

**A SYMPOSIUM CELEBRATING THE  
FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY  
OF THE  
VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT**

**PANEL THREE: THE IMPACT OF VAWA: BILLIONS  
(YES, WITH A B) FOR PREVENTION, VICTIM SERVICES,  
LAW ENFORCEMENT, UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS  
AND THE COURTS, AND LOOKING AHEAD TO VAWA IV**

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER  
LEGAL MOMENTUM AND *THE GEORGETOWN JOURNAL OF GENDER AND THE LAW*  
APRIL 22, 2009

JULEY FULCHER, PANEL DIRECTOR: My name is Juley Fulcher. I am with Break the Cycle, an organization that works to end violence in the lives of young people. We work toward helping them to develop safe, secure, stable, healthy relationships and futures. I first became involved with the Violence Against Women Act (“VAWA”)<sup>1</sup> just after it was passed. Initially I was here at Georgetown working in the Georgetown Sex Discrimination Clinic, which is now called the Domestic Violence Clinic. I was under the wonderful tutelage of Susan Deller Ross and Deborah Epstein, and we were handling domestic violence cases here in D.C. The system was not working, but the new VAWA was putting money out there and incentives out there to really make a difference, and it was our opportunity to start looking at the laws and systems in D.C. We helped to develop a unified court. We helped to get a prosecution unit that would focus on domestic and sexual violence crimes. The unit went from literally less than twenty domestic violence crimes being prosecuted in a year, to prosecutions in the three thousands in the following year, once we started seeing that kind of focus.

I was lucky enough to then be brought on at Legal Momentum, that was at the time the NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund, to help with the drafting of the reauthorization of VAWA. I was involved in the reauthorizations both in 2000<sup>2</sup> and 2005,<sup>3</sup> and am looking forward to the next reauthorization of VAWA, which we are going to talk about a little bit with this panel. You have heard a lot about the original VAWA, how it came about, as well as the VAWA civil rights

---

1. Violence Against Women Act of 1994, Pub. L. No. 103-322, 108 Stat. 1902 (codified as amended at scattered sections of 18 U.S.C. and 42 U.S.C.) (referenced throughout).

2. Violence Against Women Act of 2000, Pub. L. No. 106-386, 114 Stat. 1491 (codified as amended at scattered sections of 42 U.S.C.) (referenced throughout).

3. Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2005, Pub. L. No. 109-162, 119 Stat. 2964 (codified as amended at scattered sections of 8 U.S.C., 18 U.S.C., and 42 U.S.C.) (referenced throughout).

remedy,<sup>4</sup> which was a very critical piece in our legal history. What we are going to be talking about on this panel, though, is the dollars. There has been a lot of money that has been authorized and appropriated under VAWA that has gone throughout the country to address this issue. About nine billion so far. Now to us that sounds absolutely fabulous, and then I turn on the TV and I hear them talking in hundreds of billions of dollars and trillions of dollars, and I kind of have to step back and say, “Okay, we need to think bigger.” We are here to think bigger today as we talk about what great things that money has been able to do.

I want to go ahead and introduce the various panelists who are going to be up here talking about the different pieces of the puzzle—both their role in helping to develop VAWA and its reauthorizations, as well as the way that they have been able to use it in their everyday work as implementation. First, we are going to have Claudia Bayliff, who is currently the National Judicial Education Program’s Project Attorney. She was the first Chief of the United States Air Force’s Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program, and from the news these days that is something we want to see happen. Much of her work in Colorado was key in helping to get the VAWA initially passed, in letting the Senate committees know about the need that was out there to address sexual assault. We will also be hearing from Lisalyn Jacobs, who is the Vice President for Government Relations with Legal Momentum. She was with the Department of Justice during the very early years of VAWA, and so was there for the initial interpretation and implementation that was happening, and she will be able to talk to us about that. She has also worked quite a bit, as we have been through the reauthorizations, on the economic impact of domestic and sexual violence on women’s lives. Leslye Orloff, who is the director of the Immigrant Women Program at Legal Momentum and has always been known as the immigration guru in my head, has been working on the rights of immigrant women for many, many years—and has been a critical part of all of the iterations of VAWA in making sure that there are protections and services that are available for immigrant women. Lastly, we are going to hear from Lynn Hecht Schafran. She is Senior Vice President of Legal Momentum and director of their National Judicial Education Program. She was not only extremely helpful in getting the original VAWA passed, but also since then has done a lot with judicial education, which has been a key component of really trying to change the environment that we see around the country when it comes to addressing this issue and finding justice.

I want to note that at Break the Cycle, where we work primarily on issues around teen dating violence and domestic and sexual violence in teens and young adults, we are not only working on the various reauthorizations of the Violence Against Women Act, to make it better address the needs of all of the populations

---

4. Violence Against Women Act of 1994, Pub. L. No. 103-322, 108 Stat. 1902 (codified at 42 U.S.C. § 13981), *held unconstitutional* by *United States v. Morrison*, 529 U.S. 598 (2000) (referenced throughout).

that we can identify—but we are also recipients of VAWA money. We use it for our direct services with the young people who are experiencing violence in their lives, and so we are an example of what kind of thing can be funded and what kind of work can be done with this really important legislation. I will end by saying that these days we are hearing an awful lot about people wanting to keep their jobs, not be laid off, and we are hearing an awful lot about the need to create jobs. People who are working in this field to address domestic and sexual violence, who are providing direct services on the front line, and who are benefitting from the kinds of things that are happening on the federal level, they have a very different goal in mind. We all want to be unemployed; we all want to be obsolete, unnecessary and be able to retire to some really nice tropical island where they bring you drinks with little umbrellas. This is really about trying to make a difference that will sustain us, not just put a Band-aid on a problem, solve the specific situation, but hopefully move forward and prevent violence in the future. I am going to pass it on to our first panelist, Claudia Bayliff.

CLAUDIA BAYLIFF: Hello everybody. As Juley said, I am an attorney and educator. I have worked on issues related to sexual assault for many years; I just had my twenty-first anniversary in March; and I have done it in many, many different aspects—from being the assistant director of a community-based rape crisis program, to, as Juley said, being the first Chief of the Air Force's worldwide Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program. I went from working out of my house in Boulder, Colorado for Lynn Hecht Schafran, to the Pentagon, but that is a story for another day. That is a very long story. It would have made a great sitcom, but anyway, today what I would like to focus on is my work as the Assistant Director of the Boulder County Rape Crisis Team.

Telling the story of the Boulder County Rape Crisis Team is the best way I know of to demonstrate the profound effect of the VAWA on those who suffer the consequences of rape, those who try to help them recover, and those who try to hold their perpetrators accountable. I want to start with the bad old days, the pre-VAWA days. I started at the rape crisis team as a hotline volunteer in March 1988. Let me give you a little background about Boulder County. Its current population is about 290,000 people. It covers about 740 square miles. It is home to the University of Colorado, which currently has almost 30,000 students and received the dubious distinction a few years of being voted the number one party school in the nation. So that is where I came from. When I started at the rape crisis team we had two paid staff members, a full-time executive director, and a very part-time administrative assistant. Everything else was done by volunteers. We even had a local therapist who provided all of our case supervision for the entire team on a volunteer basis.

This was before we had specially trained Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners. If victims wanted medical attention or a forensics exam, they had to go to the hospital emergency department. We went with them. Victims were told not eat, drink, urinate, smoke, or do anything before the exam. I never went to the

hospital with a sexual assault victim that I did not spend at least five to six hours there. Whoever was on call did the forensic exam, which often led to disastrous results, and as I was thinking about putting this together, two specific situations came to mind. In one case, the physician was in the process of conducting a forensic exam on a victim, who was screaming hysterically while the physician was getting informed consent from her for emergency contraception. He said to the rape victim, and I quote, "Imagine if you get pregnant and have the baby and he comes to you for child support or visitation." This is while the woman was in the hospital, screaming hysterically. I will also let you know, that was my very first night on call to the hotline. I figure, I do not color my hair because I earned every one of these gray hairs. In another case, a dermatologist was on call at the student health center at the local university. Our volunteer and the victim had to walk him through the process he needed to go through to do a pelvic exam, including telling him he had to put the young woman's feet in stirrups. Over the course of my five-and-a-half years with the rape crisis team, I donated over 3,300 hours serving as a hotline counselor, the assistant director, the legal advocate, a trainer, etc., and I was certainly not the only one filling all these duties as a volunteer.

Now I would like to fast forward twenty-one years and talk about the organization post-VAWA. It is now called Moving to End Sexual Assault (MESA) and it currently has seven paid staff members. As a result of the progress that we have made and all of this funding, MESA has been able to start the first Spanish-speaking hotline in Colorado. It has created Men Standing Up, which is a primary prevention program for men. MESA worked with a local hospital to create a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner program, which provides highly trained nurses to conduct all the sexual assault forensic exams for Boulder County. MESA has created and coordinates a sexual assault response council, which helps improve the community's coordinated response. It created a local sexual assault review team which meets weekly with the local district attorney to discuss all of the sexual assault cases that have been reported that week. It includes all the various law enforcement agencies, the campus police, department of social services, and child advocacy, as well as the local rape crisis team. As you know, prosecutors have complete discretion in deciding whether to charge on a sexual assault case. So the fact that the local district attorney allows the local rape crisis team to sit in on these discussions when they make these charging decisions is a profound difference.

The victim services have been enhanced tremendously as well. MESA now provides a twenty-four/seven hotline in both English and Spanish. They conduct numerous therapy groups run by paid professionals including an equine therapy group, which is actually very popular and uses horses to help women in their healing process. There are also art therapy groups for children, teens and adults, as well as adult support groups. Of course, not all of this is directly attributable to VAWA, but MESA gets almost seventy percent of its funding from grants.

But the numbers do not tell the whole story. VAWA's impact is much broader. When I spoke to Dr. Janine D'Anniballe, who was MESA's Executive Director for ten years, about VAWA's impact, she said the most important thing, even beyond the money, was the fact that they could always count on the money. It was stable, it was sustainable, so it allowed them to plan for the future and to grow the program, as opposed to some of these grants that you get for a couple of years and then you are scrambling to find replacement funding. We all know how that works. She said that not only did the money help them do more, but it also helped her make long range plans and really grow the rape crisis center.

Another aspect that I think we cannot underestimate is the community collaboration required by VAWA. In order to illustrate that I want us to go back to the bad old days in Boulder, Colorado, again in the early 1990s. We were noticing that cases were not being prosecuted, and if they were being prosecuted the perpetrators got an incredibly lenient sentence. We used to call it "probation and treatment," and that was about it if they got anything. At the same time, the local district attorney published something claiming to have an eighty-four percent conviction rate. We were skeptical. We analyzed every single case referred to the District Attorney's Office for 1990. We wrote a report on it. We gave the local district attorney the draft report, the district attorney gave us twenty-three single spaced typed pages of comments. We then spent the next six months negotiating with the local district attorney and our board of directors to make sure our report was "fair and accurate." We were stunned by what we found. Even though we worked with the victims on a daily basis, once we put all the numbers together we were still astonished by it. The key statistic, I think, was that out of sixty individuals who were convicted of crimes related to incest or sexual assault on a child, one went to prison. That finding was so egregious it was cited by the Senate Judiciary Committee's Majority Staff Report in support of VAWA, and we were so proud of the fact that we played our little tiny part in supporting what was being done.

Once we published our report, things got very ugly in Boulder, Colorado. The district attorney went to our board and told them he would no longer work with the rape crisis team unless the director and I were replaced. The district attorney wrote a letter to one of our primary funders pointing out the flaws in our grant proposal. The director and I eventually left and were replaced by a woman who had worked directly for the district attorney for many years. Let us fast forward to 2009. That is how you can really see the significance in Boulder, Colorado, the fact that the district attorney meets on a weekly basis with MESA and other advocacy organizations to talk about what cases are taken. Once again, this not all attributable to VAWA. It took a few sacrificial lambs, us, and many years of hard work and a change in the district attorney for MESA to get where it is today.

The community collaboration required played a significant role in that process. It has other indirect benefits as well. In 2008, Dr. D'Anniballe was called to

testify as an expert witness in sixteen different cases, and she attributes that directly to the close collaboration with the other systems working in Boulder County. What we accomplished at the rape crisis team with two paid staff people was nothing short of miraculous, but it was nothing close to what they are able to do today. I truly believe that the passage of the Violence Against Women Act is the most significant accomplishment since I began doing this work twenty-one years ago. On behalf of all the sexual assault victims, all the prosecutors, judges, law enforcement, victim advocates, medical personnel, and everyone else we have trained all over the country, I want to thank every one of you in this room who made this possible.

JULEY FULCHER: We're going to hear from Lisalyn Jacobs now.

LISALYN JACOBS: I think where Claudia ended is a fitting place for me to begin. It is always curious and unfortunate to be on the last panel because people who have come in and been able to spend part of the day with us, have sort of run off to put out the many fires that they have to put out, and have not remained. But I do want to take a moment, because so many of these folks are here, to thank the members of the National Task Force who are here—both past and present. There are people here, clearly, like Pat, who worked on that which we referred to as VAWA I through VAWA III. But there are a fairly good contingency of people sitting in various parts of the room who worked very closely with us on VAWA III as we tried to get that reauthorized in 2005. There are clearly folks with whom we are already in discussions about VAWA IV, so please, will all of those people stand and be recognized.

As Juley said in her discussion, I have two roles with regard to this work. One is that although I was not present at the creation per se, I was very much present at the implementation. I got to the Justice Department's policy office in February 1995, and I was talking to Katherine Pierce of the Office on Violence Against Women. I think we both arrived at the same time, which was about a month before Bonnie Campbell, who was the office's first director, arrived. I know that we heard one of the judges this morning talk about the role that VAWA has played with regard to setting forth a model, as it were, for other countries and the legislation that they pursued in the realm of violence against women. I had the privilege of staffing Bonnie Campbell; I was her first staff person on international issues. When international delegations—including presidents and first ladies and others—came to the Justice Department and wanted to know about VAWA, which was not an infrequent occurrence, I worked with Bonnie and prepped her on those meetings. I also prepped her prior to her trip to Beijing for the International Women's Conference.

As I said, I have this dual role. I worked for DOJ during the early part of my career, but in 2005 I was privileged to chair the group that worked to reauthorize VAWA, so what I wanted to talk about was how we have evolved over the last fifteen years and perhaps, talk about what is the work that remains to be done. What is the way forward?

I was on the phone earlier this week with a Capitol Hill staff member, and she called to my attention a curious piece of policy that I had actually never known existed. The Office of Personnel Management, actually I think contemporaneous with the passage of VAWA, drafted policy guidelines for the federal agencies on how to address issues of domestic violence with regard to their own staff. This included how those procedures should be implemented and what kind of processes should be undertaken. As I looked at those documents with her, I was struck by how domestic-violence focused—in fact, exclusively domestic violence-focused—those policy drafts were.

That really is one of the ways in which VAWA has blossomed and lived up to its promise. In its original iteration, while not exclusively, VAWA was very heavily focused on domestic violence issues. As we came into the first reauthorization curiously known as VAWA II, and the second reauthorization, VAWA III, I think we very much tried to go to the grassroots, and to go to the source, and to figure out ways in which VAWA had not addressed various communities. Instead of speaking of exclusively domestic violence when VAWA was reauthorized in 2005, we actually saw enshrined side-by-side four crime categories: domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. We saw for the first time the Native American women's concerns, though Native American issues had always been addressed in VAWA. For the first time, Native American women had a title that exclusively addressed the needs of women who were victimized in Indian country, which I would say as an Episcopalian is meet and right, given that Native women are victimized at rates which are exponentially greater than for any other group of victims. We all acknowledge in this room that while the legislation we speak of is called VAWA, that in reality it is legislation which is gender neutral. VAWA has in fact been used to prosecute at least one woman who crossed state lines to murder an intimate partner. So while we say VAWA in shorthand, I think it is important to acknowledge that we are talking about all categories and all classes of victims crossing gender lines, and crossing lines of sexual orientation should be acknowledged as well.

I think in terms of looking at how the work has changed over the last fifteen years, one of the single most important—or maybe interesting—improvements has been these curious little things that I refer to as “the devil's machine.” As I was sitting in the back of the room refining my remarks today, I was getting e-mails from colleagues who are associated with the Georgetown community about what protests might be underway today related to the Vice President appearing. The way in which we are able to be so much more responsive either to the things that we hear from the field, and are bombarded by the things we hear in the news, or perhaps the way in which we find ourselves over-engaged by the work because we can literally take work to bed with us and sometimes have a charming habit of doing just that. That, I think, is one of the key ways in which we have both seen the benefit and the burden of technology's impact on the work that we do.

I think that we have seen the work we do with Capitol Hill evolve in so many ways. We have seen the strategic ability of the D.C. part of the VAWA coalition and in its ability—particularly with regard to VAWA 2005—to, instead of blanketing the Hill in the way that we did the last time the bill was reauthorized to strategically target particular offices. The coalition knew which offices had concerns or were balking, and was able to focus our efforts on these particular offices to the point where we had some of them begging us literally to make the calls stop. No other parts of Capitol Hill were being disturbed, we had a very strong sense of who was where and everything else, but the ability to be strategic and focused and targeted. And another curious necessity, which we won't need this time, is an outside lobbyist. The last time, as we sat around the table and asked ourselves what kinds of skills we brought to this effort and what things we lacked, we realized what we really needed to be able to do was to influence the Republican Congress in ways that we as advocates felt like we needed some help with. That is certainly another way in which the work has evolved.

I've spoken about it in generalities, in terms of how, particularly with VAWA III, we figured out what other communities needed to be brought to the table. And I just wanted to identify, and Juley has spoken to that as well, some of the other communities that we focused on in greater depth. Whether or not they were the elder communities, the rural communities, the communities of color, the immigrant communities . . . the ways in which we focused on sexual assault issues, on dating violence issues, on stalking issues . . . I think we have definitely brought a new level of—if you will—refinement, but also breadth, to the work.

In terms of the way forward and the unfinished agenda, part of the agenda of VAWA IV is really the unfinished agenda of VAWA III. Although VAWA was reauthorized by the President very early in 2006, the Congress looked at a very lengthy list of new programs that we presented to it with the reauthorization and said to us, "Pick five." A number of these new programs from 2006 still have not received their initial funding. So seeing that the Sexual Assault Services Program and the National Resource Center that deals with the impact of domestic and sexual violence on the workplace actually receives funding, and to use DOD terminology gets "stood up," is a priority. That those programs get initialized is part of our work, but also seeing that the other new programs that have yet to receive appropriations are funded is clearly part of the agenda.

I think it is also wise to point out that, while we have been talking about VAWA, that VAWA has a twin (if you will) that sits at the Department of Health and Human Services. That is the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act,<sup>5</sup> and it is working its way through its reauthorization as we speak. Seeing that program—which funds the domestic violence hotline and shelters, etc.—seeing that that program receives the kinds of appropriations and the kinds of support, so that we see that all the wrap-around federal services that are needed are

---

5. 42 U.S.C. §§ 10401-10410, 10412-10419 (2010).

adequately funded across the board I think, is another piece of our unfinished agenda.

Claudia talked generally about her work. But particularly, one of the things that we have tried to focus on as a historical matter, but not done as solid a job as we should have, is the question of violence against women in the military. Whether or not we are talking about military spouses, or people who are active, or retired military personnel—particularly given the engagements that have been ongoing for the last several years—is another part of the agenda that will need to be addressed.

We heard the Vice President clearly talking about the intersection of violence and the economy, and talking about how costly violence is. One of the things we have not hit on today is the effect of the economy on violence or interpersonal violence, and the fact that as our economy worsens, interpersonal violence worsens as well. Trying to figure out ways in which we can address those issues—whether through stimulus or other kinds of funding—is part of the unaddressed mandate.

Also part of it is trying to figure out how to assist women who are in the workplace and also experiencing domestic or sexual violence, because we know that being able to maintain employment is key to them being able to escape the abuse when they are ready and able to do that. We also know that poor women are at the greatest risk for abuse. Thus, trying to figure out how TANF recipients—or other people who were in dire straits before the middle class began to experience it, in the context of the economic downturn—trying to figure out how to address that piece as well, I think, is also key to the way forward.

The Vice President sketched it out very nicely because he also talked about some of the problematic comments that you hear coming from judges. And while it is very well the case that VAWA has sent a lot of money to the states to train law enforcement and to train judges, I think what we know about VAWA is that there is a cyclical issue that takes place when the money goes out. The cycle demonstrates that the funding happens and then the judges, the cops, and others may rotate, may retire and other things like that. A victim that we were privileged to work with a few years ago, Yvette Cade, is a fabulous example of this. Yvette Cade came to national prominence when her husband walked into her workplace and threw gasoline on her and set her on fire. This was in the fall of 2005. That was what I would describe as the public aspect of her victimization, but she had been victimized by the system before. She had gotten a temporary protection order and when she went to the judge out in Prince Georges County to seek to make it permanent, he said things to her such as, “Well, if you would like to save your marriage, I think you should seek marriage counseling.” He did not at all credence her concerns about the various ways in which her intimate partner had violated the order.

So there clearly are ways in which the work that I think was done tremendously by VAWA I and II and III—those efforts need to be redoubled, and we need to

figure out ways in which we can continue to invite our colleagues in all aspects of the judicial spectrum, whether or not we are talking about law enforcement or judges or others, to continue to partner with us in this effort to eradicate the scourge that is domestic and sexual violence. The final thing I would say, and Julie Goldscheid and I have had at least one conversation about this is, query whether or not the civil rights remedy should continue solely to be a relic of history, or whether or not there might be opportunities to think about ways to revive it going forward. Thank you.

JULEY FULCHER: We're going to hear from Leslye Orloff now.

LESLYE ORLOFF: I feel like I have gone on a trip down memory lane. I want to take us back in time to give you an idea of what it looked like for immigrant women, women of color, and underserved communities in 1994, in terms of access to services and assistance for domestic violence and sexual assault. In those days there were very few programs—and we could probably count them on two, maybe four hands nationally—that were working specifically and had expertise working with immigrant victims, non-English-speaking victims, and women of color victims. Those programs were isolated from each other. In 1994 I was working as a family lawyer at a program I helped found—AYUDA, a legal services agency serving the immigrant community in Washington, D.C. Janet Calvo was working with battered immigrants at CUNY Law School in New York, and in San Francisco the group of attorneys working with immigrant victims included Bill Tamayo at the Asian Law Caucus and Deena Jang at the San Francisco Neighborhood Legal Assistance Foundation. Leni Marin and Debbie Lee at the Family Violence Prevention Fund teamed up with Martha Davis at Legal Momentum to bring us all together for a meeting to plan the first national conference on immigrant and refugee women's rights that was held in Berkeley, California in 1991. This conference was the first effort nationally to bring together those of us working with immigrant populations and refugee populations.

We convened at a time when Pat Reuss and Sally Goldfarb had begun leading this work for Legal Momentum and were working with Victoria Nourse at Senator Biden's office. Prior to Senator Biden and Legal Momentum's leadership, those of us who were working on immigrant victim's issues, could not get our foot in the door. We would try to talk with people and the people who were previously running the advocacy work for domestic violence victims in Washington believed that adding protections for immigrant women would somehow diminish the pot of funding for other programs. They would tell me this directly. So those of us who were working nationally with immigrant victims formed what is now the National Network to End Violence Against Immigrant Women. The only member of that initial coalition that was a mainstream group—that was not an immigrant women's group—was Legal Momentum, formerly the NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund. Martha Davis was at our first meeting and Legal Momentum's support and commitment to this work was incredibly helpful, powerful, and important in terms of the evolution of the work

to be inclusive of immigrant victim's needs. For me personally, it was not a fluke that, when Janice Kaguyutan and I at AYUDA decided we needed to move our work on behalf of immigrant victims to a place where we could do national policy work, that we came to our good friends and allies at Legal Momentum.

Since the early 1990's the world has changed a lot for immigrant women. Back then, to get access to the courts for a protection order, there were no court interpreters, in Spanish or other languages. There were no advocates or attorneys who spoke Spanish or other languages. So literally, I started my career representing every immigrant battered woman in the District of Columbia who spoke Spanish. Once I started working at protection order court the judges would send me cases of any battered immigrant who did not speak English. In addition, when immigrant victims wanted justice, when there was a need for prosecutions, none were occurring—because there were no bilingual interpreters, and there was no way for the police to communicate with non-English speaking immigrant victims. The prosecutors thought it was too much effort to bother. I remember the days when I would call up to have my immigrant client go to a shelter. I would speak with the shelter and determine that there was enough bed space. I would then begin to discuss my need to accompany my client to shelter, and they would ask why, and I would say, "Because she doesn't speak English." They would then say there were no beds. That was the world that we were all working in for marginalized immigrant women in communities across the country before VAWA.

Once the National Task Force on Domestic Violence was founded we worked together to bring diverse groups together in support of the passage of the Violence Against Women Act. The Task Force included faith based groups, the domestic violence groups and organizations that were working with immigrant victims and women of color victims—were invited to the table. We were in that room at the Methodist building that gradually filled more and more and more with each meeting. I remember the day that Victoria Nourse came and literally handed me the bill and said, "Tell us what we need to include to help immigrant, native women and women of color victims." I took the draft of the bill and sat down with Laura Martinez and the now-Judge Lora Livingston and working on her kitchen table in Texas, we took the bill, created the first draft of the underserved victim definition of VAWA. We actually took the whole bill and wrote access for underserved victims into the bill everywhere we could think of. Then we worked through the National Network to End Violence Against Immigrant Women and the National VAWA Task Force to refine the language and to gain consensus among all of the women's groups that this was the right thing to do. Once we garnered consensus we took that language back to Victoria Nourse and Senator Biden who took the lead in making sure that for VAWA I, II, and III—and hopefully in some way IV—that the bill would be inclusive and would serve all victims including immigrant and women of color victims. And so that when Irasema Garza said today that we're talking about all women, we are talking

about all women. Without regard to disability, national origin, immigration status, language ability, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or other factors included in the VAWA underserved population definition. That is something that we were able to bring about through building a truly collaborative coalition.

Talking to Bonnie Campbell in the last couple of months, she said something to me that I think is relevant here: That is, when I hear and when we think about what we have all gone through in terms of the civil rights remedies there were tough battles in this bill—clearly. But VAWA’s immigration protections have been some of the hardest ones to secure. One of the things that happened—and in this Senator Biden was brilliant, but at the time I was really frustrated—he basically said to us with regard to our advocacy that the bill include immigration protections for immigrant victims, “Go get the Republicans, and we will do it.” From the beginning starting with VAWA 1994, that is what we always did on VAWA’s immigration provisions. The immigration provisions have always been bipartisan, and have always required going to and convincing Senator Simpson, Senator Hatch, Senator Abraham, Senator Brownback, Representatives Lamar Smith and Jim Sensenbrenner, not only to agree, but to become advocates for the VAWA immigration provisions. What it took us to secure agreement on inclusion in VAWA of ever increasing protections for immigrant victims is what it will take us to continue moving forward on VAWA advocacy. A diversity of voices in the room, people with different perspectives, who hold us accountable and make sure that what we were crafting would really work for immigrant victims. We have also benefited greatly from the work of incredibly strong mainstream allies.

In original VAWA in 1994, the Wyoming Coalition Against Domestic Violence—an unlikely partner, in terms of what you might think of in terms of immigrant populations in the state—became our right hand. They were brilliant strategists, they sent me into Senator Simpson’s office with a letter saying I was their lawyer. And you know, basically what happened was that whenever we got stuck, we would call the women in Wyoming. The Coalition would call Senator Simpson’s office and two days later Senator’s office would call and say, “Okay, what do you need?” This grassroots connection both gave us the power and held us accountable. We learned the importance of these partnerships crossing disciplines and areas of expertise to work together and bring the experiences of all victims to the work. We succeeded on VAWA immigration because immigration attorneys and immigrant victim’s advocates worked closely with mainstream service providers to further a common end. Similarly, as our work continues we recognize that to expand the work a movement driven solely by domestic violence service providers is never going to wholly account for or accurately resolve problems that sexual assault survivors face. A movement consisting of all people that look like me needs to reach out and include those from diverse communities who can help assure that the solutions we craft will work for victims from all communities, including immigrant communities.

When we look toward the challenges of the future it is important to look at, appreciate and see what we have gained to date. How far we have come. See what Violence Against Women Act money has done both what is happening in the states through the STOP grant program and what is happening nationally. There is program after program in communities of color serving immigrant women, serving deaf women, serving rural communities, serving people that we never dreamed would ever have a part of the pie. That money is serving as a catalyst for programs like I used to run, at AYUDA, and programs at which I know many of you worked for in immigrant communities across the country. The VAWA funding serves as a core pot of funding that is a catalyst that helps us secure local money to complement. VAWA has helped this work survive and grow to better serve our communities. We did a training two weeks ago in Philadelphia and we looked around the room, and there has been a dramatic change in the face of the advocacy community. The advocates and the lawyers and the health care providers and the people that are working to serve victims also now reflect the diversity of the populations we serve—and for us that is really what our goal should be, because that will hold us accountable for the future.

You have to understand the world in which we worked together to create VAWA. In the early 90s we would go to meetings on the Hill, we would come back, I would sit down on the typewriter (and anybody who knows my spelling or anything like that knows I cannot type), and I would type or handwrite a fax that I would send out that evening to our National Network allies in California. My father had to buy and donate a fax machine to AYUDA so that I could communicate about VAWA with allies in San Francisco and New York because I would come in at eight o'clock in the morning and there would be a fax on the floor from our allies in San Francisco who had rewritten a provision and I would take this back to the Hill and continue negotiations. That is how we did it: no cell phones, no Blackberries, no Internet. It was just the telephone and really, really good relationships and allies that we could trust. That is what we have to continue to nurture for the future. We see it every day at Legal Momentum, in the hundreds of immigrant foreign-born young women from different communities and different cultures who come through our doors as interns, who have become attorneys, who have become grant officers at OVW, who have become lobbyists, who have become all kinds of professionals furthering this important work. There is hope for all of us in what this can bring in terms of our future work together and our future achievements.

In terms of hard numbers: there have been over 30,000 cases of VAWA self-petitions granted to battered immigrant women and children since the VAWA became law in 1994. There are currently roughly 12,000 crime victims' U-visa petitions pending and in the process of being adjudicated at the Department of Homeland Security. Additionally, DHS has granted 1,500 trafficking victims visas.

And so what's the future? The future needs to include more funding for programs that are serving diverse communities, more emphasis on funding for

language access, and some serious enforcement of language access laws. I was doing a training with a deaf advocate not too long ago and she said, “Why don’t language access laws have the same enforceability as the Americans with Disabilities Act?” I thought, “Good question.” This is one of the types of protections we will be taking a look at as we develop future protections to include in VAWA IV. We will look at what are the particular threats and the particular future needs of immigrant women and we know that the main one is protection from deportation. We have provided immigration relief for victims, but in the current atmosphere of increased enforcement abusers, rapists, and crime perpetrators are very effective in getting their victims turned in for deportation and removed from the country before they even know what VAWA is. This is true for victims, even though they are legally eligible for VAWA immigration protection. Full access to the public benefits safety net should be provided to everybody who is a victim of crime who needs help surviving and overcoming rape, sexual assault, domestic violence, and other crimes.

I want to end with a story that we should all think about. Last summer I was out planting my spring garden, and I got a call from an ally, a health care provider in Wisconsin, and she said, “I called to say thank you,” and I said, “What are you talking about?” She said, “We just finished six weeks of work on a case of a victim in Wisconsin who initially lost her children in court to her abuser, eventually was turned in to DHS, and was detained. Because of the work we all did and because of VAWA, that woman was able to get to programs that were funded in two states by VAWA funding, was able to get a VAWA self-petition granted, was able to get out of detention, was able to win a protection order and was able to win back custody of her children from her abuser.” And that is what this work is all about. Thank you.

JULEY FULCHER: Lastly, we will be hearing from Lynn Hecht Schafran.

LYNN HECHT SCHAFRAN: Several years ago in Wisconsin, a judge scolded a rape victim for crying on the witness stand. He said that her behavior was “inappropriate,” and that if she did not stop crying he was going to dismiss the case. There was a fair bit of hue and cry in the community and the judge said, “This is no sixteen year-old school girl. The woman was twice divorced; you might say she was well-experienced in the school of life.” When asked if her divorces mattered, the judge said, “Yes, it sheds a different light on the circumstances.” So, the question that Claudia’s remarks have raised, and in fact all of our remarks have raised, is: When a victim of sexual assault or domestic violence or stalking or teen dating violence or some combination of all of these (as is usually the case) comes forward to seek help or redress in the justice system, is she going to encounter ER doctors like those who were on call in Boulder before VAWA and SANE education? Is she going to encounter someone like this Wisconsin judge who thought that rape is just bad sex if the woman was already sexually active? Or is she going to encounter someone who is knowledgeable about the dynamics and impact of violence against women?

The happy news, of course, is that thanks to VAWA funding for professional education for the gamut of people and services who interact with victims of violence—medical personnel, law enforcement, prosecutors, judges, and others—the odds of encountering someone knowledgeable have gone up sharply. That is hardly to say that everyone who needs this education is rushing to take and embrace it. We all know that, but today is a celebration, so I am just going to tell you about some people who have appreciated and applied what they have learned at the programs that they have attended.

Of course, in the few minutes we have, I can only give you a glimpse. I can tell you that if you want to know more and you are prepared to be overwhelmed, you might go to the web and look up “Violence Against Women Online Resources.”<sup>6</sup> This is a web site that the Office on Violence Against Women maintains with the University of Minnesota, and it has a staggering wealth of material developed by OVW grantees. NJEP’s four-day prosecutor curriculum, which I’ll say a few more words about, is up there. There are literally millions of pages up there. We tried to do a count. Someone once told me ten million pages; I do not know if that is true. I tried to verify it, but it really is staggering.

In preparation for today’s panel, I called some people I know who do a lot of professional training for different groups. I thought it would be interesting to find out from them what VAWA funding has made possible for their organization, and what the response has been of the people who have come to their trainings.

#### LAW ENFORCEMENT EDUCATION

Nancy Turner is the Director of the National Leadership Institute on Violence Against Women for the International Association of Chiefs of Police (“IACP”). She wrote me about what she called the range of efforts that VAWA funding has supported, from guide books on interstate enforcement of protective orders to a roll call training video on identifying and investigating human trafficking to educate first responders, who are the people in the best position to identify the victims of this hidden crime.

VAWA also supports IACP’s National Law Enforcement Leadership Institute on Violence Against Women. Nancy sent me many e-mails from participants who wrote, in subsequent weeks, days, and months, about what they had done when they returned home. Here are just a few. The Chief of the Delaware, Ohio Police Department collaborated with local victim advocates and prosecutors in a civil protection order compliance check. They went door-to-door to check on compliance and see if a violator had manipulated a return to living again with his victim. The Chief wrote, “This initiative came about as a result of my attendance at the Institute.” The Assistant Chief of Police in Riverside, Illinois, wrote that

---

6. Violence Against Women Online Resources, <http://www.vaw.umn.edu> (last visited Feb. 9, 2010).

since the Institute they had created a “domestic violence sexual resource officer position and policy,” and they had drafted legislation on domestic assault by strangulation that was then pending in the Illinois legislature. From a law enforcement category we do not always think of, campus security, the chief at a small Colorado state college wrote, “New educational and prevention efforts, new checklists and reporting procedures, and new investigative awareness are all hallmarks of the legacy of the Institute’s impact on this graduate. Without question, my constituents are being better served as a result of my participation.”

#### PROSECUTOR EDUCATION

Turning to prosecutor education on adult victim sexual assault, this is an area that I mentioned NJEP somewhat surprisingly has had some direct experience with, because several years ago the Office on Violence Against Women asked us to adapt our Understanding Sexual Violence Program for judges for prosecutors. We created a four-day curriculum. Claudia was one of my partners in crime—that must be some kind of a pun or oxymoron in this context. On that effort, we presented it around the country with the American Prosecutors Research Institute’s National Center for the Prosecution of Violence Against Women. Then it became the basis for their VAWA-funded National Institute on the Prosecution of Sexual Violence, which is the companion to their VAWA-funded National Institute on the Prosecution of Domestic Violence.

At a pilot of NJEP’s prosecutor curriculum I met Herb Tanner, who was then a line prosecutor in Michigan, and who today is the prosecutor coordinator for all violence against women education for Michigan prosecutors. Herb’s position is funded through the VAWA STOP-grant formula funds, which provide money to the states on a population formula. When I wrote Herb about this panel, he wrote me back: “When I put into practice what I learned at NJEP’s program, I got a conviction in every rape case I tried for almost two years afterward, and it set me on the path to becoming an educator for my own colleagues.”

This is what he wrote about his own current funded position. It is a long quotation, but I really thought it told us what VAWA funding has provided, and that it was worth reading to you:

My job is to provide training and technical assistance to prosecutors on issues surrounding domestic and sexual violence and stalking. One of the hallmarks of our program is that it is highly collaborative. I work with as many of the stakeholders as we can bring to the table, including domestic violence and sexual violence service providers, law enforcement, medical care providers, sexual assault forensic nurse examiners, batterer intervention providers, mental health professionals, faith based groups, court staff, probation and parole agencies and other state agencies. We trained over 1,100 professionals last year. I think what VAWA money has meant to Michigan prosecutors is that we have highly-trained prosecutors who have access to the best practices and

who see the value of working collaboratively in their communities. If we did not have VAWA money, we would return to the days where prosecutors existed more or less on an island. I remember those days and they were not a lot of fun.

#### JUDICIAL EDUCATION

Turning to judicial education, which is my bailiwick, obviously, this requires something quite different than what Herb Tanner described. In very few states are judges willing to participate in multidisciplinary education, because they are very concerned that this will be seen as in some way violating the code of conduct against the appearance of impropriety. There is also the very significant fact that the judge's role is not about winning and losing cases; it is about conducting a fair process, and in the particular context of our focus—which is adult sexual violence—conducting a process that respects defendants' rights but at the same time minimizes the re-traumatization of the victim. Our two-day curriculum for judges is titled *Understanding Sexual Violence: The Judicial Response to Stranger and Nonstranger Rape and Sexual Assault*. It provides current research on how victims react during and after the assault; the neurobiology of trauma and how that affects memory and makes people say things that seem like they are inconsistent statements, but are not; sex offenders, sex offender treatment, and sentencing; and jurors' attitudes toward rape. The expert faculty presents this information in the context of what it means to the judge's role, and all of these issues are discussed throughout the two days in small groups and reports back.

VAWA funding has enabled NJEP to present this curriculum in more than twenty states, and as you can imagine, there have been memorable moments. I put something back into my talk that I had taken out, because when Vice President Biden today was talking about what we should tell our daughters, I thought I had to tell you this: In one state that Claudia and I were in, the chief justice said (and all the judges of the state were there), the chief justice said to the room, "If my daughter were ever raped I would not let her go into the criminal justice system." Whereupon there was a general discussion about what these judges—who were almost all men—should tell their daughters. We get this a lot; we have male judges asking us what they should tell their daughters, and we say, "What are you telling your sons?"

The absolute standout memorable moment, though, that I do have in my little talk is this: in an unmentionable state, a male judge was listening as our sex offender expert read the transcript of an interview that he had conducted with a male college student who blithely described how he held his arm across his date's windpipe in order to hold her down and have what he perceived as having sex with her. After Professor David Lisack—whose name I'm sure is known to many of you—had finished, a male judge in the group said, "I do not see where there is a rape in that narrative." A female judge jumped up, ran behind her colleague's chair, put him in a chokehold and said, "Do you see it now?"

In addition to our live programs, VAWA funding has enabled us to turn this two-day curriculum into a four-hour DVD so we could get the information out more widely and on an as-needed basis. We were able to create a two-hour DVD called *Presenting Medical Evidence in an Adult Rape Trial*, which explains what a rape kit exam is, so the judges—even though they will not know how to do it, they ought to understand what a victim goes through. The judges and jurors and others will understand why victims so rarely have the kind of brutal genital injuries that people so mistakenly assume are the hallmark of non-consent. Our latest VAWA-funded project is a Web course/resource titled “*Intimate Partner Sexual Abuse: Adjudicating this Hidden Dimension of Domestic Violence*.”<sup>7</sup> It is free, it is open to everyone, and the URL is on the flyer that I do believe is outside on the table.

With respect to how judges actually use what we hope they learn in our presentations in their own courtrooms and court systems, I am going to just choose one example because it is about our latest product, and it is the perfect bookend to the judge I told you about at the start of my remarks, because it is about a different Wisconsin judge. NJEP wanted to bring this issue of intimate partner sexual abuse to the attention of the judiciary and others because it is a prevalent but hidden problem, and research has shown that forced sex is extremely indicative of increasing dangerousness even to the point of lethality. A judge in Wisconsin named Mel Flanagan felt that this information was so important for her colleagues that she took our Web course, and out of it she created her own in-person training and she went around her state, presenting it in every judicial district and for the Wisconsin tribal judges.

To close, I actually want to echo something that Claudia touched on, that everybody actually has touched on, and that is this question of continuity. What VAWA funding has meant for professional education is so powerful because it has enabled providers to continually strengthen, revise, and update their programs to embrace the newest evidence-based practices, bring in the best experts, utilize the most effective teaching techniques—and the fact that many times, VAWA will fund the travel of those who need to come to these programs. That is a very significant issue because when the court systems have no money, the first thing that goes is judicial conferences. Thomas Jefferson wrote that “eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.” I will close by saying that eternal professional education is the price of an effective response to violence against women. At the same time that we strive to prevent and reduce this violence, we know that it is never going to be eliminated. Only by keeping our victim advocates, health professionals, law enforcement, prosecutors, judges, and court personnel fully educated about these issues, can we serve victims and promote a fair and effective court process.

Thank you all for coming today.

JULEY FULCHER: I want to thank all of our panelists for excellent presentations, and we have a little bit of time for some questions and discussion amongst us as

---

7. <http://www.njep-ipsacourse.org> (last visited Feb. 9, 2010).

we look forward to the new VAWA. I would like to kick off the questioning. VAWA is due to be reauthorized in 2011, which is going to be upon us before we know it, so I would like to ask the panelists, what would you like to see in the next iteration of VAWA, and how do you think we should go about getting it?

LYNN HECHT SCHAFFAN: I really do want to repeat with what I closed. There are a lot of new things that we might need, and Lisalyn and Leslye touched on many of them, but I think we need more of the same and that really is what has made VAWA powerful. Because as was adverted to before, foundations are cyclical; they fund something this year and then next year they have a new interest and their board gets together and they have a new board chair and he or she likes something else. Helen Neuborne is laughing; all of us who live on grants know this, and so we need to have a source of funding from people who understand the need and are willing to fund it. When the National Judicial Education Program was first mooted, when the idea was put forward at the very beginning of the founding of Legal Momentum and people went around to the funding community, they said such a program was not necessary and that judges do not need it because “Judges are impartial; that is their job description.” I mean that is what people said, and so to have an entity that understands the necessity for professional education for everybody in the system—law enforcement, health professionals, judges—obviously, education that is appropriate to their role is essential. As I said before, you are not asking judges to think about the same issues as prosecutors; they have a different role . . . but more of the same. It may not seem interesting and attractive. People are always wanting the magic words “new” and “free,” but this is so important, and I hope that we can maintain the funding that we have for professional education in perpetuity.

CLAUDIA BAYLIFF: There were a couple of things I would like to mention. One has to do with a fabulous study done by the British Home Office, and what they talked about is the “justice gap.” What they meant by that was that in the U.K., reporting rates for sexual assault have been going up over time constantly, but their conviction rate has remained relatively stable—so that is what they talk about as the “justice gap.” We are asking more victims to come forward, but we are not really convicting more perpetrators. I do not want to get into the statistics argument here, but I think that is something we need to address. What makes these cases successfully prosecutable? We really do not have a good handle on what actually happens, how many are convicted, what happens to them. But if a victim has the courage to come forward and report one of these crimes, we have an obligation to ensure that that victim achieves justice. I made this pitch to the National Institute of Justice so I thought I would make it here too. We have to figure out what is going on, despite all the billions of dollars we have spent on training, why we still have relatively low conviction rates and relatively light sentences. The other thing is, we really need to look at prevention, and we really need to fund prevention. Those of us who have been doing this for a long time are getting tired. I think we have done a really good job in enhancing response, but we do not want to keep

having to mop up the pieces. What we want to do is try and figure out what we can actually do to prevent these crimes to begin with . . . so that would be my short wish list.

LISALYN JACOBS: I am going to try to focus on two things. I think that the more we do this work, the more that we realize that there are systems that our work impacts, and that some of those systems are somewhat antiquated . . . and we need to figure out how to bring them along. In particular, I am thinking about unemployment insurance. One of the things the stimulus bill just did was to give states money—a sort of carrot approach—to try to get them to improve their unemployment insurance systems. And one of the things that states are encouraged to do is to allow victims of domestic violence—or someone in their immediate family—who have to leave a job to qualify for unemployment insurance. There are two issues there: 1) because it was not the Judiciary Committee that was focused on that, the piece that got passed focused solely on victims of domestic violence, so the goal is now to broaden the law to include sexual assault and stalking; and 2) unemployment insurance is a state-based system, but as we sit here in this century we have so many people who work for national and multinational corporations. Yvette Cade, the victim I talked about before, worked for T-Mobile. She would not have been eligible for unemployment insurance because she lives in a state where it is not made available to domestic violence victims. However, had she lived in the District of Columbia she would have been eligible . . . and I am sure she had similarly situated colleagues who worked for T-Mobile in the District of Columbia who had—while not as heinous—similar issues. So, trying to figure out how to create a more seamless web to support victims, I think is one thing that we need to focus on going forward.

Equally important is to figure out how to address the invisible scourge, which is domestic and sexual violence in Indian country. I think someone else said of another issue that it could very easily be the subject of several additional conferences and lectures . . . because how a Native woman receives protection from the law—whether her case to be prosecuted in federal court, in state court, in tribal court—is governed by a very complex and interconnected series of federal and state laws. But again, as I said before, victims of sexual and domestic violence in Indian country are victimized at rates that are so incredibly heinous compared to the general population. On top of which, I heard one of my colleagues from Indian country talking about her inability to get federal prosecutors to even tell Native women if their cases were going to be prosecuted or dropped. Trying to figure out how to redouble and improve those efforts, I think, is another big piece that we need to continue to focus on going forward.

LESLYE ORLOFF: I think we need people to sign up for the VAWA committees. We need people to join the effort, come to the table and to do what we at IWP call, “help us create the kitchen sink list.” That basically is, “tell us what you want fixed.” We cannot fix a problem that we do not know about. Tell us about the problems you are seeing in the field. We have seen this time and time again as we work on VAWA. Some changes that are needed we do not get because we never

asked for them, and we never asked for them because we didn't think about the problem or were not told about the need to fix it until the day after the law passed. So it is important for everyone to come together. In imagining the reforms to propose we all need to collectively think creatively, think outside of the box, throw away the box, and think about what might be possible or could be possible. Identify what is needed, illustrate the need with real stories and examples from the lives of the women we serve. Then let us see if we can get it. For example, if we have administrative remedies for immigrant victims, why could we not have some kind of administrative remedies for sexual assault victims? Sexual assault victims could have a remedy that would get them what they need. They would prove that they were victims and be able to obtain a civil administrative remedy without regard to ever having to confront the abuser or the perpetrator. This is similar to VAWA confidentiality. Maybe it is possible. We have to think about what people need and what might be potentially possible. We need to dream, create lists, document the need and then try to convince Congress that these changes are what they should pass. An equally important part of this work is that we have to stick together, we have to learn from each other, and we have to believe that we can do it until we cannot. Sometimes there are provisions that we advocate for that we think we may never accomplish. We are told "no" five times. In the end we ask one more time for the same remedy and this time because the negotiation dynamics have changed we get the remedy. This is what happened with employment authorization for abused spouses of work visa holders in VAWA 2005. So it is really a matter of trying to really think creatively about all those we might be able to achieve and to not take the first "no" for an answer. From an immigrant victim perspective, some of the specific improvements we definitely want to see in VAWA 2011 are: we want the Women Immigrant Safe Harbor Act, that will guarantee that immigrant victims of violence against women, crime victims, get direct access to safety net programs including TANF, Food Stamps, Medicaid, SCHIP and SSI and all of the help victims need to be able to overcome the victimization. We want to see widespread screening for victimization of anybody who is caught up in immigration enforcement so that victims eligible for immigration relief actually can apply for the relief, instead of getting deported. We want to see victims who are crime victims out of detention, we want to continue to expand relief and to seek various other remedies that are needed help immigrant victims of violence against women. My challenge for you is to join us in this important work, to think creatively and—don't take "no" for an answer.

JULEY FULCHER: I just want to add to that you can see there are a lot of issues. It is very important for us to think big, and that is hard sometimes because especially here in Washington, D.C., up on the Hill, "no" is a word that we hear a lot. It can be a little bit defeating to hear that, and I think the lesson that we take from all of the panelists that we have heard today is that they are always going to be saying "no." This is nothing new. This is something that our predecessors have been able to deal with, and yet still make very dramatic changes, and we need to

be able to step up to the plate and think big and work big and ultimately, hopefully, try to change the landscape again as much as possible.

I will add that we have heard a few comments today about how we are sort of the forefront internationally in terms of these kinds of laws and programs—and that may be true in some ways, but it is also very important to note that this work is being done around the world and there are some really important lessons to be learned from our sisters and brothers who are doing this work in other places. It is very important in a lot of other places in the world that they do not talk about this as a women's issue; this is a human rights issue. This is about being able to have agency over your own body. That kind of talk is not very popular in the United States right now, but it should be. It should be the basis of everything that we're thinking about when we're talking about how to address all of these problems. How is it that we provide each and every human being with the ability to live lives free of these kinds of violence and coercion?

I do want to reiterate the prevention and just point out the young people who are out around our country, they are experiencing this violence at higher rates than adults are. They know about it, they are talking about it, it is in the news; the celebrities have it happening to them as well. They are ready to join in this effort and they recognize that prevention is a key, key element to all this, and so let us enlist that group of young people . . . because we need not only those minds, but also all that energy, because the rest of us are tired.

IRASEMA GARZA: I am going to step in right here and tell you all, thank you so much for joining us here today. I want you to please help me and join me in giving a great round of applause for all our panelists. They did a terrific job. I hope everybody here was able to listen to the Vice President and enjoyed that. There is nothing I can say that already has not been said, other than we continue to have a lot of work to do and, as I like to tell my staff often, advocacy does not mean fighting for the status quo. We have to continue to think outside the box and continue to move this issue along.

I want to do something, because in addition to all your preparation that the speakers do to come and share their knowledge with us, there is a lot of work that goes into putting these events together and I want to take a minute to say thanks to some of my staff. First of all, Lisalyn got the Vice President here. She called him up, so I wanted to recognize that. But then, there are three other people on my staff that literally have been working around the clock. I know one of them did not sleep last night because I got e-mails at 2:00, 3:00, 4:00 and 5:00 this morning, but you know, Lynn has done a tremendous amount of work here. And then two others: Jillian Weinberg, come up. Jillian hasn't slept . . . and our Vice President for Communications who has not slept in the last week, Altagracia Levat. So seriously, all the Legal Momentum staff has worked very hard, but these particularly—three individuals I have seen work around the clock, and I just wanted you to know that.

Again, thank you so much for joining us and we look forward to working together. I hope you enjoyed the program, and thank you so much for joining us all day today.