes that we're interested in can take five to seven to 10 years. This is not a short-term proposition. So we are taking a macro level, longer term perspective on how we're working. So if you look at



**National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006**

this list of things, we're actually starting at the bottom, number seven, and we're saying to our programs and the programs that we're funding, what does it take to get to a point where we can evaluate our programs and our activities and use that information, use that information to inform what we're doing.

That's important because you'd be amazed at how often organizations, agencies, national organizations that we work with have never really stopped to say, what are we doing and why are we doing it, which gets back to Bea's point of the logic model. And then a lot of these things talk about what we know about what works and what doesn't work, the number 6 addressing all levels of the social ecology.

Again, even Joe Torre said these are complex issues. Esta and the guys from Family Violence Prevention Fund know what my soapbox is. If prevention was as easy as writing the next best brochure or doing the next best program, then wouldn't we have just done that at this point and moved on? So it's these complex social interactions, interactions with norms that have already been discussed. And so that's why we are working up this list backwards, saying how do we build these and how do we measure this?

The other focus that we have is we focus on four P's, not one P. Most people, it seems anyway, there's a lot of focus on programs and what does your program do and what does your program's outcome look like, when in fact we believe, and we believe there's good strong literature to support, the fact that you need to not only be concerned with what your program is about, but also what processes are in place, what are the core principles that you're using to advance and sort of theories that drive the work you're doing, and then what policies are being advanced to support that? I mean, even if you look at things as simple as training. And how many of you invest in training, you train people at your community level, service provider, and then they go and get a new job, and there goes your training out the door – right? And there goes all your capacity out the door. We've got to talk about how we start to build capacity that's not just at the individual level but also at the organizational level – and that's partially around these organizational policy changes.

So our work really is trying to bridge this concept of where the practitioners are, what they need, and then where evaluation and research can be helpful and useful. But we're using an empowerment evaluation model. And I hope no one's offended by this. I thought it was cute, but I thought I might offend someone. But we're focusing on the fact that it's not enough to just provide tools, and just provide again information. You also have to create the structure, the infrastructure to support that. So we've been working with our programs – we have what we call the Delta Program, it's our domestic violence program. We fund 14 State Domestic Violence coalitions, and we've been working with them to help support them in hiring empowerment evaluators, them in defining the outcomes of interest for their programs, them in defining what reasonable measures are in the shorter term and in the longer terms that they can use. And then we support them by doing what we call sort of building a community of practice, I mean, building their own networking and being able to learn from one another and share.



**National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006**

And to me it gets to the point where if it's worth doing, and it's worth measuring, then it's also worth investing some time and energy and resources into supporting it. So that's the philosophy that we've brought into this. Transitioning now to some of the tools and technology and how we're using those things. As I started to think about, well how have we used it and how does it feed into the measurement issues? We've worked with the Family Violence Prevention Fund, we helped develop an online toolkit that looks at working with men and boys, and that's technology based. We also have the Prevention Connection which is a series of web-based seminars; in fact there's one coming up at the end of the month. Those are ways that we use technology.



I looked at this slide later and I was like I can't believe I also forgot our newest initiative which is called Choose Respect. It's a dating violence prevention initiative, dated at middle school age kids. It uses technology in ways that just blow me away; I mean, there are these online video maker games and we've got buddy icons and text. It's directed at middle schoolers.

But, here's the opportunity I see for how we could tie some of the work, that we've done it more in our program support work, where we haven't tied technology as much to our program outcome and measurement work, is in thinking about how we could use technological platforms to really help advance the work we're doing. Some of the things that we have in progress right now that I think we could, over time, look at ways to use technology, is we're working on a tool called Getting to Outcomes, which is really going to help define how you measure success in preventing intimate and sexual violence, and there's definitely opportunities for putting that into some kind of platform.

We also have an Evaluation Guide that is going to be coming out in terms of tools related to evaluating sexual and intimate partner violence prevention programs. Again, right now it's going to be more like a downloadable document, but I think we need to think about how we can create something that's more workable. And then lastly we've been doing work with the University of Kansas has an online resource called The Community Toolbox, and you work to create these work stations, and we're creating a work station. What that does is that really helps you measure all these community level indicators. If you are putting time into working with your media, as the previous panel talked about, how do you measure that and how can you track over time how that effort then tracks to your longer term impacts?

I will say that one thing that I didn't mention but when I talked to my office staff about well what would you all think in terms of data and measurement and technology? And they got really creative about thinking about data collection in and of itself for local providers and program people can be really- can really be challenging, as has already been said. And, you know, maybe there are ways over time to think about like little PDAs or things like that, would already be pre-programmed, that would make it easier for people to quickly and fairly simply collect data.

Jennifer Lewis-Hall:

A couple of questions for you, because we do have a little bit of time. And this is not sort of an easy question in terms of it being concise. But I was

National Domestic Violence Summit Proceedings
November 13, 2006

thinking, Corinne, if you had to describe one of the programs that you mentioned – I don't know if it would be maybe Choose Respect, the new program you're coming up with – describe a best practice program and how it integrates measurement and reporting.

Corinne Graffunder:

For Choose Respect, there were years worth of formative testing and a lot of research went into the development. In terms of the measurement, what we are really working on now is trying to once again define, for the individual communities, what is the baseline – so what currently exists, how can we take something that is going to look different in every community, because by design it looks – it's not going to be the exact same, it's not a packaged sort of you have to do it one way; and then what do we want to measure in the way of change that is at the individual level, at the organizational level, and at the community level? So we really are trying to focus on is it adopted, are people using it? If they're using it, what outcomes are they realizing, and how is that making a difference?

The real big philosophy that we use in all the work that we're doing is that it has to be community driven, which I think you've heard from all the speakers, is that we have to figure out how we work with communities so that they buy in – and even community meaning the service – I mean, people have to buy into why they're collecting these data, and why these data are important to them, that they're not just for their funders, to just report back to their funders. Because if that's the mentality and if that's the way people approach data collection, you're never going to get good data.

