

From Arrest to Accountability: The critical role of probation in a CCR

Olga Trujillo and Maren Woods Praxis International

*with Jen Wright, Arrowhead Regional Corrections, Denise Eng, Praxis International, Blueprint for Safety
August 19, 2015*

Please stand by for realtime captions.

Your call is now live.

Hello, everyone, and welcome to this Rural Webinar . These webinars feature the four components of effective institutionalized individual advocacy that improves outcome for victims and accountability for offenders. These trainings are intended to provide in-depth inking on relevant issues from experts in the field.

I am glad that you could join us today. I am the practice person that facilitates these webinars each month. Today's topic is from arrest to accountability, the critical world -- role of probation. Just to give you an idea of background, Jen is the superintendent of the juvenile facility in Duluth, Minnesota.

She was an intricate part of developing the probation response and has trained nationally and internationally on this model. She has also facilitated a lot of batterers intervention groups. Welcome to you today, Jennifer. We are glad you are here. Mac Denise is my coworker and practices in our St. Paul, Minnesota office. She is the safety program manager and she brings to practice three decades of experience in advocacy for battered women. She has worked primarily as a legal advocate, but her expertise is at community and state level and is invaluable.

She co-managed and developed the St. Paul blueprint for safety in 2008 through 2010. She now manages the implementation of the OBW blueprint for safety initiative.

I am going to just give us oriented a little bit to our session and then I will turn it over to Jen and Denise.

Today, we will be talking a bout probation. It is important to consider appropriate conditions and determining a defendant's release of probation and the history of violence, the severity of current offenses, and the risk of continued violence that the offender poses to the victim and the public.

Tran3's can help position probation to help make the most effective probation. I want to touch base on a couple of logistics relative to doing webinars. If there are any of you who are participating in this session today by telephone only, you will be able to pass your comments and questions a long to our entire group by sending an email to LIZ@PRACTICEINTERNATIONAL.ORG.

For the rest of us that are logged into this webinar, the way in which you will be able to have a bit of this dialogue with our speakers today will be through the chat box in the lower left him portion of your screen. You will see that That says public in the area of the chat box. And then, at the very bottom you can click your cursor.

Both of those options are available to you at any point during our session today. If you happen to lose your connection to the telephone or the webinar, simply rejoin through your original process or send an email to me at liz@practicesinternational.org.

This session is recorded and you will be able to visit it or share it by going to the audio archives. It will be posted by the end of the week.

With that, I would like to get us started with our presentation today. We are going to discuss the role of probation and a CCR, specifically how probation officers work to maximize the ability of the state to gain a measure of control over a domestic violence offender.

Denise, I wonder if you could get us started by providing a little bit of a context around how to maximize the ability of the state to gain a measure of control for offenders?

I would be happy to do that. I want to say how happy I am to be joined by Jen right -- Write. I am really happy to have her here with me. She is a strong advocate of using the probation response to help create greater protection for victims.

And his notion of maximizing the ability of the state to gain control over an offender, I think it is really easy sometimes for those of us working in the trenches every day to lose sight of the fact that the work that we are doing makes a difference. Over the last 30 years we know that through this kind of organizing and criminal system, we have been able to reduce incidences of serious assault. Homicide rates have been reduced, so we know this work makes a difference. Certainly, the criminal legal system is the only thing that has managed to bring down those rates of homicide and serious violence. Research tells us that we are making a big difference.

The way that we have done that primarily is through some sort of organized response and coordinating our communities that really began in Duluth, Minnesota. We are defining a CCR as an interagency method to deter battery. The blueprint for safety is a type of CCR that we developed here in St. Paul in conjunction with the city of St. Paul. It really founded on the work that Duluth did that fully articulates and further develops through joint policies and protocols on bringing everyone together under the same institutional policy from 911 all the way through probation.

The organization of that work is really around understanding what it is that victim needs to be saved. What different workers need from each other in order to be effective and promote safety and accountability.

The blueprint is organized around six underlying principles. These principles were based in the research that has been done over this past 30 or 35 years of interagency work. These six principles are beginning with the interagency approach. In other words, we know we can be a lot more effective when we all work together. Attention to context and severity and understanding that ought -- not all violence is the same.

Recognizing that domestic violence is a pattern crime requiring continued engagement. We really mean that we know these cases are really going to keep coming back. This is a pattern. If we approach this with that understanding it can make us more effective.

Sharing swift consequences with violent behavior. That is the most effective way of containing offenders. Sending messages of health and accountability to both the victim and the perpetrator.

We need to counter messages. The message to offenders are you have to stop this violence. If you are willing to stop, we have help that is available. If not, we are going to make things uncomfortable for you.

There is this notion of reducing unintended consequences and severity of impact. We want to avoid doing more harm than good. That is a shorthand version of what underlies this kind of intervention in a CCR or blueprint community.

So, Jan, can you talk a little bit about some of your thinking about what are some of the underlying assumptions or goals or ideas that you bring to this work as a probation officer?

Kind of what you were talking about where the state needs to hold the offender accountable and to stop the violence. It is really important because the offender does believe that it is her fault and insert -- excerpts a lot of influence on her to take responsibility for herself for the violence. She oftentimes believes she is at fault and he is sending these continual messages to support him. Oftentimes, there are ongoing threats. She is really not in a position to be the person that leads the effort or any accountability. That is why the state needs to take over. It really needs to be restricted to the offender that there is an a tendency to pick them blame historically.

I can think of a case here recently where we had a probation officer charged with domestic assault. The chief probation officer responded the email and I have to take him on a about it saying that it is really important. No matter what she does we do not blame the victim. We are holding him accountable. It happens frequently. If further empowers him and it pushes her down even more.

These power differentials between the victim and offender are tremendous. It must reflect -- we need to understand that not all violence is the same. We need to have a very responsive and informative approach to what type of violence is being used and what is the risk level.

A probation officer's primary job is to gather information, facts, and make judgment on risk. It is really important to understand that not all violence is the same.

Particularly when we are looking at responsive violence and self defense. We understand the difference.

It has to be -- one of the biggest changes is reducing unintended consequences peer information, we used to forge ahead taking that we are an arm of the court and we are here to make sure that she is safe and we didn't spend a lot of time understanding what were all of the consequences of our and -- actions once it played out.

I think that is a really good point that you make at the end. Certainly in the early days when I was doing this work I think there was a sense that violence is violence. And we wanted to standardize the way that we treated cases. We have learned over time they doing that without that adjusting for what is actually occurring can actually make things worse is that a better it is the kind of thing that we want to adjust. Would you agree with that.

It is all about context. I was during this training and one of the PO said you are not going to do a really good job unless you observe this family. It times out he grew up in a family of the mystic violence and understood all of the background stuff that happened.

Some of your earlier comment segue very nicely into our next big idea that we want to talk about. The notion of shifting the burden away from the victim and onto the shoulders of the criminal legal system. You did a nice job of laying out many obstacles for victim participation in a criminal legal system.

I think we know that the victim is often the person who has the least capability of actually holding the offender accountable, but yet cases are often constructed to really depend on or rely on her participation.

As one of my colleagues said to me, when the only tool in your toolbox is the victim and you are trying to get the victim to do a particular thing, that is where your attention goes.

I think what we want to talk about a little bit is how we can build additional tools. That way we are not so reliant on her and that burden is really place on the shoulders of the criminal legal system, rather than on the victim to carry some sort of intervention Board and create accountability.

Can you talk a little bit about how a probation officer actualize is this notion of shifting the burden of accountability?

We are jumping a little bit ahead, it is further down in the presentation. But we are relying on multiple sources of information. That way we can compare and contrast and good interview techniques and building rapport and just being able to really build the whole contents in which the violence has occurred.

Okay. The next slide talks about some of the various roles or chunks of things that probation officers might do. So, can you talk about how this notion of the state assuming the burden of responsibility plays out? For example, increase sentence investigation.

I will talk historically, initially, our whole system was set up much like other crimes, with the exception of sex offender crimes. So that it was really based on the number of offenses. If they had zero priors, this is what they got, so on.

The prosecution, judges, and public defenders all believes that if they established in court that if someone had this amount of priors this is what they should get prospectively. What we had to do

to turn that upside down is to say that no, cases are different. Somebody who commits a disorderly conduct, but somehow the case isn't strong enough to charge when it should be charged, they really need to be treated differently if the violence is very severe. Someone charged with a felony level offense, no two felonies are the same. Some of them are very dangerous.

The PSI these to be able to assess risk, understand context, and make addictions. We get paid to have opinions. The courts said that you have to just rely on the facts. That if you are interviewing a victim and they want to call a lot of things here say, they are really holding sentencing to the same standard of finding or guilt. That is just not required.

Sentencing these to be -- PO's are paid for their opinion. They are paid to present things in a way and come to a conclusion about risk and how to hold the offender accountable long-term and short-term and make some judgments about that. I can tell you it turned our system on its ear. They wanted to personalize it. It was crazy. We really didn't understand how to communicate days or roll them out effectively in a CCR. We had to look at things differently. It is really about safety. We are going to impact safety in the long run and turned his community around to some extent. Our presentence investigation changed dramatically.

An example is -- well, I will give that example later. The other thing is victim engagement. In our office we have this probation officer who was known as the victim specialist. She could really relate to victims. She got them to open up. Everybody knew this. Everyone knew it, all the victims knew it, all the advocates knew it, all the prosecutors and judges knew it. I sat in on some of these interviews. What she had with this ability to just really connect with victims to reinforce that it is not their fault and to have a whole arsenal at her side about preparing her for if you tell me this, this is what could happen. If you don't tell me this, this is what could happen. And really she just spent the time to engage victims. In my career working as a PO, I had the most contact with the highest risk victims then I did high risk offenders. I was trying to build rapport so that if it went bad she will call me and we would establish ways that would still protect her. For example, if he was getting violent, but he was also going to the bars and not getting caught.

Connections with advocates is really important. You have to develop relationships with advocates. You have to know where the boundaries are about what they can tell you and what they can tell you. There were times when we run across situations where we felt that victims were really shut down and isolated and not getting the services that they need. We would try to talk to them and it wasn't getting anywhere. We will call the advocates of and said this is what I think is going on. Can you try to connect with her?

It is more important to target the higher risk situations and put the extra effort in helping connect victims with advocates.

Can you dive a little more in depth about the presentence investigation?

I will do that later in the presentation.

Okay.

I want to talk about how important it is to work well with the prosecutor's office to educate judges about what it is that you are doing, what is your CCR, what are the overall goals to get them involved in the oversight stuff that is not case specific. Also, to help all agencies understand your policies if there is a new offense on -- or arrests.

It is important to get the community involved as much as you can. For example, I had this case where I had an offender on probation and another PO had the victim on probation. It was a duly charged incident. We both started talking and the situation was heating up. He had been making a threat and went to her car and left something in it. I wrote up a warrant and got a judge's signature and then I called what of our [indiscernible] officers. I said, -- they look for this guy all weekend. It turns out Monday morning I get to my office and he is sitting outside waiting for the door to be unlocked. We affectively brought him in and addressed what he had done with the victim. It wouldn't have been possible if we hadn't build those relationships and been able to work as a system together. You never want to blindside judges with a new policy or process, because they don't like to look stupid. It also helps to prepare them to address biases.

We had a judge that was known for being abusive to victims and had alleged history of domestic violence in his past. It really impacted him, our changes, because he was essentially shut down. We didn't warn him about it and it played out in court in a major way. Rolling these things out strategically and working as a team so that everyone knows what is happening. The big picture goal is to stop the violence.

Are you ready to talk about presentence investigation?

Back in the old days, we used to do PSI's that provided a good reference check and basic information about the defendant. What we were missing, we sat around and included money for food. They met all of the agencies together and bought pizza. We work together to do things differently and coordinate our responses.

Then, they started moving around to the different agencies. They started interviewing us, realizing that we did know some things and we understood on some level what needed to happen to make victim states. They asked us some questions, how much danger does this person pose to the victim?

What was the harm done to the victim and what type of violence was used?

This dialogue began in they were working their way around all the various agencies and pulling information out and eventually pulled this all together. That was the origin of beginning the Duluth model of probation response.

In our presentence investigation we used to make citizenship Centro. We would identify the parties, we knew who the family was, their income, education, military history, etc., etc.

We would look at what type of citizen the defendant was. I bought of these people can be decent. When we looked at changing this to a violence Centro motto, we looked at what is the level of

violence in the incident? What is the affect of the incident on the victim? What is her perception of action and danger. I want to stop and emphasize. I don't want -- care which risk assessment you are using, if she says everything is okay, I am said. You don't necessarily believe her if you have evidence to the contrary. If she says, if I go home or do this, he is going to injure me, you believe it. It trumps all of your risk assessment.

Jan? Can I just interject?

Sure.

We got a question from someone in the chat. Shannon is asking about suggestions when there isn't a PSI done for Mr. meters.

Right. That is really tough. I think your best -- there are some risk tools out there that you can use to help you develop a risk strategy. You can use some historical data that will allow you to respond in a way once they are sentenced. To adequately address the risk, I would encourage your agency to really dialogue about whether or not that is a good practice. What we know about risk is you can have a misdemeanor that is much higher risk than a felony. What we learned is rather it is a misdemeanor or felony really is in a determining factor in how you supervise these people. It is really about the contacts and risk factor.

You want to gather as much information on these people to pull out these high risk and respond effectively to them.

There is a need to address violence as soon as you can in the system. If we are not adequately addressing risk, it really empowers the offender more.

It really is going to disempower the victim. If he is not held accountable, she will are that she cannot turn to the system to be protected. Being able to respond to risk as it is real of all the way. The greater our ability to do that, the greater we will be at holding him accountable and disempowering the victim.

I think those are good points and I like your notion of this self categorization of certain acts, because as you pointed out, some misdemeanors are indicators of far more dangerous than some felonies. I think that is really an important conversation for a CCR to have.

The other thing that I think is important to add is that this is not an unusual thing for there not to always be a PSI particularly on the misdemeanor level. We are fairly fortunate here, because we got legislation to require a PSI, regardless of crime level. I know that is not necessarily the case around the country. Sometimes that means that your prosecutor has to do more work up front to make sure they are gathering this kind of information.

At times we have had to divert the domestic response person. That filed then moves to probation so they have a lot of that stuff ready and available for them to consult. I don't know if jurisdiction have that ability.

I want to focus a little bit on this impact on children in safety. We had a backlash in dilute when we made the change to a more risk sintered approach. Except for when he came to reporting on the impact of children. I reported that one of the children was in a bedroom and had awoken and witness the assault and has some trauma. The judge stopped and said thank you. I have been waiting five years for someone to tell me what is the impact on children. It has never happened.

All of our judges used to rotate. They would see the results of these families who were embroiled in domestic violence and the results of the children. They wanted it addressed. It was a way to get buy-in from the judges.

One of the important things about writing a PSI is we are putting in black and white the violence. I gave you an example before of what a PSI was. Outdo an oral presentation of what a violence center PSI looks and sounds like. Your Honor, this is Joe Smith. He is beyond -- before the court for domestic assault. The police state that he pulled the phone cord out of the wall, pushed her and made derogatory remarks. Children were present.

And then you would lay out the level of violence. There is a prior order of protection against him from two other partners. The prior orders state that -- and the you would lay it all out.

You are painting a picture to the judge about it the violence escalating and severity. If that is the case you will have to dig a little deeper to use a risk assessment that has victim centered risk assessment in it to determine what the level is. Sometimes we get that information from victims and sometimes we do not. That is one of those things where we have our PO do mock interviews with victims and observe each other doing them. That way they learn from each other. It is really important.

The PSI is about making the level of violence public.

Judges fall in line and prosecutors are more easily able to support. You have to put your neck out there a little bit. If you see a case that is high risk, you have to say this is high risk. Here is why.

It is about us accessing all the information that we have at our fingertips.

I had this case where five individuals took this young man who had a simple car accident and pulled him out of his car and brought him to a remote location, beat him, mutilated his genitals and shot him execution style.

Over the next five days there were a series of articles laying out prior 911 calls, police records and is escalating pattern of violence.

The victim was the son of a neighbor of mine, growing up. I want to believe that I would have the same response despite if I knew the family were not. You get the sense of what your job is to determine and understand who is high risk.

You should be able to develop together your top 25 most serious offenders. And your own caseload, you need to understand who is your highest risk offenders. There is research out there

that says if you over assess someone, you are doing harm as well. To feel like you don't know me. You are talking about someone else. It is important for us to figure out what the actual risk level is to respond in a way that says here is what is going on.

Having worked in batterers intervention groups, they are effective.

If we go in there with good information, providing the intervention group with good information so that they can not fall for the excuses and victim blaming that happens. We are then setting everyone up for success.

Our job as probation officers is to help ready people go in to treatment programs. We don't just get them and figure out what they need and send them there.

Our job is to understand their risk and help them understand it to the point where they enter the program and are ready to roll.

The hope is about their ability to change.

Jan, I am aware of the time and I am wondering if we can move ahead a little bit. You have done a good job of laying out the importance of doing that differentiation and making sure that we have a building blocks and tools in place in order to do that. Is that okay if we move ahead a little?

Absolutely.

Essentially, there are a couple different approaches to this. I know that you, as a probation officer, make use of some of these tools when you are making this kind of assessment. I am wondering if you can talk a little bit about some of the details of what the tools are and how you use them?

There is some research out there that compares risk against an intern in college and give them a risk assessment tool. Who do you think is better? The interns with no previous experience do better with a risk tool.

I have found that people who are seasoned probation officers, it's not a matter of learning the tool, but a learning. You have all these ways that you read people and patterns and history that you think are true. You must unlearn those in a way. The most important thing is to have a tool, something backed by research to fall back on. And to make sure that your staff is using it with fidelity and not just following their gut instinct.

I can think of the first generation of the domestic violence sentencing matrix that we developed. I had this guy on probation. I was doing a PSI on him. He was a jerk. He doesn't even want to give me his driver's license information. I am thinking that this guy is high risk. I get him on probation. He scored a two, which is a fairly low risk. There is some history, but it is not escalating.

Then, he comes through again. His name comes up in a PSI on another guy that I am doing. He's at his house and they were watching football, this other guy starts getting abusive to his wife because she isn't bringing him beers fast enough there and my guy, who scored a two, intervenes. He called the police and I'm like okay. Maybe this tool does work. We all have biases that lead to what we do, but the important thing is to use a validated risk tool. Note that some of them are based on factors like criminal history and things that offenders have historically done.

Some of them are based on static and dynamic factors, meaning those things that offenders are able to change. Those are the things you will uncover through the interview and standardized questions. Some of the best tools are the ones that combine those. Keep in mind, whatever tool you are using, you have to have oversight to see if you are using them correctly.

You want a tool that will be able to tell you who are your highest risk offenders and your lowest risk offenders.

You also want to be able to translate into language that judges and prosecutors and victims and offenders can understand.

All three of these tools are solid, well tested, well documented tools. The state of Maine is using Odara throughout their state. What the blueprint does is add to these tools. It doesn't say use a particular tool or not. The blueprint says that it is really important to have a way of using some validated actuarial tool to help predict likelihood of re-offense.

That really adds by describing what is happened or referring practitioners to tools to help really illuminate things further. The main tool that we are referencing is the practitioner's guide to risk and danger, which is a compelling nation of 30 years of research into what we know has made for effective intervention and what makes reticular offenders dangerous. That school is available on the website, along with the training memo that has a chart that can help to guide every worker within the criminal legal system about how to use that tool.

The second thing is a thing called the history of domestic violence summary that is an ongoing record of the institutional knowledge of and offenders action. These tools will give you what the research says about the likelihood of re-offense. The summary asked to that. It is really making the picture, and live. You might have a conviction for a felony assault, but when you read that assault was someone was beaten about the face and head and then stabbed. That really creates a very different picture. There are a lot of ways of assessing for risk and making this information comment life for practitioners and be useful in assessing risk.

We incorporated pictures into our PSI at some point. That was a dramatic change especially if the pictures revealed a lot more bruising days later we all become a little removed from the reality of what these women are going through. A picture speaks more than 1000 words. Also, we are looking at this in terms of focusing on risk. It is important to note that the people we are dealing with have layers of issues. There may be mental health issues, gang issues, dysfunctional families and how the families interact. It is important for us to not put too much emphasis on one thing. I remember earlier on I thought everyone had alcohol issues to just thought drinking and everyone would be better.

I had to stop and say that alcohol doesn't cause the message violence. It has to be something underlying in order for that to happen. That happens to many people. You have biases.

Know that these people have multiple layers of issues. It is important that they are addressed separately. The violence is really about a belief pattern. You are looking at what are all the things that are present in this power control wheel of the Duluth model to help you understand.

Levels of violence sometimes stay the same in a relationship and sometimes they change. It is really about external forces. When she is at greatest risk is when she decides to leave.

It is important to not believe that because someone has only push someone that it will stay that way.

I am noticing that we only have 15 minutes left. I think it will be useful to move on and talk a little about become engagement. On the PowerPoint now we are seeing these principles of victim engagement. I don't know if we have time to talk about all of them. We have talked about some of them, but maybe we can talk about protecting the victim from retaliation. How do you as a probation officer use information from a victim and work with her as a partner in take that information to help create accountability without further endangering her.

The number one way is to try to make it seem like we are getting all of our information. If we are set up to get the predominant amount of our information out of the PSI system she's going to believe that we have all of the secret knowledge. Also, sitting down with the victim and laying out boundaries.

Having access to other databases and information really helps. He --

Sometimes we will try to gather information through a victim advocate who might not be able to tell you things in detail, but just know there is a lot of risk. You will find a way to communicate and create your response. Be able to dress your response in a way that is not going to put her front and center. The other thing is to reach out to those high risk offenders and regularly called the victim to just check in.

On my way home I would drive by different dictums homes who had no contact order to see if he was there. Sometimes I will call the police in on my high risk once to do a drive-by. These are things that you can do to help her build trust and feel like someone cares about what is happening to her and that someone is watching. The biggest way is if he violates, be on top of it. Your agency should have policies in place so that it isn't so much discretionary. There is a delicate balance.

If he is violating and we can prove it, bring it forward and deal with it. You want to paint that picture about why you are doing it and what it is for.

This is reminding me, I had a conversation last night with an advocate who is a friend of mine. She was telling a story about working with a victim who was working with the prosecutor's

office. She'd been talking to the prosecutor and the victim witness person with the understanding that it was confidential. Her batterer ends it out with a copy of the file and goes to her house and shows it to her and says, a close clearly she -- he knew everything that she had set. Is certainly didn't do anything to encourage her level of trust. It emphasized the importance of being very clear about the boundaries of confidentiality.

The people who don't work in the system have very little knowledge about the system.

Those who are good at working with the system do really good with educating.

One of our first judges, Judge Campbell, was our first judge who worked specifically with domestic violence cases. He said he would have all these victims who come in and says that it is their fall, he would say it is her fault. It gets confusing. He said that his job is to protect the victim and treat the offender. He just Saying that over and over before he would interact with the offenders and victims in court.

It is also important for judges to understand what they say in front of everyone in that court matters in a big way. The ones holding the offender accountable give a good and solid message.

That is an excellent point. In the interest of time I want to move on and ask you to talk about one part of this notion about probation officers working with advocates. I am really glad to hear you say earlier in the webinar about the importance of building those relationships and how helpful probation officers and applicants can be to one another. I think advocates work closely with law enforcement and prosecutors peer but probation is often left on the radar screen and vice versa.

Can you say a little about this notion of how you can learn from and share information with one another between probation and advocates?

I did an entire workshop on this. I started out by saying that advocates are the ones who started his word. They are the ones who are constantly raising awareness. You have system advocates and victim advocates. They raise consciousness. Artwork job is to listen to them, they are going to see things from a perspective that we will never get close to, in terms of victim experience and safety.

Acknowledge the history of what advocates have done for this movement. If you think about the pay structure, it doesn't pay outright. Advocates should be at the top. Also, to really listen. If an advocate deals like you are really listening, there is going to be automatic trust. The biggest thing is to check in with where you are in terms of the victim blaming an understanding what underlies domestic violence, that it is really a belief system. He believes that he has the right to use force, power, and control in that relationship. If you are not there, advocates are going to know it.

Start working to help facilitate antiviolence groups. There is no better way to understand how offenders think then to be in those groups. I started facilitating men's nonviolent screws because I believed they didn't work. As APO, you are focusing on the top 10% all the time. You are not understanding or seeing the ones who are changing. When I went in the groups and saw the

number of people changing, it was astounding. It help me to stop victim blaming and to understand how the victim and the offender thinks.

I am really glad to hear you talk about the batterer group. I want to be sure to have time to cover that part of the presentation. If it is okay, I want to skip ahead to the notion of supervision and building swift consequences.

Can you talk a little bit about this notion of the importance of responding quickly with predictability?

You have to look at it from the perspective of the offender. We are agreeing with it in a way by saying we are not going to respond to this. For us to address this immediately, this is think this is important. The research out there shows across the board that immediate short-term intervention is more effective. They have to name and address the behavior to get people back on track and focused in a positive direction. It does reduce future abuse. It reduces the severity of abuse.

One example that we have had is we dialogue and the dilute model. Probation violation was one of those things that was a hot item in the domestic abuse intervention program. We felt like we should be filing violations on every new offense. It took a long time. There were judges who believe that you cannot file them in that order. If you had an offense that was in the process, you could violate probation.

You can file a violation with a pending charge. In fact, it was done on a regular basis in other cases.

A policy where agencies are holding each other accountable to do the right thing is critical here.

Will you talk a little bit about probation's role in batterer rehabilitation and working with that are intervention programs?

I had a big concern that I started working as a batterer intervention program facilitator. I trained and I had a concern about am I going to be able to work with the guys that I haven't probation. It turns out that it was a complete nonissue. We developed such a good report that it actually assisted me in a big way in supervising them. It was me and a person who was a member of the community facilitating these groups.

I would encourage all probation, if your agency doesn't let you facilitate groups, you should attend groups, it is so educational. And, it helped our agency to understand accountability from my perspective. I had all of this information from the PSI and the police reports, the way these guys were trying to slide through and blame her, it was important for me to know really what was real. There is a case and this was the exception. It was early in our CCR work. We had a case where a guy had assaulted his girlfriend in a Wiltshire and injured her to the point where she had a torn liver. So, he is in group and he comes into my office and he is still talking about the fact that he needed to do it because he was afraid of her. I call up the group facilitator and say, this is what this guy is saying to me in my office. Do you know that she is a quadriplegic.

Having that linkage a little closer, the more that you can do that kind of stuff is really important that we are able to communicate and respond.

The guys progressing in group you can save tell me the last time you felt like you wanted to use violence. They should be able to name it and own it. If they say that everything is fine they are not progressing at all peer what they are supposed to be doing is learning about themselves and how they respond and what their beliefs are and looking at the hierarchical structure of their relationship here check in with them and find out how they are doing.

If they are not progressing, you want to sit down with the domestic abuse people. We used to have a monthly meeting where we would talk about high risk cases. That was one way for appeals and the domestic abuse program to share information.

Jan, you are just a wealth of information.

I'm sorry I am so long-winded. I haven't been socialized properly. You are so knowledgeable and you bring so much history into this work and into understanding and illuminating this field. Sadly, we are out of time. I wonder if you could just have a little blurb about what do we need to do in order to create long-lasting change. [This event has reached its scheduled time.] [Event concluded]

This project is supported by Grant #2011-TA-AX-K103 awarded by the Office on Violence Against Women, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, conclusions and recommendations expressed during this webinar are those of the author/presenter(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Department of Justice.