



## **CEDV Accountability Workgroup**

**October 19<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

**3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.**

**Government Center, Room 8 and MS Teams Teleconference**

### **I. Approve remote attendees:**

Present in person: John Cook, Chair, Dr. Brenda McBorrough, Iman Omer-Bahar, Jamie Milloy, Chris Davies, Melody Vielbig, and Toni Zollicoffer.

Remote participant: Katrina Smith. Motion made and then seconded to approve Ms. Smith to participate remotely due to being in back to back meetings at the courthouse making her unable to attend in person. This is her third remote participation this calendar year.

### **II. Question and answer with a County representative on a possible Request for Information.**

John Cook opened the meeting reviewing with three areas the Accountability Workgroup is exploring: Pretrial services, post incarceration support, and community-based accountability programs defined as voluntary non-governmental option. Addressed what was learned from RISE presentation about how they started a pilot program within an existing organization. Members were provided a list of agencies within the Northern Virginia region who are providing domestic violence services that could be seen as possible partners in a community-based program. If this were the route taken, Mr. Cook asked what the next steps would be in determining interest. He asked if a Request for Information (RFI) process was a possible next step.

Toni Zollicoffer, Director with Domestic and Sexual Violence Services, talked about an RFI process leading to a Request of Proposal and funding process. At this time, she wondered if there was a way to explore existing communities such as faith based communities or strongly tied community organizations that might be able to stand this kind of initiative up. Ms. Zollicoffer talked about importance of the community that will be served being at the table to make the decisions about what kind of program and who would run it.

Mr. Cook shared that at this time the workgroup is looking to make recommendations for next steps rather than establishing a program. What we are considering is making a recommendation for a non-governmental organization that offers a route to accountability that is voluntary and separate from the legal or carceral option currently.

Chris Davies wondered if an organization such as that could be stood up in a community itself and not only looking at non-profit organizations.

Ms. Zollicoffer: The county could offer grant funding rather than the RFP process and provide Technical Assistance (TA). Talked about existing grant programs within the county and how we could use their models to fund this initiative.

Jamie Milloy: Wondered if we have large enough communities or enough smaller communities that could group together to get enough buy in or use.

John Cook, Toni Zollicoffer and Jamie Milloy discussed how a group like a large faith community could hold an accountability model within its community.

Dr. McBurrough talked about how a model cannot be so fixed, that there are common principles, but leave room to work within specific faiths or communities. Dr. McBurrough talked about in her research she saw many different ways that faith communities responded to Domestic Violence. She learned from those experiencing domestic violence that they needed support and help for the person causing harm in the home from their faith community. She wondered if we could strengthen those who have accountability programs and supports and build for those that do not. And then create space where these communities can connect together for support. Training and equipping people to go into faith based communities or other communities to support those who are seeking support around domestic violence.

John Cook wondered if we were looking at two different models. One that does training and facilitation. Does not themselves do the accountability work but helps organizations/communities to set this up in their own places. Another is to pick a group to start an accountability program and see how it is received. Then we could grow that into a county wide program.

Jamie Milloy emphasized that it needs to be customizable enough that people will come and it will translate to multiple places. Reminded group of how hard it was to get focus group and survey participants. Use places that people are already there.

Toni Zollicoffer shared that for an organization to be picked it needs to be trusted. And have appeal across the county. Which sounds difficult.

Jamie Milloy shared thought that main organization needs to be robust enough and trained in a consistent way which is a tall order.

Dr. McBurrough stated that the first one would be a pilot. A church or a community that wants to be a pilot. If it works, then can be duplicated in another context.

John Cook wondered who the “we” is that moves the pilot to the broader community.

Melody Vielbig: Can the grantor/grantee model be used where the community group or faith group can apply for funds directly?

Dr. McBurrough: The pilot group could assist the next group to replicate in their own way to meet their community’s unique needs.

Jamie Milloy wondered if cost would really be to fund the train the trainers staff, but communities could stand this up for free.

Chris Davies wondered if it could be like the AA model. That the AA brand is replicated but the groups are unique to the community, and that there is an overarching organization that maintains a directory and publishes guidance resources and a program that diverse groups and sites can implement.

John Cook: That entity would do the train the trainer, get people to the table from the communities to get buy in and willingness to bring to their community.

Toni Zollicoffer: I want to do more research but the grant would be the vehicle. Toni wants to talk with those who have grant money already. New money or carve out.

Discussion had about where funding could come from to support the recommended program. John Cook’s concern is funding would go to administration of a program but in the end there would be no participants benefitting from the program.

Dr. McBurrough: Don’t think of DV until a crisis happens. And then where do I find resources. How do we make resources available to the community? How do we make sure that leaders can access these resources?

John Cook: Seed money to this organization but continue to develop, maybe raise money, with data and annual reports. First pilot must grow beyond. Entity is the hub/organizer. Not just creating structure but also will help support building more communities.

Dr. McBurrough saw two parties that needed help. Those impacted by DV, and the leaders, support people around those impacted by DV. Make sure the community has resources to hold those who cause harm accountable.

John Cook wondered given the nature of what we are talking about, how we would individualize the response to work within different settings.

Group discussed the desire for the “Hub” to assess where starting point is in the community and help to change the thinking. And some connection to professionals. Only works with persons who have some ability to change and are not so dangerous that they need other levels of accountability and need criminal response. Assess who we can help.

John Cook: Hub or Target group would assess appropriateness of participants.

Action step: Jamie Milloy and Dr. McBurrough to write up two-three pages of a Concept report: Recommendation of what to set up for Community Based accountability. John Cook with Chris as TA support. Deadline: two weeks.

### **III. Review Creative Interventions Toolkit and discuss elements of a community-based program.**

Not reviewed today but mentioned as resource for review between meetings to support our discussions.

### **IV. Share a list of providers in the community.**

The group was provided list of programs researched by member, Adam Allston. The group discussed The Collective Healing and Transformation Project CHAT- Restorative Justice Circle model, one of the organizations identified on the Community-Based Accountability Programs.

### **V. Outline of November meeting**

The November meeting is to address Court Services/Pre Trial. Melody Vielbig will find out the status of a simultaneous court-based project to educate on accountability and arrange for an update on this at the next Workgroup meeting. Include feedback from other groups working on similar agendas/missions.

This workgroup is looking to have the report finished for CEDV by spring with full recommendations.

Next meeting: November 16, 2023 from 3:00 – 4:30 PM

### **VI. Adjourn**