

**Exploring New Directions for Systems Change
To Address the Co-Occurrence of
Domestic Violence & Child Maltreatment:**

**Final Report from
El Paso County, Colorado
Greenbook Initiative**



Terry Schwartz, Ph.D.
Greenbook Local Research Partner

Amber Ptak
Greenbook Project Director

SEPTEMBER 2007

“When you find someone that is willing to say ‘We can be there for you,’ it is like a light going on in a nighttime world.”

.....Domestic Violence Survivor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
About This Report	7
Introduction.....	9
What is the Greenbook.....	9
Federal Greenbook Initiative Partners.....	10
The Local Approach.....	11
Major Milestones in the Greenbook Journey.....	13
The Collaboration.....	19
Getting Underway – Moving Forward: Years One through Three....	19
Collaborative Process Interviews	19
Concept Mapping	20
Network Analysis	22
Stakeholder Survey	23
Moving the Work Forward	24
From Rethinking the Work to Sustainability Planning: Years Four through Six.....	24
Collaboration Behind the Curtain.....	29
El Paso County Greenbook Implementation Activities..... (With Selected Evaluation Highlights)	31
Lessons Learned.....	45
About Collaboration.....	45
About Systems Change Efforts.....	48
About Joining Programmatic and Evaluation Efforts.....	49
About Sustainability Planning.....	51
About Managing a Collaborative Grant Project.....	51
About the Role of Culture.....	53
From Family Representatives.....	54
Looking to the Future.....	57
Appendix.....	59
List of Greenbook Partners.....	60

ABOUT THIS REPORT

In December of 2000, TESSA, El Paso County's only domestic violence and sexual assault victim service agency, learned that it had been awarded Federal funding known as "the Greenbook Grant." The grant, a collaborative endeavor involving many individual organizations and Joint Initiatives for Youth and Families, an interagency collaborative, had been months in preparation. As the group celebrated the receipt of the grant, they were energized for the work ahead. Little did they know that what was originally a three-year grant would become a six and one-half year journey.

This report is the story of that journey. Its purpose is to communicate the process, major milestones, a sampling of the work that was done, the lessons learned and the future direction for the effort. In this document you will find some, but not extensive, tables of data – although many data were collected, analyzed and reported. You will not find a comprehensive description of everything that was done during the time frame of the grant. You will not find substantial reporting of the national evaluation that was implemented across all Greenbook sites. All of this information is available,¹ but to report it all in one account would result in a massive document that might or might not be relevant to all of those interested in Greenbook work. The intent of *this* report is to capture some of the essence of what it has meant to the El Paso County Greenbook partner organizations and the individuals that work within them, family representatives and concerned others to engage in a major systems change effort over a period of years. To do so, the following sections follow: an introduction to the Greenbook, a timeline of major project milestones, a section on the collaborative effort that guided and implemented the initiative, a table of major work initiatives with expanded discussion of a sampling of those initiatives, major lessons learned, and the future direction of Greenbook work in El Paso County, Colorado.

This project was supported by **Grant No. 2004-WR-AX-K001**, awarded by the Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women. Points of view and/or opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the funders.

¹ For more information, contact TESSA's Executive Director, Michelle Valdez, at (719) 633-1462 or mvaldez@tessacs.org.

INTRODUCTION

What is the “Greenbook?”

It has long been recognized that domestic violence and child maltreatment often co-exist in families, though professionals have traditionally dealt with adult survivors and their children through separate systems, domestic violence and child welfare, respectively. When communities and researchers began to question the appropriateness of dealing with an integrated problem in a disintegrated manner, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges initiated a project to develop practice and policy guidelines related to the intersection of domestic violence and child maltreatment. The Greenbook (literally a book with a green cover) was the product of this project and became the foundation for the Greenbook grants. Its recommendations focus on three primary systems: the child protection system, community-based domestic violence programs and the juvenile or trial courts that have jurisdiction over child maltreatment cases. It was acknowledged that many other systems, including law enforcement, child welfare, faith institutions, health care systems, schools and others, must contribute to solutions as well.

The bedrock principle upon which all Greenbook recommendations are based is: (a) the safety, well-being, and stability for all victims of family violence and (b) holding perpetrators accountable.

In its introduction, the Greenbook states²

Overlapping domestic violence and child maltreatment in a family raises major challenges. What can be done to stop a batterer from assaulting a woman and harming children? How can victims in a family be protected? What should be done when a battered mother wants to protect her child but is unable to do so? What should child protection workers do when a batterer is back in the house and children are not safe? Can children be protected without re-victimizing and blaming their non-abusive mothers? How will responses change when a mother is battered by her adult partner and she is also maltreating her children? Can she simultaneously be supported and protected from harm and be held responsible for child maltreatment and for changing her behavior? None of these questions leads to easy or simple answers, yet many communities are searching for solutions that address these complexities.

² Schechter, S. & Edelson, J.L. (1999). *Effective intervention in domestic violence and child maltreatment cases: Guidelines for policy and practice*. Reno, NV: The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, p. 12.

To enable a set of communities to pursue and test possible solutions, Federal funding from the U.S. Department of Justice and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services was identified for six pilot projects, requests for proposals were issued, and El Paso County became one of more than 100 communities to submit a grant request. Ultimately selected, the local effort joined Grafton County (New Hampshire), Lane County (Oregon), St. Louis County (Missouri), San Francisco (California), and Santa Clara County (California) as Greenbook sites.

In addition to providing funding to the sites, the Federal support structure included a team of federal partners to whom sites would report, a technical assistance team, and a national evaluation team, headed by Caliber Associates.

FEDERAL GREENBOOK INITIATIVE PARTNERS

FEDERAL PARTNERS

- U.S. Department of Justice
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PARTNERS

- National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges
- Family Violence Prevention Fund
- American Public Human Services Association

EVALUATION PARTNERS

- Caliber Associates
- Education Development Center
- National Center for State Courts

SIX GREENBOOK DEMONSTRATION SITES

- El Paso County, Colorado
- Grafton County, New Hampshire
- Lane County, Oregon
- Saint Louis County, Missouri
- San Francisco, California
- Santa Clara County, California

The Local Approach

It became quickly apparent that preparing the grant application was a very tiny first step on the Greenbook journey. The working group had identified a governance and operating system – an Executive Committee comprised of representatives of the three primary Greenbook systems (child protective services [DHS], the courts, and domestic violence agencies) and DVERT³ (law enforcement had been identified as a fourth primary system for El Paso County [EPC]) and an Oversight Committee, which would have decision-making authority and be comprised of primary system representatives and other organizations who play a role in response to the co-occurrence.⁴

The Oversight Committee agreed upon a “committee structure” in order to work through identified work initiatives. A key early decision was that systems change in EPC would require a broad-based effort, reaching well beyond the primary partners identified in the Greenbook. These committees would report successes and challenges to the Oversight Committee on a monthly basis.

Another key feature of the local Greenbook Initiative was the inclusion of consumers – formerly battered women who had survived their experiences with domestic violence (DV) and had experience with one or more of the primary systems.⁵ Potential consumer members were recruited through CASA, TESSA, and DHS and three women agreed to play a part in the Greenbook Initiative. These participants decided early on that the nomenclature “consumer” did not have a good feel for them – that it did not connote being on the same level as the professionals around the table – and the more accurate description “Family Expert” was created and adopted (and was later modified again to “Family Representative”). Family Representatives were seen as critical in enlightening other partners about their experiences with systems and in contributing to the direction of systems change. In addition to Family Representatives, the project included organizations that represent specific cultural communities to participate on the Oversight Committee and on various committees.

Also, per grant requirements, a Project Director was hired to guide the project and a Local Research Partner was contracted to work with the national evaluation team and conduct locally determined evaluation activities.

³ DVERT (Domestic Violence Enhanced Response Team) is a model of inter-agency collaboration that provides a multi-disciplinary response. Through a collaborative process led by the Colorado Springs Police Department, DVERT provides several forms of intervention with domestic violence victims and offenders.

⁴ It was later decided, with the consent of all partners, to change the decision-making body to the smaller Executive Committee and make the Oversight Committee the advisory body in April 2003. CASA, Court Appointed Special Advocates, was appointed to the Executive Committee in April 2004.

⁵ Later in the project, it was decided to include former offenders as well.

The El Paso County Greenbook Initiative aimed to provide proactive supports to families dealing with the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment so as to minimize their system involvement. The overall project goals set forth were as follows:

- Systems are philosophically aligned with regard to the response to the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment
- Decrease in re-victimization of individuals by any system
- Systems can provide increased safety for abused adults and children
- Increased trust of the system on the part of consumers

The initial five strategies the consortium identified to meet the goals were the following:

- Inclusion of family representatives (formerly battered women and former offenders) in the decision-making process;
- Improvement of screening and assessment to include the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment in both child welfare and domestic violence agencies;
- Increased number of safety and service plans developed for both adult and child victims;
- Incorporation of domestic violence/child maltreatment into the court's decision-making and creation of a coordinated court response; and
- Assessment of cultural competency within the primary systems and design of strategies to enhance systems' strengths as well as close systems' barriers to service.

The Oversight Committee then embarked on a process of developing a logic model for the Initiative, including specification of short-term, intermediate and long-term outcomes as well as the inputs and structures needed to accomplish them. This thoughtful process took five months of brainstorming, proposing models, and making revisions. While some members had experience with building a logic model, others needed to be convinced that the effort was worthwhile. And for a project with the complexity of the Greenbook, there was much to consider. Deeply engaged in planning to make a difference, the group members spent less time talking about their own collaborative process. Completing tasks together built and enhanced relationships, but teambuilding was not done as an intentional activity. After this period of planning meetings, armed with a structure, goals, objectives, committees, logic models, and real passion to make a difference, the El Paso County Greenbook Partners⁶ set forth on their journey – and what a journey it has been.

⁶See Appendix for a complete list of partners.

MAJOR MILESTONES IN THE GREENBOOK JOURNEY

As noted earlier, this report cannot describe every twist and turn, every work effort, every change that has occurred since December of 2000. However, it is important for the reader to see the scope of what has happened, which is illustrated in presenting the major milestones of the initiative.

A Brief History of the El Paso County Greenbook Project: A Timeline

DATE	EVENT/ACCOMPLISHMENT
May 1999	El Paso County submitted an application to be a Greenbook Demonstration Site.
Dec 1999	El Paso County was notified that it was chosen as one of six federal demonstration sites.
March 2001	Developed Greenbook Oversight & Executive Committees and began formal project planning and implementation.
April 2001	Hired Amber Ptak as the Greenbook Project Director and Terry Schwartz as the Greenbook Local Research Partner.
June 2001	Janet Kerr resigned from her position as TESSA Executive Director and was replaced by Cari Davis.
July 2001	Developed Greenbook Logic Model, which put into action the development of the following committees: Service Access and Resource Development (SARD), Judicial Integration, Judicial Education, Cultural Competency, and Family Expert.
Sept 2001	Cultural Competency Committee created a shared definition for Cultural Competency.
Jan 2002	Drafted new language on agency intakes to better screen for domestic violence and child maltreatment (DV/CM) and assess for risk/lethality.
Feb 2002	Hired Vicki Ybanez, Cultural Competency Consultant, to provide direction to the Cultural Competency Committee.
Feb 2002	Hired first Greenbook Colorado Legal Services Attorney, Jarod Balson. He resigned from his position three months later.
Feb 2002	Established Frontline Worker Committee to conduct quarterly retreats and monthly brown bag lunch meetings.
Feb 2002	Ellen Pence & Susan Schechter introduced the Institutional Safety & Accountability Audit to all Greenbook sites in Colorado Springs.
March 2002	Distributed Judicial Professional Interest Survey to District and County Court Bench to prioritize training areas.

- March 2002 Created Family Representative Committee, made up of survivors and one “former offender,” to provide presentations to the community, develop recommendations for systems’ changes, provide outreach to schools, assist in survivor focus groups, and more.
- March 2002 Established Executive & Oversight Committees Conflict Resolution Protocol and Guidelines/Values as to How to Work Well Together.
- April 2002 Began to provide partner agency presentations at every Oversight Committee meeting.
- April 2002 Greenbook funded a .10 FTE advocate at the Asian Pacific Development Center and a .5 FTE Volunteer Coordinator at CASA’s Supervised Exchange & Visitation Center.
- June 2002 Hired Michelle Valdez as the Court Case Coordinator, a position developed to integrate information across courts.
- June 2002 Developed the Cultural Competency Organizational Self-Assessment.
- July 2002 David Berns, Director of DHS, resigned from his position and was replaced by Barbara Drake.
- August 2002 SARD Committee developed system case flow maps.
- Sept 2002 Held first judicial training for District and County Court Bench with Dr. Peter Jaffe.
- Oct 2002 Ellen Pence returned to Colorado Springs for three-day Institutional Safety and Accountability Audit Training (“Audit”) and established the DHS Audit project of the Intake Unit. Hired a DV Systems Analyst, co-located in Child Protective Services, to coordinate the Audit.
- Oct 2002 TESSA and DHS implemented the Cultural Competency Organizational Self-Assessment. Both agencies created internal action plans to address the results.
- Oct 2002 SARD Committee assisted Colorado Springs Police Department in making changes to its incident reporting form to more effectively assess adult/child victim safety issues.
- Dec 2002 Provided training for all courthouse personnel on the dynamics of domestic violence and community resources.
-
- Feb 2003 Hired Terry Pruitt as the Greenbook Colorado Legal Services Attorney. He resigned from his position three months later.
- April 2003 Greenbook decision-making authority shifted from the Oversight Committee to Executive Committee.
- May 2003 Funded Dr. Astrid Heger to keynote the DV Summit.

- June 2003 National Technical Assistance Team held its first Greenbook Toolbox Meeting for Judges, Advocates and Child Protection Workers.
- July 2003 Hired Mo Frederick as the Greenbook Colorado Legal Services Attorney. Greenbook stopped funding the position in February 2006.
- July 2003 Contracted with Janet Kerr to provide mandatory training for all DHS staff on DV/CM. Additionally, DV/CM training was provided to Probation, DA's Office, Mediators, and the Bench.
- July 2003 Neil Websdale presented to the District and County Court Bench on lethality assessments.
- July 2003 Greenbook partner agencies rallied against a Chief Judge Directive that was issued that reduced the standards for offender monitoring and sentence completion. As a result of our efforts, the directive was later rescinded.
- Sept 2003 TESSA Advocates participated in all-day retreat with Olga Trujillo and Lonna Davis. Identified confidentiality, information sharing, and mandatory reporting a significant challenge across agencies.
- Oct 2003 SARD Committee recommended changes to the Colorado Springs Police Department's Academy Training on DV/CM and CSPD implemented these recommendations.
- Oct 2003 Pikes Peak Mental Health Center, Department of Health & Environment and Asian Pacific Development Center implemented the Cultural Competency Organizational Self-Assessment.
- Dec 2003 Repeated courthouse personnel training for over 200 employees on DV/CM resources and vicarious trauma.
-
- Jan 2004 Created and hired the Domestic Violence Case Monitor, Misty Young, to monitor misdemeanor DV deferred sentences, created a database to capture information relating to compliance, and created the "Judges Whiteboard" outlining revocations by division.
- Feb 2004 TESSA hired Vicki Ybanez to conduct anti-oppression trainings for TESSA staff.
- April 2004 Judge Barney Iuppa joined the Greenbook Executive Committee after the Juvenile Court Bench representatives resigned from the project. CASA was added to the Greenbook Executive Committee.
- May 2004 DHS completed and distributed the results of the Safety & Accountability Audit, including the Guidelines on Investigating Child Maltreatment & Domestic Violence Cases. The DV Systems Analyst (Deon Kenens) position was eliminated. DHS Child Protection Team Meeting Protocol revised to include representation from DV Advocates.
- June 2004 Held second Greenbook Toolbox Meeting with all Greenbook Sites.
- July 2004 Co-sponsored a retreat with Project BLOOM at the Penrose House and featured collaboration expert, Karen Ray.

July 2004	Domestic Violence Case Monitor, local offender treatment providers, Probation, and County Court Bench collaboratively developed treatment reporting forms and a new reporting process.
Sept 2004	Greenbook Partner Agencies submitted the Collaboration Commitment vs. the traditional Memorandum of Understanding. The Commitment was more specific, outlined expectations for each partner agency, and outlined ways partner agencies would be accountable to the collaboration.
Oct 2004	Funded Ellen Pence to keynote the DV Summit.
Oct 2004	Cultural Competency Committee held a press conference to formally release the Organizational Self-Assessment Toolkit to the broader community. TESSA re-implemented the self-assessment.
Jan 2005	District Attorney's Office, Probation, County Court Bench, and the DV Case Monitor collaboratively developed and adopted the Misdemeanor Sentencing Guidelines.
Feb 2005	Hired Tim Landis to devise strategies to engage men in the prevention of family violence as well as facilitate the Domestic Violence Accountability Task Force. Hired Lisa Tessarowicz as the Special Projects Coordinator.
April 2005	Greenbook funded the STOP Family Violence Mass Media Campaign, which highlights the positive role men/fathers have in preventing child abuse and violence against women.
June 2005	Developed and distributed the El Paso County Family Violence Resource Guide, a manual for workers and families outlining local DV/CM resources.
June 2005	Created and distributed TESSA's Guidelines on Confidentiality, Information Sharing, and Mandatory Reporting.
July 2005	Created MAVA (Men Against Violence and Abuse) and developed a Pledge of Non-Violence and posters highlighting men's role in the prevention of violence against women and children.
July 2005	Chief Deputy District Attorney Doug Miles, Judge Chris Acker, and Partners in Change (offender treatment agency) created the Pre-Sentence Evaluation Pilot Project.
Aug 2005	Cultural Competency Committee worked with Sujata Warriar to implement a community-wide training on DV and Cultural Competency.
Sept 2005	Margot Maguire conducted a mini safety audit of TESSA to assess their response to children involved with their agency.
Oct 2005	Funded David Mandel to keynote the DV Summit and train DHS staff on working with batterers involved in the Child Welfare system.
Oct 2005	Tim Landis created DV training for healthcare settings to increase screening for victimization as well as battering.

Nov 2005	Judicial Integration Committee began to explore the feasibility of implementing a second Institutional Safety and Accountability Audit. Hired a Systems Analyst to begin the Audit process.
Dec 2005	Contracted with the American Bar Association to offer community DV training for local attorneys.
Jan 2006	TESSA hired a community organizer to develop strategies to mobilize communities. Although the position was not funded by Greenbook, it was recognized as a need as a result of ongoing Greenbook dialogue.
Feb 2006	Juan Carlos Arean presented the Fathering after Violence framework in Colorado Springs.
Feb 2006	Stopped funding the Colorado Legal Services Attorney position in order to fund additional projects that would expand legal resource options for victims, including: (1) Needs/gaps assessment of legal resources by Lauren Litton, (2) El Paso County Domestic Violence Legal Resource Guide, (3) Web-casts of three legal clinics, and (4) Comprehensive binder of all known legal resources in El Paso County.
March 2006	Funded David Mandel to work with DHS supervisors and frontline workers. Purchased surveys from the Non-Violence Alliance to assess workers' attitudes about working with DV offenders. Devised strategies for DHS to implement to address the gaps outlined in the surveys, including an internal DV Resource Team to assist caseworkers with difficult cases.
May 2006	Hired Lisa Tessarowicz as the Safety & Accountability Audit Coordinator. Established the Audit Team and devised the Audit Question: <i>What information/factors influence prosecutorial decision-making and case disposition in misdemeanor cases, as they relate to adult/child victim safety and offender accountability?</i> Audit Team conducted interviews and observations, mapped the systems, and completed text analysis through December 2006. Audit Report released August 2007.
June 2006	Cultural Competency Committee facilitated Critical Thinking trainings utilizing Paulo Freire's techniques.
June 2006	Executive Committee hired Brinah Vincent to facilitate local sustainability planning.
July 2006	Lisa Tessarowicz and Mediation Committee finalized the DV Mediation Protocol. The protocol was never implemented by the Office of Alternative Dispute Resolution.
Oct 2006	Funded Fernando Mederos to keynote the DV Summit.
Oct 2006	DHS created and implemented DV training curricula for all workers.
Dec 2006	Funded all County Court Judges to attend the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges Domestic Violence Institute to date.
Dec 2006	Cari Davis, TESSA Executive Director, resigned from her position and was replaced by Michelle Valdez.

- Jan 2007 Executive Committee finalized the project's sustainability plan and began to develop the Council to End Family Violence. Sustained DV Case Monitor position through alternative funding.
- May 2007 Honored and celebrated the work of the Greenbook Project.
- June 2007 Created Council to End Family Violence to continue Greenbook work.
- Sept 2007 Submitted final report.

THE COLLABORATION

The Collaborative Premise:

If you bring appropriate people together in constructive ways with good information, they will create authentic visions and strategies for addressing the concerns of the organization or community.

Underlying this premise is an implicit trust that diverse people engaged in constructive ways and provided with the necessary information to make good decisions can be relied upon to create appropriate answers to the most pressing problems.⁷

The first year of the Greenbook Initiative was not only a time for establishing work structures but for many individuals and organizations to become acquainted or re-acquainted. The history of collaboration in El Paso County had been a selling point in pursuing this funding. Now, however, partners had to come together with a new mission, looking at themselves and each other in new lights around a new purpose. In addition, there was now a broader “Greenbook family:” five other sites, Federal partners, Technical Assistance (TA) partners, and the National Evaluation Team (NET) with whom to meet and build relationships. And, while the partners and staff came to the project with skills and expertise, in this new context of co-occurrence, there was much more literature and practice information to absorb. Nonetheless, the group moved forward with confidence in its ability to collaborate effectively to meet the goals of the Greenbook initiative.

Getting Underway – Moving Forward: Years One through Three

Collaborative Process Interviews –

An early local evaluation activity was conducting collaborative process interviews to collect data on partner perceptions about the Greenbook collaboration. Each partner participated in one of three group interview times; the following set of questions was asked of each group.

- **List your collaboration’s greatest successes in the last six months. What do you think facilitated each success?**
- **List your collaboration’s biggest challenges (frustrations, barriers, disappointments) in the last six months. What do you think caused each challenge? How did you deal with each challenge?**
- **What happened in the collaboration that you had not expected – positively or negatively?**
- **What insights have you had about the development of your collaboration and its work?**
- **What adjustments, if any, do you plan to make to the Greenbook collaboration based upon what you have learned?**

⁷ Chrislip, D.D. & Larson, C.E. (1994). *Collaborative leadership: How citizens and civic leaders can make a difference*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.

Many themes emerged from these rich discussions. Successes included Family Expert involvement, progress on making complex issues actionable, the right leaders were at the table, and building on the community's history of collaboration. Many of the challenges noted were structural – both regarding the collaboration and the participating organizations and systems. The time required, jurisdictional issues, and needing to know more about each partner were also prominent themes. Most of the unexpected phenomena were positive: the excellent Family Experts, the level of participation from the Bench, productivity of meetings, and visionary capacity of the group. However, there were also a few less positive factors noted, including lack of clarity from Federal partners and how long it takes to establish goals, outcomes and work plans. Insights included the problematic lack of a formal decision-making process and the awareness that “we’re in a honeymoon period.” Another partner stated, “There will be conflicts ahead over the details, but we have a common vision to fall back upon.” Major adjustments recommended included setting norms and a decision-making process, learning more about each other, and a desire to learn more about other Greenbook sites. An underlying theme throughout all the discussions was an urgent need to maintain forward momentum. These insights were used in multiple ways, as will be seen. However, not every issue raised during the interview sessions was supported as an important theme when these results were discussed with the entire Oversight Committee, demonstrating that getting past the “honeymoon” stage was still to come.

Largely as a result of feedback from the collaborative process interviews, the group did decide to revisit issues of membership and the decision-making process. A voting member and alternate were named for each partner organization and each Family Expert was given one vote. However other issues, most notably the lack of a formal process for conflict resolution, continued to simmer behind the scenes and outside of the meetings. A formal conflict resolution protocol was finally adopted in March 2002, along with another document, “Guidelines/Values as to How to Work Well Together.”

The National Evaluation Team (NET) was also engaged in initial data collection during late 2001 and 2002. Each site’s partners participated in two major activities: Concept Mapping and Network Analysis, each of which illuminated different aspects of the partners’ thinking about the work and the collaboration. Both of these assessments involved the entire Oversight Committee.

Concept Mapping

The first step in the concept mapping process is generating lists of desired outcomes, followed by a sorting process in which outcomes were clustered based on perceived likeness. This resulted in seven clusters: batterer accountability, service system enhancements, improved practice in the courts/broader community changes, cross-system outcomes, decreased harm of children's exposure to violence, decreased incidence of co-occurrence, and decrease in offender recidivism.

Participants then ranked 102 potential outcomes of the Greenbook work with regard to relevance for El Paso County and the soonest time they might expect to see evidence of that outcome occurring. A value of 5 equated to "Extremely Relevant." The table⁸ below shows the top 20 outcomes for El Paso County by descending order of relevance. No impacts were expected in less than two years, with the majority expected between three and five years. This demonstrates that even by the end of the first year of the project, partners were beginning to sense the scope of what had been undertaken and the length of time it could take to see change.

This realization continued to develop over time:

If asked in year six about seeing evidence, Greenbook partners would say that evidence of many of these outcomes is still three to five years from fruition.

⁸ Caliber Associates, 2002.

OUTCOME	MEAN RATING
Systems can identify co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment	4.91
Better screening procedures	4.91
Courts communicate with each other on co-occurrence cases to enhance consistent and safe decision making in the best interest of every family member	4.90
Judicial system members have increased awareness about domestic violence, child maltreatment, and dynamics of their interaction	4.86
System deals with whole family, not just victim	4.82
Better information sharing across systems	4.82
Better resource sharing among agencies that serve victims of domestic violence/child maltreatment	4.73
The judicial system accounts for domestic violence issues (both broadly and case specific) when making decisions	4.73
Systems make referrals for voluntary or involuntary services appropriately	4.73
Increased number of families receiving prevention/early intervention services	4.71
Retain children in home of non-offending spouse with safety and well-being intact	4.68
Enhanced ability of families to determine, access, and receive services (both voluntary and involuntary) and supports appropriate to their needs	4.68
Clear protocols applicable to all agencies to serve victims of domestic violence/child maltreatment	4.68
Sustainable systems changes	4.68
Increased education among Greenbook members with regard to best practices for families impacted by domestic violence/child maltreatment	4.62
Women and children experience seamless interaction with three systems	4.62
Lower incidence of child abuse	4.59
Increased levels of accountability for perpetration	4.59
Providing more effective and culturally appropriate services to special populations (e.g. racial/ethnic groups, gay and lesbian community, deaf community)	4.59
Increased education among Greenbook members regarding currently available services for families impacted by domestic violence/child maltreatment, how to access services, gaps in services	4.55

Clearly, a broad and ambitious agenda was in place!

Network Analysis

The NET also conducted a network analysis procedure with each site. This methodology measures levels of collaboration. For El Paso County, Caliber Associates staff conducted telephone interviews of 16 individuals from 13 organizations. According to the NET report:⁹

Most of the network measures pointed to high levels of collaboration among the organizations involved in El Paso County's Greenbook initiative. Following are key results:

⁹ Summary of El Paso Greenbook Network Data, Caliber Associates, 2002, p. 1.

- Not only do most key organizations working in the area of domestic violence and child maltreatment interact with each other, but they also interact on a fairly regular basis and recognize (to some extent) the importance of their collaboration.
- Relationships also appear to be bi-directional and balanced.
- Additionally, many organizations interact with each other outside of the areas of domestic violence and child maltreatment.

The network density of the El Paso County Greenbook collaborative was measured at 0.89, which “implies very high levels of collaboration between the organizations. Close to 90% of the interactions between organizations (of the total possible interactions) is occurring at the planning stage.”¹⁰ With this highly positive result, however, came the caution that maintaining this high level of collaboration over time could prove to be a substantial challenge and indeed, this proved to be so, as will emerge later. Respondents did indicate some barriers to collaboration of concern to them. Most prominent was communication. Also noted were staffing issues in the partner agencies, a need for more education on what other agencies provide, mismatch of organizational cultures, and language barriers between service providers and clients.

Stakeholder Survey

Another tool, a stakeholder survey, was implemented by the NET in the Spring of 2002, with a report received a year later. Twenty Greenbook partners (100% participation) completed this survey, which asked their opinions about the Greenbook planning process, levels of collaboration, and availability of community resources. Findings were consistent with those of the network analysis – collaboration levels continued to be high!

All of these findings were shared with the Oversight Committee, but in hindsight, without nearly enough emphasis. While some of these findings were reflected in actions taken by the group – communication and cross-training efforts most notably – there were missed opportunities for contemplation upon and utilization of this information. Whether some later struggles could have been averted cannot be known, but the importance of review and use of these findings presented an important lesson for future implementation of these instruments.

¹⁰ *Summary of El Paso County Greenbook Network Data*, Caliber Associates, 2002, p. 2.

Moving the Work Forward

The group had yet to learn that what was being called “collaboration” was, at this point in the Initiative’s history, still emerging from a cooperation model. As defined by Karen Ray, collaboration expert, cooperation can be an intensive relationship, involving resource and information exchange. But collaboration “is the most intense way organizations work together while still maintaining separate identities...The premise of this partnership is that individual agencies agree to change their programming and budgets to help create a better system of services for constituents.

Collaboration means the participating organizations will change” [emphasis added].¹¹

Work continued to progress through the committee structures. Each committee was co-chaired by a representative of a partner agency and a Family Expert.¹² The Cultural Competence Committee was providing training to organizations preparing to implement the organizational self-assessment. Family Experts were working with the Local Research Partner to develop recruitment procedures for domestic violence survivors for focus groups and providing input into interview protocols. The Service Access and Resource Development (SARD) committee was developing case flow maps for the Greenbook systems. The Judicial Education Committee had identified perceived professional development needs from the bench and was developing assorted ways of meeting those needs¹³. And the Judicial Integration Committee and its judicial leadership had convinced the Fourth Judicial District Court to allow implementation of a Greenbook-funded position, the Court Case Coordinator. That committee then provided oversight and direction for the role.

From Rethinking the Work to Sustainability Planning – Years Four through Six

The collaborative learned that the initial-three year funding was to be extended for two additional years at the May 2003 All-Sites Conference in Eugene, Oregon. At this point, the collaborative determined that a revisiting of the logic model and work initiatives was needed to assure that the most would be made of this extended opportunity to make progress toward Greenbook goals. A strategic planning process, facilitated by representatives from the Technical Assistance team, resulted in selection of four new initiatives for ongoing focus: redesign of the Child Protection Team process, development of protocols for frontline workers, focus on methods to improve offender accountability; and focus upon domestic violence/child maltreatment sensitive custody evaluations and mediation.

¹¹ Ray, K. (2002). *The nimble collaboration*. St. Paul, MN: The Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, pp. 16-18.

¹² Exception: The Family Expert Committee did not have a formal chairperson; the group set their own agenda and purpose and was provided staff support by the Project Director and Local Research Partner.

¹³ These efforts expanded to include needs assessment and training opportunities for courthouse personnel and members of the Bar.

Despite these new foci, it became clear that the work was wearing on the group. There are many challenges to collaboration identified in the literature and in practice – and the Greenbook Initiative partners appeared to be tiring.

In July of 2004, collaboration expert Karen Ray came to Colorado Springs to meet with the Greenbook partners and the local Project Bloom collaboration. Her knowledge and frank talk about the power and pitfalls of collaboration was just the infusion of energy that was needed. She reminded and taught that:

- *Of course*, everyone has an agenda for being part of a collaboration – personal and/or organizational. It's making those agendas transparent to all that is important.
- It *is* possible for collaborations to be “nimble.” It takes three strategies: focus on results, shape relationships, and structure for resilience.
- It is OK if collaborations terminate.
- There is a difference among coordination, cooperation, and collaboration.
- It is possible to have fun when doing the work.
- Collaborative work by definition will be infused with power, passion and politics!

Renewed and refreshed, in the fall of 2004, once again the group revisited the logic model and developed a new one to guide the remaining efforts. New committees were formed and asked to develop charters specifying their purpose, expected deliverables, relative power to make changes, and projected timelines for completion. In addition, each partner organization wrote a formal letter of commitment to the Greenbook Initiative and those letters served as Memoranda of Understanding for the duration of the Initiative. The letters set forth how each organization was going to contribute to the mission of the Initiative, the organizational self-interest and goals for being part of the Initiative, the contributions the organization would make to the collaborative, and a statement of how the organization would like to be held accountable by the collaborative partners. In essence, the letters became a “Greenbook pledge” for each member agency.

When the NET site liaison visited the project in April of 2005, she interviewed nine partners, the Project Director and the Local Research Partner. As with every site visit, the status of the collaborative effort was an important issue. Because this visit followed an extensive planning effort and reconfiguration of the work initiatives, the findings of the report are of particular interest. After four years of working together, participants were reporting the following obstacles to collaboration:¹⁴

¹⁴ *Site Visit Five Report*, Caliber Associates, 2005, pp. 4-5

- Relationship with the Court/Power issues: Overwhelmingly, collaborative members reported that the frustrating relationship with the court system (including the resignation of initial Bench representatives in April of 2004) has been a barrier. On the other hand, some judges fear participation in community groups because of the possible perception of compromised objectivity. Some members of the bench also felt that the local Greenbook initiative was too heavily focused on adult victims and not enough on children.
- Scope of project: The large scope of the project has created some challenges to collaboration. At the time of this report, 25 projects were underway in various stages. The evaluators found that “collaborative partners have difficulty grasping how each project is connected since most collaborative members only serve on one or two committees.”
- Time commitment: the ongoing time and effort required was becoming a struggle for some members.
- Keeping people motivated/preventing burnout: “Some collaborative members reported that preventing burnout and keeping people motivated to carry out Greenbook work was the most significant challenge for the community.”
- Staff turnover: there has been significant turnover, both among members of the Executive and Oversight Committees and within partner agencies.
- Information flow/communication: “Frontline workers, in general, are not seeing the concrete impact of Greenbook, and there needs to be better communication of what changes have taken place as the result of Greenbook.”
- DV/Family Court model: lack of progress toward this original goal has been a disappointment.
- Providing legal services to domestic violence victims: there is not consensus over the best model to accomplish this greatly needed service.
- Unintended consequences: not every result of the work has been in the intended direction of change.

Nonetheless, many successes were also attributed to the collaboration:

- Implementation of the Domestic Violence Case Monitor position (see next section for more on this position)
- Training opportunities
- Relationship building
- Increased open dialogue on “hot button,” philosophical issues
- Letters of commitment
- Balancing the child and domestic violence voices on the committee through adding a representative from CASA to the Executive Committee

And, lastly, the following impacts of the collaboration on the involved systems were noted:

- Increased respect and communication among partners
- Continued work on building institutional empathy, but concern about the lack of involvement from dependency court
- Deeper level of discussions among collaborative members
- Greater awareness of the intersection between child maltreatment and domestic violence

Clearly, there were some shifts from the “highs” of the original network analysis, which had been predicted. This was validated by the results of a second administration of the Stakeholder Survey by the NET. The following summary of the findings was presented to the Oversight Committee in February of 2006.

KEY FINDINGS FROM THE STAKEHOLDER SURVEY

The NET has submitted a report of Time 1 (2002) and Time 2 (2005) findings from administrations of the Stakeholder Survey. Below are some of the key findings. These are important to consider in light of sustainability and what we can build upon and where we can strengthen our efforts. You will note some increases in perceived obstacles to the Greenbook Initiative. These are not necessarily negative; they may indicate increased awareness of the reality and difficulties of collaboration. However, they are worth attention in light of the efforts underway to sustain critical endeavors of the Greenbook, particularly the findings related to burnout. Both across the demonstration sites and among El Paso County stakeholders, Time 2 survey respondents reported that there was increased burn-out among Greenbook partners, and lack of accountability among Initiative members for projects or tasks.

<i>To what extent did the following serve as <u>obstacles</u> to your local Greenbook Initiative since it was funded?</i>		
<i>(Significant measures)**</i>	El Paso Time 1 mean*	El Paso Time 2 mean*
Burn-out of participants	1.91	2.73
Turf issues (e.g., conflict over ownership of tasks/resources)	1.56	2.46
Lack of accountability among Initiative members for projects or tasks	1.69	2.64
Lack of leadership buy-in from key organizations	1.50	2.00

* 5 point scale: 1 = Not at all; 2 = A little; 3 = Somewhat; 4 = Moderately; 5 = Very Much

** t-tests showed a significant change ($p \leq 0.05$) in stakeholder perceptions across Time 1 and Time 2.

El Paso County stakeholders were **more** likely to agree that there was a formal process for resolving conflicts among participating organizations during Time 2 compared to Time 1. However, **less** El Paso stakeholders agreed during Time 2 with the following statements:

- The roles and responsibilities of members were clear;
- The partnership includes members representative of the cultural/ethnic diversity of the community;
- The collaborative had a strong commitment from the policy-making level of each organization that is represented;
- Representation from key players within the initiative is adequate; and
- Number of stakeholders involved in the initiative is adequate.

With regard to systems change:

- There were no significant changes in the perceptions related to the judicial system from Time 1 to Time 2.
- There were no significant changes in the perceptions related to domestic violence service providers from Time 1 to Time 2.
- There was a **significant positive change** for every measure related to perceptions of child protection services and child welfare agencies.

El Paso County stakeholders consistently reported that the following factors facilitated the success of their Initiative:

- **The partners on the project work well together;**
- **The right people are at the table;**
- **There is strong leadership and commitment from key leaders;**
- **There is involvement from certain key agencies/groups;**
- **Individual relationships among collaborative members and agency staff; and**
- **Partners have the needs of the women and children in mind.**

By the time of the last NET site visit, the challenges facing the Greenbook collaboration were identified as being time, shifting players, trust issues (though decreasing), conflicting regulations among partner systems, communication, and not taking time to learn about other systems. However, it was also reported that in the last year involvement from key players had increased, learning and interaction outside the boundaries of the collaboration had increased, and willingness to talk about specific cases had increased.¹⁵

So does the presence of these significant challenges six years later mean that collaboration doesn't work? Or does it mean that *this* collaboration didn't work? To the contrary, the accomplishments of the Greenbook Initiative, the persistence of the collaboration in spite of these obstacles, and the commitment to continue the work past the expiration of the Greenbook grant dollars are all powerful testimonies to the potency of a collaboration with a compelling vision and a mission to be relentless in pursuing solutions to a heretofore intractable problem. To this end, the last work of this collaborative as "the Greenbook" was the creation of an ongoing Council to End Family Violence.

¹⁵ *Site Visit Six Report*, Caliber Associates, 2006, pp. 6-7

Collaboration Behind the Curtain.....

The collaboration section cannot be concluded without a look behind the curtain. Without a doubt, the Greenbook Initiative would not have moved from coordination to cooperation to collaboration and made progress toward goals and intended outcomes without the committed participation of the member agencies' leaders. However, there were other contributions to the work moving forward. These must be acknowledged, not because of need for recognition of individuals, but to promote understanding of what it takes to make collaboration (especially on a highly complex initiative) work between the meetings.

The project director and other project staff, the co-chair, and local research partner worked diligently and daily (in particular project staff) to make sure that forward momentum of the initiative was assured. This involved:

- Meeting planning and coordination – thinking about content, scheduling, minutes, reminders
- Managing relationships and communication with the Federal team
- Handling day-to-day conflicts that arose, often without these needing to come to the attention of the larger group
- Budget management and decision-making
- Relationship building within the project and with concerned others
- Ongoing engagement with partner agencies
- Community outreach
- Committee support
- Assuring consistent updates would be available to the partners
- Helping to define and advocate for appropriate roles and responsibilities for member agencies and the initiative at large
- Asking the hard questions
- Raising philosophical issues
- Struggling with maintaining engagement of members
- Managing partners' perceptions about all of the above

Does this mean that others didn't care about these things or play a role in assuring these functions were accomplished? Of course not – but no partner had these tasks as a daily responsibility. Yet without these taking place, forward momentum would have slowed significantly. The point: Collaboration is a LOT of work and, at least for complex projects such as the Greenbook, requires the kind of daily attention that any one member with his or her own organization and significant responsibilities there would be hard-pressed to provide.

EL PASO COUNTY GREENBOOK IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES

DECEMBER 2000 – JUNE 2007

The work of the Greenbook Initiative in El Paso County was remarkable in its ambition and scope – the activities below are testimony to the commitment and passion of individuals and of organizations. Below, the reader will find a description of all of the implementation activities of this Initiative. A selected few also include comments about an evaluation effort or other follow-up to the description of the activity.

Activity Name: Collaborative Structure

The Executive Committee and the Oversight committee held monthly meetings. The Executive Committee was the decision-making body with representation from the project co-chairs and a key stakeholder from each of the primary partners, which included the Department of Human Services (DHS), TESSA (the local domestic violence service provider), the El Paso County Court, the Domestic Violence Enhanced Response Team (DVERT), Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA), and family representatives. The Oversight Committee consisted of a wider group of partner agencies from community organizations that serve families experiencing domestic violence and child maltreatment. The Oversight Committee discussed collaborative work and issues surrounding co-occurrence and advised the Executive Committee on these matters. The committees, or workgroups, met monthly and focused on more issue- and task-specific work.

Activity Name: Sustainability Plan

The Greenbook Executive and Oversight Committees began planning for sustainability in September 2005 by hosting a facilitated meeting with our Technical Assistance providers. Starting in June 2006, time was dedicated at every Oversight Committee meeting to discuss how/why a current project should be “embedded” into current practice; identify who was responsible for embedding the initiative; outline how the initiative would be funded, if continued; identify what data would be needed to continue the initiative and how the initiative would be evaluated for short-term and long-term results; and, most importantly, how the initiative would be accountable to battered women and their children’s ongoing safety. A formal sustainability plan, including the development of the Council to End Family Violence, was release in January 2007.

Activity Name: Project Staff

The Greenbook Project funded a full-time Project Director to oversee activities relating to project planning, implementation, evaluation, contractors and additional project staff, including an administrative assistant. The Project Director participated in all Greenbook-related meetings, oversaw/evaluated the progress of all initiatives, coordinated/scheduled meetings, facilitated collaborative meetings, and participated as the site representative on monthly federal calls, technical assistance calls, and Greenbook site calls. The Project Manager was also responsible for all federal budget and progress reports.

Activity Name: Local Research Partner

The Greenbook Project funded a part-time Local Research Partner (LRP) to oversee local and national evaluation efforts. The LRP met regularly with the Project Director and Project Co-Chairs to discuss evaluation activities and direction to assess progress and assure integration with the overall initiative. Oral updates were provided at Oversight and Executive Committee meetings.

Activity Name: Collaborative Letters of Commitment

Memoranda of Understanding were drafted and signed by all partners at the beginning of the collaborative process. In July 2004, the collaboration held a retreat with Karen Ray, who suggested that the partner agencies draft and sign a new letter of commitment (versus a general Memorandum of Understanding). These new letters more specifically stated each partner's goals for the collaboration, how the agency would participate as an active partner in the project, what the agency expected from the collaboration, and how the agency would like to be held accountable to the Initiative. The partners each presented the content of these letters to the collaboration.

Activity Name: Conflict Resolution Protocol & How We Will Work Well Together

A conflict resolution protocol was originally developed in May 2002 in response to an individual-level conflict, and was later revised to include information on dealing with conflicts between organizations. The protocol also contains information on how to deal with conflicts when behavior and/or expectations have not been met. Additionally, the collaboration outlined values for the collaboration and called them, "How We Will Work Well Together."

Activity Name: Partner Presentations to the Collaboration

At nearly every Oversight Committee meeting, there was a presentation from a partner agency. Early in the collaborative process, these presentations focused on the partner agency itself, highlighting its mandate(s), policies, and contributions to addressing co-occurrence through community collaboration. Later in the collaborative process, the presentations moved from being agency focused to dialogues on specific topics and hot-button issues surrounding co-occurrence, such as child witnessing of domestic violence and forensic examining of children.

Activity Name: Assessment of Co-occurrence Trainings in Primary Partners

The Greenbook Service, Access, and Resource Development (SARD) committee assessed and reported on the domestic violence, child maltreatment, and co-occurrence training that existed in each of El Paso County's primary partner agencies (the courts, DHS, TESSA, DVERT, and CASA) during the Greenbook planning phase and made recommendations to the Oversight Committee. This work identified training needs in the community and provided a starting point for developing Greenbook-sponsored training and other information dissemination efforts.

Activity Name: Primary Systems Mapping: Service Access & Resource Development

The SARD committee conducted a systems mapping exercise early in the Greenbook project to document how families were being identified and served in the primary systems. The system map identified strengths and gaps in the systems' identification, case management, and referral processes. The map then served as a starting point for later activities, particularly those related to formal policy and procedure changes in the primary systems and the Safety and Accountability Audits.

Activity Name: Frontline Worker Committee

In response to Toolbox meetings sponsored by the National Technical Assistance Team in 2002, a Frontline Worker Committee (comprised of direct service workers from child protection, the family independence program [TANF], and TESSA) was created early in 2003 and met quarterly to discuss Greenbook issues and activities at the frontline worker level. In addition to quarterly trainings through 2005, the committee sponsored monthly brown bag lunches to highlight a

community agency, program, or a hot topic related to the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment. The Frontline Worker Committee distributed a survey to all frontline workers from the Greenbook partner agencies and outlined priorities, including the monthly brown bag lunch meetings, to continue its work beyond the life of the Greenbook.

Activity Name: Family Experts/Representatives

The Family Representative committee was originally made up of three domestic violence survivors and a “former DV offender” who each had experience with the primary Greenbook systems. The committee’s goal was to bring the perspective of family members to the collaboration. They were involved as leaders at all Executive, Oversight, and subcommittee meetings, and infused the client experience perspective into the Initiative through personal input in focus group and interview protocols. As the collaboration moved from planning and early implementation into full implementation and sustainability, there was some turnover among the family representatives, and the collaboration decided to be less directive in how family members are involved in the collaborative process. As the Initiative progressed, the collaboration incorporated the family perspective through contracts with five women who had experience with family violence and the primary systems. The women each played various roles targeted to their own unique experience and interests, including providing expertise to the safety audit team at DHS, outreach to schools, writing personal stories, and attending Oversight and other committee meetings to add their perspectives to committee discussions.

Activity Name: TESSA Community Organizer

As a result of Greenbook’s continued focus on community organizing, TESSA hired a part-time community organizer. The position was not funded by the Greenbook project, but was initiated after ongoing dialogues about the importance of mobilizing communities in the effort to end violence against women and their children.

Activity Name: MAVA (Men Against Violence and Abuse)

MAVA was created by two men who had completed offender treatment and a local treatment provider from Partners in Change (offender treatment agency) who stated that they wanted to more actively engage men in the effort to prevent violence against women. The committee developed a Pledge of Non-Violence and a series of posters highlighting the positive roles men can take in the community. MAVA is represented at a variety of community health fairs and presents to a variety of audiences.

Activity Name: Consultant to Engage Men/Fathers in the Greenbook Partner Agencies

The Greenbook Project contracted with Mr. Tim Landis to identify ways to engage fathers involved in child protection and other partner agencies. In addition to creating DV/CM assessment tools, Mr. Landis helped DHS create an internal DV consultant committee that encourages workers to contact internal ‘experts’ about challenging DV cases. Mr. Landis also worked with MAVA in its quest for structure and ongoing connection to the broader community.

Activity Name: Facilitator for the Domestic Violence Accountability Task Force

In 2002, a state-level offender treatment board replaced the county-level board in El Paso County that had been certifying local treatment providers. Local treatment providers, Probation, the Office of the District Attorney, and TESSA recognized the need to continue to talk about the challenges in treatment and offender accountability and created the Domestic Violence Accountability Task Force (DVATF) in June 2003.

Due to a lack of focus, the committee decided to disband in June 2004; however, Greenbook recognized the need for the group to continue meeting. The Greenbook Project funded a facilitator to convene the Task Force monthly to develop by-laws, an Executive Committee, and a conflict resolution protocol. Additionally, the Greenbook Executive Committee outlined expectations for the DVATF, which included the investigation and/or development of local offender treatment standards that would incorporate the Family Violence Prevention Fund's Fathering After Violence framework. Although the DVATF did not meet the expectation of developing community standards for treatment (beyond what is required by the State Domestic Violence Offender Management Board), the El Paso County Department of Human Services did create contracts with local providers to develop and implement curricula targeted towards abusive fathers involved in the Child Protection system.

Activity Name: Batterer Accountability Technical Assistance

Members of El Paso County's Greenbook Initiative joined an audio-conference on batterer accountability sponsored by the National Technical Assistance Team. Additionally, members of the El Paso County Greenbook Initiative attended batterer accountability training in Eugene, OR and Detroit, MI. The collaboration had difficulties tackling the issues of offender accountability, and these conferences helped push them to move the conversation forward in a constructive manner.

Activity Name: DV-Dedicated Attorney at Colorado Legal Services & Access to Legal Resources

The Greenbook Initiative funded an attorney from Colorado Legal Services (CLS) to work solely with victims of domestic violence who had children living in the home when the violence occurred. The position was originally designed to provide victims access to civil legal counsel, thereby enhancing adult and child victim safety and offender accountability. The collaboration revised the referral process to connect families with the CLS attorney, which historically had not always worked as planned, and TESSA's referral process.

In March 2006, the Greenbook Executive Committee voted not to renew the contract with Colorado Legal Services, thereby eliminating the full-time attorney position. In April 2006, the Executive Committee voted to fund the following: (1) Consultation from Lauren Litton to assess options for the delivery and funding of legal services in El Paso County, Colorado. Ms. Litton's interviews helped identify opportunities for legal resources and funding, assessed current gaps in services, and surveyed other communities about how they are delivering similar legal services; (2) Development of the El Paso County Domestic Violence Legal Resource Guide; and (3) Development of legal clinic web-casts that provide information about post decree matters, dissolution of marriage, allocation of parental responsibility and consumer credit/debt issues and that are accessible to anyone 24 hours, 7 days a week.

Activity Name: Court Case Coordinator

A Court Case Coordinator (CCC) position was implemented in El Paso County's Dependency and Neglect Court. The CCC focused on the behavior and criminal history of the parties, which allowed the courts to ask fewer questions of the non-offending parent. The CCC provided judges and magistrates with case history information to make more informed decisions. The information included criminal and traffic history, as well as current and past orders associated with the family. Among other duties, the CCC researched interfering current orders for cases in front of a judge and developed history forms to share information between courts (Dependency and Neglect Court, Fast Track Court, Protection Order Court and some Domestic Relations Courts). Additionally, families used the CCC as a source for more information about their current court orders and community resources.

Activity Name: Mediator Training and Protocol for Co-occurrence

Mediators from the Office of Alternative Dispute Resolution successfully completed eight-hour training on the dynamics of domestic violence and child maltreatment, funded by Greenbook. Greenbook created a committee to develop a DV/CM sensitive protocol to be adopted in all cases as the community standard for alternative dispute resolution. The protocol was designed to help victims understand their options around participating in mediation or other forms of alternative dispute resolution and identifies ways to make informed choices. If the protocol is implemented, mediators will be better equipped to screen for and address family violence, and mediation will promote victim safety and offender accountability.

Note: Despite numerous attempts to implement the protocol through the Director of the Office of Alternative Dispute, the protocol has not been implemented.

Activity Name: Judicial Education Committee

The Judicial Education committee developed a number of trainings for court and agency staff. The collaboration contracted with an expert to develop materials and provide training for district attorneys, county attorneys, judges, court personnel, and probation staff about the co-occurrence and the local Greenbook Initiative. Judges participated in a professional development needs assessment and devoted time to training on understanding domestic violence victims, batterers, children who witness, vicarious trauma, lethality assessments, and offender accountability.

Activity Name: Domestic Violence Case Monitor

Greenbook created and funded a Domestic Violence Case Monitor to track compliance with DV misdemeanor deferred sentences in the following ways: 1) the offender must present evidence of enrollment with a offender treatment provider within two weeks; 2) if evidence is not provided, a warning letter is sent giving the offender an additional two weeks to comply; 3) if the offender has not provided evidence of attendance after this time, a judge will issue an appearance; and 4) the offender treatment provider will monitor the offender throughout treatment and serve as the primary point of contact for the provider. The monitor tracks continued program attendance and treatment outcomes, which are all reported back to the court. The monitor tracks revocation hearings and the outcomes of those hearings, with particular attention to the outcome of cases that meet the criteria for revocation (i.e., whether they are actually revoked or not and why). The monitor produces a monthly data summary of offender compliance with court-ordered treatment as well as the court's response to compliance and non-compliance. These reports have shown that a high proportion of offenders now enroll and successfully complete treatment within the specified time frame. The monitor position was sustained through alternative funding in January 2007.

Evaluation Highlight:

Increasing accountability of men who batter was one of the primary focal points of the initiative and this position was central to that effort. Therefore, the position was selected as a focus for local evaluation. To that end, in the winter of 2006, surveys to measure the impact of the position were created for each of four constituent groups: judges, District Attorney's office, probation officers, and offender treatment providers. The full report of those surveys contained a wealth of information supporting the positive impact of the position; a summary of key findings included the following:

- Representatives of all respondent groups saw a primary impact of the DVCM position being increased offender accountability.
- Representatives of all respondent groups reported that their practice has changed in a positive way as a result of the DVCM position.

- All respondent groups rated the sustainability of the position as very important, with many using the word “essential.”
 - Judges, Probation Officers, and treatment providers all reported positive change on multiple elements since implementation of the position (DAs were not asked this question due to turnover within the office).
 - Judges were much more confident that offenders are being monitored appropriately.
 - Judges found it more typical to have timely and adequate information at revocation hearings than before the implementation of the position.
 - Sustainability of the position was noted to be important to the Probation Department in terms of enhanced communication and provision of effective supervision by the DVCM resulting in fewer cases ending up with Probation.
 - 100% of the treatment provider respondents reported a positive impact of the DVCM. Two major areas were most frequently cited:
 - Increased offender accountability
 - Improved communication between the courts and treatment providers
 - 91% of the treatment providers reported that the position has had a positive impact on their practice.
-

Activity Name: Information Sharing Related to Batterer Treatment

A Colorado State Statute requires offender treatment providers to report monthly progress on each court-ordered domestic violence offender. There was confusion as to who sent it, who received/reviewed it, what information should be collected, how the information would be used, and how this practice increased offender accountability. The form was revised by the Judicial Integration Committee and it now includes information on behavioral outcomes. As a result, there is more consistent reporting and information sharing between the courts, probation, the DAs Office, and treatment providers. The District Attorney’s Office now has a clearer picture of what is occurring with treatment provider clients and the courts have more information during revocation hearings. The reports are managed by the Domestic Violence Case Monitor.

Activity Name: Judicial Consultants

A consultant role was developed for members of the bench who could not be full members of the collaboration. As a consultant, these individuals could remain engaged in the collaborative process without being formal members and regularly attending collaborative and committee meetings. Instead, the consultants could be engaged as needed and as interested in specific collaborative work.

Activity Name: Court Pilot Project for Pre-Sentence Investigation and Differential Treatment of Domestic Violence Offenders

The Fourth Judicial District Attorney’s Office, Partners in Change (offender treatment agency), and the County Court Bench initiated a Pre-Sentence Evaluation Pilot Project in July 2005 to better evaluate the context and dynamics present in misdemeanor domestic violence cases and to provide as much information as possible to the County Court Judge prior to a sentencing hearing. Initiated for a variety of reasons, the project has proven to treat each case individually, rather than a “one size fits all approach.” In addition, the project allows for more context in cases, particularly in cases where women have been arrested for misdemeanor domestic violence. In the pilot project, many of these women have been identified as battered women who either retaliated or self-defended and their cases were either appropriately dismissed or, in cases where women used violence illegally and the courts/treatment agency felt as though they needed to be held accountable, were sentenced to alternative treatment options.

Activity Name: DHS Institutional Safety & Accountability Audit and Guidelines for Investigating the Co-Occurrence of Child Maltreatment and Domestic Violence

Greenbook funded a coordinator to assist in the implementation of an Institutional Safety & Accountability Audit in Child Protection. The coordinator was a TESSA advocate co-located in Child Protective Services. The Audit was implemented to identify gaps in current child protection response and to make recommendations, particularly around the issues of re-victimization and offender accountability. In order to minimize blaming the non-offending parent, the Audit examined the existing criteria for opening a case and assessed offender accountability strategies used during the investigation phase. As a result of the Audit findings, the committee developed an internal document titled, "DHS Guidelines for Investigating the Co-Occurrence of Child Maltreatment and Domestic Violence," practical applications for responding to family violence cases in DHS. The committee also developed training for frontline workers and supervisors on these guidelines. After the Safety Audit Team completed their work, they voted to implement the Non-Violence Alliance (David Mandel) surveys to assess the level of batterer engagement in child welfare. The Team reviewed the survey analysis and proposed recommendations, including additional consultation with Mr. Mandel and the creation of an internal team of DV Consultants accessible to caseworkers via email/phone.

Evaluation Highlight: When audit findings led to the recommendation for developing guidelines, there was concern that the potential users would find them of value and actually implement the guidelines in their practice. Therefore, a series of focus groups were held with caseworkers from multiple units to assess these questions. Multiple findings emerged, summarized in the following key themes from the data:

- Caseworkers believed that a protocol for co-occurrence cases would be useful.
- Child safety was the driving force in assessing co-occurrence cases.
- Caseworkers had serious concerns and fears in responding to co-occurrence cases.
- Effective training was seen to be key in facilitating protocol implementation.
- Caseworkers requested an opportunity to have input into the guidelines before they would be final.
- Caseworkers revealed that they had ongoing concerns and confusion about confidentiality and information sharing, especially with regard to domestic violence advocates.
- Caseworkers felt that involved professionals from other disciplines should also be made aware of the guidelines.

All of these issues were addressed in the development of the guidelines and caseworkers, supervisors, and family representatives all provided input into a draft document through a second series of focus groups. This input was incorporated into the final document.

Activity Name: DHS's Implementation of the Non-Violence Alliance Surveys and Related Training

The Greenbook Project contracted with David Mandel three times over the course of eighteen months to provide guidance as to how to work more effectively with DV offenders involved in the Child Protection System. The Department of Human Services implemented a series of staff surveys from the Non-Violence Alliance that assess workers' attitudes and perceptions of working with offenders. A set of recommendations were developed for DHS after the data were analyzed and reviewed by administration. Mr. Mandel also offered training for frontline workers, supervisors and other community partners that highlighted offenders' patterns of ongoing coercive control and how this coercive control is often used to manipulate workers. As a result of the survey

implementation, DHS created the internal Domestic Violence Consultant Team to assist workers in their investigations.

Activity Name: DHS Protocol to Screen for DV

Based on recommendations from El Paso County's Greenbook Service, Access, and Resource Development (SARD) committee, DHS added questions to the intake form to screen for domestic violence risk factors, including whether there are weapons in the home. The state-level DHS data system was revised, however, and the new intake questions that had been developed in El Paso County were not included in the new data system. The Safety Audit Coordinator developed a one-page laminated sheet of those questions and posted it in every hotline screener's work area. The coordinator also trained hotline workers on the use of these questions during initial screening. In addition to DHS's screening questions, other Greenbook Partner Agencies added DV questions as well: TANF (Temporary Aid to Needy Families), CASA, Health Department, Children's Advocacy Center, and DVERT/CSPD. TESSA revised its entire intake to assess for children's exposure to domestic violence.

Activity Name: DHS Training on DV Victim Safety Planning and Batterer Accountability

In an effort to increase safety planning with mothers, the child welfare system worked with an external expert to develop a two-day training curriculum that focused on safety planning, contextualizing domestic violence, and offender accountability. The training was mandated for all DHS caseworkers in November 2003.

Activity Name: DHS Information Sharing Protocol with TANF

Prior to Greenbook involvement, it was standard practice for CPS caseworkers to share information with the domestic violence liaison located in the TANF office. Because of greater awareness of confidentiality issues for adult victims through Greenbook, specifically as a result of the efforts of the Safety Audit Coordinator, CPS no longer shares information related to child maltreatment investigations with the domestic violence advocate co-located in TANF. There are now clearer procedures at intake that do not allow the sharing of such information between the TANF and CPS offices.

Activity Name: Formal Recommendation to Revise Dependency & Neglect (D&N) Language to Minimize Blaming of Non-Offending Parent

After attending a toolbox sponsored by the National Technical Assistance Team, staff from the child welfare system reviewed local D&N petition language and recommended changes to minimize the use of blaming language in petitions written by CPS workers. The collaboration found that while some county attorneys were writing petition language that reflected Greenbook principles, the practice was not uniform throughout the system. The collaboration received examples of non-blaming petition language from Santa Clara County and submitted this language to the County Attorneys Office. The Office has not yet adopted Greenbook's formal recommendations around petition language to minimize re-victimization.

Activity Name: DHS Child Protection Team Protocol for Cases Involving Domestic Violence

The purpose of the Child Protection Teams (CPT) at DHS is to provide Child Protection and Family Independence Program [TANF] staff with multi-disciplinary/multi-agency case consultation and review. The CPT reviews the nature of the allegation and the disposition of the investigation. It also provides a forum to advise the caseworker (or the county) on community standards and resources for families. There are two Child Protection Teams that review the investigatory reports of each

case, which includes diagnostic, prognostic, and treatment services being offered to the family in connection with the reported abuse. As a result of the safety audit work, a child protection team protocol addressing DV/CM was developed and implemented successfully. All child maltreatment cases that are presented with domestic violence are now reviewed by a multidisciplinary case planning team where a domestic violence advocate is present. CPS workers were trained on the protocol and community partners understand the practice change associated with co-occurrence cases. The multidisciplinary decision-making meetings represent a substantial change in DHS case review practice so that now a domestic violence advocate participates in all child protection team meetings where domestic violence has been identified (including Family to Family Team Decision Meetings).

Activity Name: Organizational Cultural Competency Self-Assessment

The Greenbook Cultural Competency Committee developed an Organizational Self-Assessment as a tool for each agency to begin assessing their level of cultural competency. TESSA and DHS were the first two agencies to pilot the assessment. This self-assessment tool was developed by the cultural competency subcommittee based on a review and modification of a wide variety of existing instruments identified by the Local Research Partner. The comprehensive assessment includes: surveys for staff, volunteers, board members; surveys for clients; document review; and a facilities checklist. The toolkit is available online (www.thegreenbook.info: federal initiative, El Paso County). In addition to TESSA and DHS, CASA, Department of Health & Environment and Pikes Peak Mental Health Center implemented the assessment tool. Agencies that did not implement the assessment during the Greenbook Project include: DVERT, Courts, Ft. Carson Family Advocacy, Colorado Legal Services, Office of the District Attorney, Family Center and Urban League of the Pikes Peak Region.

Evaluation Highlight:

As part of the assessment, the Local Research Partner conducted interviews with the CEO of each participating organization. The interview protocol had questions in six categories: leadership; organizing principles/strategic plan; working atmosphere; program management and operations; staff diversity; and, outreach and community involvement/collaboration. While there were certainly elements unique to each organization, there were also some common themes.

- Greenbook CEOs¹⁶ share the belief that it is a responsibility of leadership to promote the development of cultural competency in their organizations and to create an atmosphere that supports this development.
- Most Greenbook CEOs believe that their organizations have a common understanding of culture, but few have an articulated definition of cultural competence.
- Most respondent organizations had some elements of striving for cultural competence in the agency strategic plan. These were most likely to be in the area of staff/board diversity and training.
- Greenbook CEOs recognize the importance of a working atmosphere that provides a safe climate for discussion of cultural issues among staff and between staff and clients.
- Greenbook CEOs are committed to staff and board diversity, believing that these entities should be representative of clients served and the community, but struggle to make this a reality in their organizations.
- Meeting the needs of linguistically diverse clients is a challenge all these leaders and their organizations face regularly.

¹⁶ “Greenbook CEOs” refers to those CEOs whose organization participated in the assessment, not every Greenbook partner CEO.

- Greenbook CEOs believe that more training in the area of cultural competence is needed and want more knowledge on taking training “to the next level.” “We need much more than ‘Diversity 101.’”
- Most CEOs agreed that staff of color bears a disproportionate weight of advocacy for cultural competence within their organizations and are concerned about changing this.
- Other than hiring and anti-discrimination policies, most believe that cultural competence is not adequately included in written policies and procedures.
- Cultural competence is generally addressed only indirectly, if at all, in performance appraisals.
- Most have some mechanisms for obtaining staff and community input into agency planning, but agree that there is room for this to increase.
- Greenbook CEOs support community involvement on the part of their staff.
- All agree that their organizations have a long way to go in striving to become culturally competent in internal operations, provision of services and community relations.
- All agree that striving to do so is critical to their organizations.

Activity Name: Cultural Competency, Anti-Oppression Training, and Critical Thinking Training

As a result of the Cultural Competency Organizational Self-Assessment, agencies prioritized “training” as a need. A number of primary partner representatives attended ongoing external trainings on cultural competency, oppression, and how sexism intersects with racism, classism, heterosexism, etc. Trainings were provided by Sujata Warriar and Vicki Ybanez. TESSA and CASA requested ongoing, intensive training/dialogue on anti-oppression/racism throughout the course of the Initiative.

The Cultural Competency Committee implemented a series of Critical Thinking trainings offered throughout 2006. Critical thinking is a tool that will serve to deepen the discussion and analysis around how organizations are considering multi-cultural perspectives. During the training, the audience had the opportunity to examine local issues, practice using critical thinking and engage in dialogue with each other. The Critical Thinking Training also includes a Train the Trainer component to allow six community members to continue the critical thinking dialogue. The training explored:

- Paulo Freire’s Key Principles of Critical Thinking
- Tools for critical analysis
- Choosing dialogue to examine an issue
- Working with relevant issues
- How we take critical thinking back to our organizations

Activity Name: Development of Cultural Competency Definition

The cultural competency subcommittee reviewed and adapted existing definitions of “cultural competence” and approved the following definition: Behaviors, attitudes and policies that reflect a consistency in our words and actions that enables a system, agency, or group of people to work effectively in cross-cultural situations. The collaboration also adopted five essential elements that contribute to an organization’s ability to become culturally competent:

1. Value diversity: Organizations and individuals must value diversity in order to establish the policies and procedures needed to become culturally competent.
2. Have the capacity for cultural self-assessment: Organizations and individuals must establish and understand their own identity in order to develop and implement goals.
3. Be conscious of the dynamics inherent when cultures interact: How and where the services are provided are critical to service delivery.
4. Institutionalize cultural knowledge: All levels of the organization must be culturally aware.

5. Adapt service delivery based on understanding of cultural diversity: Programs and services must be delivered in a way that reflects the culture and traditions of the people served.

Note: The definition is outdated. If the community continues to do “cultural competency” work, it should collaboratively create a shared definition of cultural competency and outline how it will strive to incorporate anti-oppression efforts.

Activity Name: Institutional Safety and Accountability Audit Coordinator (formerly the Family Violence Systems Analyst)

After the Court Case Coordinator position was terminated, the project funded a Safety and Accountability Audit Coordinator. The Audit Coordinator conducted an Audit that explored the criminal justice system’s response to families experiencing domestic violence and child maltreatment. Lisa Tessarowicz, Safety Audit Coordinator, was hired in October 2005 to coordinate an Audit Team made up of District Attorneys, Bench, Law Enforcement, Domestic Violence Advocates, Children’s Advocates, 911 Operators/Dispatch, and Probation. The Team consulted with the Battered Women’s Justice Project for Technical Assistance. The Audit Question was, “What information/factors influence prosecutorial decision-making and case disposition in misdemeanor domestic violence cases, as they relate to DV adult/child victim safety and batterer accountability?” The team mapped the system, observed practice, interviewed frontline workers, and analyzed text. A final report is available August 2007.

Activity Name: STOP Family Violence Media Campaign

The Greenbook collaboration launched a media campaign in partnership with the STOP Family Violence Coalition. The campaign focused on the positive effect that men/fathers have on family violence prevention initiatives by being a positive role model to other men and children. Currently, there are TV and radio spots, billboards, city benches, resource cards, and posters that carry the message throughout El Paso County. The MAVA committee developed a Pledge of Non-Violence and worked closely with a designer to develop a series of posters highlighting men’s role in the work to prevent violence.

Activity Name: TESSA Guiding Philosophy for Information Sharing and Mandatory Reporting

In April 2003, domestic violence advocates received training from a local attorney, child welfare staff, and the executive director of TESSA on existing statutes related to privileged communication and mandatory reporting requirements. Participants also role-played to acquire experience working with specific kinds of cases. As a result of the training, TESSA created a guiding philosophy for information sharing with other systems, including written guidelines related to mandated reporting and confidentiality. The guide was created for TESSA staff, but is also used as a training tool for other partners, particularly DHS. The TESSA confidentiality/mandated reporting protocol explains confidential privilege—and when it must be broken—to ensure that victims have obtained “informed consent.” TESSA developed and implemented guidelines relating to when/how information can be shared with partner agencies so as to maximize information sharing without compromising confidentiality laws.

Activity Name: TESSA Greenbook Committee and All Day Retreats: Focus on Children

In September 2003, two Technical Assistance team members facilitated a retreat with domestic violence advocates to identify internal working priorities. The group identified confidentiality and information sharing as priorities and began to meet monthly to discuss these issues.

The group replaced those meetings with all-day retreats on a quarterly basis to assess how the agency is working with children. Priorities were developed and their latest project related to how effective the agency is in its response to children who have been exposed to domestic violence. The group met to discuss children's advocacy, how to engage children beyond the shelter and domestic violence education, and developed recommendations as to how the agency can better work with children.

Activity Name: TESSA Intake, Changes to Protocol Re: Assessing Child Maltreatment

TESSA added child welfare screening items to its intake protocol, including an entire section (approximately 1 page) of child behavioral indicators. Changes also included moving questions about the child to the front of the intake protocol. TESSA replaced language on the protocol that was deemed to be judgmental with language that can be viewed more as behavioral descriptors.

Activity Name: Revised Colorado Springs Police Department DV Incident Reporting Form

A committee with representation from all of El Paso County's law enforcement entities, including Domestic Violence Enhanced Response Team (DVERT), changed the incident reporting forms based on many recommendations from the Greenbook SARD subcommittee and other community partners. Questions containing victim identifying and locator information (e.g., address of victims) were taken off of reporting forms to ensure confidentiality and victim safety when case-specific information is exchanged between agencies. The incident report form is standardized for all law enforcement entities (including Colorado Springs Police Department, El Paso County Sheriff's Office, Fountain Police Department, and Manitou Police Department).

Activity Name: CASA Supervised Exchange & Parenting Program

CASAs that are responsible for the Supervised Exchange and Parenting Time Program (supervised visitation) recognized that many of its former practices blamed the victim. CASA staff/volunteers are now working on practice and culture changes to the supervised exchange and parenting program protocol in order to minimize blaming. This program was funded through a Greenbook contract with CASA, which helped to expand the supervised exchange and parenting program by enabling a part-time employee to become full-time.

Activity Name: El Paso County Family Violence Community Resource Guide

As a result of the SARD system-mapping activities, the collaboration developed a community resource manual highlighting all Greenbook Partner agencies. The manual contains organizational and case-flow charts, trainings that are offered, and general family violence resources throughout the community. The manual was released in 2005 to all partners.

Activity Name: Special Projects Training Coordinator

The collaboration supported a special projects training coordinator, a temporary position to get several of the trainings up and running. The coordinator was working with the mediation committee to develop the mediation protocol and also works with the Local Research Partner to explore alternative treatment options for offenders who are identified through the civil court.

Activity Name: Translation Services for the Asian/Pacific Islander Communities

The El Paso County Greenbook Initiative contracted with the Asian Pacific Development Center to work with the primary systems to increase translation services and reduce language barriers in

each system. In addition to translating agency documents for families, the Center was giving the primary partners guidance and training for practitioners and service providers to be sensitive about other cultural issues existing within the community. The formal contract with the Asian Pacific Development Center ended in 2003 because the Center was facing budget cuts and no longer had the staff to dedicate to Greenbook work.

TRAINING

Activity Name: DV Summits

The Greenbook collaboration helped plan and fund a series of community conferences called the "DV Summit." During these Summit, the topics of co-occurrence and batterer accountability were highlighted, along with the role of the three primary partners in addressing co-occurrence. One hundred and fifty community members attended each annual Summit and it is held annually. Greenbook supported three keynote speakers: Ellen Pence, David Mandel and Fernando Mederos.

Activity Name: Confidentiality & Information Sharing Training

The collaboration sponsored two trainings for frontline workers on the confidentiality/information sharing rules and constraints of partner agencies.

Activity Name: Co-occurrence Training by American Bar Association

The Judicial Education Committee contracted with the American Bar Association in December 2005 to offer local training to the El Paso County Bar Association, GALs, Probation, courthouse personnel, attorneys, and child protection workers on:

- The impact of domestic violence & child maltreatment and the consequences of children's exposure to domestic violence (DV);
 - How to effectively screen, intervene and articulate safety needs of the child/adult victims of DV;
 - Elements of appropriate and effective intervention, assessment and treatment options that prioritize batterer accountability;
 - How a batterer's abusive and controlling behavior damages the family and impacts the effectiveness of the court process;
 - The steps batterers must take prior to being considered "responsible and safe" parents
 - Effective strategies to prevent, intervene and treat family violence; and
 - Dynamics of cultural differences and how they may intersect with family violence.
-

Activity Name: National Greenbook Trainings and Meetings

The Greenbook Project Director attended numerous local, state, and national meetings/trainings to highlight the progress of the Greenbook Initiative. Additionally, special meetings were held for the Project Directors and Local Research Partners throughout the course of the initiative.

LESSONS LEARNED

Many lessons have been learned during the six and one-half years of Greenbook implementation. Some of these have been the results of successes; probably not surprisingly, many have been the results of challenges and even some efforts that simply did not work. Perhaps there has been an individual or organization involved in this initiative that has not been influenced or changed by the work, but, on the whole, it has been a powerful experience on levels ranging from individual hearts and minds to organizational cultures and operations to systems interactions and, yes, systems change. These lessons learned are offered in support of the new Council to End Family Violence, to other communities who are engaging or wish to engage in Greenbook work, and to other groups who wish to work together to make a difference in systems that serve people.

A caution to the reader: Many of the lessons learned may seem quite evident. Please be assured that it took "living" this work and the collaboration process before these seemingly obvious truths resonated from the inside out.

Lessons Learned about Collaboration

- **Power differentials** will exist among the leaders/organizations at the table. As much as there may be a norm that everyone is equal at the collaborative table, these differences will come into play at different times. Smaller agencies may hold contracts from larger agencies that are quite important in their budget and operations. Some leaders may be more politically well-connected than others. Whatever these differences may be, it is important to be aware that they exist and be sensitive to when these differences are impacting the work of the collaboration.
- **Leadership** matters. It is important that members of the collaboration be able to speak for their respective agencies, be able to make policy and practice changes, and commit resources. It is also important to understand the dynamics that can emerge when everyone around the table is a leader and used to being in charge. In a collaboration, leadership is distributed. Members step forward to take the lead on different aspects at different times.
- **Facilitation** of meetings should be rotated or carried out by an outside facilitator to ensure that all members can represent the interests of their organizations and concentrate on content and tasks rather than meeting process.
- **A history of collaboration is helpful, but do not assume that it will make the new collaboration smooth or easy.** El Paso County had many collaborative endeavors to its credit when the Greenbook grant was received and initial collaborative process interviews

indicated that members believed that “we know collaboration.” In fact, the focus on co-occurrence changed the nature of how individuals and organizations needed to collaborate. The early assumption that teambuilding and working on process was unnecessary created roadblocks later.

- **Not everyone /every organization who is involved in achieving the goals of the collaboration will come to the table.** If, after every effort, this cannot be accomplished, ways to obtain the input of these individuals/organizations need to be developed. In the case of the El Paso Greenbook Initiative, this was developing a consultant role in which representatives could be advisory to the Oversight and Executive Committees. In practice, developing this consultant role did not reach successful fruition.
- **Organizational cultures vary widely** and these differences will impact how individuals approach collaborative work, comfort level with collaboration, and the way in which collaborative initiatives can be carried back to the individual organizations. Greenbook agencies varied in organizational structure and culture from the extremely flat and democratic to the extremely “top-down” and hierarchical. When members became frustrated with each other, for example over the pace of change, the influence of organizational culture was not taken into account, particularly during the first half of the initiative. This is not to suggest that organizations get a “pass” on making changes due to culture, but that the process of making changes will be different and needs to be understood and respected.
- There are **myths and realities** about each member organization that need to be articulated and discussed early on in the work.
- **Collaboration is just plain difficult.** It is time-consuming, labor-intensive, frustrating, and can seem slower than molasses. Is the payoff worth it? Can collaborations learn to be “nimble,” a la Karen Ray? Absolutely, but it is not easy.
- **Relationships are key.** They are built through taking time to establish trust, and sometimes being in a different context means that relationships need to be expanded or enhanced. As Ray notes, disclosing one’s personal and organizational self-interest can be key in building trusting relationships.
- **Building an effective collaborative process takes time.** Many members spend far too much time in unproductive meetings. There is passion for the work at hand and an eagerness to get underway and start making a difference right now. But even the most task-oriented members of the Greenbook Initiative have acknowledged that spending more time planning, getting to know each other, establishing articulated and intentional group norms, understanding each others’ organizations up front would have sped things up later on. It’s hard to “go slow to go fast,” but the EPC Greenbook members wish they had done so longer at the beginning.

- All that said, **having goals and a logic model with specified outcomes is critical**, too. The work is too important and too complex not to have a roadmap for getting it done.
- **External partners create both value and challenges.** It was incredibly helpful to have the resources and input of the Federal team, the Technical Assistance team, and the National Evaluation Team. We gained access to national experts that the community would never have accessed without this grant and they made a real difference in what we were able to accomplish. And yet... sometimes the external partners' timelines were not our timelines, sometimes their expectations had to take precedence over local ideas, sometimes external expectations became moving targets. Overall, these partners resulted in value added, but unquestionably these were part of the time demands on Greenbook co-chairs and staff.
- **Staff support is essential** for a collaboration purpose is complex, membership is large, and time frame is long.
- **Keeping multiple work efforts tied to overall goals** is one of those essential staff functions and is critical. Many sub-projects co-existed and took on lives of their own. Many of them had members who were not part of the Oversight Committee and did not come together as part of the larger group. It is important for the members of each work group to see how their effort is part of the whole and for the whole to maintain a sense of what is going on across the initiative and how those efforts tie to the overall goals.
- **Communication – everyone wants it, few want to work at it – at least to the extent that is actually needed.** Truly, communication issues are constant, frustrating and incredibly important to resolve. Like the initiative itself, communication systems are quite complex. There needs to be communication among the committees, between governance structures and committees, between Greenbook staff and partners, between individuals and their organizations. Monthly meetings were often too packed for all the needed updates to be made in person. Yet it would become obvious when we tried written updates that those, and meeting minutes, were not read or not read thoroughly. Did we find the solution? Not exactly – multiple modes of communication and never minimizing its importance are probably as close as we got.
- **It is a challenge to make meetings of the collaborative meaningful**, but well worth the effort. Some of the topics that worked best were myths and realities, using case studies about the issues we were confronting, and hearing from Family Representatives. Having presentations from member agencies was also useful, as was identifying and discussing “hot button” issues. Yet there was a constant struggle to tie these discussions to the work that was taking place outside of the meetings so that meetings would be more action oriented.
- **Maintaining engagement over time** is both difficult and essential. The work is exhausting. Despite its importance, the Greenbook work was never the only important issue or priority facing its member organizations.

- **Adaptation** to changing issues, changing people and new understandings that come from the work that is being done is essential in keeping the work and the collaboration dynamic.
- **Losing and adding people** creates both challenges and opportunities. This is true of the collaboration itself and of turnover within the member organizations.
- **There will be setbacks, even failures**, and those are learning opportunities to forward the work, not bring it to a standstill.
- **Working collaboratively on issues that inspire passion evokes deep feelings** in people and can bring out their best and their worst. Expect conflict and have a process in place to first resolve it and second, learn from it.
- **CELEBRATE** - even the smallest of victories! Learn to recognize a victory when it happens! Celebrate early and often – do not wait for the big victories or the end of a work initiative (you never know – what starts out to be three years might end up being almost seven and that is a long time to wait for a ‘party’).

<h3>Lessons Learned about Systems Change Efforts</h3>

- **Systems change takes time** – no matter how much you think you have taken this into account, it will take longer. It will take longer to understand where you currently are, where you need to go, how to get there, and to implement the strategies. Then it will take longer to see the results you are striving for – stick with it!
- **Initial needs/readiness assessments** can provide important data to inform the planning and implementation processes of collaborative systems change efforts.
- **Frontline workers** need to be brought into the process early. Leaders who sit at the collaboration table need to remember that those who will implement the work need to feel part of the process AND have valuable input.
- Complex initiatives have so many important goals that it is easy to get bogged down trying to do too much. Think about **fewer projects with more impact**.
- It is important that people are not left out. **Find a way to include all who are part of the issue**. Our project did not include men who used violence from the beginning of the project, but their ultimate participation made a big difference in the shape of the initiative and what was accomplished.
- It is important to **keep the end in mind**. One of the lessons of this project has been the length of time it takes to effect systems change and even longer to make significant client-level impacts. But ultimately, these projects are about making systems work better for the people they exist to serve, not to improve systems as an end in itself.

Lessons Learned about Joining Programmatic and Evaluation Efforts

- **Evaluation findings must be made relevant both to partners and to end users.** While partners might be most interested in what is being learned about systems change impacts, direct service workers need to understand relevance to their practice.
- **It is important to overcome the view that evaluation is a mandated add-on to already overworked individuals and systems to be tolerated and demonstrate that it is value-added.** The evaluator must put in the time to build relationships with both leadership and program staff and communicate the ways that evaluation can help them accomplish their intended goals and impacts more effectively. Engagement with evaluation activities yields much more than mere compliance.
- **Evaluators must not discount program staff's fear of being found inadequate.** Direct service workers dealing with co-occurrence issues deal with complex, fragile, and high-risk situations every day. Even the most competent worry about doing the wrong thing or "seeing my case on the front page of the newspaper."
- **Evaluators must be honest that evaluation can create extra work for agency staff – it is not always just a perception, it can be a reality.** Staff must be acknowledged for their efforts and contributions. This acknowledgement should include those staff members' supervisors and the leaders who are part of the collaboration. In addition, staff members need to understand the purpose of what they are being asked to do and how it contributes to the bigger picture. Managers and supervisors need to express support for the contributions their staff is being asked to make.
- **Working with a national evaluation team brings opportunities and challenges.** At the planning stages, it is important to define roles and responsibilities and set the expectation for mutual respect and regard. The EPC Greenbook Initiative could have benefited much more from the national work if there had been agreements up front about timelines and methods for reporting back to the local initiative. However, being part of a national structure also created invaluable opportunities for dialogue across sites, learning, and bringing new ideas to bear on local evaluation activities.
- **Real-world contingencies have an ongoing impact on evaluation efforts and systems change efforts.** One of the most telling in this project was staff turnover within partner agencies. Both programmatic and evaluation activities would gain momentum and grind to a halt on a cyclical basis because of this contingency and others.
- Our initiative learned a great deal from both programmatic and evaluation endeavors about the **difficulty of sustaining change** (see the bullet about "embeddedness" in the sustainability

section). This, too, is impacted by factors such as turnover, other internal shifts, or changes in the external environment.

- Perhaps one of the most significant lessons about joining programmatic and evaluation efforts from this initiative is the **importance of promoting a utilization focus for evaluation information and results** from the very beginning of the initiative. Advocacy for evaluation use, in turn, must be a primary role of the evaluator. Complex initiatives have many competing – and legitimate – demands for the time and attention of the members and it is easy for evaluation to be pushed to a “back-burner” in the zeal for focusing on programmatic initiatives. It is essential that the evaluator demonstrate the immediate relevancy of evaluation activities and findings and not agree to only submit written updates or be bumped from the agenda.
- Despite the major importance of the evaluation component, it is important to **know when to “back off” on requests for support of evaluation activities**. There *are* times when agencies truly have everything they can handle at the moment or are feeling so vulnerable that promoting eventual use will be better served by waiting a bit. When a manager who has been supportive, helpful, and interested in integrating evaluation findings says, “If we need to do this right now, we will, but we already know we aren’t doing a good job, so why?,” it is time to back off for a little while.
- **Multiple evaluation champions within the partner agencies are essential**. They may already exist; if not, they need to be developed. While the evaluator and project manager can and should be strong voices for evaluation activities and use of results, their success will be greatly enhanced if internal leaders, managers and supervisors, and direct service workers are also champions of evaluation.
- As evaluation results are integrated into practice, **there must be a feedback loop on the results**. This promotes continuous learning that can be sustained after the evaluator is gone and reinforces the utility of evaluation.
- The evaluator needs to be a voice for **communicating the substantial timeframe required for achieving systems changes** and seeing significant, sustainable results of those changes at the client level. While not always easy, it seems to fall to the evaluator – not solely, but almost always inclusively – to remind the partners to think about what is measurable, how long it might take to see even emerging outcomes, and the like. There are many times when no one wants to hear the effort and time required to achieve the intended impacts or when the realization seems overwhelming – “Should we even be trying to do this?” On the other hand, the awareness and reminders of how long initiatives of Greenbook complexity really take to achieve results can be comforting when things seem to be going oh so slowly.

- **The evaluator should assist in early-on capacity assessment relative to the intended outcomes.** Building the logic model included several questions like, “Is that an outcome for which this collaboration can and wants to be held accountable?” “How will you measure that? What will be an indicator of success?” and so forth.
- **Joining programmatic and evaluation efforts enhances both.** While we might elect to do many things differently on both the program and evaluation sides if starting over, having the opportunity to work in this manner is worth all of the effort, communication time, thinking time, and meeting time required.

Lessons Learned about Sustainability Planning

- Start thinking about sustainability from **Day One** and continue to expand this planning as the project moves forward.
- “**Embeddedness**” is an extremely useful frame to think about whether or not the work efforts, positions, organizational changes will sustain past the life of the grant dollars. Use this test often.
- The EPC Greenbook Initiative found it very useful to **bring in a consultant** for the last several months of sustainability planning. Deciding what to maintain and what to let go – even if only temporarily – is quite difficult for those who have been invested in the project for substantial lengths of time. A neutral and objective perspective can be very useful in sorting things out.
- Particularly when an initiative has received substantial grant funding, it is impossible to continue to do everything. **BE REALISTIC** about the time, resources, and commitments that you will have moving forward and set goals and objectives that match the reality of those resources.

Lessons Learned about Managing a Collaborative Grant Project

- **The role of the Project Manager should be clearly defined and articulated early in the process.** Many times, a Project Manager has a lot of accountability to the project, but very little authority to make the necessary changes. Hiring someone to coordinate a collaborative effort could include a number of responsibilities, including (but not limited to): administrative responsibilities, meeting facilitation, strategic planning, planning and implementing training, overall process management, managing staff and contractors, grant and other report writing, conflict resolution among partners, liaison to the media and other local or national partners, and more. Identify the skills that are needed for the coordination. Is the Project Manager a neutral

party or is he/she connected to a particular agency/system? Who provides direction to the Project Manager and who does he/she report to?

- **Collaboratively outline a vision and clearly articulate goals, objectives and expectations for every work group.** Karen Ray, collaboration expert, suggests creating committee charters to help guide a committee's work. A charter may include a description of the desired project, potential impact, timeline, power of the committee to make decisions, identifies who is accountable for the work and how the committee plans to communicate its successes and challenges. Find data to support the need, vision, gaps, and successes.
- **Talk about power differentials and self-interests of the represented partner agencies and how they will impact the decision-making process.** Clearly articulate who has accountability to the successes and challenges relating to the project and who has the authority to 'get things done.' Consider more detailed letters of commitment to the project rather than general memoranda of understanding.
- **Explore the differences between cooperating, coordinating and collaborating** in order to outline clear expectations and a process of accountability for the group.
- **Develop a process for resolving** conflict in the beginning (between individuals and organizations) and identify operating values for the group. A conflict that occurred fifteen years prior can easily impede the current process. Create a safe, open, honest environment for partners to identify and work through any conflict (past and present).
- Collaborative partners, particularly directors and high-level managers, may be involved in a number of community efforts that address similar issues. **Identify where dialogues are taking place in your communities**, the goals of similar efforts and how to streamline the work in order to prevent "too many meetings," burnout and making the same decisions in multiple venues.
- **Involve workers from every level of an organization** in the collaborative effort. Encourage directors to talk with direct service workers about what is really happening on the frontlines and devise strategies to incorporate input from a broader base of constituents.
- **Incorporate training about each partner agency** to openly discuss organizational cultures, mandates, priorities and organizational case flow. "Map" each system's case flow to assist in gap identification.
- **If the goal is systems change, the conversations will not always be easy.** Define system bashing ("you do this") versus system accountability ("families are experiencing the system in *this way*") and outline ways to address them.

Lessons Learned about the Role of Culture

- **Culture must be understood and defined broadly.** There are many ways to define culture and the more narrow the definition, the less useful it is in framing systems change efforts.
- We learned that **every assessment, every focus group protocol, every tool, every survey** related to Greenbook work had a legitimate cultural component in fulfilling its specific purpose. The role and understanding of culture had to be infused throughout practice and evaluation.
- **The power of the organizational cultural competence assessment was even greater than expected.** Implementing the assessment process and striving to understand the results for the organizations that did so were transformational in ways that were never predicted. From changing understanding of violence and oppression to in depth changes in organizational understanding and practice, this assessment was a genuine catalyst in the Greenbook Initiative.
- **A way, or multiple ways, must be found to incorporate representatives of multiple cultures and culturally specific organizations that is genuine and inclusive and does not tokenize.** This means listening as well as asking, and equality of partnership, not “please bring your perspective to inform what we have already decided to do.”
- **Use of consultants** to guide and support efforts towards increased cultural understanding and competence is extremely helpful. Consultants can ask the hard questions, guide in helping organizations and individuals to see their own biases and blind spots, and challenge practice in ways that might be hard for partners to do with each other – particularly at early stages. Consultants also can help partners learn to do those hard tasks effectively on their own.
- **Organizational culture is as important an issue as any other cultural issue.** The EPC Greenbook was slow to learn this lesson, resulting in significant and troublesome bumps in the road. These were not permanently disabling and did bring their own silver linings in time, but could have been mitigated with earlier recognition of this truth. Organizations differ in communication patterns and systems, decision-making, pace and acceptability of change, values, importance of artifacts and many other elements of organizational culture in some very entrenched ways. The larger and more bureaucratic the system, the more time it takes to identify, understand, and begin to work through these differences. Some partners at the table may be taking significant risks in advocating for change within their organizations – this **MUST** be recognized and supported. Some of the EPC partners had to learn to hear this as a truth, not an excuse, from some of their colleagues at the table.
- **There are very different understandings and approaches to understanding culture and striving for cultural competence among partner organizations.** Approaches varied from intermittent speakers, workshops and celebrations of cultural events to deep anti-oppression

work. It is important to understand where each organization is starting and support it in its efforts to grow.

Lessons Learned from Family Representatives

- **The voices of family representatives – survivors of family violence, individuals who have used violence – MUST be included** in systems change efforts addressing co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment. Their experiences and insights are a critical piece of understanding how systems are currently functioning and how they must change to meet the goals of the initiative.
- Even when family representatives are invited, welcomed, paid appropriately for their time and expertise, it can be **hard for them to feel comfortable and equal in a group of professionals**. “I just always felt ‘less than’ everybody else. They had all these organizations and power behind them and I didn’t.”
- The coalition that continues this work will have to continue to work with family representatives on **how to make their involvement the most useful and meaningful**. In the opinion of many partners, the EPC Greenbook Initiative never really figured it out.
- However, the **ongoing effort to figure it out** was very meaningful to the family representatives.
- **Representatives of all who use the involved systems must be included**. When this initiative recognized that men who have used violence had to be part of the solution, it was a breakthrough moment resulting in major work efforts.
- **It is heartbreakingly hard to hear how we (systems) have failed** and working on non-defensiveness to truly hear must be part of our commitment to family representatives when we ask them to share their stories.
- **“No one listened until I was part of the Greenbook,”** shared one family representative. Systems need to learn to listen whether or not an individual has the power of a coalition behind her.
- Lastly, many lessons were learned from the women who came to participate in focus groups and shared their stories with great generosity of spirit – “If telling what I went through helps even one woman, it might mean something after all.”
 - Service providers were often unable or unwilling to recognize the **multiple issues and needs** of these women, choosing to focus on only one or two and leaving the rest unaddressed.
 - When seeking assistance, an **emotional connection with the service worker** can make all the difference in the world – “I had no idea what to do – I didn’t even know what I

needed.” “I needed to know he could not find me.” “I had a lot of fear – I needed someone to help me get over that and be able to live.” *“When you find someone that is willing to say ‘We can be there for you,’ it is like a light going on in a nighttime world.”*

- There was a **high degree of variability** in whether or not women were asked about children when seeking domestic violence services.
- It is highly difficult for women to get past **fear of losing their children**.
- The women who were **abused as children** have deep-seated fears about the impact of family violence on their children. “I can’t remember a time in my life when I wasn’t being abused until I came to the safe house.”
- Many of these women felt **alone in an adversarial system**, even after connecting with an agency. Several mentioned how much they wished an advocate could come to court with them.
- Experiences with systems are generally worker dependent. “It was the **constant support** from my caseworker – telling me I still have my mind and helping me to different services – I can tell her anything – she saved my life and my son’s life.” “My first worker always said things like ‘You should have done that instead of this – you should have been thinking about your kids.’ I felt really pushed down.”
- These women’s experiences with **law enforcement were generally negative**. Many reported feeling pushed down or not believed.
- The majority of the participants **felt intimidated in court**, think the system is set up to favor the offender, and **did not feel respected or protected** by the courtroom experience or outcomes. “The judge didn’t feel there had been enough physical abuse...” I left there scared to death, feeling totally unprotected.” “The judges should take our situations more seriously – they are our only protection when you get down to it.”
- **Re-victimization takes many forms**. “I finally got away from a man who controlled me and told me where I could be and when I had to be there and what I had to do. Now the system tells me I have to take control of my life and then does the same thing.”
- Women in their situations **will always need help** from systems, so systems need to work better. These women recommended:
 - More outreach and education on what family violence is (“I thought it was normal to be pushed and shoved and yelled at – I didn’t know I was abused until he threw me down the stairs”) and what services are available.
 - There is a strong desire for more protection from the courts.
 - Charges for services are a real barrier to getting help.
 - Agencies need to communicate with each other.

- Police need more training about domestic violence.
- Stiffer laws and penalties are needed for offenders.
- Women need hope. ***“...all I would actually hope is that of all the people in the whole world there might be one person who says, ‘You know, I love her. I don’t want to beat her.’ Maybe I have the hope that might happen.”***

Undoubtedly, every individual participant in Greenbook work has taken away even more lessons. Perhaps one of the most compelling is that it is impossible to engage in this work and remain untouched. Perhaps that is our hope for the future.

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

Although deeply immersed in the work and the collaboration process, the Greenbook partners had been keenly aware of the finite nature of grant funding from the beginning. Even with extensions, it was clear that the work would need to go forward well beyond the end of Greenbook dollars – and that the partners were committed to doing so. Still, this awareness became more pressing as time passed.

In September of 2005, members of the Technical Assistance Team facilitated a discussion on sustainability. At that time, co-chair Cari Davis broadened the Greenbook lexicon by introducing the concept of “embeddedness.” In a retreat setting, partners identified key initiatives, particularly those that they felt should be sustained past the termination of the grant. The facilitators guided the group through an assessment process of how currently embedded each initiative was at the time. That is, they asked, “If Greenbook funding disappeared overnight, is Initiative X embedded deeply enough in an organization or a system that you feel assured it has what is needed – resources, organizational commitment, infrastructure – to continue in an uninterrupted fashion?” After careful analysis, participants were frankly dismayed at how little they could honestly describe as fully embedded.

This session galvanized thinking about sustainability to a new level and, in 2006, the group contracted with a facilitator to help guide thinking and planning for sustainability. Once again, the collaborative revisited its process, initiatives, successes and challenges and gave consideration to not only *how* they should continue, but *if* they should continue. With a clear “yes” to the “if” question, focus turned to how to continue Greenbook work in El Paso County.

The group worked through multiple possible scenarios and structures. Finally, ***“From a re-commitment to the values of the Greenbook Project to the development of legal and organizational structures, a new entity – The Council to End Family Violence (“Council”) – has begun its journey toward successfully maintaining an action oriented presence supporting families and individuals impacted by domestic violence, child maltreatment and its ultimate community consequences.”***¹⁷

¹⁷ Vincent, B.L. (2007). *Council to End Family Violence Final Consultant Report and Recommendations*, p. 3.

The consultant's report also identified several challenges that face the new Council as it moves forward.¹⁸ First of all, the Council must establish realistic expectations for its work and its resource needs. One of the lessons of the Greenbook Initiative has been the importance of staffing to assure forward momentum of a very complex project. In the absence of Federal dollars for such a position, the new Council must be careful to structure and limit its expectations and activities in a realistic manner. Secondly, the initial goals and objectives of the Council should be achievable irrespective of extremely limited resources. In light of the above, the Council will ultimately have to face the challenge of seeking funding for its work in a constrained resource environment.

Beyond the issues identified above, the new Council must continue to struggle “with the conflict between a strong belief in the equality of all partners and reality that certain partners will play a larger role in providing time and money to the group. A concerted effort will need to be made to ensure that power – whether real or perceived – is shared among all members.” Noting the lessons learned regarding the importance of communication structures, the Council to End Family Violence will need to attend to this issue from the beginning. Lastly, new membership and clear plans to educate and engage the community in the work will be critical to long term sustainability.

While the Greenbook Initiative of El Paso County is ending its journey as “the Greenbook,” the commitment to the principles, to sustaining changes made and continuing to work towards those needing to be accomplished, the passion and caring all remain. The journey continues...

¹⁸ Ibid, pp. 3-4.

APPENDIX

- APPENDIX A: List of Greenbook Partners

APPENDIX A: LIST OF GREENBOOK PARTNERS

The following agencies signed a Memorandum of Understanding for participation in the Greenbook Initiative at some point during the term of the project. Other organizations and individuals made contributions throughout the project without formally signing on as partners via the Memorandum of Understanding.

Centro de la Familia
Colorado Legal Services
Colorado Springs Police Department/Domestic Violence Enhanced Response Team
Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA)
El Paso County Combined Courts
El Paso County Department of Health and Human Services
El Paso County Department of Human Services
Family Representatives
Fourth Judicial District Office of the District Attorney
Fourth Judicial District Probation Department
Pikes Peak Mental Health Center
Safe Passage (formerly the Children's Advocacy Center)
TESSA

