

TRANSFORMATION IS POSSIBLE:

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SEATTLE
COMMUNITY RESPONSES TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
WORKGROUP

With

Amarinthia Torres, Ari Lozano, Liam Nold, Chi May Praseuth, Divya Chand, Elena Orlando, Hana Kawai, Jackie Meleisa, Kai Horton, Mercedes Taitt-Lamar, Samia Rashid, Sela Mafi, Shannon Perez-Darby, Sid Jordan, Rahma Rashid and Ye Qing Jiang.

JULY 2023

Accountability Communities Consortium

Table of Contents

<u>Summary</u>	2
<u>Acknowledgements</u>	4
<u>Workgroup members</u>	5
<u>Key Terms</u>	6
<u>Introduction</u>	7
<u>Assessment of existing resources</u>	14
<u>Workgroup recommendations</u>	16
<u>Conclusion</u>	20
<u>Appendix</u>	23
A. - <u>Workgroup overview</u>	
B. - <u>Examples of domestic violence survivor resources in the Seattle Metro Area</u>	
C.- <u>Examples of culturally specific community organizations in the Seattle Metro Area</u>	
D. - <u>Examples of youth-based resources in the Seattle Metro Area</u>	
E. - <u>Bibliography</u>	

Summary

TRANSFORMATION IS POSSIBLE is a report of the Community Responses to Domestic Violence (CRDV) workgroup, part of Seattle's Office for Civil Rights Criminal Legal System (CLS) Project. The CLS Project focuses on eliminating systemic racism in the criminal legal system and advancing social justice by involving communities that have been negatively impacted by criminal legal policies in advising the City's efforts for change. The CRDV Workgroup brought together local domestic violence survivors, advocates, and policy experts with experience intervening in domestic violence outside of the criminal legal system. The primary aim was to identify and make recommendations to expand community responses to domestic violence.

Domestic violence (DV) is a pervasive social problem; most Seattle residents will directly experience or be close to someone experiencing DV in their lifetimes. Seattle spends significant public resources on a criminal legal response to DV, yet this strategy generally fails to address the scale and root causes of the problem. Many survivors avoid involving law enforcement and most people abusing their partners do not come into contact with the criminal legal system for DV. Alternative forms of DV intervention have long been practiced within Black and Indigenous communities, communities of color, and among LGBTQ people, immigrants and refugees, and other groups in which survivors have been marginalized and criminalized, yet there are limited public resources available to directly support this work.

It is time to transform the public response to domestic violence in alignment with Seattle's stated commitments to racial and social justice. Seattle is well positioned to lead nationally by supporting a robust network of survivor-centered organizations working on the frontlines to provide community-based responses to domestic violence. TRANSFORMATION IS POSSIBLE identifies this work and provides the next-step recommendations for the city to invest in a broader vision of DV response. We highlight the need for durable funding streams and political leadership to support community-owned efforts that can prevent violence before it escalates, provide pathways for healing and accountable relationships, and motivate personal and social transformation.

Recommendations discussed in the report:

1. Establish durable public funding streams for community responses to domestic violence that reach people being abusive and are independent of the criminal legal system.
2. Invest first in strategies developed by marginalized survivors of domestic violence and practiced in Black and Indigenous communities and other communities of color; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer communities; immigrant and refugee communities; and other communities that have been systematically harmed by the criminal legal system.
3. Start with a pilot phase including a community-directed funding process with sufficient funding for community organizations to plan, design, implement, and evaluate programs over a three-year period.
4. Protect community ownership of programs including independent leadership and decision-making, reporting requirements that reflect community-driven evaluation criteria, and participant confidentiality.
5. Demonstrate public leadership and transparency in the adoption of community responses to domestic violence.

Acknowledgements

The Seattle Office of Civil Rights initiated the Community Responses to Domestic Violence (CRDV) workgroup in collaboration with the Accountable Communities Consortium. The project was supported by the Seattle City Council 2021 Budget Action that added funds to the Seattle Office for Civil Rights (CBA OCR-002-A-001).

Accountable Communities Consortium supports people, organizations, and communities to be in right relationship through organizing, facilitation, training, and consultation. Team members on this project included Shannon Perez-Darby and Marci Taitt-Lamar, with consulting by Sid Jordan.

Shannon Perez-Darby is an anti-violence advocate, author, and consultant working to create the conditions to support loving, equitable relationships and communities. With nearly 20 years of experience Shannon Perez-Darby centers queer and trans communities of color while working to address issues of domestic and sexual violence, accountability and transformative justice.

Marci Taitt-Lamar is a domestic violence advocate and consultant whose work in the field has focused on research, best practices, and training and technical assistance. Marci brings a wealth of experience working in grassroots LGBTQ organizations and movements and is committed to capacity-building work that centers the liberation of queer and trans survivors of color.

Sid Jordan is an assistant professor at Portland State University's School of Social Work. Jordan is an anti-violence researcher and educator with two decades of experience advocating with and for survivors of domestic and sexual violence. His work includes collaborating with community organizations using participatory research practices to advance gender, racial, and economic justice.

Additionally, we thank Damon Agnos, Caedmon Magboo Cahill, Angélica Cházaro, Merrilyn Leapelt, Liam Nold, Lan Pham, Emily Thuma, Hannah Whitworth, and JM Wong.

Workgroup Members

NAME	AFFILIATION
Amarinthia Torres	Coalition Ending Gender-based Violence
Ari Lozano	AGE UP
Chi May Praseuth	Good Foot Arts Collective
Divya Chand	API Chaya
Elena Orlando	Collective Justice
Emi Koyama	Seattle Office for Civil Rights Community Taskforce
Hana Kawai	AGE UP
Jackie Meleisa	UTOPIA Washington
Kai Horton	Gay City
Liletha Williams	Seattle Office for Civil Rights Community Taskforce
Mahkyra Gaines	Lavender Rights Project
Metasabia Rigby	Community member at large
Rahma Rashid	Muslimahs Against Abuse Center
Sela Mafio	Seattle Office for Civil Rights Community Taskforce
Sumina Rashid	Muslimahs Against Abuse Center
Terri Sulaiman	Mother Nation
Ye Qing Jiang	Collective Justice

Key Terms

For the purposes of this report, the following terms and concepts are defined as such:

Community-owned refers to non-governmental groups who maintain responsibility and autonomy for decision-making, including budget authority, governance, project structure, program delivery, protection of data, and evaluation.

Domestic violence refers to a pattern of one person in a romantic, sexual, and/or spousal relationship asserting power and control in ways that diminish or threaten the other person's agency and safety.

A **survivor** of domestic violence is a person who has directly experienced a domestic violence relationship, as described above.

A **person being abusive** is a person asserting a pattern of power and control in an intimate interpersonal relationship.

A **victim-defendant, or survivor-defendant**, is a survivor of domestic violence facing criminal charges either directly or indirectly related to their DV experience.

Introduction

Domestic violence (DV) is a pervasive social problem. Despite decades of policy-making and public investment, DV remains one of the most prevalent forms of interpersonal harm and an insidious driver of preventative injury, housing insecurity, educational disruptions, chronic health problems, and premature death. National studies suggest that one in three women, one in three transgender and nonbinary people, and one in four men have experienced severe physical abuse by an intimate partner.² These numbers increase when we include other forms of abuse such as stalking, manipulation, economic control, and reproductive coercion, as well as other familial or household relationships, such as child, elder, or sibling abuse.³ Taken together, it can be assumed that most Seattle residents will directly experience or be close to someone experiencing DV in their lifetimes. It also means that most of us know someone who has engaged in abusive behavior.


This report focuses on responding to intimate partner violence, or abuse in the context of romantic, sexual, and/or spousal relationships. We define DV here as a pattern of one person in a romantic, sexual, and/or spousal relationship asserting power and control in ways that diminish or threaten the other person's agency and safety. This contextual understanding of DV is broadly accepted by DV advocacy groups but is notably distinct from criminal legal definitions. In Washington State, DV is statutorily defined to include specific criminal offense categories, such as assault, reckless endangerment, coercion, and kidnapping, when they are committed by and against an intimate partner, a legally recognized family member, or a household member.⁴ Whereas the contextual definition of DV emphasizes patterns and dynamics of abuse, the criminal offense of DV is defined by discrete intentional acts. Thus, the criminal legal definition may include actions that survivors engage in to escape or mitigate an abusive situation and, at the same time, disregard dynamics of abuse or control that do not fit the criminal legal standard. As scholars and advocates have documented, the criminalization of DV survivors and the dilemma of survivor-defendants is an urgent human rights and racial justice issue.⁵

Domestic violence impacts entire communities.

DV fundamentally disrupts the lives and life chances of its victims, survivors, and their families. At its most severe, domestic violence can be lethal. An estimated sixty-four people in Washington State die in domestic violence-related events each year.⁶ Far more often, DV causes preventable physical and psychological injuries. By one national estimate, more than 4.1 billion dollars is spent annually on DV-related medical and mental health care.⁷ Between December 2022 and February 2023, King County saw at least 530 DV-related emergency room visits.⁸ Survivors of intimate partner violence experience higher rates of traumatic brain injury, post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, and chronic disease and pain than those who have not experienced DV.⁹ Survivors also sustain economic harms ranging from lost wages and career opportunities to medical and legal debt.¹⁰ These deleterious consequences can extend to those who witness DV, especially children, including the effects of social isolation, chronic stress and educational disruptions.¹¹

Less often acknowledged are the many negative repercussions of DV for those engaging in abuse. These can include social alienation, lost housing, interrupted employment, termination of parental rights, incarceration, and medical and legal debt. Engaging in abusive behaviors against intimate partners is also associated with preventable health problems, such as post-traumatic stress, depression, and cardiovascular disease, and can lead to acute injury and premature death from self-inflicted harm, a survivor's self-defensive actions, and law enforcement interventions.¹² The cumulative impacts of DV on communities are brought into even sharper focus when recognizing that many people who enact abuse are also survivors of violence.¹³

The consequences of DV have meaningful impacts on municipal budgets. Public funds pay for emergency shelter, advocacy, health care, and legal services, as well as criminal legal interventions including emergency police response, civil protection order enforcement, prosecution, court, probation, and incarceration. A comprehensive analysis of Seattle's DV-related expenditures on criminal legal interventions is not currently available. However, the Washington Association




of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs estimated that nearly half of the law enforcement responses to “crimes against persons” in 2021 were DV-related.¹⁴ In Seattle, more than half of assault charges referred from law enforcement to the City Attorney’s office in 2022 were DV-related, and DV accounted for nearly one-third of all referred charges.¹⁵ Given the size of the City’s public safety budget relative to its DV-specific human service commitments, the criminal legal system represents Seattle’s single largest investment in domestic violence response. Importantly, CRDV Workgroup members point out that the true fiscal costs of DV are much higher than public expenditures, since many people turn to family and friends rather than public systems, and many advocacy organizations rely on philanthropic funding and charitable donations to maintain their operations.

Dominant policy approaches have failed to curb domestic violence.

Policymakers have generally favored funding community-based supports for survivors and criminal penalties for people who have engaged in domestic violence. One reason that both approaches have failed to prevent or significantly reduce the rates of domestic violence is that they concentrate on responding to individual instances of violence. Similar-scale investments of public funds have not been made in community-level prevention strategies or efforts to intervene in controlling behaviors before violence escalates.

Community-based supports for survivors

Community-based domestic violence advocacy organizations focus on the needs of survivors. Survivor-centered programs provide emergency shelter, basic needs support, legal aid, and advocacy services, among other kinds of support. As CRDV Workgroup members attest, survivors routinely report that community-based advocacy services have been useful, if not critical, to their sense of safety and self-determination. Researchers find that access to community-based services is associated with increased levels of social support and improved mental health for survivors, and in some cases reduced partner aggression.¹⁶




These organizations have also helped change the ways that communities and policymakers understand intimate partner violence by pairing their work to address the immediate needs of survivors with prevention and social change work. Yet, in a climate of deepening economic inequality, inflation, and public funding austerity, these already under-resourced organizations have increasingly had to narrow their focus to meeting the immediate basic needs of survivors.¹⁷ A 2020 report published by the Coalition Ending Gender-based Violence in King County highlighted the need for dedicated funding streams for domestic and sexual violence prevention work and called for investments in community-level approaches of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color-led organizations.¹⁸

State-based responses for people being abusive

DV criminal legal interventions are rooted in criminological theories of deterrence, retribution, and corrections. A primary flaw of the criminological understanding of abuse is that it misidentifies its root cause as individual anti-social behavior. But DV is widespread and frequently socially sanctioned behavior; it manifests in the context of unequal relations of social power. Further, most instances of DV never come to the attention of law enforcement¹⁹ and the current practice of highly selective prosecution undermines a potential deterrent effect. Moreover, DV arrests tend to follow existing patterns of racial criminalization where living in a highly policed neighborhood is a strong predictor of arrest probability. **In the City of Seattle, where an estimated 7% of the population is Black, the City Attorney’s most recent Criminal Division report indicates that approximately 40% of the referrals for DV-related offenses involved Black suspects.**²⁰

Criminal legal interventions are often contradictory to what DV survivors want and ask for. While survivors generally want the violence to stop, many make efforts to avoid interactions with law enforcement due to fears of reprisal, escalated violence, and a desire to protect themselves or a loved one from criminal penalty or deportation.²¹ According to the City Attorney, “a large proportion of domestic violence declines [decisions not to prosecute] are related to the victim not wanting or being able to assist the prosecution.”²² As discussed



below, this is especially the situation of survivors who belong to communities that have been historically and presently marginalized by and harmed within the criminal legal system.

Criminal legal responses have come at the expense of marginalized survivors.

Some of the most devastating consequences of DV have been facilitated by the criminal legal system itself and levied most heavily against survivors who belong to historically and presently marginalized groups, including Black and Indigenous people and other people of color (BIPOC); lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ+) people; immigrants and refugees; people with disabilities; and especially those living at the intersections of these identities. This includes patterns of survivors being ignored, disbelieved, and discredited as victims and witnesses. It also includes survivors facing arrest, detention, and penalty for not behaving “appropriately” as a victim, and for activities carried out under duress of an abuser or in the course of trying to escape or avoid further abuse.²³ For those facing criminal charges, the effects of trauma and economic hardship can jeopardize the ability to mount an effective legal defense.²⁴ Most women currently incarcerated in the United States are DV survivors, and they are disproportionately BIPOC and LGBTQ people.²⁵


For both survivors and people who have caused DV, a criminal conviction compounds the health and economic consequences of this form of violence. For example, a conviction can negatively influence child custody proceedings, inhibit employment and economic opportunities, and limit access to housing and human services. Heightened state surveillance as a condition of probation or parole can contribute to the accumulation of charges and further periods of confinement. At the same time, there is inconclusive evidence to date that court-mandated treatment programs are effective for those who are arrested for DV. A²⁶growing demand for alternative responses DV was reflected in the 2022 reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, which advises federal funding support of survivor-centered, community-based restorative practice services, as defined as “unaffiliated with any civil or criminal legal process.”²⁷

Equitable and accountable relationships are supported by communities.

Most survivors turn to their friends and family members when experiencing a pattern of power and control. Some may seek support from a trusted therapist, counselor, clergy member, teacher, healthcare provider, or neighbor. This pattern of help-seeking has led many domestic violence advocates to regard friends, family members and other community members as “first responders.” A crucial aspect of creating a safety plan, for example, is identifying friends, family, and other community members who can provide aid and resources, and be involved in violence prevention and intervention strategies. These first responders can also be crucial resources for people who are being abusive in offering support and accountability for changing their behavior.

Most people do not wish to hurt people that they care about. People who are being abusive often regret their actions even as they continue to engage in them. **While domestic violence is a learned behavior, there are currently few identifiable resources for people to ask for help in unlearning these behaviors, whether on their own volition or at the urging of a survivor, their children, families, friends, or broader communities.** It is well established in other behavioral change contexts (e.g., substance use reduction) that self-motivation and community-based support and accountability play a crucial role in sustainable change. Yet, there are no widely available non-criminal options for people who need support in maintaining equitable and accountable relationships.

Individual accountability includes taking responsibility for one’s choices and the consequences of those choices. True accountability is not something that can be mandated or bestowed. For people who are being abusive, accountability requires personal commitment and transformation to stop the harmful behaviors, understand the dynamics that underpin their abusive actions, and meaningfully attends to the harm they have caused. Abusive patterns of power and control are established over time and undoing those harmful patterns also takes time. The process of recognizing and accounting for the harm caused can also be a long-term and time-intensive process.



Nationally, a number of anti-violence organizations have looked to develop and evaluate survivor-centered approaches to working with people who are being abusive to transform their behavior and take accountability outside the criminal legal system.²⁸ Many factors have influenced this growing area of anti-violence practice, including learning from previously failed partnerships with the criminal legal system, a recognition of the harm policing has caused marginalized survivors, and a belief that partnership with the criminal legal system is weighted to favor and maintain that system's power. This work is rooted in BIPOC-led (often BIPOC LGBTQ-led) community organizing.²⁹

Several Seattle-area organizations have contributed to the demand for and development of community responses, particularly practices that build the skills of family members, friends, and community members to prevent and effectively respond to domestic violence. These efforts have primarily been community supported rather than publicly funded. To the best of our knowledge, **the City of Seattle does not currently fund non-criminal, community responses to DV that focus on reaching people who are being abusive in a romantic, intimate, or spousal relationship.**

Assessment of Existing Domestic Violence Resources

The CRDV Workgroup conducted a brief landscape analysis of the Seattle Metro Area's existing DV resources and identified four primary categories, as described below.

Survivor-led services


Seattle has a large network of services for DV survivors. Built over several decades, this network includes services for survivors navigating both emergency and long-term needs, including housing, medical care, legal advocacy, counseling, support groups, transportation, childcare, employment, and flexible financial assistance. As a matter of practice, these organizations do not and have not historically offered services to people being abusive. An illustrative list of Seattle domestic violence survivor-serving programs can be found in Appendix B.

Culturally specific community organizing groups

Seattle has long been an incubator for culturally specific anti-violence organizations and groups seeking to prevent and respond to violence outside of the criminal legal system. These efforts often build on the knowledge and skill of survivors and their advocates and focus on restorative, transformative, healing-based, and integrated approaches for preventing and intervening in domestic violence, especially in LGBTQ+ and BIPOC communities. An illustrative list of Seattle-area culturally specific groups can be found in Appendix C.

Youth-based programs

Our region has a vast network of youth-based and youth-led programming from after-school programs to skill development to community-building programs. Although the CRDV workgroup focused on the need for community responses to DV in adult relationships, programs that work directly with youth and young adults are an important part of our region's response to domestic violence. Patterns of power and control are often easiest to address early in the



cycle of violence and, even more importantly, before it ever occurs. Programs that are most successful at violence prevention are those that keep young people socially connected to a community and provide skills and resources for practicing accountable relationships. An illustrative list of Seattle area youth-based and prevention programs can be found in Appendix D.

Mandated treatment

The Seattle Domestic Violence Intervention Project (DVIP) is a post-filing diversion program for those facing misdemeanor DV charges, which includes court monitoring, group and individual counseling, and referrals to substance abuse or mental health treatment. In the DVIP model, a treatment provider conducts an intake assessment and confers with a multidisciplinary team consisting of probation staff, victim advocates, treatment providers, and community consultants. The team determines the appropriate level of treatment and any additional requirements, such as substance abstinence or parenting sessions. The DVIP treatment levels range from Level One to Level Four. Those assessed as Levels One, Two, and Three are admitted to the DVIP and those determined to be Level Four are not admitted to the program. There have been 393 court referrals to DVIP since the first case was diverted in June 2018. In 2022, the Seattle Municipal Court referred forty-seven people facing a misdemeanor DV offense to the program. Sixteen people have since met the program requirements and completed the program. Notable to the CRDV Workgroup, the DVIP only works with men in heterosexual relationships and does not accept women and LGBTQ people facing misdemeanor DV charges.


A pre-filing diversion program called Access to Change is funded by the City of Seattle and hosted by Gay City, Seattle's LGBTQ Center. The Access to Change program sits at the intersection of criminal legal, community-based, and youth-based responses to domestic violence. The program utilizes a cohort-based advocacy model to provide support and stabilization to young people facing non-intimate partner DV charges.

Recommendations

The CRDV Workgroup calls for public investment in community resources that engage Seattle residents in preventing and responding to DV outside of the criminal legal system, long before crisis situations arise. Community responses to DV are strategies that focus on the self-determination, safety, well-being of survivors and uphold the potential that people who engage in abuse can change, understanding that many times they are also survivors of violence themselves. Community responses to DV require well-resourced organizational infrastructures to support individuals, families, and communities engaged in processes that promote lasting change.


The City of Seattle is uniquely positioned to be a national leader in investing in community responses to DV in alignment with the city's broader commitments to racial and social justice. The following recommendations from the CRDV Workgroup are premised on a vision of equitable, affirming, and accountable communities supported through a transformation of the current public policy approach to DV.

- **Establish durable public funding streams for community responses that reach people being abusive and are independent from the criminal legal system.** Currently, there are no widely available voluntary programs that people being abusive can access should they want to change their behavior, either on their own volition or at the prompting of their loved one, friends, family members, or other community members. The lack of resources and referral options outside the criminal legal system represents a significant gap in Seattle's domestic violence response. It is also a significant gap in Seattle's public safety plan given that most cases of DV never come to the attention of law enforcement and many survivors work to avoid contact with the criminal legal system. A community-level response to DV aims to reach people who are engaging in abusive or controlling behaviors and who may or may not be in contact with the criminal legal system. Community responses to DV are not simply alternative individual-level interventions, but rather strategies rooted in a community-level theory of change. Funding for this work must not be siphoned from existing funding for services for



survivors. The CRDV Workgroup supports a deep investment in survivor-led services and understands an ongoing commitment to survivor-centered support as an indispensable part of our region's response to DV.

- Invest first in strategies developed by marginalized survivors of domestic violence and practiced in Black and Indigenous communities and other communities of color; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer communities; immigrant and refugee communities; and other communities that have been systematically harmed by the criminal legal system. The CRDV Workgroup reflects the expertise of local DV survivors, DV advocates, and community organizers who have practiced responding to DV in communities where criminal legal responses have been disproportionately harmful. Public investments in community responses to DV should start with these communities of practice, and those who are least likely to benefit from efforts to reform criminal legal responses to DV.
- Start with a pilot phase including a community-directed funding process with sufficient funding for organizations to plan, design, implement, and evaluate programs over a three-year period. The CRDV Workgroup understands that several local organizations have already practiced community responses to domestic violence, but they have lacked sufficient funding to develop, evaluate, and expand these efforts. A pilot program is recommended to build these field-generated practices, including program design, implementation, and independent evaluation:
 - Resources should focus on helping people stop abuse, understand the context of the harm caused, and work towards meaningful accountability. This can and does involve a range of activities.
 - The pilot phase should be a minimum of three years to allow sufficient time for design, implementation and evaluation.
 - There should be funding for at least three organizations with levels sufficient to support a minimum of two Full Time Employees (FTE) per organization (a minimum of 6 FTEs/year in total); staff salaries and benefits should ensure a livable wage in the City of Seattle.

- 
- Funding levels should be sufficient to support operational and administrative costs at the rate of at least 10% of total program costs.
 - Funding levels should be sufficient to support design, implementation, and evaluation.
 - Funding levels should be sufficient to support a minimum of \$100,000 per organization per year for program participant stability needs. The CRDV Workgroup identified stabilization funding as an essential part of creating the conditions to allow program participants to engage in the long and important work of accountability. Stabilization funds should:
 - be sufficient to cover the cost of administering funds;
 - be flexible to include transportation costs, childcare, interpretation, food, housing stability, educational support, employment stabilization, medical and mental health needs, and accommodations for people with disabilities; and
 - not be structured as a participant incentive or reward in order to ensure the integrity of a voluntary model.
 - The funding should be administered by the Seattle Office for Civil Rights (OCR). OCR has taken consistent leadership in addressing complex intersectional community needs and has both the framework and community relationships to maintain consistent, values-aligned administration of the pilot funding.
 - Community input through the funding decision-making process is essential. The CRDV Workgroup recommends the following guidelines to ensure a community-informed process.
 - The request for proposals should be vetted by community partners prior to release.
 - Funds should be made available to both established community-based programs with a history of working within their communities as well as new, innovative, or novel programs.
 - Funding should be available to a broad range of organizational structures including fiscally sponsored projects, non-professionalized community groups, and other evolving structures.

- **Protect community ownership of programs including independent leadership and decision-making, reporting requirements that reflect community-driven evaluation criteria, and participant confidentiality.** CRDV Workgroup members identified community ownership as a key pillar of success. Funding administration should clearly define community ownership as:
 - Independent leadership and decision-making related to all fundamental program qualities, design, and implementation;
 - sufficient resources for independent community-driven evaluation and improvement;
 - reporting requirements that reflect community-driven evaluation criteria, in which community organizations lead meaning-making over goals and outcome measures and the collection and interpretation of data;
 - the ability to protect the confidentiality of individual participants when meeting reporting requirements for funding; and
 - leadership and organizational stewardship of the evidence base.
- **Demonstrate public leadership and transparency in the adoption of community responses to domestic violence.** Elected officials and city leaders should be prepared to speak to diverse constituencies, agencies, and concerned groups about the need for community responses to domestic violence, including: the current scale and consequences of DV; the limits and harms of criminal legal approaches to the problem; and how public investments to support community responses strengthen Seattle's vision for community safety and racial and social justice. This may include working with local domestic violence programs for training and technical assistance and the development of written materials that strengthen understandings of dynamics of abuse and the negative effects of criminal legal strategies in historically and presently marginalized communities.

Conclusion

It is time to transform the City of Seattle's response to domestic violence to align with its stated commitments to racial and social justice. Transformation is possible, but it will require strong political leadership and dedicated public resources. Seattle can be a national leader in investing in survivor-centered organizations' development of community responses to domestic violence. We can invest in community responses that prevent violence before it escalates, motivate change through healing and transformation, and provide pathways for true accountability. This report has provided recommendations toward a broader vision where all of us can thrive in loving, equitable and safe relationships and communities.

Notes


1. Leemis, Ruth et al. "The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey: 2016/2017 Report on intimate partner violence." (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2022); See also, Pavao, Joanne et al. "Intimate partner violence and housing instability." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 32, no. 2 (2007): 143-146; Petrosky, Emiko et al., "Racial and ethnic differences in homicides of adult women and the role of intimate partner violence—United States, 2003–2014." *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 66, no. 28 (2017): 741.
2. Leemis, et al., 2022. See also, Peitzmeier, Sarah et al. "Intimate partner violence in transgender populations: Systematic review and meta-analysis of prevalence and correlates." *American Journal of Public Health* 110, no. 9 (2020): e1-e14.
3. Leemis, et al., 2022.
4. Revised Code of Washington, tit. 10, § 99.020.
5. See, for example, Richie, Beth E. *Arrested Justice: Black Women, Violence, and America's Prison Nation*. (New York University Press, 2012). Goodmark, Leigh. "Gender-based violence, law reform, and the criminalization of survivors of violence." *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy* 10, no. 4 (2021): 13-25. Survived & Punished, "Defending Self-Defense: A Call to Action by Survived & Punished," ed. Alisa Bierria and Colby Lenz (Survived & Punished, 2022).
6. This figure includes deaths of DV survivors as well as people being abusive who were killed due to survivors acting in self defense, or by family members, friends and bystanders acting on behalf of a victim. "Domestic Violence Fatalities and Homicide Rates in Washington State." (Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence, 2022).
7. "Costs of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the United States." (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2003).
8. "Domestic Violence & Child Abuse Demographic Data." (King County Public Health, 2023).
9. Campbell, Jacquelyn C. "Health consequences of intimate partner violence." *The Lancet* 359, no. 9314 (2002), 1331-1336.; Bacchus, Loraine et al. "Recent intimate partner violence against women and health: A systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies." *BMJ Open* 8, no. 7 (2018): e019995.; Trevillion, Kylee et al. "Experiences of domestic violence and mental disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis." *PLoS One* 7, no. 12 (2012): e51740.
10. Pavao, "Intimate partner violence and housing instability." See also Peterson, et al., "Lifetime economic burden of intimate partner violence among US adults." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 55, no. 4 (2018): 433-444.
11. See, for example, Bair-Merritt, Megan et al., "Silent victims--an epidemic of childhood exposure to domestic violence." *The New England Journal of Medicine* 369, no. 18 (2013): 1673-1675.
12. See, for example, Shorey, Ryan et al., "The prevalence of mental health problems in men arrested for domestic violence." *Journal of Family Violence* 27 (2012): 741-748.; Kafka, Julie et al., "Intimate partner violence victimization and perpetration as precursors to suicide." *SSM-Population Health* 18 (2022): 101079.; "Domestic Violence Fatalities and Homicide Rates in Washington State", 2022.
13. See, for example, Spencer, Chelsea, Bryan Cafferky, and Sandra M. Stith. "Gender differences in risk markers for perpetration of physical partner violence: Results from a meta-analytic review." *Journal of Family Violence* 31 (2016): 981-984. Roberts, Andrea et al. "Adulthood stressors, history of childhood adversity, and risk of perpetration of intimate partner violence." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 40, no. 2 (2011): 128-138.
14. "The Crime in Washington 2021 Annual Report." (Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, 2022).
15. Swanson, Per-Olaf. "Criminal Division Quarter IV, Report" (City of Seattle, City Attorney's Office, 2023).

16. Ogbe, Emilomo et al., "A systematic review of intimate partner violence interventions focused on improving social support and/mental health outcomes of survivors." *PLoS One* 15, no. 6 (2020): e0235177.
17. For a broader discussion of these dynamics, see Mehrotra, Gita, Ericka Kimball, and Stéphanie Wahab. "The braid that binds us: The impact of neoliberalism, criminalization, and professionalization on domestic violence work." *Affilia* 31, no. 2 (2016): 153-163.
18. Alcantara-Thompson, DeAnn & Sid Jordan. "Mapping Prevention: Lifting up transformative approaches to domestic and sexual violence prevention." (Coalition Ending Gender-based Violence, 2021).
19. National Bureau of Justice Statistics figures indicated that 51% of intimate partner victimization was reported to law enforcement in 2021. See Thompson, Alexandra, and Susannah N. Tapp. "Criminal Victimization, 2021." Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2022. However, earlier research conducted by the National Domestic Violence Hotline suggested that a much lower percentage of cases are reported. See Logan, T. K., and Roberta Valente. "Who will help me? Domestic violence survivors speak out about law enforcement responses." (National Domestic Violence Hotline, 2015).
20. Swanson, Per "Criminal Division Quarter I, 2023 Report." For general population figures, see "Quick Facts, Seattle City, Washington." (U.S. Census Bureau, 2020).
21. Goodman, Lisa, et al. "Informal Help Seeking in Moments of Acute Danger: Intimate Partner Violence Survivors' Emergency Outreach Efforts and the Forces That Shape Them." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 38, no. 5-6 (2023): 4742-4767.; Decker, Michele R., Charvonne N. Holliday, Zaynab Hameeduddin, Roma Shah, Janice Miller, Joyce Dantzer, and Leigh Goodmark. "'You do not think of me as a human being': Race and gender inequities intersect to discourage police reporting of violence against women." *Journal of Urban Health* 96 (2019): 772-783.
22. Swanson, "Criminal Division Quarter IV," 2022.
23. Richie, *Arrested Justice*, 2012.; Mogul, Joey L., Andrea J. Ritchie, and Kay Whitlock. *Queer (in) justice: The Criminalization of LGBT People in the United States*. Vol. 5. Beacon Press, 2011. Goodmark, "Gender-based violence, law reform, and the criminalization of survivors of violence," 2021.
24. Lenz, Colby et al. "Maximizing Time, Maximizing Punishment: The Lived Experience of Long-Term Prison Sentences in California Women's Prisons." (UCLA Center for the Study of Women, forthcoming).
25. Dichter, Melissa E., and Sue Osthoff. "Women's experiences of abuse as a risk factor for incarceration: A research update." (National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, 2015). See also, Said, Neda, Sadé
26. Lindsay, and Joanne Tien. "Punished by Design: The Criminalization of Trans & Queer Incarcerated Survivors." (Survived and Punished, 2022).
Wilson, David B., Lynette Feder, and Ajima Olaghere. "Court-mandated interventions for individuals convicted of domestic violence: An updated Campbell systematic review." *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 17, no. 1 (2021): e1151.
27. *Violence Against Women Act*, 2022, 34 U.S.C. §12514.
28. Cissner, Amanda, Erika Sasson, Rebecca Thomforde Hauser, and Hillary Packer. "A national portrait of restorative approaches to intimate partner violence: Pathways to safety, accountability, healing, and well-being." (Center for Court Innovation, 2019). Kim, Mimi. Non-law enforcement restorative justice addressing domestic and sexual violence: Pilot evaluation results from the CHAT project (The CHAT Project, 2022).
29. See Kim, Mimi E. "From carceral feminism to transformative justice: Women-of-color feminism and alternatives to incarceration." *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work* 27, no. 3 (2018): 219-233. Some of the organizations that CRDV Workgroup members identified as inspiring nationally, included Ahimsa Collective, Project Nia, Just Practice, Interrupting Criminalization, H.O.L.L.A., SOIL, Life Comes From It, and Spring Up.

Appendix A

Workgroup Overview

The Community Responses to Domestic Violence (CRDV) workgroup was an initiative of the Criminal Legal System project of the Seattle Office for Civil Rights (SOCR). The workgroup was established based on the recommendation of the SOCR's 2021 Community Task Force Report on the Criminal Legal System. In that report, the community task force identified the need for greater expertise on domestic violence. The Seattle City Council 2021 Budget Action added funds to the SOCR budget to convene this specialized workgroup. The purpose was to identify non-criminal legal system alternatives for people who are enacting patterns of power and control over their partners. The CRDV Workgroup was composed of survivors, advocates, and local leaders and representatives of community-based and culturally-specific organizations. The Workgroup included people with experience working directly with people who have caused harm or engaged in patterns of abuse and control. It was convened in June 2022 and met monthly through April 2023 to develop the recommendations in this report. Workgroup members shared experiences with a wide range of approaches including violence prevention and education programs, community-led processes of intervention, accountability plans, restorative processes, trauma-based modalities, and long-term personal transformation.



Appendix B

Domestic Violence Survivor Services in the Seattle Metro Area

Please note that this is a summary list of domestic violence survivor-based services in the Seattle metro area. Additional supports may be available even if not listed.


- Abused Deaf Women's Advocacy Services
- API Chaya (Serving Asian, South Asian, and Pacific Islander Survivors)
- Broadview Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing Program (Seattle)
- Consejo Counseling and Referrals Service (serving Latino/a Survivors)
- Domestic Abuse Women's Network (24 hours, South King County)
- DoVE Project (Vashon Island)
- Jennifer Beach Foundation
- Jewish Family Service Project DVORA
- LifeWire, formerly EDVP (24 hours, East King County)
- Mother Nation
- Multi-Communities
- Muslimahs Against Abuse Center
- New Beginnings (24 hours, Seattle)
- Northwest Family Life (Christian faith-based)
- NW Network for Bisexual, Trans & Lesbian Survivors of Abuse
- Refugee Women's Alliance Domestic Violence Program
- Salvation Army Domestic Violence Program
- Seattle Indian Health Board Domestic Violence Program
- Somali Family Safety Taskforce
- YWCA – East Cherry
- YWCA Downtown Seattle Shelter
- YWCA – South King County Domestic Violence Services

Appendix C

Culturally Specific Community Groups in the Seattle Metro Area

Please note, this is not a comprehensive list of Seattle Metro Area community organizing groups. This list is meant to be illustrative of the kind of community groups working in our region.

- Freedom Project
- UTOPIA Washington
- Collective Justice
- Lavender Rights Project
- Muslimahs Against Abuse Center
- East African Community Services
- Urban League
- West African Community Council
- Mother Africa
- Ingersoll Gender Center
- Gender Justice League
- Filipino Community of Seattle
- Casa Latina
- Sacred Community Connections
- Multi-Communities
- Rooted Reentry




Appendix D

Youth-based and Prevention Programs in the Seattle Metro Area

Please note, this is not a comprehensive list of Seattle Metro Area youth-based and prevention programs. This list is meant to be illustrative of the kind of community groups working in our region.

- All Girl Everything Ultimate Program (AGE UP)
- Asian Counseling and Referral Services
- Gay City Youth Programming
- Powerful Voices
- API Chaya Youth Programming
- Goodfoot Arts Collective
- Coalition Ending Gender-based Violence Transformative Justice Program
- Community Passageways
- FEEST
- Creative Justice
- The Service Board
- Muslimah's Against Abuse Center Teen Awareness Program



Appendix E

Bibliography

_____, "Costs of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the United States." (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2003). <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/ipvbook-a.pdf>.

_____, "The Crime in Washington 2021 Annual Report." (Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, 2022). <https://www.waspc.org/assets/CJIS/2021%20CIW.pdf>.

_____, "Domestic Violence (DV) & Child Abuse Demographic Data." (King County Public Health, 2023). <https://tableaupub.kingcounty.gov/t/Public/views/KingCountyFamilyViolenceData/DVChildAbuseDemographics>

_____, "Domestic Violence Fatalities and Homicide Rates in Washington State." (Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence, June 2022). <https://wscadv.org/resources/domestic-violence-fatalities-and-homicide-rates-in-washington-state>.

_____, "Quick Facts, Seattle city, Washington." (U.S. Census Bureau, 2020). <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/seattlecitywashington>.

Alcantara-Thompson, DeAnn. & Sid Jordan "Mapping Prevention: Lifting up transformative approaches to domestic and sexual violence prevention." (Coalition Ending Gender-based Violence, 2021). https://www.mappingprevention.org/wpcontent/uploads/2021/09/MP_Lifting_Up_Transformative_Frameworks2021.pdf

Bacchus, Loraine J., Meghna Ranganathan, Charlotte Watts, and Karen Devries. "Recent intimate partner violence against women and health: a systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies." *BMJ Open* 8, no. 7 (2018): e019995.


Bair-Merritt, Megan, Barry Zuckerman, Marilyn Augustyn, and Peter F. Cronholm. "Silent victims--an epidemic of childhood exposure to domestic violence." *The New England Journal of Medicine* 369, no. 18 (2013): 1673-1675.

Campbell, Jacquelyn C. "Health consequences of intimate partner violence." *The Lancet* 359, no. 9314 (2002): 1331-1336.

Decker, Michele R., Charvonne N. Holliday, Zaynab Hameeduddin, Roma Shah, Janice Miller, Joyce Dantzler, and Leigh Goodmark. "'You do not think of me as a human being': Race and gender inequities intersect to discourage police reporting of violence against women." *Journal of Urban Health* 96 (2019): 772-783.

Dichter, Melissa E., and Sue Osthoff. "Women's experiences of abuse as a risk factor for incarceration: A research update." (National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, 2015). <https://vawnet.org/material/womens-experiences-abuse-risk-factor-incarceration-research-update>

Goodmark, Leigh. "Gender-based violence, law reform, and the criminalization of survivors of violence." *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy* 10, no. 4 (2021): 13-25.



Bibliography

Kafka, Julie M., Kathryn Beth E. Moracco, Caroline Taheri, Belinda-Rose Young, Laurie M. Graham, Rebecca J. Macy, and Scott Proescholdbell. "Intimate partner violence victimization and perpetration as precursors to suicide." *SSM-Population Health* 18 (2022): 101079.

Kim, Mimi E. "From carceral feminism to transformative justice: Women-of-color feminism and alternatives to incarceration." *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work* 27, no. 3 (2018): 219-233.

Kim, Mimi E. Non-law enforcement restorative justice addressing domestic and sexual violence: Pilot evaluation results from the CHAT project (The CHAT Project, 2022). <https://chatproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/CHAT-Pilot-Evaluation-FULL-REPORT-August-2022.pdf>

Leemis, Ruth W., Norah Friar, Srijana Khatiwada, May S. Chen, Marcie-jo Kresnow, Sharon G. Smith, Sharon Caslin, and Kathleen C. Basile. "The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey: 2016/2017 Report on Intimate Partner Violence." (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2022).

Lenz, Colby, Joe Hankins, Emily Thuma, and Sid Jordan. "Maximizing Time, Maximizing Punishment: The Lived Experience of Long-Term Prison Sentences in California Women's Prisons." (UCLA Center for the Study of Women, forthcoming).

Logan, T. K., and Roberta Valente. "Who will help me? Domestic violence survivors speak out about law enforcement responses." (National Domestic Violence Hotline, 2015). <https://www.thehotline.org/wp-content/uploads/media/2020/09/NDVH-2015-Law-Enforcement-Survey-Report-2.pdf>

Mehrotra, Gita R., Ericka Kimball, and Stéphanie Wahab. "The braid that binds us: The impact of neoliberalism, criminalization, and professionalization on domestic violence work." *Affilia* 31, no. 2 (2016): 153-163.

Mogul, Joey L., Andrea J. Ritchie, and Kay Whitlock. *Queer (in) Justice: The Criminalization of LGBT People in the United States*. Vol. 5. Beacon Press, 2011.

Pavao, Joanne, Jennifer Alvarez, Nikki Baumrind, Marta Induni, and Rachel Kimerling. "Intimate partner violence and housing instability." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 32, no. 2 (2007): 143-146; 22.

Peitzmeier, Sarah M., Mannat Malik, Shanna K. Kattari, Elliot Marrow, Rob Stephenson, Madina Agénor, and Sari L. Reisner. "Intimate partner violence in transgender populations: Systematic review and meta analysis of prevalence and correlates." *American Journal of Public Health* 110, no. 9 (2020): e1-e14. 23.

Peterson, Cora, Megan C. Kearns, Wendy LiKamWa McIntosh, Lianne Fuino Estefan, Christina Nicolaidis, Kathryn E. McCollister, Amy Gordon, and Curtis Florence. "Lifetime economic burden of intimate partner violence among US adults." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 55, no. 4 (2018): 433-444.

Petrosky, Emiko, Janet M. Blair, Carter J. Betz, Katherine A. Fowler, Shane PD Jack, and Bridget H. Lyons. "Racial and ethnic differences in homicides of adult women and the role of intimate partner violence—United States, 2003–2014." *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 66, no. 28 (2017): 741.

Bibliography

Ogbe, Emilomo, Stacy Harmon, Rafael Van den Bergh, and Olivier Degomme. "A systematic review of intimate partner violence interventions focused on improving social support and/mental health outcomes of survivors." *PLoS One* 15, no. 6 (2020): e0235177.

Richie, Beth. E. *Arrested Justice: Black Women, Violence, and America's Prison Nation*. (New York University Press, 2012).

Ritchie, Andrea J. *Invisible No More: Police Violence Against Black Women and Women of Color*. Beacon Press, 2017.

Roberts, Andrea L., Katie A. McLaughlin, Kerith J. Conron, and Karestan C. Koenen. "Adulthood stressors, history of childhood adversity, and risk of perpetration of intimate partner violence." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 40, no. 2 (2011): 128-138.

Said, Neda, Sadé Lindsay, and Joanne Tien. "Punished by Design: The Criminalization of Trans & Queer Incarcerated Survivors." (Survived and Punished, 2022). https://survivedandpunished.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/PunishedByDesign_FINAL-2.pdf

Shorey, Ryan C., Jeniimarie Febres, Hope Brasfield, and Gregory L. Stuart. "The prevalence of mental health problems in men arrested for domestic violence." *Journal of Family Violence* 27 (2012): 741-748.

Spencer, Chelsea, Bryan Cafferky, and Sandra M. Stith. "Gender differences in risk markers for perpetration of physical partner violence: Results from a meta-analytic review." *Journal of Family Violence* 31 (2016): 981-984.

Survived & Punished, "Defending Self-Defense: A Call to Action by Survived & Punished," ed. Alisa Bierria and Colby Lenz (Survived & Punished, 2022). <https://survivedandpunished.org/defending-self-defense-report/>.


Swanson, Per-Olaf. "Criminal Division Quarter IV, 2022 Report" (City of Seattle, City Attorney's Office, 2023). <https://www.seattle.gov/documents/Departments/CityAttorney/Reports/CAO2022Q4Report.pdf>.

Swanson, Per-Olaf. "Criminal Division Quarter I, 2023 Report" (City of Seattle, City Attorney's Office, 2023). <https://www.seattle.gov/documents/Departments/CityAttorney/Reports/CAO2022Q4Report.pdf>.

Thompson, Alexandra, and Susannah N. Tapp. "Criminal Victimization, 2021." (Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2022).

Trevillion, Kylee, Siân Oram, Gene Feder, and Louise M. Howard. "Experiences of domestic violence and mental disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis." *PloS One* 7, no. 12 (2012): e51740.

Wilson, David B., Lynette Feder, and Ajima Olaghere. "Court-mandated interventions for individuals convicted of domestic violence: An updated Campbell systematic review." *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 17, no. 1 (2021): e1151.



THANK YOU

www.accountablecommunities.com

Suggested citation: Perez-Darby, Shannon, Sid Jordan, and Mercedes Taitt-Lamar.
“Transformation is Possible: Recommendations from the Seattle Community Responses to
Domestic Violence Workgroup.” (Accountable Communities Consortium, 2023).