

Utilizing Community Assessment to Improve Responses to Sexual Assault

*Olga Trujillo , Praxis International
with Kerry Beldin, John Beyer, Mike Colyer
April 5, 2016*

Please stand by for real-time captions.

Ladies and gentlemen your car -- call is now live.

Hello. Welcome to this webinar on institutional analysis presented by Praxis international. In partnership with the office of violence against women. Today's webinar is utilizing community assessments to improve responses -- responses to sexual assault.

My name is Olga Trujillo I am the senior training and program specialist here at Praxis international.

We have a few others on the call today. First we have Liz Carlson, my colleague here at Praxis who will manage the technical details of your participation as well as the chat during the webinar.

Before I introduce it to our other guests I will pass it over to Liz to go over some important tips.

Hello everyone. Welcome to our webinar today. Thank you for being with us. Just a couple of things to smooth over your participation today. If there is anyone who is participating just on the telephone only and is not plugged into the webinar a couple of things to keep in mind, if you're able to email me and ask me to send me the power points so you can have that available to you to follow along as we go through the presentation. Or if you have questions or comments that you would like to make to our presenters today you can do so by email. Send a note to liz@praxisinternational.orf.

For the rest of you who are logged into the webinar you will utilize the chat for your questions and comments. We encourage you to do so freely and regularly. We want to know what is on your mind. It is a nice way to start a session by having a little practice and saying hello to everyone in the group if you would. In the lower left-hand portion of the screen you will see the chat box. If you move your cursor to the bottom and click on that rectangle you can say hello or tell us where you are calling from and if any colleagues are joining you. It is a nice way to begin a session. Feel free to do that now and throughout the session today.

If you happen to have an issue and you would like to chat privately just to one of the presenters you will see there is a gray tab that says private. If you open that and double-click on one of the presenters that will open a private line between you and that person. If it is technology or a specific question feel free to utilize that function at any point during our session.

Just a couple of other things, if you get disconnected either by telephone or to the webinar of course rejoined to your original process. Remember this session is being recorded. If there happens to be any portion that you miss you will be able to revisit it on the institutional analysis technical assistance reporting webpage of the Praxis international website.

With that, Olga, I will turn his back to you and you can get it started.

Thank you.

Today we will be examining the use of Praxis international institutional analysis process. To examine the law-enforcement response to sexual assault. With us today we have coordinators and participants from three different communities that worked on sexual assault audits. We will explore how these teams came to use the [Indiscernible] for sexual assault, how they organize their work and how teams adapt in any way the institutional analysis process to make it work for them and for sexual assault.

Before I get started in getting everybody acquainted with the institutional analysis process, the me introduce our presenters. Please welcome Jerry Feldman from Lincoln Nebraska. Keri Is a professor at the University of Nebraska Omaha and has worked as a coordinator on three or four audits.

I think it is more five.

Thank you. Thank you for being here Keri.

And then we have John buyer from Duluth Minnesota. John is a retired deputy chief of police from the Duluth Police Department in Duluth Minnesota. John, how many audits have you been involved with?

I was involved, my first experience was the audit in Duluth of women who have been sexually assaulted then I worked in a number of communities including Lincoln Nebraska, Missoula Montana doing their audit classes. I would say probably three or four.

Thank you, John. Thank you for being here.

Finally we have Mike Hall your -- [Indiscernible] who is from Missoula Montana. The detective division captain of the Missoula Police Department. Welcome, Mike.

Thank you.

Mike, you are involved in the one audit that Missoula Montana did on sexual assault, right?

Yes. It just concluded last spring.

Great. Thank you very much. Thank you all three of you for being here.

Before I come to you guys and hear about your communities experience, I would like to do a quick summary for those of us that are new to the audit process.

Community assessment or safety accountability audit as we call them is a systemic method of analyzing how specific features and in particular safety and accountability because these are the ones that put center into the audit process. It is a method of analyzing how these features are or are not incorporated into the daily work routine of practitioners.

It is not a performance review tool and it doesn't assess individual if active miss. It is not going to help you remove troublesome judge or prosecutor from your community response. What it is and? -- What makes it so useful is it looks into the institutional responses to domestic violence or in this case sexual assaults. It examines how we are organized and coordinated to think about and act on these cases.

One of the main ways, basically the steps in conducting an assessment involved case processing, mapping out basically the aspect of the response that you are examining, collecting data, Hugh collect it in several different ways through observation, text analysis and [Indiscernible]. Analyzing the data and generating and articulating findings and implementing the solutions.

The central premise to the audit process is every organization has eight essential elements that govern how the employees of those organizations do their job. It is not necessarily about that particular person, but about these different elements of the loss, the forms, the regulations, the resources, the training people get, the concepts and theories that they work under. Their mission, purpose and function, their efforts of accountability. These are the ways in which anyone would be organized to do their job. This is what influences people more than anything else. The other central premise to the institutional analysis process is taking into account the complexity of risk and safety for each woman and her child -- children and how those risks come up.

As you can see from here it is primary focused on domestic violence risk and safety analysis. You keep the center and institutional analysis process every step of the way, you keep center the notion of whether something is enhancing safety for the victim and accountability of the perpetrator.

As I mentioned earlier there are three types of data collection that are utilized during the institutional analysis process. You conduct interviews of practitioners and potentially victims through focus groups, you do observations, he watch people do their work, and you look at text and analyze case files, forms, pretty much any text that is created in the process.

That is a thumbnail sketch of what the institutional analysis process is just to make sure everyone is on board.

One thing I forgot to mention is if you have any questions throughout please feel free to chat your questions in the chat bar. Liz will keep an eye on that for us. We also will stop at different points and check to see if people have questions. If you have questions, get them in and we will get to them as soon as we can.

I wanted to start with get -- just to get a sense of what is going on in your community and how the audit team about and what were you hoping to accomplish. [Indiscernible] I will start with you what was going on in Missoula Montana for you all to do an audit on sexual assault?

In May 2013 we entered into an agreement with the United States Department of Justice to improve our response to sexual assault. It was many pages of agreement that came with a couple dozen requirements to be full compliance. One of the biggest pieces in our compliance was to conduct a safety and accountability audit.

It really was an acquirement -- requirement it was not an optional thing it was a requirement from the agreement that we participated and spearheaded. It was nothing that I had never even heard of. There were people that had heard of them but had never done them. It was from ground up, learning about what the whole process is about, bringing it back to Missoula and going from there.

John, what were you doing in Duluth?

In the summer of 2006 right around then, two of our local nonprofit organizations [Indiscernible] in the program for [Indiscernible] and sexual assault got together and conceived the idea of taking the audit process which Duluth had done many times looking at domestic violence cases but actually applying that to examine the system's response to reported rapes of native women. That is how that came about. It was a collaborative idea of putting the concept together, having some meetings with partners and then drafting a grant application and get grant money to actually do that.

What we hoping to accomplish?

Our focus is really to identify whether a woman safety is increased or decreased through the systems [Indiscernible] and of course to look at whether or not the offender was healthy -- held accountable. Where you start this whole concept of offender accountability and victim safety is what we were looking at and to see how our system was doing when it came to those to import measures.

Keri what about you in Lincoln ?

What was happening in Lincoln is there were conversations happening between the primary advocacy agency, core dating Council and are Police Department about how we could improve services for victims of sexual assault. One of the things that had happened around that time was Lancaster County had received national attention for a sexual assault case, this certainly was not the only incident that we had received national attention for a sexual assault case in which it the judge had said the victim could not use the term sexual assault, she could not use the term victim, she cannot use any of these terms to describe the situation. There was clearly indication that we had some work that we could do in terms of protecting the climate for sexual assault victims. It seem like it was the right time. All of the agencies involved were at a place where they were ready to look into that.

Was that the beginning of your first audit or was that the one where you guys focused on sexual assault or was that the same?

That was the beginning of the first one. We did three audits on sexual assault. This was the very beginning,

When you decide to do something, you decide to do something.

We are all in.

Thank you. Mike, I am curious how did you get involved in this and what role did you end up having?

I was assigned from the Police Department to be the person responsible for all of the compliance or DOJ agreements. I remember John story about having the ability to delegate this to somebody. I had a similar feeling about it that John did, I thought it was a huge part of our client that I should be directly involved rather than have somebody else pick it up, so much of our compliance up to this point was nonferrous is a big tax -- tasks, very specific individual work. This was the ultimate compliment to that because it was the furthest thing from that individual work. It was about a system and I knew it is a community deal. It is not just [Indiscernible] and it was not just detectives or individual patrol officers. To answer your question, not only did I feel an obligation because of the compliance, I wanted to be involved to get a totally different perspective about how we had addressed it prior to that.

Really from a personal standpoint I felt like this topic is not going away. This is the newest and professional league for law enforcement for the foreseeable future and I wanted to personally understand that so the rest of my career I felt like I would be dialed in on the topic.

Great. You ended up being one of the coordinators of the audit, right?

Right. I was one and we had another person from the community who actually volunteered she is a super, well-respected professional who has worked in a lot of different areas throughout the community. So we thought we would bring in a second party, somebody who does not have law enforcement and we would work off each other. She brought a lot to the table and I really appreciate that.

Great.

John, how are you involved? You were not a coordinator at all.

Right. Literally one of the first things I got promoted to Jeff -- deputy chief in 2006, I just let the patrol division and one of the first things that the new chief handed me was this safety audit saying we have the money now to figure out how we are going to implement our role in doing the safety assessment. Literally it was one of the first things I touched in my new role as deputy chief.

At first when I looked at it I thought I have a lot of stuff on my plate, a brand-new job, I should delegate this to somebody within my organization and I talked to a few people about it, I started learning more about the audit process, I read through the grant application and it intrigues me. At

some point my thinking shifted from thinking delegation to thinking I might be a good role or a good person to sit in that chair and do it. Eventually that is what I decided.

On a side note which will figure out as we go through the presentation, I looked back at that expresses one of the best professional decisions I have made in the sense that it really changed in brought in my perspective on the roles of law enforcement how we interact with our partners in what we define successful. It turned out to be a really good experience not only for my department but for me personally.

Great, John. I love listening to talk about your experience on this audit. It always gives me goosebumps. I don't mean to be silly about it. You are just really passionate about it.

Keri, tell us how you got involved in this first audit. You are off at the University of Nebraska and not really working in domestic violence and actual salt.

Right. I got involved in a different way. I had just presented my doctoral dissertation and it was April or May and I was waiting to start. I had an academic position and it was not starting until August. I had worked with both our local core dating Council and I worked with the local advocacy agency so they knew me and knew my work. I always had my hand in working with domestic violence and sexual assault so they knew me and my interest. They asked me if I would be interested in doing this training with them. And being the audit coordinator. I think part of the appeal was because I was not part of the system that the sense was I might be seen as a neutral party, that I wasn't advocacy, I was not law enforcement, people would see me as someone who is interested in the tasks at hand and keeping things on track and not during the process in one direction or another. That is what my role was, just to be a task master. To keep people on track at a very process oriented group as you know. They could get very off track and very full soft. My job many times was to bring them back to the task at hand.

That really was my role just to bring them back to the praxis model, bring them back to the audit question and to say this is what we need to accomplish today and this is what we need to have at the end of this process.

Great. I remember working with you all. Initially it might have been the audit that John was doing from -- some consulting on as well and then later with one of your other sexual assault audit I was more involved with it. It had to have been one of the most interesting conversations when I was out in Lincoln working with your group, and at the same time bringing everybody back was critical.

It was really hard because it is such a great group of thinkers. You get so engaged in the conversation and it was a fascinating conversation and exciting to hear people really drill down in certain topics. That will get you off track very quickly.

For sure.

It was a tough job.

Mike, was it hard to get by and from others on the team and did it help that you are the coordinator since you are coming from law enforcement?

Surprisingly I had [Indiscernible] coming back thinking that I would have a real fight to get people to come back to this, in reality it was one of the easiest part. Obviously the advocates were immediately all in and the 911 dispatcher was in, my role just to clarify a few things the prosecutor and other law enforcement agencies were pretty minimal but it did help to have a local cop pitching this because the prosecutor's and the law enforcement agencies -- it was no hesitation they just had questions and they need more information. After that they were in. We started the discussion by sending each department head a letter and giving them the 10,000 foot [Indiscernible] about it but being very open that this was a big right off the Apple. This was going to take commitment from their organization to letting the person be out of their primary role for several hours a week for the next foreseeable months to a year.

That helps. I did not want to shine them on that this wouldn't be a big deal because I thought it would be a big deal. And I think that pay dividends later as we kept pushing, the conclusion day pass the bit, in answer to question I do think it helped having someone for my profession there to answer questions to the other agents involved and I do think that being very open to those department heads about this is a big commitment, I think that is helpful because they feel like they are getting a real honest proposal from the administrators.

Great.

John, was it like that for you guys? You guys had to be brought in. Once you are on board to that make a difference for others?

I think so. Like I said earlier, I was not familiar with the process and it was not Intel I actually got to the praxis today audit training that one of the people that did it for us open my eyes with helping me understand the significance of the time commitment and energy that would go into it.

At first I thought our team was bonded right away after we finish the training, we had our first meeting and it went very well and I was energized after that. I thought maybe because Duluth has a long history of working more collaboratively concerning these issues and violence against women issues that it helps. I think it did to a certain extent but when I went to other communities and I saw their audit teams come together and flourish and get down to work and be so energized, the example was a couple summers ago when I went to Missoula and helped train their audit team I walked away from that experience thinking this audit team is great. I had the same explains in Lincoln when I was there and met with their team and did work with them. I think the key really was to get them in the process. I really think that I was able to help in the sense no more or no less than any other team members. I was invested in trying to improve my organizations response to native women that had been sexually assaulted. I know for a fact each and every one of our audit team members have the same goal and objectives. We really came together with common goal and shared interest in it made all the difference in the world.

I think a key piece to this is to get the right people sitting in the chair's that have the skill set that are really important to do an audit or be successful. For us it took two years for us to finish that and have the final report.

I see the question that Liz has in the chat, if there is anybody on the call that had difficulty with community by an -- in Keri, what you guys decided you are in, right?

We do not have problems with that. One of the really great things about working in Lincoln and Lancaster County is their service agencies and law enforcement, they are so well established and they have professionals who had been in their roles for a long period of time and they were really great at being able to work together even when there was disagreement at the table. We are all really committed to this idea in this process. The buy-in was not a problem for us. We got lucky.

I am trying to think if I worked with anyone where the buy-in was difficult. I guess if I had to look at where there might have been some challenges in buy-in I would have to say, this is a little bit of a segue to our next question. I would have to say in time to get beyond the criminal justice system [Indiscernible] participate. When I look at who is involved and when you look at sexual assault, the only people that I think that were not involved that could have been involved was the medical community. Hospitals and sexual assault nurse examiners. I'm curious if any of you want to talk about if you reached out to them, if you could tell us who else was involved and tell me or mention if you had tried to get [Indiscernible] in the medical community involved or not.

Mike, let me start with you. Who else was involved and did you have or make any effort to get the same folks involved in a so how did that go? Maybe you guys did have them.

We did have been. We had 10 organizations on our team, city police the Sheriff's office and the University police. We had the city attorney's office in the county attorney's office. We had a system in space [Indiscernible] office we had student advocacy resource Center which is the advocacy office on campus, the YWCA was represented and the 911 dispatcher and in answer to your question directly were the same nurses involved? Yes they were.

Our program works to St. Patrick's hospital is called first step. We had a same nurse from first step on the team. They were just like any other organization. They were excited to do it. Of course they had questions but they were not a hard sell. They just needed to plan for it. That's why I say be transparent about how much time you ask of people so they can plan for it and be there. They are huge part of the reality. [Indiscernible] that I will talk about later that related to that part of the process so it was great to have them at the table to talk about that.

How about you, John? Who was on your team and were you able to get medical folks involved?

We decided our focus was going to be narrow than most audits. We specifically had law-enforcement response to the case both patrol level and investigative level. We looked at advocacy response and prosecution. We did not include hospitals or nursing or same nurse or 911 by design. We were thinking our focus would stick right to that which we ended up doing. Our team consisted of 12 members, one of those 12 -- out of those 12 three were from governmental bodies, myself, Duluth Police Department, and the Sheriff's Department in St.

Louis County and the St. Louis County prosecutor who had prosecuted sexual assault cases. The other nine were nongovernmental organizations who are mostly made of women and worked in some type of advocacy role and are to audit coordinator's were both stellar and advocates. That was our core group that we got together and work through the process. Along the way our group stuck together for the two years.

Keri, how about you ?

I would say that one of the biggest mistakes that we made was when we were grant funded and when we were allocating parking for our team and thinking through hole -- who are initial team would be it was an oversight on our part that we did not include funding to have a SAN nurses table. I think we would've benefited greatly from that. We did the best we could once we realize that to include them, we did interviews, focus groups, we brought them in as much as we could. We really should have had them be a member of the team. It was frankly an oversight on our part.

They were not a member of the team from the initial phase of our work which I think is something that if we were to do it again obviously we would make that change.

Other key members were we had our Executive Director, our advocacy program and our sexual assault coordinator for the advocacy program. We had the executive director of the coordinator in counsel, head of [Indiscernible] units. We had our County attorney, one of our deputy county attorneys. We had a captain who was in charge of investigations from the [Indiscernible] youth department and whether the investigations. We had a deputy from the Lancaster County Sheriff's office and a police officer from the University police.

Tran10, at the very first audit, did you have any trouble getting any of them to participate?

Not really. I think the reason we did it was because the core people as we started -- as you started that conversation [Indiscernible] the executive director of our victim advocacy group and are police chief at the time. They had such a great working relationship. They all [Indiscernible] leadership in their agencies. When they agreed to do this they got good buy-in from their staff. It was pretty easy once they said we think this is a good idea, it was pretty easy to get people from their agencies on board. Then it was not too hard to get their agencies to follow suit. In that sense we were lucky. I think what I sort of heard Mike and John say is one of the things that you really want to do is make sure you are very clear and comfortable about what Dick Bennett is going to be in terms of if you are asking people to be a part of the process and letting them know this is [Indiscernible] in terms of time and effort. I think that helped us.

When people said they could not do it oftentimes [Indiscernible] a level of time and then they were able to commit to doing interviews or things like that.

It does take a lot of time. If you lay it all out for people, if they can devote the time to it it pays off in a really big way.

Let me talk about how you determined your focus and what were you looking at? Mike, I will start with you. You are looking at -- IM guessing some of your focus was determined by the agreement with the Department of Justice. Sexual assault is a big area. How did you narrow it down. How did you get to your audit question?

We leaned on praxis a lot. They are good resource. You have to whittle it at some point to keep it manageable. We talked it through and thought what are the important things to victims because so much of our agreement was about that.

We talked it through and we realized the very first most initial aggression a victim gets when they reach out to somebody is critical for how far this person will remain engaged. We literally starts at the 911 phone call. We ultimately stopped at the charging decision. In hindsight that leaves out a big part of the accountability part. In hindsight maybe we should have had it extend through either our sentencing or case revolution. We stopped it at the charging decision. That kind of made our focus for us. And that is what brought the 10 organizations to the audit team because each one of those 10 from law enforcement, advocacy, SAN nurse, prosecutors, they are all part of that process. I was kind of joking but I was kind of serious really people should look to praxis for it. They are the experts on it. They were my first go at this and they were a great help.

Thank you, Mike. That is nice to hear.

We are not paying them to say that just so everyone knows.

John, how did you come up with your focus?

I would echo what Mike said. A key piece for us was the training and guidance that you guys provided not only [Indiscernible] but as we are doing it [Indiscernible] it made all the difference in the world for us. When you think about the focus of our audit it was really determined by [Indiscernible] the sacred hoop which is a local nonprofit that came up in conceived this idea of looking at native women and sexual assault and they partnered with another nonprofit in Duluth so they form the basis of where we were going to go. It was not until we got our team together and went through the two day audit training and had our personal meeting where we focus in on deciding for sure what our scope was going to be, law enforcement, prosecution and advocacy.

Secondly what is our audit question. What were we going to look at specifically. We landed on a generic question which served as well, how does the practice secure victim safety and [Indiscernible] accountability.

Whenever native women report rape, right?

Right that was a focus.

Keri, how about you in Nebraska?

I would echo what has been said. A lot of how we narrowed our focus came from the training that we got. Our focus came from a lot of discussions that we had. A lot of times we would go to dinner while we were doing the training and thinking through what we want to have at the end of the process. By the time we left the training we had a good idea of what we wanted our audit question to look like. Then when we had our first meeting with the rest of the team members we brought it to them and based on what we learned in the training we had the team help us the question. -- Helped us finish the question. At the end our focus really was about trying to balance how well do we really provide for the safety and respect of sexual assault victims in our community as well as making efforts to hold offenders accountable.

It is amazing how similar these questions were.

Right.

The [Indiscernible] accountability audit and toolkit was designed originally by Alan [Indiscernible] using institutional ethnography which he added the essential elements, the eight essential elements of [Indiscernible] that doesn't work. Her focus was on domestic violence. I know when I look at the toolkit I can see all the ways in which focus on domestic violence. Keri I want to talk to about this , I think that having done five audits, three of which I think were sexual assault in the other two were domestic violence. I wanted to see how did you have to adapt the process to be able to go from one to the other.

I think we learned pretty quickly that we would have to make some decisions about how to apply some of the concepts. One of the things for me was as we were thinking through the questions specifically and [Indiscernible] are concepts was the concept of age and how important it would be when we were thinking about victims. When it comes to statutes, when it comes to where services are provided, if you provide services whether you are 15 or 16 and makes a dramatic difference in our community regarding where you go for services and the type of services you get. Something like that, something as simple as a year age difference makes a huge difference in thinking through how victims are treated in our system. We had to be very thoughtful about we are talking about sexual assault victims and we need to make sure we really nailed down in age range we need to make clear what we are talking about and the implications for what service providers we were going to include in our conversation.

That was one thing.

Something else you and I talked about that quickly came up in our work as well was the ideas about safety and safety planning it was very different in sexual assault and domestic violence. The thing about motivation looks a lot different. Many times domestic violence victims their abuse is oftentimes seen as ongoing. That reporting is a way to potentially stop the abuse. Often times sexual assault victims are seen as having this experience that is much more localized and time-limited. In that sense there may not be the same motivation to report.

Motivation for reporting, planning for safety, how would you feel if you resulted in your home, all of those things are very different in sexual assault cases or can be then they are in domestic violence. Those things were different.

Been recruiting was very, very different. We hammered out quickly that we needed to talk to people that were [Indiscernible] what we wanted to do was to talk to sexual assault victims who had experience in reporting, but the focus group that we had, this is surprising in hindsight him a when we met with our first focus group there was not a single survivor in the group that had ever reported. In about half of the group it was the first time that they ever told their story.

In hindsight that is not surprising. A lot of the information they gave us was extremely helpful. It is so different than how we would have recruited. All of those things were very different experience.

I think I have worked with, I have not worked with all the sexual assault August the -- audits but I worked with a number them. We are here at practice looking at how would we develop guidance for communities if they wanted to take the official analysis of the safety and accountability audit and apply the sexual assault. Some of the things that you mentioned, Keri, were totally there for us, determining age and all the implications that age has come safety seems to be different, the reporting, victim engagement looks different.

What we found is because victim engagement looks different, and I think all of you figure this out as well, the 911 response investigation was not going to necessarily capture a lot of the cases. People need to incorporate emergency rooms, health clinic, sexual assault examiners, rape crisis hotlines, that is not typically what people in that focusing on when they are looking at a criminal justice response to domestic violence.

The other thing is then doing observations, observations is one of the key data collection tools that you use in a audit it is tricky with sexual assault, you cannot observe a SAN exam. You will not be able to observe advocates working with sexual assault victims, that seemed a little tricky in terms of how you observe people. Patrol officers if you do ride along or sit along 911 you will not hear them responding to sexual assault very often you will not necessarily have an opportunity to observe them response of sexual assault because so few cases are actually called into 911. Then have a patrol response.

When you talk but the issue of confidentiality and confidentiality laws there seems to be a lot more a lot more laws and privilege. There seems to be a lot more laws focused on sexual assault than domestic violence. There are all kinds of restrictions in sharing data in sexual assault cases that is different than domestic violence. It can complicate an audit moving forward. Especially because all of our training materials are geared for domestic violence. It is interesting to see how you adapted it.

I'm going to stop here and check in with Liz to see if there are any questions in the chat.

We have none BuSpar. It is not too late. We would love to know what is on your mind, get some feedback on information that John, Mike and Keri have talked about . And at any point for the next 30 minutes just chat that in.

Please feel free to ask. We love answering questions. If you have any. Did you guys notice any of the adaptations from the audit for sexual assault and domestic violence.

As I think about that I am not really sure other than we did use the toolkit. I think during a lot of our meetings we kind of maybe adaptation on the fly, if you will, instead of using domestic violence terminology we would insert sexual assault. So we did it in our heads more than doing anything on paper.

I remember talking to Rebecca St. George about this a little while back. She said the only thing she can remember that they did really formally is they went through the interview sheets and changed some of the questions. Otherwise she said you guys were adapting as he went.

Yes we were.

How about you, Mike. By the point you got involved we might have tried to adapt all that for you.

Right. I had to have it done once on domestic violence [Indiscernible] I don't really have that perspective like the other speakers have. You guys had cut some of that out for us. Some differences that I can see there are a lot of similarities. Most sex assaults our acquaintance based which parallel some of the dynamics for domestic violence. I think there were some that flew under the radar because I had not been exposed to it. I also think there are some things that we did that [Indiscernible].

Thank you, Mike.

Keri I notice there is a question .

The question is, how about if we go in order that we went if you have anything you want to add. For the speakers, did one department apply for grant funding and informed a coalition or was a coalition for first and then you went for grant funding?

Mike, do you know?

We did not use grant funding. The city funded on their own. We were lucky because they had the other co-administrator was Janet and she volunteered so that was a lot right there that we do not have to pay for. And then practice supported it with all of the physician assistants and also the on-site visits through their own funding. We did not have to apply for any grant at all. Anything that was not covered by practice itself or [Indiscernible] we paid for out of our budget. I think the city acknowledged and we had an agreement that it would come with a price tag. Fortunately for me that was not my cross to bear, that was the chief to bear to figure that part out in Iran the audit.

Great.

John, do you know?

Originally the whole concept was [Indiscernible] then they partnered with, of course the pool -- the Duluth police signed a memorandum that [Indiscernible] if they got the funding. The funding came through and then we pull together as a team and selected individual people to be part of that group.

It sounds like some coalition of agreement among key parties was formed then applied for funding and then expanded that coalition.

Yes.

Okay. Keri, let's say your first grant compared to the rest

I don't know. I was not working at that level. I know that my sense is it was the advocacy agency, the court mating agency in the law enforcement who were awarded mating them. I don't know how that process got started.

When I think about your community, your community has such a strong coordinating Council. A lot of the funding went through that, right?

Right. I'm not quite sure that I know some of it was managed through the Police Department but they worked collaboratively I'm not sure who managed it and whether or not they came together collectively first and then applied. I don't know the sequence of events.

I think the most successful is the approach that some people like they didn't Duluth a smaller group get together and apply for the funding. Then bring the rest of the people in. The big key, I will say, Catherine, is when you do a sexual assault audit is to build in the medical community into your grant. They are really different than a lot of the other folks involved, the nonprofits and the government agencies. You might want to start conversations with them and incorporate them into the grant.

Liz, no other questions.

That is right.

Let's talk about what you thought you were going to find. Then I will come back about what you did find. What did you think before you got involved? Mike?

I would say what I anticipated would be we would keep seeing double up the inability to exchange information. I would say that is not within the criminal justice system but from the criminal justice system out, from the medical community out, from advocacy out. I thought that would all be identified as being problematic.

If that is the case, if that is what we anticipated we would find, I also anticipated we would find that bubble over to victims that they would be asking the wrong agency and they would appeal to disclose the information probably because they did not have it or they could not get it. I really

thought the flow of information among disciplines and from the system so to speak to victims would be a problem.

The flip side what I thought I would see is individuals are very good at their jobs. They are technically proficient and in for the right reasons. Those were my theories going in.

John, what did you guys think?

Like I said earlier I was not part of the [Indiscernible] prior to this I did not know what to expect but I do know during the audit trail do not come with any preconceived ideas of where this is going to go and what we will find but of course we are human. I really thought that Duluth had a history of working on these types of issues that we would find some gaps related into procedural things in our policy and protocol, some communication issues with our partners especially advocates and how we can exchange information. In the end what I really found out is I was unprepared for how big some of the gaps were that we dug into and shed a light on. What I originally thought we were going to find it turned out to be slightly the truth but there was more that was much bigger than I thought. I am really convinced that the audit process brought that to my attention and help me see some of those things that I might not have and probably would not have seen without the help of the team and the coordinated response of advocates and law-enforcement working together.

Good point, John.

Keri what did you think ?

I think I did not really know. I think that helped me not having a role in the system, I honestly did not have enough working knowledge about the day-to-day to have any well-developed there is about what we find. Then with the research I tried not to speculate about what we would find. I was trained to keep an open mind.

I think I knew enough to know [Indiscernible] how we could be treating them better, how we could be responding in a way that would make them feel more comfortable. I think that was something that I knew was coming.

When you said being the researcher, you are kind of trained to not really be predisposed to a particular finding. I think in that way you are different than the rest of us.

I'm always thinking we will find this or that even if it is not in my community.

What did you find? Mike we will start with you. When you were looking for what did you find?

I will say that first theory was true. There is a real inability to share information. A lot of our audit related to the campus community, you have a [Indiscernible] conflicting with state criminal justice information law and you have advocacy is unable to share information. The inability to share information from one professing -- profession to the other and at the end of the day we do not have a solution. Unless you are changing federal statutes and states statutes and

code of ethics, everyone was doing their job correctly. This was an unintended consequence of some of the privacy issues. We do not have a solution to that.

The other thing we found is we found inconsistency between law enforcement agencies. There are three key agencies in my jurisdiction, the city police, the Sheriff's office and the University police. We are all doing business a little different in that was due to resources, due to policy, due to some training and so on. That was a bit of a surprise. If you think about it a person can call and report a crime on one side of the street and it goes to one agency and if they are across the street it goes to another. Victims don't know what they will get in the should get the same experience regardless of what law enforcement agency they're reaching out to.

The third thing that we notice, I press this earlier was [Indiscernible] the value of having SAN at the table is we have cops doing suspect exams. From an accountability standpoint that is an issue. Not only should police officers not be doing him, crime scene text should not be doing, a medical professional should be doing those. You are missing valuable evidence, if you're getting the evidence it might not be collected appropriately. All of that goes to the strength of the criminal case which could have an effect on the accountability.

The last thing which was really an unforeseen outcome, it was a whole community and misperception of this issue. You can have the dispatcher doing the best job bringing it in, the police doing the best job investigating it, the advocates doing the best job in keeping victims engaged, this -- be SAN nurses doing that. At the end of the day we realized the huge gap is so much of our society does not understand real rape. You bring forward the best possible product to a trial and they are found not guilty or they are found hung jury. That was the fourth and the biggest result of the audit.

I have heard prosecutors talking about that issue in particular and how juries and misconceptions around rape really make it so difficult to actually find someone guilty.

John, I wonder if you could tell us some of the things that you found in Duluth.

When we worked through it we ended up discovering seven distinct gaps. The first one that was significant was the intervening agencies do not viably follow through with the investigation charging of the women who had been sexually assaulted. It was interesting that we looked at consistency in investigation and charging a prosecution when it came to domestic violence cases, it was really well, there was a good consistent effort. When it came to sexual assault cases is in dark -- it seemed like a lot of things fell through the gap. I will circle back to that we talk about recommendations.

Secondly we found native women do not have regular access to sexual assault. That is a big piece if you think of vendor accountability and safety advocacy is a huge part of both of those. We also discovered that native women received few if any follow context from the Police Department or even advocates. We narrow that down to a couple of things one of which I did not expect to find and I will circle back to that we talk about recommendations.

We spent a lot of time working through and looking at something that everyone who works in the field those that many of these [Indiscernible] more on the perception of the victims credibility than the set of circumstances and there were a couple of big pieces one of them really eye-opening that I will circle back to.

The next one was a lack of sexual assault specific to native advocacy. Although there were lots of advocates, there was very few native advocates. We also were very interested in looking at the key aspects of safety in danger assessment domestic violence cases are well-defined [Indiscernible] we saw that as a missing piece. When we go to every domestic violence call we are asking risk assessment questions and life safety but we do not see the same thing in the sexual assault.

Last, native women were negatively affected by the system's effort to be colorblind. In other words I think there is a strong push toward doing -- undoing racism because of that in many ways there is a lot of cultural incompetency when it comes to dealing with issues involving different races and cultures. I want to circle back to that one as well.

Keri what did you find ?

We had the big picture finding that went into the report but one thing that I'm really liked about this process is you have the opportunity to learn and [Indiscernible] that seemed sort of smaller scale. One thing we found out was one of the agencies sent a letter to a victim that was all caps. When you write like that you are essentially screaming at someone. It was a computer-generated letter that was all caps. That obviously was not one of our big findings but it was something that had an effect on the and it could be easily and thankfully quickly changed.

We had another form that an agency was using that was in triplicates. It was a carbon copy which was almost unheard of. We found there was an agency that really needed that form but that agency was getting the third copy and so it was virtually on readable -- unreadable in every single case. We talked about how it would be easier to do a Xerox and send it.

There were findings like that that never made it into the report that could potentially make a big difference. That is one of the things that I like about this process is because you have the potential to stumble across these things that you would not probably pay any attention to in any other format because you do not have the time or people are used to using that format or that particular form.

That is a good point.

Those are things that still stick out to me years later. I can't believe all caps. We found a variety of different things. In terms of the bigger findings not surprisingly one of the biggest findings that we found was that victims very often did not feel believed when they were meeting with people that were supposed to be helping them. The result of that had a huge impact in how they interacted with the system whether it was advocacy or law enforcement and whether or not they even chose to interact with the system.

Another big finding was in both law enforcement and advocacy we had individuals who were working specifically with sexual assault cases who were not specifically trained in sexual assault. We had a lot of journalists who were much more comfortable in working in domestic violence cases who were handed sexual assault cases and it was assumed they had the same type of expertise and people were reporting they did not have the same expertise and certainly we do not have the same comfort level.

That was a big finding. Big implications in terms of training and resources.

We are coming close to the end of our time. I wanted to go back to John, some your finding she wanted to discuss in the recommendations. I wonder if you could tell us what some of the recommendations were in your community and I will go from there and closes up.

I will touch on a couple, one of the ones that caught my eye was that native women are negatively affected by the system's effort to be colorblind. As we talk through that and dialogue to with what we started to recognize is that a lot of people especially police officers are really a couple talking about any differences between cultural and race. Oftentimes are officers would mystically believe the native victims as they are telling their story aren't being truthful or honest or confused or can't remember because they weren't telling their story in a chronological order in other words like heil -- how I would expect to hear the story. What we discovered talking through that is in the native culture there is something very different called circular storytelling in which it is very common and it is a cultural thing to tell stories that jump around in the timeline. You go back to the moment that he first met her in the talk was something that happened during the sexual assault then it goes back to the event two weeks ago and then move from -- forward to something that happened as they were driving in the car prior to the sexual assault. And as officer started to hear that many of them I think made their decisions thinking something else was going on and not understanding the cultural significance of how they share stories in an entirely different formats.

Once we realize that was happening we were able to get some cultural competent training to help her officers understand that. If you're dealing with the Native American regardless if they are victim of a crime or not and you through this non-chronological telling of events it does not mean anything other than that is the way their culture relays information. I think once we got that, it saddened me to think how many times officers were hearing that in making very poor decisions on it that sabotaged cases in a lot of ways. That was one of the real big significant pieces that we found that we needed to do cultural competent training. We were missing the boat.

On a side note personally I believe there is no possible way I could have ever have seen that outside of going through the audit process that native women that were part of our team, there was a whole number that helped me see something that was sitting right beside it might professional blind spot. -- Right inside of my professional blind spot. Because of this we were able to work in a something that was sabotaging cases for too long.

It is such a good point. Also when I think about what we know now about the brain and about sexual assault and how people [Indiscernible] affects how we collect that information to talk about it, it is similar to what we are talking about that we find in native culture that people are

not able to talk about the experience in a linear manner, they do talk about it in the way that their mind coded it which is usually through the senses.

It is a really great point and kind of a nice point to leave folks with today.

I want to thank all three of you, Mike, John and Keri for being on the call. Mike especially for interrupting your vacation and stopping and talking with us. Thank you very much.

John and Terry thank you as well for taking the time and working with me to develop this webinar

For everyone today, thank you for joining us. I wanted to let you know there are some resources if you're thinking about a community assessment you can check our website. We have training and technical assistance. There is a 16 minute video about the institutional analysis process that you can take a look at. There is a introductory webinar that you can download and listen to from January from this year. Next month our webinar will be learning from survivors. The beginning, the middle and the end of community assessment projects. We will have Alex Wilson from the native women's research project with us. That is May 3 from 2-315 daylight time. We will be preparing for a recruiting on the power of focus groups. Focus groups are the heart of institutional analysis work.

Thank you everyone for listening and for tuning in and thank you Liz, I think that is it for today.

That is it. Just one final detail. When you disconnect from the webinar you will be routed to an evaluation of today's session. Please spare a few moments to share your thoughts about your experience today. It is really important to our future.

Thank you everybody. Take care.

Talk to you next month.

[Event Concluded]

Actions