

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

Document Title: Next Millennium Conference: Ending Domestic Violence; The Importance of Researcher/Practitioner Collaboration

Author(s): Jeremy Travis ; Beth Richie ; Gail Garfield ; Jeff Edleson ; Carol Arthur

Document No.: 184574

Date Received: September 27, 2000

Award Number: 1999-WT-VX-0002

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

184574

**THE NEXT MILLENNIUM CONFERENCE:
Ending Domestic Violence.
The Importance of Research/
Practitioner Collaboration
August 31, 1999**

Page 1
BOS:nd

MODERATOR: Good morning. The easiest job at the conference continues. This morning we have the plenary panel discussion on working together, The Importance Of Research/Practitioner Collaboration. This morning I would like to present to you Jeremy Travis, director of the National Institute of Justice. Jeremy Travis has served as director of the National Institute of Justice since 1994 when he was nominated by President Clinton and confirmed by the United States Senate. Before joining NIJ Mr. Travis was a deputy commissioner for legal matters of New York City Police Department, and while with the department he developed the Civil Enforcement Initiative, which won an Innovation in Government award from the Kennedy School of Government and the Ford Foundation. Mr. Travis authored New York City's ban on assault weapons and chaired the New York City Chancellor's Advisory Panel on School Safety. Under his tenure you might also note that the budget for the National Institute of Justice has quadrupled. It is my pleasure this morning to present Mr. Jeremy Travis.

JEREMY TRAVIS: Good morning all. Good morning and welcome to this discussion. My job is to say a couple of quick things and get out of the way because we have a wonderful, wonderful panel here to talk about what we consider at NIJ

and HHS and the other federal agencies that are involved in violence against women issues, we consider to be a very important development and an experiment that we are supporting which is to promote the idea of collaborations between research and practitioner sectors of our community around the issue of violence against women. The panel, that I will introduce in a moment, is really just a stellar group of people that we are privileged to be able to hear from this morning who are really the front lines in trying to think about the contours and the dimensions and the difficulties, frankly, of some of these collaborations. They are in some ways scouts and pioneers, they're exploring uncharted territory and they are going to report back to us today on what they've learned that will, hopefully, inform work in the field.

Before introducing the panel at some greater length, I do want to provide just a moment of overview on some of the developments that are underway looked at from the point of view from the director of NIJ, the research arm of the Justice Department, but hopefully reporting on some things that are underway in our colleague agencies within the federal government. As you know, the word partnership is very much in the air these days, and I just want to give that word some practical context. Particularly, focus in on issues of intimate violence and violence against women. For those of you who follow these things, it's noteworthy that

within the past three years the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences has issued two landmark reports on violence against women and family violence. These are pronouncements from our highest sort of science agency in the country.

In both of these reports, in important ways, stressed the collaborations between researchers and practitioners are critical to developing knowledge about the most effective prevention and intervention strategies in this field. And these reports, in important ways, have guided our work within NIJ and I think the work of other federal research agencies, and federal program offices, in thinking about how to develop a national response, a federal response, to the issues of family violence and violence against women. Within NIJ we have had a number of opportunities to seek the advice of practitioners and researchers about how to mount a federal research enterprise. Nearly four years ago Peter Adelman, then the Assistant Secretary of HHS, and I co-chaired a day long strategic planning meeting at which researchers and practitioners, advocates, people engaged in this work, came together to help us think about a multi-year research agenda, and two years ago NIJ convened a smaller focus group of practitioners and researchers as we started to think about the partnership program that I want to talk about this morning. So, we have learned a lot from those

listening opportunities, and I hope that the voices that we've heard have been reflected in our funding.

So the partnership activity that we see within the federal government really exists on three levels. First we have a number of collaborations that are unprecedented between the various federal research agencies and institutes that have an interest in this area. Three years ago nine federal research institutes came together to pool resources and more importantly, to engage in the intellectual challenges necessary to develop, what turned out now to be, a three year, 5.2 million dollar research portfolio on violence against women. This portfolio, which I encourage you to take a look at on our web site, is wonderfully rich and covers a lot of very important topic areas that will inform research and, more importantly, inform practice for years to come. And every year we have convened the researchers who have been funded under this portfolio to come together, share research findings, to learn from each other's work, to talk about publications, to talk about implications for practice, and to lay the foundation for the next generation of intellectual inquiry for the next generation of practice and advocacy.

In a similar vein NIJ and the Center for Disease Control and Prevention have committed to a five year partnership to conduct basic research on violence against

women to implement the research agenda that was developed by the National Academy of Sciences. A research agenda that importantly had been requested by Congress, and Congress doesn't do these things in a vacuum, the Congress made this request because of pressure from advocacy groups, to ask the fundamental questions about violence against women, make sure that we have a research agenda that develops our understanding. One exciting product already published, first results of this CDC, NIJ partnership has been the National Violence Against Women Survey, which is a survey about life-long experiences with violence that has been conducted by Patricia Jaden (sp.?) from the Center for Policy and Research in Denver, Colorado. This study, and we're starting to see the first results of this, will provide a much more detailed, much richer understanding of men's and women's self-reported history on stalking, intimate partner violence, rape victimization, much better understanding than was ever made available before. The results of these partnerships at the federal level have been and will be a much deeper understanding of the phenomenon of violence between intimates and violence against women.

On a second level, NIJ has been engaged in a very productive and exciting partnership with our colleagues in the Violence Against Women office in the Department of Justice. Katherine Pierce is here this morning, I know

Bonnie Campbell addressed you yesterday, and each year we've gotten together funds have been transferred from that office to NIJ to support evaluations of different interventions, to find out what works and what doesn't at a practical level. And to publish the results of those evaluations. So, we're learning much more about the role of police, prosecutors, service providers, the important role of advocacy, particularly as these sectors work together in ways that are envisioned by the Violence Against Women Act.

Together we are also near completion, Katherine, we're almost there, of a design and implementation and soon to announce the results of a site selection for a major demonstration project that will test the advocacy of judicial oversight with batterers to improve the safety of women. This will be very important, we believe, for the field in years to come. So, these basic research projects have been made possible because of the willingness of the staff of our two agencies to come at these issues from different perspectives, to find common ground and common purpose.

And, on a third level, which provides the setting for today's discussion, NIJ has been actively supporting the creation of partnerships between researchers and practitioners in local jurisdictions. Within four of the institute's portfolios, in the policing area, in the

corrections area, in the partnership we have underway with Sonia Bergos (sp.?) at Housing and Urban Development, and in the area of violence against women, we have set aside funds for the explicit purpose of funding partnerships with the researchers and practitioners. Now you might reasonably ask, how is this different from most research funding? Isn't it true that researchers, by the nature of what they do, who work in real world environments are dependent upon the support of practitioners for access to data and program operations in order to conduct their work? This is true. However, in our partnership initiatives we start with a different premise. Our starting premise for this initiative is that a partnership is just that. It's a commitment between two equal entities to work together in ways that meet each other's needs. So, in our partnership funding we are looking for researchers who are willing to be engaged, willing to commit over the long haul to the life of the practitioner agency. We explicitly discourage what one might characterize as hit and run research, where little attention is paid to the consequences of findings, or publications, or the research enterprise itself. We explicitly encourage researchers who see research as a tool for improving program operations, for developing and deepening the practitioners knowledge of issues that that practitioner entity faces on a daily basis. We seek out

researchers who value the wisdom and insight of practitioners who listen well and understand the complexities that arise in action oriented enterprises. What are we looking for in practitioners? The other part of the partnership. Not every practitioner is willing, perhaps initially, to allow a researcher to come into agency operations. Researchers are, after all, committed to independence, objectivity, qualities that might be perceived as threatening. So, we are looking for practitioners who are secure enough to allow this outsider to come inside. And who are strong enough to know how to negotiate the terms of this new collaboration so that essential values of the service agency and the advocacy enterprise are not compromised. In short, we are looking for practitioners in our partnership funding who are open to new knowledge and who can take research findings and translate them into new practices that are, in turn, evaluated.

So, these research/practitioner partnerships that we have funded are very exciting, and they are an important way to finding new roles for all parties, for both professions, testing traditional values and accepted ways of doing business for researcher and practitioner alike. In some cases these are initially not natural relationships, and we may hear about some of the difficulties this morning, because usually academics and practitioners are

instinctively distrustful of each other. Yet, these initial reactions can be overcome, and these partnerships can show results as our panel this morning will demonstrate.

So, my personal hope is that in the next millennium, which is the topic of this conference, that this relationship between research and practice, between science and the enterprise of advocacy, will become a standard way of doing business. Our country has, after all, an enormous talent bank in our nation's universities. People who are trained to be analytical, theoretical and to be critical. Our country also has a rich tradition of innovation and a rich resource of committed practitioners who are finding new ways every day to tackle the problems of our society. So, I think our hope is that these folks will learn to talk to each other, to learn from each other and to share that learning with a wider audience on behalf of a common goal of improving safety and enhancing justice. People like our panelists this morning give us reason to believe this stream, in fact, can become a reality.

So, let me then introduce these folks. After this build up they're going to show us these uncharted territories and tell us of what they've learned. What I'll do is introduce the first panel first. Our hope is that the discussion will allow for two things, which does not always happen at conferences. One is discussion within the panel

after each of the teams presents, and then questions from the audience before our time is up at 10:00. I'll introduce the first team first and then I'll sit down and they'll talk, and then I'll get up and introduce the second team. Our first team is comprised of Beth Richie and Gail Garfield. Beth Richie is known to most in this room, I'm sure. She's been an activist and advocate in the movement to end violence against women for the past two decades. The emphasis of her work has been on the ways that race and ethnicity and social position affect women's experiences of violence, with a particular focus on the experience of African-American battered women and sexual assault survivors. She is currently on the faculty here, at the Department of Criminal Justice and Women's Studies at the University of Illinois at Chicago. We New Yorkers like to think that she will always be a New Yorker. And she is also, as we'll see, a senior consultant at the Institute on Violence. She has authored numerous articles and books, and has been active in training and technical assistance to local and national organizations. Her current work presented this July at a conference at NIJ is on the relationship between violence against women and women's involvement in illegal activity. Very important topic for us to consider.

Gail Garfield, who is her team member for this

presentation, is the executive director of the Institute on Violence, incorporated an eight year old organization in New York City. The four focus areas of that institute, within the overall umbrella of violence against women, are on research, technical support for communities, both policy and media advocacy and outreach and education. Her focus has been on black women's experience of violence. It's the only institute of it's kind in the country and a very important topical area. She is currently completing her dissertation on this topic of how black women interpret their experiences with violence. So, please join me in welcoming Gail and Beth, who will introduce each other.

GAIL GARFIELD: I suppose the first thing that I want to say is good morning and thank you very much for the invitation here. Beth and I, in trying to figure out what it is that we wanted to say, thought that we would start off by introducing each other. And I suppose that my job is probably much easier than Beth's because in looking at the conference catalogue I probably saw maybe two or three pictures of Beth, a bio and presentation, so I think that many of you probably are aware of who Beth is and her working relationship. It's indeed a pleasure for me to offer some introductory remarks about Beth because Beth and I have known each other for probably more than 10 years, and she is someone who I have known professionally, someone who

I have known, and continue to know I should say, politically and socially, and she's someone who I consider a friend, someone who I consider a collaborator and, depending upon the sides of the times, she's someone who I consider a partner in crime, particularly around unpopular issues. So, I met Beth before Beth received her doctorate in Sociology from the graduate school and university center at the City University of New York. I also met Beth before her faculty appointment, and most notably here at the University of Illinois, and I met Beth, also, before she developed her impressive array of research studies on health care related and violence against women's issues, and before her numerous publications and her widely acclaimed book, *Compelled to Crime*, and I suggest that you pick it up. I met Beth before her extensive involvement in providing consultation and technical assistance to national organizations and foundations, and I must say, I'm impressed with all of Beth's accomplishments.

Even though Beth and I were residents of New York City, and in many ways I wish that she was still a resident of New York City, Beth and I did not actually meet in New York City, we met in New Orleans and we both shared a panel where Beth was talking, of course, about battered women, and I was on the panel talking about the unexpected explosion of infants born in utero exposed to crack in New York City. So,

Beth and I met each other when we were both advocates, and when we were both activists. I met Beth at a time when she was helping to organize a very important program in East Harlem that's entitled, The Violence Intervention Program in East Harlem, and I also met Beth at the time when she was helping to organize the New York Women Against Rape project. What attracted me to Beth was, in comparison to me, her quiet passion, and her ability to offer informed, but also critical, judgment on the very complicated issue of domestic violence. She was also one of the first people that I called when I became, for a whole host of reasons, deeply disturbed by what I perceived to be the rising incident of violence against black women, particularly in New York City. And, that began our working relationship. Over the years my respect for Beth's professionalism has just grown. My trust in her insight and judgment has been unwavering. And my appreciation, and I should say deep appreciation, of her commitment to include black women and other women of color and also marginalize women into the discourse on violence, extremely important. And so, we will talk more about our relationship throughout this presentation, but what I want to offer is an unabashed and glowing introduction to someone who I have enormous respect for, and that is Dr. Beth E. Richie. I have to figure out what the E is for.

BETH RICHIE: Thank you, Gail. Good morning. I guess the

E is probably going to be another conference, another millennium maybe.

To know Gail Garfield you must also know Tiwana Brawley (sp.), you must know Eleanor Bumpers, you must know Desiree Washington and you must know Anita Hill, among the hundreds of other black women that we came together to organize around when we learned about the violence that they had experienced. Gail is an advocate, she's an activist, she's also a researcher, she's a leader both in New York and around the country, a leader in the movement to bring the awareness of violence against black women's lives to our consciousness. And I name names, not only Gail's name, but there are many women that Gail has worked with, because Gail embodies her work not only in her own desire to publish and her desire to speak at conferences, but most important, Gail imbeds her work in the reality of lives of women, primarily black women, who are experiencing violence as we talk about their lives at conferences like these. Gail has chosen to do her work in communities where violence against women is deeply imbedded in tensions around identity politics, where community dynamics are very, very difficult around the issues of gender. Gail has chosen to be an outspoken race woman, confronting patriarchy, addressing issues of class exploitation. She's chosen to do her work and indeed, live her life, at the intersection where gender and race and

class seem to somehow collide, collide in the experiences of women who are battered and raped and sexually assaulted in our communities.

To know more about Gail you have to take a walk with me to Harlem in New York City, where for almost 20 years we have been trying to address the issues of violence against women in the context of a community in turmoil. And there Gail has been an activist, she's been an organizer, she's been an agitator, she's been a bridge builder, she's been a community resident. When Jeremy began his introduction Gail and I looked at each other as we have so many other times and said, are you the activist? No, you are. Are you the researcher? No, you are. And, indeed, that mirrors in fact what our collective partnership has been. One where we change roles often, and we work not only as partners with specific roles, but sisters in a struggle in a community that we deeply, deeply care about.

Gail has been educated by women on the streets of Harlem. She's been educated as a service provider of programs, and she's been educated by experiences in her own life. She's also been educated in graduate studies in public policy and she's educating others in a PhD program at the City University of New York in Sociology, where she's working on her dissertation. She's a visionary, she's a very, very humble leader, she's a dear friend, she's a

persistent agitator, and we'll tell stories of her agitation as part of our research efforts. And she sees our chance, as I do, as an opportunity also to be advocates for those who don't have the opportunity to speak. And we've decided, therefore, to share a very short part of our time with you to read a call to action that was presented to us, and ask that you pay attention to it. We'll weave some of the content of it, also, into our presentation.

At this conference we want to acknowledge and honor the work and success of the Millennium organizers in bringing together so many groups of us from diverse communities working on the issue of domestic violence. And as advocates for communities we think it's very important that people have the opportunity to speak.

Last night a culturally religious, ethnically diverse group of more than 50 lesbian, bi-sexual, trans-gendered, queer and questioning individuals came together to share experiences and reactions to this conference and we learned there that a group of young people called the Sexual Minority Youth Assistant League had been treated in a manner that was felt to be inconsistent with the goals, objectives and philosophy of the conference, and that in some way the conference organizers made a decision to not allow them to present their work at this conference. They were invited to come and present in the youth track, however, having

designed a play about lesbian dating violence, specifically for this conference, they were not allowed to present it. Approximately two weeks ago they were told that their workshop would not be included in the conference agenda. They traveled here to present that workshop but were not listed in the programs, and they were not assigned a room to do their work. These actions, we think, silenced and objectified and marginalized them. It was particularly painful for the young people who came here as our queer youth and people of color, and many of them survivors. They found this treatment disheartening rendering their indivisibility, and they are asking that we pay attention to their experience here at this conference. Their voices having been silenced, and they expect that the conference organizers, of which, of course, I am a part, will respond by acknowledging that without lesbians there would be no battered women's movement. They are our founding mothers and sisters indeed. All lesbians. Recognizing that each of us were deprived of the full value of this conference because we were not able to witness their work, and we, therefore, expect to have the Millennium Conference compensate them and be able, for the rest of us, to look at a video of their work. We hope that a formal apology will be offered to them and to insure the integration at future conferences indeed. Gail and I have tried to do that in our

work in Harlem of lesbian, gay, trans-gendered and bisexual voices in development of social action and research programs. A copy of the formal statement, which I couldn't read verbatim because I don't have my reading glasses on, a copy of this formal statement is available at the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence table. We hope you will go and take a look at that and endorse the request of this call to action. They ask that people who feel it is important to address this issue to stand for a moment to acknowledge their presence in this room.

GAIL GARFIELD: I think that the statement was most appropriate in light of our work at the Institute. One of the things that we attempt to do is to affirm our diversity as black women. One of the things that I have had to work through, and I am constantly asking others to at least think about the issue, it is with the notion that black women are not monolithic. That I cannot identify an authentic black woman's experience within the black community, and I say that in my working on many different levels with many different kinds of black woman. Is a black woman who is making a six figure salary, who owns her own business, who's body was chopped up with a machete and who had to go and continue to undergo extensive surgery, is her experience more authentic or less authentic than a poor woman, a poor black woman, who may be on government benefits for her

livelihood, who has been raped by her significant other and also several of her children? So, when we begin to talk about authenticity, it becomes a very thorny issue that we have to include the experiences of all black women in order to give a voice to our own diversity. I think that the approach that we have taken as one of those, sort of like founding philosophies of the Institute, is that we want to affirm our diversity because that is our strength. That we do not want to not recognize and struggle over silencing different voices.

We decided to develop an Institute on Violence, and as part of that we decided to focus exclusively on black women's experiences, and we were asked, well, why black women? Why not women of color? Why not all women? To focus on ourselves was not to the exclusion of others, but it was to focus on ourselves because we have been asking the question, why not include black women? The response that we got was basically unacceptable and unsatisfactory. We also wanted to develop an organization that would create opportunities that would allow other black women to speak. We did not want to become the black voice for black women, but our challenge was to create whatever opportunities that we could so that all of these diverse voices could speak. And in doing that one research has been an integral role of what it is that we have been doing. We started off not as

the Institute on Violence, but I can't even remember it, it was the African-American Task Force Against Violence, blah, blah, blah, a real long name. Because one of the things that we wanted to do was begin to explore the possibility of whether or not there needed to be an organization. And essential to that we decided to do, or to hold a whole series of focus groups, to ask in essence black women, what kind of organization would they like to see that would address their interests, their concerns and their aspirations in addition to their needs in this area. And from there, and of course, Beth and others were very much a part of actually running our focus groups, but from there the Institute was born, and it was born from the understandings and the perceptions of an array of black women. Anything you want to add to that?

BETH RICHIE: I just want to say a little bit about the context of Harlem, which is within where we did our work. It's very important that you know that Harlem was a community that had for years been very active in attempting to define on it's own terms which issues were important and how to respond to those issues. Gender and gender violence was not part of the agenda, the template with which community organizers had attempted to do their work. But there was an existing network which as feminists who were coming into the community, or having been in the community,

there was an existing network which we respected and honored and felt like we needed in order to begin to address some of the questions of gender violence. It was very different than some of the approaches of working with communities to do research where we develop an agenda and go into communities and do that work. But it's also important to note that Harlem, like many other communities of color around the country, was very suspicious of research and very concerned about the appropriation of ideas and knowledge and experience for the benefit of people who were not of and from and maybe even not interested in that community. So, on the one hand we understood that there was already an apparatus within which we could work to explore the issues of gender violence, we also knew that there was suspect in those communities about part of what our agenda was in attempting to uncover the needs and experiences and dilemmas of women who were living in that community.

GAIL GARFIELD: Before we got to Harlem, let me just say, we received to our amazement, thorough amazement, a major research grant from the Commonwealth to do a base line study on black women's experiences of violence. When we were organizing for the Institute no one could actually tell you what was happening to black women. How many black women were being raped. How many black women were being battered and abused and in need of services. The only firm figure

that we could get was homicide figures. How many black women were dead. And that's real concrete, and it doesn't take a rocket scientist to try to figure that one out. So, we did this base line study using what we continue to use, a blended methodology. We, again, we've become quite positioned in focus groups, and when I was coming in yesterday evening, I think after the session, I saw women and I said, well, where are you guys going? They said, oh we're going to our focus group. So focus group research has become, indeed, very mainstream. We did focus groups, we concentrated on two communities that had the largest population of black women in them, and that was Jamaica and Hollis in Queens, and also the East Bushwich section in Brooklyn.

In addition to focus groups we did needs assessments of both of those communities. In addition to the needs assessment one of the things that we wanted to know was basically what was the literature saying? What were black women's experiences on violence? So we did a critical review of the literature. Then what we did was purely in essence quantitative study, reviewing and analyzing agency data. Primarily law enforcement related data and health care related data, to see from all of these sources if we could get some handle, some picture on what was happening to black women and what were their experiences.

BETH RICHIE: We want to jump forward to some of the lessons that we learned from our research as partners. I just want to say a few other things about methodology. As Gail said, it was very important for us to use both quantitative and qualitative methods. We kind of moved back and forth as a way to see if the quantitative methods actually captured what the qualitative findings were showing us. When we did the review of the literature we not only included the scientific literature of violence against women, but we stepped into the popular literature that black women read, to understand what kind of messages were being put forth by that form of media. Things like Essence Magazine and Jet Magazine, so that we had a sense not only about what science was telling us, but what some of the African-American driven media were saying about violence against women. It was very clear to us that more people read Jet Magazine than a violence against women journal. With all due respect to the journal, indeed.

That took us also to, and one part of our research led to another. We also realized that there was, at the time that we were conducting our research, a wonderful explosion in literature on black women's lives. And we knew that as many people were reading Jet Magazine were reading Toni Morrison and Alice Walker and Terri McMillan. And we understood that messages about violence against women were

imbedded in that literature, and we needed to understand where those messages were coming from and what they were saying about violence in our lives. So, with every piece of research that we did, starting with the scientific literature, we had insight into other places that we needed to go in order to explore the issues that we were concerned about. I want to just very quickly, because you know we've got to give other people some time to talk. I just want to say one last thing and then we'll just list out the lessons and then we can have time to talk about them later.

One of the things that Gail did as a member of the African-American community, as an activist but also as a researcher, was walk to those places where people were gathered and already talking, and ask them to consider violence against women as part of what they were talking about. And we mobilized an oppressive, when we say we did a needs assessment, what we did was go to those community leaders and say, pull together some of your people because we want to come to those forums and ask those people who are already going to be gathering there under your leadership, what they think about violence against women, what they know about violence against women, what services are available in this community to respond to violence against women, and so the sense of creating community forums that were both toward the goal of inquiry at the same time that they were toward

the goal of organizing was a very important, early component of our work. We talked with law enforcement officials, we talked with people in treatment programs, we talked with people in homeless shelters, in housing projects for senior citizens, in youth programs, we talked with groups of men, we talked with union organizers.

(END SIDE ONE TAPE ONE)

GAIL GARFIELD: ... We were not service providers. They know about service provision. What we were seeking funds for, funds that would allow a community time to think about itself around this issue. And there were very few foundations that was willing to take a risk on us. It is so difficult to say what we want to do is to think and to analyze and be informed by this issue. So, I must here say, who did take a risk on us, although, who did take a risk on us was the Violence Against Women's Office, Grants Office, out of the Department of Justice. And so, to them we have enormous appreciation because for planning money, research money going specifically to a cultural/racial/ethnic community to do research on itself and for itself is an undaunting task. Let's make no mistake about that. So, as we move on, so we can hurry up.

BETH RICHIE: One last story. We're a community that tells stories. So Washington took a risk on us, which we are very grateful for. But Gail took a huge risk. We started

getting calls when we were starting to do our research without funding from organizations in downtown Manhattan. This is sort of a little bit of a geographic story, but downtown Manhattan had a lot of service programs for battered women and rape survivors, and I guess one of the, I know, one of the funding requirements was collaboration with marginalized communities or under served populations. We became, we were that, and we became the opportunity for many of the programs to get funding if they partnered with us. And I remember, I may be elaborating a little bit on Gail's tenaciousness, but I remember Gail saying, why now do they want to partner with us? Just because now there's a funding requirement to do so. Gail said, we want our own money. Which I thought was an important idea, but I thought it would sort of stop there. Indeed, Gail got on an Amtrak train, went to Washington and said to people in Washington, we want our own money. And they said to her, did you have an appointment with us? Is there an RSP who initiated this? She said, no, we're here because we want our own money. And, they sent Gail home. I don't think you went alone, but I didn't go. I was not a part of this. They sent Gail home and the next thing we knew we had the Violence Against Women Act Office coming to visit us. They came to visit us and we took that walk with them through our community, at which point I think they took a risk on us because we took a risk

with them to say we want funding to understand our own lives.

We will do our lessons very quickly because we only have a few minutes left. The first lesson, we have about five of them, and I'll just name, let's name them and then we can have discussion on them. The first lesson is that we did not begin as a research project, we began as an organizing project, and that order matters. That we were embedded in doing community, political work. And from there began to do the inquiry part of our work. The order of doing research after you have a sense of organizing and activism in a community was very important to our success.

GAIL GARFIELD: One of the things that is important and you have to be real clear about is the issue of power and power relationships. We would like for those relationships to be even. They are not even. Often times when we talk about research it is often times initiated by the researcher that comes into the community with their own resources and has, in fact, developed the kinds of questions that they are interested to know. That's okay. We don't quarrel with that, but I suggest that in terms of practitioners that you find your own resources and you hire your own researchers to ask the kinds of questions that you want, you need, you demand to be asked in your work to inform you. There are many different kinds of relations of power. Beth and I

have, they change from time to time, but as she said they're fluid. But I think that we have a history of working together and a commonality, and also very importantly, a language. I would suggest to all of the providers who need and want research that you inform yourself about research, that you either take classes, you talk to researchers to begin to understand the language of research.

BETH RICHIE: We also felt like it was very important that the history of the community be understood as somehow linked to the issue of violence against women, that is violence against women didn't happen separate from other community struggles. One of our most profound recruitment efforts for focus groups and community forums, for example, was going to a rally that was happening when Mike Tyson was released from prison having served his sentence for having raping Desiree Washington. And as the community was organizing to welcome Mike Tyson home we were there handing out flyers not only about the issue of violence against women, but the question of why a community would celebrate the return of a rapist to our community. We also were using it as an opportunity to get information about the community's perception, and indeed, as a separate story we will tell you that we were not well received. And that was a very important message for us about a community perception of rape.

GAIL GARFIELD: I believe that communities have to be able to

identify, participate in and play an active role in research. Our focus is on communities. We believe that a community must take ownership of this issue. We believe therein lies prevention, therein lies the elimination of violence, therein lies the start to devaluing the lives of women and girls in the communities. We think programs are absolutely essential, but it is so important that we get communities to take ownership. In addition to that it's hard, hard, hard work, because unlike this room, when we talk about a community we don't necessarily get everybody who agrees with the approach. We have a divergent opinion but we think it is very important that we include those differing opinions about how to deal with this issue.

BETH RICHIE: Our last lesson, I think, which is one that we're still learning, is that doing community based action research is long term work. It requires a pre-existing relationship and respect for communities that we're working in. It also requires that we be fluid in our roles, which is a theme that we've talked about here. That is, I think of myself as a researcher and I also think of myself as an activist and I think of myself as an advocate. So, also, were the people who came to our focus groups, who had to go find other people and their perceptions. They were also researchers, and they were activists and they were advocates. And in some ways the erasure of the artificial

distinctions between researcher and community service provider, or outside authority and community resident, we tried very hard, and continue to try very hard, to not dichotomize those roles in such a way that we can't work with the community, not only to produce our reports but to end violence against women.

GAIL GARFIELD: In closing, one of the things that will be a big issue is who has the authority to speak. And for us, we believe that it is the community in all of its diversity that has the authority to speak on this issue, and our roles as best we understand them, and our understanding is constantly changing, but our role as technicians, but also as advocates and also as activists, is to create those opportunities and to provide the necessary resources that will allow communities to do that. Thank you.

MODERATOR: Our thanks to Beth and Gail for that really stimulating presentation. Gail mentioned the phetics(sp.?) issue. NIJ has a phetics issue, also. We had hoped to have publications here. When they arrive they'll be in the resource room next door. I also wanted to make sure that I didn't neglect to introduce the NIJ staff that are here. Brie Auchter (sp.), Angela Morparmy(sp.) are here from NIJ if you want to talk to them about the work that we're doing. I want to thank Gail. I have now a new nominee for the mission statement of NIJ. It is that we provide funds

to allow communities to think. Isn't that a wonderful statement of what this should be about? To allow communities to think. So, we're going to appropriate that maybe on our front door tomorrow.

Our next presentation is another partnership that will provide some lessons learned. Jeff Edleson is a professor at the University of Minnesota School of Social Work and the director of that University's center against violence and abuse. He's published numerous articles on domestic violence. He was a member of the National Research Council's panel and research on violence against women, which I alluded to before, and currently sits on an expert panel of the National Resource Center of Domestic Violence Child Protection and Custody of the National Council of Juvenile _____ and is consultant on these issues. His partner on this presentation is Carol Arthur who is the executive director of the Domestic Abuse Project in Minneapolis. They've been working together for a decade plus. Prior to her work at DAP she was the executive director of Childbirth Education Association and Planned Parenthood in Iowa. She's written on reproductive health care and sexuality issues and has done work in that area for a number of years. Let me just also make a program announcement just to remind you that after their presentation we hope to have questions, and Bill Riley has

an award presentation to make at the end of our time together. So, let's start off with Jeff.

JEFF EDLESON: I just want to give an overview first. Carol and I are going to kind of go back and forth. This is actually 16 years that I've worked with the domestic abuse project. Ten of those years, 11, 10, ten years Carol has been the director of the agency. We're going to talk a little bit about the history of our collaboration, the benefits we see to both the program and to the research community, the outcomes of our joint work, the challenges that we have faced in our collaboration, both from the program and the research side, and some strategies we think, which I think overlap with what you've just heard, about making it work.

CAROL ARTHUR: Again, we have a 16 year history together and our relationship started in 1983. It was initiated by Jeff coming to the University of Minnesota and volunteering to be involved in our program, co-facilitating men's groups. About the same time the United Way agency that funded our program asked for evaluation criteria. They wanted us to evaluate our program and we were scrambling to try to do that. We had lots of data that we had collected that we hadn't done anything with, and we were trying to figure out how do you evaluate the work that we do with men, women and children in our program and the legal advocacy program, and

we involved Jeff in doing that. All of this as a volunteer at that point. It developed from there to a reporting system that is still in place for us to do a six month telephone evaluation with men and women who complete our program and a variety of other reporting systems, all of which are still in place in written format so we can pass it down, etc. We have many staff who ended up working on graduate degrees, masters and PhD's and so on while they were part of our program, and Jeff assisted them in doing a lot of that work. And we ultimately were able to have funded research projects, and I absolutely concur with Gail, it is very exciting to see research being talked about. We had to beg and plead with funders to fund research. They wanted to fund services but not research to find out about the effectiveness of what we were doing. And, in fact, we had many programs that did fund us who even then disavowed that they funded research. Didn't want anybody else asking them for it.

We have evaluated, involved ourselves in research programs and evaluated every aspect of our program from our community intervention project, to our men's program, to our children's program in several different areas. First of all, effectiveness and second, about barriers to children receiving services. Our advocacy program, again, nearly every aspect of our program has gone through a full research

project. We have moved to training our evaluation since we had 16 years of experience with it and there are many people out there grappling with how do you establish outcomes and how do you measure it and how do you do it in a reasonable kind of way if you're only doing phone contact to a woman in crisis, how do you measure that? So, Jeff has worked with us and has graciously agreed to do training on evaluation. How we do it and we've shared all of our materials in that. And finally, we are now at a point where we are moving on to collaborate with other programs. We have a collaboration now that involves six programs in the area, Mincava(sp.?) and five better women's programs in our area that we're working with.

The benefits. The benefits are very numerous and Jeff keeps telling me you have to be concise and that was even before we were second in presentation, so I'll try to do my best. Some of the benefits for us is our absolute focus on mission. To create a world without domestic violence helps us focus on that mission because every part of our agency knows how they contribute to that mission. It's also about accountability. In our movement we're really good about holding police accountable, holding batterers accountable, this is an opportunity for us to hold ourselves accountable. Accountable to battered women that we're doing and using that money to do what we say we will and that we are doing

the things that they need for us. So, it's about accountability to the men, women and children that we live with. It expands our staff capacity and program resources. As a result of seeking funding, we always build in funding to assist us in documenting some of our work, so we have completed manuals on every aspect of our program so that when we train new staff we've got something to train from. It's not a verbal heritage of how we do our work at our agency. And even beyond that we believe that we have contributed to other practitioners in the work that they do. We know, as a result of our ability, to put things in writing that Jeff has been able to take some of our information to Singapore and Israel. We also know that there are programs in Australia for children that wouldn't exist without some of the initial work that we did in working with children of battered women so that they have something to start from, and to encourage other practitioners to provide those services and resources for men, women and children.

We create a culture of testing new ideas. We take our name seriously. We are the Domestic Abuse Project, which means we're constantly trying new things. And we try those new things based on what the people we work with tell us and that's one of the benefits of evaluation research is that we hear directly from the people that we work with what helps

and what doesn't help, and what we're not doing that they need. Most of our new programming has been created from what people tell us they need. The self-help groups didn't work for me, I was at a different place, I need an after care group, I'm further along in my healing process than crisis. So, we listen to the men, women and children who come to our agency and we respond to what they have to tell to us.

It supports our system's advocacy. Any of you who work in criminal justice intervention projects constantly know that we know that we're getting told, well, that's anecdotal information. The stories of battered woman are anecdotal information and they don't carry weight. But when you can come with research data and evaluation information and say this is what we know, or you take the time to pull into your computer system all the arrests and then pair them with all of the outcomes then you can say, this is unacceptable. You have a 60% dismissal rate. Then you can begin to do through systems advocacy where they're going to listen to you because you've got the data. Not only that, now our police department sends the media to us to find out what they're doing with our domestic assault arrests and we go to the City Council and the Mayor to tell them what our prosecutors are doing with domestic violence. So, it assists us in our system's advocacy. It adds to our program of credibility in

a variety of ways, not only with funders and obviously with the systems folks that we have to work with, but with our clients. And with our colleagues. That we can share what we have learned in the 20 years that the Domestic Abuse Project has been doing this work, so that they can build on our work to be even better in that sense back that information.

JEFF EDLESON: I think to the research side and I agree with that. I know Mark Rosenberg once interviewed me and he started out our conversation, he's from CVC, started out by saying, now are you an advocate or a researcher? And I sort of fumbled. I couldn't respond because I feel that I'm sort of both an advocate and a researcher, and I don't think there's a conflict in that role, although I think that in traditional research methods you're taught that that is a conflict of role. I think that my research, and I felt really wonderful having people come up to me and just grab me and say, I've cited your work for so long I just wanted to meet you. My research is the result of my collaboration. It's not my ideas, it's really me working very closely with practitioners in the community and listening to the voices of primarily the women who use the services, but all the other clients and the community members and the various stake holders in the community who really shape the program that is the Domestic Abuse Project, so for me, I think, even

the issues and the questions that I'm involved with are shaped in the community and it makes my research much more useful from the very start. It's not at the end when I have my results and I discuss it with somebody, but it's our partnership, our collegial work together as program and science, or researcher and advocates that has really developed, I think, a very rich research agenda, not just for my product but the product of this collaboration.

I do think that it's also made my work and the work of the other researchers that I've worked with much more accountable to women and the services much more accountable to women. We have much better descriptions of what we do. We can tell the women who come to the agency the men who are going through this program, 2/3 of them are likely to drop out by the last session. And only 2/3 of those men who stay in are going to be non-violent, so when you look at the big picture you're partner going to a men's group is not a solution to your safety. And we can give very specific numbers to back that up. And I think that's really important, that we are accountable to people who are banking their future safety and lives and the lives of their children, that we have outcomes that say this is not your particular experience, but this is what we generally can promise and deliver to you. And I think it also gives greater legitimacy, frankly, to be part of a larger

movement. It's been, for me, a wonderful experience and it's, I think, made for wider use of my research. And I see a number of people in this room who could equally be up here, Jackie Campbell, Kirstie Elo(sp.?), Ed Gaundolf(sp.), a whole variety of people out in the audience who are also very involved, researchers who would probably have a hard time with Mark Rosenberg's question as well.

The outcomes of our work, and Carol has the stack of manuals. There are four manuals, a book from Sage Publications. We do a research update that goes to 10,000 people. We do it quarterly, and that sort of blankets our community as well as other people nationally, but I think it's been very important that we have documented, not just done research, but we have documented what we are doing, the work we're doing. We've evaluated both the process and the outcome of our work, and that's resulted in training programs and manuals, a newsletter, and what I'm very excited about, is an expanded collaboration of five of the major domestic violence programs in Hennepin County on an issue around children and domestic violence, and hoping to collaborate. We just had a brainstorming session with about 20 staff from the five programs, brainstorming what are their priorities and what do they think their clients' priorities are in terms of research, and hopefully, that will direct where we go in the future.

CAROL ARTHUR: Challenges to the program. When I talk about the challenges I try to think about if I were advising someone else what would I tell them some of those challenges might be. So, this is not necessarily challenges to the relationship with Jeff that we've experienced, but things that I have thought about as I have thought about if we were collaborating with a different person what would be things I would want to be aware of. Because we all know that not everybody is going to find a Jeffrey Edleson or a Beth Richie or even a Susan Schechter out there. So, some of the challenges that I would be aware of, and we have been aware of and confronted, are issues of power, number one. This is a system, like all systems battered women's programs work with. The University of Minnesota is a large educational institution because of Jeff's position at the University has access to a lot more resources and power than we do. Sometimes the partner's role gets lost in that relationship, so there are definitely issues of power that need to be acknowledged up front and you need to be aware of.

We think it's really important to have an agreement on some basic philosophy pieces. We could, at the Domestic Abuse Project, not work with a researcher who did not have a feminist perspective of battery. We could not work with a researcher that did not see that domestic violence was linked to all other issues of oppression. Those would be

sort of bottom line issue things for us in working with a researcher and we were fortunate enough to be working with Jeff who had those things clear when he came to us.

Who is the authoritative voice, is another issue that's important to know. When a researcher is working with the program the authoritative voice, the battered women and the advocacy staff of that agency around issues of domestic violence. We are the authoritative voice about what are the questions to ask, how do you ask them, what do the measurements mean, what are the findings and what are they saying to us? Those folks have a lot to say about what that stuff means. They are the authoritative voices and you need to work that out when it comes down to some of those roles.

Again, feeds into the next one. Who determines questions, scope, use of results? It is absolutely critical for us as programs, at this juncture with funders and others who are interested in this issue of domestic violence, that we define what are appropriate outcomes based on the voices of battered women and what they tell us they need from us. We define what the appropriate outcomes to be measured. It's critical for us to do that.

We have a tremendous responsibility to the victims, to the women that we work with and all the clients that we work with, as we enter into these relationships. We have responsibility for insuring safety, for insuring

confidentiality. We have a responsibility for, again, that interpretation of data. Mis-interpretation of data can be devastating to the people that we work with. I think about simple mis-interpretation of data, for instance, in the city of Minneapolis about 21% of our population are people of color, yet in terms of who gets arrested for domestic violence and most other crimes, it's closer to 68%. Now, some people might interpret that that people of color are more violent than white people. So, it's absolutely critical that we're involved in the interpretation of the data. And we have responsibility for that.

We have to be prepared for some negative outcomes related to our programs. Everything that's come out of our research hasn't always been glowing about that. When we took a look at barriers to services to children it told us that we had to do some very different things about what we were doing. But, that also has lended to our credibility. Not only are we willing to share those negative outcomes with the funders who may have funded that research, but we share it with our colleagues and our community because if we're doing those things wrong and creating barriers and not addressing barriers, so are our colleagues. So, we create public _____ where we show that stuff and we also say how we've decided to respond to those negative outcomes.

JEFF EDLESON: And we'll try to wrap up here. I think the

challenge is for somebody that's trained in doing research in a university setting is that we're not trained to share the control of the research. We're trained to be the experts on design, to do our wonderful, perfect design, random assignment control groups, etc., and to demand that that level of design be implemented. And I've seen many researchers who are very knowledgeable about research design and complete failures in terms of implementing the research in the community. So, I think one lesson for me has always been that this is a partnership and I am sharing this journey with the program staff and the women who's voices are so important to the outcome of our research and where it directs the services.

I think time and mistrust and trust are huge issues. And, for me, it took many years of being at the Domestic Abuse Project and really showing a commitment that I wasn't just dropping in, getting my data, weaving and publishing it, but I was there for 16 years, I'm the longest serving member of the staff. I am the historian on the staff. Nobody else, I think 10 or 11 years is the longest next serving person at the agency. So, I think that trust and certainly with turnover in staff you have to make a huge commitment to keep re-establishing that trust and re-communicating. And, I'm given a lot of time to do research and practitioners are not, and that's a huge issue, as well,

of really power and control around time allotted to research.

I think there are huge disciplinary differences in language, terminology, etc., and then just finally the skills of the researcher. I really see, I'm a social worker, I'm a group worker by training, and I really see my research as group work practice. That it takes a lot of those same communication skills and skills of running and facilitating a good group.

Angela, if you could skip the next slide and go to Advocacy as a Metaphor. I really think that my research draws on advocacy as a metaphor for my research. These next three slides come from a paper that I wrote for NIJ last year with the Andrea Bible. Andrea Bible who is now at the National Clearing House for the Defense of Battered Women in Philadelphia. But, I really see that the research should be woman centered, it should allow both the battered woman, the victims, and their children and practitioners to define and shape the questions and the methods that we use, and that we again share control of the process. So, for me good battered women advocacy is also the frame work for doing good research as well.

If you could do the next slide. And I think this calls for new roles for me, as a researcher, and for practitioners in the program. We are co-researchers in this process, and

I think Gail and Beth really spoke to that very beautifully. That there is an intermingling of rules and I think domestic violence programs and many programs don't understand the power that you really do have. The data that exists in your agency and access to the women and being careful about that access to the women, but not being sort of condescending about controlling the women's own choices about whether they participate or not. I think all of that, you have great power in this research process and much more than you often think you do. I would argue, exactly as Gail said, that you need to be good, educated consumers about research and become co-participants in that process. But we are interdependent and we should be, researchers should be active members of the battered women's community and the local community, as well.

And I also want to just say that I believe very strongly that research is value based. It's not value free, which is what I was traditionally taught in my PhD program, but I see research, as a social work researcher, as service to the community. Research should be defining, redefining and improving our approach to empowerment, social justice and social change, and I think research, much like program, has a role to play in that and a way to promote empowerment, social justice and change in our communities. And in that sense it is not at all value free. And that those values

define our questions, they define the measures we use, the way we analyze data and how we interpret it. And I think that's a very important value system to bring to the research endeavor. We'll end with our strategies and then we'll be done.

CAROL ARTHUR: These are some of the strategies we've identified that have worked for us and as part of the article that Jeff and Andrea worked on. Other folks indicated as well. Sharing the power. We've talked and talked about that. It's important. Sharing the power about what are the issues? We define what are the issues we want to know about? We've created a decade worth of research based on talking with our staff about what do we need to know about.

Control of the budget. Money is power. Sometimes the budget runs through our agency, sometimes it runs through the University of Minnesota. We always build in money for our agency to cover the cost of our involvement, because it takes that time to do research and be involved.

Early collaboration, which is the next point, throughout. From conceptualization to dissemination. Again, from early on. Jeff has not been the researcher who has come to us with a question and said, can we do research about this? And we have had researchers do that. It's about our creating the agenda, collaboratively and what are

the questions and how are they asked, etc.

Acknowledge what each party contributes and receives, stated in writing and sign off. So, we do it both formally and informally so that one party does not feel the other is taking advantage of them. There are very clearly benefits to both. And we identify what those are. Ongoing communication is absolutely critical. Ongoing communication about your roles as you are going on problem solving. One of the things that I didn't mention when I talked to you about things to consider, that's always been a problem at our agency is, does the research interfere with direct service? And it cannot interfere with direct service, so this problem solving as we go along. This, well, I can't talk to the clients because I'm using this time and group for this and this and this, so it's constant ongoing communication about what's happening. And time _____ which again speaks to a piece about this involvement in the work of the agency. That's why our relationship has lasted for 16 years, and why I'm willing to go to my colleagues that we're now thinking of collaborating with, and encourage them to do it and why I'm here to talk to you about the benefits. Because Jeff has involved himself in our work inside and outside the agency. He has been an advocate with us within the system to talk about the research. He has testified before our legislature when they're ready to start

things that are going to be very damaging for battered women and children. And he continues to do that on a national level now around our issues. That's critical. It can't be hit and run research. It has to be involvement by that person for that trust to be interviewed, developed.

It's also worked because it's useable research. It's research with tangible results. Again, all of you who work in agencies, we are stretched to the limit in terms of providing services that we do and if I ever had any hope of getting the rest of the staff involved in research it is this business about, it has tangible results. We hear from our clients. They tell us what they need and want. They tell us what programs we ought to be developing next. What we're doing right and wrong. And we develop manuals that can be useful to us and other folks in our field. The active dissemination of those findings, again, internal to the program before we ever release any research findings we do it internally first. It's presented to our staff, it's reviewed by our staff. We do community forums. We have responsibility to our own local community, that we share that information and we talk about it and what's the meaning and what do we see here. And then, finally, we disseminate it more broadly through print and the electronic media to share with our colleagues. We take our mission seriously to create a world without domestic violence, and we believe we

have something we've learned that we might be able to share with the rest of you.

And, as someone that I admire and respect very much frequently says, *Que bono* (sp.?), what good is it? And that's what it helps us answer.

JEFF EDLESON: There are a number of resources about the collaborative research projects that we have available through my center's web site, so we'll just leave that up for a while, but we'll finish at that point.

MODERATOR: This is really inspirational. To hear the level of commitment and the idea of researchers, an agent for social justice is just wonderful observation to hear from Jeff. All the sort of asides about how we hurried to end, we did it. And the panel has left time for some questions and then we'll ask Bill to come up and make his presentations. So, please just address your questions to a panel member.

FROM THE FLOOR: Could any of the panelists talk about the role of publicated research in this field, especially when you get some _____.

BETH RICHIE: I guess a quick answer, as a qualitative researcher, I think it's very, very important. And I think rigorous, qualitative research is very, very important. And I also think it's a research methodology that community members resinate with how people live their lives and think

their thoughts, so I think it's not only good for science but I think it's good for organizing and good for community involvement. And I think more and more we're seeing funding sources, including NIJ, look toward qualitative projects as very, very significant, especially as your work is on some of the under-explored or cutting edge issues.

JEFF EDLESON: I was trained as a quantitative researcher, but I've really come to believe that the dichotomy between qualitative and quantitative research is a false dichotomy. It's really what is your question, and what are the best tools to answer that question. And, at times it's a mix of methodologies and at times it's one or the other, or little parts of one and the other.

FROM THE FLOOR: You talked about value driven research and having gone through a graduate program myself, our professors are always telling us that you have to avoid bias, that it can stand on it's own two feet and withstand scientific scrutiny. My question is, how publishable are _____ and the work that you've done and you talk about collaboration. It seems to me that you have become real live _____ in each other's work. Not so much collaboration, you seem to have different _____.

GAIL GARFIELD: Because our approach to research and our understanding of what research can do to inform our work, is outside of the traditional mainstream about how people

perceive research. It is, I can speak for myself and Beth, in terms of professional expectations, in terms of the quality of what it is that we do, we're extremely demanding of ourselves. Because we know, given our approach, but also given our focus, that one way to discredit you is often times looking at your methods. And looking at your findings. And, questioning the technical aspects of that work. So, we're extremely concerned about how we approach our work, and it may not be mainstream, but the quality is good, we know it's good. And it's useful.

In terms of values, no. I'm like Jeff. I think that I don't make those pretense to being value free, because I think that's a lie. But I also want to bring an element of honesty as to where it is I stand and you understand where it is I stand, so we can either engage that or move on.

MODERATOR: Thank you. And, I'm sure the panel will be available to help answer some additional questions if you want to come up afterwards, but now we'll turn it back.

WILLIAM RILEY: We do have the opportunity to make two awards, which we have categorized this morning. One for leadership in research and evaluation, and another for men doing the work.

The first award we'd like to give is to Jeff Edleson and I'll forego reading his bio because most of you know him, but we'd like to present Jeff with an award for his

leadership in research and evaluation, and also for his work that he's done with the Domestic Abuse Project.

JEFF EDLESON: Thank you. Thank you. Okay, you've used my 10 seconds now. I'm really happy that Gail and Beth talked longer than planned because now I don't have to make a long acceptance speech. This is really not my award, and I think our panel discussion spoke to that. It's really an award that goes to a lot of different people, and I have just been sort of a conduit to a lot of different voices. So, I thank all of you and there are a lot of other researchers in the room, as well, who deserve this as much as I do. So, thank all of you for doing your work.

WILLIAM RILEY: Our next award is to men doing the work.

Jerry Tello, and many of you in here, I _____ there are those of you in here who do not know Jerry, and so bear with me while I give you a bit of his background.