



WASHINGTON
COURTS

GENDER AND JUSTICE COMMISSION

AOC SEATAC CONFERENCE ROOM
18000 INTERNATIONAL BLVD, SUITE 1106
FRIDAY, JULY 10, 2015 (8:45 A.M. – NOON)
CHIEF JUSTICE BARBARA MADSEN, CHAIR
JUSTICE SHERYL GORDON MCCLOUD, VICE CHAIR

Agenda

Page

8:45–8:55 AM CALL TO ORDER

- Introductions
- Approval May 8, 2015, Meeting Notes

1

8:55–9:45 AM COMMISSION BUSINESS

Objective: Chair and staff report on past and upcoming activities and interactions that affect the Commission.

- Chair Report Chief Justice Madsen
 - ▶ ATJ Conference / LLLT Program
 - ▶ Supreme Court Roundtable
 - ▶ WID Executive's Summit

➤ Staff Report

- ▶ Activities, Updates, Collaborative Efforts
 - Collaborative efforts with MJCOM re: re-entry issues
 - LSAC Update.....

11

- ▶ Budgets: GJCOM and Grants

15

GUEST SPEAKER(S) & EXPLORATORY PROJECTS

Objective: Forum for members to discuss items of interest they are involved in or would like the Commission to explore.

- 9:45-10:15 AM SAVIN Ms. Jamie Yoder, Victim Notification System
- 10:25-10:45 AM Judicial Evaluations Ms. Judith Lonquist.....
- Proposed Future Guest Speakers/Topics
 - ▶ Judge Elizabeth Berns, Child Maltreatment Manual Update (Confirmed November)
 - ▶ Joy Williams, WSBA, Latest on diversity of the bar survey results (Possible November)
 - ▶ Maureen Kelly, DSHS, DV Treatment Provider Program

17

10:15-10:25 AM BREAK

10:45-Noon COMMITTEE REPORTS

Objective: Committee chairs will report on progress of work plans, discuss new areas of interest, problems that have arisen, ask for feedback, ask for assistance.

- Communications Judge Paja
- Domestic Violence Judge Jasprica.....
 - ▶ Judicial Roundtable
 - ▶ Miscellaneous: CCI Report, Modifications & Rescissions, HB1840

33



WASHINGTON
COURTS

GENDER AND JUSTICE COMMISSION

AOC SEATAC CONFERENCE ROOM
18000 INTERNATIONAL BLVD, SUITE 1106
FRIDAY, JULY 10, 2015 (8:45 A.M. – NOON)
CHIEF JUSTICE BARBARA MADSEN, CHAIR
JUSTICE SHERYL GORDON MCCLOUD, VICE CHAIR

Agenda

Page

COMMITTEE REPORTS (continued)

- Education Judge Melnick & Staff
 - Evaluations from SCJ Spring Conference **39**
 - DMCJ Spring Conference
- Incarcerated Women & Girls Sara Ainsworth
 - Mission Creek
- Membership Committee Pam
- Tribal State Court Consortium Judge Pouley and Judge Tremaine
- Women in the Profession

Miscellaneous

- Proposed 2016 GJCOM Meeting Dates **45**
- Blank Notes Pages **47**

12:00-12:15 **ADJOURNMENT**



WASHINGTON
COURTS

GENDER AND JUSTICE COMMISSION (GJCOM)

AOC SEATAC OFFICE
SEATAC, WASHINGTON

FRIDAY, MAY 8, 2015 (8:45 A.M. – 11:45 A.M.)

MEETING NOTES

Present: Chief Justice Barbara A. Madsen, Chair; Justice Sheryl Gordon McCloud, Vice-Chair; Ms. CaroLea Casas, Ms. Laura Contreras, Judge Michael Evans, Ms. Grace Huang, Judge Judy Jasprica, Judge Eric Lucas, Judge Richard Melnick, Judge Marilyn Paja, Judge Mark Pouley, Ms. Leslie Savina, Judge Tom Tremaine, Mr. David Ward, Ms. Danielle Pugh-Markie, and Ms. Pam Dittman

Excused: Ms. Sara Ainsworth, Ms. Josie Delvin, Ms. Trish Kinlow, Ms. Taryn Lindhorst, Ms. Judith A. Lonquist, Judge Ann Schindler, and Ms. Gail Stone

Guests: Ms. Kelley Amburgey-Richardson, Mr. Jim Bamberger, Ms. Cynthia Delostrinos, and Ms. Elizabeth Hendren

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at approximately 9:30 a.m. Justice Gordon McCloud opened the meeting and introductions were made. The March 13, 2015 meeting notes were approved and adopted.

COMMISSION BUSINESS

Chair Report

- March 13, 2015 Meeting Notes
The March 13, 2015 meeting notes were approved and adopted.
- Myths and Misperceptions Video
The Gender & Justice and Minority & Justice Commissions provided financial support to the Public Trust and Confidence Committee to produce a video highlighting Washington's judicial branch and misperceptions about how courts work. The video is nominated for an award. You can view the video at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vBy43azhWHk>
- Washington Initiative for Diversity (WID) Events
The Washington initiative for Diversity is hosting its 4th Annual Legal Executives Diversity Summit, *The Invisible Power of Bias: Leading with Awareness and Action*, on May 11, and the Commission is again sponsoring this event. The intent of the WID and the Summit is to get the legal community to think about the importance of diversity in law firms and corporate legal environments, and to address the problems with recruitment and retention for people of color and women in those fields. We know from our statistics that these groups leave the profession or leave big law firms and corporate settings at disproportionate rates. Dr. Jerry King will be presenting on issues of diversity and inclusion.

- 35th Anniversary Celebration Northwest Intertribal Court System
The Northwest Intertribal Court System (NICS) is a consortium of tribes in Washington State who have joined resources, share judicial officers, prosecutors, and possibly other court services. Many times we refer to NICS as contracted judges. The Chief was invited to this event and used the opportunity to reach out to tribal judges and tribal council members, and to explain to them the vision for the Tribal State Court Consortium (TSCC) and the commitment of the Commissions and the state judiciary in this endeavor. The Chief thought it was a great celebration attended by 30-40 persons. She was able to have a fantastic conversation with a Council Chairman from the Tulalip Tribe, who was really enthusiastic about the TSCC. I think little by little we are getting the word out about the TSCC. I thought we would be over-burdened with state court participation, but what we have had so far is people attend the annual meeting, at the fall conference, but we don't necessarily get people seeking membership in the consortium.

Staff Report – Danielle Pugh-Markie and Pam Dittman
Activities & Updates

- Staff Transition
Danielle announced that she has taken a new position within AOC. Her official start date was May 1, and she is working with existing staff to transition. The position has not yet been posted. A nationwide search will be conducted. In the meantime, Danielle will be working on several items with all the Commissions including the Judicial Roundtable on Domestic Violence Interventions on June 26, the Enhancing Courts' Response to Adult Victim Sexual Violence on August 21-22, and continuing to take lead on the Tribal State Court Consortium. Since Pam has so much on her plate between the Committees and Commission, staffing the DMCJA Diversity Committee, and picking up slack from Danielle's vacancy, Cynthia Delostrinos has agreed to be the lead for the Commissions' Team. Cynthia is the primary coordinator for the Minority & Justice Commission and staffs the SCJA Equality and Fairness Committee. Cynthia will stay as lead until the Commissions Manager position is filled.

What members need to know is that as lead, Cynthia will not be working in the same capacity as Danielle was. The lead position is more administrative to assist with the internal day-to-day operations such as approving leave slips, payments, representing the Commissions in management meetings, etc. Pam will be your one and only staff person for all Commission-related things at this time.

The team approach for the Commissions is to tap into the resources AOC has to assist with our work. For example, using the Public Information team to assist with communications or working with the Associations' staff people on projects. AOC has a lot of really dynamic, excited, and interested managers who work well together and we expect to see more collaboration across the agency.

- SAVIN Link
The Statewide Automated Victim Information and Notification (SAVIN) is a free and confidential telephone and/or web service that allows victims and other concerned citizens to track the custody status of offenders in county and city jails and the Department of Corrections. It is also known as VINELink. Additionally, there is a sub-

system that allows for victims to register to be notified when their protective orders have been served. Both systems are managed through the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC). As staff, Pam sits on the advisory board which meets quarterly. The project manager met with Danielle and Pam to discuss the system, and encouraged us to help promote the use of the system through speaking, distributing the brochures, and/or tear sheets. Tear sheets were provided at the meeting. For example, in one court, when a protection order is issued, the tear sheet is now stapled to the signed order given to the petitioner. The petitioner can then set up the notification quickly and easily.

The program person is also working with jails across the state to have the link to VINELink placed on their websites, as it allows for victims to access the information quickly and easily.

Action: Invite Ms. Jamie Yoder to the July Commission meeting to explain more about the program and ways it is being implemented in different counties.

Update: Jamie has agreed to be the guest speaker for the July Commission meeting.

- Bench Guides

The Sexual Offense Bench Guide has a few changes taking place around Chapter 9 and sexual assault protection orders. These changes are due to legislative updates. Laura Jones is managing these changes and the original set of reviewers will review Chapter 9 with an anticipated release date of August.

The DV Bench Guide is in the final review with the copy editor and proofer. It should be ready for release by mid to late summer.

The Sexual Orientation Bench Guide is being revised by QLaw. Judge Melnick and Pam have been in touch with QLaw and they expect to have an updated guide by October.

- Budgets

The Gender & Justice Commission budget is on the verge of being overspent. The GJCOM budget is \$150,000 inclusive of staff salaries and benefits. As the budget shows (included in meeting packet), this leaves approximately \$30,000 to cover travel to/from Commission meetings, projects, etc. Danielle will be meeting with the Chairs of each Commission and AOC management to discuss a better and more equitable solution and distribution of the Commissions Manager salary. Since Danielle is now with a different program, we should be on target and not overspent.

The STOP grant budget is included in the meeting packet. The budget continues to provide an accurate portrayal of the activities STOP funds are supporting. However, we continue to struggle with how best to use the funds specifically required to be used for sexual violence activities. We did receive approval from OVW to use these funds to supplement the OVW grant and training in August if we need to.

GUEST SPEAKERS & EXPLORATORY PROJECTS

- Civil Legal Aid Needs Study – Jim Bamberger
Jim Bamberger is the Director of the Office of Civil Legal Aid, which was created in response to a need to have coordination amongst legal service providers. Jim oversees contracts for the provision of legal services as well as work with the 17 volunteer lawyer programs around the state. He is nationally recognized as a leader in the area of the delivery of legal services.

As you may recall, this is an update to the 2003 Civil Legal Aid Needs study and the project is in the home stretch. We are working with the Social and Economic Research Center at Washington State University to complete the study. The 2014 study shows that victims of domestic violence have a probability of having the highest number of legal problems per capita. There are 1.25 million persons in Washington living at or below 125 percent of the federal poverty guideline. The highest rate of discrimination is experienced by Native Americans, racial and ethnic minorities, and victims of domestic violence, just to name a few. We found tremendous patterns of unfair treatment that people experienced as a result of prior court involvement, bad credit history, or just general credit history, and we are still trying to tease out what that all means. It is clear that there is some very significant underlying policy issues that affect low income people dramatically, simply because they have bad credit or because at some point in their lives they were involved in the juvenile justice, child welfare, or the criminal justice system.

Update: The report was released and can be found at: <http://ocla.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/CLNS14-Executive-Report-05-28-2015-FINAL1.pdf>

- Re-entry Project – Elizabeth Hendren
Elizabeth Hendren is with the Northwest Justice Project. Elizabeth started a nonprofit called the Incarcerated Mothers Advocacy Project, which was a joint Seattle University and University of Washington project. Elizabeth works with women coming out of prison and jail and conducts a monthly prison clinic at Mission Creek Corrections Center. Women in prison are the fastest growing prison population, and if you include the jail population, the number would be just over 200,000 women who are incarcerated every year in both prison and jail. We incarcerate more people per capita than any other country in the world. The only other countries that even come close are Uganda and Russia.

Elizabeth's presentation covered a myriad of data and obstacles women face in and out of prison. Some of the highlights were:

Women of color, especially African American and Latina women are incarcerated at higher rates than white women. In terms of domestic violence, the numbers vary widely and we don't have any number specific to Washington; but nationally, as many as 90 percent of incarcerated women are survivors of DV and/or sexual assault. Most women have been victimized, and most have been victimized on numerous occasions. Many grew up in abusive households, ran away, lacked family support, which makes them more susceptible to abusive relationships, and they end up in this perpetual cycle of violence, which a lot of times puts them into situations where they start engaging in criminal activity.

Nationally, the majority of women (50 percent) are incarcerated for drug and or property offenses. Washington numbers are consistent with this trend as well. While they are two different crimes, many times property offenses are fueled by addiction, so they are very connected to drug offenses. When we talk about women in prison, a lot of the problem is they don't fit the model of the perfect victim. They didn't respond like we would like people to respond to DV by calling the police. However, the reality is that a lot of times when people are surviving horrific experiences they are not always perfect in that situation. One study has found that approximately 74 percent of women in substance abuse treatment have experienced sexual violence. Another study found that 90 percent of women in drug treatment experience severe DV from a partner during their lifetime. New studies are starting to look at, including studies by Stephanie Covington, the connection between trauma that results from DV and sexual abuse in an attempt to numb that trauma, either with illicit substances or studies done on affluent women who are drinking a lot or are misusing opiates or sleeping pills.

The greatest needs are multi-disciplinary, with needs for treatment for addiction, trauma recovery, education for jobs, coping mechanisms, and parenting skills. They need opportunity to grow and learn to make changes in their lives. However, the current focus and goal of our justice system is control, not change. When you take into account the histories of trauma and violence that women experience and put them into the criminal justice system, women disproportionately continue to be victimized sexually once they are in prison, and that is something we know happens across the board. Even if they are not further victimized in that concrete way, arguably, just the experience of being in prison when you are not allowed to make any decisions controlling your life, the whole system is based on just following orders and not asking why. There are a lot of people who have written very eloquently about how the experience perpetuates the victimization and the powerlessness that a lot of women had experienced throughout their lives. A lot of literature and data talks about it in terms of overcoming adverse childhood experiences. More training about prison responsiveness is needed if we are going to incarcerate people, and training on how to create environments that actually help women with this history of trauma and addiction grow and change so they don't continue committing crimes when they are out. There is motivation to work on this. Even if you don't care about the women at all, there is the issue of the children left behind and the impact that this has on them. The last numbers that we had in 2011 and 2012 were that 28,000 children in Washington had an incarcerated parent that they reported. It is worth noting that there is a lot of underreporting in terms of incarcerated parents. A lot of incarcerated parents have had very negative interactions with systems, and children don't want people to know their parent(s) may be incarcerated. We don't have a clear picture of how many children of incarcerated parents there are. What we do know is that there are at least a lot of them.

There are huge access to justice issues, and as a result, people end up basically in these situations where the only advice they are getting on family law issues is from their public defender. Women incarcerated at the Washington Women's Corrections Center in Purdy have access to a law library, which helps. However, the minimum security camp at Mission Creek does not have access to a law library, which presents a problem. Some ideas for areas to help address these problems are to work with the Department of

Corrections (DOC) to set up kiosks in the prisons that would provide a one-directional portal (i.e, no access to the internet) to things like court forms; provide more frequent transportation from Mission Creek to Purdy for legal library access; and provide trauma-informed support groups to address the underlying issues of things like DV, SA, drug and alcohol addiction, etc.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There was a discussion about needing clarification on the roles of each committee, its members, its chair, and the administrative role of the staff person supporting the committee.

- Are the Committees policy-oriented with staff doing the bulk of the administrative work?
- Who is making decisions and in what capacity?
- Who is doing what work?
- Who is ultimately responsible for whatever tasks set out?
- Is it providing input or doing?
- Lines are blurred at times between staff and members.

In the past, we worked under ad hoc committees to meet the needs of projects or work that was assigned and people volunteered as needed. Under previous leadership, we started working under standing committees and now we have a blend between ad hoc and standing. The problem with this approach is sometimes one committee has too much on its plate and priorities shift. The other thing is we haven't been working under standing committees long enough to figure out if this approach is working well or not.

In the BJA, the Chief has asked each Committee to draw up a charter so there is an understanding of why each Committee is in existence, what the work is of each of the committees, and what are the goals, deliverables, timelines, and accomplishments. We need to look at the Commission work plans and see if they will help delineate roles and responsibilities.

Action: Staff will look into roles and responsibilities and provide something to the members for discussion with the goal to have written roles and responsibilities.

- Communications - Judge Marilyn Paja, Chair
Ron Miles was the Chair of this Committee, but due to health reasons, Ron has resigned from his seat on the Commission and a new Chair is needed. Judge Paja indicated she would step in as Chair.

Some of the projects this Committee is responsible for is the annual report, website updates, mission/vision statement, Commission logo, and the roll out of plans for new resources such as bench guides or other tools (i.e., a marketing strategy).

- DV Committee – Judge Judy Jasprica, Chair
The DV Committee didn't meet for a bit while we were waiting for some word on the CCI Report. This doesn't mean other things haven't been going on behind the scenes, such as work around batterers' intervention programs. We held an in-person meeting last month and had a very ambitious agenda. We will be meeting again after today's GJCOM meeting.

- CCI Report
We have been waiting anxiously for the report from CCI as to the effectiveness of sentencing in DV cases. We had the opportunity to review the draft report (not for release) to discuss and determine next steps. We are realizing the report doesn't provide as clear direction on what we should be doing as we had hoped it would.
- Modifications/Rescissions
We are waiting for a link on the GJCOM website that will take persons to the Modification/Rescission forms. Once that is completed, Judge Melnick inquired into whether the Commission, under the Chief's signature, could send a letter to all the courts with a copy of the model policy, forms, and links, and let them know the Commission (members/staff) is available to provide technical assistance.

Update: The GJCOM website has been updated to provide persons separate links to different forms pages:
http://www.courts.wa.gov/programs_orgs/gjc/?fa=gjc.Resources&parent=res
- Judicial Roundtable
The Judicial Roundtable on Domestic Violence Interventions in Washington State is scheduled for Friday, June 26. A list was compiled of judicial officers from across the state from each county, and all court levels, including tribal judges. The intent of the roundtable is to provide the opportunity for open dialogue and to listen to what is happening around the state regarding DV interventions.
- HB1840 re: Surrender of Firearms
Jake Fawcett made a separate presentation to the Committee. From that, two sub-groups were formed. One will be to look at education on the provisions of this legislation and the other is to assist with the logistics to provide the education (e.g., stakeholder roadshows across the state). Judge Riehl, who is now retired and invested and committed to this cause, has agreed to participate in these roadshows to provide a consistent message and voice.
- Education – Judge Rich Melnick, Chair
 - Appellate Conference
Dr. Dana Raigrodski, University of Washington, School of Law presented on feminist legal theory. The evaluations are provided in your meeting packet. They are favorable considering we had a few logistical problems with the PowerPoint presentation. It was mentioned that Dr. Raigrodski brought an important perspective to this conference that had not been heard before. It is a challenge to present to this level since appellate judges apply and think about the law from a different perspective, a feminist perspective was interesting.
 - SCJA Spring Conference
The evaluations have not been released yet, but we had two sessions. The first session included a brief update on the DV bench guide and then focused on HB1840. Grace provided the updates to the bench guide and focused some time on dependency caseloads and then on evidence case law. Grace also talked a bit about HB2777, which passed in 2010, and how everybody is supposed to have a

policy on allowing victims to be able to petition to have their orders amended or dismissed. We wanted to tie the presentation into all the things the Commission has done and is doing in relation to the domestic violence bench guide.

Judge Chris Wickham then directed the conversation to HB1840 re: surrender of firearms and protection orders. We started off with a bit of discussion about some of the cases that ended up in the news because of DV and protection orders, and how certain cases don't impact the immediate litigants but can have a larger impact on the community. The presentation provided an opportunity to ask about what has been or is being implemented in response to this legislation in communities across the state. Approximately 5 of 80 judicial officers responded that they knew of something or were part of something that was happening. After that, we asked folks in the same room how many of you actually know when you issue a protection order what law enforcement does with that order and what happens afterwards? Again, about 5 of 80 raised their hands to indicate they understood what happens after the order leaves court. We had people break up into discussion groups around other questions on how do you figure out whether or not your order has been complied with, whether the firearms are actually surrendered, and some other questions.

It was apparent that there needs to be more information provided on HB1840, and we promised that we would do more in the future around sharing best practices and information about what is happening around the state. On a separate note, at the national level there are folks who are also convening a workgroup because several states have passed similar laws in the last two years. This group is looking at what other states have been doing and how they are dealing with some of the constitutional and process issues around the question of when one admits to a court that they still have a firearm, whether or not that violates ones constitutional rights. There are all sorts of issues that come up in this context to try and sort out how people have deal with these issues. Judge Wickham was invited to be a part of the national group and we will touch base with him to ensure we are kept apprised of what is happening.

The second session was on abusive litigation and David Ward and Judge Joan DuBuque, Ret. were the presenters. This session was also well-received and interactive. Hypotheticals and small group discussions were used to assist with the conversation.

- DMCJA Spring Conference

Gael Strack will be speaking on Strangulation. Gael is the CEO for the National Family Justice Center Alliance, which provides technical assistance to over 100 existing and pending Family Justice Centers across the world. Gael is also the foremost expert on strangulation and co-authored several articles on this topic.

- Fall Conference

The planning for this conference has been a bit different this year as we are partnering with the AJA on it. We will be holding a Tribal State Court Consortium meeting at the conference on Sunday, October 4. The conference is from October

4-7 in Seattle. We are still working on the budget around the conference and what will be paid for.

- Tribal State Court Consortium – Judges Mark Pouley and Tom Tremaine
Judges Pouley and Tremaine have continued to do outreach to other tribal judges regarding the TSCC. We have completed one regional meeting, are on the agenda to present to the Northwest Tribal Court Judges Association, and will be holding a meeting at Fall Conference.

We also have been working with AOC on a website for the TSCC. We have a mock up that is a start. The plan is for the website to be housed as a separate page under the programs/organizations and not on inside courts. We will be holding a conference call or meeting to flesh out more of the website and information needed on it.

- Incarcerated Women & Girls – Sara Ainsworth, Chair
Sara was unable to attend, but we had a great presentation from Elizabeth that shows the intersections of where this Committee is already addressing some needs.

Action: Pam will follow-up with Sara to schedule a conference call or discuss next steps.

- Membership
This Committee is comprised of the Chairs of the other Committees and the Commission's Chair and Vice Chair. We have several vacancies that need to be filled.

Action: Staff will follow up with prospective members: Jim Bamberger, Rita Bender, Sonia True, Kelley Amburgey-Richardson, someone from the Superior Court Administrators, and possibly someone from the treatment community (Dr. Chris Blodgett), and also check in with Dr. Lindhorst.

Action: Staff will set up a conference call with Committee members to discuss the openings.

Update: A message was released to the Superior Court Administrators asking if anyone was interested. At this time, no one was willing to commit and it was agreed that we will work with the head of that group to disseminate information or get input.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 12:15 p.m.

**The Road to a Diverse Bar and Bench
LSAC Grant Application**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY & PROJECT TIMELINE

The Road to a Diverse Bar and Bench

Narrative Description of the Project

The Washington State Supreme Court (WA Supreme Court) and its community partners are committed to a bar and bench that reflects the expanding diversity of American society. The WA Supreme Court is involved with many initiatives at every level of education, but it has faced challenges in the implementation of pre-college diversity pipeline programs.

With that in mind, this project proposes to enhance the collaboration between the judiciary, the three Washington State law schools, and the Washington State Bar Association (WSBA) to implement the project, *The Road to a Diverse Bar and Bench*.

Two of the WA Supreme Court Commissions – the Gender and Justice Commission (GJCOM) and the Minority and Justice Commission (MJCOM) – have independently been offering youth pipeline programs through the years. The GJCOM has made numerous efforts to implement “Color of Justice,” but has faced challenges with coordination. While the “Color of Justice” program is an excellent concept, it is not coordinated with the secondary schools’ curriculum or other pipeline projects that exist in the state. The MJCOM has offered the Tri-Cities Youth and Justice Forum for over ten years, but it has yet to implement the follow-up and program evaluation to determine its impact.

Therefore, in 2012, the GJCOM funded an examination of the extent of youth pipeline programs in Washington with the purpose of identifying the most strategic use of time and energy in its youth diversity programming (See Appendix A). The results revealed that pre-college pipeline programs are offered by stakeholders in many of the major communities of Washington. These programs tend to be the product of the local community without input, collaboration, or communication with other similar programs in the state or country. They range from a partial day’s activities to multi-year programs. Practically none of the programs knew of the efforts or content of the other youth diversity pipeline programs, or of the resources available through national programs such as LSAC’s *DiscoverLaw.org*.

The groups and individuals contacted for this inventory of programs were unanimous in their desire to learn from each other by coming together to learn about the other projects and to share resources developed by other in-state and national programs.

Additionally, each of the State’s three law schools offer youth diversity pipeline programs (Appendix A). These law schools have the knowledge and expertise about how to approach law school admission. Their involvement in *The Road to a Diverse Bar and Bench* will be both as

resources of information about law school admissions and as stakeholders in offering youth pipeline programs.

The WSBA does not currently offer youth pipeline programs. Instead, it is in the process of articulating the criteria for when it will partner with pipeline programs. The WSBA has indicated that it was interested in partnering with this project.

This proposed one-year project, under the joint leadership of the WA State Supreme Court's GJCOM and MJCOM, will bring together key people from the pre-college youth diversity pipeline programs in Washington, the State's three law schools, the WSBA, and from national programs.

The Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts' (AOC) programmatic staff will lead the project.

The Road to a Diverse Bar and Bench project has set these three goals:

1. Establish a working network of stakeholders who offer or plan to offer pre-college youth diversity pipeline programs in Washington State for the purposes of ensuring high quality programs and eliminating duplication.
2. Collect and share materials from existing pipeline programs that identify target audiences, sample agendas, activities, and promising practices that will be shared widely with individuals interested in conducting youth pipeline programs.
3. Assist stakeholders to assess their programs for effectiveness in encouraging diverse youth to pursue careers in the law and to accomplish other objectives of their individual programs.

Project Schedule – (Duration: 1 year)

1st Trimester of Grant: April - July 2015

- GJCOM and MJCOM will announce the program to the stakeholders.
- GJCOM and MJCOM will establish a Working Committee of law schools and WSBA.
- Working Committee together with AOC staff will develop potential dates for first stakeholder meeting and disseminate to all identified attendees.
- AOC Staff will do further outreach to determine what additional communities may be undertaking pipeline programs in order to include them in the stakeholder meeting.
- AOC staff will distribute survey instrument to each pipeline program and solicit completion prior to Stakeholder Meeting.
- Date will be selected and preparations will begin to conduct meeting, including logistics, draft agenda, materials for distribution.

2nd Trimester of Grant: August - November 2015

- Conduct first stakeholder meeting, including action planning for the next year.
- Evaluator evaluates first stakeholder meeting.
- Collect materials from stakeholder participants.
- Begin follow-up on action planning.
- Set date for next stakeholder meeting one year out.

3rd Trimester of Grant: December 2015 – March 2016

- AOC Staff will gather information for final report to LSAC, which will include lessons learned and promising practices of holding a collaborative stakeholder meeting and creating an ongoing network of support for diversity pipeline programs. In addition, it will collect evaluation methods developed for review by the evaluator. The evaluator will also engage in discussion with the AOC staff to provide advice and input on the implementation of programs and evaluation methods.
- Invite the judicial community, legal community, community organizations, colleges and universities, and institutions of faith to learn more about the resources collected from the stakeholders and provide opportunities to be involved in diversity pipeline efforts.

Ongoing Work

This collaboration among partners will continue beyond the dates of the proposed grant proposal through the support from the Washington State Supreme Court's Commissions, the state's three law schools, and the State bar. These groups will continue to work together to ensure that high quality diversity pipeline programs will become institutionalized and that promising practices including evaluation approaches will be disseminated to new and interested pipeline programs around the State of Washington.

Gender & Justice Commission
Proposed Budget July 1, 2015 - June 30, 2016

Projected Spending	Starting Budget = \$150,000	Projections FY15-16
Salaries & Benefits	Staff (1.65 FTEs [manager, coordinator])	\$110,000
Commission Meetings	Travel-related costs for members (lodging, per diem, mileage, airfare, etc.) (<i>July, Sept, Nov, Jan, March, May</i>)	\$13,000
	March 2016 - Reception (Food Only)	\$850
General Operating Expenses	Printing, conference calls, supplies, etc.	\$6,500
Staff Travel & Training	Registration Fees, Travel-related costs	\$6,000
	Local and National conferences	
LSAC Grant Support	<i>For November 2015 Stakeholder Mtg</i>	\$5,000
Communications	<i>Outsource design & print of Annual Report</i>	\$2,500
Education	<i>SCJ Spring Program</i>	\$1,000
	<i>DMCJ Spring Program</i>	
	<i>Fall Conference</i>	
	<i>Appellate Conference</i>	
Incarcerated Women & Girls		
Tribal State Court Consortium		\$1,500
Women in the Profession	<i>Judicial Officer & Law Student Reception</i>	\$1,150
Sponsorships	Washington Initiative for Diversity	
	<i>Judicial Institute</i>	\$1,000
	<i>Legal Exec Summit</i>	\$1,000
	<i>Mini Legal Exec Summit - Eastern WA</i>	\$500
Undetermined		\$0
		\$150,000

STOP BUDGET FFY14
Proposed Budget January 1, 2015 - December 31, 2015

Projected Spending	Total = \$133,192	\$98,266	\$34,926
		DV Projects	SA Projects
Salaries & Benefits	Staff (Program Coordinator = 0.35 FTE)	\$23,178	\$9,926
Office Supplies, Copies, Printing		\$1,500	
Staff Training & Education	To attend local and national conferences and training events	\$8,100	
Contracts	PSC14119 - Center for Court Innovation re: Sentencing & Monitoring Project <i>(carry over from FFY13)</i>	\$10,000	
	ESA15384 - Scott Miller re: Judicial Roundtable 6.29.2015	\$3,000	
	ICA15384 - DV Symposium	\$5,000	
Judicial Officer Training & Continuing Education	Scholarships for judicial officers to attend local and national conferences & training events as related to DV/SA		
	Enhancing Judicial Skills in DV (Lodging & Airfare Only) (\$1000*8)	\$8,000	
	Continuing Judicial Skills in DV (Lodging & Airfare Only) (\$1,000*3)	\$0	
	NCJFCJ National Conference (\$2100*9)	\$18,900	
	Children's Conference (Courthouse Facilitators Registration Only) (\$199*10)	\$1,592	
	Supplement SA judicial officer training		\$15,000
Education Proposals	SCJA Spring Program Proposals	\$500	
	DMCJA Spring Program Proposals	\$2,600	
Proposed Work	Working with Tribal courts on SA issues		\$10,000
	Undetermined	\$15,896	
	HB1840 re: surrender of firearms		
Totals per portion of grant		\$98,266	\$34,926
Total Grant		\$133,192	

Updated 7.8.2015

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO
THE WASHINGTON STATE GENDER & JUSTICE COMMISSION
REGARDING JUDICIAL EVALUATION**

Submitted by:

Judith A. Lonquist

on behalf of

The Subcommittee on Women in the Profession

July 10, 2015

Background: Last year, Commission member Judge Ann Schindler suggested that the Commission consider issues about potential bias toward women judges, particularly with respect to judicial performance evaluation. The task was assigned to the Women in the Profession Subcommittee to review and report back to the Commission. It was suggested that the subcommittee interview Judge Sharon Armstrong, who served on a judicial evaluation review committee of the Seattle/King County Bar Association (“SKBA”).

Report: The subcommittee met with Judge Armstrong who reported on the lengthy project undertaken by the SKBA in collaboration with the Washington Chapter of the American Adjudicature Society (“WCAAS”). The project, which had begun with the appointment of the Walsh Commission in 1996, culminated with the formal presentation to our State Supreme Court in 2014 of a proposed addition to the General Court Rules providing for a state-wide procedure for evaluating the performance of judicial officers and individuals seeking election or appointment to the bench. A brief history of the project is set forth in Attachment A. The 2005 White Paper authored by the WSAAJ is attached as Attachment B.

Commission’s Interest: Elimination and prevention of sex-bias in the selection and evaluation of judges. In 2000, the ABA Commission on Women in the Profession acknowledged that “even women who enjoy the prestige of the judiciary are affected by bias. Judicial evaluation programs reflect that women judges endure consistently stronger criticism than their male colleagues, especially in subjective categories such as ‘demeanor.’” See: *Methodologies for Measuring Judicial Performance: The Problem of Bias*, Attachment C. Such bias includes both stereotypic (See: *Improving Judicial-Performance Evaluation, Countering Bias and Exploring New Methods*, Attachment D) and implicit (See: *Implicit Bias in Judicial Performance Evaluations: Why the ABA Guidelines Are Not Good Enough*, Attachment E).

Proposed Action: Consideration of Proposed General Rule 35. See: *Summary Regarding Proposed General Rule*, Attachment F, and *Final Draft of Proposed General Rule for Judicial Performance Evaluations*, Attachment G.

Recommendation: Endorse and recommend prompt adoption by the Supreme Court of Proposed GR 35.

Andrew Prazuch

From: Andrew Prazuch <sylvan@iialaska.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 2:02 AM
To: Andrew Prazuch
Subject: King County Bar Association Judicial Survey

November 11, 2013

Dear Colleague:

The King County Bar Association is launching today its quadrennial Judicial Officer Survey of attorneys who appear in local courts of limited jurisdiction. These surveys have been conducted for the past 65 years and are one of several tools that KCBA provides the public to evaluate judicial officers. You have received this survey because court records indicate you have appeared at least once from 2010 to the present before one or more of the judges being evaluated.

If you have completed a survey in past years, you will notice some changes to the process this year. The most noticeable is that while in past years attorneys would receive a separate survey instrument for each judge, this year attorneys will receive just one survey from which you will rate all judges.

Participating attorneys can choose to complete the survey in one session or complete it over several sessions (your work will be saved as you proceed). When you restart the survey it will bring you back to the point where you left off. While the survey is functional on a smartphone or tablet (as well as a computer, of course) you cannot switch between devices. Whatever device you start the survey on is the device on which you need to complete the entire survey.

This year's KCBA survey is being conducted by Information Insights, a private research firm. Should you experience any technical problems while taking the survey, please contact Sylvan Robb at Information Insights by phone (907-450-2456) or email (sylvan@iialaska.com).

The deadline to complete this survey is Monday, December 2, by 9:00am. KCBA plans to release the results in January.

To learn more about KCBA's Judicial Officer Survey, visit www.kcba.org/judicialsurvey.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

[Click here](#)

Sincerely,

Andrew Prazuch
Executive Director
King County Bar Association

andrewp@kcba.org
206-267-7061

<http://www.event.com/d/YKkUtr3sUqSKhCD6feUlw/gmml/P2?>

Start Survey

Having trouble with the button? Copy and paste the entire address listed below.
<http://www.event.com/d/YKkUtrz3sUqSKhCD6feUlw/gmml/P2?>

Click the link below to opt out of receiving survey emails from Andrew Prazuch.
[Opt-Out](#)

powered by
cvent

<u>Contact Information</u>

<i>All fields with an asterisk (*) are required.</i>
--

Saving your work

<p>You may choose to complete the survey in one session or complete it over several sessions (your work will be saved as you proceed). When you restart the survey it will bring you back to the point where you left off. While the survey is functional on a smartphone or tablet (as well as a computer, of course) you cannot switch between devices. Whatever device you start the survey on is the device on which you need to complete the entire survey.</p>
--

*1. Please select ALL of the King County District Court judges you wish to evaluate. You will select Municipal Court of Seattle judges and King County Municipal Court judges in subsequent questions. In order to select multiple applicants, please hold down the 'control' key (if using a PC) or the 'command' key (if using a Mac) while making your selection. You must answer this question; if you have not appeared before any of these judges please select "I haven't appeared before any of these judges," in order to move forward. (*Required)

Select between 0 and 26 choices.

<input type="checkbox"/>	I haven't appeared before any of these judges.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Marcine Anderson
<input type="checkbox"/>	Richard Bathum
<input type="checkbox"/>	Johanna Bender
<input type="checkbox"/>	Arthur Chapman
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mark Chow
<input type="checkbox"/>	David Christie
<input type="checkbox"/>	Charles Delaurenti, II
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mark Eide
<input type="checkbox"/>	Michael Finkle
<input type="checkbox"/>	Janet Garrow
<input type="checkbox"/>	Nathaniel Green
<input type="checkbox"/>	Corinna Harn
<input type="checkbox"/>	Anne Harper
<input type="checkbox"/>	Linda Jacke
<input type="checkbox"/>	Eileen Kato
<input type="checkbox"/>	Susan Mahoney
<input type="checkbox"/>	David Meyer
<input type="checkbox"/>	Peter Nault
<input type="checkbox"/>	Susan Noonan
<input type="checkbox"/>	Victoria Seitz
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ketu Shah
<input type="checkbox"/>	Douglas Smith
<input type="checkbox"/>	David Steiner
<input type="checkbox"/>	Elizabeth Stephenson
<input type="checkbox"/>	Donna Tucker
<input type="checkbox"/>	Matthew Williams

*2. Please select ALL of the Municipal Court of Seattle judges you wish to evaluate. You will select the King County Municipal Court judges you wish to evaluate in the next question. In order to select multiple applicants, please hold down the 'control' key (if using a PC) or the 'command' key (if using a Mac) while making your selection. You must answer this question; if you have not appeared before any of these judges, please select "I haven't appeared before any of these judges" in order to move forward. (*Required)

Select between 0 and 7 choices.

<input type="checkbox"/>	I haven't appeared before any of these judges.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Fred Bonner
<input type="checkbox"/>	Karen Donohue
<input type="checkbox"/>	Willie Gregory
<input type="checkbox"/>	Judith Hightower
<input type="checkbox"/>	C. Kimi Kondo
<input type="checkbox"/>	Edward McKenna
<input type="checkbox"/>	Steve Rosen

*3. Please select ALL of the King County Municipal Court judges you wish to evaluate. In order to select multiple applicants, please hold down the 'control' key (if using a PC) or the 'command' key (if using a Mac) while making your selection. You must answer this question; if you have not appeared before any of these judges, please select "I haven't appeared before any of these judges" in order to move forward. (*Required)

Select between 0 and 16 choices.

<input type="checkbox"/>	I haven't appeared before any of these judges.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Veronica Alicea-Galvin
<input type="checkbox"/>	Elizabeth Bejarano
<input type="checkbox"/>	Melanie Dane
<input type="checkbox"/>	Michelle Gehlsen
<input type="checkbox"/>	Robert Hamilton
<input type="checkbox"/>	Karli Jorgensen
<input type="checkbox"/>	Terry Jurado
<input type="checkbox"/>	Michael Lambo
<input type="checkbox"/>	David Larson
<input type="checkbox"/>	Glenn Phillips
<input type="checkbox"/>	Linda Portnoy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Rebecca Robertson
<input type="checkbox"/>	Stephen Rochon
<input type="checkbox"/>	N. Scott Stewart
<input type="checkbox"/>	Wayne Stewart
<input type="checkbox"/>	Kimberly Walden

Marcine Anderson
King County District Court

4. Roughly how many times have you appeared before the judge over the past 4 years?

Select one.

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | Once |
| <input type="radio"/> | 2 to 3 times |
| <input type="radio"/> | 4 to 10 times |
| <input type="radio"/> | More than 10 times |

Legal Ability for Marcine Anderson

5. How would you rate this judge's ability to capably identify and analyze legal and factual issues?

Select one.

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | Excellent |
| <input type="radio"/> | Very good |
| <input type="radio"/> | Acceptable |
| <input type="radio"/> | Below expectations |
| <input type="radio"/> | Unacceptable |
| <input type="radio"/> | Don't know |

6. How would you rate this judge's ability to capably apply rules of evidence and procedure?

Select one.

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | Excellent |
| <input type="radio"/> | Very good |
| <input type="radio"/> | Acceptable |
| <input type="radio"/> | Below expectations |
| <input type="radio"/> | Unacceptable |
| <input type="radio"/> | Don't know |

7. How would you rate this judge's ability to articulate rulings and grounds for rulings in a clear and concise manner?

Select one.

- Excellent
- Very good
- Acceptable
- Below expectations
- Unacceptable
- Don't know

8. How would you rate this judge's preparation for court?

Select one.

- Excellent
- Very good
- Acceptable
- Below expectations
- Unacceptable
- Don't know

Integrity and Impartiality for Marcine Anderson

9. How would you rate this judge's avoidance of impropriety and the appearance of impropriety?

Select one.

- Excellent
- Very good
- Acceptable
- Below expectations
- Unacceptable
- Don't know

10. How well did this judge treat all people equally without bias based on race, gender, or any extralegal personal characteristic?

Select one.

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | Excellent |
| <input type="radio"/> | Very good |
| <input type="radio"/> | Acceptable |
| <input type="radio"/> | Below expectations |
| <input type="radio"/> | Unacceptable |
| <input type="radio"/> | Don't know |

11. How well did this judge base his or her rulings on the facts and the law?

Select one.

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | Excellent |
| <input type="radio"/> | Very good |
| <input type="radio"/> | Acceptable |
| <input type="radio"/> | Below expectations |
| <input type="radio"/> | Unacceptable |
| <input type="radio"/> | Don't know |

12. How well did this judge display a neutral presence on the bench?

Select one.

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | Excellent |
| <input type="radio"/> | Very good |
| <input type="radio"/> | Acceptable |
| <input type="radio"/> | Below expectations |
| <input type="radio"/> | Unacceptable |
| <input type="radio"/> | Don't know |

Demeanor, Temperament, and Communication for Marcine Anderson

13. How well did this judge treat people with courtesy and respect?	
<i>Select one.</i>	
<input type="radio"/>	Excellent
<input type="radio"/>	Very good
<input type="radio"/>	Acceptable
<input type="radio"/>	Below expectations
<input type="radio"/>	Unacceptable
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know

14. How attentive was this judge to the proceedings?	
<i>Select one.</i>	
<input type="radio"/>	Excellent
<input type="radio"/>	Very good
<input type="radio"/>	Acceptable
<input type="radio"/>	Below expectations
<input type="radio"/>	Unacceptable
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know

15. How well did this judge act with patience and self-control?	
<i>Select one.</i>	
<input type="radio"/>	Excellent
<input type="radio"/>	Very good
<input type="radio"/>	Acceptable
<input type="radio"/>	Below expectations
<input type="radio"/>	Unacceptable
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know

16. How well did this judge use clear and logical communication while in court?

Select one.

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | Excellent |
| <input type="radio"/> | Very good |
| <input type="radio"/> | Acceptable |
| <input type="radio"/> | Below expectations |
| <input type="radio"/> | Unacceptable |
| <input type="radio"/> | Don't know |

Administrative Skills for Marcine Anderson

17. How well did this judge maintain control over the courtroom?

Select one.

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | Excellent |
| <input type="radio"/> | Very good |
| <input type="radio"/> | Acceptable |
| <input type="radio"/> | Below expectations |
| <input type="radio"/> | Unacceptable |
| <input type="radio"/> | Don't know |

18. How appropriately does this judge maintain case management and enforce court rules and deadlines?

Select one.

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | Excellent |
| <input type="radio"/> | Very good |
| <input type="radio"/> | Acceptable |
| <input type="radio"/> | Below expectations |
| <input type="radio"/> | Unacceptable |
| <input type="radio"/> | Don't know |

19. How prompt and timely is this judge in making decisions and rulings?	
<i>Select one.</i>	
<input type="radio"/>	Excellent
<input type="radio"/>	Very good
<input type="radio"/>	Acceptable
<input type="radio"/>	Below expectations
<input type="radio"/>	Unacceptable
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know

20. How well does this judge use the court's time efficiently?	
<i>Select one.</i>	
<input type="radio"/>	Excellent
<input type="radio"/>	Very good
<input type="radio"/>	Acceptable
<input type="radio"/>	Below expectations
<input type="radio"/>	Unacceptable
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know

21. Please provide any additional comments or details related to either the items raised in this questionnaire or the judge's performance in the space below. Note: As this information will be provided to the judge, please refrain from providing any information that might identify you.	

Background and Demographic Information

In order to place the evaluation results in context, we need to ask you some questions about your background.

886. How long have you been a practicing attorney?

Select one.

- 1 to 2 years
- 3 to 5 years
- 6 to 10 years
- 11 to 20 years
- More than 20 years

887. Which of the following areas of law best describe your practice?

Select one.

- Criminal law
- General civil
- Domestic relations / Family law
- Government practice
- Other:

888. How many attorneys are employed by your law firm?

Select one.

- Sole practitioner
- 2 to 5 attorneys
- 6 to 10 attorneys
- 11 to 20 attorneys
- More than 20 attorneys

889. What best describes your racial background?	
<i>Select one.</i>	
<input type="radio"/>	Caucasian/white
<input type="radio"/>	African American/Black
<input type="radio"/>	Hispanic/Latino/Latina
<input type="radio"/>	Asian/Pacific Islander
<input type="radio"/>	Native American
<input type="radio"/>	Other: <input type="text"/>

890. What is your gender?	
<i>Select one.</i>	
<input type="radio"/>	Male
<input type="radio"/>	Female

*891. CERTIFICATION I certify that I answered this survey truthfully and only evaluated judges whom I have appeared before in the previous four years. If you check "No" your survey will not be included in the analysis.(*Required)	
<i>Select one.</i>	
<input type="radio"/>	Yes
<input type="radio"/>	No

**Judicial Roundtable on Domestic Violence Interventions
In Washington State
Friday, June 26, 2015**

Red Lion SeaTac – Rainier Room
18220 International Blvd, SeaTac, Washington

Participant Agenda

The Gender & Justice Commission is convening this judicial roundtable to examine complex and often controversial issues that impact the administration of justice and provision of services in domestic violence cases. The intent of this roundtable is to create a safe, open space inclusive of all opinions, whereby judicial officers can delve deeper into some of the reasons for the tension around domestic violence interventions.

Throughout this critical conversation, we will be looking at how to approach some of the concerns and challenges raised by the judicial roundtable participants.

- 8:30-8:50 AM **Welcome, Introductions, and Overview**
Judge Judy Jasprica, Pierce County District Court
Judge Katherine Tennyson, Multnomah County Circuit Court
- 8:50-9:05 AM **Opening Exercise: Tony and Mindy**
Judge Tennyson
Using a short scenario, participants will begin the discussion on domestic violence interventions.
- 9:05-10:00 AM **State of the Art of Domestic Violence Intervention Programs**
Etiony Aldarondo, Ph.D., Provost, Albizu University
During this segment, Dr. Aldarondo will discuss the purposes of domestic violence intervention programs. Participants will learn about research on domestic violence intervention programs including how to maximize their effectiveness, obstacles, and criticisms. Participants are encouraged to ask questions during the presentation.
- 10:00-10:10 AM **Break**

- 10:10-11:00 AM **Domestic Violence Intervention Programs on the Ground Nationally**
Scott Miller, Blueprint Coordinator, Domestic Abuse Intervention Project
Participants will learn about what is happening nationally with regards to domestic violence intervention programs. Mr. Miller will focus on current practice and will also explain new practices that providers are implementing. Participants are encouraged to ask questions during the presentation.
- 11:00-11:10 AM **Break**
- 11:10-11:45 AM **Washington Domestic Violence Intervention Programs**
Steven Pepping, President, Northwest Association of Domestic Violence Treatment Professionals
Participants will gain a better understanding of the differences and types of evaluations and assessments programs used in Washington and the parties who conduct them. Additionally, participants will learn about a 2014 survey sent to Washington State batterer treatment providers. Using the survey information, Mr. Pepping will illustrate, highlight, and compare and contrast Washington practice to the research discussed. Participants are encouraged to ask questions during the presentation.
- 11:45 AM-1:00 PM **Lunch On Your Own**
- 1:00-1:50 PM **Current and Local Practice: Small Group Discussions**
In small groups, each participant should describe current domestic violence intervention programs and practices in their local jurisdictions. The following questions are to help guide the discussion:
- What is your judicial philosophy for addressing domestic violence?
 - What does “holding a batterer accountable” mean to you?
 - What are the elements of “success” for a domestic violence intervention program?
 - How would you evaluate the effectiveness of the justice system, including domestic violence intervention programs, in holding batterers accountable?

- What outcomes, with respect to domestic violence intervention programs, would we hope to obtain in an ideal world?
- What other challenges are you dealing with in your jurisdiction (lack of programs, funding, etc.)?

1:50-2:00 PM

Break

2:00-2:50 PM

Large Group Free Think

Judge Tennyson, Scott Miller, and Dr. Etiony Aldarondo

Through report backs from the small group discussions and using a question and answer format, faculty will lead participants in a larger conversation and dialogue on the use and effectiveness of domestic violence interventions.

2:50-3:00 PM

Break

3:00-3:40 PM

Domestic Violence Intervention Program Scenarios

Judge Tennyson

Participants will work in small groups to apply concepts discussed throughout the day with the purpose of illustrating possible judicial responses and gaps in services.

3:40- 4:15 PM

Improving the System

Judge Tennyson and Judge Jasprica

Participants will participate in a large group discussion around what could/should be done about domestic violence intervention programs.

4:15-4:30 PM

Next Steps

Judge Jasprica and Judge Tennyson

Participants will try to reach some consensus on what judges can do including steps that can be taken locally, how DV offenders can be held more accountable generally, and how we will communicate this consensus to our colleagues, the Bar, advocates, and the community at large.

4:30 PM

Adjourn

**JUDICIAL ROUNDTABLE ON
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INTERVENTIONS
IN WASHINGTON STATE**

June 26, 2015

PARTICIPANTS

Judge Scott Ahlf
Olympia Municipal Court
sahlf@ci.olympia.wa.us

Judge Sandy Allen
Milton and Ruston Municipal Courts
sandyallen3@wamail.net

Judge Elizabeth Bejarano
SeaTac Municipal Court
ebejarano@ci.seatac.wa.us

Judge Elizabeth Berns
King County Superior Court
elizabeth.berns@kingcounty.gov

Judge Karla E. Buttorff
Pierce County District Court
kbuttor@co.pierce.wa.us

Judge Regina Cahan
King County Superior Court
regina.cahan@kingcounty.gov

Judge Patti Connolly Walker
Spokane County District Court
pwalker@spokanecounty.org

Judge Sara Derr
Spokane County District Court
sderr@spokanecounty.org

Commissioner Heidi Heywood
Wahkiakum County Superior Court
heywood@centurytel.net

Judge Anne Hirsch
Thurston County Superior Court
hirscha@co.thurston.wa.us

Judge Judy Jasprica
Pierce County District Court
jjaspri@co.pierce.wa.us

Judge David Ladenburg
Tacoma Municipal Court
dladenbu@ci.tacoma.wa.us

Commissioner Jennie Laird
King County Juvenile Court
jennie.laird@kingcounty.gov

Judge Mary Logan
Spokane Municipal Court
mlogan@spokanecity.org

Judge Eric Lucas
Snohomish County Superior Court
eric.lucas@snoco.org

Judge Ed McKenna
Seattle Municipal Court
ed.mckenna@seattle.gov

Judge Raquel Montoya-Lewis
Whatcom County Superior Court
rmontoya@co.whatcom.wa.us

Judge Alicia Nakata
Chelan County Superior Court
alicia.nakata@co.chelan.wa.us

Judge Glenn Phillips
Kent Municipal Court
gphillips@kentwa.gov

Judge Douglas Robinson
Whitman County District Court
dcjudge@co.whitman.wa.us

Judge Ketu Shah
King County District Court, East Division
ketu.shah@kingcounty.gov

Judge Charles Short
Okanogan County District Court
cshort@co.okanogan.wa.us

Judge Lori Kay Smith
King County Superior Court
lori-kay.smith@kingcounty.gov

Judge David Svaren
Skagit County District Court
dsvaren@co.skagit.wa.us

Judge Tom Tremaine
Kalispel Tribal Court
ttremaine@kalispeltribe.com

Judge Chris Wickham
Thurston County Superior Court
wickhac@co.thurston.wa.us

Commissioner Paul Wohl
Thurston County District Court
wohlp@co.thurston.wa.us

FACULTY & STAFF

Mr. Mark Adams
Wellspring Family Services
madams@wellspringfs.org

Dr. Etiony Aldarondo
Provost, Albizu University, Miami Campus
National Council of Juvenile & Family Court
Judges
ealdarondo@albizu.edu

Ms. Pam Dittman
Gender & Justice Commission
pam.dittman@courts.wa.gov

Mr. Scott Miller
Domestic Abuse Intervention Programs
smiller@theduluthmodel.org

Ms. Danielle Pugh-Markie
Office of Tribal Court Services and Judicial
Education
Supreme Court Commissions
danielle.pugh-markie@courts.wa.gov

Mr. Steven Pepping
Northwest Association of Domestic
Violence Treatment Professionals
steven.pepping@puyalluptribe.com

Judge Katherine Tennyson
Multnomah County Circuit Court
katherine.tennyson@ojd.state.or.us

Superior Court Judges' Spring Program

April 26 - 29 2015

149	87
Audience	Evaluations

SESSION EVALUATION

Session:	Battle Within the Courts . . . Abusive Litigation Tactics in Domestic Violence Civil Cases
Faculty:	Judge Joan E. DuBuque and Mr. Dave Ward

Please include narrative comments, as well as numeric rating on a **5-point scale**.
(5 = Excellent; 4 = Good; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; N/A = Not Applicable)

EFFECTIVENESS	5	4	3	2	1	
1. The objectives of the course were clear.	54	22	5	1	0	4.3
2. The objectives of the course were achieved.	48	27	6	0	1	4.2
3. The faculty engaged me in meaningful activities.	48	24	7	2	0	4.1
4. I gained important information or skills.	39	26	14	2	1	4.0
5. The faculty made a clear connection between the course and the work place.	54	19	7	1	1	4.3
	Average:					4.2

COMMENTS:

- The hypos were very useful tools.
- Hypotheticals seem contrived. Especially #4, why not offer attorney fees as option?
- I feel I am very experienced in this area, thus the reason I downgraded #4. However, this is important to have as a plenary since folks that really need this may "opt out".
- Good topic! I'm confident I will consult the materials when I face these circumstances.
- The premise of the session was problematic as, I "assumed" the abuser was male as in criminal DV cases whereby in the civil/family law case it appears to be evenly abused by both male and female litigants.

COMMUNICATION SKILLS

	5	4	3	2	1	
1. The faculty was well prepared.	66	12	3	1	0	4.5
2. The presentation was organized.	62	16	3	1	0	4.4
3. Written materials enhanced the presentation.	38	18	13	5	2	3.6
4. Audiovisual aids were used effectively.	44	25	10	1	0	4.0
5. The presentation kept my interest throughout.	48	23	8	1	1	4.1
	Average:					4.1

COMMENTS:

- Excellent! Good concise resources and statutes.
- Good discussion. Important topic. I like hearing about “tools” to use in these cases – they are frustrating.
- Judge Dubuque was very helpful.
- Should make presentation gender neutral and not presume offender is male. Discuss more abuse of protection order filings as tactic to evict or otherwise no really DV on other basis.
- This session was offensive. It presumed all victims female and all abusers male. No regard for LGTB community or what is reality in society today.
- Is it not improper (although statistically accurate) to always portray the abuser in your examples as the male (“he”) and the victim “survivor” – arguably a loaded term as female? Are we not being improperly lobbied by one side of this issue but not by defense side?
- Very good! Thank you!
- Thank you!
- Well done. Especially for newer judges.
- Less reading of hypos – great opportunity for group discussion, sharing of ideas at table.
- Great job!
- The reading of the hypotheticals – necessary.
- Really great presentations from both speakers. Made me realize I have several of these cases happening in front of me now. Great tools.
- Materials are excellent. Many useful citations – not just statements. Presenters were skilled in the technology and used it to advantage. Presenters were easy to hear and not monotonous.
- Judge Dubuque was, as always, clear, concise, and to the point while providing very useful information.
- It would have been helpful to have heard copy of the PowerPoint as a handout for taking more detailed notes regarding the lecture comments.
- Excellent presentation to keep your attention at the end of the day. Thank you!
- This is the first time I can recall this specific subject being addressed in a full session. Very timely and useful, especially with so many new judges among us.
- Well organized, good pace and the presenters stood up which was really helpful!
- Better than most of the other sessions!
- Materials located online did not help at the time of presentation.
- Great! Thanks!
- Hypotheticals were instructive.
- Great information – practical. I will be able to improve my practice.

- Excellent!
- Good program – lots of practical use and wide familiarity.
- At end, sounded more like advocacy than education.
- Too much advocacy can interfere with the presentation of useful information.
- Good job of using PowerPoint, discussion, hypos, and transponders.
- Really Great!
- Skewed presentation and positive feedback for most draconian responses obtained the reaction desired – but not very realistic or helpful.
- I was aware of Mr. Ward's implicit gender bias – when identifying survivors or abusers by gender, survivors were always "she" and abusers always "he".
- Great job – Judge DuBuque was awesome and so was Mr. Ward– kept it moving!

Superior Court Judges' Spring Program

April 26 - 29 2015

85	38
Audience	Evaluations

SESSION EVALUATION

Session:	Domestic Violence Bench Guide and Firearms Surrender Update
Faculty:	Ms. Grace Huang and Judge Chris Wickham

Please include narrative comments, as well as numeric rating on a **5-point scale**.
(5 = Excellent; 4 = Good; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; N/A = Not Applicable)

EFFECTIVENESS	5	4	3	2	1	
1. The objectives of the course were clear.	22	11	5	0	0	4.4
2. The objectives of the course were achieved.	20	13	5	0	0	4.4
3. The faculty engaged me in meaningful activities.	23	13	1	1	0	4.5
4. I gained important information or skills.	26	10	1	1	0	4.6
5. The faculty made a clear connection between the course and the work place.	24	12	1	1	0	4.6
	Average:					4.5

COMMENTS:

- The presenters seemed to be un-interested in hearing about flaws in the statute and how to draft a better product. It is a bit tiresome to hear constantly about King County for the rest of us from elsewhere.
- I wanted to hear explicit connection to the work I do.
- Great faculty.
- Lots of unanswered questions for courts to resolve, but great discussion and brainstorming.
- Way too much time on DV Bench Guides and limited time on firearm surrender update.
- Practical issues that come up were thoroughly discussed.

COMMUNICATION SKILLS

	5	4	3	2	1	
1. The faculty was well prepared.	29	7	2	0	0	4.7
2. The presentation was organized.	26	7	4	1	0	4.5
3. Written materials enhanced the presentation.	21	10	6	1	0	4.3
4. Audiovisual aids were used effectively.	16	7	10	3	2	3.8
5. The presentation kept my interest throughout.	24	11	3	0	0	4.6
	Average:					4.4

COMMENTS:

- I think you need to be really careful about the way you present the lack of enforcement of tribal court orders. It was presented as if all it takes is for the state court judge to have a relationship with the tribal courts that are nearby – ok, fine but that does very little. The issue is not a lack of relations – it’s a fundamental flaw in our information systems. There is no way at present for a tribal court to get its protection order into a state database. The only way to do that is to have the petitioner take the tribal court order to the state and get full faith and credit. Most petitioners are unwilling to do that. In addition there’s no access to the NCIC system (which you did mention, but said that some tribes can, which I have never seen happen). Finally, I have had countless order of mine (when I was in the tribal court) ignored and outright refused to be enforced by law enforcement. This is a much bigger issue than was represented by this session. It may not be the focus of the session and that would be okay, but please font bring it up and give incomplete information.
- Too bad video didn’t work – nice to have videos to break up all talking and tell the stories real life.
- Ms. Huang needs to remove the word “um” from her presentation and she needs to speak into the mike [sic] so as to be heard clearly.
- Seemed disjointed. Handouts were not on the table.
- Not enough copies of written materials and handouts available. No bench guides available.
- PowerPoint contained too much information.
- While there was a technical problem, faculty did not allow that to deter them from providing the info! Great faculty.
- Technical problem with the slides.
- Very timely program, well informed faculty.
- Audio visual problems.
- With all the firearm law changes, time allocation to this issue was insufficient. No time to discuss practical implementation.
- Need larger class.

**Gender and Justice Commission
Proposed Meeting Schedule**

**January – December 2016
(Leap Year)**

Date	Time	Location
January 8, 2016	8:45 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.	AOC SeaTac Office
March 11, 2016	9:45 a.m. – 2:00 p.m. (tentative)	Temple of Justice, Chief Justice Reception Room (Meeting/Luncheon)
May 13, 2016	8:45 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.	AOC SeaTac Office
July 8, 2016	8:45 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.	AOC SeaTac Office
September 2, 2016 or September 16, 2016	8:45 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.	AOC SeaTac Office
November 4, 2016 or November 18, 2016	8:45 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.	AOC SeaTac Office

Note: September 2, 2016 is Labor Day weekend.
November 11, 2016 is Veteran's Day

AOC Staff: Vacant, Supreme Court Commissions Manager
360.705.5290

Pam Dittman, Program Coordinator
Pam.dittman@courts.wa.gov; 360.704.4031

**WASHINGTON STATE SUPREME COURT
GENDER AND JUSTICE COMMISSION**

2015-2016

CHAIR

Honorable Barbara A. Madsen
Washington State Supreme Court

VICE-CHAIR

Honorable Sheryl Gordon McCloud
Washington State Supreme Court

MEMBERS

Ms. Sara L. Ainsworth
National Advocates for Pregnant
Women

Honorable Josie Delvin
Benton County Clerk

Honorable Michael H. Evans
Cowlitz County Superior Court

Ms. Grace Huang
Washington State Coalition Against
Domestic Violence

Honorable Judy Rae Jasprica
Pierce County District Court

Ms. LaTricia Kinlow
Tukwila Municipal Court

Honorable Eric Z. Lucas
Snohomish County Superior Court

Honorable Rich Melnick
Court of Appeals, Division II

Honorable Marilyn G. Paja
Kitsap County District Court

Honorable Mark W. Pouley
Swinomish Tribal Court

Ms. Leslie J. Savina
Northwest Justice Project

Ms. Gail Stone
King County Executive's Office

Honorable Tom Tremaine
Kalispel Tribal Court

Mr. David Ward
Legal Voice

AOC Staff

Vacant
Manager, Supreme Court Commissions

Ms. Pam Dittman
Program Coordinator

