

**Federal Advisory Task Force on Violence  
Against Indian Women**

**Research on Violence Against  
American Indian and Alaska Native  
Women Living in Tribal Communities**

**Meeting Summary**

*March 7–8, 2013*

**Office of Justice Programs  
810 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20531**

**Meeting Summary  
March 7–8, 2013  
Office of Justice Programs  
Washington, D.C. 20531**

**NIJ**

U.S. Department of Justice  
**OVW**  
Office on Violence Against Women  
Working Together to End the Violence

## Day 1

### Traditional Opening

**Juana Majel Dixon** (Pauma Band of Mission Indians)  
*Task Force Member*

Ms. Juana Majel Dixon opened the meeting by leading participants in a traditional prayer.

### Welcome

**Bea Hanson, Ph.D.**  
*Acting Director, Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), Task Force Designated Federal Official*

Dr. Hanson remarked that it was an auspicious day, as the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) was being reauthorized. She thanked the Task Force for its work protecting American Indian (AI) and Alaska Native (AN) women and said the legislation is another step forward. She noted that several participants would be leaving the meeting to attend the signing later in the day and that President Obama would appreciate having tribal leadership at the table.

Dr. Hanson had just returned from speaking on tribal sovereignty at a United Nations (U.N.) meeting, where there was a focus on indigenous women from a global perspective. A Task Force member said that tribes have traditionally not had a seat at the table in the U.N. because they have separate governments. Because they have had no voice in these settings, it was fitting that Dr. Hanson carried their message in the world arena. Dr. Hanson planned to post her comments on the OVW [website](#) and said she will continue to carry the torch. She also noted the productive conversation that took place in Oklahoma at last year's Annual VAW Tribal Consultation.

Dr. Hanson explained that the Reauthorization of [VAWA 2005](#), Title IX, Section 904(a), directs the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), in consultation with OVW, to conduct studies of violence against Indian women in Indian Country. The legislation consists of three major research components: (1) the prevalence and nature of violence against Indian women, including domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and murder<sup>1</sup>; (2) evaluation of the effectiveness of federal, state, tribal, and local responses to violence against Indian women; and (3) recommendations to improve the effectiveness of such responses. The Task Force was appointed to move this important work forward and influence Federal Government decision-making. She explained that the intent of the current meeting was to focus on process, not specific recommendations. The group will continue to have input after the meeting. She then introduced Dr. Greg Ridgeway and explained his role as the Acting Director of NIJ.

**Gregory Ridgeway, Ph.D.**  
*Acting Director, National Institute of Justice (NIJ)*

On behalf of NIJ, Dr. Ridgeway thanked the Task Force for its leadership and welcomed the federal members in attendance. He assured the Task Force members that their input on strengthening the program and moving it forward is essential. The forthcoming research outcomes will inform policy as well as new grant programs. As a scientist, Dr. Ridgeway said, he was drawn to the work of the Department by its across-the-board approach to objectivity, accuracy, and integrity. He noted that NIJ will need Task Force input to interpret and translate

---

<sup>1</sup> [VAWA 2013](#) mandates that 'trafficking' be added to the research program.

research findings. There will be an important translational step, which was a high priority for former NIJ Director John Laub. It is not enough to publish; new applications must be translated into the field. Task Force input will provide a feedback loop that will be incorporated into NIJ's work. Dr. Ridgeway thanked the group for their dedication to ending violence against women. He asked participants to introduce themselves.

## Reflections and Introductions

Task Force members attending in person and by telephone, as well as those representing OVW, NIJ, and other federal agencies, introduced themselves. Task Force members' biographical sketches are listed in Appendix A. All meeting participants are listed in Appendix B. DOJ participating staff and invited presenters' biographical sketches are listed in Appendix C.

### **Meeting Facilitator**

#### **Kelley Moulton, Ph.D.**

*Director, Gender, Health, and Justice Research Unit, University of Cape Town*

Dr. Kelley Moulton asked the Task Force to think about the report that will be developed after the December 2013 meeting, both during the current meeting and over the next few months. The proceedings were being recorded, so she asked participants to use their microphones. She explained that because this was a Federal Advisory Task Force, participation was limited to Task Force members only. Time was set aside for public comments for those who registered. However, no public comments were scheduled for either Day 1 or Day 2.

## Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) Management Overview

### **Catherine M. Poston**

*Attorney Advisor, OVW*

Ms. Poston explained the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) and the specific role of Federal Advisory Committees. They provide important opportunities for the public to weigh in and help shape policy in federal agencies. They have been in existence since the time of George Washington. Ms. Poston noted that at present, 1,000 committees exist. They give federal agencies diverse and wide-ranging advice on how to better perform their jobs. Their purpose is to give advice and make recommendations, not to engage in the operational decision-making of an agency. Their advice is not binding.

In 1972, this legislation formalized what had been an informal system of advice. FACA lays out the rules for establishing a Federal Advisory Committee. Members of the public who have expertise in a certain area are convened in a public setting, and the General Services Administration (GSA) monitors committee activities. Ms. Poston explained that "Federal Advisory Committee" is defined as any advisory group, with limited exceptions, that is established or utilized by a federal agency to obtain advice on government policy where the advice or recommendations are provided by the group and that has at least one member who is not a federal employee. These groups can be created only when they are essential to the performance of a duty or responsibility conveyed upon the Executive Branch by law. Department officials create a charter, and once it is approved, the head of the federal agency signs the charter. It is then signed by the GSA, which ensures that the committee will be beneficial to the government.

The committee's existence and scheduled meetings (For a copy of the agenda, see Appendix D) are announced in the *Federal Register* (see Appendix E) to accommodate public participation. After the charter goes to U.S. Congress, the committee can begin operations. Membership must be broad and diverse, with multiple points of view represented. This includes both private- and public-sector representation; members are appointed to serve from local, state, or tribal governments or private-sector organizations. They are designated to be representative members, which means they represent the views of their constituency (not personal views),

such as a victim's organization for a tribe. Members must be free from real or perceived conflicts of interest and should not have any special access to federal officials.

A Designated Federal Official (DFO) opens each meeting. Detailed minutes must be kept, and records that are available for contemporaneous public inspection must be maintained. There is, however, no set format for reports. Any report generated is an official government record. The group as a whole must reach consensus about all recommendations presented. And all issues must be debated in a public forum. This does not mean that offline conversations can't take place, but there can be no private voting or reaching of consensus outside of a public setting.

Every Federal Advisory Committee has a 2-year life, after which the overseeing government officials can decide whether the committee is still useful. This committee currently meets only once a year. If a committee has reached the end of its usefulness, the Attorney General can terminate it early or allow it to sunset. Every 2 years, an individual can be reappointed or another member appointed.

## Welcome

### Mary Lou Leary

*Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs*

Ms. Mary Lou Leary emphasized that the work of the Task Force is important to the Office of Justice Programs' (OJP's) mission. It contributes to a body of knowledge that informs practitioners and brings a perspective that those in Washington don't have. She said the issue of violence against women is a top priority for OJP, and she was happy that the legislation was being reenacted while the Task Force was in town.

OJP has a number of initiatives that address needs in AI and AN communities. The Department published a guidebook recently on how to prosecute domestic violence crimes in Indian Country. In December, at the 13<sup>th</sup> National Indian Nations Conference, OJP convened another Federal Advisory Task Force to address issues of sexual assault in Indian Country. Along with other federal agencies, OJP also is very involved in the implementation of the Tribal Law and Order Act (TLOA), and it has made tremendous progress since its passage. This legislation has given the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) the ability to collect valid statistics, and without such data, the parameters of the problem cannot be understood.

Ms. Leary closed by stating that translating research so that it's accessible to practitioners is an important obligation of OJP. She thanked the Task Force and said the information it contributes helps build the knowledge base about problems in Indian Country and informs collaborative work to solve these problems. Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) discussed some research issues of concern to her. She asked how they can grapple with the idea of colonization and gave examples of non-Indians committing violent crimes against Native American women. In one case, two white men abducted, sexually assaulted, and intended to murder a Native American woman on a reservation, but she escaped. This is the type of crime Section 904<sup>2</sup> of VAWA 2013 is intended to address. She also noted the habitual-offender provisions of VAWA, including the registry designed to help with notification. In some cases, those who commit crimes are banished or exiled from a reservation, but nothing

---

<sup>2</sup> Congress recently passed the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, or "VAWA 2013." VAWA 2013 recognizes tribes' inherent power to exercise "special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction" over certain defendants, regardless of their Indian or non-Indian status, who commit acts of domestic violence or dating violence or violate certain protection orders in Indian country. For more information go to: S. 47--113th Congress: Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013. (2013). In [www.GovTrack.us](http://www.govtrack.us). Retrieved June 26, 2013, from <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/113/s47>.

prevents them from moving to another reservation where their crimes are not known. They sometimes become repeat offenders, moving from one reservation to another. She remarked that this is an exciting time for research and she hoped these problems could be addressed.

Task Force member Juana Majel Dixon (Pauma Band of Mission Indians) cited her positive conversations with the Attorney General. She stated that with the passage of VAWA, more Native American women will come forward. Indian women will speak out in larger numbers. She asked what mechanism was in place to capture that information and disseminate it. In most cases, the information is communicated verbally, not in writing. She spoke with the Attorney General about how the practice of banishment for offenders does not prevent criminals from going from one reservation to another, and there is a responsibility to notify other tribes. Sometimes no one knows where a criminal has gone, or there is no communication with other tribes. It's important to coordinate responses to these cases, she said.

Dr. Moulton thanked the participants and said there would be time to discuss additional issues later in the day.

## **American Indian and Alaska Native People in the 2010 NISVS Survey**

**André Rosay, Ph.D.**

*Visiting Executive Research Fellow, NIJ*

Dr. André Rosay provided preliminary updates and findings on violence and victimization rates of self-identified AI and AN men and women from a nationally representative sample of self-identified AI and AN men and women using the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) that offers the most comprehensive overview on the prevalence of violence and includes both lifetime and past year measures. NIJ provided funding to CDC to collect this oversample in 2010. This study was conducted using a random digit dial (RDD) telephone survey that includes a random sample of self-identified AI and AN men and women in the U.S. who are 18 years or older, and in geographic areas where it has been reported by the U.S. Census Bureau that there is a high AI and AN population. When completed, this study will provide the best representation of self-identified AI and AN people living in the U.S. than is currently available.

At the time of this presentation, Dr. Rosay was still in the process of determining the best weighting methodology. He noted some limitations of NISVS: it excluded people without telephones, those who do not speak English or Spanish, and those who do not live in a residence (e.g., jail/prison, group home, shelters). Further, it used national averages, which mask important differences such as geography or age. He cautioned that the estimates provided were conservative because of the continuing stigma associated with disclosing victimization, especially when talking to a stranger on the telephone. He also listed several advantages of NISVS: It's the best available survey for estimating violence and victimization rates because the questions are behaviorally specific and avoid legal definitions (e.g., assault); it avoids terms such as victims or survivors; and all blame is attributed to the perpetrators. It also has a strong research protocol.

Dr. Rosay emphasized that these data were preliminary and should not be disseminated. In his presentation he addressed only one area of the survey—physical and sexual violence by intimate partners as reported by participants. “Physical violence” by intimate partners was defined as being slapped, pushed, or shoved. The survey did not ask whether sex was consensual. “Severe physical violence” included such experiences as being hit with a fist or something hard, kicked, slammed, choked, suffocated, attacked with a knife or gun, or beaten or burned.

The measures of sexual violence are more complicated. One broad measure includes all forms of sexual violence; another addresses whether there was penetration or attempted penetration. “Completed forced penetration” is defined as vaginal or anal sex whether performed or received. “Attempted forced penetration” means force was used, but sex did not occur. “Completed alcohol/drug facilitated penetration” includes vaginal, anal, and oral sex. It is not limited to romantic or sexual partners.

“Other sexual violence” is defined as the number of people with whom the individual had vaginal, oral, or anal sex because they were coerced, told lies, or worn down repeatedly with the use of influence or authority. The survey also asked about being shown exposed body parts or being made to look at sexual photos. In the future, other estimates will be made available concerning stalking, psychological aggression, control of reproductive health, and possibly abuse against elders.

The next steps are to develop final estimates, write a summary report, peer review the report, and publish and disseminate the results. Dr. Rosay expressed thanks to the people who told their stories. He said the researchers were committed to share these stories accurately and in a respectful way.

In response to a Task Force member’s question, Dr. Rosay said the interviewers are trained to be sensitive to the interviewees. They learn to recognize signs of distress, such as the tone of voice or speaking more quickly or slowly. In these cases, the interviews are stopped and the individuals are asked whether they want to continue. There are some questions during which the interview is always stopped and the interviewer assesses whether the person should continue participation. He observed that distress rarely occurs during the survey; most people want their stories to be told. He also noted that interviewers can directly transfer people to national hotlines for support and local resources, and all participants are provided with access to other resources. The researchers paid significant attention to the safety of the respondents.

## **NIJ’s Violence Against Indian Women in Indian Country Research Program: A Roadmap to the Present Day (Part I)**

**Christine R. Crossland**

*Senior Social Science Analyst, National Institute of Justice (NIJ)*

**Jane E. Palmer**

*Research Associate, NIJ*

Ms. Crossland and Dr. Palmer provided an update on NIJ’s Violence Against Indian Women (VAIW) research program since 2006. The program includes two components:

1. Primary data collection in Indian Country (i.e., Phase I, VAIW Pilot Study and Phase II, National Baseline Study); and
2. Other primary and secondary data collection and analysis efforts.

To provide a legislative context to this research, Ms. Crossland described the Violence Against Women Act of 2005. [Public Law No. 109-162, Title IX, Section 904\(a\)](#) mandates that NIJ conduct a National Baseline Study (NBS) “to examine violence against Indian women in Indian country.” The statute requires an examination of “(i) domestic violence; (ii) dating violence; (iii) sexual assault; (iv) stalking; and (v) murder.” The law also requires an evaluation component that assesses the effectiveness of federal, state, tribal, and local responses to violence against Indian women, as well as recommendations to improve the process. The overall program is guided by the Federal Advisory Task Force, which includes representatives from tribal governments, national tribal domestic and sexual violence nonprofit organizations, and other national tribal organizations. The first

Federal Advisory Task Force served from March 2008 to March 2010; the current Task Force members have been serving since April 2010.

Foundation activities of NIJ's program of research began with developing a systematic matrix of research and evaluation studies, methods, and statistics, followed by an inventory of data systems at all levels of government. Staff conducted outreach to federal, state, and tribal agencies and partners. NIJ then commissioned the VAIW report, "[Violence Against American Indian and Alaska Native Women and the Criminal Justice Response: What Is Known](#)." NIJ also commissioned a [Bureau of Justice Statistics/Justice Research and Statistical Association Statistical Analysis Centers report](#), which is available on the NIJ website.

In 2009, a research and evaluation workshop was held with a number of research experts to gather feedback on NIJ's proposed research program. Shortly thereafter, a Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued to secure a research team to work with NIJ on pilot activities. RTI International was the recipient of that contract. NIJ also commissioned a report with the Census Bureau to look at sample size and cost estimates for the National Baseline Study. At the same time, oversample data collection began using CDC's NISVS as part of the 2010 general population study data collection effort. Related intramural studies included the examination of Executive Office for United States Attorneys' Legal Information Office Network System (EOUSA/LIONs) data and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) case management data.

In 2010, NIJ and RTI research staff began questionnaire development and testing for the NBS pilot, conducted cognitive interviews, developed research protocols and training materials, and initiated the primary data collection mechanism. It was a long process, but ultimately, approval by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) was received in 2011. In 2011, pilot sites were agreed on, and tribal resolutions and agreements were put in place. Extensive outreach was conducted at all sites with each tribe involved. The researchers established the foundation of a long-term relationship with individuals in the sites. They recruited, hired, and trained interviewers and interpreters and began pilot data collection, processing, analysis, report writing, and dissemination of findings.

In 2012, the pilot study was completed and OMB was briefed. Also in 2012 the second research and evaluation workshop was convened by NIJ, which coincided with a critical juncture in the development of the program of research and involved a select group of prominent researchers and experts in the area of violence against women, AI and AN research and evaluation, public health and public safety in Indian Country, and experts on conducting research in Indian Country. The group has provided input on sampling strategies, instrumentation, analytic strategies within the context of balancing cultural sensitivity, and scientific rigor of such methods. Also in 2012, NIJ Visiting Executive Research Fellow Andrè Rosay began work on analyzing the NISVS AI and AN study data. In addition, NBS sampling meetings and discussions took place, as well as review and refinement of NBS instrumentation and initiation of the Federal and Tribal Response to Violence Against Women in Indian Country Study.

Ms. Crossland provided some context to the pilot study by explaining key decision points, with some explanatory notes. She discussed the following:

- *What is the unit of analysis?* Tribally enrolled or self-identified AI and AN adult women, or both.
- Need to *crosswalk* to other national studies while remaining culturally relevant and appropriate (e.g., Alaska State Victimization Study, CDC's NISVS, and BJS' National Crime Victimization Survey).
- *What is the best survey mode?* Pen/paper, telephone, Computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI), Audio computer-assisted self-interviewing (ACASI), etc.
- *Sampling frame, plan, and method:* Different sampling methods were tested in the pilot.

- *Burden on the respondents*: Length of questionnaire, topics covered, level of detail.
- *English-only instrument versus multiple translations*: Decisions on translators, interpreters, and multiple survey instruments.

### Pilot Study Goal

The goal of the pilot study was to test a survey that would increase understanding of the experiences of AI and AN women living on tribal communities, including:

- Their opinions about safety issues in their communities;
- Their experiences with violence;
- The kinds of support available to them; and
- Their opinions about police, courts, prosecutors, and service providers.

The original data collection submission to OMB requested three full-scale studies at three different geographical locations. However, OMB and NIJ agreed that three separate pilot studies focusing on different factors of the study's methods would be more beneficial. Therefore, Site #1 looked at sampling techniques, Site #2 was a full-scale study (nuts to bolts), and Site #3 conducted cognitive interviews of select portions of the NBS pilot survey.

With the completion of data analysis and report generation, the pilot study provided considerably more knowledge, tools, experience, and methods to coordinate and field the larger baseline study. Ms. Crossland noted that NIJ has:

- Created and pilot-tested a survey instrument with women who self-reported as AI or AN and reside on recognized tribal lands in the United States.
- Developed and tested a study method, including different sampling strategies and data collection approaches that enable the safe collection of data and analysis of results, which can be generalized to AI and AN women aged 18 or over residing on tribal lands.
- Worked collaboratively with tribal and local contacts to implement the pilot study at three sites. Pilot study data collection began in fall 2011 and was completed in winter 2012.

### Sampling Frames for Indian Country

Methods examined for sampling AI and AN women included preexisting lists, such as tribal enrollment lists, tribal census lists, tribal address/housing lists, and U.S. Census rolls. Convenience sampling was also considered. Methods for creating sampling frames included identifying and enumerating dwelling units or households using counting and listing and enumerating households using map-based methods. All of these approaches required local tribal buy-in and permission, true partnerships and collaborations with the local communities, and special consideration for cultural sensitivities. There was acknowledgement of tribal sovereignty; permission of the tribal administrator/council; tribal resolutions; Memorandums of Understanding or Memorandums of Agreement (MOU/MOAs); and local, onsite staff.

The advantages and disadvantages of using a preexisting tribal list to sample women are:

- Some screening (e.g., 18+, female, living on the reservation) is often possible.
- Randomly sampling from the list is often straightforward.
- This is a tested and proven method, although not necessarily in Indian Country.



However, researchers do not know how many tribes will not be able or willing to share their lists. And they do not know how accurate, current, or complete various tribal lists will be.

The advantages and disadvantages of using convenience sampling to select women are:

- It is often easy and efficient to carry out.
- It allows researchers to collect information that could be difficult to collect from a probability-based sample.

The resulting sample, however, is often not representative and can suffer from a number of sources of bias. It is often not ideal for collecting data from large samples.

Counting and listing involves driving around predefined areas and routes and identifying, describing, and counting households. The advantages and disadvantages of using this method to create sampling frames are:

- Coverage is often nearly complete, although not necessarily in Indian Country.
- Data are relatively current.
- Randomly sampling households from the resulting list is often straightforward.
- This is a tested and proven method, although not necessarily in Indian Country.

However:

- It is not known how many tribes will approve of this method.
- It is labor-intensive and expensive.
- Characteristics of residents remain relatively unknown.
- It can be invasive.

The advantages and disadvantages of using map-based methods to create sampling frames are:

- It is very efficient, and boundaries are often marked clearly; however,
  - Age, accuracy, and quality of maps and photos can be a problem.
  - Characteristics of residents remain relatively unknown.
  - Researchers do not know how many tribes will approve of using aerial photographs, regardless of their source.
  - They do not know how valid this method is for creating frames.

Each method of sampling women and creating sampling frames in Indian country has distinct advantages and disadvantages. Site-specific considerations about logistics and preferences for and concerns related to methods will dictate what is possible and appropriate in a given community. Decisions about which method is most appropriate should be based on collaboration with, approval from, and the preferences of tribal communities, as well as goals related to scientific rigor and validity.

### Pilot Study: Pilot Site #1

For the NBS, it is understood that some tribes will not be willing to share their tribal enrollment lists, so researchers needed another option. The purpose of pilot site #1 was to test the viability of using a new sampling method—i.e., a map-based approach to obtain a random sample of women on reservation lands. Two independent household enumeration activities were conducted whereby researchers:

- Used an innovative, map-based approach to identify and enumerate all household units in a predefined area of the reservation; and

- Traveled to the predefined area and worked with tribal partners to undertake more traditional counting and listing.

The goals were to test the scientific robustness, the burden to infrastructure, and the cost of each approach. Where appropriate, researchers considered an approach that could combine elements of both designs for maximum efficiency. The typical method of randomly selecting households is through “counting and listing.” A team of researchers drives down every street and writes down information about every dwelling to create a complete list. This process is labor intensive and could be perceived as invasive. An alternative method to counting and listing is for researchers to use aerial photographs and maps to randomly select households. However, just as some tribes will not share enrollment lists, some will not approve of aerial photographs. In addition, it is expensive, and the accuracy and quality of maps and photographs is sometimes a problem. The maps include streets, block boundaries, tract boundaries, hydrography from the 2010 TIGER files (U.S. Census Bureau), and reservation boundaries from the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Geographic Data Service Center (GDSC). For the pilot study, aerial photographs came from an Internet image service provided by BING from May 2010 to March 2011.

### ***Creating Sampling Frames: Counting and Listing Versus Map-Based Activities***

NIJ an RTI research staff partnered with a tribal community to compare counting and listing with map-based methods. They obtained all necessary approvals from the IRB and the tribe, including two tribal resolutions and a letter of approval from the tribal administrator. The tribe was interested in helping with the pilot and national study as well as future research efforts. Maps and other documents were made available to the tribe, which could help inform outreach and service delivery activities in the future. Dr. Palmer displayed a map of one area for counting and listing, a map/photograph of one area for map-based methods, and a zoomed-in map/photograph of part of one area for map-based methods.

To conduct counting and listing, a small team of RTI and NIJ staff traveled to a reservation, met with tribal representatives, and conducted counting and listing activities with a tribal member. Map-based methods were conducted by separate staff at RTI, who studied maps and aerial photographs of the same three non-contiguous areas of the reservation to identify and enumerate households.

The counting and listing activities resulted in 223 households across three areas. Map-based sampling resulted in 220 households across the same areas. The reasons for the three-household (1.35 percent) discrepancy between counting and listing and map-based results are that two houses were not visible in the aerial photographs due to smoke or cloud cover and one house counted through counting and listing was clearly outside the reservation boundary, according to the maps and aerial photographs.

Counting and listing results from two areas were shared with the tribal enrollment office to compare results to the tribal enrollment list. It was determined that 84 of 98 houses enumerated had at least 1 enrolled member. Of these 84 houses, 62 included at least 1 enrolled woman 18 years old or older.

The conclusions from comparison of the methods are that map-based methods for creating sampling frames of households in Indian Country seem sufficiently valid, were tested in an area with substantial tree cover, and have the advantage of being able to determine whether households are within or outside reservation boundaries. Caveats are that the test was conducted on only part of one reservation, so results could vary in terms of representativeness by tribe, reservation, geography, housing density, quality of aerial photographs, season, or other factors. Also, this technique requires specific software and skills that can be costly, and this method doesn't address transiency issues.

There are several implications for future research studies. With tribal consent, this new, innovative sampling technique could be valuable in conducting studies of tribal households. The maps also can be useful for tribal administration and community services, can help identify areas where services are needed, and can be used to verify tribal enrollment or tribal census data.

### **Pilot Study: Pilot Site #2**

Pilot site #2 was a small, full-scale pilot test of all components of a field-based data collection study, including:

- Recruiting, hiring, and training a local Native American research coordinator and four Indian women field interviewers (FIs);
- Randomly sampling potential respondents from a tribal enrollment list;
- Recruiting American Indian women living in the tribal community who are at least 18 years of age to participate in the study;
- Administering the interview in a public, yet private location; and
- Conducting debriefings with respondents and pilot staff.

FIs were able to complete 33 interviews.

NIJ hired a local, onsite research coordinator who knew the community, council members, language, and customs. Researchers recruited, hired, and trained four local Native American women to be field interviewers based on tribal council preference. The individuals had to be trusted and respected by the community.

Everyone, including local tribal service support staff, participated in a 3½-day training conducted by RTI staff, tribal research consultants, and NIJ project staff. There was not enough time to cover everything needed; in the future, 5 days will be allotted for training. The following topics were covered: the history/background of NIJ's Violence Against Indian Women (VAIW) program of research; the pilot study and previous studies; data collection design and scheduling; human subjects training; conflicts of interest; the role/responsibilities of FIs; laptop training on CAPI/ACASI and practice sessions; survey question review; data security and transmission; initial respondent contact and gaining cooperation; administrative and logistics discussions (e.g., sample, recruitment, interview schedule and locations, child care/transportation issues); recognizing vicarious trauma; and self-care guidance for field staff. The method of delivery combined lecture, group discussion, practice interviews, paired mock interviews, and mock recruitment activities.

Study outreach and recruitment involved several tribal council discussions regarding access, study protocols, and logistics. An article about the study had been published in the local monthly tribal newsletter 1 month before the study took place. Immediately following training, a 2-day intensive door-to-door recruitment process was conducted in pairs (FIs and the research coordinator) to schedule interviews. Researchers brought a letter of introduction signed by the Tribal Chair and the NIJ Director and a copy of the newsletter article. A call-back card with the telephone number of project staff was left if no one was home.

The interviews were conducted in two public places with private interview rooms. Participants selected the location and time, and researchers offered child care, if needed. Behavioral health specialists were on call in case participants or FIs needed them.

### ***Sampling From a Tribal Enrollment List***

The local tribal coordinator secured permission from the tribal council so researchers could randomly sample potential respondents from a tribal enrollment list. The list was only available for sampling purposes and only to the tribal representative working on the study and essential research staff. The research team worked out

sampling procedures, resulting in a subset of enrolled women who were at least 18 years of age. The team determined the necessary sampling rate to arrive at a random sample of 140 women:

- They selected a random start and sampled every  $n^{\text{th}}$  woman ( $n=140$ ).
- One hundred out of 140 women were selected randomly to be included in data collection.
- The remaining random 40 women were put in a reserve sample.

### **Survey Mode and Content**

The mode was a combination of Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) and Audio Computer-Assisted Self-Interviewing (ACASI). CAPI is interviewer administered. A field interviewer reads questions to the respondent and enters responses into the laptop. ACASI, the self-administered approach, allowed respondents to see questions on the laptop screen and hear the questions read to them through audio headphones. Participants entered their answers directly into the computer using a touch screen. The voice recordings were created by a female American Indian member of the project team.

Computer-Assisted Recorded Interviewing (CARI) allowed laptops to be programmed to randomly record sections of the interview for quality-control purposes when permission was granted from participants. Neither the FI nor the respondent knew when the recording was occurring.

The survey content included:

- Respondent characteristics
- Health & Wellness
- Community crime and safety
- Psychological aggression
- Coercive control and entrapment
- Physical violence
- Sexual violence
- Perpetrator characteristics
- Stalking
- Impact of victimization
- Service needs, service seeking, and utilization
- Reporting victimization
- Attitudes toward law enforcement
- Community strengths
- Debriefing questions

Other items used in the pilot study instrument were:

- Depression: Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale, 10-item version (CES-D)
  - Post-traumatic stress: Veterans Administration Primary Care Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Screen (PC-PTSD)
  - Public safety attitudes: British Crime Survey (BCS)
  - Impact of victimization: Indian Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS)
  - Reporting: British Crime Survey (BCS), Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Survey
  - Perceptions of the criminal justice system: British Crime Survey (BCS)
  - Cultural and spiritual identity: Indian Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS), Copper River Women's Experiences Survey (CRWES), Anishnaabek Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grants Cultural Assessment (ASSCA)
  - Historical trauma: Copper River Women's Experiences Survey (CRWES)
  - Social support and community cohesion (ASSCA, Glynn/Naser & Julian)
  - Perceptions of social and health services: Copper River Women's Experiences Survey (CRWES)
- New items were created for some constructs, including:
- Identifying tribal and village affiliation

- Access to communication and transportation resources
- Service need, seeking, receipt, and satisfaction
- Future reporting intentions
- Awareness of various law enforcement and criminal justice entities in the community
- Opinions on how to better meet the needs of women who experience violence in the community

### **Results**

In all, 33 interviews were completed over a 3-week period (it was extended by 1 week due to weather issues). There were no adverse events. The researchers received positive feedback from participants concerning the mode, survey content, and length. Essential feedback and recommendations were received from site research staff (i.e., the coordinator and FIs) and the tribal council. Lessons learned included: the importance of combining Western and traditional approaches and information-sharing in training and using culturally appropriate and/or site-specific protocols based on culture and social perceptions. Also important was a training module on respondent distress and vicarious trauma and self-care guidance for all study staff. The research team also noted many cultural norms that could affect interview administration (e.g., physical position relative to the respondent, amount of eye contact, silence, “check-ins” with respondent, reading pace, vocal tone), as well as culturally sensitive ways to handle respondent distress.

Recruitment relied on a local onsite research coordinator who was a known, respected, and trusted member of the community and well acquainted with regional customs. Native American field interviewers were preferred, particularly local or non-local FIs to ensure confidentiality. Concerning interview location, some public places can have stigmas attached to them, as was learned from the local staff. The interviewees preferred public areas with private rooms (e.g., community centers, tribal offices, library, health clinic). The researchers provided local and national resources and referral materials. The fielding period was customized based on local activities (e.g., ceremonies, holidays, fishing/hunting season, weather). Transportation and child care were provided to and from interview locations. Daily or frequent debriefing sessions with the FIs were critical.

Participant feedback was collected in a series of questions at the end of the interviews. The field interviewers also completed a daily journal. Task Force member Rachell Tenorio (Santo Domingo Pueblo) asked what was done with the data collected during this process. Ms. Crossland explained the data were and are being used for testing the instrument measurements and that actual counts would not be disseminated. The purpose of the study was explained to the tribe and the tribe knew this specific data collection effort focused on the “methods,” not estimates. That said, NIJ staff member Jane Palmer did share some of the aggregate information concerning help-seeking with the Tribal Council, Tribal Chairman, and community service providers.

### **Pilot Study: Pilot Site #3**

This site was used for the following purpose: to cognitively test select portions of the survey instrument and consent form (i.e., do they make sense?); to collect information about confidentiality issues (e.g., understanding of the language used and length of informed consent); the potential for telescoping on the 12-month estimates (i.e., how respondents placed victimization experiences in time by testing past 12-month versus lifetime victimization recall); and respondent concerns and feedback about survey language/questions. Other purposes were to determine respondent preferences for interview locations, data collection mode, interviewer characteristics, and the need for an interpreter.

In the convenience sample of women, the researchers worked with local contacts in multiple sites to recruit women to participate in cognitive interviews. Most of the contacts were service providers in the community.

Contacts recruited women they knew, distributed flyers, and asked others to spread the word. Many, though not all, of the women who participated in cognitive interviewing had a history of victimization.

Cognitive interviews were conducted with Native American women at least 18 years of age in several different regions of the country (the lower 48 states and Alaska, including a regional “hub” town<sup>3</sup> and three nearby villages). The first round was conducted in 2010 (N=9). The second round was conducted in 2012 (N=17) where participants were administered an abbreviated questionnaire using CAPI/ACASI, with interviews taking about 90 minutes each. Native American interpreters (bilingual/bicultural) were hired for the 2012 data collection effort to be available as needed and to debrief with respondents.

The major findings were that researchers should shorten and simplify the consent language and reduce the reading level of all materials (from 8<sup>th</sup> grade to 4<sup>th</sup> grade), as there were Native American language and English language conversion issues. It was better to use an interpreter than translate the instrument into all local languages. Individual question wording refinements were needed for the directionality and positive wording of questions because if the questions were negatively worded, participants had difficulty understanding the questions. Other findings were that interpreters are essential for all interviews, respondents are comfortable using laptops, and respondents prefer using ACASI for answering the more sensitive questions in the survey rather than answering those questions directly to the interviewer.

The researchers also explored how people cognitively identify whether something occurred within the last 12 months. That is, were respondents accurately including (or not including) behaviors that happened in the past 12 months in their reporting? The concern was that respondents might include behaviors that happened outside the 12-month reference period. This “telescoping” might occur if the reference period is not effectively bounded (i.e., given a reference point, such as before or after an event). Telescoping is a memory error in the temporal placement of events. Someone remembers that an event happened but might think it happened closer to the present than it actually did. The pilot study was not able to undertake the ideal testing method because it is a cross-sectional study. An alternative method was used: Participants were asked questions about their lifetime and past 12-month experiences with psychologically aggressive and physically violent behaviors. When reporting a behavior (either lifetime or past 12 months), they were asked how they arrived at their answer. The revised protocol was to ask if two other anchoring methods would be more helpful in correctly recalling past-12-month experiences. These were either the month/year (e.g., March 2011) or identifying a personal event (such as a birthday, anniversary, or other event that stood out for the respondent) that happened one year previously.

In all cases, it was clear to the respondents whether the event was recent or took place a long time ago. No one reported a victimization occurring near the 12-month time period (that is, victimization was either far in the past or more recent, such as in the past few weeks or months). Given that no participants reported victimization occurring *near* the 12-month time period, researchers were not able to test for telescoping. They do not believe that it is possible to make a sufficient evaluation of potential telescoping and bounding effects in the questionnaire at this time as this effort was intended as a pilot from which researchers would learn, not an ongoing data collection. The goal was to capture both 12-month and lifetime victimization because of the importance of understanding child sexual abuse and its potential impact on later violence victimization.

---

<sup>3</sup> Hub refers to a service/commercial center often a centrally located village or town that has grown to include support services for surrounding villages.

### ***Pilot Study Key Findings***

There were many unknowns at the outset, because a study of this type has not been done in Indian Country. NIJ now has considerable more knowledge, tools, experience, and methods to coordinate and field a larger study (i.e., the National Baseline Study) as mandated by VAWA 2005. Areas of learning included sampling options, survey content and mode, and study protocols (e.g., training, recruitment for interviewers, interpreters, respondents).

Certain key components were found to be necessary. Researchers must rely on consultants with strong tribal community connections and long-term relationships to make initial and ongoing contact with tribal officials. Regular conference calls are important and, when possible or necessary, in-person meetings. It's important to obtain tribal resolutions and/or MOUs/MOAs at all locations so that everyone is aware of what the researchers are doing. The research team tried to avoid "helicopter" science as much as possible by establishing and maintaining long-term relationships.

The lessons learned to date relate to:

- Marrying Western-oriented, science-based research methods with traditional and culturally appropriate practices.
- Ensuring that research methods are respectful of tribal sovereignty, customs, and traditions.
- Local coordination and buy-in with tribal councils and tribal members is needed and hiring local research coordinators, interviewers, and interpreters is part of the buy-in.
- Ensuring collaboration and true tribal partnerships—i.e., constant contact concerning what's going on and when to expect things.
- Total transparency at all times.
- Be flexibility.
- Do no harm.

Lessons learned specifically about data collection are:

- Hiring local or non-local AI or AN field interviewers should be determined by each tribal nation.
- Respondents must be allowed some anonymity.
- Understanding of the local Native language and customs is critical.
- Clear conflict of interest and confidentiality policies must be in place (e.g., mandatory reporting laws).
- Field interviewers require local, community-specific support, likely in the form of an onsite supervisor from a tribal designee, although this person could be a member of the research team.
- An onsite supervisor is critical to ensure a smooth data collection process.
- Transportation and/or child care for respondents should be worked out well when scheduling interviews.

Lessons learned about the survey were:

- It is important to obtain additional information from stakeholders about the optimal and most analytically useful way to ask for tribal and village affiliation. This includes AI and AN adult women and enrolled members (current residency versus actual tribal affiliation).
- The need to further explore the analytic importance and operational methods to best capture changes in residency, such as mobility of residents and when events occurred in time (on or off the reservation), because this is related to jurisdictional issues in the criminal justice systems.
- In-person interpretation of the survey questions (as needed) by local interpreters offers a viable alternative to translating the questionnaire into several languages, which is cost-prohibitive.

Instrument areas requiring further refinement include:

- Respondent characteristics, such as enrollment, tribal affiliation, and mobility/transiency.
- Health and wellness.
- Help-seeking behavior.
- Attitudes toward law enforcement.
- Law enforcement response.
- Community strengths.

Ms. Crossland thanked the consultants in the pilot study, including Ms. Ada Pecos Melton, President/Owner of American Indian Development Associates; Dr. Michelle Chino, Professor of Environmental and Occupational Health at the University of Nevada Las Vegas; and Dr. André Rosay, Director of the Justice Center at the University of Alaska Anchorage. She also thanked RTI International VAIW pilot project staff; NIJ VAIW project staff; other NIJ and DOJ colleagues; and other federal, state, and tribal partners, the Native American field interviewers, interpreters, and participants in the pilot study.

### ***Overview of the Federal and Tribal Response to Violence Against Women in Indian Country Study***

**Alison Brooks**

*Research Associate, NIJ*

Ms. Alison Brooks explained that because available records and data systems were insufficient, NIJ staff chose to conduct interviews to obtain information for this study. The study's overall purposes are to improve law enforcement, prosecution, and judicial responses (including interagency coordination and communication); to strengthen training and outreach efforts; to build victims' trust in law enforcement; to encourage reporting of victimization; and to hold offenders accountable for crimes against Indian women. The researchers conducted face-to-face interviews with law enforcement representatives from a spectrum of agencies and organizations: Federal employees involved in responding to crimes in Indian Country; Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Supervisory and Special Agents (Federal 1811); Criminal Investigators (detectives of locals-638), BIA Police Officer/Tribal Police (638); FBI Supervisory and Special Agents; U.S. Attorneys and Assistant U.S. Attorneys (AUSA); tribal liaisons; and victim specialist personnel from the BIA, FBI, and U.S. Attorney's Office (USAO). Participants were asked about their current practices in the field, the challenges they face, and promising practices that others might benefit from.

The following domains shaped the types of interview questions asked:

- **Context:** How do perspectives differ in different levels or units, such as agency perspective, staff-level perspective, and laws in place at various locations?
- **Case Processing:** What is the typical case processing path for cases of violence against women in each locality?
- **Agency Roles and Collaboration:** How does the jurisdictional context affect tribal and federal responses to violence against American Indian women?
- **Interagency Communication:** How common is consultation between the investigating agent (e.g., FBI, BIA) and the AUSAs during the investigation stage?
- **Incident Tracking:** What formal policies are in place for documenting case initiation and response practices by law enforcement and prosecutors?
- **Aggregate Reporting:** How can reporting systems and protocols be improved to better meet the needs of law enforcement and prosecutors?



- **Staff Training:** What professional development training is provided to federal staff with regard to working in Indian Country and responding to VAIW?
- **Community and Victim Outreach:** What community initiatives or outreach efforts are federal agencies involved in related to VAIW, including efforts to prevent violence and increase reporting in a timely manner?
- **Vicarious Trauma:** How are staff members personally affected by the nature of their work?

### ***Federal and Tribal Response to Violence Against Women in Indian Country Study: Cognitive Testing***

RTI and NIJ researchers started work in 2009 and NIJ staff completed the interviews in 2011. NIJ drafted research questions and interview guides, established codes and themes, and, in 2011, began cognitively testing the instrument with multiple Indian Country experts and stakeholders. They piloted a revised instrument at two Indian Country trainings in August and September 2012, making clear that participation was voluntary and confidential. There was a team of two interviewers; no recording device was used. Respondents' identities were kept confidential. They were interviewed in secure, private, quiet rooms for 60 to 90 minutes.

Concerning recruitment, purposive sampling was conducted in a non-random manner. The selection of cases was made to reflect the following relevant characteristics:

- Assigned to or working in Indian Country
- New employees and veteran staff
- Supervisory and non-supervisory staff
- Men and women
- Geographic diversity

There was an excellent, positive response to recruitment efforts; NIJ staff interviewed 15 participants initially. Ms. Brooks noted that the researchers didn't have enough time to interview everyone who wanted to participate. There was diversity in the respondents' regions of the country and their professional positions.

Full-study implementation began in January 2013. Data collection is expected to be complete in May 2013. The goal is to conduct approximately 50 to 60 interviews; about 40 have been completed to date. A report is expected in 2013, with the hope that the recommendations in the study can soon go out to people in the field.

### ***Sample Preliminary Findings***

Preliminary findings concerning law enforcement (BIA and FBI):

- Relationships with other entities/agencies (FBI, BIA, tribes, USAO) vary by location and tribe and can affect case processing. The researchers will be trying to tease out how these relationships affect case processing in future interviews.
- More FBI Agents/AUSAs are needed to work in Indian Country.
- Most training on Indian Country happens on the ground. Many people don't see the reality of their jobs until they get in the field, and there's not much training before starting the position.
- Improvements in medical care for victims are needed—e.g., there is limited Indian Health Service (IHS) hours and a lack of nurses trained as Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners (SANEs).

Preliminary findings concerning Assistant U.S. Attorneys:

- Depending on the office, AUSAs may have more formal or informal relationships with tribal entities, the FBI, and BIA.
- AUSAs with informal relationships may be in more frequent contact with investigators.
- The effectiveness of investigators/AUSAs depends on whether they want to work in Indian Country.
- The attorney's case management system (i.e., LIONS database) is not user-friendly; it's hard to tell how many Indian Country cases are in the system.

Preliminary findings concerning victim specialists (FBI, BIA/Department of Interior [DOI]) and victim-witness staff at USAO:

- There are large caseloads, and specialists sometimes work on both Indian Country and non-Indian Country cases.
- Many crimes do not come to the attention of law enforcement/prosecutors, which will be explored in future interviews.
- Distance can make it hard to facilitate services for victims; they might have to drive 2 hours or more.
- Need more personnel and more training on Native American culture and on vicarious trauma.

Preliminary findings from tribal representatives (prosecutors, law enforcement, victim specialists):

- IHS lacks the resources to conduct sexual assault exams. One respondent said their IHS has several SANE-certified nurses, but they don't have the equipment or policies in place to conduct the exams, so the victims have to be driven several hours for an exam.
- They need better resources to collect and store evidence. A dedicated police officer could act as an evidence technician; better evidence storage facilities are needed.
- There is a lack of cooperation and collaboration between federal and tribal agencies.

Ms. Brooks clarified that the interviews addressed both obstacles and promising practices. Ms. Crossland stated that NIJ hopes to use what was learned to immediately influence policy and practice. They will be presenting best practices in the next couple of months.

***Next Steps for the National Baseline Study (NBS)***

Ms. Crossland first noted that additional fine-tuning of the NBS survey instrument was needed and she asked the Task Force to provide input. She also said that a new research team would soon begin work on the project, but she could not yet disclose that information at the time of presentation. The Task Force will meet them at the next meeting. She noted that OMB approval can take 9 to 18 months and data collection will take several years. In sum, the NIJ NBS research program is moving forward and will take place from 2013 through 2017.

In the meantime, Ms. Brooks will be finishing the *Federal and Tribal Response to Violence Against Women in Indian Country Study*, and Dr. Rosay will continue to analyze the NISVS data to obtain lifetime prevalence of interpersonal and sexual violence of self-identified AI and AN men and women living in the U.S. NIJ also will further investigate federal, state, local, and tribal data. Ms. Crossland said they were interested in evaluating promising programs too and asked the Task Force to inform them if they are aware of any that should be considered. NIJ also intends to finish all partnership studies with the FBI and EOUSA by year's end.

## Discussion

Ms. Crossland clarified that telephones will not be used in the NBS study going forward, so the issue of cell phones versus land lines will not arise.

Task Force members expressed concerns about the fact that English is not the first language of some tribes. Ms. Crossland said local interpreters appear to be the best solution; materials can't be developed in 40+ languages because of the study's budget. Therefore, individuals will be asked up front if they want/need an interpreter, and that practice will be built into the protocol. She emphasized how much was learned about the local communities by working with interpreters. Dr. Palmer agreed, and said the interpreters were essential. She noted that because people know one another in small communities, consent must be granted for the interpreter to be present if it is someone who is known. For some women, it was helpful to have a friendly face in the room; in other cases, they may be uncomfortable. She said these adjustments can be made on a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Crossland also said it was important to have an onsite research coordinator who knew the cultural norms. For example, they did not knock on the door in some communities because that is a sign of bad news. Because of these differing norms, it's important to have a community profile ahead of time. The researchers did not plan to interview people in their homes. They went to public and private settings that did not create suspicion, such as libraries. However, certain places had a stigma attached to them and it was important not to go to those places.

Also, it was learned that some respondents had concerns about going to local service providers that they or their families knew. Therefore, it was important to have national resources available. Additionally they looked at community schedules before going out, so they knew what activities people would be engaged in. For example, in Alaska, they didn't go out during the summer months because of the fishing season.

### ***Refinement and Field Implementation of the Tribal Study of Public Safety and Public Health Issues Facing American Indian and Alaska Native Women: The National Baseline Study***

Ms. Crossland displayed the Lessons Learned slide from her *Roadmap* presentation and said the instrument needed further refinement for the NBS. The researchers were adapting or creating instruments on their own to address everything required by the statute as well as the unique characteristics of the population. For example, they had learned that people of different ages identify with the community in different ways, and that fact needed to be incorporated into the questionnaire. Researchers wanted additional help from the Task Force in the following areas: health questions; enrollment; tribal affiliation; residency, mobility, and transiency; help-seeking behaviors; attitudes toward law enforcement and law enforcement responses; and community strengths. The core questionnaire was not adequate in these areas. Ms. Crossland asked what data they should be collecting. She started the discussion by asking about questions that should be asked concerning health or overall wellness. There were only five questions in the instrument and the researchers wanted to include broader topics.

Ms. Ruth Mary Jewell (Penobscot Nation) observed that people are being screened for sexual or physical violence when they see providers, but if there is a positive response, the providers don't know what to do with the information.

Ms. Juana Majel Dixon (Pauma Band of Mission Indians) raised mental health issues—i.e., women should be asked why they are depressed or sad, especially if there is no apparent physical reason. She said the communities live and die as a collective. The effects of depression in one family member spill over to other

family members. The question could be asked, Who in the family is sad? She advised that “wellness” is a different concept and a better word to use than “health” in the tribal community. There’s a mixed message in these communities that “health” can be scary. For example, it was previously legal to sterilize Native women. Because of the tribes’ history of perpetration, there is a level of fear that hasn’t been resolved. The term “wellness” sends a more positive message.

Carmen O’Leary suggested asking if health care is available. Sometimes care is a great distance away. Other suggested questions were: Will you see a doctor, or just a nurse? What is your exposure to suicide or have you contemplated it yourself? Do you receive prenatal care, access to contraceptives, Pap smears, and other basic women’s health services? Do you receive dental care for basic check-ups or for injuries? Do you take your children to someone for health care? When is the last time your child had an immunization? Do you go a traditional spiritual leader or healer? Ms. Rachell Tenorio (Santo Domingo Pueblo) said the term “health” is very vague. She suggested that a question be asked about a spiritual health component.

Ms. Jewell (Penobscot Indian Nation) suggested asking, “Were you injured to the point where you needed health care? Did you sustain injuries? Have you sought help for a sexually transmitted disease or the possibility of HIV/AIDS?” She pointed out that in the area of sexual violence and assault, including after rape, women might not seek care. And health care providers might not ask about it. She suggested that women be asked about miscarriages, whether they were subjected to trauma, and whether they sought care. What are the ramifications of not seeking care or not having care available?

Ms. Jacqueline Agtuca (Cherokee) raised the issue of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder that women experience because of the fear of being attacked or raped.

Dr. Moulton observed that the suggestions seemed to fall within several main subheadings: availability of services, obstetrics/gynecology, and mental health/depression/PTSD. She noted that the survey is only 60 to 90 minutes long, so there are some limitations on the number of questions possible.

Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) said many women have never had a pap smear or been to a gynecologist. Some aren’t educated about Human Immunodeficiency Virus; it depends on the community.

Ms. Crossland said a significant issue for the questionnaire would be determining who to include in the sample concerning those living in the community (affiliated) versus being enrolled in the tribe. They haven’t been able to accurately capture information about whether individuals are part of a tribe. The instrument’s mobility and transiency questions address how long women have been in the community.

Concerning law enforcement, the researchers want to know: Who is prosecuting? Who is the victim? Who is the offender? Where did the alleged crime take place? Task Force members asked whether the focus of the study is on Indian Country in general, those enrolled in the tribe, or Indian women. What do the researchers want the results to reflect? It was agreed that a starting point is the legal interpretation of the statute: Enrollment is based on the tribe’s criteria. However, someone could be enrolled in one community and live in another. Two parents could each be affiliated with different tribes.

Ms. Jewell (Penobscot Indian Nation) suggested asking the women about enrollment. It’s rare that someone would be dually enrolled, although this is more common in border states. Family members might be enrolled in two places, but can receive services in only one and vote in only one. Some people are not enrolled anywhere. Also, most people are not from one tribe only. Ms. Dixon (Pauma Band of Mission Indians) said letters from the tribe stating where people are receiving services might be useful in capturing that information.

Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) said there are two separate questions: What tribe are you affiliated with? and Where are you enrolled? She noted that perpetrators can be natives (descendants) but not enrolled; therefore, tribal law enforcement has no authority over them. Men can marry Native American women and live with the tribe, but they, too, are not subject to tribal law enforcement.

Ms. Crossland asked about eligibility for services: What services do they have access to? Ms. Jewell (Penobscot Indian Nation) responded that in Maine, it depends on how far away from the reservation someone lives. Generally, the available services are voting, walk-in care, and contract care from a facility. One must live within 50 miles of the reservation for contract care, but clinic access is available even if one lives farther away. Other tribes have very different rules; there are different models. Housing can be part of the determination. The CIB, or certificate of Indian blood, is maintained up to the current day. It plays a role in Indian preference in hiring (some show the percentage of Indian blood). Ms. Dixon (Pauma Band of Mission Indians) said that in the federal work they do, the quantification of blood is the make-up of the relationship. It's what they're entitled to for what was taken. They carry their IDs to be able to use services. The tribe has the right to determine membership. She suggested that the interviewers focus on the sovereignty of the tribe.

Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) commented that origins are important; you have to track populations. She talked about the forced relocation to Oklahoma known as the Trail of Tears. Children were taken from parents, and the Indian General Allotment Act (IGAA) was interpreted to mean that only men could be heads of household. These were dark, genocidal years. IGAA was not reauthorized for 12 years because the tribes wanted to be able to provide services to a broader group of people. She said exclusion is not at the tribal level, it originates in federal policies.

Ms. Lorraine White (Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux, South Dakota) discussed a failed project at her agency for providing mental health services. The flaw was that women had to be enrolled to obtain services. It was stopped immediately because of the shame the women felt when they couldn't be enrolled. The project ended up victimizing the women all over again. She cautioned the researchers to be careful in their approach.

Dr. Moulton asked the group to brainstorm about questions related to law enforcement responses. Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) said that asking if law enforcement is available is the starting point. If yes, is it tribal or county law enforcement? If there's none available, any further questions would be irrelevant. The next question could be: Would you call law enforcement if they were available? Ms. Crossland noted the difficulties of assessing law enforcement related to tribes, as a different series of questions would be needed in every jurisdiction. Dr. Rosay felt that level of detail would be necessary because of the fundamental differences in different places. The researchers will probably have to use four to five interchangeable modules in different areas.

Ms. Dixon (Pauma Band of Mission Indians) said their tribal police are clear about what services they will provide. She said the historical context of violence must be taken into consideration. In the past, the sheriff's department came in groups with intent to harm. She told the group that the reenactment of VAWA was bringing out threats and warnings against Native Americans; they were saying the law could not be enforced. She said the researchers have an opportunity to capture the real hatred that exists against tribal people.

Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) suggested the researchers ask why women do not call the police and why they do. She noted that many communities have no law enforcement. Some women have been raped by county officers, so they wouldn't call law enforcement. There's also a fear of retaliation: i.e., that law enforcement officers will shoot someone on the reservation if they are called. She said all the reasons for not calling could be teased out; the underreporting is significant.

Dr. Moulton summarized the question areas for law enforcement as: Are services available? Do you use them? Why? What are the barriers to service usage? What is the satisfaction level with these services?

**Bea Hanson, Ph.D.**

*Acting Director, Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), Task Force Designated Federal Official*

Dr. Hanson provided an overview of topics for Day 2 and adjourned the day's meeting.

## Day 2

### Opening Remarks and Announcements

**Bea Hanson, Ph.D.**

*Acting Director, Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), Task Force Designated Federal Official*

Dr. Hanson opened the meeting by stating that the previous day was a good start in grappling with issues that must be addressed. Those discussions would continue on Day 2 and they also would look ahead. She expressed appreciation for all the time Task Force members expend and acknowledged that it takes significant time out of their lives. She wanted to provide some type of support for the work (which must occur in the public space); possibly someone to distill information and distribute it. She asked what kind of knowledge base would be needed to do that kind of work.

Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) asked if a staff person could provide research support to locate documents. She also suggested a group listserv and group website where all documents could be posted so the Task Force has online access to them. She asked for all the e-mail addresses of the federal partners. She said the Task Force needs help streamlining and organizing so they can focus on the primary task. She recalled that when they developed the previous Task Force document, they wondered which parties needed to review and scrutinize it. Future drafts could be uploaded to a dedicated website.

Because of the limitations of sequestration, OVW would have to be creative in finding resources for support. She asked what kind of process works when the group is writing. Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) said she and a former Task Force member were the primary writers and noted that others were extremely helpful. Ms. Crossland wanted to avoid having the work fall to only one or two people. Ms. Crystal Tetrick (Otoe-Missouria) asked if they could describe the report process for the new members.

Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) said the report is reviewed by the full Task Force, which provides feedback, and then goes to the Attorney General. She recalled that during the previous review process, the same statutory language was interpreted differently by different people. She noted the importance of having federal partners debate specific words for precise meaning. The previous document went through five drafts before all Task Force members signed off on it. She said they used e-mail, but they need a better system for distribution to the Task Force so that no one is omitted. New Task Force members might want to help with the writing. Dr. Hanson wanted the Task Force to let DOJ know what they need as they move forward. Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) asked if they could meet online more frequently. Ms. Poston was contacted, and she stated that they could conduct a webinar focused on decision-making, if they want. They could have conference calls that are information-only but cannot make new decisions.

Dr. Hanson said the next in-person meeting is tentatively planned for December. The group agreed that it was important to schedule the meetings well in advance because calendars fill up quickly. One location under consideration was Columbia, South Carolina. Someone asked if it would make sense to coordinate the next

meeting with the Annual DOJ VAWA Tribal Consultation in Bismarck, North Dakota. Ms. Crossland said the location could be a concern because of the budget, and the issue would be discussed offline.

### Overview of NIJ's Proposed Sampling Plan for the National Baseline Study

#### **Greg Ridgeway, Ph.D.**

*Acting Director, NIJ*

Dr. Ridgeway said the primary aim of the National Baseline Study (NBS) was taken directly from the statute: "Provide an accurate victimization rate of violence against American Indian and Alaska Native women in Indian Country." The proposed sampling plan is to enlist 40 tribes, approach the tribal governments and engage them, and, once they agree to the plan, randomly enroll up to 25 households from each tribe. After gaining their cooperation, all women in the households would be interviewed. Consent is required at each level. This approach will result in approximately 1,500 completed interviews, depending on the number of women in the households and the rate of participation. The overall cost will be roughly \$1.8 million. They hope to obtain accuracy to within 5 percent of the actual victimization rate.

Dr. Hanson asked Dr. Ridgeway to address aiming for accuracy within 5 percent rather than 2 percent. He explained that cost considerations were the primary factor. It would take a significant amount of money to get another percentage point shaved off the accuracy; in fact, it could cost twice as much. He stated that 5 percent is very close. Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) asked how the funding from the legislation that just passed will be used. Ms. Crossland explained that it was authorized but not yet appropriated, although the research is a high priority.

Dr. Hanson noted that OVC was expecting funding for evaluation that has not yet been designated to a specific project. Dr. Ridgeway explained that the NBS has many upfront costs. If funding becomes available to develop a surveillance rate over time, they could use the same tribes and "take the temperature" regarding the direction of victimization rates. In response to a question, it was noted that the women interviewed will be compensated for their time.

Dr. Ridgeway displayed a table that included IHS service areas, as well as the estimated share of AI and AN women in each and the estimated representation of each area in the sample. Because the focus is on the national rate, the concentration of the sample must be in larger areas.

Dr. Ridgeway displayed a map of the United States indicating the number of tribes to be sampled by region. It provides for at least one tribe in each IHS region, with the sample proportional to the population size within the region. Ms. Crossland explained that Ms. Brooks researched information from a number of sources and helped to create the distribution using a spreadsheet with a large number of variables. All of these factors helped identify where the population is concentrated.

Ms. Jewell (Penobscot Indian Nation) wanted to ensure that the Eastern tribes are sufficiently represented; she said the Western tribes generally tend to receive more focus. The map displayed only one Eastern tribe to be sampled, and she said she knew of many tribes Northeast of the Washington, D.C., area. Dr. Ridgeway explained that adding tribes to the Eastern region would result in a less accurate national estimate. Ms. Jewell wanted it to be officially recorded that the Eastern tribes were receiving less representation in 25 states. Ms. Jewell (Penobscot Indian Nation) said data from the smaller Northeast tribes could present an entirely different picture. In the Midwest, the impact is in response to a different sort of violence than in places such as northern Maine. She said she sometimes questions the accuracy of statistical reporting that claims to fully represent Indian Country. Dr. Ridgeway said he wouldn't be able to address anything more definitive than a national sample. If there were additional funding, they could focus on Eastern tribes versus the Southwest, and

so on. Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) asked about the large number of tribes on the map from Oklahoma. Dr. Ridgeway said the state has about 36 percent of the AI and AN population; at least according to the U.S. Census. The study needs a good estimate in that region or the national estimate will not reflect one-third of the population. A random sample would omit key tribes.

Ms. Crossland explained that the estimates took into account federally recognized tribes with land (about 540); the total population as reported by the 2010 U.S. Census data; and many other variables (e.g., PL280 status, tribal population, IHS service area). Developing the estimates was very time-consuming and thoroughly done, and the effort was crosschecked and verified with other federal offices (i.e., the Department's Office of Tribal Justice and the Department of Interior).

Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) said people would feel more comfortable if the Northeast and East had more representation. Ms. Crossland tried to explain that budget constraints was a key determinant when developing the sampling plan. NIJ doesn't know what will happen to its research funding under sequestration and if there will be any future funding for the NBS. To accomplish the mandate, she said, the plan Dr. Ridgeway presented was the best possible approach given the funding currently available. Some Task Force members said they understood the need for the suggested weighting on tribal lands and the fact that the sampling complied with the statute. Others felt the plan did not sufficiently account for all federally recognized tribes.

Ms. Dixon (Pauma Band of Mission Indians) said she thought the sampling plan as presented would tilt the numbers. She explained that the majority of Oklahoma is territory and is not defined in the same manner as tribal lands in other states. She offered to supply data that would indicate where the population is larger. Because she is involved in allocating resources for all government monies (she is the 1<sup>st</sup> Vice President of the National Congress of American Indians' Executive Board), she is in a position to inform the research.

Ms. Crossland noted that although one of the variables used is Indian Country, a key source of data is the 2010 Census, even though NIJ knows there are serious problems with those data as it pertains to enrolled AI and AN tribal members. Unfortunately, the U.S. Census is the only source available that measures the population. It would be ideal if tribes provided enrollment logs, but gathering 566 enrollment logs would take a long time. She said it was surprising how little is documented about federally recognized tribes and Indian Country.

Dr. Hanson said the key issue was whether the current sampling approach would skew the data, and the Task Force believed it would. She asked how they could arrive at a place where the data is not skewed. Dr. Ridgeway asked how the numbers for population, other than the 2010 Census, could be substantiated. Some Task Force members said that in their tribes, the message they were given was not to cooperate with the Census; i.e., "Don't tell them who you are and where you are." Others did not participate because they did not live on a reservation. Ms. Dixon (Pauma Band of Mission Indians) stated that perhaps 30 percent of the population participated in the Census. However, they know where the population is and were successful in getting out the vote, including 2 million adults age 21 and over. She said she would try to obtain the documentation needed to make the shift that's needed. They want to help NIJ capture the real numbers. She asked what the cost would be to conduct the study that's needed and was told an estimate of US\$15 to US\$20 million.

Dr. Ridgeway suggested a homework assignment for Task Force members. He said the current charge has to stand as presented. However, the issues the Task Force raised indicate that there is another objective, and he asked what it is—is it, for example, getting more regional understanding, getting more detailed information from the tribes, and/or getting more representation from the East Coast? He asked the Task Force to consider this second objective, and said NIJ will attempt to tackle it.



Dr. Ridgeway presented diagrams that simulated whether his plan would provide an accurate estimate of the victimization rate within tribal households. He presented different strategies for selecting tribes and respondents. His recommended approach was to allocate the tribe sample to cover geography, select tribes proportional to size, randomly select households, and then survey all women in the households. He said this approach would provide accuracy plus or minus 5 percent.

## Discussion

Ms. Jewell (Penobscot Indian Nation) said the work against violence is more inclusive than what she saw in the approach to the NBS sampling plan. There are differences among women in different states and in the contributing factors, such as climate and access to services. She felt there were many factors that were not reflected and that people who live in similar geographic areas should be compared. Not all participants agreed.

Dr. Hanson said NIJ and OVW understood the concerns discussed in the previous session about overrepresentation in some areas and underrepresentation in others. There is a need for representation of the diversity of tribes in all parts of the country and for different types of tribes (e.g., rural, more or less access). She said they would be going back to look at the original numbers with some ideas for positive changes. The Task Force will receive this updated information for comment. Ms. Crossland said she would send Ms. Dixon (Pauma Band of Mission Indians) the variables that were used to determine the strategy for the NBS sampling plan so that she could comment and decide whether she wanted to add anything. She asked Ms. Dixon (Pauma Band of Mission Indians) to recommend to NIJ which variables are the most reliable, and which are the highest priority, and she asked her for any supporting documentation available.

## The Collaboration Challenge: Developing Outreach & Dissemination Vehicles and Messages Regarding the VAIW National Baseline Study

### *Facilitator and Task Force Discussion*

The group discussed outreach goals for proposed studies and implementation. They sought ideas for reaching tribal members and communities and gauging tribal support and willingness to participate. The researchers want to gather tribal input during all study phases (e.g., planning, implementation, collection, interpretation, dissemination). Questions put forth to the group included: How can we best disseminate information? What mechanisms and activities might be useful? What role can the Task Force play in this process?

Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) said the most important issue in terms of collaboration is relying on solid relationships, which NIJ and others have already established. It will be important to build on those and continue to forge solid partnerships. She suggested that at each webinar or consultation there should be a pre- or post-consultation dialogue and update. In terms of messaging, they should continue to make updates online, have releases at each juncture, and involve the media. People need to know that the VAWA 2005, Title IX, Section 904(a) research is proceeding.

Task Force members said they wanted to know about scheduled events—such as the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) meeting—so they could prioritize them and attend.

Ms. Jewell (Penobscot Indian Nation) emphasized the importance of reaching out to tribal leadership and councils of each tribe to explain the project and receive permission to move forward. In some cases, the researchers will not be able to take action until this step is taken. This should be done several months before the actual visit. Ideas are accepted at the broader tribal level. Once there is buy-in from tribal leadership, buy-

in from the participating women will be needed. Ms. Jewell (Penobscot Indian Nation) suggested reaching out to tribal coalitions to get ideas from them and their violence and sexual assault programs. However, they should be accompanied by someone from the tribe. Ms. Tenorio noted that it is important for dissemination purposes to have a key point of contact in the community.

Participants mentioned the Women are Sacred meeting June 10–12, 2013 in Albuquerque. It will be a large gathering with opportunities for dissemination of information. A Task Force meeting also could be held there because so many members will be attending.

Ms. Crossland asked if there was a website where people could view the recent NIJ VAIW webinar. Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) said it could be posted on the National Indigenous Women’s Resource Center (WRC) [website](#).

Ms. Lorraine White (Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux, South Dakota) offered the resources and programs that are available in Minnesota. One organization is having a conference in April. She said she can help with those connections. She also has contacts in the states of South Dakota, North Dakota, and Wisconsin.

Ms. Lorraine Edmo (Deputy Director for Tribal Affairs, OVW) noted a consultation in the Northern plains that might be taking place the second or third week of October. She said NIJ could issue a news release for the [Native American Journalist Association](#) or [indianz.com](#).

Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) asked if tribal coalitions, indigenous women’s resource centers, and national organizations could provide local support for production of materials. She wondered if this would be allowed under FACA. She noted that some tribes tell their stories at a certain time of year. It might be helpful to partner with specific community organizations and have them take the lead in presenting and messaging. They could communicate the importance of the study.

Ms. Jewell (Penobscot Indian Nation) noted that a university in Maine has students attending from all the tribes in the area. There might be study groups at the universities that could help with dissemination.

Ms. Dixon (Pauma Band of Mission Indians) pointed out that social media is an important tool that could help the Task Force. It’s easier to get the youth population involved this way. Facebook and Twitter are good tools. People can announce when they’re attending gatherings. In addition, webinars have a good track record of success. Some thoughts are needed on imaging for medallions or buttons that reflect the Earth, our Mother. This is intrinsic to the spiritual side and gives the researchers protection when they are in tribal communities. Researchers also should bring gifts. Tobacco is a common gift, but the type differs by region.

Ms. Crossland spoke about the effectiveness of the NIJ VAIW Program flier that recaps the program as a messaging tool. NIJ would like Task Force feedback on it. They also would like to create a brochure or some other materials that describe the program. Ms. Jewell (Penobscot Indian Nation) said a link to the one-pager or any brochure produced should be put online. Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) mentioned the souvenir USB thumb drives that was distributed after the initial passage of VAWA. We could give out another one that contains the statutory language so the limitations of the Task Force are understood. Key PowerPoint presentations also could be placed on the thumb drive.

Ms. Dixon (Pauma Band of Mission Indians) suggested that tribal newsletters could publish articles. They could package the message so it’s easier for the tribes to reproduce in their newsletters. Youth programs are charged with getting members out and they could be of assistance. The music industry is increasingly important in Indian Country. Someone made a video with the story of the women that was widely seen. Artists from various

genres can be allies. Fundraisers could be held, and a widely attended rodeo was coming up. There are many avenues to work with. There are radio sound bites that are played frequently. They can be crafted so there's a positive message in the community. National Public Radio (NPR) wants to link with tribal radio stations. The radio program "Native American Calling" would be a good show for getting messages out. It goes out nationwide. Googling "Native American media" would bring up other ideas.

Ms. Crossland said they have a template of the information they go over with tribal leadership and they must address "what's in it" for the tribes. Dr. Rosay said that if the tribe won't receive anything in return for its participation, that point should be made honestly. It was noted that they will be helping all tribes by contributing to the national data. In response to a Task Force question, it was explained that the data from specific tribes will not be made available to them, as it could easily violate human subjects protections and confidentiality of participants, especially in smaller communities. This policy is stated up front. The researchers cannot give out certain information. Someone commented that the benefits to the tribe might not be immediately known. Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) felt there was tremendous benefit in participation. She said the current excitement and momentum from the passage of VAWA could be leveraged to gain support for the research.

The following materials and resources might be useful for knowledge dissemination:

### Forthcoming Publications

- NIJ's Executive Office for United States Attorneys' (EOUSA) Legal Information Office Network System (LIONS) Case Management System Review: Fiscal Year 2008 [Executive Summary available by request]
- Special Issue of the [Violence Against Women Journal](#) – Overview of NIJ's VAIW Program of Research (June 2013)
- FBI's Response to Violence Against Women in Indian Country in Fiscal Year 2008: A Case File Review [Anticipated release fall 2013]
- Federal and Tribal Response to Violence Against Women in Indian Country Study [Anticipated release fall 2013]
- NIJ AI and AN NISVS Study (a.k.a. *Lifetime Prevalence of Interpersonal and Sexual Violence of Self-identified AI and AN Men and Women Living in the U.S.*) [Anticipated release spring 2014]
- NIJ VAIW Pilot Study: Final Report
- NIJ's Tribal VAIW Program Brochure

### Ongoing Studies

- *Homicide Estimates of AI and AN Women in the U.S.*
- *AI and AN Self-Identification and Visual Verification Practices and their Legal and Political Implications*

### NIJ Tribal Web Page Overhaul/Update

<http://www.nij.gov/topics/tribal-justice/vaw-research/welcome.htm>

### Presentations at Meetings, Workshops, and Webinars

- [VAIW R&E Workshops](#)
- [Task Force Meetings](#)
- The Attorney General's Native American Issues Subcommittee

- Tribal Events (e.g., National Indian Nations Biennial Conference, National Congress of American Indians Annual Meeting/VAW Task Force, Annual VAWA DOJ Tribal Consultation)
- Academic venues

## Task Force Members' Final Comments

### *What are your last impressions?*

One Task Force member stated that Ms. Crossland's presentation validated that the number of victims is larger than what was previously reported and that there is a high number of male victims. Respect was shown to the tribes by providing letters signed by key officials, which acknowledges tribal leaders as sovereigns. This was helpful in obtaining their support and buy-in.

Because some tribes have done their own mapping, part of the buy-in might come from respecting their work and asking the tribes to share their geodata. Providing that information might make a difference for them. Data from the study could be leveraged to show why services are not available to some on a 24/7 basis because of harsh geography—i.e., roads that are inaccessible at certain times of year. This helps make the case that mobile services would be useful. Ms. Crossland asked whether some tribes might be opposed to the types of maps she displayed in her presentation. Ms. Dixon (Pauma Band of Mission Indians) agreed with others that this issue could be addressed from the standpoint of the accessibility of roads and the availability of services. She also noted that there are homes that should be taken down because they have become havens for crime. Ms. Debra Elaine Gee (Deputy Attorney General, Chickasaw Nation) pointed out that mapping is being used for innovative purposes in her area, particularly in the law enforcement arena. She verified that other tribes are using maps as well.

## Closing Remarks

### **Bea Hanson, Ph.D.**

*Acting Director, Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), Task Force Designated Federal Official*

Dr. Hanson introduced Acting Associate Attorney General Tony West, who has been very supportive of efforts to reduce violence against women in Indian Country, as well as supporting tribal sovereignty.

### **Tony West**

*Acting Associate Attorney General of the United States*

Mr. West said there was much to celebrate. Passage of VAWA 2013 was a great victory for Indian Country. He was a young attorney who worked on the Omnibus Crime Bill, so he was gratified to see what hard work could accomplish. He pointed out that, historically, Indian tribes had jurisdiction over all crimes committed against them, and in 1978, the Supreme Court took that authority away. The previous day of the Task Force meeting (March 7), it was restored. We can now hold perpetrators of violence accountable. These issues were raised with Attorney General Eric Holder, and the Department of Justice put forward the language that became law. The process benefited from the cooperation of the tribes. The key now is to protect this victory in the implementation stage. The legislation must be protected from challenges and must move forward in the most effective way possible. It's critical to learn about victimization in Indian Country and to inform the judicial systems. One of the real keys, he said, is to continue the open dialogue and have ongoing communication.

Ms. Dixon (Pauma Band of Mission Indians) had a list of concerns for Mr. West about protecting the legislation's implementation. She noted that a test case will be coming soon and the data from NIJ can support the need for the legislation. She gave Mr. West a synopsis of earlier discussions. Mr. West thanked her for her dedication.

Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) thanked Mr. West and said this step was a tremendous victory historically, similar to the passage of the Civil Rights Act. Each year the Annual DOJ VAWA Tribal Consultation focused the lens on violence against women. The research component provided the leverage to make necessary changes to enhance the safety of women. Given the victory, she said, it's extremely important to roll out clarification of Sections 904 and 905 of [VAWA \(2013\)](#) in terms of implementation because people have many questions. A statement from the Attorney General would be helpful. She noted the importance of OVW in terms of funding. Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) suggested that training and technical assistance on VAWA take place at upcoming major gatherings.

Mr. West said it was gratifying that all those present are on the same page. He asked if someone from DOJ should fly out to regional meetings and whether the Attorney General should discuss implementation when he is speaking. He noted that working groups should include all parties, including the tribes, local law enforcement, judges, and DOJ. He said they have two years to get implementation rolling. The Annual DOJ VAWA Tribal Consultation will support this effort and the [Tribal Nations Leadership Council](#), which advises the Attorney General, should stay in place and play a key role.

Ms. Agtuca (Cherokee) mentioned the sexual assault and violence coalitions that are in place in key regions to conduct training and technical assistance. She said that provides an opportunity for a wonderful partnership. In addition, the Women are Sacred Conference scheduled for June in Albuquerque will have large numbers of advocates and representatives from all parties, including the tribes. It will be a very grassroots meeting. Mr. West acknowledged its importance.

Ms. Dixon (Pauma Band of Mission Indians) stated that women should increase their use of social media forums to come forward and speak about acts of violence against them. She told Mr. West that they are being targeted with palpable hate. She said there has been a comfort zone concerning the Indian Child Welfare Act, and she asked that DOJ send out a bullet sheet on how it should be implemented.

Task Force member Jacqueline Agtuca (Cherokee) thanked the speakers and organizers. She said the VAWA research is life-saving. She suggested setting up a group listserv so that members do not have to e-mail each other individually. She expressed gratitude for the pilot study.

## Adjournment

### **Bea Hanson, Ph.D.**

*Acting Director, Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), Task Force Designated Federal Official*

Dr. Hanson closed by saying it was an incredible meeting and very helpful to have the dialogue and discussion that took place. She encouraged the Task Force as they move forward. She said DOJ really wants to show what violence against women looks like and take steps to address the problems. OVW and NIJ will work together on next steps. She thanked everyone for their participation. Ms. Jewell (Penobscot Indian Nation) added, "We do this work in honor of those who have no voice."

## Next Steps: Task Force Homework Items

Ms. Crossland asked that the Task Force consider the following issues and be prepared to provide input to NIJ in the near future:

1. Task Force recommendations for VAIW program and initiative evaluations at the federal, state, local, and tribal levels

## 2. Developing outreach & dissemination vehicles and messages for the VAIW National Baseline Study

### **Task Force Recommendations for VAIW Program and Initiative Evaluations at the Federal, State, Local, and Tribal Levels**

Please identify programs designed to address violations committed against Indian women in Indian Country, including formal and informal programs at the state, local, and tribal levels.

Consider the following questions:

- How will such an evaluation be used? In other words, to what end?
- Who will use such an evaluation?
- What format will such an evaluation take?
- What is its key method(s) and research question(s)?
- How do we best identify programs that might be included?
- How do we access information in these programs?

Other criteria:

- Type of program
- Focus of program (subject)
- What is the value to other users/audiences?
- Why is it a promising program?
- Geographic location
- Other

Please provide the following information about recommended programs:

- Program name
- Type of program
- Location
- Focus
- Value or innovation

### **Developing Outreach & Dissemination Vehicles and Messages for the VAIW National Baseline Study**

Please review the discussion of this topic (above, Day 2) and provide additional vehicles and messages.

## Appendix A: Task Force Members

**Jacqueline Agtuca (Cherokee)  
Director of Public Policy, Clan  
Star, Inc.  
Cherokee, NC**

Jacqueline Agtuca is the Public Policy Director of Clan Star, Inc., a not-for-profit devoted to improving justice to strengthen the sovereignty of Indigenous women through legal, legislative, and policy initiatives, and, education and awareness. Ms. Agtuca has dedicated her legal career to enhancing protections for women by reforming tribal, state and federal law and policy. Ms. Agtuca has served as staff attorney for the Legal Assistance Foundation of Chicago (1984-88), director of the San Francisco District Attorney's Office's Family Violence Project (1988-90), and director of the Criminal Justice Advocacy Unit for the Family Violence Prevention Fund (1990-1995). In 1995, Ms. Agtuca was a staff member of Office on Violence Against Women at the U.S. Department of Justice. In 1999, she became the deputy director, and then acting director, of the U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Tribal Justice. She has also worked as chief of staff for the National Indian Gaming Commission. She is also a founding member of the National Congress of American Indians Task Force on Violence Against Native Women. Ms. Agtuca received her law degree from the Chicago Kent College of Law and her B.A. in Political Science from the University of Washington. She is a former member of the Task Force.

**Alyssa Ben (Mississippi Band of  
Choctaw Indians)  
Program Manager, Choctaw  
Children's Advocacy Center**

Alyssa Ben is an enrolled tribal member of the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians where she currently serves as Division Manager of the Choctaw Children's Advocacy Center (CCAC), the Family Violence and Victim's Services Program (FVVS), and the Nittak Himmona Domestic Violence Shelter. Ms. Ben provides oversight of all services administered to Choctaw children and adults victimized by sexual or physical abuse to ensure they receive appropriate interventions and support. Additionally, Ms. Ben oversees eleven federally-funded grant projects. Some include the American Indian/ Alaska Native Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner-Sexual Assault Response Team Program (AI/ AN SANE-SART Program) from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office for Victims of Crime; Children Justice Act Partnerships for Indian Communities Grant Program from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office for Victims of Crime; and the Tribal Sexual Assault Services Program from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women.

**Debra Gee** (Navajo Nation/Muscogee (Creek) Nation)  
**Deputy Attorney General, Chickasaw Nation**  
Ada, OK

Debra Gee has served as the Eastern Oklahoma delegate to the Tribal Justice Advisory Group, which advised the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs (OJP) on research, tribal consultation and Programmatic activities. Ms. Gee is currently deputy attorney general of the Chickasaw Nation. She has served as deputy director in the Office of Tribal Justice and Tribal Legal Counsel in the Office on Violence Against Women, both of the U.S. Department of Justice. She has also been the assistant attorney general of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation's Department of Justice and staff attorney for the DNA-People's Legal Services for the Navajo Nation. Ms. Gee received her law degree from Arizona State University College of Law and her B.A. from Smith College.

**Ruth Jewell** (Penobscot Indian Nation)  
**Program Coordinator, Penobscot Nation Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Services Program**  
Indian Island, ME

As the founder and former program coordinator for the Penobscot Nation Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Services Program, Ms. Jewell was responsible for the delivery of direct services to people affected by domestic violence and sexual abuse. Ms. Jewell is the former president of the Board of Directors for the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, a member of the Maine State Commission on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault, board member of the National Indigenous Women's Resource Center, a former consultant to the Maine Coalition to End Domestic Violence and a member of the Board for the Penobscot Nation Boys and Girls Club. Ms. Jewell has served on several boards and committees relating to domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence and stalking. She has received training and certification from Muskie School of Policy Victim Witness Academy, Praxis International Safety and Accountability Audit Training, Maine Criminal Justice Academy, and the Predominant Aggressor Identification program. She is also certified in addressing confidentiality by the State of Maine. She currently works as a Senior Program Associate at the National Center for Victims of Crime, a nonprofit organization that advocates for victims' rights, trains professionals who work with victims, and serves as a trusted source of information on victims' issues.

**Lori Jump** (Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians)  
**Executive Director, Uniting Three Fires Against Violence**

Lori Jump has directed the Advocacy Resource Center of the Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians in northern Michigan for the past 13 years. The program offers comprehensive services to victims of crime, especially women who are victims of domestic and sexual assault. Ms. Jump also has eleven years of experience working in the tribal court system as both a victim advocate and Tribal Probation Officer. She was instrumental in bringing a men's re-education group to Sault Ste. Marie and in the establishment of the Lodge of Bravery, a shelter for women and children on her reservation. Ms. Jump recently accepted the position of Executive Director for Uniting Three Fires Against Violence. Ms. Jump is one of the founding members of UTFAV, a statewide tribal domestic and sexual assault coalition in Michigan. Ms. Jump is a B.A. candidate at Lake Superior State University and received a certificate in Tribal Business Management in 1988 from Bay Mills Indian Community College. She is a former member of the Task Force.



**Dee Koester (Lower Elwha Klallam)**  
**Director, Washington State Native American Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault --Women Spirit Coalition**  
**Olympia, WA**

For over 25 years, Dee has championed services for American Indian and Alaska Native people facing the challenge of many underserved populations. The majority of her work experience has been managing private, non-profit agencies. Dee served as the Social Service Director for several tribes from 1988-1992. After receiving her M.S. Degree in Agency Administration in 1992, Dee went on to develop and manage many programs and agencies that served children, youth, and families in Indian Country including Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA), children's sexual assault therapy program oversight, foster care and adoption placement and licensing, child protective services investigation, expert witness in Indian Child Welfare cases, and as an administrator of a group care facility for DSHS that worked with Sexually Aggressive Youth (SAY). Since 1998, she worked as a shelter manager, direct services manager, and community educator for a mainstream (county) domestic violence agency.

From 2000-2006, while at the Thurston County Prosecuting Attorney's Office, as their Law and Justice Planner, she was able to bridge the gap between victims and the legal/court system by funding victim advocacy services. She coordinated and participated in the local DV and SA Task Force for over 10 years, convening conferences, and summits to support efforts to provide "best practices" to the domestic violence community. She administered grants for several Department of Justice grant programs since 1989. Since 2002, she led the grassroots organizing effort by Native advocates to form the Washington State Native American Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault- WomenSpirit Coalition.

Dee is an Elder and enrolled member of the Lower Elwha Klallam tribe, with ancestry in the Quileute and Makah Tribes. She is a mother of three and a grandmother of seven. She continues to work as an anti-violence educator.

**Patricia McGeshick (Assiniboine and Sioux)**  
**Program Director, Ft. Peck Family Violence Resource Center**  
**Poplar, MT**

Patricia McGeshick is the co-founder of Women's Kinship Circle, and for 23 years, she has been Director of the Ft. Peck Tribes Sexual Abuse Victims Treatment Program/Family Resource Center. She has been a tribal prosecutor, criminal investigator, and Clerk of Court as well as an instructor at the Ft. Peck Community College on "Family, Child, and Domestic Violence." She has made presentations at conferences on domestic violence issues and testified before the Montana Joint Appropriations Committee and the Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services on Child Protection on Reservations. Ms. McGeshick has received numerous awards in recognition of her public service, including the "Victims Rights Award" from the Montana Attorney General's Office in 1991 and 1997; the United States of Department of Justice Attorney General's "Victims Rights Award" in 2005; and the Montana-Wyoming Tribal Leaders "2005 Indian Health Award." Ms. McGeshick has a B.A. in Community Studies from Naes College. She is a former member of the Task Force.

**Juana Majel Dixon (Pauma Band of Mission Indians)  
Vice-President, National Congress of American Indians and Co-Chair of the NCAI Task Force on Violence Against Indian Women  
Pauma Valley, CA**

Juana Majel Dixon, the current first Vice President of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI). Ms. Majel Dixon previously served as the recording secretary of NCAI for 9 years. She founded the NCAI Task Force on Violence Against Indian Women in 2003 and has served as its Chair since that time. Her other positions within NCAI include chair of the Cultural and Religious Concerns Committee, liaison for Medicare/Medicaid Case Management and the Tribal Technical Team, liaison for the Alcohol Substance Abuse Summit, and Indigenous Representative to the World Conference Against Racism. Ms. Majel Dixon is a professor of Federal Indian Law and U.S. Policy at Palomar College and is a visiting professor at San Diego State University and Claremont Graduate University. Ms. Majel Dixon serves as Traditional Legislative Council Woman of the Pauma Band of Luiseno. She holds a tribal position as the natural resource director and policy director. Ms. Majel Dixon is ABD on her PhD, from San Diego State/Claremont Graduate University (US Policy and Education), M.S. (Behavioral Science) and M.A. (Community Base Development) from San Diego State University and a B.S. in Behavioral Science from National University.

**Jeri Museth (Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska)**

Jeri Museth previously worked as a wellness coordinator and program specialist for the Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska at the Tribal Family and Youth Services Department in the Wellness Program. She has served on the Juneau Youth Services Board, Juneau Recovery Unit Advisory Board, Alaska Native Indian Child Welfare Association, and the League of Women Voters. She has been a member of National Indian Child Welfare Association, Coalition Against Racism and Discrimination in the Systems, and the Alaska Women's Political Caucus. She is a founding member and coordinator for the Alaska Native Domestic Violence Task Force. Ms. Museth has also served as a permanency planning specialist with the Department of Tribal Family and Youth Services. She received a Master's Degree in Social Work from the University of Alaska, Anchorage and a Bachelor's Degree in Business Administration from the University of Alaska, Southeast, Juneau. She currently works as a Protective Services Specialist with Health & Social Services, OCS-Family Services in Juneau, Alaska.

**Carmen O'Leary (Cheyenne River Sioux)  
Director, Native Women's Society of the Great Plains  
Timber Lake, SD**

Carmen O'Leary is the Director of the Native Women's Society of the Great Plains, a coalition of Tribal and non-profit native organizations serving women affected by violence. Ms. O'Leary provides support, training, and technical assistance to the member programs. Previously, she held the positions of Grants Organizer for the Missouri Breaks Industries Research, Inc. serving tribes on health issues, Co-coordinator of the Sacred Heart Women's Shelter in Eagle Butte, South Dakota, Magistrate Judge of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribal Court, and Child Protection Worker for the South Dakota Department of Social Services. She has served as a consultant and trainer for victim advocacy organizations. Ms O'Leary currently serves as a Guardian Ad Litem for at-risk children with the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribal Court.

**Rachell Tenorio MSW (Santo Domingo Pueblo) Albuquerque, NM**

Ms. Rachell Tenorio is an enrolled member of the Santo Domingo Pueblo in New Mexico and is a proud mother of two wonderful boys, Nathaniel and Dominic. Ms. Tenorio received her B.A. in Psychology with a minor in Family Studies from the University of New Mexico (UNM). She also earned a Master of Social Work at New Mexico Highlands University in 2012. Her internships during her graduate program provided her with valuable experience that continues to shape her career. At the Domestic Violence Resource Center her role as a victim advocate and grant writer provided much needed assistance to domestic violence survivors. Another internship at the UNM Center for Rural and Community Behavioral Health helped her gain valuable experience in providing technical assistance and consultation to Southwest Native American agencies and communities.

Ms. Tenorio's past involvement in professional activities include serving as a consultant for the Methamphetamine Suicide Prevention Initiative Grant at Five Sandoval Indian Pueblos Inc., chairing the Native American Professional Parent Resources Policy Council, and proudly served as a tribal grant reviewer for the Family and Youth Services Bureau's Tribal Personal Responsibility Program.

Ms. Tenorio is currently employed as a Research Assistant at the Albuquerque Area Indian Health Board, Native American Research Center for Health (NARCH). The Southwest Tribal NARCH partners with academic institutions to conduct intensive biomedical and behavioral research on existing and persistent AI and AN health problems and to increase the number and capacity of AI and AN professionals in the field. In her current position, Ms. Tenorio is working on the Adverse Childhood Experiences feasibility study involving southwest tribal communities. She also provides assistance to the Southwest Tribal Institutional Review Board and the Student Development Program. Currently she serves as the co-chair of the National Association of Social Workers of New Mexico Native American Task Force. The Native American Task Force supports Native American social workers in New Mexico by providing training, collaborating with tribal programs, and increasing awareness on issues affecting Native communities.

**Crystal Tetrick (Otoe-Missouria) Seattle, WA**

Crystal Tetrick has over 14 years of experience in public health. Ten of those years have been dedicated to urban Indian health care services and research. She is passionate about improving the lives of women and children and developing programs that promote health equity. After receiving her Masters in Public Health in Maternal and Child Health from the University of Washington, Ms. Tetrick began her career as Clinic Support Services Manager at the Seattle Indian Health Board, a non-profit community health center. After serving two years as the Executive Director of the San Diego American Indian Health Center, Ms. Tetrick returned to the Seattle Indian Health Board as the Associate Director of Health Care Operations. Most recently she was the Associate Director of the Urban

Indian Health Institute, a national epidemiology center supporting the health and well-being of urban Indian communities through information, scientific inquiry, and technology. Ms. Tetrick is currently the Parent and Child Health Manager at Public Health Seattle and King County. She is responsible for overseeing all Maternal and Child Health programs for the 14<sup>th</sup> largest county in the United States. She is a descendant of the Otoe-Missouria and Munsee Tribes.

**Grant Walker**  
**Chief Prosecutor, Standing Rock**  
**Sioux Tribe**  
**Fort Yates, ND**

Currently, Mr. Walker is the Chief Prosecutor for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe. In addition, he is a Special Assistant United States Attorney for the District of North Dakota and the District of South Dakota. He received his Juris Doctor from the University of South Dakota School of Law and was admitted to the South Dakota Bar in 2004. Mr. Walker was also admitted to the Bar of the United States District Court for the District of North Dakota and the District of South Dakota. Prior to his current positions, Mr. Walker was the Walworth County State's Attorney, a Special Prosecutor for Hughes, Campbell, and Potter County (South Dakota), a member of the South Dakota State's Attorney's Association, a member of the Legislative Committee for the South Dakota State's Attorney's Association, a member of the Consolidation and Long-Range Planning Committee for the South Dakota State's Attorney's Association, a member of the National District Attorney's Association, a County Chair to Governor Dennis Daugaard in the South Dakota Gubernatorial Election (2010), a Campaign Aid to Governor M. Michael Rounds in the South Dakota Gubernatorial Election (2006), a Campaign Coordinator and Personal Aid to Governor M. Michael Rounds in the South Dakota Gubernatorial Election (2002), and a Law Clerk for the First Judicial Circuit of South Dakota.

In addition, Mr. Walker has published the following articles: "No Limits. *State v. Martin*: The Scope of a Warrantless Inventory Search", South Dakota Law Review, Volume 47, Issue 1; and "The Abolishment of Covenants Not to Compete Among Physicians" in the South Dakota Defense Lawyers Association, Volume 2003, Issue 1. Currently, Mr. Walker serves as a member of the Governor's Council of Juvenile Services (South Dakota), a member of the Disproportionate Minority Confinement Committee (South Dakota), a member of the Criminal Law Committee for the State Bar of South Dakota, an Adjunct Professor for Sitting Bull College, a member of the Criminal Justice Advisory Committee for Sitting Bull College, a Special Prosecutor for Yankton Sioux Tribe, a member of the South Dakota Tribal Attorney's Association, a member of the South Dakota Tribal Juvenile Justice Advisory Group, a member of the Sioux County, North Dakota, Domestic Violence Task Force, and a member of the Standing Rock Sexual Assault Response Team.

**Lorraine White (Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux, South Dakota)  
Director, Family Stabilization Program, Minnesota Indian Women's Resource Center, Minneapolis, MN**

Lorraine White is the director of the Family Stabilization Program and served in front line work as parent educator and case management. She has over 20 years in the field of domestic violence prevention and serves as a child and women's advocate with the Tubman Family Alliance. Ms. White has been a Doula coordinator and was the designer of a Parenting Program for the Division of Indian Work and a family resource worker with the Family and Children Service. She worked as a truancy liaison officer with the Minneapolis Public Schools. She serves on the boards of the Safe Families Community Coalition, the Minnesota Coalition for Battered Women, the American Indian Advisory Council, the Mini-MUID Family Preservation Committee, the Youth Prostitution Committee, and other family- and youth-centered organizations. Ms. White received her A.A. from Minneapolis Community College, her B.A. in Business Management and Economics from Augsburg College, and is currently completing her final thesis for a master's degree at Augsburg College in Leadership in 2013. Lorraine is currently working towards completion of expert witness training in domestic and sexual violence, and most recently completed National Strangulation training in Indian County.

## Appendix B: Participant List

**Jacqueline Agtuca**

Director of Public Policy  
Clan Star, Inc.  
8941 Gibson Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90034  
Phone: (310) 467-2116  
jacque@clanstar.org

**Summer Baugh**, Intelligence Analyst

Indian Country Crimes Unit  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Federal Bureau of Investigation  
935 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20535  
Phone: (202) 324-1618  
Email: Summer.Baugh@ic.fbi.gov

**Allen J Beck**

Senior Statistical Advisor  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Bureau of Justice Statistics  
810 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 616-3277  
Email: allen.beck@usdoj.gov

**Alison Brooks**, Research Associate

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice  
810 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 305-7748  
Email: alison.brooks@usdoj.gov

**Christine R Crossland**

Senior Social Science Analyst  
U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice  
810 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 616-5166  
Email: christine.crossland@usdoj.gov

**Lorraine P Edmo**

Deputy Director for Tribal Affairs  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Office on Violence Against Women  
145 N Street, NE, 10W-212  
Washington, DC 20530  
Phone: (202) 514-8804  
Email: lorraine.edmo@usdoj.gov

**Ivette Estrada**

Victim Justice Program Specialist  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Office for Victims of Crime  
810 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 307-0932  
Email: ivette.estrada@usdoj.gov

**Debra E. Gee** (via phone)

Deputy Attorney General  
Chickasaw Nation  
P.O. Box 1548  
Ada, Oklahoma 74821  
Phone: (580) 436-7233  
Email: debra.gee@chickasaw.net

**Kathleen ME Gless**

Victim Justice Program Specialist  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Office for Victims of Crime  
810 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 307-6049  
Email: kathleen.gless@usdoj.gov

**Bea Hanson**, Acting Director

United States Department of Justice  
Office on Violence Against Women  
145 N Street, NE, 10W.142  
Washington, DC 20530  
Phone: (202) 514-9556  
Email: Bea.Hanson@usdoj.gov

**Ruth M Jewell**

Penobscot Indian Nation  
4171 Anneewakee Road  
Douglasville, GA 30135  
Phone: (207) 735-3016  
Email: rjewell51545@yahoo.com

**Joan B LaRocca**

Public Affairs Specialist  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs  
Office of Communications  
810 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 307-6873  
Email: joan.larocca2@usdoj.gov

**Betsy B LaRocque**

Consultant writer, CSR  
20081 Placid Lake Terrace  
Germantown, MD 20874  
Phone: (301) 906-1088  
Email: Betsy7376@comcast.net

**Mary Lou Leary**

Acting Assistant Attorney General  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs  
810 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 307-5933  
Email: Marylou.Leary@ojp.usdoj.gov

**Nicole A Longobardo**, Intern

U.S. Department of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs  
810 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 616-5090  
Email: nicole.a.longobardo@ojp.usdoj.gov

**\*Juana Majel Dixon**

Pauma Tribal Legislative Council Woman  
National Congress of American Indian  
P.O. Box 734  
Pauma Valley, CA 92061  
Phone: (760) 855-1466  
Email: jmajel@aol.com

**Kelley Moulton**, Director

Gender, Health & Justice Research Unit  
University of Cape Town  
Falmouth Building, Medical School  
Anzio Road, Observatory, AL 7700  
Phone: (202) 387-0870  
Email: kelley.moulton@uct.ac.za

**Carmen L O'Leary**, Director

Native Women's Society of the Great Plains  
P.O. Box 448  
118 S Willow Street  
Eagle Butte, SD 57625  
Phone: (605) 850-1332  
Email: nativewomenssociety@gmail.com

**Jane E Palmer**, Research Associate

U.S. Department of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs  
810 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 514-8223  
Email: jane.palmer@ojp.usdoj.gov

**Steven W. Perry**, Statistician

U.S. Department of Justice  
Bureau of Justice Statistics  
810 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 307-0777  
Email: Steven.W.Perry@usdoj.gov

**Catherine M Poston**, Attorney Advisor

U.S. Department of Justice  
Office on Violence Against Women  
145 N Street, NE, 10th Floor  
Washington, DC 20530  
Phone: (202) 514-5430  
Email: catherine.poston@usdoj.gov

**Gregory Ridgeway**, Acting Director

National Institute of Justice  
810 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 616-5146  
Email: Greg.Ridgeway@ojp.usdoj.gov



**André Rosay**

Visiting Executive Research Fellow  
U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice  
810 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 353-0949  
Email: Andre.B.Rosay@ojp.usdoj.gov

**Rachell M Tenorio**

Santo Domingo Pueblo  
106 Morenci Street  
Santo Domingo Pueblo, NM 87052  
Phone: (505) 250-4432  
Email: Rachellt19@gmail.com

**Gaye L Tenoso**, Deputy Director

U.S. Department of Justice  
Office of Tribal Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Ave, NW  
Washington, DC 20530  
Phone: (202) 307-6302  
Email: gaye.tenoso@usdoj.gov

**Crystal C. Tetrick**

Parent and Child Health Manager  
Public Health Seattle and King County  
401 5th Avenue, Suite 1000  
Seattle, WA 98104  
Phone: (206) 263-8378  
Email: crystal.tetrick@kingcounty.org

**Mariah Thompson**, Counsel for the Minority

Senate Committee on Indian Affairs  
838 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510  
Phone: (202) 224-2251  
Minority Fax: (202) 224-5429

**Jennifer Truman**, Statistician

U.S. Department of Justice  
Bureau of Justice Statistics  
810 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 514-5083  
Email: jennifer.truman@usdoj.gov

**Allison Turkel**, Senior Policy Advisor

U.S. Department of Justice  
SMART Office  
810 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 305-2117  
Email: allison.turkel@usdoj.gov

**Eugenia Tyner-Dawson**, Executive Director,

JPCNAA and Senior Advisor to the Assistant  
Attorney General for Tribal Affairs  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs  
810 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 616-5177  
Email: eugenia.tyner-dawson@ojp.usdoj.gov

**Grant L. Walker** (via phone)

Chief Prosecutor/Special Assistant United States  
Attorney  
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe  
District of North Dakota and District of South  
Dakota  
P.O. Box 363  
Fort Yates, ND 58538  
Phone: (701) 854-7244  
Email: grantwalker@gmail.com

**Debra Whitcomb**, Visiting Fellow

U.S. Department of Justice  
Office for Victims of Crime  
810 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 514-5412  
Email: debra.whitcomb@usdoj.gov

**Lorraine White**

Family Stabilization Program Director  
Minnesota Indian Women's Resource Center  
2300 15th Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55404  
Phone: (612) 728-2024  
Email: lwhite@miwrc.org

## Appendix C: Biographical Sketches of USDOJ Participating Staff

**Alison Brooks** is a Research Associate with NIJ at OJP. Ms. Brooks is primarily responsible for assisting with the planning, development and implementation of the research program on violence against AI and AN women authorized under Title IX, Section 904(a) of the 2005 reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

At NIJ, Ms. Brooks has served on projects related to wrongful convictions, sexual assault kit backlogs, and using DNA in cases of motor vehicle theft. Prior to joining NIJ, Ms. Brooks collaborated with the University of Virginia on a federal grant studying sexual coercion in prison. She has given lectures about issues related to prisoner reentry and prison violence. Her research interests include alternative sentencing, restorative justice, and prisoner reentry.

Ms. Brooks is currently a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Justice, Law, and Society at American University in Washington D.C. She received her Master's degree in Justice, Law, and Society from American University and her Bachelor of Science in Public Policy and Administration from James Madison University.

---

**Christine Crossland** is a Senior Social Science Analyst in the Office of Research and Evaluation at NIJ. Ms. Crossland is primarily responsible for planning, implementing, testing, evaluating, managing, and reporting on criminal justice grants, cooperative agreements, contracts, and studies. She currently works with other government agencies, non-profit organizations, public and private businesses, criminal justice and public health agencies to coordinate the establishment of a broad and enhanced research agenda in the area of violence and victimization and implementation of a new program of research addressing AI and AN crime and justice issues.

Ms. Crossland is currently directing and organizing, in partnership with OVW and CDC a research program to examine violence against AI and AN women living in tribal communities. Ms. Crossland is NIJ's liaison to OJP's Justice Programs Council on Native American Affairs (JPCNAA) as well as the co-chair for the JPCNAA's Research, Data Collection, & Information Sharing Working Group. Other committee assignments and participation include: the Attorney General's Native American Issues Subcommittee, a member of OJP's Tribal Law & Order Steering Committee, and the Section 904 Federal Advisory Task Force on Violence Against Indian Women in Indian Country.

---

**Lorraine Edmo** currently serves as Deputy Director for Tribal Affairs in the U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women (OVW). In this capacity, she supports the Director in all matters relating to the Safety of Indian Women, pursuant to Title IX of the Violence Against Women Act of 2005 (VAWA 2005). She directs OVW's Tribal unit that manages the Grants to Tribal Governments Program and the Tribal Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Coalitions Program. The Tribal Deputy Director position is statutorily required and created under Title IX of the VAWA 2005.

Ms. Edmo joined OVW in November 2006 with more than 30 years' experience working on behalf of AI and AN people at the regional and national level. Ms. Edmo's federal career includes positions at the U.S. Department of Interior where she directed the National Fund for Excellence in AI Education; the U.S. Department of Education where she worked on implementing Executive Order 13096 on AI and AN Education; and the U.S. Department of Health Services where she managed grants for the Administration for Native Americans.

Prior to her federal service, Ms. Edmo directed two national non-profit Indian organizations, including the American Indian Graduate Center in Albuquerque, NM and the National Indian Education Association in Alexandria, Virginia. She served on numerous boards and commissions working for the betterment of Indian people, and, in 1992, was named Outstanding Alumnus by the University of New Mexico's Public

Administration Department. She began her career as editor of her tribe's newspaper and founded the currently published *Sho-Ban News*.

Ms. Edmo is a member of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribe of Fort Hall, Idaho. She received her Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Montana and her Master of Arts degree in Public Administration from the University of New Mexico.

---

**Bea Hanson** is the Acting Director of the United States Department of Justice's Office on Violence Against Women (OVW). Dr. Hanson was appointed to this position on April 9, 2012. As Director, she serves as the liaison between the Department of Justice and federal, state, tribal, and international governments on matters relating to violence against women. She is responsible for developing the Department's legal and policy positions regarding the implementation of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) and overseeing an annual budget of nearly \$400 million. Prior to her appointment as Acting Director, Dr. Hanson served as OVW's Principal Deputy Director since May 2011.

Dr. Hanson previously served as Chief Program Officer for Safe Horizon, a crime victim service organization in New York City that serves 350,000 victims annually, where she directed a staff of 500 in 60 locations. She joined Safe Horizon (formerly Victim Services) in 1997 as the Director of Emergency Services and went on to oversee the agency's domestic violence, homeless youth, and child abuse programs before being promoted to Chief Program Officer.

During her tenure at Safe Horizon, Dr. Hanson doubled domestic shelter capacity and tripled revenue in four years for the country's largest domestic violence shelter provider. She also advocated and collaborated with city and state governments to establish Child Advocacy Centers in Manhattan and the Bronx, co-locating the police, assistant district attorneys, child protection workers, and medical providers to serve victims of child sexual and severe physical abuse.

She established a new borough-based, victim-centered program, which refocused interventions on meeting all safety needs of clients, developed program-based performance measures to evaluate services meeting budgetary and operational objectives, and refocused research and evaluation activities to prioritize internal evaluation.

Before joining Safe Horizon, Dr. Hanson served as the Director of Client Services for the New York City Gay and Lesbian Anti-Violence Project, serving 2,000 victims of hate crimes, domestic violence, and sexual assault annually. She also held positions with the Northwest Bronx Community and Clergy Coalition, the National Training and Information Center, and Ozone House: Counseling Center for Runaway and Homeless Youth.

Dr. Hanson earned a Doctor of Philosophy in Social Welfare degree from City University in New York, a Master of Social Work degree from Hunter College School of Social Work in New York, and a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor.

She served as an adjunct professor at Hunter College School of Social Work and Fordham University Graduate School of Social Services in New York. Her writings are published in a range of books and journals, and she has served on the boards of numerous organizations including the Paul Rapoport Foundation, the National Association of Social Workers, New York City Chapter, and the New York City Human Resources Administration.

---

**Mary Lou Leary** was appointed Acting Assistant Attorney General on March 1, 2012. As head of the Office of Justice Programs, she oversees an annual budget of more than \$2 billion dedicated to supporting state, local,

and tribal criminal justice agencies; an array of juvenile justice programs; a wide range of research, evaluation, and statistical efforts; and comprehensive services for crime victims. Prior to her appointment, she served as Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General.

Ms. Leary has 30 years of criminal justice experience at the federal, state, and local levels, with an extensive background in criminal prosecution, government leadership, and victim advocacy. Before joining the Office of Justice Programs in 2009, she was Executive Director of the National Center for Victims of Crime, a leading victim advocacy organization in Washington, D.C. She also served in leadership roles at the Office of the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, holding posts as Principal Assistant United States Attorney, Senior Counsel to the United States Attorney, Chief of the office's Superior Court Division, and United States Attorney. From 1999 to 2001, she held several executive positions at the Department of Justice, including Acting Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs, Deputy Associate Attorney General, and Acting Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

In addition to her years as a federal prosecutor, Ms. Leary prosecuted crimes on the state and local levels as Assistant District Attorney in Middlesex County, Massachusetts. She received her law degree from Northeastern University School of Law, a Master's degree in education from Ohio State University, and a Bachelor's degree in English literature from Syracuse University.

---

**Kelley Moul** is the Acting Director of the Gender, Health, and Justice Research Unit at the University of Cape Town (UCT). Dr. Moul obtained her Ph.D. in Justice, Law, and Society from the American University in Washington, D.C. She also holds a Master of Art's degree in Criminal Justice from the George Washington University, as well as an undergraduate and postgraduate degree in Criminology from the University of Cape Town. Before returning to UCT in 2010, she was an adjunct faculty member at American University and at George Washington University - a position she still holds. She was a Research Assistant (2008-2010) at NIJ where she worked primarily on a program of research to examine violence against AI and AN women. Kelley has been a Fulbright Fellow (2004-2006) and was the recipient of the Neil and Anne Kerwin Dissertation Fellowship (2009) for her research on domestic violence court clerks and the administration of justice in South Africa. Her areas of interest are feminist criminology, gender-based violence and policy, domestic homicide, and the intersection of traditional and Western justice systems in terms of these issues. Her work has been published in *Feminist Criminology* and the *South African Crime Quarterly*.

---

**Jane Palmer** is a Research Associate with NIJ at OJP. Dr. Palmer is primarily responsible for assisting with the planning, development, and implementation of the research program on violence against AI and AN women authorized under Title IX, Section 904(a) of the 2005 Reauthorization of the VAWA. Her Ph.D. is from the Department of Justice, Law, and Society at American University in Washington D.C. She received her Master's degree in Social Work from the Jane Addams College of Social Work at the University of Illinois at Chicago and her Bachelor of Arts in Sociology from Smith College.

Jane's research interests include the prevention of gender-based violence, help-seeking by survivors of gender-based violence, legal/policy responses to gender-based violence, and measurement issues in violence against women research. She received the American University Dissertation Fellowship Award and the Neil and Anne Kerwin Dissertation Fellowship for her dissertation on the role of bystanders in preventing and responding to sexual assault and dating violence. Prior to working at NIJ, Jane was a prevention educator, advocate, counselor, and executive director in non-profit organizations focused on the prevention of violence and ending violence against women. She has served as a board member, consultant, trainer, and grant writer for anti-violence non-profits and has assisted with the development of several community-based peer-to-peer initiatives focusing on meeting the needs of underserved survivors' gender-based violence. She also is an

adjunct faculty member and a part-time Post-Doctoral Associate at the Rutgers University School of Social Work's Center on Violence Against Women and Children.

---

**Cathy Poston** serves as an Attorney Advisor in OVW. Since 2001, she has provided legal advice to the Director and OVW staff on a broad range of issues including the implementation of VAWA. Previously, Ms. Poston served as a Deputy Assistant Attorney General and as Senior Counsel in the Office of Policy Development at the U.S. Department of Justice, focusing on criminal justice issues, including violence against women, media violence, and judicial nominations. Before she began her service with the Department of Justice in 1995, Ms. Poston was the Chief Nominations Counsel and a Nominations Counsel for the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee during the chairmanship of then Senator Joseph Biden. She was a litigation associate with a Washington D.C. law firm, Collier, Shannon, Rill & Scott, from 1989-1993.

Ms. Poston received her Juris Doctorate from Georgetown University Law Center in 1989 and her B.A. and M.A. degrees from Stanford University in 1986.

---

**Greg Ridgeway** is the Acting Director of NIJ. Dr. Ridgeway was appointed to this position on January 4, 2013. Prior to this appointment, he served as Deputy Director where he oversaw the three scientific offices at NIJ – the Office of Investigative and Forensic Sciences, the Office of Research and Evaluation, and the Office of Science and Technology. Prior to joining NIJ, Dr. Ridgeway worked for the RAND Corporation directing the Safety and Justice Research Program, managing RAND's portfolio on policing, crime prevention, courts, corrections, and public and occupational safety. He has worked with numerous police departments on recruiting, gun violence, illegal firearm markets, police-community relations, use-of-force, racial profiling, performance measurement, and other key policing issues.

As a statistician, Dr. Ridgeway has studied statistical learning theory, causal analysis, and analytical methods for massive datasets. In 2007, the American Statistical Association for innovative analysis of policing issues recognized him. Prior to RAND, Dr. Ridgeway worked at Microsoft Research, receiving seven patents for developed methods. He received his Ph.D. in statistics from the University of Washington, where he also was a lecturer and visiting scholar. He received his Bachelor's degree in statistics from California Polytechnic State University.

---

**André Rosay** is a Visiting Executive Research Fellow in the Office of Research and Evaluation at NIJ. Under this fellowship, Dr. Rosay is working on NIJ's program of research on violence against Indian women living in tribal communities. He also is a Professor and the Director of Research for the Justice Center at the University of Alaska Anchorage. He has tremendous experience working with practitioners to conduct community-based participatory research that influences policy and practice. His substantive areas of expertise include violence against women and juvenile justice. He has worked extensively with tribal communities in Alaska and previously served on the Board of Directors for the Alaska Native Justice Center. He also has served as the Principal Investigator for the Alaska Victimization Survey since 2010.

---

**Tony West** was appointed the Acting Associate Attorney General of the United States on March 9, 2012. Previously, he was nominated by President Barack Obama to be the Assistant Attorney General for the Justice Department's Civil Division on January 22, 2009. He was confirmed as the head of the Civil Division by the U.S. Senate on April 20, 2009.

As the Acting Associate Attorney General, Mr. West's primary responsibility is to advise and assist the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General in formulating and implementing Departmental policies, and programs related to a broad range of issues, including civil litigation, federal and local law enforcement and

public safety. Mr. West, the third ranking official at the agency, oversees the Department's civil litigating components (Antitrust Division, Civil Division, Civil Rights Division, Environment and Natural Resources Division, Tax Division, Community Relations Service, Executive Office of U.S. Trustees, Office of Information Policy and Foreign Settlement Claims Commission) and grant-making components (Office of Justice Programs, Office on Violence Against Women, and Community Oriented Policing Services).

In his capacity as Acting Associate Attorney General, Mr. West serves as the Co-Chair of the President's Task Force on Puerto Rico, the Vice Chair of the Steering Committee of the President's Financial Fraud Enforcement Task Force and the federal government's Chief FOIA Officer. He has taken an active role in leading the Department's response to the Deepwater Water Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, improving the federal government's relationship with Native American communities, raising awareness about intimate partner violence, and enhancing collaboration between federal, state, local and tribal law enforcement.

From April 2009 to March 2012, Mr. West served as the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Division, which is the largest litigating division in the Department of Justice. In addition to focusing on traditional areas of the Civil Division's work – such as representing the United States in legal challenges to congressional statutes, Administration policies and federal agency actions, as well as defending the President, Cabinet officers, and other federal employees in lawsuits filed against them

Mr. West bolstered the Civil Division's affirmative civil enforcement efforts in areas such as health care fraud, mortgage fraud, procurement fraud and other civil actions to recover taxpayer money lost to fraud and abuse. Mr. West also emphasized the Civil Division's responsibility to bring civil and criminal actions to enforce the nation's consumer protection laws. During his tenure in the Civil Division, Mr. West served in various positions on the Financial Fraud Enforcement Task Force, including Co-Chair of the Mortgage Fraud Working Group, the Residential Mortgage-Backed Securities Working Group, and the Consumer Protection Working Group.

Mr. West first served in the Department of Justice a year after graduating from law school. From 1993 through 1994, he served as a Special Assistant to the Deputy Attorney General. From 1994 to 1999, he was an Assistant United States Attorney in the Northern District of California. From 1999 to 2001, Mr. West served as a State Special Assistant Attorney General in California.

Prior to returning to the Justice Department, Mr. West was a litigation partner at Morrison & Foerster LLP in San Francisco.

Mr. West graduated with honors from Harvard College, where he served as publisher of the Harvard Political Review and received his law degree from Stanford Law School, where he was elected President of the Stanford Law Review.

## Appendix D: Task Force Meeting Agenda



**Federal Advisory Task Force on Research on Violence Against American Indian and Alaska Native Women living in Tribal Communities**



**Meeting Agenda**  
**Office of Justice Programs, 810 7<sup>th</sup> Street, NW**  
**3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Ballroom**  
**Washington, D.C. 20531**  
**March 7-8, 2013**



<b>Thursday, March 7, 2013</b>	
<b>8:00 am to 8:30 am</b>	<b>Registration – Lower Lobby Check-in (Government ID and Escort Required)</b>
<b>8:30 am to 10:00 am</b>	<p><b>Traditional Opening</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Juanita Majel Dixon (Pauma Band of Mission Indians), Task Force Member</li> </ul> <p><b>Welcome</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bea Hanson, Acting Director, Office on Violence Against Women (OVW)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Task Force Designated Federal Official</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mary Lou Leary, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs (OJP)</li> <li>Gregory Ridgeway, Acting Director, National Institute of Justice (NIJ)</li> </ul> <p><b>Reflections and Group Introductions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Task Force Members</li> <li>OVW &amp; NIJ Participating Staff</li> </ul> <p><b>Meeting Facilitator</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kelley Moul, Director, Gender, Health, and Justice Research Unit, University of Cape Town</li> </ul> <p><b>Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) Management Overview</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Catherine Poston, Attorney Advisor, OVW</li> </ul>
<b>10:00 am to 10:15am</b>	<b>Morning Break</b>
<b>10:15 am to 11:45 am</b>	<p><b>American Indian and Alaska Native People in the 2010 NISVS Survey</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>André Rosay, Visiting Executive Research Fellow, NIJ</li> <li>Task Force Question &amp; Answer (Q&amp;A)</li> </ul> <p><b>NIJ's Violence Against Indian Women (VAIW) in Indian Country Research Program: A Roadmap to Present Day</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Christine Crossland, Senior Social Science Analyst, NIJ</li> <li>Jane Palmer, Research Associate, NIJ</li> <li>Alison Brooks, Research Associate, NIJ</li> <li>Facilitator &amp; Task Force Q&amp;A</li> </ul>
<b>11:45 am to 12:00 pm</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Session: Public Comment – Registration Required</b>
<b>12:00 to 2:45 pm</b>	<b>Lunch On Your Own - (VAWA Reauthorization Signing at DOI for invited guest)</b>
<b>2:45 pm to 4:45 pm</b>	<p><b>Refinement and Field Implementation of the Tribal Study of Public Safety and Public Health Issues Facing American Indian and Alaska Native Women: The Baseline Study</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Christine Crossland, Senior Social Science Analyst, NIJ</li> <li>Facilitator &amp; Task Force Discussion</li> </ul> <p><b>National Baseline Study Survey Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilitator &amp; Task Force Discussion</li> </ul>

Thursday, March 7, 2013	
4:45 pm to 5:00 pm	<p><b>Wrap-up: Day 1 Takeaways and Overview of Day 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kelley Moulton, Director, Gender, Health, and Justice Research Unit, University of Cape Town</li> </ul> <p><b>Day 1 Adjournment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bea Hanson, Acting Director, Office on Violence Against Women (OVW)</li> </ul>
Friday, March 8, 2013	
8:00 am to 8:30 am	<b>Registration – Lower Lobby Check-in (Government ID and Escort Required)</b>
8:30 am to 10:00 am	<p><b>Opening Remarks &amp; Announcements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bea Hanson, Acting Director, Office on Violence Against Women (OVW)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Task Force Designated Federal Official</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Overview of NIJ's Proposed Sampling Plan for the National Baseline Study</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gregory Ridgeway, Acting NIJ Deputy Director</li> <li>• Task Force Q&amp;A</li> </ul> <p><b>Task Force Recommendations for VAIW Program and Initiative Evaluations at the State, Local, and Tribal Level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitator &amp; Task Force Discussion</li> </ul> <p><b>The Collaboration Challenge: Developing Outreach &amp; Dissemination Vehicles and Messages Regarding the VAIW Baseline Study</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitator &amp; Task Force Discussion</li> </ul>
10:00 am to 10:15am	<b>Morning Break</b>
10:15 am to 11:45 am	<p><b>Overview of Task Force Meeting &amp; Proposed Next Steps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitator - OVW &amp; NIJ Staff</li> </ul> <p><b>Task Force Members Final Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Task Force Members</li> </ul>
11:45 am to 12:00 pm	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Session: Public Comment – Registration Required</b>
12:00 pm to 12:30 pm	<p><b>Closing Remarks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tony West, Acting Associate Attorney General</li> <li>• Bea Hanson, Acting Director, Office on Violence Against Women (OVW)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Task Force Designated Federal Official</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Meeting Adjournment</b></p>

## Appendix E: Task Force Meeting Federal Register Notice

10636

Federal Register / Vol. 78, No. 31 / Thursday, February 14, 2013 / Notices

noon the next day pursuant to section 210.4(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.4(f)). Submissions should refer to the docket number ("Docket No. 2938") in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (See Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, [http://www.usitc.gov/secretary/fed\\_reg\\_notices/rules/handbook\\_on\\_electronic\\_filing.pdf](http://www.usitc.gov/secretary/fed_reg_notices/rules/handbook_on_electronic_filing.pdf)). Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary (202-205-2000).

Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary to the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. See 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and of sections 201.10 and 210.8(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.10, 210.8(c)).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: February 8, 2013.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Acting Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2013-03442 Filed 2-13-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701-TA-488 and 731-TA-1199-1200 (Final)]

### Large Residential Washers From Korea and Mexico

#### Determinations

On the basis of the record<sup>1</sup> developed in the subject investigations, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines, pursuant to sections 705(b) and 735(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671d(b) and 1673d(b)) (the Act), that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports from Korea of large residential washers that the U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) has determined are subsidized by the Government of Korea and sold in the

United States at less than fair value (LTFV). The Commission further determines that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports from Mexico of large residential washers that the Commerce has determined are sold in the United States at LTFV. The products subject to these investigations are provided for in subheading 8450.20.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, and imported under statistical reporting number 8450.20.0090. Products subject to these investigations may also be imported under HTS subheadings 8450.11.00, 8450.90.20 or 8450.90.60.

#### Background

The Commission instituted these investigations effective December 30, 2011, following receipt of a petition filed with the Commission and Commerce by Whirlpool Corporation, Benton Harbor, MI. The final phase of the investigations was scheduled by the Commission following notification of a preliminary determination by Commerce that imports of large residential washers from Korea were subsidized within the meaning of section 703(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671b(b)) and that imports of large residential washers from Korea and Mexico were sold at LTFV within the meaning of 733(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673b(b)). Notice of the scheduling of the final phase of the Commission's investigations and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** on August 24, 2012 (77 FR 51569). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on December 11, 2012, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determinations in these investigations to the Secretary of Commerce on February 8, 2013. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4378 (February 2013), entitled *Certain Large Residential Washers From Korea and Mexico: Investigation Nos. 701-TA-488 and 731-TA-1199-1200 (Final)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: February 8, 2013.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Acting Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2013-03422 Filed 2-13-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Task Force on Research on Violence Against American Indian and Alaska Native Women; Meeting

**AGENCY:** Office on Violence Against Women, United States Department of Justice.

**ACTION:** Notice of Meeting.

**SUMMARY:** This notice sets forth the schedule and proposed agenda of the forthcoming public meeting of the Task Force on Research on Violence Against American Indian and Alaska Native Women (hereinafter "the Task Force").

**DATES:** The meeting will take place on March 7, 2013 from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and March 8 from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will take place at the Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, 810 7th Street NW., 3rd Floor Ballroom, Washington, DC 20531. The public is asked to pre-register by March 1, 2013 for the meeting due to security considerations and so that there is adequate space (see below for information on pre-registration).

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Lorraine Edmo, Deputy Tribal Director, Office on Violence Against Women, United States Department of Justice, 145 N Street NE., Suite 10W.121, Washington, DC 20530; by telephone at: (202) 514-8804; email: [Lorraine.edmo@usdoj.gov](mailto:Lorraine.edmo@usdoj.gov); or fax: (202) 307-3911. You may also view information about the Task Force on the Office on Violence Against Women Web site at: <http://www.ovw.usdoj.gov/section904-taskforce.html>.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Notice of this meeting is required under section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Title IX of the Violence Against Women Act of 2005 (VAWA 2005) requires the Attorney General to establish a Task Force to assist the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to develop and implement a program of research on violence against American Indian and Alaska Native women, including domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and murder. The program will evaluate the effectiveness of the Federal, state, and tribal response to violence against Indian women, and will propose recommendations to improve the government response. The Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women, established the Task Force on March 31, 2008.

A meeting previously scheduled for October 30 and 31, 2012, and previously

announced in the *Federal Register*, was cancelled due to extreme weather conditions. The March 7–8 meeting will include an update on NIJ's program of research, an overview of NIJ's Federal Response Study, an overview of the Center for Disease Control's 2010 General Population National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Surveillance Study (NISVS) and NIJ's American Indian and Alaska Native NISVS Oversample Study, an overview of NIJ's proposed sampling plan for a baseline study, and a presentation on refinement and field implementation of the Tribal Study of Public Safety and Public Health Issues Facing American Indian and Alaska Native Women as well as facilitated Task Force member discussion. In addition, the Task Force is also welcoming public oral comment at this meeting and has reserved an estimated 15 minutes on March 7 and on March 8 from 11:45 p.m. to 12:00 p.m. for this purpose. Members of the public wishing to address the Task Force must contact Lorraine Edmo, Deputy Tribal Director, Office on Violence Against Women, United States Department of Justice, 145 N Street NE., Suite 10W.121, Washington, DC 20530; by telephone at: (202) 514–8804; email: [Lorraine.edmo@usdoj.gov](mailto:Lorraine.edmo@usdoj.gov); or fax: (202) 307–3911. The meeting will take place on March 7, 2013 from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and will include a lunch break and on March 8 from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Time will be reserved for public comment from 11:45 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. on March 7 and 8. See the section below for information on reserving time for public comment.

**Access:** This meeting will be open to the public but registration on a space available basis and for security reasons is required. All members of the public who wish to attend must register in advance of the meeting by March 1, 2013 by contacting Lorraine Edmo, Deputy Tribal Director, Office on Violence Against Women, United States Department of Justice, by email: [Lorraine.edmo@usdoj.gov](mailto:Lorraine.edmo@usdoj.gov); or fax: (202) 307–3911. All attendees will be required to sign in and be processed through Security at the Lobby Visitors Desk. Please bring photo identification and allow extra time prior to the start of the meeting.

All members of the press who wish to attend and/or record any part of the meeting must register in advance of the meeting by March 1, 2013 by contacting Lorraine Edmo as noted above. In addition to being processed through Security at the Lobby Visitors Desk, all members of the press are required to sign in at meeting registration and must present government-issued photo I.D.

(such as a driver's license) as well as valid media credentials. Please allow extra time prior to the start of the meeting for registering.

The meeting site is accessible to individuals with disabilities. Individuals who require special accommodation in order to attend the meeting should notify Lorraine Edmo no later than March 1, 2013.

**Written Comments:** Interested parties are invited to submit written comments by March 1, 2013 to Lorraine Edmo, Deputy Tribal Director, Office on Violence Against Women, United States Department of Justice, 145 N Street NE., Suite 10W.121, Washington, DC 20530 by mail; or by email: [Lorraine.edmo@usdoj.gov](mailto:Lorraine.edmo@usdoj.gov); or by fax: (202) 307–3911.

#### Public Comment

Persons interested in participating during the public comment period of the meeting are requested to reserve time on the agenda by contacting Lorraine Edmo, Deputy Tribal Director, Office on Violence Against Women, United States Department of Justice, by email: [Lorraine.edmo@usdoj.gov](mailto:Lorraine.edmo@usdoj.gov); or fax: (202) 307–3911 by March 1, 2013. Requests must include the participant's name, organization represented, if appropriate, and a brief description of the subject of the comments. Each participant will be permitted approximately 3 to 5 minutes to present comments, depending on the number of individuals reserving time on the agenda. Participants are also encouraged to submit written copies of their comments at the meeting. Comments that are submitted to Lorraine Edmo, Deputy Tribal Director, Office on Violence Against Women, United States Department of Justice, 145 N Street NE., Suite 10W.121, Washington, DC 20530 by mail; by email: [Lorraine.edmo@usdoj.gov](mailto:Lorraine.edmo@usdoj.gov); or fax: (202) 307–3911 before March 1, 2013 will be circulated to Task Force members prior to the meeting.

Given the expected number of individuals interested in presenting comments at the meeting, reservations should be made as soon as possible. Persons unable to obtain reservations to speak during the meeting are encouraged to submit written comments, which will be accepted at the meeting location or may be mailed to the attention of Lorraine Edmo, Deputy Tribal Director, Office on Violence Against Women, United States Department of Justice, 145 N Street NE., Suite 10W.121, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: February 7, 2013.

**Bea Hanson,**

*Acting Director, Office on Violence Against Women.*

[FR Doc. 2013–03454 Filed 2–13–13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410–EX–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Office of the Secretary

**Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Mine Rescue Teams, Arrangements for Emergency Medical Assistance, and Arrangements for Transportation for Injured Persons**

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Labor (DOL) is submitting the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) sponsored information collection request (ICR) titled, "Mine Rescue Teams, Arrangements for Emergency Medical Assistance, and Arrangements for Transportation for Injured Persons," to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval for continued use in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.).

**DATES:** Submit comments on or before March 18, 2013.

**ADDRESSES:** A copy of this ICR with applicable supporting documentation; including a description of the likely respondents, proposed frequency of response, and estimated total burden may be obtained from the RegInfo.gov Web site, <http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain>, on the day following publication of this notice or by contacting Michel Smyth by telephone at 202–693–4129 (this is not a toll-free number) or sending an email to [DOL\\_PRA\\_PUBLIC@dol.gov](mailto:DOL_PRA_PUBLIC@dol.gov).

Submit comments about this request to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for DOL–MSHA, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503, Fax: 202–395–6881 (this is not a toll-free number), email: [OIRA\\_submission@omb.eop.gov](mailto:OIRA_submission@omb.eop.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michel Smyth by telephone at 202–693–4129 (this is not a toll-free number) or by email at [DOL\\_PRA\\_PUBLIC@dol.gov](mailto:DOL_PRA_PUBLIC@dol.gov).

Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3507(a)(1)(D).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This ICR is to re-authorize existing information collection requirements supporting regulations 30 CFR part 49 regarding the