

Dear Colleagues,

Please find attached a report from the conference, “Reducing the Risk of Lethal Violence. Collaboration in Threat Assessment &

Risk Management: From Theory to Practice” held in Hamilton from February 7 – 9, 2010. At the conference we endeavoured to provide participants with opportunities to share challenges and to learn from promising practices used in other communities. The discussions and suggestions put forward during the event were recorded, discussed by the organizing committee and incorporated into the attached report. We welcome your feedback on this report. We have also attached the conference program if you would like to refer to it.

As a first step, we want to make sure this information is made available to all those who attended the event and shared with community partners who were interested in the event but unable to attend.

As a second step, we would like to ask that you take some time to review the report and, based on your learning from the forum and your experience in the field; begin to take some steps in your community towards greater collaboration to reduce the risk of lethal violence.

In August, we will be following up with a survey to all Coordinating Committees to ask about what participants learned at the forum and what they shared with their DV Community Coordinating Committees and other colleagues after the forum. We will ask about changes participants and DV Community Coordinating Committees have made to their on-the-job practices following the forum. And we want to know what training gaps still exist.

This report is part of an effort to promote collaboration between individuals and organizations that are working to ensure the safety of women through better threat assessment, risk management and safety planning. We appreciate your involvement in this work and we value your ideas and perspectives.

Please send your feedback to Anna-Lee at annalee@brktel.on.ca.

Regards,

Peter Jaffe and Barb MacQuarrie

**Threat Assessment and Risk Management in Domestic Violence
Cases: An Overview of Ontario Justice and Community
Collaboration for 2010 and Future Directions**

Author: Marcie Campbell
Edited by: Pam Cross, Peter Jaffe and Barb MacQuarrie

Centre for Research & Education on Violence against Women and Children, 2010

Threat assessment and risk management¹ in domestic violence cases: An overview of Ontario justice and community collaboration for 2010 and future directions

Domestic violence related deaths, or domestic homicides, have been called the most predictable and preventable of all homicides.² They represent 17% of all solved homicides and 47% of all family homicides in Canada.³ According to the latest annual report of the Domestic Violence Death Review Committee (DVDRC) through Ontario's Office of the Chief Coroner, the vast majority of domestic homicides reviewed had at least seven well-known risk markers.⁴ Over the past six years, the DVDRC has reviewed domestic homicide cases and formed recommendations aimed at community and government organizations to prevent similar tragedies. One common repeated theme is the need for community-based and government agencies that work with victims and perpetrators of domestic violence to collaborate on threat assessment and risk management and communicate about the results to establish an effective safety plan for the victim and risk management plan for the perpetrator. One of the first recommendations made by the DVDRC about risk assessment is from the 2003 annual report:

There is a need to have appropriate assessment tools available to those who work with victims and perpetrators of domestic violence to better assess the potential for lethal violence in their lives. Correspondingly, once the risk is identified, victims and perpetrators of domestic violence need access to appropriate services and programs. The person at risk requires access to:

- *a specialized and comprehensive risk assessment by an appropriate agency;*
- *skilled assistance to engage the victim in developing a safety planning process; and*
- *risk management, for both the victims and the perpetrator.*

Additionally, the DVDRC created a recommendation about the importance of communication and collaboration between community and government systems when identifying and managing risk:

All front-line professionals that deal with individuals and families in crisis should adopt an appropriate risk assessment process and a mechanism or protocol at a local level to facilitate and enhance communication between agencies and professionals when a person is identified to be at risk. For example, such a protocol should permit any professional evaluating a high risk case to contact the local police service's case

¹ This paper uses the terminology of threat assessment and risk management, except where it is referencing or quoting other sources. Our terminology in this area has been evolving and threat assessment and risk management are currently widely accepted terms.

² DeBecker, G. (1997). *The Gift of fear: And other survival signals that protect us from violence*. New York (NY): Dell.

³ Statistics Canada. (2008). *Family violence in Canada: A statistical profile 2008*. Ottawa: Ministry of Industry.

⁴ Ontario Domestic Violence Death Review Committee. (2008). *Annual report to the Chief Coroner*. Toronto, ON: Office of the Chief Coroner.

manager or domestic violence coordinator to establish a case conference to ensure appropriate tracking and response to the case.

The importance of the DVDRC recommendations was underlined by a recent Ontario government panel that reviewed the need for a comprehensive action plan to improve various systems' responses to domestic violence. Among many strategies outlined was the importance of professional education and enhanced collaboration in threat assessment and risk management (Domestic Violence Advisory Council (DVAC), 2009).

The challenges of doing this work are greater in rural and remote areas, which may require more intensive support to ensure good threat assessment and risk management is equally available across the province.

It is also important to remember, as the DVAC report pointed out;

Ontario's broad-based violence against women system is intended to provide a comprehensive response to all women experiencing violence. Yet, a number of studies and reports have documented equity and access barriers, gaps and issues faced by some women in accessing services and supports.

While significant investment has gone into responding to individual incidences of violence, there is a need to respond to the systemic discrimination that leaves vulnerable women isolated and excluded from benefiting from and contributing to a system that is designed to protect them from violence. Unfortunately, racism, sexism and discrimination continue to be part of Ontario society and our institutions. To address these issues, a systemic anti-discrimination strategy is needed to change attitudes, institutions and systems.⁵

The Council's detailed plan together with the repeated DVDRC recommendations inspired a provincial conference to address these critical issues. The Centre for Research and Education on Violence against Women and Children (CREVAWC) hosted this conference with government and community stakeholders guiding the program development (program available in Appendix A).

The conference was entitled "Reducing the risk for lethal violence: Collaboration in threat assessment and risk management." It was designed to initiate more dialogue with community and justice partners around the issues of threat assessment, risk management, and collaboration among systems. The conference was funded by the Ontario Women's Directorate. Two hundred and eighty-six people attended the conference with 101 justice representatives, 99 community representatives, eight Ministry representatives (e.g., Ministry of the Attorney General, Ontario Women's Directorate, Ministry of Community and Social Services, and Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services), and 12 representatives of the

⁵ Domestic Violence Advisory Council. (2009). Transforming our communities: Report from the Domestic Violence Advisory Council for the Minister Responsible for Women's Issues. Retrieved May 31, 2010 from <http://www.crvawc.ca/documents/DVAC%20Report.pdf>.

Advisory Committee from various community-based agencies (e.g., shelters, rape crisis centres, batterers' programs) and the justice sector (Crown Attorneys and Probation and Parole.) The attendees represented 48 coordinating committees from across the province. To view the evaluations of the conference by participants, refer to Appendix B. The issues relating to threat assessment, risk management, and system collaboration were presented by panels of guest speakers from various agencies that have the knowledge and working experience with risk management and system collaboration. This paper will summarize the discussions about the challenges that impede collaboration on risk management; practical solutions to the barriers for information sharing posed by confidentiality requirements and potential action plans to advance collaboration on threat assessment and risk management in different jurisdictions.

What is risk management?

Risk assessment has been defined as “the formal application of instruments to assess the likelihood that intimate partner violence will be repeated” and potentially escalate into lethal violence. The term is synonymous with dangerousness assessment and encompasses lethality assessment, the use of instruments specifically developed to identify potentially lethal situations”.⁶

For the criminal justice system, risk assessment is based on many factors, including the victim's perception of risk, professional judgment, and information gathered through processes such as Bail Safety Programs and Domestic Violence High Risk Committees, checklists of risk factors such as the Domestic Violence Supplementary Report Form (DVSRF) and more formalized instruments, and assessments such as those conducted by police threat assessment units and forensic psychiatrists.

Conducting risk/threat assessments is important because it: 1) helps victims and professionals develop a more realistic safety plan; 2) can provide insight for Partner Assault Response (PARS) programs to develop appropriate treatment plans; 3) helps the justice system identify high-risk offenders that need continuous monitoring and management; 4) can educate service providers about domestic violence; and 5) provides a common language on risk for professionals across different systems and organizations.⁷

Why share information?

The need to collaborate and communicate among different services is important to maintain the safety of vulnerable women and children. Sharing information between sectors and agencies can help generate new insights and solutions for prevention and intervention strategies and can make the delivery of services more coherent and effective. Additionally, the victim and the perpetrator can be assured that their situations are well understood and will be managed effectively across a range of service providers. Dr. Stephen Hart, a psychologist and risk

⁶ Roehl, J., & Guertin, K. 2000, 'Intimate partner violence: The current use of risk assessments in sentencing offenders', *The Justice System Journal*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 171-198.

⁷ Laing, L. (2004). *Risk assessment in domestic violence*. Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse. Retrieved March 17, 2010 from: http://adfvnew.arts.unsw.edu.au/topics/topics_pdf_files/risk_assessment.pdf.

management expert at Simon Fraser University makes the point that good risk management is good information management.⁸

One example of a threat assessment tool is the Danger Assessment Scale developed by Jacquelyn Campbell. It is a two-part tool that measures the level of risk for lethality. The first portion evaluates severity and frequency of abuse by asking women to mark dates of past abuse on a calendar for the previous year, ranking the level of severity of each incident on a scale from 1 to 5. The second portion is a 20-item questionnaire which includes a weighted scoring system to count yes/no responses of risk factors associated with intimate partner homicide.⁹ This portion is to be completed by a professional who has received training on the use of the tool.

Front-line investigating police officers throughout Ontario use the DVSRF, created by the Ministry of Community Safety & Correctional Services and the Ontario Provincial Police (O.P.P.). This assessment form consists of a list of 19 risk factors, including a past history of violence, access to firearms, sexual abuse and bizarre and/or unexplained behaviour. The results of this report may be used by Crown Attorneys in domestic violence cases at different stages of criminal proceedings such as bail hearings.¹⁰

The DVAC published a report titled “Transforming our Communities,” which outlines several recommendations related to threat assessment and risk management.¹¹ First, the Council recommended that police be mandated to use an enhanced supplementary report as the threat assessment tool when responding to all domestic violence calls. This will create consistency and communication between police services, Crown Attorneys, and other justice representatives. Second, the Council recommended mandatory training on the dynamics of domestic violence, threat assessment, and risk management. Specifically, professionals who work in the violence against women (VAW) sector, including police officers, shelter workers, child protection workers, family court personnel, and health practitioners, should receive training on threat assessment tools and risk management. Finally, it was recommended that every high-risk team work with an accredited threat assessor to apply a broad inventory of threat assessment tools. These recommendations are congruent with those made by the DVDRC, and together they highlight the importance of threat assessment and collaboration on risk management.

Challenges to Collaboration and Information Sharing

Although threat assessment, risk management and system collaboration is critical to managing risk and protecting victims and children experiencing violence, the processes are not without challenges. Several barriers to collaboration were identified at the conference and are outlined below. These challenges fall into four categories: a) confidentiality and information sharing; b) who comes to the table; c) assessment tools; and d) resources.

⁸ Stephen D. Hart, Presentation in London, Ontario (April 26, 2010)

⁹ Campbell, J. (2005). *Danger Assessment*. Johns Hopkins University. Retrieved March 17, 2010 from: <http://www.dangerassessment.org/WebApplication1/pages/product.aspx>.

¹⁰ Millar, A. (n.d.) Inventory of spousal violence risk assessment tools used in Canada. Department of Justice Canada. Retrieved March 17, 2010 from: http://www.crvawc.ca/documents/rr09_7.pdf.

¹¹ Domestic Violence Advisory Council. (2009). *Transforming our communities: Report from the Domestic Violence Advisory Council for the Minister Responsible for Women’s Issues*. Retrieved March 17, 2010 from <http://www.crvawc.ca/documents/DVAC%20Report.pdf>.

The need to enhance coordination between family and criminal courts in order to avoid the failure to share information about the risk abusers may pose to their ex-partners in different court proceedings is particularly salient.

a) Confidentiality and information sharing

There is a broad understanding of the importance of confidentiality between an agency and its client. This code of confidentiality creates a relationship of trust which allows for full disclosures and a feeling of safety and comfort.

In most cases, victims will welcome collaborative risk management because it will increase their safety. However, some women might be reluctant to participate. They may believe that involving more parties could make the situation more dangerous for themselves and their children or they may have had a negative experience previously with one or more of the collaborators. Under these circumstances, VAW services, which work to empower women and to help them take control of their life, trust women to know what solutions will work best for them. They insure that women are fully informed of their options and they allow women to make their own decisions.

VAW services have learned that acting against the will of a woman can actually increase her risk if she isolates herself because someone else is again taking control and she feels betrayed. If a woman refuses to participate in a collaborative risk management process, VAW service providers can continue to be involved in threat assessment and safety planning with her.

Currently some women do not access services because they are worried about the duty to report to child protection authorities. Any new requirements to report women's risk could lead to shelters being perceived as unsafe for women. Such a perception is very difficult to reverse. The only way to ensure safety for women who experience domestic violence is through building trust and collaborating with them in all aspects of the work.

Offenders may be more likely than victims to object to a collaborative risk management process. An agency that needs to share information without consent from the client may be concerned about breaking the trust of its client and liability. These concerns need to be weighed against the need to ensure victim safety. Not sharing information that could prevent serious injury or death also poses liability concerns. Negotiating the decision to share personal information with other professionals or to protect confidential information about the client can pose ethical dilemmas on both a personal and an organizational level.

Once a decision has been made to share information with other professionals in order to protect the victim, the next challenge is to determine what information needs to be shared. It is important to share only vital information that is relevant for creating an effective safety plan, especially when a professional or an agency chooses to breach confidentiality.

Professionals have concerns that disclosing too much information about their client can violate the client's right to privacy without contributing to the risk management and/or safety plan. In the absence of widely understood and accepted guidelines about when it is appropriate to share information, professionals exercise their own judgement, sometimes choosing to withhold

client information that may be significant to a risk management process. It is important to remember that liability can result from a failure to share information as well as from the choice to share information.

The lack of accepted guidelines leads some agencies to focus exclusively on their own mandate, and concerns about liability rather than considering the broader context and the need for collaboration. The current emphasis on individual mandates and fears of liability lead to communication barriers between sectors as well as between agencies. Many communities experience a lack of collaboration between the justice sector representatives, such as police and Crowns, and the community-based representatives such as shelters.

b) Who comes to the table?

When it comes to collaborating on threat assessment and risk management, it is imperative to bring together all the systems and agencies that are working with the vulnerable family. However, creating a collaborative process can be fraught with challenges. First, there is a question of who should come to the table. It is important to have the professionals involved with the family represented; however is there a need to invite other professionals who don't have a relationship with the family? Some argue that having input from other systems can be beneficial when trying to understand the full picture. However, inviting other professionals not directly involved with the family to participate raises further issues related to confidentiality.

In some cases, not all professionals directly involved with the victim and/or perpetrator want to be a part of a collaborative process. Scheduling conflicts, mistrust, turnover rates and conflicting mandates are all factors that can be at the root of these issues.

VAW services, which have tried to limit the imbalance of power between women and their services, feel that having professionals decide what is best for women without their input is counterproductive. They feel it is imperative that women be given the option of participating directly in discussions with other professionals about risk management.

Potential stakeholders in collaborative risk management processes do not always trust each other or fully understand or concur with the motives and philosophy of each other's organizations. Since organizations have different mandates and work primarily with different individuals within a family or an intimate relationship there are concerns that some representatives may try to prioritize their own or their client's perspective and, in the process, lose sight of the safety of the woman and her children. A potential conflict can arise between child protection workers and women's advocates. Women's advocates may fear that the child welfare agency will re-victimize abuse victims by blaming them for living with the violence. Their mandate leads them to prioritize the victim's autonomy and ability to plan for her future, while child welfare workers prioritize the children's safety.

Some professionals involved with the family may not be from organizations in the VAW sector (e.g., family physician, psychiatrist). If these professionals are included in the collaboration, there is concern that they may lack an understanding of woman abuse dynamics and that their own biases will prejudice their judgment. Additionally, those from the VAW sector sometimes question the commitment of representatives from outside the sector and

struggle with issues of the payment expected for services and concerns about liability. Some organizations have a high turnover rate which may impede the flow of work as the committee tries to bring new collaborators up to speed on the current issues. Finally, a collaborative team requires impartial leadership to provide direction and organization for members. However, deciding who will govern the collaborative is a challenge. Governing the collaborative team includes arranging meetings, taking minutes, storing confidential information, communicating with members and providing staff support.

c) Assessment tools

There are approximately 24 spousal violence threat assessment tools used across Canada, including the Danger Assessment Scale (DA), the Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment (ODARA) and the Spousal Assault Risk Assessment Guide (SARA). Some circumstances require the use of a specific type of threat assessment tool (e.g., assessing lethality vs. risk of a repeated assault.) Agencies and organizations from different sectors have come to use and rely on specific risk assessment tools that fit well with their mandate. For example, the police use the DVSRF when frontline officers respond to a domestic violence call. However, a local women's shelter is more likely to use the DA to assess a woman's risk for lethality. The DA has been evaluated for validity and reliability and the DVSR focuses on DV risk factors that have been well-recognized in the research. Each tool is recognized to have different strengths and uses, yet not everyone is trained or educated in the use and interpretation of each one.

Having access to several different threat assessment tools can create confusion and uncertainty among professionals from different organizations. This is especially problematic when a Judge or Justice of the Peace (JP) is relying on a threat assessment tool to make a decision on whether or not an accused in a domestic violence case should be released on bail with strict conditions. A Judge or JP relying on a single threat assessment tool may not fully realize the level of risk and may release the accused even though he poses an elevated risk to the victim. In some cases, the court may require an expert to testify on short notice to help provide background information on the social science behind the tool and predictions of future violence.

The DVAC noted that, "finding one screening tool for the entire VAW system is a compelling idea but difficult to achieve." After reviewing threat assessment tools with leaders in this field, the Council concluded that there is not a single tool that can be used in every situation. They note that, "In fact, the situational specifics around domestic violence, the emerging research and promising practices suggest the use of a host of tools and interventions may be optimal."¹²

Just as there is not a single threat assessment tool that serves all situations and sectors, it has been difficult to settle on a common definition of risk. Dr. Stephen D. Hart, describes risk as, "a threat or hazard that is incompletely understood and therefore can be forecast only with uncertainty."¹³ Risk, he explains, does not exist physically, it is a human perception. Risk assessment tools provide a common language for professionals who work with victims and/or

¹² Domestic Violence Advisory Council. (2009). Transforming our communities: Report from the Domestic Violence Advisory Council for the Minister Responsible for Women's Issues. Retrieved March 17, 2010 from <http://www.crvawc.ca/documents/DVAC%20Report.pdf>

¹³ Stephen D. Hart, Presentation in London, Ontario (April 26, 2010)

perpetrators of domestic violence. The challenge for those involved with the threat assessment and risk management process is to understand the nature of risk factors, what can influence someone's decisions to use violence or to escalate their use of violence and the motives for using violence.

Deciding how to balance the intuition or clinical judgement of professionals with empirical data collected through an actuarial tool may be another challenge related to threat assessment tools. Frontline professionals may conduct a threat assessment with a victim and/or perpetrator of domestic violence and the risk may appear to be quite low. However, the professional may have an intuitive sense that this victim and/or perpetrator pose a higher risk than what is captured by the threat assessment tool. It is a challenge to explain to other professionals that this client is high-risk and petition for high-risk case management based solely on a hunch. For example, there may be one factor such as a new partner in the victim's life that can elevate the risk of a homicide in light of the perpetrator's history of jealousy and controlling behaviour.

d) Resources

Professionals need training to effectively use threat assessment tools. The Ontario Provincial Police requires two years to train an officer in its specialized threat assessment unit. Training can be a greater challenge in rural and remote areas where considerably fewer staff and/or frontline professionals are available.

Maintaining a high-risk team requires qualified staff and adequate support. The committee needs space to meet and to store records. The team requires administrative support. The question of whether team members will be compensated by their home agencies or whether they will need specific funding to participate also has to be addressed.

Not all victims at high risk are in the justice system. This makes public education campaigns to help friends, family and co-workers recognize high-risk situations and inform victims about where they can seek support vitally important.

Once high-risk perpetrators have been identified, resources are needed to monitor and manage them. PAR programs need to reduce waiting lists in order to do their work effectively.

The lack of co-ordination between criminal and civil laws continues to be a problem. The criminal system and the family law system have different objectives and legal standards. They represent two very different paradigms. The criminal law system is more aware of risk and emphasizes risk management and safety planning for the victim. On the other hand, the family law system emphasizes rebuilding relationships.

Currently, a domestic violence victim may have to deal with several different legal cases, such as a criminal charge against the perpetrator, a request for a restraining order and child custody or divorce proceedings. These cases are handled by different courts and different judges, which can lead to potentially conflicting orders (eg. bail conditions and custody and access orders that contradict one another).

Inconsistent or nonexistent information sharing between the courts puts the woman and her children at risk. Family court orders can provide abusers with access to both their ex-partner and their children, undermining attempts at risk management and safety planning. The fragmentation of the justice systems can also further traumatise the victim who has to navigate through the different courts, continuously repeating her story.¹⁴ These situations point to the need to enhance links between the family and criminal justice systems.

Practical Solutions

Although there are challenges to implementing cooperation and collaboration between systems to conduct risk management, these challenges are not insurmountable. Participants put forward many suggestions for practical solutions to overcome the identified barriers.

The discussion above identified some of the challenges and tensions related to information sharing and confidentiality. Professionals and organizations need to determine whether there is good cause to share private client information with other professionals for the sake of the victim’s safety and they need to decide what information is appropriate to share. There are four logical possibilities of information-sharing behaviour (see figure 1).¹⁵

Figure 1: The four logical possibilities of information-sharing behaviour

	Information is shared inappropriately or without good cause	Information is shared appropriately or with good cause
Information is withheld inappropriately or without good cause	A. High risk of breaching confidentiality and high risk of neglecting to pass on important information	B. Low risk of breaching confidentiality and high risk of neglecting to pass on important information
Information is withheld appropriately or with good cause	C. High risk of breaching confidentiality and low risk of neglecting to pass on important information	D. Low risk of breaching confidentiality and low risk of neglecting to pass on important information

The goal of professionals and organizations is to share information in a manner consistent with the conditions outlined in quadrant D, where information is either shared or withheld appropriately..

Agencies and professionals are very cautious about sharing client information due to ethical issues, liability concerns, and apprehension about how that information will be used. If

¹⁴ Uekert, B., Keith, A., & Rubin, T. (2002). Integrating criminal and civil matters in family courts: Performance areas and recommendations. The National Center for State Courts. Retrieved March 17, 2010 from: <http://207.242.75.69/cgi-bin/showfile.exe?CISOROOT=/famct&CISOPTR=71>.

¹⁵ Richardson, S., & Asthana, S. (2005). Policy and legal influences on inter-organisational information sharing in health and social care services. *Journal of Integrated Care*, 13(3), 3-10.

information is to be shared, it is best to gain explicit consent from the client. Many agencies have a standard confidentiality agreement that is signed by all clients using their services. There is an understanding that confidentiality will automatically be breached if clients disclose intentions to harm themselves or someone else or if they disclose child abuse. However, these informed consents do not routinely include provisions for sharing personal information in a collaborative effort to maintain the client's safety.

A first step to overcoming barriers to sharing information for the purpose of risk management is for agencies and professionals working with victims and perpetrators of domestic violence to inform them that they may be asked to give consent to share information with other professionals in a risk management team for the purpose of managing risk and/or creating an effective and appropriate safety plan for the victim.

Consent forms are needed that specify what information may be shared with other professionals in a risk management team for the sole purpose managing risk and/or creating an effective and appropriate safety plan for the victim. To the extent possible, professionals should inform clients at the time they sign a consent form about what information they intend to share, for what purpose, and possible consequences for the client.

Agencies/organizations could work towards a best practice standard by sharing a standard informed consent form to build a common understanding of consent across different systems.

It may not always be possible to obtain consent from a client. Perpetrators of domestic violence can be very hesitant about agreeing to share information due to their legal concerns. However, if the safety of the victim and her children is in jeopardy, there are reasonable grounds to breach confidentiality and share information with other systems and professionals. There are legislative provisions for breaching confidentiality for the purpose of keeping the client safe without facing liability issues and/or other ethical concerns. For example, the Information and Privacy Commissioner of Ontario, Canada states that:

Government organizations are only permitted to disclose the personal information that they collect in accordance with FIPPA or MFIPPA. Health information custodians are only permitted to disclose personal health information in accordance with PHIPA.

Under FIPPA and MFIPPA, some of the circumstances in which government organizations are permitted to disclose personal information include:

- *where the individual has consented to the disclosure;*
- *for the purpose for which the personal information was obtained or compiled or for a consistent purpose;*
- *where the disclosure is necessary and proper in the discharge of the organization's functions;*
- *for the purpose of complying with another Act;*
- *for law enforcement purposes;*
- *in compelling circumstances affecting the health or safety of an individual;*

- *in compassionate circumstances, to facilitate contact with the next of kin or a friend of an individual who is injured, ill or deceased;*
- *to the Information and Privacy Commissioner; and*
- *to the Government of Canada in order to facilitate the auditing of shared cost programs.*¹⁶

Reasons for not sharing information about the victim without her consent are detailed in the previous section. In very rare circumstances, workers may find themselves in an agonizing ethical dilemma where they are weighing the immediate potential threat to the survivor's life (based on repeated and escalating incidents) against her wish not to have contact with the police. These rare circumstances are when VAW workers may risk breaching her confidentiality to try to ensure her safety by consulting with the police.

Although the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA) outlines situations where information can be shared without client consent, agencies and professionals are still uncertain about the exact circumstances when confidentiality of a client can be breached without legal liability. The province of Ontario can help to resolve these dilemmas by establishing guidelines for when community organizations should consider information confidential, when it can be shared, what the process for sharing information should be and for dealing with liability issues. Building on this work, individual organizations can create their own protocols for sharing information without client consent that are consistent with the provisions of FIPPA and the Ontario guidelines. For example, the *Police Services Act* has a protocol for disclosure of personal information that follows the laws under FIPPA and outlines the exact circumstances under which the chief of police or his or her designate can disclose personal information without consent to other professionals/agencies.

To further the protection of client information, certain practices can be established within the risk management team. All members of a high-risk team can be required to sign a memorandum of understanding that outlines what information can be shared and what information should be withheld. The memorandum can also outline how the information will be used to ensure that all of parts of it will not be given to the offender in a way that could put the victim at greater risk for re-assault or lethality. An example of a committee memorandum of understanding is illustrated by the Hamilton High-Risk Domestic Violence Community Advisory Committee (see Appendix C). The committee's memorandum states that 1) confidentiality applies to written and verbal information, 2) information shared is solely for the purpose of reviewing and assessing the release or potential release of high-risk offenders, 3) membership on the committee is subject to the approval of the chief of police and enhanced security clearance, 4) representatives from each agency must swear an Oath or Affirmation of Confidentiality, and 5) parties are indemnified by the police unless negligent.

Some members of a collaborative high-risk team may be able to discuss case scenarios without disclosing any identifying information. While some members of the team, including Crown Attorneys, would not generally engage in discussions of real cases on an anonymous

¹⁶ *Disclosing Information*. (2010). The Information and Privacy Commissioner, Ontario, Canada. Retrieved March 17, 2010 from: <http://www.ipc.on.ca/english/Privacy/Disclosing-Information/>.

basis, discussions of hypothetical case studies could be helpful to build the skill and knowledge of the team as a whole, as well as individual members.

The collaborative team may also look to creative ways to obtain information without consent. For example, court documents are available to the public and can be used without requiring consent from the client. Additionally, collaborators could access information from family and friends of the perpetrator without consent from the client.

Many of the challenges related to developing a risk management team can be resolved through the development of guidelines such as a Memorandum of Understanding and an Oath of Confidentiality. The Memorandum of Understanding can address who should participate in the collaborative and why. It can allow for both permanent and occasional members who are invited to participate on an as-needed basis. Agencies/organizations can include membership on a high-risk management team as part of the job description for employed professionals or membership can be considered voluntary. The memorandum can also outline the duration of participation by representatives and the process to terminate their participation from the team. These terms can help resolve the issue of high turnover rates by giving the team ample time to make new arrangements when a team member decides to leave. Furthermore, in the case that a member of the high risk team is not available for a particular case, the memorandum can allow for the participation of other representatives from the same sector to step in and offer advice and/or support.

This is a place to establish guidelines about when community organizations should consider information confidential, when it can be shared, what the process for sharing information should be and how liability issues associated with sharing or withholding information should be handled.

An Oath of Confidentiality can formalize the agreement of each participating member of the high-risk team to abide by the guidelines on how and when to share information.

Another challenge that can arise in developing collaborative relationships for a risk management team is a lack of trust between stakeholders. Concern that agencies with different mandates may try to push their own agendas and, in the process, lose sight of the victim's safety may surface. This can be exacerbated when the assessments and judgments of professionals not from the violence against women sector and not educated on the dynamics of domestic violence are biased in a way that minimizes risk. Educating all members of the high-risk team about the mandate of each agency can help all stakeholders understand the specific expertise and experience at the table and can facilitate the negotiation of different perspectives and approaches to reach the common goal of protecting the victim and her children. The high-risk team can also provide ongoing training about the dynamics of domestic violence to educate representatives not from the VAW sector.

The number of risk assessment tools used by different sectors can cause confusion and uncertainty when collaborating on risk management. To overcome this challenge, all sectors need training on the variety of threat assessment tools that are available and in use.

While it is difficult to establish a standard definition of risk, in Ontario we can benefit greatly from the work of the Domestic Violence Death Review Committee which has identified factors in domestic violence cases that signal high risk. The most common risk factors in cases that have resulted in death include:

- Actual or pending separation between the deceased and the perpetrator.
- A history of domestic violence.
- Obsessive behaviour, including stalking.
- Depression in the perpetrator.
- An increase in the level of violence.
- Threats to kill the victim in the past.¹⁷

These conclusions allow high-risk teams to focus on the facts of the case and indicates what information the team needs to seek out, if it is not immediately available. Focusing on known high-risk factors for domestic homicide avoids the difficult and potentially divisive task of coming up with a common definition of risk.

Dr. Stephen Hart identifies three important risk factors that can influence decisions about intimate partner violence. These are: motivation, destabilization and disinhibition. Motivation refers to an increase in the perceived rewards or benefits that result from using violence; disinhibition refers to anything that can make someone blind to the negative consequences of using violence (eg. alcohol). Destabilization refers to ongoing stresses that can upset emotional balance and mental health. These factors can act on their own or in tandem to increase the likelihood that someone will decide to use or increase violence against a partner or an ex-partner.

Deciding how much weight to accord an expert's intuition about the level of risk, especially when it is not consistent with the empirical data collected from threat assessment tools may be a challenge for high risk teams. A case may be deemed low risk by a standard threat assessment tool yet the professionals dealing directly with the case may feel that the case is likely high-risk. Or, there may be few risk factors but the woman may have a heightened, intuitive sense of fear. A professional may question the science that results in an assessment of low risk when they have a sense that the case is definitely high risk. The Huron Assessment Risk Reduction Team (HARRT) has an open door policy when it comes to referrals. HARRT bases its decisions to accept a referral on the number of risk factors present; however it will also accept referrals of cases with few or no risk factors based on the victim's intuitive sense of fear and the collective knowledge, experience and intuitive assessment of the team members.¹⁸ While each high-risk team will have to establish its own inclusion criteria, it is important to recognize the importance of clinical judgment as well as data collected from actuarial tools.

An effective risk management process requires trained professionals who understand risk and specific threat assessment tools. Fully training professionals in risk management requires an investment over time. Therefore, agencies and organizations need to take responsibility to

¹⁷ Ontario Domestic Violence Death Review Committee. (2008). Annual report to the Chief Coroner. Toronto, ON: Office of the Chief Coroner.

¹⁸ Ontario Domestic Violence Death Review Committee. (2006). Annual report to the Chief Coroner. Toronto, ON: Office of the Chief Coroner.

provide ongoing training in risk management for their professionals. Additionally, different sectors can provide a variety of training seminars and workshops on particular threat assessment tools and allow professionals from different systems to attend.

Finally, links and collaboration between the family and criminal justice systems must be established and maintained. While not all women are involved in both courts, many are. A flow of information between the two, particularly with respect to orders relating to contact between the parties, could increase women's safety and feelings of security. Family courts need to recognize that cases involving domestic violence cannot be treated in the same way as cases where domestic violence is not occurring. Research from multiple sources, including the Domestic Violence Death Review Committee, has clearly established that women are most at risk of domestic homicide at the time of separation, precisely when they are entering the family court system.

The Ministry of the Attorney General is presently working to establish a single case management system approach. In its report, the Domestic Violence Advisory Council supported "the establishment of a single case management system approach, with the restraining order index as the first test of a business process to share information between the family and criminal courts. Priority be given to the communication of orders issued by either court."¹⁹ This and other recommendations from the DVAC provide excellent suggestions for improving women's safety and reducing risk as they enter the family court system.

Unique challenges and practical solutions for threat assessment and risk management within minority populations

The barriers for professionals related to risk management and collaboration extends to all families experiencing domestic violence. However, minority cultures have unique circumstances that create specific challenges for professionals attempting to conduct threat assessments or collaborate on risk management. There is no known threat assessment tool that incorporates specific risks associated with minority populations. Minority cultures often face significant rates of poverty, language barriers, and racism. Many people from these communities distrust values, norms, and authority figures from the dominant culture. All of this can cause stress and increase the level of risk for domestic violence and/or lethality. Using standard threat assessment tools, without taking these particular issues into consideration, may lead to mistakes in accurately identifying the level of risk. Therefore, work is needed to understand and incorporate risk factors related to re-assault or lethality that stem from the unique features of minority cultures.

Language barriers pose a serious challenge for conducting threat assessments with people from minority populations. Threat assessments require the voice of the victim and, if the professional does not speak the language of the victim, many issues can be lost in translation. Immigrant women need to express themselves in their native language to capture the true impact of the violence on themselves and their family. It is critical for frontline professionals to use

¹⁹ Domestic Violence Advisory Council. (2009). Transforming our communities: Report from the Domestic Violence Advisory Council for the Minister Responsible for Women's Issues. Retrieved March 17, 2010 from <http://www.crvawc.ca/documents/DVAC%20Report.pdf>

professionally trained interpreters when conducting threat assessments with immigrant women in order to capture the full impact of the violence, assess an accurate level of risk posed by the perpetrator, and to create an environment of safety, concern, and respect for the victim.

Francophone women emphasized the importance of providing French language services, especially in designated areas of the province. French is one of the two official languages of Canada. It is legislated as an official language of Ontario in the courts and in education. The right to services in French is protected under the *French Language Services Act* (1986). Accordingly, interpretation services for French speaking women do not constitute adequate, sufficient or quality French language service.

This is an issue of law, language and culture, but also of safety. If a Francophone woman calls 911 in an emergency, she should have a legal right to receive services in French. If her message is incorrectly understood and her situation is not considered urgent, serious safety risks ensue. These are risks she would not have faced if she spoke English.

Minority communities are often quite small and interconnected. Many community members know each other. This can create a challenge for professionals working with families experiencing domestic violence in terms of maintaining confidentiality or remaining neutral and eradicating biases that may stem from having a personal relationship with the victim and/or the perpetrator or their families. The interrelated nature of the community may also make victims reluctant to disclose abuse for fear that this information will get back to the perpetrator and put them in greater risk of further abuse or lethality.

Minority cultures have unique circumstances that can influence their level of risk for violence and lethality. A woman's culture may play a role in whether she seeks support from Canadian anti-violence agencies when she is experiencing abuse. Seeking support from a mainstream agency may mean a loss of support or even ostracization by other community members, including her extended family. This would leave her isolated when she is most in need of support. Research has demonstrated that Arab Muslim women who are being abused often do not seek support from anti-violence agencies because of beliefs in the Muslim culture that using these support networks and publicizing private domestic disputes is a violation of the marriage contract. A woman who chooses to disclose violence may risk losing status and respect in her community and within her family. Unfortunately community and justice sectors don't always take these unique circumstances into account when assessing and/or managing high-risk cases. Therefore, when developing a high-risk management team, it is important to include team members who are knowledgeable about minority cultures to ensure the development of safety strategies that incorporate the unique circumstances and customs of the women, children, and men from these populations.

The Muslim Resource Centre for Social Support and Integration in London, Ontario has developed new ways of working with mainstream service providers to help them deliver culturally competent services. It recently formalized a protocol with the Children's Aid Society. Craig Harper, supervisor, Diversity and Child and Family Services for the CAS was quoted in the London Free Press as saying, "Up until five or six years ago, we practiced a risk-assessment model that didn't really take into account some of the dynamics of the Muslim community. As

we became more aware, we realized it is more difficult to assess risk in a culture you don't understand,” he said. More initiatives are required to help mainstream service providers work with leaders and woman abuse experts to build trust, to understand the core values of those they are working with and to learn how to intervene more effectively.

To increase safety provisions for victims that live in small communities and disclose abuse, more professionals need to visit these communities regularly. Another critical need is safe transportation, so that women can travel to safe shelters, legal services and court when required. Affordable housing is another key component of assuring long-term safety for women and their children. These communities require access to the justice system (e.g., Crown Attorneys, courts) and professionals to come together and collaborate on high-risk cases. When distance and time make face-to-face consultation impractical or prohibitively expensive, professionals can collaborate on high-risk cases by way of the internet or teleconference.

As of March 31, 2010, the Native Women’s Association of Canada (NWAC) had gathered information about the disappearance or death of more than 580 Aboriginal women and girls across Canada. This finding is the result of quantitative and qualitative research carried out over a period of five years.²⁰ The United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women confirmed, in 2008, that “...hundreds of cases involving Aboriginal women who have gone missing or been murdered in the past two decades have neither been fully investigated nor attracted priority attention.”²¹

Many Aboriginal women experiencing violence do not have access to the justice system, safe housing, and/or other essential supports. In addition, many of the safety plans, threat assessments, and justice processes do not take into consideration the life circumstances unique to Aboriginal families. It is time for the justice and community sectors to recognize the prevalence of domestic violence and homicide within Aboriginal communities and to create safety measures that are respectful of the needs of Aboriginal people. This includes: providing resources and funding that will allow Aboriginal women to have access to essential safety supports; creating threat assessment tools that incorporate the unique circumstances of Aboriginal populations; developing risk management techniques, such as batterer intervention programs specific to Aboriginal men, that integrate Aboriginal customs and beliefs; and educating the general public about the missing and murdered Aboriginal women and girls. In September, 2007, the Ontario Native Women’s Association and the Ontario Federation of Indian Friendship Centres released, “A Strategic Framework to End Violence Against Aboriginal Women.” This is a comprehensive document that lays out a way to proceed with this important work. Again, Aboriginal people must be leaders in seeking solutions.

Next Steps

²⁰ Native Women’s Association of Canada website, Retrieved May 15, 2010 from <http://www.nwac-hq.org/media/release/21-04-10>

²¹ Amnesty International website, Retrieved May 15, 2010 from http://www.amnesty.ca/campaigns/sisters_overview.php

Conference participants agreed that the first step required to create effective high-risk management teams involving justice and community partners is to share the knowledge gained from the conference with community partners. As the conference evaluation (Appendix B) shows, the information presented was relevant and helpful to the work of participants and informative.

Although encouraged by the possibilities presented at the conference for expanded relationship building and collaboration between community and justice partners to create high-risk management teams, questions and apprehension remained about the specifics of sharing information and potential breaches of confidentiality. Many communities included provisions for creating protocols and memorandums of understanding in their action plans.

There was a shared hope among conference participants that the government will support the development of more high-risk management teams that include both community and justice partners, continue to support public education campaigns and provide support to programs that can track high-risk perpetrators (e.g., PARS). The province of Ontario can play an essential role in encouraging the establishment of high-risk management teams that include community and justice partners across the province and in supporting the development of guidelines and information to assist community partners in determining what is confidential, when it can be shared, what the process for sharing information should be and for dealing with liability issues. Ontario can build on promising practices such as those of the Hamilton Police Service, which has benefited from legal consultation in its development of guidelines that can be shared with other police services.

The Province of Ontario can also support the establishment of training resources and an implementation plan for a basket of threat assessment and risk management tools with which all sectors should be familiar. This can be facilitated through local, regional and/or provincial meetings and/or events to provide organizations with an opportunity to network, exchange information, identify best practices and receive training.

Through education on the specific threat assessment tools and the mandates of particular organizations that deal with families exposed to domestic violence, communities and systems will begin to work together to protect women and children from further abuse and/or lethality.

Recognizing that there are limitations to what we can do, in particular due to privacy legislation and the fiscal environment, organizations still have an opportunity to reduce the risk of lethal violence through increased collaboration and improved communication.

Conclusions

This paper represents the thinking of community and justice reps from across Ontario, who deal with threat assessment and risk management in their daily work. Two hundred and eighty-six people, roughly half from the justice sector and half from community based agencies, from 48 coordinating committees across the province contributed to the analysis and the ideas expressed here.

A clear commitment for enhanced collaboration and continuous improvement to all systems emerged from the conference. Lessons learned from DVDRC and the framework offered by the Domestic Violence Advisory Council signify tremendous progress in developing common understandings of risk management and agreement that we need to work collaboratively. We are poised to take the work to the next level as we translate promising practices identified at the conference into action in communities across Ontario.

Reducing the Risk of Lethal Violence

Collaboration in Threat Assessment &
Risk Management: From Theory to Practice

Hamilton Convention Centre, Hamilton, ON

safety planning
risk reduction
innovation
public education
understand



Reducing the Risk of Lethal Violence

Funded by:

Ontario Women's Directorate, Province of Ontario

Host:

Centre for Research & Education on Violence against Women and Children, Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario

Advisory Committee:

Clare Freeman, Former Chair of the Domestic Violence Advisory Council, Executive Director, Interval House, Hamilton, Ontario

Deborah Sinclair, Former member, Domestic Violence Advisory Council, Member, Domestic Violence Death Review Committee, Social Worker/ Consultant, Toronto

Mark Holmes, Former member, Domestic Violence Advisory Council, Program Coordinator, New Directions, Catholic Family Services Ottawa

Sean Tout, Staff Sergeant, Project Manager, Executive Office Research and Planning, Waterloo Regional Police Service, former member of the Domestic Violence Advisory Committee

Norine Nathanson, Crown Counsel, Provincial Co-Lead, Domestic Violence Court Program, Criminal Law Policy Branch, Ministry of the Attorney General

Johanne Ouimette, Consultant on issues of VAW & Delegate, Action ontarienne contre la violence faite aux femmes

Gaëtane Pharand, Former member of the Domestic Violence Advisory Council, Director of Centre Victoria pour femmes & Member/delegate, Action ontarienne contre la violence faite aux femmes

Tracey Foreman, Ministry Lead, Corrections Domestic Violence Management & Operational Support Branch, Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services

Purpose:

"An effective response to domestic violence requires not only well-informed individual interventions, but also coordination of services by different professionals involved with family members."¹

"Threat assessment and risk management can be better achieved when different individuals who intersect with clients at separate points are able to put risk factors together to form a complete picture."²

Case reviews by the Domestic Violence Death Review Committee consistently show that cross-sectoral collaboration can increase the effectiveness of responses to high risk situations. Other research on intervention strategies has validated that threat assessment and risk management is most successful when professionals within the justice system and community services who interact with clients at distinct times and in distinct settings work together.³

In Ontario we have begun to establish teams focused on providing an appropriate response to high-risk cases of spousal violence. They are involved in developing comprehensive safety plans and risk management strategies with the parties involved, ensuring appropriate monitoring and an ongoing evaluation of the level of risk.

This conference is an opportunity for partners from the justice sector and from community-based services to come together to discuss the challenges and benefits of cross-sectoral collaboration and to build stronger relationships. Strong working relationships provide the foundation for collaboration, thereby increasing the effectiveness of our responses to high risk cases of woman abuse/domestic violence.

¹Domestic Violence Death Review Committee. *Domestic Violence Death Review Committee Annual Report to the Chief Coroner, 2005*. Office of the Chief Coroner of Ontario. (2005). 21.

²Transforming our Communities Report from the Domestic Violence Advisory Council for the Minister Responsible for Women's Issues. (2009). 92.

³Gondolf, E. W. (2002). *Batterer Intervention Systems: Issues, Outcomes, and Recommendations*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Sunday, February 7, 2010 - Sheraton Hotel

7:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

Registration and Networking Reception

South/West Ballroom 2nd floor (above the lobby) of the Sheraton Hamilton Hotel, 116 King St. West, Hamilton, ON. The hotel adjoins the Convention Centre.

Seating will be assigned and changed for each half-day to mix the sectors and jurisdictions. On the final half-day people from the same jurisdiction will be seated at the same table to facilitate discussions about local processes.

Entertainment provided by D J Moons (sponsored by CREVAWC)

Monday, February 8, 2010 - Hamilton Convention Centre - Chedoke A

7:30 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.

Registration and Continental Breakfast

8:30 a.m. – 8:45 a.m.

Opening Ceremony – Elders from Six Nations

8:45 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.

Welcome and Greetings

The Honourable Chris Bentley, Attorney General

Chief Glenn DeKaire, Hamilton Police Service

Confronting the Challenges in the Change Process: Naming the Problems

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

Opening Plenary

Co-chairs

Mark Holmes, Former member, Domestic Violence Advisory Council, Program Co-ordinator, New Directions – Catholic Family Services Ottawa

Deborah Sinclair, Former member, Domestic Violence Advisory Council, Member, Domestic Violence Death Review Committee, Social Worker/Consultant, Toronto

Introduce Domestic Violence Death Review Committee and Domestic Violence Advisory Council reports and recommendations



Jacquelyn Campbell, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs/Professor,
Johns Hopkins University

An overview of challenges for justice and community partners in working collaboratively on risk assessment

Chris Kiriakopoulos, Sexual Assault Unit, Victims of Crime Branch, Hamilton Police
Challenges for Police in collaborating on risk assessment

Teresa Donnelly, Assistant Crown Attorney, Huron County
Challenges for Crowns in collaborating on risk assessment

10:30 a.m. – 10:50 a.m.

Break

10:50 a.m. – 12 noon

Small Group Discussion & Large Group Report on Challenges: Confidentiality and Information Sharing

Discuss real and perceived problems such as information sharing and access to resources and report back

12 noon – 1:30 p.m.

Lunch & Luncheon Address

No Private Matter: Protecting Women & Children Living with Domestic Violence

Mary Ellen Turpel-Lafond, B.C.'s first Representative for Children and Youth in November 2006. The Representative is an Independent Officer of the Legislature.

Ms. Turpel-Lafond authored the report on the death of six-year-old Christian Lee who died along with his mother and three other members of his family in a murder/suicide committed by his father Peter Lee.

Recognizing the Opportunities for Effective Collaboration: Identifying Solutions

1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Co-chairs

Afternoon Plenary

Mark Holmes, Former member, Domestic Violence Advisory Council, Program Co-ordinator, New Directions – Catholic Family Services Ottawa

Deborah Sinclair, Former member, Domestic Violence Advisory Council, Member, Domestic Violence Death Review Committee, Social Worker/Consultant, Toronto

Introduction to the discussion

Debra Heaton, Behavioural Sciences Section, Ontario Provincial Police
Understanding tools for threat assessment/risk management

Marco Visentini, Legal Counsel, Hamilton Police Service
Resolving the conflict between confidentiality and information sharing

Pam Mank, Director, Waterloo Family Violence Project

Paul Lobsinger, Domestic Violence Unit, Waterloo Regional Police.
Resolving the conflict between confidentiality and information sharing

Maureen Reid, Manager, The Children's Aid Society of London & Middlesex
Sharing information and collaborating to keep children safe

3:00 p.m. – 3:20 p.m.

Break

3:20 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Small Group Discussion & Large Group Report

Discuss practical solutions to address the barriers discussed in the morning or that you have encountered in your own community

4:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

Cash Bar Entertainment provided by Corner Pocket (sponsored by CREVAWC)

6:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

Dinner

7:00 p.m. – 7:45 p.m.

Representatives from the Sisters in Spirit Campaign

Risks for Aboriginal Women

7:45 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

Holly Johnson, Associate Professor & Senior Research Associate, Department of Criminology and Institute for the Prevention of Crime, University of Ottawa

Mohammed Baobaid, Executive Director, Muslim Family Resource Centre for Social Support and Integration

The Intersection of Risk & Vulnerabilities



Tuesday, February 9, 2010 - Hamilton Convention Centre - Chedoke A

Promising Practices in Ontario: Taking Them Back to Our Communities

8:00 a.m. – 8:45 a.m.

Continental Breakfast

8:45 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.

The Honourable Laurel Broten, Minister of Children and Youth Services and Minister Responsible for Women's Issues

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

Plenary

Chair

Clare Freeman, Former Chair of the Domestic Violence Advisory Council, Executive Director, Interval House, Hamilton, Ontario

Hamilton High Risk Team

Chris Kiriakopoulos, Sexual Assault Unit, Victims of Crime Branch, Hamilton Police

Susan Double, Acting Administrator, Victim Services, Hamilton Police Service

Terry McGurk, St Joseph's Heath Care/ COAST

Mary Jo Calvert, Manager of Intake Services, Children's Aid Society of Hamilton

A model program

Waterloo Family Violence Project

Paul Lobsinger, Domestic Violence Unit, Waterloo Regional Police Service

Kathryn Black, Sergeant, Domestic Violence Unit, Waterloo Regional Police Service

Pam Mank, Director, Waterloo Family Violence Project

Teresa Donnelly, Assistant Crown Attorney, Huron County

A model program

Belleville

Lorie Baird, Victim Witness Services Worker, Belleville Victim Witness Assistance Program

Cathy Gaebel, Victim Witness Services Worker, Belleville Victim Witness Assistance Program

A model program

10:30 a.m. – 10:50 a.m.

Break

10:50 a.m. – noon

Small Group Discussion on Developing an Action Plan for your Jurisdiction & Large Group Reporting

12 noon – 1:00 p.m.

Closing Luncheon

1:00 p.m. – 1:10 p.m.

Conference Evaluation

1:10 p.m. – 1:20 p.m.

Clare Freeman, Former Chair of the Domestic Violence Advisory Council, Executive Director, Interval House, Hamilton, Ontario
Closing Reflections

1:20 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.

Peter Jaffe, Academic Director, Centre for Research & Education on Violence against Women & Children, Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario, Member, Ontario Domestic Violence Death Review Committee

Barb MacQuarrie, Community Director, Centre for Research & Education on Violence against Women & Children, Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario, Member, Domestic Violence Advisory Council

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Reducing the Risk of Lethal Violence

Biographies

BAIRD, LORI

Lorie Baird is a Victim Witness Services Worker at the Victim Witness Assistance Program in Belleville. She has worked in this capacity for two years. Before joining VVAP, Ms. Baird worked as a member of the Outreach Team for Three Oaks Foundation, Belleville's shelter for women and children and previously worked as a House Counsellor. During her tenure with Three Oaks Foundation, Lorie attended the Domestic Violence Court on a weekly basis to meet women at court, offering services and support. Since joining VVAP, Ms. Baird has provided services on all HART cases, coordinates the bi-weekly HART schedule and has made varied and numerous contributions to improving the HART process.

BAOBAID, MOHAMMED

Mohammed Baobaid, PhD, earned his doctoral degree from the institute of Psychology at the University of Erlangen Nurnberg in Germany. He is the founder of the Muslim Family Safety Project that addresses Domestic Violence in the Muslim community of London Ontario. Dr. Baobaid is currently the Executive Director of the Muslim Resource Centre for Social Support and Integration. He is also a research associate at the Centre for Research & Education on Violence against Women and Children at the University of Western Ontario. His research areas include cross-cultural perspectives on preventing domestic violence in Muslim and Arab Communities. In addition, he has trained mainstream service providers about working with Muslim families affected by domestic violence. Dr. Baobaid was the second recipient of Every Day Hero Award of the Centre for Research & Education on Violence against Women and Children. He is also on the list of the most 500 influential Muslims that was published in a book by the Royal Islamic Strategic Studies Centre in Jordan and the Prince Alwaleed Bin Talal Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding at Georgetown University.

BLACK, KATHRYN

Kathryn Black is a Sergeant in the Waterloo Regional Police Service Domestic Violence Investigation Branch. She has been an officer for 17 years and has worked in a variety of areas including patrol, Communications, Research and Planning, and Quality Assurance. She is on the Critical Incident Team for Waterloo Regional Police Service.

As a Sergeant in the Domestic Violence Investigation Branch, Kathryn supervises a platoon of seven investigators. She has taken a key leadership role in the successful development and implementation of the collaborative model. Kathryn is the co-chair of the Waterloo Region High Risk Case Review Team. Kathryn enjoys working with the other community agencies within the Family Violence Project to proactively address issues of family violence. She recognizes that the entire community has a role to play in eliminating domestic violence.

CALVERT, MARY JO

Mary Jo Calvert has worked at the Children's Aid Society of Hamilton for the past 20 years. She has worked as a child protection investigator and is currently the Manager of Intake Services. In her capacity at the CAS, Mary Jo has collaborated with both the Violence Against Women services as well as the Men's Anti violence service providers in an attempt to increase safety for children and women receiving child welfare services.

CAMPBELL, JACQUELINE

Jacquelyn Campbell is the Anna D. Wolf Chair and a Professor in the Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing with a joint appointment in the Bloomberg School of Public Health. She has been conducting advocacy policy work and research in the area of violence against women since 1980 and has published more than 200 articles and seven books. Dr. Campbell has been PI on 10 major US governmental research grants and Co-Chaired the Steering Committee for the WHO Multi-country Study on Violence Against Women and Women's Health as well as consulting on several major research projects related to domestic violence in Canada. She is an elected member of the Institute of Medicine and the American Academy of Nursing and is President of the Board of Directors of the Family Violence Prevention Fund. She also was a member of the congressionally appointed US Department of Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence and served on the Board of Directors of the House of Ruth Battered Women's Shelter and three other shelters.

DONNELLY, TERESA

Teresa Donnelly has been an Assistant Crown Attorney in the County of Huron since 2008. Prior to that, she was an Assistant Crown Attorney in the Region of Waterloo for 14 years. Teresa specializes in Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault prosecutions. Her passions are protecting women and children. In 2006, Teresa Donnelly became the first Crown at the Family Violence Project in Waterloo Region where Justice Partners and Community agencies work closely to ensure that victims have a voice and that their needs are met promptly, thoroughly and with respect. Teresa was a member of the High Risk Team in the Region of Waterloo and is a member of the High Risk Team (H.A.R.R.T.) in Huron County.

DOUBLE, SUSAN

Susan Double graduated from McMaster University with a B.A. in Sociology. Upon graduation she was employed with the Ontario Government in a variety of positions including Youth Correctional Officer, Probation Officer for young offenders and Client Service Representative with the Ontario Disability office. She has been working with victims of crime for 12 years. From 1997-2004 she was the Assistant Coordinator and Acting Manager of the Ministry of Attorney General's Victim/Witness Assistance Program in Hamilton. Since 2004 she has been the Coordinator and recently the Acting Administrator of the Victim Services Branch of the Hamilton Police Service. Her position entails a dual role of administration and front line crisis response responding to victims of crime and tragedy.

FOREMAN, TRACEY

Following roles in several community-based facilities, including Addictions Specialist and Clinical and Support Staff Supervisor at the Stonehenge Therapeutic Community in Guelph, Ontario, Tracey Foreman joined the Ministry in 1990 as a Clinical Social Worker II at the Guelph Correctional Centre. She served in subsequent clinical roles at the Wellington Detention Centre, Sarnia and Chatham Jails before advancing to the position of Deputy Superintendent at the Sarnia Jail.

Since then, she has honed skills in change management, consensus building and policy/program development and implementation as a Project Manager at local, regional and corporate levels, including postings with the Office of the Assistant Deputy Minister, Adult Community Corrections.

Since 2005, Tracey has led the Corrections response to the government's Domestic Violence Action Plan, and serves as Domestic Violence Inter-Ministerial Coordinator, developing and implementing strategies addressing domestic violence initiatives while ensuring Corrections' policy and programs are integrated with broader governmental priorities of public safety and violence, leading special projects, and representing the Ministry on interministerial, intergovernmental and stakeholder committees, work groups and task forces.

FREEMAN, CLARE

As a therapist, educator and advocate Clare Freeman has worked with and for children and female sexual assault and woman abuse survivors for the past 17 years in both residential and counseling settings. Currently, Clare is the executive director for Interval House of Hamilton, a women's shelter and outreach service for abused women and children and is a member of Hamilton's High Risk team. She is the past chair of the Provincial Domestic Violence Advisory Council to Minister of Women's issues and Ministry of Child and Youth Services.

She holds a Masters degree in social work, a child and youth diploma, and a behavioural science certification. She has been involved in providing post secondary educational instruction in the area of family work, human relations, human sexuality, social movements and group work.

In addition to this, she has provided training to both Hamilton Police Services and to the Bell Cairn Institute for provincial Probation and Parole training. She was a co-investigator on Dr. MacMillian's Ontario Women's Health Grant studying "If, when and How to ask the questions of woman abuse in Health care settings" and Clare has just finished a research project with Dr. MacMillian and Nadine Wathan on the education of Health care and social work providers in the area of Domestic violence.

GAEBEL, CATHY

Cathy Gaebel is a Victim Witness Services Worker at the Victim Witness Assistance Program in Belleville. Ms. Gaebel has worked with VVAP since 1998, and previously volunteered with the program. Ms. Gaebel has worked in the Domestic Violence Court on a number of rotations over the years. During these rotations, Ms. Gaebel provided services to HART cases, coordinated the biweekly review schedule and was instrumental in shaping the HART process for Belleville. She has participated in a number of workshops and training sessions, both as participant and presenter, included the DVC Co-leads conferences and police training sessions.

HEATON, DEBRA

D/Sgt. Debra Heaton has been a member of the Ontario Provincial Police for 25 years. She has investigated numerous criminal offences including homicides, arsons, robberies, stalking and threatening cases, narcotics, sexual assaults, and abductions and also served as a hostage/barricaded person's negotiator.

D/Sgt. Heaton has been assigned to the OPP Behavioural Sciences and Analysis Services for 13 years, first as a Supervisor and violent crimes analyst in the Violent Crime Linkage Analysis Centre. In 2000, she assisted in the formation of Canada's first sex offender registry, the Ontario Sex Offender Registry. In September 2001 Detective Sergeant Heaton was assigned to the Threat Assessment Unit.

D/Sgt. Heaton is a member of the Association of Threat Assessment Professionals and the Canadian Association of Threat Assessment Professionals and has extensive training and experience in the management of incidents where there is a potential for targeted violence such as stalking, workplace violence, school violence, sexual offenders, threatening correspondence, threats to public/political figures, high risk releases and domestic violence cases for the OPP, other law enforcement agencies and criminal justice agencies nationally and internationally. She has been qualified as an expert in the field of Threat Assessment in the Ontario Court of Justice.

Detective Sergeant Heaton frequently provides instruction regarding domestic violence, sex offenders, school violence and other threat assessment areas and services offered by Behavioural Sciences and Analysis Services.

HOLMES, MARK

Mark is the Co-ordinator of the New Directions Program, a Partner Assault Response Program which is located at Catholic Family Service Ottawa. He is the co-founder of New Directions and has worked in the program since its inception in 1984. New Directions has provided service to approximately 8000 men during that time. Mark has a Diploma in Early Childhood Education from Algonquin College and a B.A.(Psychology) and a Master's of Social Work from Carleton University. He has also worked as a day care worker, childcare worker with the Ottawa Children's Aid Society, a community legal worker and with the Ministry of the Attorney General's Victim Witness Assistance Program, as well as providing support to male survivors of physical and sexual abuse that occurred at the St. Joseph's Training School in Alfred, Ontario.

In May 2009, Mark concluded an appointment as a member of the Government of Ontario's Domestic Violence Advisory Council.

JAFFE, PETER

Dr. Peter Jaffe is a Professor in the Faculty of Education at the University of Western Ontario and the Academic Director of the Centre for Research & Education on Violence against Women & Children. He is the Director Emeritus for the Centre for Children and Families in the Justice System, which is a children's mental health centre specializing in issues which bring children and families into the justice system in London, Ontario. He has co-authored many books, chapters and articles related to children, families and the justice system including Children of Battered Women, Child Custody & Domestic Violence and Working Together to End Domestic Violence. He has presented workshops across the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Europe to various groups including judges, lawyers, mental health professionals and educators. Dr. Jaffe has been an expert witness in three Ontario inquests into domestic homicides. He is a founding member of the Chief Coroners Domestic Violence Death Review Committee.

JOHNSON, HOLLY

Holly Johnson is Associate Professor of Criminology at the University of Ottawa, Canada. Her primary research interests over the past two decades have centered on methodological and policy issues surrounding male violence against women. She was principal investigator of Statistics Canada's first national survey on violence against women and a collaborator on the International Violence Against Women Survey. She is author of numerous peer-reviewed articles, books and government reports on this topic and has served as expert advisor to several UN undertakings, most recently the UN Expert Group on Indicators on Violence Against Women. She is co-investigator on the Canadian Observatory on the Justice System's Response to Intimate Partner Violence and co-author, with Myrna Dawson, of the upcoming text Violence Against Women in Canada: Research and Policy Perspectives (Oxford University Press). In her local community, she is an active member of the Ottawa Coalition to End Violence Against Women.

KIRIAKOPOULOS, CHRIS

Detective Sergeant Kiriakopoulos began his career with Hamilton Police Service in 1984. He has been assigned to the Patrol, Parks Marine, Criminal Investigation, and Crime Analysis Branches. In 2000 Det/Sgt Kiriakopoulos was assigned to the Family Violence resource Unit and promoted to the rank of Sergeant. He continued in this role for three years and then to the Hate Crime Branch. Chris was promoted the rank of Detective Sergeant and for the past 3 years has been in charge of the Victims of Crime Branch including the Sexual Assault Unit, Child Abuse Branch, Family Violence Resource Unit and the Crimes Against Seniors Branch.

LOBSINGER, PAUL

Paul Lobsinger is the Staff Sergeant in charge of the Waterloo Regional Police Service Domestic Violence Investigation Branch located at the Family Violence Project of Waterloo Region. He is in his 23rd year of police service to his community. Prior to coming to the Domestic Violence Unit he was a Sergeant in Support Services at Headquarters.

Paul has extensive experience in criminal investigation and community policing. He has experience in Patrol, Detectives, Divisional Street Crime Unit, Drug Investigation and Professional Standards.

Having focused much of his policing career in Criminal Investigations, Paul is committed to ensuring that victims of domestic violence and elder abuse receive the utmost level of support and investigation from the Waterloo Regional Police Service. Working closely with the co-located community services to provide a seamless and holistic response to domestic violence and elder abuse is essential in providing the best service possible to our community. Tackling these social ills is a new challenge for Paul and he welcomes the opportunity.

MANK, PAMELA

Pamela Mank is the Co-ordinator of the Family Violence Project Waterloo Region. This seamless response to family violence is the first of its kind in Canada. It is a collaborative response to Domestic Violence representing a one-stop service approach with 13 co-located Partner agencies and services. She is also the Assistant Clinical Director of Catholic Family Counselling Centre (CFCC), Waterloo Region. Pamela has a Masters degree in Social Work. For over 25 years she has specialized in working with women particularly in the areas of Family Violence, Sexual Assault, Self Esteem and Self Growth/Understanding. She has developed a psychoeducational programme for women dealing with Domestic Violence related issues. She has been successfully running this programme, “Understanding Me” for 12 years as well as leading Family Violence Therapy Groups and Separation/Divorce Groups. She indicates that ultimately working with these groups and in the area of Family Violence is a mutual learning process. The women have taught her about their experiences and she has been able to use their collective voices to teach others. She has a leadership role with CFCC’s Critical Incident Response Team which has responded to a myriad of crisis/incidents within her community. Pamela is a long term field placement supervisor for Wilfrid Laurier University Masters of Social Work students. She has had articles published on a variety of topics related to personal growth and recently The Family Violence Project.

MACQUARRIE, BARB

Barb MacQuarrie is the Community Director of the Centre for Research & Education on Violence against Women & Children at the University of Western Ontario. She works to promote collaboration between community-based professionals and advocates and academic researchers. She has been an advocate for survivors of violence and has worked on diverse fronts to give voice to their experiences of violence as well as their experiences in the systems that are intended to respond to this violence. She has co-authored publications on workplace harassment, violence in the lives of girls, violence on college and university campuses and has written for local anti-violence organizations about the challenges facing front line service providers and the connections between mental health, addictions and trauma. She is the executive producer of the video, “The Way Forward: Rethinking the problem of workplace sexual harassment” and an executive producer for the just released video, “Voices of Diversity: Creating a culture of safety, respect and belonging on campus.” Recently, she coordinated the writing and publication of the Surviving the System Handbook. Advice on using the legal system if you are a survivor of sexual violence. Barb manages the provincial Neighbours, Friends and Families public education campaign and the Respect-at-Work training program. She chairs the Muslim Family Support Service in London. Barb is interested in how research can inform prevention of and responses to violence against women and girls.

MCGURK, TERRY

Mr. McGurk has worked in a variety of hospital settings as a Psychiatric Nurse for the past 40 years, and has a wide range of experience in Clinical and Administrative roles. He worked as a Case Manager for the Hamilton Program for Schizophrenia, Nursing Supervisor for the Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital, and taught in the Mental Health Nursing Certificate Program/Psychiatric Rehabilitation Certificate Program at Mohawk College for a number of years. 13 years ago, Mr. McGurk, developed the COAST Hamilton Program and for 5 years also managed the Psychiatric Emergency Services at St. Joseph’s Healthcare. In early 2005 he developed the COAST Halton Program and then later became the Director of Programs for CMHA Halton. In January of 2009 he left CMHA Halton to enhance the Crisis Assessment Support Team (CAST) and Addictions Services of Haldimand Norfolk. Presently Mr. McGurk splits his full time position with COAST Hamilton and the CAST/Addictions Services of Haldimand Norfolk and sits on a number committees in both communities.

Mr. McGurk is the Chair of the Human Services and Justice Coordinating Committee in Hamilton

NATHANSON, NORINE

Norine Nathanson is Crown Counsel and the Provincial Co-Lead of Ontario’s Domestic Violence Court Program with the Ministry of the Attorney General. She has been Crown Counsel with the Ministry since 1991 serving as an Assistant Crown Attorney and Domestic Violence Crown Lead and as Counsel to the Victim Witness Assistance Program.

OUIMETTE, JOHANNE

Formatrice, conférencière et consultante, Johanne Ouimette œuvre dans le domaine de la violence faite aux femmes depuis près de 25 ans. Psychologue-sexologue de profession, elle travaille à améliorer la condition des femmes en recourant à divers moyens, dont le counselling individuel et de groupe, le développement communautaire, la formation des intervenantes et la supervision. Auteure du livre La force de s’affranchir, elle a aussi collaboré à la rédaction des modules de la formation en ligne et élaboré le « Manuel d’animation d’atelier pour femmes de 65 ans et plus victimes de violence » pour AOcVF. Elle est présidente du conseil d’administration du Centre Novas, centre d’aide et de lutte contre les agressions à caractère sexuel des comtés de Prescott et Russell.

PHARAND, GAËTANE

Gaëtane Pharand est directrice fondatrice du Centre Victoria pour femmes de Sudbury depuis 1993. Le CVF est voué au soutien des femmes francophones qui luttent contre toutes les formes de violence. Elle a été membre du comité aviseur de la Ministre de la Direction générale de la Condition féminine en matière de violence contre les femmes. Entre 1999 et 2009, elle a assumé le poste de présidente du regroupement provincial Action ontarienne contre la violence faite aux femmes, organisme voué au développement des services en français en matière de violence contre les femmes et qui agit aussi comme lieu de réseautage et de formation des intervenantes francophones dans ce domaine. De 1991 à 1995, Mad. Pharand a agit comme commissaire à la Commission ontarienne des droits de la personne. Elle est formée en radiotélédiffusion et en gestion d’entreprise mais c’est auprès de divers regroupements de femmes francophones qu’elle a choisi d’œuvrer depuis plus de 20 ans.

REID, MAUREEN

Ms. Maureen Reid has worked in the areas of child protection and child physical and sexual abuse for the past twenty-eight years. Within a child welfare agency, Ms. Reid developed a treatment program for families (child victims, perpetrators and non-implicated parents) where sexual abuse has been verified that includes individual, group and family treatment. This program is in its 20th year and provides therapy to over 100 individuals per week. She has also co-facilitated community based groups for adult male survivors of childhood sexual abuse. She co-facilitates the Caring Dad’s group in partnership with Changing Ways of London. This is a program for fathers who have been physically abusive with their children or are at risk of being physically abusive. She has been the Child Abuse Consultant for the London and Middlesex Children’s Aid Society and is currently Chair of the Child Abuse Prevention Council in London, Ontario. She is past Chair of the Adult Survivors Committee in London, Ontario.

She is an authorized trainer for the Ministry of Families and Children teaching the modules: Impact of Child Maltreatment; Interviewing Children; Investigating Sexual Offences Against Children and Forensic Interviewing. She has presented at numerous conferences on topics related to sexual abuse within families and other child protection issues, and has been a consultant to the Centre for Children and Families in the Justice System of the Family Court Clinic and the London Custody and Access Project for the past twenty years.

SINCLAIR, DEBORAH

Deborah Sinclair is a senior social worker, consultant, trainer and community organizer in independent practice in Toronto, Ontario. She has served as an expert witness in court cases, and in October 2002, testified as an expert witness at the inquest into the murder of Gillian Hadley and suicide of Ralph Hadley. She is a member of the Domestic Violence Death Review Committee (DVDRC is an expert advisory committee of the Chief Coroner's office) and has been since its inception. Deborah was appointed to the Domestic Violence Advisory Council which was responsible for providing advice to the Minister Responsible for Women's Issues on improving the existing system of services to better meet the diverse needs of abused women, their partners and their children across the province of Ontario. Also, the Domestic Violence Advisory Council was to identify key components and/or issues within the broader system of services supporting abused women and their children. Deborah participated on two working sub-committees - Child Welfare and Threat Assessment/ Risk Management. The findings of the panel are presented in the report Transforming our Communities: Report from the Domestic Violence Advisory Council for the Minister Responsible for Women's Issues (Final May, 2009

TOUT, SEAN

Staff Sergeant, Project Manager, Executive Office Research and Planning, Waterloo Regional Police Service, former member of the Domestic Violence Advisory Committee.

TURPEL-LAFOND, MARY ELLEN

Mary Ellen Turpel-Lafond was appointed B.C.'s first Representative for Children and Youth in November 2006. The Representative is an Independent Officer of the Legislature. Ms Turpel-Lafond is on leave from the Saskatchewan Provincial Court, where she was the Administrative Judge for Saskatoon. She was appointed to the bench in 1998, and was actively involved in projects relating to access to justice, judicial independence, and public outreach. She has also worked as a criminal law judge in youth and adult courts, with an emphasis on developing partnerships to better serve the needs of young people in the justice system, particularly sexually exploited children and youth, and children and youth with disabilities, such as those who suffer from fetal alcohol spectrum disorder. Ms Turpel-Lafond was a tenured law professor at Dalhousie University Faculty of Law, and taught law at the University of Toronto, the University of Notre Dame and other universities. She has been a visiting professor at University of British Columbia and University of Victoria law schools. She holds a doctorate of law from Harvard Law School, a master's degree in international law from Cambridge University, a law degree from Osgoode Hall, and a bachelor of arts degree from Carleton University. She also holds a certificate in the international and comparative law of human rights from the University of Strasbourg in France. The Representative was also awarded an honorary doctorate degree from B.C.'s Thompson Rivers University in 2009. In 2007, the Indigenous Bar Association awarded her the distinction of 'Indigenous Peoples' Counsel'. As well, Time Magazine has twice bestowed honours upon Ms Turpel-Lafond, naming her one of the '100 Global Leaders of Tomorrow' in 1994, and one of the 'Top 20 Canadian Leaders for the 21st Century' in 1999. A member of the Muskeg Lake Cree Nation, she is active in her First Nations community. In 2005, she published a book on the history of the Muskeg Lake Cree Nation that was short-listed for a Saskatchewan Book Award. Ms Turpel-Lafond, her husband George Lafond, their son and three daughters, (including twins), reside in Victoria, B.C.

VISENTINI, MARCO

Marco Visentini is Legal Counsel for the Hamilton Police Service. He graduated from McMaster University with a Bachelor of Arts in 1993 and obtained his Bachelor of Laws (LLB) from Osgoode Hall Law School in 1996. After graduating from law school, he spent a year in the People's Republic of China teaching law and legal English at the Southwest University of Political Science and Law in the City of Chongqing, in the Sichuan Province. Upon his return from China, Marco articulated with the law firm of Agro Zaffiro Parente Orzel and Baker in Hamilton, Ontario. After his call to the Ontario Bar in 1999, he entered practice with the firm in the field of civil litigation. While at the firm, he was also appointed a Standing Agent for the Federal Crown, conducting prosecutions under federal statutes (primarily under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act) in the City of Hamilton. Marco joined the Hamilton Police Service in October 2003, where he acts as Legal Counsel to the Chief of Police. He has been Chair of the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police (O.A.C.P.) Police Legal Advisors Committee since June 2006.

Appendix B

CONFERENCE EVALUATION SUMMARY

JOB TITLE	FREQUENCY
Victim Witness Assistance Program	23
Probation/Parole Officer	9
Police Officer	50
Mental health	10
Sexual assault/domestic violence	16
Shelter	33
Crown Attorney	13
PAR program	3
Bail Safety	1
Legal Aid	1
Program coordinator	25
CAS	8
Victim services	13
Big Sisters	1
Judge	1
Outreach	14
Supervised Access	1
Family counselling centre	6
Government representative	14

Opening Plenary						
<i>Confronting the Challenges in the change process: Naming the problems</i>						
	1=strongly disagree	2=disagree	3=neither agree nor disagree	4=agree	5=strongly agree	% agree and strongly agree
Relevance of Information for my Work	0	1	7	51	41	92%
Informative	0	2	16	47	30	81%
Quality of Presentation	0	1	13	44	34	85%

Challenges: Confidentiality and Information Sharing						
	1=strongly disagree	2=disagree	3=neither agree nor disagree	4=agree	5=strongly agree	% agree and strongly agree
Relevance of Information for my Work	-	3	15	37	42	81%
Informative	1	3	19	46	27	76%
Quality of Presentation	-	4	14	48	26	80%

<i>Luncheon Address: No Private Matter: Protecting Women and Children living with domestic violence</i>						
	1=strongly disagree	2=disagree	3=neither agree nor disagree	4=agree	5=strongly agree	% agree and strongly agree
Relevance of Information for my Work	-	-	9	25	63	91%
Informative	-		6	26	65	94%
Quality of Presentation	-	-	7	26	64	93%

Recognizing the opportunities for effective collaboration: Identifying solutions						
	1=strongly disagree	2=disagree	3=neither agree nor disagree	4=agree	5=strongly agree	% agree and strongly agree
Relevance of Information for my Work	-	-	9	48	37	90%
Informative	-	1	17	52	22	80%
Quality of Presentation	-	1	15	50	28	83%

<i>Practical Solutions to address barriers or solutions you have encountered in your own community</i>						
	1=strongly disagree	2=disagree	3=neither agree nor disagree	4=agree	5=strongly agree	% agree and strongly agree
Relevance of Information for my Work		4	11	40	36	84%
Informative	1	5	22	41	19	68%
Quality of Presentation	1	6	22	40	20	67%
<i>Risk & Vulnerabilities: Risks for aboriginal women & the intersection of risks & vulnerabilities</i>						
	1=strongly disagree	2=disagree	3=neither agree nor disagree	4=agree	5=strongly agree	% agree and strongly agree
Relevance of Information for my Work	1	3	15	30	42	79%
Informative	1	3	12	27	45	82%
Quality of Presentation	3	2	12	33	40	86%
Tuesday, February 9, 2010						
Promising practices in Ontario: Taking them back to our communities						
	1=strongly disagree	2=disagree	3=neither agree nor disagree	4=agree	5=strongly agree	% agree and strongly agree
Relevance of Information for my Work			5	34	48	94%
Informative			12	32	32	84%
Quality of Presentation			14	33	38	84%

<i>Developing an action plan for your jurisdiction</i>						
	1=strongly disagree	2=disagree	3=neither agree nor disagree	4=agree	5=strongly agree	% agree and strongly agree
Relevance of Information for my Work			6	29	33	91%
Informative	1		7	34	31	88%
Quality of Presentation	1	1	7	31	25	86%

OVERALL CONFERENCE CONTENT						
	1 strongly disagree	2 disagree	3 neither agree nor disagree	4 Agree	5 strongly agree	% agree and strongly agree
Content of conference was arranged so that it was conducive to learning.	1	1	8	59	29	90%
Content of conference was consistent with its description.			13	49	37	87%
Content was relevant to my work.			7	45	47	93%
Content extended my knowledge of this topic.	1	4	17	46	31	78%
Content was at an appropriate level of sophistication.		2	11	50	34	87%

PRESENTERS						
	1 strongly disagree	2 disagree	3 neither agree nor disagree	4 Agree	5 strongly agree	% agree and strongly agree
The presenters were well prepared and knowledgeable.			5	40	55	95%
The presenters allowed time for discussion.	2	13	27	37	20	58%
The presenters made me aware of new issues and resources.	1	3	16	46	33	80%

RELEVANCY						
	1 strongly disagree	2 disagree	3 neither agree nor disagree	4 Agree	5 strongly agree	% agree and strongly agree
My learning objectives for the conference were met.		4	15	49	27	80%
I gained new insight relevant to my work.		6	13	33	35	78%
I learned new applications.	1	5	20	44	27	73%

FACILITY						
	1 strongly disagree	2 disagree	3 neither agree nor disagree	4 agree	5 strongly agree	% agree and strongly agree
I felt reasonably comfortable (physically) throughout the conference.	1	5	18	37	36	75%
The length of the conference was appropriate.	2	13	22	41	20	62%
The conference atmosphere was positive.			15	46	38	85%
The pace of the conference was appropriate.	6	12	17	40	25	65%
The audio/visual supplies were adequate.	1	2	10	45	41	87%
The conference was well organized.	1	3	4	39	52	92%
My overall rating of the conference.		1	7	53	38	92%

COMMENTS		
THEMES	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	QUOTES
Group discussions	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not enough small discussion time - Needed facilitators to keep discussions focused - Too much to work through with strangers - Too many people at each table - Note-takers railroaded discussion - Note-taker had offensive table manners - Great learning opportunity reinforced through group discussions
French language concerns	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concern that there were no presentations in French - no voice for French language issues; felt like an afterthought - translators were excellent - everyone should have had access to translation both ways <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - difficult for French language group to participate - not good instruction regarding availability/access to translation headsets
Seating arrangements	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enjoyed assigned seating - Helpful to meet and discuss with people from other disciplines - Not good balance in seating
Sisters in Spirit presentation	28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation was too long - Gave a face to issue- Norma, daughter, granddaughter - Should have been given better time slot - Lack of respect for other presenters (length

		<p>of presentation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needed aboriginal representation on planning committee - Lack of connection between community programs and professionals - Inspirational, educational - Did not address risks and vulnerabilities - Facilitator lost control, should have stepped in
Length/time of presentations	50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some presentations were too rushed - Did not like presentations during meals and after dinner - Concern that Holly and Mohammed were shuffled to next day and then not given adequate time to present - Some people did not comply with time restrictions - Presentations were too rushed - Too much information in too short a time - First day was too long - Program went too late on first evening
Topics	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - was looking for more information on specific high-risk tools, training, certification - too much information from Hamilton Police, would like OPP perspective for rural areas - want more on helping men who are abusive - would like provincial protocol on

		<p>confidentiality not discussion on challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - information too heavily weighted to Western Ontario – consider Eastern and Northern Ontario - would like info on military issues, concerns - more information on immigrant related risks & vulnerabilities - most groups already have high-risk teams – why not start at this point? - wanted more in-depth discussion of high-risk teams
Speakers	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mary Ellen Turpel-Lafond- really appreciated her presentation but not over lunch - Have heard the Waterloo presentation too many times - Appreciated concrete information from Hamilton High-Risk team, Marco Visentini - Wanted more from Holly and Mohammed - J.Campbell offered good perspective with stats; others found her too repetitive, have heard her too many times before - Enjoyed Teresa Donnelly’s passion
Facilities, accommodations	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Felt it was unsafe to walk to/from Crowne Plaza hotel at night - Should have water on tables - Needed wireless mics for some speakers - Need to be scent free – migraine sufferer - Liked that it was free

Representation at conference	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Lacked victim participation- Concern that it was limited to only 4 members from each coordinating committee- Concern that not all coordinating committee members were represented
------------------------------	---	---

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

BETWEEN :

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

(hereinafter referred to as “the Board”)

- and -

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

(hereinafter referred to as “Corrections”)

- and -

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

(hereinafter referred to as “the Ministry”)

- and -

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

(hereinafter referred to as “V.W.A.P.”)

- and -

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

(hereinafter referred to as “the C.C.A.S.”)

- 2 -

- and -

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

(hereinafter referred to as “the C.A.S.”)

- and -

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

(hereinafter referred to as “the Shelter”)

- and -

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

(hereinafter referred to as “Family Services”)

- and -

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

(hereinafter referred to as “H.H.S.”)

- and -

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

(hereinafter referred to as “C.O.A.S.T.”)

- and -

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

(hereinafter referred to as “the Community Member”)

PREAMBLE

WHEREAS the parties are desirous of forming a community consultation committee to review the release, or potential release, of High Risk Domestic Violence Offenders, as identified by the **XXXXXXXXXXXX** Police Service (hereinafter referred to as “the Police Service”), into the City of **XXXXXXXXXXXX**, for the purpose of providing community stakeholders with an opportunity for effective and informed input into the pre-release and release process in an effort to address issues of public fear, community safety, and resource identification and utilization relative to offender re-integration;

AND WHEREAS it is intended that this committee, which shall be referred to as the “**XXXXXXXXXXXX** High Risk Domestic Violence Community Advisory Committee”, will provide a mechanism for the Police Service and community agencies to liaise with each other and with the community, in an informed manner, regarding issues surrounding the release, or potential release, of High Risk Domestic Violence Offenders into the **XXXXXXXXXXXX** area, including intervention and monitoring strategies, and will make recommendations to the Chief of Police as to the safe and effective re-integration of High Risk Domestic Violence Offenders into the community;

AND WHEREAS the parties are also desirous of creating a forum in which public concerns in relation to the release of High Risk Domestic Violence Offenders may be determined and discussed in an informative, co-operative, and confidential manner;

AND WHEREAS an exchange of information between the parties with respect to High Risk Domestic Violence Offenders is necessary to achieve an effective working committee;

AND WHEREAS it is recognized that the right of the members of the community to be informed of, and included in, a decision-making process which may affect public safety in their community must be balanced against the rights of individual offenders to privacy;

AND WHEREAS the parties hereto agree that the exchange of information in accordance with the provisions of this Memorandum of Understanding is not intended to breach their respective security policies, procedures and regulations, nor the provisions of the *Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, the *Access to Information Act*, or the *Privacy Act*;

NOW THEREFORE the parties to this Memorandum of Understanding agree with each other as follows:

A. GENERAL

1. This Memorandum of Understanding shall apply to any and all information, both verbal and written, to which the parties, and the authorized representatives of the parties, have access as a result of, or connected to, membership on the **XXXXXXXXXXXXX** High Risk Domestic Violence Community Advisory Committee (“hereinafter referred to as “the Committee”).
2. Any representative attending on behalf of a party must be authorized in writing by the party prior to attendance, and such attendance must be approved by the Chief of Police of the Police Service., or his/her designate, prior to the provision, exchange or sharing of any information.
3. The Board shall be represented on the Committee by a member or members of the Police Service appointed by the Chief of Police.
4. Subject to paragraph 5, all parties, and all authorized representatives of the parties, must receive an enhanced security clearance through the Government of Canada, as well as security clearance through the Ministry, and through the Police Service. It shall be the responsibility of every party, or the representative of any party, to consent to such clearances, and to submit the information required for the purpose of conducting such security clearances.
5. Where an authorized representative of either Corrections, the Ministry or V.W.A.P. has been the subject of an enhanced security clearance administered through his/her respective employer, then the said enhanced security clearance is sufficient to satisfy the requirements of paragraph 4. Proof of such enhanced security clearance must be provided to the Chief of Police of the Police Service, or his/her designate, in a form acceptable to the Chief of Police or his/her designate.
6. Subject to paragraph 7, all parties, and the representatives of any parties, shall swear/affirm the Oath or Affirmation of Confidentiality, attached as Schedule “A” hereto, prior to participation in any Committee meeting and prior to receiving any information related thereto.
7. Where an authorized representative of either Corrections, the Ministry or V.W.A.P. has provided an oath or affirmation of confidentiality to his/her respective employer, then the said Oath or Affirmation of Confidentiality is sufficient to satisfy the requirements of paragraph 6. Proof of such Oath or Affirmation of Confidentiality must be provided to the Chief of Police of the Police Service, or his/her designate, in a form acceptable to the Chief of Police or his/her designate.
8. Any party, or any representative of any party, who fails to comply with the confidentiality requirements as specified herein or in the Oath or

Affirmation of Confidentiality, or fails to meet the requirements of Committee membership and participation as specified herein, may be immediately prohibited from further Committee participation, and action may be taken against the party and/or the party's representative as may be necessary and reasonable in the circumstances.

9. It is understood and agreed that, from time to time, the Committee may draw upon the resources of other community service agencies or groups, including, but not limited to, representatives from residential programs, mental health services, employment services, child welfare agencies, women's services, psychiatric / psychological services and victim services. Any resource member will be required to adhere to the security clearances and confidentiality requirements enumerated herein.
10. The Chief of Police of the Police Service shall have the right to terminate this agreement, on behalf of the Board and acting as agent of the Board, at any time, without prior notice, upon determination that a breach of security or confidentiality has occurred through improper use or dissemination of information provided in accordance with this Memorandum of Understanding, or for non-compliance with the provisions of this Memorandum, or for any other cause whatsoever as determined by him/her.

B. TERMS OF INFORMATION EXCHANGE OR SHARING

11. It is understood and agreed that any and all information provided, exchanged or shared by the parties, or by the representatives of the parties, is solely for the purpose of reviewing and assessing the release, or potential release, of High Risk Domestic Violence Offenders, as identified by the Police Service, into the City of XXXXXXXXXXXXX, with a view to considering the rights and the needs of the offender and the rights and needs of the community, and with respect to determining community resources available to assist both the community and the offender in re-integration and/or managing re-integration.
12. Except as may be expressly provided herein or in accordance with law, information provided, shared or exchanged in accordance with the provisions of this Memorandum shall not be disclosed by any party, or any representative of any party, to any other agency or person, and shall be used solely for the purposes authorized herein. Use of this information for unauthorized purposes is expressly and strictly prohibited.

13. The Police Service shall have the right to sever, in its discretion, any information contained in records maintained by it, to protect the privacy interest of third parties and confidential informants, and to prevent any interference with law enforcement or revelation of law enforcement techniques, in accordance with the principles contained in the *Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, prior to providing, sharing or exchanging same.
14. It is expressly understood and agreed that information exchanged, shared or provided to the parties, or to any representative of any party, shall not be copied, circulated or disseminated in any form or manner.
15. It is expressly understood and agreed that neither the information exchanged, shared or provided to the parties, or to any representative of any party, for the purpose of a Committee meeting, nor the content of discussions occurring during the course of a Committee meeting, shall be divulged, disseminated, discussed nor communicated in any manner outside the confines of the Committee meeting to which the information relates.
16. It is expressly understood and agreed that any information exchanged, shared or provided to the parties, or to any representative of any party, shall be returned to the Police Service Committee member(s) in its original form, and in its entirety, at the completion of the Committee meeting to which the information relates.

C. LEGAL INDEMNIFICATION

17. (a) In consideration of compliance with the terms of this Memorandum of Understanding and with the provisions of the Oath or Affirmation of Confidentiality entered into by each party in accordance herewith, the Board undertakes to hold and save harmless and agrees to indemnify the parties to this Memorandum of Understanding, and the authorized representatives of the parties to this Memorandum of Understanding, from and against any and all liability incurred by any or all of them arising as a direct result of, or connected to, a breach of the provisions of this Memorandum of Understanding or of the Oath or Affirmation of Confidentiality taken by the party in accordance herewith, EXCEPT WHERE such liability is contributed to or occasioned by the negligence of any of the aforesaid parties.
- (b) Indemnification for legal costs incurred in the defence of any action or cause of action which falls within the parameters of indemnification specified in paragraph 17(a) shall be provided by the Board on the following terms:

- (i) Where the Board is not joined in the action as a party, and the Board does not defend the action on behalf of itself and of the party as joint tortfeasors, the Board will provide counsel at the Board's sole expense.
 - (ii) Where the Board is joined as a party or elects to defend the action, but the solicitor retained on behalf of the Board and the party is of a view that it would be improper for him or her to act for both the Board and the party in that action, the Board will provide alternate counsel at the Board's sole expense.
 - (iii) In any other case, counsel acting on behalf of the Board shall act on behalf of any and all parties named in the action.
- (c) Where the Board is required to indemnify a party for legal costs, indemnification shall be for the necessary and reasonable legal costs incurred in the defence of the action. "Necessary and reasonable legal costs" shall be based on the account rendered by counsel performing the work. The account shall be subject initially to the approval of the Board's solicitor and, in the case of a dispute between the counsel rendering the account and doing the work and the Board's solicitor, the account shall be paid after it has been assessed on a solicitor and client basis by an assessment officer of the Superior Court of Justice.

D. DEFINITIONS

18. "High Risk" Domestic Violence Offender:

A "High Risk" Domestic Violence Offender shall be as identified by the Police Service, and may include domestic violence offenders released, or to be released, from federal institutions at warrant expiry, and/or from provincial institutions at warrant expiry or on terms of probation.

E. NOTICES

19. All correspondence and other notices related to access to the terms of this Memorandum of Understanding shall be delivered as set forth below:

For the Board:

XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Attention: XXXXXXXXXXXXX

For Corrections:

XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Attention: XXXXXXXXXXXXX

For the Ministry:

XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Attention: XXXXXXXXXXXXX

For V.W.A.P.:

XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Attention: XXXXXXXXXXXXX

For C.C.A.S.:

XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Attention: XXXXXXXXXXXXX

For C.A.S.:

XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Attention: XXXXXXXXXXXXX

For the Shelter:

XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Attention: XXXXXXXXXXXXX

For Family Services:

XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Attention: XXXXXXXXXXXXX

For H.H.S.:

XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Attention: XXXXXXXXXXXXX

For C.O.A.S.T.:

XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Attention: XXXXXXXXXXXXX

For Community Member:

XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Attention: XXXXXXXXXXXXX

F. DURATION

20. (a) This Memorandum of Understanding shall be effective upon the date of the signature of the last signatory hereto and shall continue until terminated as provided herein.
- (b) Any Party may terminate their participation in this Memorandum of Agreement upon written notice to the Police Service at least thirty (30) days in advance of the termination date. The Police Service may waive the notice period.
- (c) This Memorandum of Agreement may be terminated at any time by the mutual consent of the Parties.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF this Memorandum of Understanding has been executed by the parties, or duly authorized officers or representatives of the parties hereto.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Witness

Date

Name of Witness (Please print)

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Witness

Date

Name of Witness (Please print)

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Witness

Date

Name of Witness (Please print)

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Witness

Date

Name of Witness (Please print)

Attachment – Schedule “A”

SCHEDULE "A"

**XXXXXXXXXXXXX HIGH RISK DOMESTIC VIOLENCE OFFENDER
COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

OATH OR AFFIRMATION OF CONFIDENTIALITY

I, _____ do solemnly swear (affirm)
NAME (Please Print)

that, except in the course of judicial proceedings, by order of a court or tribunal of competent jurisdiction, pursuant to statute, or as otherwise required by law, I will not disclose, communicate or convey, or allow to be disclosed, communicated or conveyed, directly or indirectly, to any person, organization or publication, any information whatsoever obtained by me while a member of the XXXXXXXXXXXXX High Risk Domestic Violence Offender Community Advisory Committee.

Furthermore, I do solemnly swear (affirm) that I will not allow any person or persons to inspect or have access to any information, verbal or however recorded, including but not limited to any documentation, records, written statements, correspondence, reports, plans, or photographs, to which I have access, or which is provided to me, as a result of my membership on the said Committee, and will prevent such inspection or access, except as required by law.

Furthermore, I do solemnly swear (affirm) that I will not copy, circulate, disseminate, share, or disclose, any information, verbal or however recorded, including but not limited to any documentation, records, written statements, correspondence, reports, plans, or photographs or other data, to which I have access, or which is provided to me, during the course of my membership on the said Committee.

So help me God. (Omit if affirmation)

SWORN (AFFIRMED) BEFORE ME AT)
the City of XXXXXXXXXXXXX, in the)
Province of Ontario, this _____ day of)
_____,)
201___.)
)

A Commissioner, etc.

Signature of Member,
XXXXXXXXXXXXX High Risk
Domestic Violence Offender
Community Advisory Committee

Appendix D

GLOSSARY¹

Aboriginal refers to persons descending from the original inhabitants of Canada, including Status Indians, non-Status Indians, First Nations people, Métis and Inuit. In Ontario, Aboriginal people live both on- and off-reserve, and have unique and diverse heritages, languages, spiritual beliefs, and cultural and traditional practices. There are approximately 242,000 Aboriginal people living in Ontario. (Adapted from the Assembly of First Nations definition, Statistics Canada 2006 Census)

Accessible refers to the state or quality of whether needed services or opportunities are available to and are used by people from diverse groups. For example, people with disabilities often face barriers to accessibility in employment, communication, public transportation, public places, housing, office buildings, government services, use of everyday products and access to quality education (City of Toronto Task Force on Community Access & Equity, 1998-1999)

Anti-Oppression refers to strategies, theories and actions which challenge socially and historically built inequalities and injustices that are ingrained in our systems and institutions by policies and practices that allow certain groups to dominate over other groups (Canadian Race Relations Foundation)

Anti-Racism is an active and consistent process of change to eliminate individual, institutional and systemic racism as well as the oppression and injustice racism causes. (Canadian Race Relations Foundation)

Bi-Directional violence characterizes violence in intimate relationships as mutual, or occurring at similar levels for women and men. (Council definition)

Discrimination is the denial of equal treatment, civil liberties and opportunity to individuals or groups with respect to education, accommodation, health care, employment and access to services, goods and facilities. Behaviour that results from prejudiced attitudes by individuals or institutions, resulting in unequal outcomes for persons who are perceived as different. Discrimination involves differential treatment may occur on the basis of race, nationality, gender, age, religion, political or ethnic affiliation, sexual orientation, marital or family status, physical, developmental or mental disability. Discrimination includes the denial of cultural, economic, educational, political and/or social rights of members of non-dominant groups. (Canadian Race Relations Foundation)

Diversity is a term used to encompass all of the various differences among people – including race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, disability, socio-economic status, etc. The term is commonly used in Canada to describe workplace programs aimed at reducing discrimination promoting equality of opportunity and outcome for all groups. (Canadian Race Relations Foundation)

Domestic violence (also referred to as intimate partner abuse) is a crime. It results from an imbalance of power and control over one's partner. Domestic violence is primarily committed by men against women but also occurs in same sex relationships and by women against men. All survivors are not physically battered or beaten. Abuse can include other forms of mistreatment and cruelty such as constant threatening, psychological/emotional, sexual, financial/material, spiritual and verbal abuse. (Ontario Network of Sexual Assault/Domestic Violence Treatment Centres)

Ecological Model recognizes the multiple interactions and relationships that exists between the individual and their environment. While individuals are autonomous, individual behavior is determined to a large extent by social environment, e.g. community norms and values, regulations, and policies. (Council definition modified from the U.S. Centre for Disease Control)

Gender-based analysis (GBA) is an analytical tool that systematically integrates a gender perspective into the development of policies, programs and legislation, as well as planning and decision-making processes. It helps to identify and clarify the differences between women and men, boys and girls, and demonstrates how these differences affect their lives. (Government of Canada)

Intersectional perspective recognizes “*how multiple forces work together and interact to reinforce conditions of inequality and social exclusion.*” An intersectional perspective recognizes that each person occupies many different social locations. “Social locations” are categories that prescribe attributes and denote power differentials and include such categories as: race, gender, age, faith and class. (The Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women)

Risk management is a systematic approach to assess and respond to risk by identifying, assessing, understanding, acting on and communicating risk issues amongst community partners who are working with the victim of abuse or the abuser. (Council Definition)

Social Location reflects the many intersections of our experience related to race, religion, age, physical size, sexual orientation, social class, and so on. Social location contributes not only to our understanding of the ways in which our major institutions work, but also to our ability to access them. (See also Intersectional Perspective) (Cultural Safety: Peoples’ Experiences of Oppression, University of Victoria)

Structural Inequality exists where social groups based on ethnicity, race, tribe, gender, or cultural differences are systematically disadvantaged compared with other groups with which they co-exist. Structural inequality exists “when unequal status is perpetuated and reinforced by unequal relations in roles, functions, decision rights, and opportunities that are intricately bound up in a web of inter-dependence. (A. Dani & A. de Haan editors. *Inclusive States: Social Policy and Structural Inequalities*. World Bank, 2008)

Structural violence denotes a form of violence which corresponds with the systematic ways in which a given social structure or social institution prevents people from meeting their basic needs. (See also systemic discrimination) (Johan Galtung)

Systemic Discrimination is “an act, practice, or policy that is applied consistently to all people but which results in unequal, unfair, or unfavourable treatment of a person or group.” (Ontario Human Rights Code)

Threat Assessment is the formal application of instruments to assess the likelihood that intimate partner violence will be repeated and will escalate. The term is synonymous with the use of instruments specifically developed to identify potentially lethal situations. (Roehl, J., & Guertin, K. 2000, ‘Intimate partner violence: The current use of risk assessments in sentencing offenders’, *The Justice System Journal*, vol. 21, no. 2)

Transformation Agenda was a massive change in child welfare service delivery in Ontario. Changes began in April 2007 in the areas of differential response (a more child-family-centered approach and the right service at the right time), better permanency planning (including kinship and foster care, adoption, custody arrangements), and alternatives to court processes (mediation, talking circles). The Transformation Agenda also includes special Aboriginal provisions for Aboriginal and First Nations children to be served by their own communities. (April 4, 2007 media release, Ontario Association of Children’s Aid Societies)

Violence Against Women is a manifestation of historically unequal power relations between men and women, which have led to domination over and discrimination against women by men and to the prevention of the full advancement of women. Violence against women is one of the crucial social mechanisms by which women are forced into a subordinate position compared to men. (The Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), 1979)

The term “**violence against women**” means any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or private life. Accordingly, violence against women encompasses but is not limited to the following:

Physical, sexual and psychological violence occurring in the family, including battering, sexual abuse of female children in the household, dowry-related violence, marital rape, female genital mutilation and other traditional practices harmful to women, non-spousal violence and violence related to exploitation.

Physical, sexual and psychological violence occurring within the general community, including rape, sexual abuse, sexual harassment and intimidation at work, in educational institutions and elsewhere, trafficking in women and forced prostitution;

Physical, sexual and psychological violence perpetrated or condoned by the State, wherever it occurs.

Acts of violence against women also include forced sterilization and forced abortion, coercive/forced use of contraceptives, female infanticide and prenatal sex selection. (United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women, 1973; Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, Fourth World Conference on Women 1995.)

Women Abuse is any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm, or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or private life. Woman abuse can be:

- Physical, including, punching, kicking, choking, stabbing, mutilation, disabling, murder
 - Sexual, including, rape, any unwanted touching or act of a sexual nature, forced prostitution
 - Verbal/Psychological, including, threats to harm the children, destruction of favourite clothes or photographs, repeated insults meant to demean and erode self-esteem, forced isolation from friends and relatives, threats of further violence or deportation if the woman attempts to leave
 - Stalking, including, persistent and unwanted attention, following and spying, monitoring of mail or conversations
 - Financial, including, taking away a woman's wages or other income, limiting or forbidding access to the family income, and other forms of control and abuse of power.
- (Thunder Bay and District Coordinating Committee to End Women Abuse)

ⁱ Originally published in: “Transforming Communities: Report from the Domestic Violence Advisory Council for the Minister Responsible for Women’s Issues” (2009)