



Reflections from the Field on Victim/Survivor Advocacy

**Summary Report from an Advocates Roundtable convened by the
Office on Violence Against Women, U.S. Department of Justice**

January 2017

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to Amy E. Judy, J.D. who serves as a Senior Program Associate at the Center on Victimization and Safety at the Vera Institute of Justice for facilitating, helping to shape the agenda, and guiding the discussion for the day.

We also want to thank Ms. Judy for her assistance in writing this report.

Lastly, our sincere thanks to all the Roundtable participants who volunteered their time and talents to collectively advance the dialogue on these critical issues.

January 2017

The opinions, findings, and recommendations expressed by the presenters and participants in this report are those of the presenters and participants and do not necessarily reflect the views of OVW or the Department of Justice.

Table of Contents

Advocacy Roundtable Overview	4
Roundtable Themes	4
Theme 1: The Multi-Faceted Role of the Individual Victim/Survivor Advocate.....	5
Theme 2: Partnerships, Collaboration, and Community Accountability	7
Theme 3: Culturally Responsive and Sustainable Advocacy Organizations and Infrastructure	8
Theme 4: Connections with and among State and National Stakeholders.....	9
Recommendations.....	9
Theme 1 Recommendation: Promote Building Skills, Capacities, and Competencies to Advocate Effectively for All Survivors.....	10
Theme 2 Recommendation: Reframe Partnerships and Collaboration to Foster Accountability that Influences Systems Advocacy and Communities.....	10
Theme 3 Recommendation: Invest in Organizational Infrastructure that Promotes Cultural Responsiveness and Sustainability.....	11
Theme 4 Recommendation: Facilitate Stronger Connections with and Reciprocity among Key Stakeholders Working to End Violence Against Women	13
Conclusion	13
Appendix A	15
Advocacy Roundtable Participants	15
Office on Violence Against Women Attendees	15
Roundtable Facilitator	15
Appendix B: Advocacy Roundtable Agenda	16

Advocacy Roundtable Overview

Community-based advocacy to address domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking has grown and transformed, especially since the original passage of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) in 1994. What began as more informal, loosely structured efforts to address and combat domestic and sexual violence has emerged into organized and systemic efforts to prevent, intervene, and end domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. At the heart of these efforts are advocates – individuals working within and for various types of organizations, agencies, and systems - who provide vital information, support, and advocacy to those affected by these forms of violence. Community-based advocates within rape crisis centers, domestic violence programs and shelters, on college campuses, within criminal justice agencies, and in culturally-specific and/or population specific organizations and agencies work directly with victims and survivors while also engaging the systems encountered by and impacting victims (i.e., criminal justice, health care, education, housing, and child welfare systems).

Victim advocacy requires that advocates on-the-ground address the realities and needs of all survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking at the individual, systems and community levels. To gauge the current state of advocacy, the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) convened a roundtable of 15 invited, community-based domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence and stalking advocates on October 5-6, 2016 in Washington, DC. OVW convened this roundtable to hear directly from advocates in the field about current advocacy practices and trends in order to inform and enhance its training, technical assistance, and policy efforts. To that end, this roundtable sought to gauge what advocacy is and what it entails among those doing the on-the-ground advocacy work and learn more specifically how individual and institutional or systems advocacy is practiced. This convening also delved into learning about barriers that impede the provision of effective and holistic advocacy to individual victims and obstacles that affect efforts to engage in more robust systems-level advocacy. As a result of this roundtable, OVW is better positioned to assess and reframe its training, technical assistance and policy efforts in light of the input gleaned from advocates in the field.

Roundtable Themes

Through facilitated small and large group discussions, the Roundtable advocates explored key topics, including what advocacy entails; the essential elements of advocacy and the barriers that impact how that advocacy is practiced; potential solutions to identified barriers that impact individual and systems advocacy; training and technical assistance needs; and the strength of connections among community-based advocates and statewide domestic violence and sexual assault coalitions and State STOP Administrators¹.

¹ STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program, awarded to states and territories, enhances the capacity of local communities to develop and strengthen effective law enforcement and prosecution strategies to combat violent crimes against women and to develop and strengthen victim services in cases

Advocacy is multi-faceted. It is practiced face-to-face with victims/survivors. It entails entering into partnerships with other advocacy and community-based organizations through informal and formal relationships to achieve justice and healing for and with survivors. Advocacy requires speaking up and speaking out about violence and victims/survivors with allied stakeholders in coordinated community response (CCR) teams, sexual assault response teams (SARTs), and within communities – geographic, cultural, and identity-specific. Advocates on the ground navigate these vast terrains to provide help, hope, and justice to and with survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking every day.

Representing a total of nearly 380 years of advocacy experience, the dialogue among roundtable participants demonstrated keen insight into the breadth and depth of what advocacy means today, how it is practiced, the challenges that impede its effectiveness, and possible solutions to address its shortcomings. Whether representative of mainstream domestic violence programs or rape crisis centers, advocates housed within law enforcement or other criminal justice agencies, emerging programs that advocate within marginalized communities (e.g., LGBTQ), and organizations that advocate for and with specific cultural and linguistic constituencies (e.g., American Indian or Alaska Native communities, Latina survivors, or Asian Pacific Islander survivors), the input shared with OVW revealed both strengths and challenges with the current state of victim/survivor advocacy.

Based on these identified strengths and challenges, several themes emerged that provide a snapshot of the current state of victim and survivor advocacy in response to domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. The four themes gleaned from the roundtable discussions are:

1. The central and multi-faceted role of the individual victim/survivor advocate;
2. The challenging reality of partnerships, systems-level advocacy, and community accountability;
3. The need for culturally responsive and sustainable organizations and infrastructure; and,
4. The variability of connections with and among state and national stakeholders.

The input provided by Roundtable advocates is captured within these themes.

Theme 1: The Multi-Faceted Role of the Individual Victim/Survivor Advocate

Advocacy is always changing and evolving. There are different yet interconnected levels in which survivor-focused advocacy is practiced – the individual, systems, and community levels. One advocate captured the essence of what advocacy is by defining it as the process by which advocates help victims achieve justice. To do so, advocates must navigate multi-faceted and multi-tiered interactions and boundaries: working directly with each survivor, working with and sometimes challenging other systems, and being responsive and accountable to the community. At the core of victim/survivor advocacy rests the person-to-person, individualized advocacy and support for and with each victim/survivor – one person at a time.

involving violent crimes against women. Each State and Territory designates an agency to administer this Program and the agency's primary contact person for the Program is the STOP Administrator.

The essential elements of individualized advocacy require meeting each individual survivor however they present, listening to their stories, interacting with respectful engagement, and promoting strength- and relationship-based advocacy. As one advocate stated, “the individual advocacy is crucial” -- understanding what the survivor/victim wants and needs, and educating that individual about potential options and barriers so that s/he is able to make informed decisions about services, support, and the path to healing and justice. Yet tensions exist that strain the focus and responsiveness of advocates working directly with victims/survivors.

Several advocates noted how external pressures have shifted what advocacy is and how it is practiced. They revealed that advocacy often is driven less by the needs of the victim/survivor and driven more by data, deliverables, and more rigidly defined outcomes. In other words, advocacy has become provider driven and outcomes focused instead of survivor focused. As one advocate remarked, “I’ve got to limit how much time I spend [with program participants] because I’ve got all this stuff I’ve got to get entered into a computer.”

Linked to an increased emphasis on outcomes, advocates raised concerns about how their roles, work, and the organizations in which they operate are changing, not necessarily for the betterment of victims/survivors. This shift was described best by an advocate who stated, “I think there’s almost a division within our organizations around: Are you doing advocacy, or are you doing service provision?” Advocates explored this question and identified key elements of what differentiates the two. In advocacy, the survivor gets to decide what a successful outcome is. In service provision, the survivor is given the services that the organization provides and a successful outcome is determined when the survivor uses those services. Although service provision is a routine component, advocacy often involves challenging the status quo among unresponsive systems to ensure victims/survivors have access to and secure needed services. Yet, one advocate described how the advocacy/service provision dichotomy has become a vicious cycle for organizations:

Organizations that follow a service provision model tend to have more rules, serve in more parental roles in their relationships with survivors, and focus on ensuring staff check all of the boxes, instead of engaging meaningfully with survivors seeking their support. Organizations more focused around advocacy tend to operate from more of an empowerment philosophy. The result is that survivors who have experienced both environments tend to want to gravitate towards the organization that’s meeting them where they are -- the more advocacy-based organization. But then that causes a burden on the organization in terms of their capacity and economic limitations, which then forces that advocacy organization to become more parental and move away from advocacy because they’re just trying to keep up with the increased demands through the crisis line. So it ends up being this vicious cycle of more and more programs becoming more service provision oriented because that’s an easier model to manage when your crisis line is ringing constantly.

Advocates also emphasized the day-to-day strain that exists in balancing relationship building with victims/survivors and vital systems-level work. The strain is due to competing priorities, time limitations, resource deficiencies, and the complexity of issues that individual survivors face. Advocates must navigate daily these competing interests and simultaneously engage with and advocate within other systems, including criminal and civil justice, housing, child welfare, vocational, and mental health systems, to meet survivors’ needs. Moreover, advocates who work

with traditionally underserved and marginalized cultural and linguistic populations experience additional barriers due to the lack of cultural and language access, prejudices, and overarching oppressions that impact advocacy work at the individual, systems and community levels.

While individual advocacy represents the central function of advocates on the ground, it is inextricably linked to advocating for changes with and in other systems (e.g., coordinated community response teams, hospitals, criminal and civil justice systems, human services, etc.) and in the broader community. Advocates are simultaneously working with and supporting individuals, working in relationships with people from other systems, working in communities, and then working to change, adapt or create new systems to enhance the safety of and responsiveness to victims and survivors of violence. Advocacy involves harnessing a collective voice to forge broader, more systemic change beyond each individual survivor. The challenge lies in the necessity to work with and know what is happening to individuals that then informs what needs to change at the systems level. This interplay between individual and systems advocacy becomes more and more difficult to navigate. Advocates lack the capacity to “do it all” because they simultaneously are wearing so many different hats: responding to victims, responding to systems, and responding to the community.

Beyond working with and holding other systems accountable to victims/survivors, advocates also recognize their role in forging dialogue and change within their communities. Advocates strive to engage the communities in which they operate to confront the realities of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. They seek to identify strategies and solutions that create accountability structures within their communities to counter the violence that is happening. In essence, advocates are expected to “...know it all, provide all of the training, and equip others to do their part in ending violence and supporting victims/survivors.”

Theme 2: Partnerships, Collaboration, and Community Accountability

Advocates work in a broad range of organizations – stand-alone rape crisis centers or domestic violence programs, culturally-specific organizations, within law enforcement agencies and/or prosecutors’ offices, or other larger and varied agencies and entities. This variety of settings and the staffing capacities, funding limitations, and operational parameters in which these advocates work directly impacts how and whether they engage in systems-level advocacy and partnerships – however formal or informal.

Roundtable advocates acknowledged both a lack of time and the lack of funding to support building meaningful partnerships and collaborations, all of which impact systems advocacy efforts. More specifically, advocates expressed frustration with the state of partnerships and systems advocacy involvement. A common frustration centered on advocates’ skepticism of other organizations’ and systems’ motivations and expectations to partner when past partnerships proved inauthentic, ineffective, and inflexible. Specifically, advocates raised numerous challenges and shortcomings related to forming effective partnerships and practicing systems level advocacy that they had experienced:

- Tokenism as a motivation for partnership whereby an organization or system needs to “put a face” on victimization, and seeks to collaborate to gain access to victims for that purpose or needs a culturally-specific or marginalized community represented in a grant proposal in order to be eligible for and secure that funding.
- Unrealistic and uninformed expectations about sharing information regardless of victim/survivor values, legal requirements, and practices that ensure confidentiality.
- Pressure from systems players to “share the partner’s lens” – to help influence the victim to do what is easiest for the partner (e.g., report or not report the crime, testify, undergo a rape exam, etc.), regardless of the victim’s/survivor’s wishes.
- Lack of resource parity when entering into partnerships, including heavily resourced organizations’ expectations of capacities and financial resources relative to smaller, less resourced organizations.
- Unequal compensation within more formalized partnerships that impede equal footing among organizations involved in a common cause.
- Expectations to “play nice,” and/or to fit within traditional systems and models versus representing differing communities, different strategies, and innovative solutions.

Theme 3: Culturally Responsive and Sustainable Advocacy Organizations and Infrastructure

The current state of victim/survivor advocacy is influenced greatly by the capacity, skills, and cultural competency and humility of the organizations and systems within which community-based advocates work. Advocacy requires community-based advocates, organizations, and systems to be equipped with training, technical assistance and resources that ensure the organization’s sustainability, relevancy, effectiveness, and its holistic approach to organizational infrastructure. Moreover, deeply entrenched and sometimes implicit biases, prejudices and oppressions exist that reinforce marginalization of survivors, communities and the organizations that work with and within these communities. Providing meaningful and culturally relevant infrastructure support to culturally specific organizations would directly counter the invisibility and marginalization that looms over advocacy, systems and justice to support all victims and survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence and stalking.

Mainstream and culturally specific organizations alike lack the resources needed to strengthen organizational operations and infrastructure. Organizations continue to grapple with numerous challenges: high staff turnover; compliance with generally accepted accounting standards and practices required of federal grantees and sub-recipients of federal funding; adherence to federal and state laws and regulations; grantee reporting requirements; and non-discriminatory and effective hiring, human resource, and non-profit organizational policies and procedures. Changes in organizational leadership and staff, for example, continue to interrupt and/or derail strides made in individual, systems and community-level advocacy and overall organizational health.

Advocates and organizations working to end violence also have unmet needs around trauma. They lack trauma-informed and trauma-responsive policies and practices that promote healthier organizations and more effective and satisfied staff. Lack of resources for self-care, strategies to reduce staff burnout, and actions that prevent organizational dysfunction remain backburner

concerns for so many organizations. Organizations need and want trainings, resources, and ongoing technical assistance that will help strengthen their infrastructure in the short and long term.

Theme 4: Connections with and among State and National Stakeholders

The Advocacy Roundtable participants also expressed wide variation in the strength of connections with their respective state level domestic violence and/or sexual assault coalitions, and even more tenuous connections to their respective State STOP Administrators. As a result of these varied connections, or lack thereof, advocates highlighted the need to facilitate, enhance, and strengthen these relationships. Because addressing domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking in a meaningful and effective way requires leveraging the expertise, skills, and resources available, strengthening these connections is critical to the vitality, sustainability, and effectiveness of advocates and organizations working to end these forms of violence.

Advocates articulated the need for state coalitions across the country to be able to provide resources, training, and capacity and skill development opportunities that support and promote sustainability of community-based domestic violence organizations, rape crisis centers, and other programs and entities working to end domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. Moreover, state coalitions can serve a vital role statewide to effect systems changes needed that impact victims more broadly.

State coalitions are uniquely poised to anticipate and respond to systemic issues that impact the complexities advocates on the ground encounter when directly supporting victims and while trying to engage in systems advocacy within their respective communities. Therefore, coalitions need the support and resources to effectively engage with and be responsive to advocates in the field.

State STOP Administrators also play an important role in funding and supporting systems and organizations working to intervene effectively when violence does occur. Increased dialogue and connection between community-based advocates and State STOP Administrators would enhance the relevancy of and responsiveness to what actually occurs with victims and survivors on the ground. Strengthening these connections would have a ripple effect to positively impact advocacy on the ground at all levels – individual, systems, and community-wide.

Recommendations

Roundtable participants focused attention not only on the current situation and challenges advocates encounter, but offered potential solutions and recommendations about how to manage and overcome these challenges. This section sets forth recommendations aligned with each of the themes gleaned from the Advocacy Roundtable. Additional recommendations, including training topics, substantive technical assistance needs, and funding priority areas were documented on wall charts during the Advocacy Roundtable discussion.

Theme 1 Recommendation: Promote Building Skills, Capacities, and Competencies to Advocate Effectively for All Survivors

The ongoing and ever changing responsibilities of advocates in the field require a consistent, well-funded, and intentional focus on supporting, sustaining and expanding the capacities of community-based advocates. Whether it involves addressing high rates of burn out, staff turnover, competing time pressures, or ever-increasing outcome expectations, advocates face constant challenges, competing priorities, and resource deficiencies. A nationally voiced, deliberately tailored, well-funded, and practically focused strategy to elevate the skills, capacities, and competencies of all anti-violence advocates is needed. Recommended elements include:

- Invest in and encourage the development of practical information resources that better equip advocates to navigate the variety of systems and substantive issues they encounter.
- Provide community organizing and systems advocacy resources and training to better equip advocates and organizations to build and sustain effective systems-based relationships that positively impact survivors.
- Support organizations to learn how to evaluate and demand meaningful and authentic partnerships and collaborations.
- Provide specific tools, resources, and training that engage advocates and organizations in building and leveraging relationship-based advocacy and collaborative efforts.
- Ensure mainstream organizations and systems adhere to non-discrimination laws and policies, such as meaningful access for individuals with limited English proficiency, and provide tools and resources advocates could use to engage systems in critical dialogue that ensures all victims and survivors have access to the services and supports available.
- Promote resource development and funding strategies that value self-care and alleviate staff turnover, and unhealthy, dysfunctional organizations.
- Announce, communicate, and fund opportunities for advocates to attend trainings that directly impact their work, including training that emphasizes a more advanced substantive focus – beyond the basics trainings -- on the issues and strategies advocates need.

Theme 2 Recommendation: Reframe Partnerships and Collaboration to Foster Accountability that Influences Systems Advocacy and Communities

Partnerships and collaboration often are requirements of grant awards, and their efficacy directly impacts systems advocacy efforts. Multi-faceted strategies that enhance the authenticity and responsiveness of these relationships are key factors to building and strengthening the interconnectedness between and accountability among systems and communities. Recommended strategies and solutions to reframe these relationships include:

- Providing training, technical assistance, and resources about how to build and sustain authentic and meaningful partnerships and collaborations.
- Encourage and fund increased participation of grantees in specific technical assistance and training for advocates, such as the [Praxis Advocacy Learning Center](#), which OVW currently funds.

- Promote inter-organizational sharing of connections and resources.
- Facilitate opportunities to communicate with other advocates and advocacy organizations to share ideas, strategies, and build support networks.
- Promote innovations and creative strategies that work. One example involved groups coming together on community-driven decision making regarding funding. Instead of looking at funding solely from an individual agency perspective, the community came together to make community-driven decisions about what was needed and how to access needed community-wide resources.

Of particular relevance to partnerships, whether they are formal relationships (e.g., a coordinated community response team or via a memorandum of understanding (MOU)) or something less formal, is the authenticity, mutual respect, and level of engagement that occurs. Often, ad hoc partnerships in name only are formed in response to writing a grant or securing specific funding. Culturally specific organizations repeatedly expressed frustration with how often this form of tokenism occurs: “Don't just call us when you need to write that grant or get that funding. How are we going to meaningfully and authentically partner?” Several recommendations were offered to address these situations:

- Hold organizations accountable for these partnerships by reviewing the MOUs and letters of support that were written. Encourage organizations to engage in greater mutual accountability by challenging each to follow up on these agreements with a phone call or meeting to determine further action needed to strengthen and implement the agreements in the MOU or letter of support.
- Require grantees to identify specific steps, communication strategies, and ongoing benchmarks that evaluate the authenticity and impact of these partnerships.
- Critically evaluate whether each potential partnership reflects reciprocity and equality of work, effort, and funding.

Theme 3 Recommendation: Invest in Organizational Infrastructure that Promotes Cultural Responsiveness and Sustainability

Of particular importance to roundtable participants was the need for emphasis and action to promote healthy, sustainable, and culturally responsive organizations. A key component of this emphasis involved creating and promoting training and resources that community-based advocates and organizations need to remain responsive to and effective within their communities. Recommendations for training, technical assistance, and infrastructure development include the following:

- Additional funding to attend training and conferences that increase the skill-set of staff.
- Templates, tool kits, trainings and samples that support and enhance core administrative functions (e.g., finance, human resources, operations, policy/procedures development).
- Skills development and resources directly connected to organizational sustainability.²

² Roundtable participants also recommended training to enhance fundraising skills and efforts; however, this type of training is an unallowable activity under OVW grants, and would need to be supported through other funding sources.

- Strategic planning on capital issues, including how to respond to organizational growth and decline – a natural phenomenon for organizations that traditionally have a heavy reliance on grant funding.
- Ideas, resources, and strategies that promote healthy, trauma-informed organizations, including technical assistance that encompasses the layers of trauma present within many advocacy organizations (i.e., primary, secondary, vicarious, and historical trauma).
- Leadership development skill and capacity building, coupled with leadership transition planning.
- Employment-related resources, including personnel, hiring, managing and retaining diverse staff, and successful staff evaluation techniques.
- Supervision practices and resources that parallel the core elements of what it means to be a trauma-informed advocate (e.g., building trust, establishing a relationship, allowing choices, and working collaboratively).
- Practical direction and implementation strategies that reinforce to organizations their legal obligations to ensure culturally relevant language access, including an emphasis on cultural competency and meaningful access for individuals with limited English proficiency or for those who are deaf or hard of hearing.

Another recurring recommendation involved transforming the invisibility and marginalization of victims/survivors, advocates, and organizations that work with and exist within culturally specific communities.³ Specific recommendations addressing the cultural contexts and differences among victims/survivors and the advocates and organizations that work within these communities highlight the explicit and implicit biases that continue to impede the responsiveness and sustainability of ongoing advocacy efforts. Advocates emphasized that training alone does not and will not create or ensure culturally relevant or responsive advocates, organizations, and systems. Instead, organizations have to be held accountable and intentionally act more comprehensively in their efforts to be culturally responsive, culturally and linguistically accessible, and equipped to serve all survivors. Intentional infrastructure development must include training coupled with ongoing technical assistance around implementation of policies and procedures that adhere to non-discrimination laws, require budget line items for cultural and linguistic access in day-to-day work, and emphasize quality assurance and monitoring strategies that evaluate continual refinement of processes that assure organization-wide compliance and organizational commitment to cultural and linguistic access.

One advocate offered a multi-faceted, organizational approach to cultural and linguistic accessibility that includes the following: an organization-wide cultural competency team comprised of staff at all different levels of authority; ongoing trainings about implicit bias and micro aggressions; an annual staff survey and an additional anonymous staff survey to provide feedback about staff experiences, including questions about implicit bias in the workplace and cultural and linguistic access; and staff exit interviews that integrate questions regarding these . Another recommendation involved promoting the importance of hiring people from the same communities being served.

³ The term “community,” as it was referenced throughout the Advocacy Roundtable, is defined broadly. It encompasses overlapping and distinct racial and ethnic identities, discrete cultural and linguistic communities, geographical jurisdictions, and gender identifying and inclusive populations.

Theme 4 Recommendation: Facilitate Stronger Connections with and Reciprocity among Key Stakeholders Working to End Violence Against Women

Tremendous variation exists in the experiences roundtable advocates have in connecting with their respective state domestic violence and/or sexual assault coalitions and State STOP Administrators. To leverage the expertise, resources, and impacts of efforts to address domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking, stronger connections need to be fostered between and among advocates on the ground and these state level stakeholders. Roundtable advocates recommended the following considerations and strategies to strengthen these connections:

- Make training and substantive resource development and sharing available statewide to any advocate working to end domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking.
- Involve advocates on the ground in developing and creating trainings and resources to ensure relevancy to the work and realities experienced in the field.
- Enhance state coalition accountability and responsiveness to local programs' needs and realities, including increasing the coalitions' capacity to: provide more information to local programs about varied funding opportunities; help develop the capacity of local programs to more efficiently track and manage reporting obligations to funders; promote healthy and sustainable agency infrastructure maintenance and development; provide guidance on staffing and personnel related issues; and prepare and support advocates around emerging trends in victim/survivor advocacy.
- Ensure that State STOP Administrators receive training and guidance to increase support for more culturally relevant and accessible programs for traditionally underserved and marginalized communities.
- Reframe grant funding's emphasis on outcomes to better reflect the value of and commitment to victim/survivor-centered advocacy and its inherent link to systems level advocacy and community accountability. Allow advocate time to be used and billed for relationship building, systems advocacy, and community engagement.

Conclusion

Advocates working directly in the field bring unique and vital perspectives to OVW's efforts. Their day-to-day experiences, identified needs, and their expectations of what advocacy entails can assist OVW in its consideration of future training, technical assistance, and policy initiatives.

The wealth of information shared in this roundtable helps guide future work and systemic changes to transform day-to-day advocacy undertaken to end domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. The work of advocates and victim/survivor advocacy continues to evolve, including continued efforts to dismantle the systemic silos that prevent holistic and effective advocacy, eliminate entrenched biases and prejudices that reinforce a one-size-fits-all view of victimization and advocacy; and respond to the ever-changing landscape of advocacy as a profession becoming increasingly specialized. Fundamental to that evolution, however, are the voices of individuals engaged day-to-day, on the ground, working directly with victims/survivors of violence. Advocates in the field must remain central to understanding and navigating the

ever-changing landscape of advocacy and the movement to end domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking.

To that end, these on-the-ground advocates expressed gratitude to OVW for the opportunity to provide input and be heard. OVW staff, in turn, assured advocates present that they were grateful to the advocates, who communicated a vibrant, interconnected, multi-faceted, and multi-cultural vision for ensuring the future of advocacy for all victims/survivors and communities – a vision that can help guide the training, technical assistance, and policy decisions of individual organizations, statewide coalitions, and key national stakeholders alike, including OVW, in the years to come.

Appendix A

Advocacy Roundtable Participants

Cathleen Barkley, HOPE Works, Burlington, VT
Kimberlee Bruce, Shelter House, Midland, MI
Emily Burton-Blank, Center for Victims, Pittsburgh, PA
Francesco Duberli, Survivors' Pathway Organization, Miami, FL
Vicki Frederick-Toure, Safehouse Center, Ann Arbor, MI
Jennifer Johnson, Bluegrass Rape Crisis Center, Lexington, KY
Ana Lopez Salazar, Enlace Comunitario, Albuquerque, NM
Teresa Mills, Peace at Home Family Shelter, Fayetteville, AR
Patina Park, Minnesota Indian Women's Resource Center, Minneapolis, MN
Holly Rider-Milkovich, Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center,
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI
Katherine Romero, In Our Own Voices, Albany, NY
Debra Suh, Center for Pacific Asian Family Community, Los Angeles, CA
Lisa Thompson Heth, Wiconi Wawokiya, Project SAFE Shelter, Fort Thompson, SD
Alena Victor, New York Asian Women's Center, New York, NY
Carrie Warf, Shelter House, Fort Walton Beach, FL

Office on Violence Against Women Attendees

Kellie Greene, Program Specialist
Bea Hanson, Principal Deputy Director
Rosie Hidalgo, Deputy Director for Policy
Amy Loder, Associate Director
Erin McDonough, Management Analyst
Carrie Mitchell, Program Specialist
Jan-Sheri Morris, Program Specialist
Lauren Nassikas, Associate Director
Nadine Neufville, Deputy Director
Tonette Ngassa, Program Specialist
Sylvia Pauling, Program Specialist
James Smith, Program Specialist

Roundtable Facilitator

Amy Judy, Facilitator, Consultant

Appendix B: Advocacy Roundtable Agenda

October 5-6, 2016 Washington, D.C.

Day 1: Wednesday, October 5, 2016

9:00 – 9:30 a.m.	Welcome -- <i>Bea Hanson, Principal Deputy Director, U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women</i>
	Roundtable Introductions and Overview
9:30 – 10:30 a.m.	“What is Advocacy?”
10:30 – 10:45 a.m.	Break
10:45 – 11:45 a.m.	Expectations of Advocates
11:45 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.	Lunch on your own
1:00 – 1:30 p.m.	Advocacy: A Reality Check
1:30 – 2:45 p.m.	Barriers to Practicing the “Essentials of Advocacy”
2:45 – 3:00 p.m.	Break
3:00 – 4:00 p.m.	Solutions to Barriers
4:00 – 4:30 p.m.	Wrap Up

Day 2: Thursday, October 6, 2016

8:45 – 9:00 a.m.	Welcome Back
9:00 – 9:45 a.m.	Training Needs
9:45 – 10:45 a.m.	Training and Support Needs
10:45 – 11:00 a.m.	Break
11:00 – 11:45 a.m.	Advocate Connections
	Ideas about the Future of Victim Advocacy
11:45 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	Wrap up, Next Steps and Closing