

CEDV Leadership Facilitation Group

September 15, 2022

9:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

ZOOM Meeting

Attendees: Supervisor James Walkinshaw, Chair, Chris Leonard, Joe Meyer, Captain Berkely by phone, Dr. Michelle Boyd, Michael Becketts, Soo-Jin Kim, Toni Zollicoffer, Corie O'Rourke, Brittany Vera

Staff: Eduardo Leiva, Irma Mejia-Lewis, Stacy Ziebell,

I. Electronic Meeting Requirements

Supervisor Walkinshaw read the electronic meeting script. Supervisor Walkinshaw moved that each group members' voice could be heard by the other group members. Corie O' Rourke seconded a motion to ensure the voices of all members were audible to the other group members. It passed without objection. Supervisor Walkinshaw also moved to verify that the state of emergency makes it unsafe to meet in person and that video conferencing technology should be utilized to conduct the meeting. Chris Leonard seconded the motion, and it passed without objection. Supervisor Walkinshaw made a third motion that all matters discussed in the meeting are necessary to continue operations and the discharge of the Committee's lawful purposes, duties, and responsibilities. Chris Leonard seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

II. Adoption of June Meeting Minutes

The June meeting minutes were introduced for comment or discussion. Hearing none, Chris Leonard moved to approve the June meeting minutes and Toni Zollicoffer seconded the motion. The June meeting minutes were adopted and approved without discussion or opposition.

III. Coordinated Community Response Updates & Discussion

a. DV Network Update on Trends (Anna Kim)

There has not yet been a DV Network meeting prior to this Leadership meeting. Anna does not have a full update on trends and challenges.

Anna met with Deputy County Executive Tom Arnold and Stacy to talk about trends seen with law enforcement. There will be a follow up discussion with the DV Network.

b. Status/ Discussion on Work of CCR Workgroups & Committees

The Annual Meeting will be October 7th, virtual with in-person networking event to follow that evening. A save-the-date has been sent and an invite will follow. Stacy asked members to push the invites out to their networks as they came through.

The Civil and Criminal Protective Order Process Workgroup is sponsoring a training for all magistrates about domestic violence and the impact of trauma. The Chief Magistrate is making the training mandatory for all magistrates. The training is being provided by a national technical assistance provider.

A group from the Court Process Workgroup created an updated version of the Protective Order packet that is used by victims when applying for protective orders in Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court (JDRDC). General District Court expressed interest in creating a similar packet for their court. The subgroup will meet to start developing the packet. This is a big win since GDC is new to the coordinated community response effort.

Stacy shared that the Tier 1 Training is coming the last two Saturdays in October in person. There is a training on working on LGBTQ survivors of DV next week.

Brittany Vera shared the Victim Access Workgroup is taking the JDRDC protective order process that was mapped out in a systems walkthrough in 2020 and putting it in a simpler, more user-friendly format that can be used by the public to navigate the PO process. This “map” of the process will be put online on the CEDV’s website and will contain key information about what victims need to know when applying for a protective order. There has been a lot of input from all the key stakeholders, including judges, the Chief Magistrate, the Sheriff’s office, court staff, and others. The group is still gathering information. Once the process is finished with JDRDC, the group will then start the GDC process.

The Accountability workgroup is meeting to set goals and objectives. More information will be forthcoming as they develop their work.

Firearms Surrender Workgroup is meeting regularly. They are developing a video on the rights and responsibilities for respondents when surrendering firearms. The group is evaluating various models for differential response that could be effective and are collaborating with the Countywide LAP team.

Supervisor Walkinshaw asked about the protective order mapping process and whether there would be opportunities to simplify the process. Brittany explained that the mapping process itself was complete and that the process itself might not be able to be streamlined due to the judicial process, however the intent was to find other agencies that might be able to simplify their process, or address identified gaps in services. Many of the workgroups are using the map to address the identified gaps and strengthen the system of response to victims and respondents to protective orders. Examples include language access issues and a pilot compliance docket.

Supervisor Walkinshaw clarified whether the original map is currently on the website. Brittany explained the map itself will not live on the website as it is extremely complicated, but the simplified protective order process will be the final product that lives on the website.

i. Equity Workgroup, Leadership & Succession Planning

Toni Zollicoffer shared about the leadership structure recommendations from the Equity subcommittee. The goal from this discussion is to hear everyone's concerns and feedback about the model that is being proposed. Toni reminded the group of the structure and goals of the Equity Subcommittee when it was developed: to integrate equity and racial justice, to update the bylaws, to consider how to have full CEDV participation, and look at leadership succession planning and barriers.

The Equity subcommittee presented three governing bodies that would make up the leadership of CEDV: Executive Committee (currently leadership facilitation group), the Nominating Committee, and potentially a co-chair model of the CEDV. The Executive Committee would select and appoint the Nominating Committee. The Nominating Committee would appoint the co-chairs. The Nominating Committee and the co-chairs would all be a part of the Executive Committee.

In addition to selecting and approving the Nominating Committee, the Executive Committee would also contribute heavily to succession planning for the Council and guiding the strategic direction of the Council. The composition of the Executive Committee is still being finalized but would include board members or executive directors of non-profits, chairs of the workgroups, and representatives from the survivor community and immigrant community. The Nominating Committee takes a key role in succession planning and filling leadership vacancies. They would look at CEDV leadership effectiveness, recruitment, and governance. They would be responsible for developing a formal, transparent process for filling leadership vacancies and work together in recruitment of leadership. They would ideally have a deep role in the community and in the government to be able to identify and recruit co-chairs. The Nominating Committee's composition would be a chair and co-chair and three to five members with at least two government representatives and two representatives from county leadership and a diverse composition of members.

The Co-Chairs of the CEDV would bring concerns and actions to the Board of Supervisors, they would partner and liaise with the DV Network, guide the strategy of the CEDV, and lead the CEDV meetings. One co-chair would ideally be a member of the Board of Supervisors or member of the County's Senior Leadership team and the other co-chair would be a non-profit leader or prominent member of the community. They would need to be a resident or work in Fairfax County. The Nominating Committee would bring the names of the nominees to the full Council for a vote. The benefits of the co-chair model are that there is shared leadership between high level government and community representatives, leveraging the skills and relationships of each chair, shared work load, and the Nominating committee reduces the risk of ineffective partnership. Disadvantages of the model include that the recruitment of leadership will only be as strong as the reach of the nominating committee, the roles may be blurred if communication is not clear and solid and will require more time for two people to coordinate and plan.

The Equity subcommittee looked at a chair and vice chair model and the chair and two vice chair models. The power dynamics between government and community was a recurring theme in the discussion in the selection of a leadership model.

The group discussed benefits and disadvantages of the co-chair model. Chris Leonard expressed hesitancy around the co-chair model, felt more comfortable with the chair and vice-chair for succession planning. Co-Chairs can be unwieldy for the people serving in those positions. If the dynamics of the group are given proper attention and there are attempts to ensure good engagement from the community those dynamics can be mitigated.

Toni shared that the community expressed in the beginning of this process that there was already not shared equal power and equal input from the community. This is what gave birth to the Equity Subcommittee. The community felt there was not enough representation at the leadership level for the community. Whatever leadership structure is settled on would want to address those concerns. The Equity subcommittee wanted to equalize those power dynamics without losing access to the Board of Supervisors. This is one of the strengths of the CEDV and what makes it so effective. Whatever structure is chosen, we want to maintain that access to the Board of Supervisors

Michael Becketts clarified how the co-chairs would be selected. Toni clarified the Nominating Committee would be responsible for recruiting the co-chairs and creating a "ballot" versus the current process of anyone submitting their name for consideration. The full Council would still vote on the final selection of the co-chairs. Toni also pointed out that most, if not all, the chairs of the CEDV have been mostly government officials who are white men. Having the nominating committee govern this process would bring diversity and ensure qualified leadership.

Supervisor Walkinshaw clarified this would be a standing Nominating Committee that would be able to bring forth qualified leaders. He also asked about the composition of the Nominating Committee and the inclusion or exclusion of community members. Toni acknowledged that they want a minimum of two government and two nonprofit leaders, but they want an odd number of people. Supervisor Walkinshaw wanted to ensure that community members were reflected in the groups and that wording reflected this. He acknowledged how much work had gone into this process so far.

Supervisor Walkinshaw acknowledged he does not plan to seek another term as chair or co-chair at the conclusion of his term for the reasons already discussed as to the historic leadership of the CEDV. He has been trying to recruit his colleagues but has not been entirely successful. Supervisor Walkinshaw acknowledged how difficult it might be to have co-chairs due to planning and logistics. He thinks a chair and Vice Chair model makes more sense. He plans to stay relatively quiet with the full CEDV on this issue. He also thinks it might be difficult to recruit a member of senior leadership from the County, either a member of the Board of Supervisors or senior leadership.

Toni shared that there was a lot of robust conversation around the two models and the biggest concern is losing access to the Board of Supervisors no matter which model is chosen. Toni asked about the likelihood that if a Chair-Vice Chair model is chosen, would a high-level government official be open to serving as a Vice Chair to a community member (if the community member is moving into the Chair role after having served as Vice Chair)? Or would the community representative always have to serve as the Vice Chair to the government official so access to the Board is not lost?

Supervisor Walkinshaw felt like in addition to the consideration about access to the Board, the other important component is the issue of high level of engagement from senior members of executive County leadership. He acknowledged that this was the benefit of having a member of the Board engaged to ensure engagement at the highest level. Supervisor Walkinshaw assured the group he wanted to continue to be involved in the Council and would continue ensure the issues before the Council were represented to the Board.

Chris shared that his preferred model was the Chair-Vice Chair model. This is the model used by the more successful committees and bodies in which he participates. He feels that the issues facing the Council can be addressed by successful, intentional engagement and participation from the larger Council. This is a significant challenge because among other dynamics, there is the dynamic of community and non-profit leaders being in a room with government officials and the power dynamics. Everyone needs to be intentional in minimizing this dynamic to increase participation.

Michael noticed that there is the simultaneous desire to flatten the hierarchy and share power while also saying that people who have formal power in the system have a better chance to influence the system. This is in opposition to looking at the whole membership and how to increase adequate participation and equitable representation of members. It is the power of the group that is generated from within, not by the chair or vice chair, to provide the strength of the group.

IV. Report - Impact of Fairfax County's Misdemeanor Prosecution Policy Change on Victims of Simple Assault

The hope is to get a recommendation from this group to the full Council to adopt this report at the January meeting. This has been a long process and there has been a lot of back and forth between the Commonwealth Attorney's Office (CWA). They do not agree with the report, but their considerations have been taken into account throughout the process.

Stacy provided some background on the history of the issue when in July 2020, the CWA's office decided not to prosecute certain misdemeanor crimes. This including cases for crimes involving violence for cases where relationships between the victim and offender were "not covered." They returned to staffing these cases in July 2021 when the Board of Supervisors increased the CWA's funding. The Leadership Team wanted to understand the implications of that policy while it was in place.

The goal now is to understand the legacy of the policy decision and if there was an impact from an equity perspective. The report is an important reminder of the need to take equity into account and put it at the forefront so that systemic disparities are not created.

Supervisor Walkinshaw noted the report has a lot of value in lessons learned and the importance of prosecutorial involvement in these cases. There is also now a collection of stories in this report that speak to how they were impacted by the CWA's decision.

Other jurisdictions in Virginia do not have prosecutors involved in misdemeanor cases and hopefully this report might be helpful to other jurisdictions and Commonwealth Attorneys in Virginia and the harms associated with the lack of prosecution in similar cases. There was no additional discussion from the group.

Supervisor Walkinshaw moved the CEDV Leadership Facilitation Group recommend to the full Council to End Domestic Violence that they adopt the report "Impact of Fairfax County's Misdemeanor Prosecution Policy Change on Victims of Simple Assault." The motion was seconded by Michelle Boyd. There was no discussion, and the Leadership Facilitation group approved the motion unanimously.

V. Agenda Setting - Next CEDV Meeting January

Stacy shared the January meeting may be in person, there may need to be some new policy adoption around remote participation. We will need to discuss the CWA's report as just discussed and we will need to hear recommendations from the Equity Subcommittee and discuss the leadership structure.

If space and time permits, the group may want to want to invite the service dogs Lisa Sales suggested.

There may be discussion on the CWA report and the adoption of it by the full Council that will require about 45 minutes. The Council will also need to take a vote. The discussion on leadership structure from the Equity subcommittee will also take some time. There is still a lot of time between now and then, so remaining flexible will be helpful.

Proposed agenda:

- I. **Adoption of CWA Misdemeanor Report**
- II. **Leadership Structure Discussion**
- III. **Service Dogs**

VI. Adjourn

Stacy reminded the group there were multiple events coming up for Domestic Violence Awareness Month, which starts October 1st. The Annual Meeting will be virtual on Friday, October 7th at 9am.

**Next Meeting:
DV Community Annual Meeting
October 7th, 9am**