

**Event ID:** 2663590

**Event Started:** 7/15/2015 2:50:55 PM ET

Please stand by for realtime captions.

---

Good morning or good afternoon depending on where you are. Welcome, everyone. This is dying doses at Praxis international joined by a lot of folks from ALC and Praxis as well as Priya from mono be enjoyed by you classes JK and L are with us today for the keynote address. They are designed to encourage our critical thinking, to stretch our imagination and expand our knowledge base. As some of you know who participate in them before, BO4 class L, your first keynote -- for class L, thinkers, researchers, practitioners, writers, activists working in human rights advocacy both inside and outside the violence against women field. Today we are happy to have Annabelle been joining us as the keynote presenter. Anna has more than 20 years of experience working with nonprofit organizations and on state and federal level policy issues. In 2012, she joined the full frame initiative as the director of network growth and strategy. The full frame initiative mission is to change systems so that people and communities experiencing poverty, violence, trauma have the tools to support some resources they need to thrive. Anna has worked with SSI leading multiyear, statewide project in California, documenting how different stakeholders understand success for domestic violence survivors. We will hear about the project today in our session. Which is success for survivors in California, connection cannot not separation.

---

Before we move into things, welcome, Anna, to our session. Let me turn to Liz for some webinar reminders. Liz?

---

Thank you, Diane. Hello, everyone. Welcome to class L participants. This is your first keynote so we are very happy you can join us today. Briefly, the webinar tips we offer on each webinar session are the same, but I will go over them again and that is to say if there is anyone who is participating in our session, just by telephone only, the best way for you to engage with our speaker today, Anna Melvin would be to send an email to me, Liz at Melvin would be to send an email to me, Liz@tranlinternational.org -- Praxis International.org and I will integrate your comment into our session and training today. For the rest of you who are dissipating in the webinar itself, I will remind you that you are welcomed to chat in a comment or question in the public tab of the chat box on the lower left portion of your screen at any time today. We will -- the ALC staff will keep an eye on your questions and comments and make a point of pointing them out to Anna for the presentation. So you can chat in your comments on that public Or if you have something you would like to chat in privately, double-click on the private tab and you will see the list of presenters, clicking on the presenters will open up an individual feed between you and that person. You are welcome to do so at any point today. Just a couple of other pieces, if you happen to get disconnected to either the telephone, webinar, you should rejoin by your original process and also the session is the recorded and will be available on the ALC archive page of the protected class webpages. You can look for it they are after tomorrow. That is all I have. Diane, I will turn the keynote back to you.

---

Thank you so much, Liz. Classes J, K, and L were last together acute -- a few weeks ago during the July advocacy discussion formally known as our affinity discussions. And that we explored how those of us in domestic violence or dual programs are advocating for battered women

beyond the binary or black and white options of staying or leaving. We had a couple of class participants glory and Nina who helped us explore the ways we are a could strengthen our social change advocacy by understanding what individual survivors want and working to meet those needs. We are interested in finding out how many were able to participate in that webinar. If you could -- there we go. Liz opened up a feedback box. Check net -- yes or no if you are able to participate and if you have any insights, highlights you want to mention, you want to check them in. If you were not able to participate in that session, you can go to the archive event recording page on the ALC website to listen. There are many ways of intersecting with Anna's topic for us today. Looks like a lot of you were able to be a part of that.

---

Some responses still coming in.

---

Thank you for your feedback. If we were to truly do advocacy liberating and not dominating, how can we really listen to dialogue with and learn from survivors? As one of the core principles of social change advocacy states, how can we place the person's reality and actual needs at the center? It starts with finding out what the reality is, what those needs are and we are so happy to have Anil with us to explore this topic. Welcome, Anna. Happy to have you here.

---

Thank you, so much. I'm hoping you can hear me and someone will let me know if they cannot. I suppose if you cannot hear me, then you can't hear me.

---

We can hear you [ Laughter ].

---

Thank you for having me and thank you for Praxis international and Advocacy Learning Center for Liz and Diane for making it a topic that was started talking about doing this webinar when I remember Liz and I were emailing when it was cold and freezing out, which could have been any time basically up until April where I live. It was many months ago and have -- at the time, July 15 felt far in the future. I am pleased both because the weather is nice out and more importantly that we are finally here together today and it seems like great timing given the conversation many have participated in the last couple of weeks. What I will do mostly for the next hour-hour and 20 minutes is do most talking and sharing information with you. And very much hoping to hear from you through the Paul's and through the chat box sort of what your thoughts and feelings are and where the information I'm sharing alliance or challenging some of the things that challenges you guys have been doing through the ALC as well. Thank you for having me and everybody, thank you for being here.

---

And amended I'm going to tell you more about who the full frame initiative is and then move onto talking specifically about this multiyear project we have in California. I would like to start by just hearing quickly from you all. Cool -- what is a representation on the webinar today? I want to say, we know your job is not who you are in your HRT and hopefully you have roles on identities in your life. For the purposes of this webinar, what is a professional at you are wearing. If you're from a domestic violence, sexual assault or dual advocacy program, a culturally specific duty or essay or dual up program, tribal government program, coalition, or if you -- if your role defies labels, chat in if you don't feel like you fit into ABC ready -- A, B, C, or the.

---

We have two thirds of folks that are DSAR dual advocacy from advocacy programs which makes me think most of you are probably advocates and we have a few -- 5% from culturally specific programs. Glad to have you here.

---

Interesting. Good. Thank you. I'm going to move on and I think I now have dashed line of control? No. Someone else will do this for me.

---

Let me tell you about the full frame initiative. The purpose of this webinar is not just to tell you about us but in our work, we do many -- VR Systems change organization and we have products across the country and work with many partners and today we will focus specifically on one of those projects but I do want to give you a little bit of context for who we are and I think it is important to understand how and why we do the work we do because we are not your traditional technical assistance and training organization in any real way. So we began 10 years ago when our founder Katja Smith set out to understand why a handful of social service programs, not just sexual assault but all kinds of social service programs, why these particular programs were having better outcome with people are struggling at the intersection of poverty, trauma, and that --, and violence compared to many other programs across the country. For the most part, these were organizations that were working with people and families that had either failed out or had been kicked out of every other program or system that was available to them. I know you all know who the people and families are they often struggle with multiple challenges often intergenerational and just do not do well in traditional systems and yet these are people and families that were thriving and doing well and had better outcomes. Conti and her colleagues wanted to find out why. What was different about these programs. What they discovered was that these organizations were doing their work in a fundamentally different way. They may have been providing similar services and it looked similar on paper, but they shared what we have come to call a common DNA. We call that DNA full frame practice. At the center and heart of this full frame program -- practice is a center, focus on well-being. And includes both a set of principles and values, how the organization believes and how they organize their work and as different ways of working with people, what they do, which is different. So full frame practice includes focusing on people, not their problems so seeing the whole person with a range of both challenges and assets, just not just in people as victims or survivors of domestic violence. Supporting well-being and recognizing and addressing the trade-offs that exist in every system and in all of our lives. I will tell you more about this. When we talk about supporting well-being, we are talking about specifically this framework that you see here, the five domains of well-being which came from the field. This is not a theater article framework or a framework that we devised and then decided let's see if it actually resonates with people. It actually happened the opposite it this is a framework from -- came from talking people like you who are supportive people programs and people who are receiving services and this is our tool and framework for well-being. The recognizing trade-off is important because full framed programs work to minimize the trade-offs that create barriers to long-term change in well-being. All of us -- I should say this remark applies to everybody. If not of framework for survivors of domestic violence. It's not a framework for survivors of sexual assault. It's not a framework for people who are homeless or struggling with addiction. It's a framework for all people. It applies to all of us and we are all working to achieve balance with the five domains of well-being and minimize the trade-off between them.

---

Anna, this is media can I ask you the graphic is a little bit small, can you read off the five domains for us? Like absolutely. Social connectedness, stability, safety, which I know we are all familiar with, mastery and meaningful access to relevant resources. And we have very specific definitions of each of those domains which you can find on our website that as you -- as I said, the point of the webinar, I wanted to give you the information is context but I'm not going to go through the five domains in any real detail.

---

Let me leave it at that for now and if there are questions we can come back to them. In the interest of getting to the California project, I'm going to move forward. Quickly, I want to share with you our purpose and mission. I do this in this specific order for a reason. It is because we did not create our mission and then set out to figure out the best way to achieve it. Instead, as I mentioned, we learned an incredible amount of what it really -- what works to marginalize communities and then we articulated our purpose which is that we believe that everybody has a right to well-being and therefore our work is too great access to well-being and the conditions and climates to co-create the conditions and climates that support more of it. I'm really, this should say help co-create as opposed to -- we are not doing this alone. We are doing it in partnership with people. You can see the mission as well. The last thing I want to say is that as I mentioned, even though I am not going to be focusing specifically on the five domains of well-being today, the purpose of the California project was not to prove ourselves with that framework. Interestingly, what we heard over and over again from the people participated in the project is to further support what we had around five domains of well-being. While it was not the purpose, it was an outcome of the project which will understand more as I move forward.

---

I want to do another poll. I want to ask you all, I know this is going to be tough but I'm going to ask you to choose the phrase that you see on the slide that best describes how you would define success in your own life. I know this is hard but I'm going to ask you to choose one for the purposes of this exercise. Success is about minimizing problems and challenges be, success is about having a rewarding relationship with your friends, family, community, feeling a sense of belonging and connectedness. Uppercase C would be getting back, creating value for others in your life. D, physically and/or emotionally safe. Success is about being safe however you -- however you define. And D, I'm not sure if we get an E. But you can chat it in if D is about achieving something for yourself, get a good job, learning how to change your tire, staying sober for a period of time, we ask that you share that

---

Do not see anybody -- is anybody chatting and -- one person chatted in D -- E. 60% chose B having rewarding relationships. And 30% or so picked giving back. And 5% said minimizing problems. As I said, we had a couple of people saying that they would pick E. Great. Nice to know. I know it is hard to the still that down to one letter. Let's move onto this project I want to tell you about what we will move into and the bulk of the conversation today is about how survivors of domestic violence, those who self identify, define success in their own lives. And you can see that this is a new project to address a commonly overlooked question. And I want to tell you a bit about the goals that we had for this project. The goals are to begin to help fill what we found was a knowledge gap about how survivors talk about success for themselves, not how programs are other people talk about success for the survivors. We wanted to start from a place of learning from success, not crisis response or problem-solving. We wanted to identify active -- opportunities for change. How can we use this project and we we learned to strengthen responses

and systems for survivors and we paid close attention to creating access for folks who identify and making sure we have access for folks from different cultural and linguistic communities as well. The real question for me here was how can the various systems that touch survivors lives help support how survivors define success for themselves and as a survivors defined not survivor centered. And I think there's a difference there. As the field I should say I've been doing domestic violence work for more than 20 years so I can consider myself part of the field. I think we have done a great job coming back to our roots and that is putting survivors at the center of our work and I think there is something different from deciding how we define what survivors entered is and really being a field and movement that is survivor defined the extent that was why I was hoping to begin to move toward in this project and how can we essentially better integrate all of these systems toward a shared idea of success that is driven by survivors themselves. We start by understanding how survivors talk about success in their own lives. They use the word commonly overlooked, the worst commonly intentionally. Because I want to say clearly that we know that in particular, and culturally specific communities and many culturally specific programs around the country, this is a question that has been and is being explored and has been for years. I know you all had started this conversation so I just want to say the full frame initiative does not believe we are the only ones asking this question and yet I believe that the mainstream domestic violence world field has not paid good enough attention to this question. We've asked a lot about the effectiveness of programs and what survivors experience and services, which is important, but that already starts with the assumption that's success is about access to services or programs. So what we want to do is take a really big step back and create an opportunity for survivors to tell us about success however they wanted without a lot of assumptions or parameters.

---

I am pausing as I move forward just in case anybody wants to ask a question.

---

I'm going to refined -- remind people as we go through this that we have time at the upper questions but if anyone has a question as we go through, please feel free to check them in and we will pull them into the conversation.

---

Great. Thank you. I will be doing a little bit of pausing so I'm not talking out in cyberspace. The bottom line about what we learned. Moving into details about what the project entails and what we found but I want to give you -- I call it the bottom line but maybe it's a headline, it's some line here. What we found was there was actually a significant disconnect between how survivors think about and define success in their own lives and how other stakeholders define success. I will tell you more about who the stakeholders were. The flipside of that coin is that there was a great deal of commonality between survivors and a lot of commonality between practitioners and other stakeholders. Interestingly, survivors across the state, there was very little variation and no statistical significance in differences and how they talked about success. One of the lessons here for me is that survivors are more like -- alike than different which I think is an important thing to recognize. Success for survivors and this project is not about traditional ideas of safety -- safety for separation of services which I think it's probably aligned with and hopefully builds on all complements the conversation that you all are having about moving away from this idea that success is just about leaving a relationship are staying. We found that culturally specific programming has a very wide reaching relevance and in particular, relevance I think for all of us working in this field. I want to be clear that what I am not saying that because everybody is

similar -- more similar than different that we don't meet -- need culturally specific programming. That's not what I'm saying. There is an important and critical role for programs and communities to organize themselves and support themselves in ways that are culturally specific and culturally relevant and appropriate. With that said, what I think the lesson for me is that those of us that identify in the mainstream domestic and sexual violence world which I include myself in that have a lot more to learn from culturally specific programs than I think we have recognized in the past. In the past, we have separated and said Thomas that -- those practices and finding things only applied culturally specific and I think we need to change the way that we are orienting ourselves and shift what we consider to be those at the margins and those at the center. Some of you may be familiar with national organizing called Cox of the Speranza and the partner organization, the national Tina network. Carla fine who used to be a -- at Casa, we talk about the cost of where culturally specific practices are relevant for mainstream communities but not this opposite is not necessarily true. It's not always vice versa and that is absolutely what I think this project founded on. The last bullet, the field is really ready for change. This was a surprise to us. We thought after we did the first phase of the project which I will talk about, we thought we were going to be up against a fair amount of Bush -- pushback. And having to defend our findings and instead, what we found was people are in particular practitioners, folks like you all on the webinar who are supporting survivors and systems and programs are hungry for these findings and are eager to shift our work, the field, the movement back toward -- away from places response services and social change -- more towards social change and justice.

---

Just pausing. Let me tell you about what the project was what we did. This was a mix of significant moment reflection and appreciative inquiry which some may be familiar with. This project focused heavily on exploration and learning and innovation and was not a traditional evaluation project. This was not a project to evaluate the effectiveness of programs or services, per se and it was not even research with a capital R. In the sense that we evolved even as we went along. It was a 2.5 almost three-year project and we shifted some of what we did as we learned which is not how traditional research is John. I think it is important to tell you that. We also did not collect demographic or personally identifying information for the work shop dispense. And as some people have challenge that is appropriate and fine but were really wanted to create a process that was as accessible as possible and we had a sense that the more information -- personal and demographic information we asked from people, the more potential barriers there were to accessing the project so we didn't. And the project was guided by a national advisory Council of 21 folks from around the country, both representing California and national perspectives and eight variety of -- in a variety of disciplines.

---

Let's get down to the nuts and bolts. What did we do? We started with literature review, reviewing 27 sources from the United States, Canada, and the UK and in particular, we are looking to understand how the literature talks about survivors themselves. And what we found was very few specific references to survivors success and instead we found a lot about measures of program success. Those two concepts were conflated but survivor success was considered in the context only of a program had met if outcome and most of the outcomes were really related to labeling or responding to people as victims or perpetrators and not necessarily as a whole people who may have these experiences. For example, how many protection orders were granted or how many California hours were given -- counseling hours were given. Those are measures of success we found. That reinforce what we suspected, which was that there was a place for this

project and a need to begin to fill some of that knowledge gap. What we did was set out to do workshops with survivors and practitioners to understand how they defined success for survivors. We started -- we were a little bit naïve to say that word, we started in July 2012 and we thought -- this is a statewide project across California and we thought we would do about 18 workshops, mostly with practitioners may be handful of survivors and that would be it. What we found and heard within one month or two and part of the reason was we thought it would be difficult to break into communities. That's probably more of a valid term that I'm -- then I mean. We had a lot of connections in California and the full frame initiative is not based in California. So we had the sense that people may not be entirely open to the project and it may take us time to build investment and enthusiasm for it. And Wyrick -- wow, were we wrong. July 2012 we started, September 2012 we had to go back to the funder and say there is such demand for these workshops, we need -- the funder was Blue Shield of California foundation. A great partner for us. We had to go back to Blue Shield of California foundation is a there is so much demand for the workshops, we have to expand the project. So we did. We ended up doing 25 workshops with survivors, 150 survivors across the state. We ended up doing 21 workshops with 186 practitioners and those practitioners, two thirds were in what I will call mainstream or traditional domestic violence programs. The other third work during other service settings. Settings where DV may not be their primary mission but they are seeing survivors so they might include free healthcare clinics, healthcare for the homeless clinics, long-term housing programs, LGBT welcome centers, supervised visitation centers, places like that. In addition, we also did 12 interviews with policy advocates and funders as our -- there were three stakeholder groups, practitioners, policy advocates and funders. I'm not going to spend a ton of time on those, the findings from the interviews today. I think we have one slide about it. I can certainly share more later but the end for the interviews were so small. Nothing of the interviews was dramatically different than what we heard from practitioners. I don't think it adds a huge amount of information. The everything we did early in the project was we added this cultural and linguistic access pilot. We heard from many folks including Advisory Council early on that our idea of providing language interpreters during the workshops would -- was not adequate enough to appropriate way of creating access for people for whom English was not there first language. What we do is -- we created a pilot. I will tell you about that in a minute.

---

You can see the five workshops thing here. Of these 25 workshops with survivors, five of those you will hear me refer to as a pilot workshop and those were actually done by non-SSI staff and were done in culturally specific communities in their own communities and in their own languages. I hope that makes sense. I'm happy to answer questions. I see a lot of conversation in the chat box which I do not follow entirely but I will pause in case there are questions about the workshops themselves or what we did.

---

Thank you, Anna. We had one specific question regarding your national advisory Council

---

Sure.

---

Whether it is listed on your website

---

I do not know if it is listed but it is listed in the report which I have a link in this presentation and that is on our website which I can share separately. The list of advisory Council members is available. I do not think we are listing it on the website because the project was wrapped up

---

And the other lives was offering to send people copies of this PDF of this presentation. There are folks requesting that. Praxis ails the one strong connections to what we explore in the Advocacy Learning Center that there are many ways it overlaps and intersects with the conversations we had throughout the 18 month course. So very helpful to think about this in that context, in the context of our work. As I hear you, I think it is really encouraging that part of what you found is that people want to have these conversations and want to do that around this

---

Yes. And when we think -- get to the end of the presentation I will share with you what we are doing next that technically the project is wrapped up and we are building on it and starting another project

---

I will share some of that as well and I think it's a good segue. You can see I described the phase 1 which took us to -- from July 2012 to about I would say October October 2013 I think. 2013. That was phase 1 and what we did was spent a couple of months the end of 2013 which seems like eons ago, we spent that time to use a technical term analyzing data, making sense of it and we did both a quantitative analysis effortlessly allowed -- and houses and qualitative story and houses which is detailed in the report. I will not go into a lot of detail about that. We brought in a number of folks as consultants to help us do that coding because myself and Audrey Jordan who is the primary -- the other primary staff person, she's African-American but we consider ourselves to be mainstream Western American people and so we wanted -- we partnered with representatives and allies from culturally specific communities so we could make sure the coding we were doing was not entirely biased and was impossible to eliminate all biased but we didn't want to just [ indiscernible ]. Starting in January through July July 2014, we engaged in phase 2. What we did was essentially took what we understood to be our findings and the sense we had made, the meaning we heard from the findings and went back out into California and the F-15 conversations with 19 mixed groups of stakeholders presented our findings and did it in such a way that we ask people what resonates for you, what don't you agree with, what -- surprises and what he wants to do with these reclamation -- recommendations. I with these findings, what should be the recommendations from the field. We fell -- feel strongly that it is not up to SSI solely to say what should happen, that should come from the field and the folks on the ground. That was phase 2 of -- and that is where really we began to hear clearly how excited and eager people were for the findings themselves which we can talk about the recommendations. I will share about what the recommendations were. Let me tell you quickly about what this pilot was. This took place in July 2013. We brought 12 participants by invitation word-of-mouth recruitment together for a one-day train the trainer where we essentially trained these folks who are representative of culturally specific communities. We trained them to go out and do the workshops on our behalf. Again, those five pilot workshops came out of these 12 participants did a total of five workshops for a number of reasons, two of them were done in English but with Native American communities. One was done in Thai, Mandarin, and in Spanish. When you hear me refer to those five pilot workshops, those are the workshops that were not done by Audrey and I but done by the pilot participants. Essentially, what we did over that day is experienced the workshop as participants and we spent the rest of the afternoon helping them talk through and

they help us customize the process and content to be culturally relevant for their own communities and languages.

---

I want to share the actual workshop process itself. If I don't keep us up on notes we will be here for four hours.

---

We call these workshops and not focus groups for important reasons. Traditional focus groups ask a question and everybody answers it and then you ask another question and everybody answers it and it is one directional and a very linear you ask a question and answer, ask a question and answer. These workshops we that -- we had anywhere from 6 to 8 people in these workshops and someone -- 8 to 10 people in the practitioner workshops. We had specific criteria for setting up the workshops they had to be in a place that had the dorm walls and we wanted to sit in a circle and be able to see each other if there was always food there were no children we asked people not bringing children but we wanted to focus on the task at hand we gave every survivor a \$20 gift card to target or Walmart as a thank you for their time. This is the actual process we used. You can see all of this in the report and see copies of this. We asked survivors to -- started by asking everybody in the survivor workshop to identify a single moment in time when it felt right for them. The moments that we all have where you feel like everything is clicking and we talked a lot about recognizing for most of us, first of all these moments do not happen all the time. When they happen, we -- they are fleeting and don't last long. Hopefully everybody who is on the call can conjure up a couple of seconds thrown together where you felt on top of the world, felt like everything was right. Those were the moments we were looking for it we asked everybody to take a couple moments to think through about their moment they could draw pictures or doodle or whatever they wanted to do and then we asked one by one everybody in the workshop went around and described their moments in what we call a verbal picture. We asked all kinds of details, tell us what you are wearing, was it hot, cold and where were you and who else was there and what did you see, smells, all of those things. So we could help and habit the moment so we could figure out -- we could be in the moment with the person describing. Each workshop was two hours. The workshop built on that first moment. We asked for people to identify who are what made the moment possible what we girl enabling factors, what did you do as a person describing the moment to make the moment possible and what did others do. Was it fate, God, faith, what are the factors that went into the moment being possible. Then we asked, what do you do in between these great moments. Who or what helps keep you going. We talked about recognizing that we do not have these moments on the time. We are lucky if we have a couple every day. For a lot of us in particular, folks struggling with poverty, violence and other challenges, there are crappy days in between. So we wanted to know what else goes on for folks. What do they do to get by in these moments? And you can see we did a parallel process with the practitioners. Be difference was -- we asked them to identify a moment where it felt right for survivor that they worked with or were working with. That's an important distinction. I want to name it clearly that for the survivors we were asking them to pinpoint the moment for themselves and their own lives and for the practitioners, we were asking them to point point -- pinpoint a moment for someone they worked with recently. And the rest of the process has to do with what did this person do to make the moment possible, what did others do, what did you do as someone supporting the survivor. Was it fate, God, what are the factors. We also asked how did you feel in the moment and Wes practitioners what happens in between these moments, what did the survivor to do to keep him or her growing in between the great moments. This is a different

workshop process than your traditional group. I see a question but let me ask this -- finish this thought. One question you don't see on the slide which is because I felt like they were enough words on the slide already, but we asked everybody at the end of the workshop to put aside the moments and come back to the present time and asked what was the experience of the workshop for you. Was it different than you expected? What did you expect and how was it different. I will share what we found. I tell you that because to be honest we added that on as part -- a throwaway question. We were curious. What we found in terms of the answers to the questions actually proved to be an important data point for the larger project.

---

Is a question in the chat box and I will answer this and give people a chance pick this is where I get questions about the workshop process itself. Williams is asking if we included death culture NASL. -- DEAF Culture and ASL. It's not because we didn't think it was important. I should of told you that when we -- I think I did say that early on in the project with expanded the scope of the number of workshops and almost tripled it. The truth is we could have done 400 workshops. We had so much demand and so many people saying you need to do workshops with this subgroup, this subgroup, this culturally specific community, etc. We were -- they were time and resource limitations. We could still be doing this project. I say that not as an excuse and not to be evasive but to recognize both that we felt we had a pretty good representation of survivors, specifically geographically around the state and recognized that there are a lot of survivors we didn't talk to in a lot of different identity groups and cultures. That was the reality of the project.

---

I'm pausing in case anyone has questions about the project.

---

If there are questions, check those in. I imagine many are here -- eager to hear about the results.

---

Tillie is a question about the the program study to their own workshops in their ongoing way?

---

Good question. I'm not sure if I know the answer to that. In some ways is not possible to follow up with everybody. What we know is that we have gotten an unbelievable and overwhelming demand for project findings and report which came out last November, November 2014. There has been a tidal wave of interest in learning from the findings and incorporating them and I know that we gave people the end of each workshop the opportunity to take a copy of the questions and certainly heard anecdotally from folks that they would incorporate not just the questions, but the approach to starting from what's going well and I will talk more about that toward the end of the presentation. My feeling is the answer is yes. And I cannot give you any data about how many or which ones.

---

A follow-up comment about it being a good idea to contact deaf agencies to interview with survivors.

---

That is a good idea. Unfortunately, we are not necessarily -- I will tell you more about what we are doing next. This workshop best project was wrapped up in this iteration. If other folks are interested in using our workshop process and or building on this particular project, I would be interested in having a conversation about what that might look like and how we can support you.

---

Is another question but I suspect we will come back to the answer as you discuss.

---

Quick summary. This was the fear project. It's wrapped up in a couple loves -- of slides. Forgive me for a fair amount of nuance and depth and richness that cannot become they'd in a PowerPoint screen. Here is the bottom line. Survivors themselves, we talk to about 151 survivors across the state of California. What we heard overwhelmingly was that over 55% of those moments of success fundamentally had to do with connection to family and friends and what people call their tribe, community and not what the field traditionally thought of survivors which was separating from abusive relationships. 50% had to do with connection. Thinking about the five domains of well-being, this is where again, we did not set out to prove the framework right and clearly social connectedness is critical to people's success.

---

The number two and number three themes that we heard when doing coding, frequency and story and now this was achieving something of value for self and others so this is what we call internally these I did it moments. And the moments of what I call normalcy. Moments like the woman who described having her friends over and they were playing cards and laughing. That was a moment. I can speak for myself as someone who is not living at the intersection of poverty, trauma and violence. I get those moments every day and don't notice them. I take a lot of that for granted as part of my life. That stood out. Those were the three was a connection that separation, achieving something of value for self and others and the idea that moments and moments of calm and normalcy. -- I did it moments and moments of calm and normalcy.

---

Hopefully this will not come as a big surprise, this mirrors a lot of what you said was a success in your own life. I will come back to that. This is important. The experience of domestic violence was simply not central to the moments of success that we heard. Remember that we gave survivors an opportunity to talk about success in any context and any moment, the only parameter we gave people was we asked people to pick a moment in their adult life and not go back to childhood. I can only think of the one of 150 or so survivors that her moment was in childhood but everybody else was about adulthood. We did not hear about domestic violence as essential identity or central experience in terms of the context of success. In fact, those I did it moments of achieving something for self and others were not moments of I left, meaning I let the abusive relationship. Only 7% of all the moments overall had anything to do with changes in the abusive relationship. I want to say something else, I want to talk about the 7%. For many of those, the change in the abusive relationship actually came after or as a result of experiencing a different kind of success. These I did it moments. For me, this is flipping the narrative. I was trained in DV work 20 or more years ago and I feel like I was -- the narrative I was given was very much -- and continues to be that if only we can help people get away from the person who's abusing them and get away from the abusive relationship and all kinds of other great things will be possible in their lives. The first steppingstone is these more traditional ideas of safety through separation. Interestingly, what we heard instead was that survivors who can create or achieve all kinds of other great things in their lives that have nothing to do with domestic violence, then realize maybe I can make a change in the relationship maybe I want to make a shift or leave; therefore, it changes the order that we set up our assistance to support. It raises really critical questions about if this is the case, then as people supporting survivors, what is our role. If our role is to increase safety and separation if that is what he or she ultimately wants, and may be that our first response should be not about the domestic violence what we call mastery and other places of her life. I know people have questions. Let me tell you about practitioners, how they

defined survivor success and then happy to take questions and hear from folks about what you are thinking. For the practitioners, their moments of survivor success more than 65% were characterized by what I call breakthrough insights or big shift in personal agency and transformation. On all of them in the context of the relationship itself. These breaks desperate to insights might be a moment where she stood up and support group, and said I don't have to take this anymore or don't deserve this. More than 65% of moments for practitioners, that's what it was about. Interestingly, 30% of the moments that practitioners thought about were about their own since it that success or a combination of the survivor practitioner success. They were moments like this success was about the program being available to the survivor, services being available, and community collaboration that worked for the survivor to help her get what she needed. 90% of practitioners moments happened in the context of a formal service. Actual active service. Things like during a support group or case management session or California session -- counseling session, which means 10% were not. Those 10% with things like I ran into her at the grocery store and the moment happened there over I got a text three years later where I was at her son's graduation. These everyday activities. The last thing I want to say it, these findings held true across all geographic mainstream and culturally specific communities. As I mentioned earlier, we did not see statistically significant or any real differences in terms of how survivors talk about success for themselves in this project and how practitioners were talking about survivors success.

---

We have one question.

---

Nancy in the Chad asked, what do we classify someone as a survivor versus a [ indiscernible ] especially given the success conversation.

---

A great question. I don't know. I don't have a specific answer. I will take this. For all of our promotional materials like flyers and working with programs and community members to set up the workshop, we spent a great deal of time talking about the word survivor, victim and how do we worded. I tell you that because we try to be intentional and were by no means -- it was not a perfect process. We used people who have experienced domestic about -- violence people who identify as having experienced domestic violence, knowing full well that most people do not identify with the term survivor and victim and yet we ended up using the terms survivor honestly as shorthand because it was a big project and because it was a big report and I'm not saying that is right but it was convenience factor. What we heard clearly -- we heard the DV was not central and we heard people in the workshops that they feel buried under these labels. These labels serve to pigeonhole them and silo their experiences outside of the context of their full lives. I think it is mirrored in practitioner -- they felt the same. You can see 90% happen in the formal context because that is the -- systems are set up for that is where the relationship gets filled. I'm going off the tangent from the question asked. We gave this thought and I do not know that we ever came up with the right answer

---

Others have thought the responses to Nancy's question and Anna's comments on that, victim survivor. Chapels in the accident -- chat those in

---

Would you say your work was in organizing effort? Did you want programs to take up work in this way? Talking with women about what they want or need. What was the desired outcome?

---

I would like to hold that -- hold off on answering that fully. The short answer is absolutely, yes. We are a systems change organization, not a training NTA organization, not a research organization. Everything we do is to better our understanding of what it takes to support people in their path toward well-being. Absolutely, we are not as a person recommended to go back and do interviews with survivors and the deaf community. We are not in a position to do only this work as our work but we hope and the goal was that this would spark more conversations and work and learning and not be an isolated project that hangs out there only for webinar conversations. They are critical, but how do we translate this into the actual work we do. I will report does a good job of talking in detail. For example, if moments of calm and normalcy are critical to people's success, what does that mean for our program? The question I would ask is, how can I offer opportunities for either achievement, achieving things that have nothing to do with the DVR relationship -- DV or relationship and having a sense of calm or normalcy. How do systems create -- how are they set up to create barriers to that. There are programs that talk about reaching goals and be motivated and being out doing things every day. Maybe that is not the only answer. I will leave it there for now.

---

This raises interesting questions and is the thinking that all of the people on this webinar are doing as part of -- many of us prior who work at the ALC but continuing to do it more intensively during this course. Thank you so much for these -- giving more food for thought since you described this project.

---

I just want to say, till he is writing that there are some things in a position to help people with. That is true. I don't -- I appreciate the reminder. I am in no way saying -- a good segue into the next slide.

---

I'm not going to read this to you. But you will have a chance to see the presentation. These were some quotes that I pulled out the illustrated survivors moments. You can get the sense in their own words about where we got the themes and findings. I will give you a moment to look at that and you will have access to the presentation. Similarly, examples of practitioners moments for survivor success. So you can get a sense of what I was talking about when saying breakthrough moments. She looked at her head, unfolded her body, the per -- person is about victim to survivor. We heard from survivors that the labels are systematically unhelpful. Practitioners talked about our role as practitioners as being helping people transition from victim to survivor and raises important questions about our role and are we in a position to shift roles depending on what survivors tell us.

---

Let me remind us, we started each workshop by asking about moments of success and moved into what we call who and what may the moment possible. I want to share the findings. I'm going to go through the next few slides more quickly.

---

Was survivors told us how they get to success, the non-pilots. 20 workshops of survivors did the number one thing that helps them get to moments of success are themselves. Number two, friends and family. Number three, professionals. That would be us, practitioners and programs.

Most often they named a specific person, Carlisle, my children's advocate for Darlene, my legal advocate as opposed to this program as a whole. Which tells me it's a lot about connection, relationship. The pilots, other five workshops, friends and family was number one, not of faith was number two, this happen to be number five for the non-pilot in the coding. And then self. I share this because this was the only notable difference that we found in all of the workshops across survivors -- survivor workshops. I want to be clear, coming back to Tilly's point, I don't think we should interpret findings that services and professionals are not helpful or important. Particularly for those facing imminent threats to safety who need to hide and need safety playing as well as a range of support. Absolutely plans and services to play an important role. For me the question is what is that role. It's not a question of whether or not we are important but is the significance to other people to survivors different than the significance we place on our services. If we create opportunity for people to have common normalcy, and may not be what we think is our primary role. That may be what people get from our programs. It's not about eliminating programs or services are thinking we are not important, but I think it raises important questions about what is significance and how can we continue to strengthen our responses to what survivors tell us they want and need.

---

Practitioners -- [ indiscernible ] number one was survivor. Actions that he or she has taken or personality. Number two, the protectionist actions, something I did and or just the fact that the program had resources and services available and friends and family. You can see there are similar themes but different order. Practitioners are recognizing that survivors themselves and informal connections are critical but they are overemphasizing systems compared to survivors.

---

Let's do a quick poll. I know we are coming up on our time. Let's see where people are in a more anonymous way than the chat box. How many people feel overall what I have shared affirms what you know about how survivors define success for themselves, whether or not it affirms what you already know about how systems and procedures define success, whether or not it challenges what you believe or have heard in the past and or giving you new ideas or thoughts on working with survivors.

---

73% are clicking D new ideas and thoughts about working with survivors. 8% affirm what they know about survivors already and an equal part say they affirm -- it affirms with a new already.

---

Interesting hearing responses. I wonder if people are willing or comfortable if there is an idea or thought that it raises for you, if you chose D and you want to chat that in. I would be interested in hearing the thoughts it's raising for people.

---

Absolutely. Check them in a let's come back to them. There's a question about the pilot and non-pilot. The non-pilot with a 20 workshops for survivors that were facilitated by myself and Audrey or SSI staff. Mostly Audrey and I did most. The pilot workshops where the five workshops that were survivor workshops facilitated by people in culturally specific communities that we trained to do the workshop in their own community and in their own language.

---

I want to quickly share, I will not go through word by word. Hopefully you remember me saying at the end of the workshop we asked about the experience and the workshop itself and through that in as an add on question at the end and what we learned quickly was that this was an

incredible data point for us. We heard first overwhelmingly positive feedback about the experiences themselves. People talked about how it was so different than business as usual and different practitioners talked about how they never get the time and space to talk about what's going well for the people we work with. And starting with going -- with what's going on and building on that as an avenue to increase safety and well-being -- well-being. I don't want to dismiss that that it comes from real threats that people work with and what we heard over and over from both survivors of practitioners was a hunger and need to spend more time learning systematically learning from what goes well in people's lives. I don't know if anyone feels this way, but by practitioners -- survivors feel by late -- feel buried by labels and practitioners do as well. They talk in phase 2 about feeling like they know this is their best work and feel constrained by the various systems that defined their work for them.

---

You could interpret this but it's a huge opportunity which I will talk about in a minute. You will have this in the presentation when you get a copy. I said we did 12 interviews with policymakers. We did not hear anything particularly different that we heard from practitioners. What we heard world -- was about being able to make your own decision and that is achieved through access to services. No surprise to anybody have a webinar, we also heard a fair amount of inconsistency about where people think definitions of success come from. Practitioners told us they are responding to funders definitions and funders told her that's told us they are responded to grantee definitions and neither one is about five -- survivors definitions. Both are frustrating and an opportunity for shifting some things.

---

Let me tell you what came out of phase 2. We had three primary recommendations. Getting back to the question of what was our goal. The goal was to understand better how the fibers that survivors defend -- define success. There's no point in learning that unless we do something with it. The full frame initiative is interested in using findings to improve systems for survivors and practitioners and we are in no allusion to do that alone. We are hoping -- I will tell you about number two because that is where we start our effort, hoping other folks want to take the findings and create change and we would love to partner with you on that but we don't feel it is our role to lead all bad. A recommendation was we need a shared definition of program success that is actually based on what survivors tell us is their success that can be stakeholders involved. People wanted more concrete skill developed -- development on what it means to support survivors and what does it mean to work with survivors communities and tribes and the places where they find belonging outside of programs. Even beyond support groups for survivors, thinking about their connections outside of programs. Number two, coming back to the calm -- commonality of the workshop experience of wanting to shift the fields focus from just responding to crisis and just learning from what's gone wrong to learning from what goes well. I think about fatality reviews which are very critical and give us a lot of information about where systems failed because someone has clearly died if we are doing a fatality review. But if we are not looking at all of the examples where no one dies, where people are actually surviving and thriving, we are only looking at a portion, maybe half of the information out there. And you can tell I feel passionately about this, what we heard from practitioners was that we need to equip the field and community feels to systematically learn from what's going well. The full frame initiative started a new project in California which I'm not going to tell you about about -- now but I will share off-line. We started in April, project where we work with three communities in California to build their capacity and skilled development specifically on asset-based skill building and learning from

what goes well to apply the new skills to their own communities and terms of improving response for survivors. We do not feel like it is our place or roll to take the lead on this but number two is where we are focusing our next efforts this context. I want to pause for questions. Bear with me and I will finish up the slides there was a question about what does this look like. What does it mean for the field? I put together a quick slide, a small piece of what we can do. A couple things are we can ask questions of the people we are working with. Instead of focusing on problems and what is going on and what people need, we can start with what is going well. What is a great day, what does that look like. Who helps you and is most important to you, etc. We can learn about positive deviance for those who may not know what that is, it is a whole field of research that focuses on if you are looking at a community that is really struggling and there are one, two, three people who are thriving. Instead of discounting those people as anomalies, positive deviance actually focuses research and efforts on understanding what is the difference for those folks that might be applicable to other folks in the community. I find it fascinating. And strengthen efforts and build on what we are doing already to learn from culturally specific programs to bridge those at the margins with those at the center.

---

I don't want this to be a poll. I just want to come full circle and I promise I will stop talking. I want us to think about you answered the questions initially. Most people take while rewarding relationships with friends and family. This directly reflects what survivors told us in the project. The next one was giving back, creating value for others which reflects what we heard from survivors in the project. Maybe minimizing problems. B and C were the top of this webinar. I remind us of that because I want us to think about his success in our lives means connection to family and friends and community and creating value for ourselves and others, and that is what we hear from survivors, then I feel like we have a responsibility to recognize we are more alike as human beings, survivors or not, then different and our programs and systems should reflect that. Programs and systems and services should reflect how we think about success in our own lives and not think we are so different than the people we serve that they would think about success differently. I'm not being particularly at this moment but I hope to get my point of boss -- point across.

---

I'm going to stop talking acts --

---

Opening it up for thoughts and reactions. A lot of you feel like you learned new things today and it affirmed what you thought already and I would love if you want to share your thinking and if there are questions I can answer, more than happy to do so.

---

Thank you, Anna. Keeping an eye on these chats. People are charting -- chatting about connection versus separation and in the ALC we explore what are the ways that we had shifted in our advocacy and created us and them and us as advocates or assist practitioners and then as victims or survivors and so much of what you are discussing challenges that notion. Affirms what it is we are exploring in the ALC.

---

Linda comments we are all interdependent and it's important we don't separate. Christina mentions liking the part of asking different questions. Sarah says affirming what we've discussed in the ALC. One of the exercises is referencing trying to get off the island of violence. We do an exercise that our in-person event where we explore and recognize and acknowledge the

magnitude of violence against women and the different ways that it affects women who are marginalized or women facing multiple forms of oppression and for us as advocates, recognizing we are part of that globe where this violence is happening that we are not separate from those we are advocating for.

---

Right. And all of that being absolutely true and people are more than just the trauma and balance they've experienced

---

Exactly. Tilly was referencing in the chat, we have a model we use around social change advocacy including several core principles and they echo a lot of what you described them a recognizing intersection of complexity that is not just a single aspect or event of violence. How are we connecting as advocates and with survivors and also how are we connecting survivors with other survivors with communities and supportive networks. Looking at some chat defining success for organization and [ indiscernible ] terms does not bode well for our clients and successes.

---

Striving to understand the needs and address those.

---

I want to build on that. I am hoping I'm also leaving you with it is absolutely understanding people's needs and also understanding what is going well and their assets and I don't mean assets like cars. All of those are hidden and buried community assets and informal resources that people have if we just do understanding. I don't want to dismiss or undermine at all that people are coming with very real and severe challenges but they are also coming with a range of assets and strengths and it is asked critical that we understand those. Absolutely. Again, what we think about it as connection versus separation and recognizing the ways that what we described as our own experiences of success or how we would define it mirrors those of the workshops you did with groups of survivors that affirms that and for any of us, I think people have experienced trauma in different ways and different hardship in life but then we are always more than that.

---

Absolutely.

---

Christie laments all of this is great and we are turning the center on survivor needs or is and would say, strength as well but we cannot get funding if we do not frame questions the weight funders want them. We will not success if we don't have funding

---

If you could respond to that you are doing work with funders

---

Our goal is to change the conditions that perpetuate inequity to well-being and back condition can include any system. Where doing a ton of work with funders. I think there is a real reality to be redundant and what we are hoping is that people begin -- again I don't mean to be cavalier or make it sound like oh, just do this. I'm not saying it is easy. In my experience as running programs as well as a TA provider being a liaison between funders and programs and from what we heard from funders the six funders in this project is that they are eager to shift their own work around survivor divined success or whatever -- survivor to find work. And I think one of the things to remember is that if connection is the key, funders are people, too. Let's make real connections and relationships with funders and please feel free to use findings from our project

and similar ones to bolster your arguments or requests if it helps to have evidence to back up that you want to shift and try something different here is one piece of that evidence but in my experience when you really develop a relationship with a funder and sit down and say this is what it would look like for our program to be more survivor defined, will you be a partner in forging that road, most funders want to be at the forefront of innovative practice. They don't want to be caught catching up late. I think that is our advantage.

---

We have a number of coalitions part of the ALCE, thinking about member programs working with coalitions who often have more of a connection with funders on the federal level at least so many great ideas and comments and thinking and we're coming to the end of our time, I wonder if what is it you would like to leave us with?

---

I said pretty much -- if you want to reflect on the findings on the project, read the full report or read the executive summary it gives you a lot more richness and depth to the project. I am absolutely available to talk it through and would be more than happy to help support you all in using these findings, whether with funding advocacy or asking different questions for survivors in the program or how you set up your services. We are learners and system change organization so we are always looking for partners and allies in this work.

---

Great. Thank you so much, Anna. Thank you for all you've shared with us this afternoon or this morning for folks on the call. And for the work you've done around this and for broadening our thinking. I will ask, lives, for any closing announcement for we say goodbye.

---

Thank you so much. I want to make a point of thanking you sincerely for all of the work that has been done and the ways in which we can benefit from your efforts and the efficacy that we do with and through the Advocacy Learning Center. I know you need to scoot to your next thing so I have a couple of wrap up comments for the AOC participants but if you need to go, thank you from -- very much.

---

I want to say thank you again to you, to Praxis International and the Advocacy Learning Center. It's both been a privilege and honor to be here and very heartening to know there are others doing this work and engaging in the journey of rethinking or strengthening our collective efforts to end violence against women. Thank you for having me and thank you for all you do everyday.

---

Thank you so much. So to be class J, K, L, and participants. Wrapup comments. We will not be together again as three classes and now that I'm thinking about it, the next advocacy session that happens September 3, that will just be the session that happens between classes K NL, class J will have left us by that time.

---

J will still be with us in September.

---

They don't graduate till October.

---

Another advocacy and discussion and keynote.

---

[ Laughter ].

---

We will all be together again J, K, and L Thursday, September 3 for what we are calling and advocacy discussion previously an affinity discussion. Check your calendars and make sure you are available to join us. Other than that, when you disconnect you will be routed to an evaluation of today's session. Spare a few moments to share your thoughts with us which is important to the programming we do. We want to provide the information that you need and benefit from. So thank you, Diane and the rest of the AOC staff and to all of you for joining us today. Always a pleasure and we hope that you enjoyed and appreciated this strength waste asset development session that we received from Anna Melvin. With that, thank you everybody. Happy summer and take it care. Goodbye.

---

[ Event Concluded ]