

[STAND BY FOR LIVE CAPTIONS] Interpreters please begin.

>> Mojdeh: Thank you. (In Spanish), Good afternoon, everybody, we congratulate the organizers of this event for their firm commitment to facilitating bilingual communication in today's meeting. My name is Mojdeh, my co-interpreter is Andreina, and we represent the Tilde Language Justice Cooperative. We will be providing English-Spanish and Spanish-English simultaneous interpretation. (Continuing in Spanish), If you joined on your phone, please join on the Zoom app so that you can access interpretation. Please note that this function is not available on Chromebook. (Continuing in Spanish) If you want to listen and participate in English, please select your language channel. Go to the bottom right-hand corner of your Zoom screen, click on the globe if you're using a computer, or the three dots if you're connected by phone. Select "interpretation", click "English", and click "done" at the end. (Continuing in Spanish) A few guidelines for creating multilingual spaces: (Speaking in Spanish) You may have noticed that I am speaking fast in Spanish, and I'm doing this introduction in both languages, but we have ASL Interpretation in English, and so, myself, and all of you, please, please do not speak fast. It's especially easy to speak fast when you're reading a presentation, or excited, nervous, or running out of time. Also, if you're not speaking, please mute yourself. (Continuing in Spanish) Lastly, we remind you to please speak one person at a time, with one language per sentence and only speak in the language of the channel you chose. If you are bilingual Spanish-English, you don't need to choose a channel, and you can speak in either of those two languages. (Continuing in Spanish) We create spaces with everyone's support... Communicate creating multilingual space, that's it.

>> HEIDI NOTARIO: Hi everyone, welcome to our policy and research briefing as we continue to observe Domestic Violence Awareness Month this year. My name is Heidi Notario. I use she/her pronouns. And I am the Vice President of Strategic Partnerships and Systems change with the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence. I have curly hair, longer on the right, and very short on the left. I'm wearing silver-rimmed glasses, roundish glasses; and I'm also wearing a black jacket and shirt with a purple tie. We would like to review some additional housekeeping notes with you as we get ready to enter into the session. As you heard, we are committed to making this an equitable space in which people of all abilities can participate fully and in their preferred language.

This will take everyone's effort and commitment to make a reality. For example, we have limited use of the chat function. It is difficult to translate the chat in real-time and can be inaccessible to assistive devices. If possible, send us questions, comments, or resources directly to the event host, and cohost. We will then read out the questions or comments so that they can be simultaneously interpreted. While we aim to make this a multilingual and mixed-abilities space, we also know that we are still learning how to do this well. So please reach out to the events staff during the briefing if you are experiencing any accessibility issues. Also, we will ask about accessibility in our post-event evaluation. Please let us know, your experience and ways we can improve. We recognize that we have lots to learn, and we want to continue to do better. This event features live captioning, you can access this feature by clicking "caption" at the bottom of your screen. We are recording the event, and we'll share it through our website, The question-and-answer feature provides an opportunity for attendees to enter questions, for the presenters to respond. Please reach out to our staff if you are experiencing ongoing technical issues but note our limited capacity to address them while the webinar is running. Today's briefing, we center on emerging solutions to housing insecurity for survivors of domestic and sexual violence, best practices and lessons learned from communities and research partners. So, without any more delays, I would like to turn your attention to our -- the message from the Director of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Office, Shawndell Dawson.

>> SHAWNDELL DAWSON: (Via video). Good afternoon and welcome! I am Shawndell Dawson, Director of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act Program. I am so pleased to welcome you all to the Safe Housing Capacity-Building Center policy briefing and it is an honor to stand in solidarity with such amazing leaders, creating social change, for survivors and their children every day. (After a pause), we have learned so much from all of you, and we thank you for continuing to ensure that everyone in this country, and around the world, understands that survivor safety is built upon a foundation of equity, accessibility, social transformation, human rights, and economic empowerment. I especially want to thank you for joining us today because I know what survivors and each of you are facing every day, is daunting. 24% of U.S. cities have identified domestic violence as a cause for family homelessness. Survivors are four times more likely to have experienced material hardship; including food, water, and housing insecurity. 78% of people experiencing homelessness are people of color. And it is increasingly harder

to find affordable housing in our own communities. Research shows that only 36 affordable and available homes exist for every 100 extremely-low-income renter households in the United States. And in 2021, FVPSA-funded shelters supported over 7 million shelter nights and were not able to meet the needs of 181,000 requests for shelter due to limited resources and being full to capacity, and not having any open beds to shelter any additional families.

Survivors and their families have to stay in shelter longer, because they do not have access to safe, affordable housing options to transition to. Given what we are all facing, every day, I greatly-appreciate your tireless advocacy, sacrifice and commitment to social change. It is your leadership, and partnership, and deep commitment to survivors, children, and youth, that help keep them safe, and resilient, and hopeful. (After a pause), Today I am joined by tremendous leaders from across the country that have helped us all know more about flexible funding, housing models, and supportive services for domestic violence survivors and sexual assault survivors. These leaders have built innovative programs and services and research that ensures that survivors' needs were centered, elevated, and respectfully researched. These leaders have made sure that advocates and Continuums of Care had access to expert technical assistance, that fostered growth and trauma-informed homeless services; and today, I am very hopeful, and excited that you-all will hear firsthand, new research findings that will spur meaningful changes in services. Over the last ten years, these leaders, survivors, and all of you, have been shaping the future of services and support. Survivors have identified direct financial support as helpful and accessing or maintaining safety and permanent housing; we know that low barrier flexible funding, given directly to survivors has shown to be a useful tool to avert evictions and foreclosures as well as help survivors obtain housing altogether. Every day survivors have stated that their safety-planning needs to include direct, cash assistance to cover the cost of rent, and mortgage payments, food, as well as utility bills and any arrears. We also know that by providing survivors with an average amount of \$1,800 to \$4,000, could help them and their children be stably housed well beyond 18 months. Thanks to the commitments of survivors, and researchers, members of Congress and the President, we are now closer than we have ever been, to achieving historic investments in flexible funding for survivors and their children. For two years, President Biden's Budget has supported a \$250 million flexible cash assistance program, for FVPSA, this proposal has been championed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Assistant Secretary for Children and Families. As well

as by all of you. For seven years, the Office of Victims of Crime and the HHS Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, the Safe Housing Partnerships Consortia, the Washington State Domestic Violence Coalition, and the Gates Foundation, and Dr. Cris Sullivan have all been building the evidence-base for flexible cash assistance, and showing that it can help survivors, and improve outcomes for children and youth all across the country. (A pause), I, along with the entire FVPSA team, FVPSA grantees, colleagues from the Department of Justice and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, are continuing to do all that we can, to lift up what we are learning from all of you, and sharing transformational findings related to research, on flexible assistance, and supportive services. Yes, there is a lot of work that still needs to be done for us to actualize expended resources and support for survivors and to support the reauthorization of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act. I thank you, all for using your voices to educate for change, and for being innovative in the face of many hardships and for never giving up. Many new and exciting things are on the horizon, and I am grateful for your partnership, your leadership, every day. Thank you for all that you do. So today, the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence has organized a very informative briefing, and I hope that each of you come away with more information and research, to help you continue to advance meaningful change for survivors and their children, all across the country. Thank you, so much, for joining us today. (Concludes remarks).

>> HEIDI NOTARIO: And now I would like to welcome Associate Commissioner Kimberly Waller from the Family Youth and Services Bureau. Welcome.

>> COMMISSIONER WALLER: Wonderful, thank you, so much, good afternoon. I am Kimberly Waller, Associate Commissioner of the Family and Youth Services Bureau and I am so glad to be able to welcome you all to this important briefing. I truly look forward to continuing to learn from these really informational conversations. I want to extend a thank you for all that everyone on this call does every day. To help survivors, and their children, safely access services and supports, and thank you to the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, for the invitation to welcome you all today, and for all the work you have done to make this briefing so valuable. FYSP is very proud of the fact that FVPSA, the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act Program grants are awarded to every state and territory and to over 250 tribes. And we, of course, fund a number of technical assistance partners, resource centers,

capacity-building centers, to support this work across our country. (An electronic tone), through our work, we know, the compelling evidence of the intersections between domestic violence, dating violence, racism, financial insecurity, housing instability, and homelessness. Director Dawson provided a lot of great information in her opening remarks; and the need for safe, accessible, and affordable housing in the economic means to maintain stable housing are two of the most pressing concerns, reported by women who are survivors of DV. These intersections, and increased trauma-related impacts are even more compounded by the lack of affordable housing and discrimination survivors face. And we also know that these challenges and barriers disproportionately impact women and more so, women of color. In my previous role before joining FYSB as the Associate Commissioner, I served as the DV liaison within my local community's Continuum of Care, or CoC. I know how challenging this work is. And I applaud your work to do intentional, and meaningful coordination and collaboration across mainstream systems and programs that may not have been designed specifically with the unique needs of survivors in mind. The work you do is important and thank you for sharing your knowledge, and expertise with us here today. FYSB and FVPSA are passionate and dedicated to identifying solutions with you, learning from the field, and experts like those who will be presenting today. And we stand ready to continue this great work alongside you going forward. Thank you, again, for the opportunity, to be here with you today and learn with you and learn from you and I really hope you enjoy the briefing, thank you, (concludes remarks at 2:16:42 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time)

>> HEIDI NOTARIO: And now I would like to welcome the National Indigenous Women's Resource Center with their safe housing capacity center.

>> CAROLINE LAPORTE: Hello everybody, good afternoon, my name is Caroline LaPorte. My pronouns are she/her/hers. I am Anishinaabe and an immediate descendant of the Little River Band of Ottawa Indians. I'm also the Director of the new FYSB funded Tribal Safe Housing Capacity Center and we do go by STTARS, and I'll talk a little bit about our acronym in a minute, but we are a project also of the National Indigenous Women's Resource Center as Heidi just stated. So, to describe myself I am wearing a black shirt. I have long, dark hair, I have on a turquoise necklace that I got from a Seminole tribal member, and I'm also wearing my supercool DVAM earrings. Gwen Packard is our Senior Housing Specialist; she is not with us today so you will just be with myself. (After a pause), I have this first slide here for

you, which has our logo at the top, as well as our MOU partners at the bottom. Of course, the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence has been with us really since the very beginning, as has the Alaska Native Women's Resource Center and the StrongHearts Native Helpline and this past year -- because we do believe that housing is a human right, we partnered with a human rights clinic at a law school so that's our other partner there, the Cardozo Institute in Holocaust and Human Rights. So, housing and shelter access issue in Indian Country, there are many, many things to think of and really that goes for on reservation, and off-reservation housing. There is a general lack of shelter options. One thing that we know, is that nationally, there may be over 2000 resources or DV shelters but for Native people wanting to access a tribally run shelter there are less than 50. It's not enough, necessarily, to meet the disparate need of... To meet the disparate experiences of survivors in our community, and it's also not enough to really meet the -- meet the threshold of there being 574 federally recognized tribes in the U.S. As is an issue for all communities, not just communities in Indian Country; there is virtually no housing inventory at the moment. And I do believe that our partners will talk about that later. There are spaces that are unsafe, and not trauma-informed. Spaces that are not culturally-rooted. Housing that is not habitable. Little to no transitional housing. Housing and shelter that's not sustainable. What we mean by that is the time limits that we place on people's access to these spaces is often too tight. And then problematic mindsets around who should have access to housing and shelter -- we think, is one of the biggest things that we have to address in our work. (After a pause), this is our framework, I'm not going to go through all of it, I am going to hit on two things, though. The first, of course, is that we believe that housing is a basic human right, and the second, is that housing stability, and access in Indian Country, has to really be understood as an ongoing crisis; one that is both historical and present. And that has to do with a ton of different federal acts that we're not going to get into today, but if you're interested in it, you can do a little research around the Dawes Act and the Homestead Act. And that picture was actually from one of the listening sessions that we were able to conduct as a new Center this past year.

This is the framework in which we approach our work, and I am taking a little bit of time to explain this, just because we are a new Center. You know, the first -- the first real thing that we've tried to focus on this year has been climate change. And the connection between violence against land, and violence

against Native women and how that intersects and impacts our unhoused relatives. Of course, I think all of us have taken a serious look on how we talk about these things from a Public Health lens, especially due to the COVID-19 pandemic. We're also centering two spirit and LGBTQAI relatives, looking at mental health and substance misuse. Incarcerated and formerly incarcerated survivors. Our Elders, our Disability Community, and then, of course, our Youth with -- especially, focusing on those who are aging out of foster care. We know that's a particular risk for Native youth, and definitely results in sort of a -- a heightened vulnerability, as they exit that space. (A pause) So, two things about the Center: The primary focus about -- of what we're doing, right? Is really looking at, gender-based violence in Indigenous communities, at the intersection of housing insecurity and homelessness; and what we did for the -- for the first year, as part of our two main deliverables in addition to others -- was funding listening sessions with survivors which I'm going to talk about in one minute. And also continuing to convene the National Work Group on Safe Housing for Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian and American Indian survivors.

So, I want to talk a little bit about these listening sessions. I won't go through all of these, but I did want you all to have them. This is how we approached the listening sessions, we developed a list of questions, and we actually ran those questions through our work group -- who does also operate in an advisory capacity. And these were some of the things that we had asked, right? Do you have access to a tribal or a Native domestic violence shelter? Do you think that there is a need for shelter? Are there some good or great resources, services, or programs in your community? And that goes for on-and off-reservation, and then do you participate in cultural and traditional practices in your community? And, of course, we found during our listening sessions that that was of particular importance. I think, obviously, we expected that. (After a pause), CAROLINE LAPORTE: These are some of the major themes that emerge, and I will go through a few of them. We held two listening sessions this past year, one in the Seattle area, and another in Minneapolis, but a lot of what we heard was pretty thematic across the board. So, we had quality of life in shelter and transitional housing was really taking, like, a sort of strong look, right? -- at the rules and policies that impacted survivors who are accessing the space. Most of the survivors that we spoke with felt that rules severely limited how they were able to access that space, and oftentimes resulted in their eviction and/or removal. And then something we heard

consistently, I would say from the vast majority of participants, not just sort of across the board in both spaces, was that there was a lack of support for Indigenous grandmothers caring for grandchildren. I don't believe this to be necessarily unique to Indian Country but I do think that it's worth noting, grandmothers appeared to be overrepresented in the unhoused populations that we spoke with. There was a clear absence of resources available to help support them as caretakers; and, of course, the problem with this was that there was, then, a heightened risk of child welfare or state system involvement, which disparately-impacts Indigenous individuals in general. Unhoused or not unhoused. This photo is actually from AICHO, which is a really cool shelter in Duluth Minnesota that we also had the opportunity to visit. Another theme that we noticed, and we just sort of titled it as "a house is not a home" -- really what this amounted to is that survivors felt they were constantly under surveillance. This led to them feeling like, a space was not theirs, they thought that the home checks were too frequent. They were invasive. Disruptive. Further traumatized them very specifically as Indigenous survivors of violence. And it wasn't necessarily just program staff, or property managers, but it was also neighbors that were reporting them to managers. And this just really led to a sense of not having community in those spaces. (Pause), Another theme that we noticed was there was a lack of identity-affirming spaces. This was pretty much the -- the most I don't know, the most overt thing that we heard was that survivors reported that racism was a common visitor to their space. It created a lack of safety and it retriggered their trauma responses. We repeatedly heard that non-Native shelter and housing was not merely unsupportive but was actually harmful to Indigenous survivors. They continually referenced the mental stigma they felt in those spaces. And they also reported feelings of guilt, right? Meaning that they felt the roof they had over their heads and so many of their other relatives and other Indigenous survivors continue to experience homelessness, was giving them a sense of this feeling. (A pause) This photo here, is from a program called "NAYA" and they actually partnered with the Siletz Tribe on their Indian block grant housing to be able to bring off-reservation housing to Indigenous survivors in the Portland area. Whoops, just a little bit of a lag, okay, sorry! In general, we know this anecdotally but, of course, didn't hear anything different from the listening sessions, there's a lack of resource to address the specific needs of Indigenous survivors. First thing being that in both cities all survivors reported a disparate and urgent need for Native or tribally run domestic violence shelters. We heard that, ad nauseam. Survivors also reported that there was

immense difficulty in finding resources in their communities, did not want to access non-Native resources. Resources like tiny homes came up frequently. Survivors for the most part felt that these were not safe for them. They were either too communal, they were easily accessed by abusers; and also, very vulnerable to elements and weather. Keep in mind, right? We hosted these in, you know, in two spaces where, winter, right? Might have been playing a large factor in the comments. They also felt as Indigenous survivors that tiny homes were not... the best possible resource for them because they were not affixed to a specific place and so they inherently lacked a sense of permanency. They also stated they experienced feelings of isolation in many spaces. They had to be creative to maintain their housing. Essentially, they were their own systems advocates. In fact, during the listening sessions, I think, we often saw survivors strategizing with one another as an issue would come up, you know, three or four people would say, "I had a similar experience" and they would say "this is how I addressed it" or "this is what I had to do," and so that was an interesting thing that we noted. And then survivors consistently stated that there was a lack of support for other financial considerations, application fees being number one. But bus passes, food, childcare, especially for those grandmothers, medical care, behavioral health, utilities, and maintenance, were also at issue. (A pause) Additional key issues -- were survivors with legal or carceral-system involvement. Survivors at both sessions reported mere prohibitions to accessing safe shelter and housing. This led to further criminalization, and, of course, it deepened their inability to find consistent and safe employment. And then survivors, with disabilities -- reported a general lack of concern for people with disability accessing shelter and housing. Stated that not all disabilities were visible. And that a lack of trust in survivors informed people's ignorant views of their lived experiences. Survivors with disabilities also shared -- that shelter is often not created with disability access in mind. And as a result, those spaces were not identity-affirming. Which, of course, impacts people's sense of dignity, right? Survivors who identify as LGBTQAI, or two-spirit, in Minneapolis in particular this was an issue. They shared that there was a disproportionate rate of Indigenous survivors who identify as LGBTQ or two-spirit that are experiencing homelessness. And that they felt the resources that were available were not safe for them at their unique intersection. Nor were they accessible, and they were not identity-affirming. I think the -- the main comment that we got here was that people really felt "othered" which was not really what we wanted to hear. Okay, so that wraps up my listening

session update. I did try to speak as slowly as I possibly could. I also have ADHD and I tend to speak very fast unfortunately but I am trying to be more mindful of that.

The last sort of section of this is a quick work group update. So, as I mentioned before, one of the main deliverables that we do is we do convene with our partners such -- as NRCDV -- a national work group of advocates, who both exist in the domestic violence and the housing spaces, we bring them together to have informed conversations with one another, to strategize around common issues, or to come up with creative solutions, you know, outside of the spaces that we work in. We had two meetings this past year, the first one we did hybrid, or not hybrid, we did it actually completely remotely over Zoom and then the second one, I was super excited we did in August was in-person, which was really nice to reconvene that space. The StrongHearts Native Help Line hosted us, and we were able to bring some new members into that space. These were some of the issues that came up during the past year specifically. Again, just this urgent persistent need for tribally run domestic violence shelters was really at the top of what everyone was discussing. Sharing that there were not enough people to staff transitional housing. Human trafficking was posing basically, an impossibly complicated barrier, in order to securing safe housing for Indigenous Survivors. Racism, in the United States, was greatly impacting survivors and advocates, there was a lot of advocate burnout that work group members reported as a result of just the environment. Rent is not affordable anywhere, even in public housing, so people who are providing those services are noticing that it's still too high. Housing authorities -- that goes for both tribal housing entities, and tribally designated housing entities, are not necessarily educated on gender-based violence. That is despite them also in certain situations being required to comply with VAWA. A lot of people talked about unnecessary cruelty, so for example law enforcement cutting up government issues I.D. cards, throwing away belongings and possessions unnecessarily -- one interesting issue that popped up was that there were little to no Native-owned property management companies. People in the work group really felt that this would make a difference, to the individuals that they're serving in their programs. And then, you know, interestingly, political oppression, political divide, actually came up routinely as exacerbating trauma in severe ways. (Pause), some needed training and technical assistance areas that we identified: First, we really do need an emphasis on our traditional ways of life, on our ways of taking care of one another. We -- of course, we do approach this from a human-rights framework, but

honestly, with an Indigenous community, this is an obligation that we have to one another. It's not framed as a collective right, necessarily, it's more framed as a collective duty to one another. And that is a little bit of a shift. And for VAWA, of course, the Violence Against Women Act, I do see that note in the chat. They need training specific to shelter-creation and sustainability, this came up a few times, as well. Training around shelter policies. Advocate-training on street outreach. This particularly for youth, cross-training opportunities for advocates and housing authorities. I think just continuing to convene the space will help with that. Because the Violence Against Women Act is a compliance issue for certain tribal housing necessities or TDHEs, advocate on working with those types of entities, was seen as very important. People wanted to see training to respond to overdoses. Training for housing authorities on gender-based violence, and then programs, actually needed specific training and support, regarding the fair-housing act, and Indian preference, and how those two -- you know, obviously, the fair-housing act is an act of Congress, and Indian preference is something that is protected by Supreme Court Law -- specifically *Morton v. Mancari* if you are interested in that -- but the way that those 2 intersect is causing certain issues in spaces but there -- the -- individuals that are in our work group, have had success in addressing that, so that's going to be something that we work on this next year.

>> CAROLINE LAPORTE: And we did have a few policy recommendations and I will just read a couple of these -- increased funding for transportation, increased funding for housing and DV advocates, for housing navigators. Funding for financial assistance programs, removal of artificial rules, credit checks for example shouldn't be a bar to housing, rent control, rent cancellation, and, of course, and, obviously, we're going to get into this much later but flexible funding for survivors and flexible funding for programs continue to be a recommendation including from the Indigenous space that we are operating within.

All right. Just very quickly, accomplishments from our policy recommendations that we had in our 2020 report. Obviously, we created the Center -- that was great. And did so in partnership, with many of you here, including FYSB and also NRC DV. We funded listening sessions with survivors, we actually paid survivors for their time, continued to facilitate the work group. There was an increase in NAHASDA funding and NAHASDA for example, is the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act, I literally do that some different way every time I say it. But that Act creates block-funding for tribes that want to

operate public housing. And it was enacted in 1996, 1997, but it was -- it's been flat-funded since then. So, this money hasn't kept up with even inflation; and when we look at, what homelessness, what.... Housing insecurity -- the condition of homes in Indian Country looks like, this funding remaining flat-funded has both been a sort of compounding factor in that, but also continues to really impact survivors who need those spaces for safety. But this past year, there was a 20% increase in that fund. So that's a success, again, that is not something that the work group is responsible for, directly, of course, we have continuously called, with our partners for an increase, but NAIHC, which is the National American Indian Housing Council, really focuses a lot of effort there. And then we all saw from the field, this was definitely a huge shared effort, probably over at least a decade, was a change to the definition of homeless in the NVA. (After a pause), >> CAROLINE LAPORTE: I am not going to go through our practical accomplishments because I want to be respectful of time, but you do have these here, and I do just want to say before I conclude, that we are always looking for people who want to collaborate with us, housing is an intensely regulated and complicated space. And we definitely value reciprocal learning and that's not just from our partners in the work group, but also from many of you that are here today.

So... This is another project that we're doing, I'm not going to go over this, but I will say that it is being continuously updated we're doing a tribal housing code clearinghouse. Most of you are aware that tribes are sovereign. They are able to enact their own, right? -- constitutions, laws, codes, ordinances, regulations. And a lot of those housing codes are available online. So, we have partnered with the clinic, to go through, collect these codes, and do a gaps analysis on what's needed in the codes, but also to look at best practices, one of the -- one of the best practices that we noticed for example, was the Nottawaseppi code. And Nottawaseppi has a domestic violence paid leave provision, and we think that is super impactful for survivors who are either experiencing or who might be on the verge of experiencing housing instability. We're collecting, via, this tiny little QR code that I made for the first time ever, was super exciting and also from that link there, if you would like, but it should just work if you pull it up on your phone. So, if you have anything that you know of, either in your tribal community or you think impacts tribal survivors, that will take you directly to a form where you can upload that information. (A pause), okay, that concludes my portion for today, I do want to say, a huge thank you, again, to our federal Partners, to Shawndell. I would like to specifically say thank

you to our partner NRCDDV, and their continued support of the work group, and our shared space, so this is my contact information if anyone wants to reach out, I am more than happy to collaborate. Thank you, (concludes remarks).

>> Funmi Ayeni: Hello everyone, it is great to be here with you today. My name is Funmi Ayeni, and I am the Director of Research and Evaluation with the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence. I use she/her pronouns. I am a dark-skinned Black Woman. I am wearing a Black shirt; I have on some white earrings, and I have short black hair. I am very excited to share with you some of the findings from our recently concluded Needs Assessment Project. Next slide, please. To give you an overview of what I will cover today: I will start by providing some background information on the purpose of this assessment and the data-collection methods used. Next, I will highlight some of the findings on the current, innovative, and emergent practices, implemented by community-based agencies, to address the housing needs of Black and Brown survivors. And then I will conclude with a review of some of the implications of these findings, for programs and agencies working with survivors. Next slide, please >> Funmi Ayeni: So, the purpose of this needs assessment project, was to examine how Black Indigenous People of Color Survivors define "safety." How they identify the housing barriers that they are experiencing in navigating housing. And also, to document the innovative practices, and solutions that are being implemented by grassroots organizations and community-based agencies to address their housing needs. Next slide please. So, for the needs assessment, we reviewed existing research reports on the topic. We conducted four listening sessions and four researcher interviews. Next slide, please. And so, we conducted listening sessions with six community partners serving Black, Indigenous, People of Color survivors; and interviews with four researchers who also identify as People of Color, working at the intersection of Gender-Based Violence and Housing. Next slide, please. So through the data that we collected, we identified several innovative housing solutions. A recurrent theme in our listening sessions and interviews was systems change. And our partners discussed systems change in the context of centering racial equity and hiring domestic violence regional coordinators. So, for all our listening sessions and interviews, there was an emphasis placed on working to identify and dismantle the White Supremacist structural policies and institutional practices that hinder the interventions that are developed by communities of color, for communities of color. And this is an important note because we cannot create systems change without acknowledging

the racially biased systems, and services, that are outside of a survivor's control, but continue to disrupt their efforts to access safety. The other innovation related to systems change, identified in this needs assessment, is the practice of hiring domestic violence regional coordinators. Domestic violence regional coordinators are advocates, who were hired by programs to build relationships with community partners and networks that serve survivors. In this role, they provide strategic coordination, ongoing training on regulations and best practices, and consultation to enhance the connections between domestic violence service providers and housing system service providers to ensure that survivors can safely and quickly access and utilize housing resources. >> Funmi Ayeni: And some evidence from the Los Angeles Domestic Violence Regional Coordinator Pilot Program conducted in 2016 showed that hiring domestic violence regional coordinators, to work across systems, actually facilitated cross-sector collaboration. And that led to improvements in the trauma-informed practices of housing and coordinated entry services providers. Which is a significant finding. Now, beyond systems change, we also identified several housing innovations that are currently implemented by our community partners. One of these innovations, is culturally-responsive and holistic on-site service provision model. Which is implemented by Ain Dah Yung. As a culturally-specific agency that works with Native youth, this organization actually separates the operations and management of their permanent supportive housing property from the agency's social services. Now, what this means, is that agency staff is not directly involved in the management of the housing units. And the separation of operations is important because it allows survivors to freely access the agency services without the fear of losing their housing if they disclose any personal difficulties that would typically result in a loss of housing eligibility in traditional housing systems. Ain Dah Yung also provides holistic services such that in addition to the housing specific services that they provide, they offer on-site additional services which includes counseling support, a support group, they have a food bank, and a free clothing closet. And this approach of providing on-site additional services directly addresses the complexity of navigating multiple systems for survivors. Which we know can be burdensome and overwhelming. And so, the next innovative practices that we identified is related to making coordinated entry processes more culturally-responsive. Now, this is also related to work that's being done by Ain Dah Yung where they worked with tribal lawyers to create what was called a sub-targeting policy and that policy was passed through the Ramsey County Continuum of Care. To make the

Coordinated Entry process more culturally-responsive to Native survivors. So, as a culturally specific agency, this policy allows Ain Dah Yung to prioritize providing supportive services to Native Persons from the continuum-of-care priority list. Now, why this is a very important innovation is because it allows culturally specific agencies to provide housing services to individuals from the cultural subpopulation that that agency serves. Which means that when an agency is approved to provide specialized services as part of the Continuum of Care, the priority list manager will, then, identify the top household on the priority list that also matches the agency's target population in eligibility for placement. So, implementing this approach increases Black, Indigenous People of Color survivors' access to housing services that are designed to address their unique needs. -- next slide, please >> Funmi Ayeni:

(Continuing). Another promising housing solution, that we identified in this needs assessment is the Community Collective Savings Model that is being implemented by Madre Tierra. Now, some of the survivors that they worked with that received services from the agency participate in an informal economic structure. Where they actually pool finances together to support the members of the group that are most in need. So, every month the group will collectively decide who receives the monies and those funds have been used to support survivors who are dealing with pressing needs; such as paying for security deposit, rent, or even their utilities. Now, this is a very innovative approach to resource sharing because it allows survivors to safely access monetary resources without engaging with traditional banking systems. Which we know can be very harmful to survivors. And then, another aspect of ensuring that survivors have access to safe, stable, and affordable housing, is investing in preventative services that are designed to help people stabilize their lives, achieve self-sufficiency, and remain in their homes. And so, many advocates who are engaged in this needs assessment reported that their agencies include a focus on community-based violence prevention and outreach activities in their work. And so, this involves providing and/or connecting survivors to services such as medical care, mental health counseling, substance abuse treatment services, assisting them with post-secondary education, job training, and employment counseling. All of which we know can, indirectly or directly, impact their housing stability. And then, finally, an innovative practice that we identified is related to survivor-centered housing approaches. Which involves recognizing that adequate housing is a human right and then, prioritizing models such as the Domestic Violence Housing First and rapid rehousing models which are useful for connecting survivors and their families

quickly and successfully to permanent housing. With no preconditions to the housing support. Now, one of our next speakers, Cris Sullivan, will discuss findings from a recently concluded, rigorous demonstration evaluation that examined the effectiveness of the Domestic Violence Housing First Model for a diverse group of survivors. Next slide, please. >> Funmi Ayeni: So, in addition to documenting the current housing innovations that are implemented by agencies working with communities of color for this needs assessment project, we also documented some emerging solutions that agencies are currently exploring. And I will highlight two of these. Now, one of the emerging solutions to increase in affordable housing for survivors is housing cooperatives. Housing cooperatives offer an alternative way live and these forms of housing have a unique social benefit because they are independently owned by the members of the cooperative. This form of ownership eliminates outside landlords and it also allows members of the cooperative to have shared maintenance responsibilities, shared community control, community involvement, and, importantly, security. We also know that cooperatives offer economic advantages such as affordability, potential tax deductions, and also limited liability. And one of our community partners, Madre Tierra, is currently working to further examine how housing cooperatives can introduce a solution to the housing needs of survivors. The other emerging solution that I would like to point out, is creating savings assistance programs for survivors. Now, there are ongoing savings assistance programs that are offered to support homeownership to families and individuals who have limited financial resources that you all may be familiar with. An example of that effort would be the Greater Erie Community Action Committee. They have what is called a Money Works for You Savings Account Program. And with that program, individuals and families can actually save money through a matched savings program. What happens with this program? Essentially, participants will maintain a savings account and they will do that through a bank that will waive their account fees because they are participating in this program. And once they have done that, the Greater Erie Community Action Committee will actually match the amount of money that has been saved by participants, and then participants can apply those savings towards meeting any of their short- or long-term goals, which may include purchasing a home. And so, one of the things that we find with these savings assistance programs is that they have, for the most part, focused on addressing housing instability for individuals and families with fewer financial resources. However, this presents an opportunity for the field. Because housing assistance programs and domestic violence service

providers can establish partnerships to provide this form of financial support to survivors as a way to further their wealth-building goals. Next slide, please, Funmi Ayeni: And so, as I conclude my presentation, I would like to highlight the implications of the findings that I've just discussed as it relates to domestic violence service provision. But, before I discuss those implications, it is necessary to acknowledge that the implementation of these recommendations truly depends on grant-making programs, institutions, (and) funders making a significant funding and investment into these efforts. (Pause) And so, the first implication that I will discuss is related to dedicating more resources towards prevention education, and awareness creating activities. Now, this should include providing information about the nature of homelessness, what an individual's rights to housing are, how survivors may be able to access support services and resources, and the federal and local enforcement of survivor housing protections. Findings from our needs assessment also highlight the need for us to continue to implement interventions that support survivors in securing and sustaining permanent housing. Such as, coordinated advocacy efforts; to increase equitable, permanent housing options for survivors; identifying funding resources for flexible funding; implementing Domestic Violence Housing First Approaches; and providing information resources and support for homeownership to survivors. Finally, it is important for us to engage survivors at all levels of service provision. In addition to doing that, there is a need to provide ongoing training, supervision, and support to domestic violence service providers, so that they can effectively implement culturally-relevant and trauma-informed services. We should emphasize evaluating advocacy efforts and program services from a racial equity lens. And finally, prioritizing the provision of low-barrier services to survivors so that we do not recreate inequities. And so, I would like to thank you all for your time this afternoon. For more information about the needs assessment, you can access the full Report and accompanying infographic on the Safe Housing Partners - Partnerships' web site. The link to the full report, I believe, will be shared in the chat. And so, as we move forward, with the presentations you will hear more about the implication of these findings for the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence's Policy Priorities from our Director of Policy, Shenna Morris. But, now for the next presentation. We'll turn it over to FreeFrom. Thank you. (Concludes remarks).

>> HYE SUN KIM: Hello, my name is Hye Sun Kim, it's like saying "hey" to the sun, so Hye Sun. I have short black hair, and I am wearing a dark green blouse with long sleeves. My pronouns are

she/her/hers, and I am the Systems Change Programs Specialist at FreeFrom, which is a national non-profit based in Los Angeles. And I am joined by my colleague Kirkley Doyle who is wearing a pink sweater and has long brown hair, and Kirkley is a Director of Data and Research at FreeFrom. And Kirkley's pronouns are she/her/hers. (A pause), I'm just trying to advance the slide, give me one second, please. Okay, there we go, so today we are presenting on Before and Beyond crisis: How to Create a Long-Term Ecosystem of Financial Support for Survivors of Gender-Based Violence. (Pause), To go over our agenda, I will introduce a little bit more about FreeFrom, and our approach. And then I will turn it over to Kirkley, who will describe on how Gender-Based Violence is an economic-justice issue and why cash is so valuable for survivors. And then we'll turn it back to me, and I will give some recommendations on how you can support survivors. So, we, at FreeFrom, are committed to building an ecosystem of support for survivors of gender-based violence. This is because survivors measure their experiences, of gender-based violence, or GBV, in years and generations, not merely the minutes, hours, or days of peak crisis. Yet, the U.S. treats GBV as a crisis issue, rather than as a structural societal problem. As a result, our responses to GBV fail to leverage opportunities to support survivors before and after those moments of peak crisis. Therefore, we must build an ecosystem of support for survivors, that exists both before and beyond crisis. So how are we at FreeFrom working towards this goal? What is our approach? FreeFrom's mission is to create pathways to financial security and long-term safety, with and for survivors of GBV. We envision a world where survivors have sustaining income, savings, and credit with which to build wealth, and the resources to support individual, intergenerational, and community healing. (A pause) So why do we focus on the financial security of survivors? And why should you focus on the financial security of survivors? The short answer to that, is gender-based violence is an economic-justice issue, and now I'm going to turn it over to Kirkley to explain on what exactly that means.

>> Kirkley Doyle: Hi everyone, wonderful to be here with you today. And thanks so much, Hye Sun. Okay, so to begin, I'm going to try to speak as slowly as possible, but please do ping me if I am chatting too quickly. To start off, we're going to begin talking about -- we're going to look at some research on intimate partner violence, which is one form of gender-based violence. And talk about the economic impacts of IPV. Next slide. So, a lot of this is probably familiar to folks on this call, but just to kind of give some background, intimate partner violence is extremely prevalent in the United States. One in 4

cis gendered women and one in two trans people are subjected to intimate partner violence in their lifetime. And the number one obstacle to survivor's safety is financial insecurity. With 84% of survivors reporting that not having enough money, is the number one obstacle to their safety. Why is this? The reality is that experiencing intimate partner violence is incredibly expensive. The CDC estimates that the lifetime cost of intimate partner violence for a cis gendered female survivor is \$104,000. And this is likely an underestimate. This estimate is primarily based on medical costs, and lost productivity. And doesn't take into account costs related to economic abuse, or other common costs that survivors face like relocation. So, these stats here on this slide, you know, really start to kind of frame intimate partner violence, specifically, as an economic issue, but, not - - there's not a lot of research talking about gender-based violence more broadly. And one way that our team at FreeFrom is really working to address that gap, is through our direct work with survivors and part of our programs like our Safety Fund. Next slide, please. So, I'm going to give folks just a quick overview, Hye Sun and I are absolutely able to answer more questions, and we have other resources at FreeFrom to kind of go into detail on this. But essentially our safety fund began as a rapid-response to COVID-19. And what it is, is, we put out applications, and it's a -- a survey, and survivor -- a way for survivors to apply for, and receive direct, and unrestricted cash assistance, and it's open to survivors across the country; We try to make it as low-barrier as possible. So, survivors, really only have to self-identify as a survivor. And tell us how to contact them safely; and how to pay them safely. And grants are available up to \$250. And what we also do with our safety fund is we have optional questions, that go along with those three basic questions that survivors need to answer in order to get cash. And we try to really emphasize that these optional questions are optional; and that survivors don't need to answer them in order to receive funds. But it has really helped our -- our team at FreeFrom, work with -- and directly hear from survivors about their needs, alongside being able to get folks directly -- cash directly to survivors; so this -- the data -- we're going to highlight in this presentation was from the second round of our safety fund, which we conducted in November of 2020, and as you can see, on this slide, we got \$534,000 in cash grants to over 2100 survivors. In 49 states. And from this data we were able to author our Support Every Survivor report. And I also just want to quickly flag that on our website, FreeFrom.org, we have screen reader-friendly and audio-versions of our report, in addition to the PDF, in case those are helpful for folks. Next slide. This slide shows some quick stats,

demonstrating the diversity of the survivors, who we got cash to, and who contributed to this data. We really prioritized getting cash to Black, Indigenous, Latinx, Queer and Trans survivors. We knew survivors from these communities were most likely to be impacted by health and economic impacts of COVID-19. And we worked with organizations and advocates in community with these folks to do that outreach. Next slide. Okay, so as I was sort of talking about earlier, one of the things we really tried to do with this report was to understand economic consequences of gender-based violence more broadly. As you can see, survivors in our sample were subjected to a variety of different types of harm, including intimate partner violence, sexual assault, chronic and repeated discrimination based on gender et cetera, and one interesting stat that was really quite devastating for our team, is that the survivors in our sample were subjected to an average of 7.5 types of harm, so it's really critical to be understanding the economic impacts in a broad, gender-based violence framework. Next slide, please, okay, so now we're -- this slide helps get into sort of some of the specific reasons, the specific financial impacts of gender-based violence found in our sample. So, 92.3% of survivors in our sample reported being subjected to economic abuse, which encompasses a lot of different things, but some examples are... like, a harm-doer incurring debt in a survivor's name without their knowledge or consent or a harm-doer disrupting a survivor's ability to earn income or pursue education. And all of these stats are really important and they're all highlighted in our report but the two that I wanted to draw folks' attention to today, are that we found that survivors in our sample reported they only had an average of \$289 that they alone could access. And that survivors shared they have just on average \$10 in savings. And that these stats really demonstrate just how financially-devastated the survivors in our sample were. Next slide. Okay, I am going to read -- actually, just one of these quotes, there's two, but just for time, I'm going to read the first one, which is the story from a survivor talking about their personal experience dealing with the economic impacts of gender-based violence. So, this reads, "I had no control over my finances for 20 years, and my husband racked up debt, told me setting up my own 401(k) was me stealing money from him, and he also opened a credit card in my name without my knowledge. I am using most of my income now to try to pay back debt." Next slide. >> Kirkley Doyle: (Continuing) and you can, yeah, skip that one. So, as I mentioned before, the main -- one of the main goals of our report, was really, to gather data that showed that survivors are grappling with intersecting systemic harms like racism, queer and transphobia, and ableism, in addition to

facing economic consequences of GBV and how these intersect. And there's really a lot of this data in our report. We really tried to show these disproportionate impacts in a lot of our data, so I encourage folks to look into our reports further, but one -- one stat I wanted to highlight for everyone here today is that, the survivors in our sample who were not cis gender, who were Queer and/or disabled, reported they were 1.6 to 1.9 times more likely to report needing support with health costs, for example. So, we saw a lot of disproportionate impacts, and wanted to just highlight a couple of those. Okay, next slide. >> Kirkley Doyle: And as this data was collected during COVID-19, we wanted to highlight some of the key ways that the pandemic exacerbated everything that the data presented already shows. The one stat I just want to draw to folks' attention is that 45.4% of survivors in our sample reported they used all of their savings to make ends meet during COVID-19. That's nearly 1 in two folks, which is a really just devastating statistic. Next slide, please. Okay, so now that we've sort of laid the context for what we found among survivors in our sample, going to pivot a little bit to kind of talking about what we can do, what survivors need and look to the future a little bit, which is what Hye Sun will really elaborate on. But what we learned from folks is that cash is really the number one thing they need and that survivors need on average just \$1,500 to stay safe. Next slide. (Pause), (sound of dog barking), so as I mentioned our grants were up to \$250 which is a meaningful amount but not everything that survivors needed, but wanted to share a little bit about how survivors spent those grants. Next slide. So, this top three ways survivors spent their grants, food, household, utilities and household items, are actually exactly the same as the survivors who -- in our earlier round of safety fund grants. So, these are the really kind of consistent essential needs costs that survivors are using their grants to cover. Next slide. Survivors, like -- covering basic needs is really only the first step, right? I think a lot of us on this call already know this but survivors reported that looking ahead that they -- what they need is ongoing, unrestricted cash support to help them achieve their goals and that can look like something like our safety fund or also something like a savings matching program which FreeFrom launched and actively doing with survivors in a trust-based way. But as the topic of this is housing we also wanted to share that, folks really need cash to cover rent or mortgage assistance. But wanted to share some of these stats to really talk about and show that -- emphasize that what survivors are saying they need is really long-term stable safe housing, that very few survivors just 1.7% of our sample -- indicated that what they need is -- access to shelter or short-term housing.

Next slide. I'm just going to read one quick quote to sort of illustrate that, you know, survivors used the grants to cover hard costs but there are also these sort of benefits that really get at survivors' safety and supporting things like their mental health so I'll read this one. "Over the last couple of months, I've worried about money every single day. Receiving a cash grant gave me a brief reprieve from that constant stress. The biggest thing this funding did for me was allow me to pay for needed expenses without reaching out to my harm-doer for financial support. That alone is an indescribable gift. It was also a huge help to my mental health." And with that I am going to hand it back over to Hye Sun, who's going to talk about really what we can do.

>> HYE SUN KIM: So, given all of the data and information that we've heard, how can we turn that data and information into actions that will support survivors in reaching their financial security and long-term safety? So, we at FreeFrom have, actually created exactly that resource. Which, is titled "Before and Beyond crisis: What Each of Us Can Do to Create a Long-Term Ecosystem of Support for All Survivors." And hopefully that is not surprising to you, because that is the title of this presentation. So, we take the data from the Support Every Survivor report and turn it into actionable recommendations for how everybody in society can create an ecosystem of support for survivors, before and beyond crisis. We don't believe that support for survivors should end at the police, non-profit organizations, and government. We believe that everybody in society has a role and responsibility to play in creating an ecosystem of support for survivors. I'm not going to read the slide, but it does list all of the actors that we include in our roadmap. And we have specific recommendations for how each actor can contribute to this ecosystem of support. (Pause), So another feature of the roadmap, is that we list a total of 18 different actions on how to create an ecosystem of support for survivors. And for this presentation, I am going to provide a summary of three of those actions, which are action 1 -- understand and address the intersections of systemic harm when you act; action 3 -- get survivors cash; and action 7 -- support survivors in saving. We do have an action that is more specific to helping survivors meet their housing needs, but I wanted to spend this time to talk about what else you can do to support survivors in addition to helping their housing needs. And so, we highly recommend that you read our roadmap for the full set of recommendations. (Pause), HYE SUN KIM: So, what can policy-makers do? First and foremost, acknowledge and address the impact of intersecting systemic harms, to ensure that policies

crafted for survivors are effective, accessible, and inclusive. It is important to understand and address how oppressive systems like racism, queerphobia, transphobia, ableism, et cetera -- Compound a survivor's experience of GBV. And so, as part of that, policymakers should earmark certain percentage of GBV funding for culturally-specific organizations serving systemically-oppressed groups. In a different report of ours called the "Trust Survivors" report we found that survivors who are women, queer survivors and Indigenous survivors are less likely to seek support from traditional domestic violence and sexual assault organizations, so it's important to have this funding set aside for culturally specific organizations in order to support all survivors. And then policy makers should support survivors in increasing access to cash by passing legislation, creating guaranteed income, increasing the minimum wage to -- a living wage, and creating direct, unrestricted cash assistance programs for survivors. And so, we highly recommend that you read our Trust Survivors report, which lists survivor informed recommendations on how to create an effective, inclusive, and accessible cash assistance program. Policymakers should also support survivors in their saving. For example, create and expand child savings account programs with progressive subsidies, savings incentives, and tax deductions. And one thing to include in a progressive subsidy is providing a greater initial seed deposit amount for folks who are coming from lower-income households. And policymakers could also create survivor savings account programs, which are similar to child savings account programs, but are intended for survivors. (A pause), now, what can funders do? Again, first and foremost, acknowledge and address the impact of intersecting harms. And really, this is a first step for everybody regardless of what type of actor they are. Funders should also dismantle systems within the funding process that mirror abuse and control tactics. Many programs and services, for example, require survivors to provide receipts for every purchase that they make. Unfortunately, we have heard from many survivors that harm-doers have required survivors to produce receipts for every single purchase that they make, effectively controlling and monitoring their every financial activity. And so, unfortunately, this requirement by programs and services, are not trauma-informed and are replicating those harm-doers' tactics, the one way to address that is making sure that your program is trust-based. For example, at FreeFrom, as Kirkley mentioned earlier, we offer trust-based savings matching programs for survivors. And what that means, is, that a survivor tells us, how much money that they save that month, and they don't show us any type of proof. And we match up to \$50 for that survivor, across a span of six

months. And so, again, it's important that funding processes are trust-based and trauma-informed. Funders should also provide unrestricted, multi-year general operating funds to organizations supporting survivors. And we've heard from many service providers, that having increased flexible funding, will better-serve -- will help them better-support their survivor clients. Funders, as mentioned earlier, should also earmark a certain percentage of GBV funding for culturally-specific organizations. And funders should engage and compensate survivors in strategic-planning processes so that survivors have decision-making power in determining funding priorities. If you're providing funding to support survivors' safety, it is important, it is essential, to have survivors in the room. To have them be a part of the decision-making processes, and compensate them for their time, knowledge, and expertise, because they are the best experts in their safety. And funders should provide flexible funding to make these programs happen. Direct unrestricted cash assistance programs, trust-based savings-matching programs. Child savings accounts, and survivor savings accounts. (After a pause), So now, what can non-profit organizations do? As you guessed it, acknowledge and address the impact of intersecting systemic harms. Non-profit orgs should also expand program eligibility to encompass survivors of different types of harm and points in their healing journeys, so making sure that you're not excluding for example, survivors who are subjected to homelessness. Non-profit orgs should also advocate for more unrestricted, multi-year grants, or general operating funds for that increased flexible funding. And non-profit orgs should create and foster mutual-aid networks, including lending circles for the survivors that they support. And non-profit orgs should support survivors in opening bank accounts, and offer financial safety planning, with tips on how to keep accounts safe. One thing that we found from our Support Every Survivor report is that 74% of survivors do not have access to a safe and protected bank account. Specifically, 58% of survivors, said that a harm-doer has monitored, accessed, withdrawn from, or otherwise controlled the survivor's bank account. And an additional 16% of survivors have said that they do not have access to a bank account. So, we've seen how valuable cash is for survivors, but also, survivors need a safe way to safely save their money, in order to get and stay safe. And without a safe and protected bank account, it is much more difficult, time-consuming, and dangerous for survivors to be able to build the wealth necessary. (Pause), all right, and then, finally, non-profit orgs, should create and offer the following: Direct, unrestricted cash assistance programs; trust-based savings-matching programs. Child savings accounts; and

survivor savings accounts. (Pause), Okay. So, I am not going to read this quote because I know we are at time but this quote just reflects how important a holistic ecosystem of support of - - for survivors is. And thank you, so much, for having us here today. I've listed our contact information, if you have any questions that you would like to follow up with. And I am now going to hand the mic to our next presenter Cris Sullivan.

>> DR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Hye Sun. It's such an honor to be with you all. These presentations, it's just blowing me away, it's just, you're all rock stars and I appreciate being here. >> Dr. Cris Sullivan. I am Cris Sullivan, the Director of the Research Consortium on Gender-Based Violence at Michigan State University. And my pronouns are she/her/hers. I have short graying hair, no glasses, and I'm wearing a purple shirt that is covered in cat hair. And I am going to be talking today about the Domestic Violence Housing First Model and its impact on survivors over two years. Especially focusing today on the importance of trauma-informed and culturally-relevant services. Which fits perfectly in with what you've heard from some of the previous presenters.

>> DR. SULLIVAN: (After a pause). Let me see if I can get this to move in the correct direction. Ah, I'm all right, I have a cold and I'm doing as well as I can today. Some of these slides, in the interest of time, I'm not going to go through other than that you will have them. But I want to talk about the domestic violence first model first and then talk about the study, itself. So, DVHF, which is what we call Domestic Violence Housing First, has two components that we evaluated. The first, is housing-inclusive advocacy. So, that would not just housing - - but, advocacy that includes, a focus on housing, and, ideally, flexible funding, for all of the reasons that you've already heard today. Sometimes flexible funding is not available to agencies, though. But the housing focus advocacy is critical to this model and this model can occur anywhere with survivors. Sometimes it's with survivors who are still staying in their current homes who need help to stay there because they're going to lose it otherwise. It can happen while people are in shelter and looking for permanent housing. It can happen while people are homeless on the street, staying with friends, or wanting to move from one housing unit to another. For this evaluation, we followed 406 survivors and we interviewed them every six months over 24 months. And we wanted to compare people who received the DVHF model with those who received services as usual. So that would be all of the other wonderful services provided by domestic violence agencies.

>> DR. SULLIVAN: We had five agencies participate in the research. They were all from Washington State. We chose them because they were similar to a lot of domestic violence agencies across the country. They were urban and rural. And to participate in the study, a survivor had to be a recent victim of domestic violence in the last six months and either homeless or unstably-housed -- however they defined that. We had a commitment to racial equity throughout the course of this project. Starting with intentionally-choosing geographic areas that would increase our odds of getting a racially- and ethnically-diverse sample. We hired and trained and supervised bilingual interviewers so, that interviews could be conducted in both English, and Spanish. And our research team was intentionally-diverse in order to enhance our ability to accurately gather and interpret and share our data.

>> DR. SULLIVAN: We had a very high retention rate due to the amazing team of people on the ground. And even though COVID happened halfway through data-collection. So, we started with 406 survivors and had a retention rate of 89%. So, we ended with 363 survivors in the sample. Just to tell you a little bit about who these people were. Similar to, if you look at a lot of our agencies across the country: 97% identified as female, 86% heterosexual, but for 20% English was their second language. And I think that does speak to the importance we put on making sure that we got a large Latinx sample, as well as other non-English speakers, or for whom English was their second language.

>> DR. SULLIVAN: For race and ethnicity, 35% of the sample were non-Hispanic white. So, the largest percentage were BIPOC survivors, with 35% Hispanic or Latinx. And a fairly large percentage of people who were Black or U.S. Indigenous. People self-identified, and 15% were multiracial or multiethnic. You won't be surprised, knowing this population, mental health issues were pretty severe as people were entering services. With almost half of the people having severe depression, severe anxiety, and $\frac{3}{4}$ PTSD. At the 6-month time frame, after people had been receiving services, we compared people who received the DV Housing First Model with those who received services as usual and found that 64% of the people had received some form of the Domestic Violence Housing First Model. So, this was a good sample for us to be able to compare.

>> Dr. Cris Sullivan: I am not going to go through this analytic plan. But I wanted you to have it, for those of you who are interested in data analysis and who wanted to be sure that the analyses we used were done in a way to make sure that differences were by DV housing first versus services as usual and not related to anything else. So, the 24-month findings significant differences were found, and all of the differences

avored those who received DVHF. And all were significant at all of the following time points: at six months, 12 months, 18 months, and 24 months. So, we were very excited to see this, as we had expected and hypothesized, those who received DVHF had greater housing stability across all of those time points. They had less domestic violence and that included physical, emotional, sexual, and stalking. As well as we measured economic abuse and the use of the children as an abuse tactic. All of those were lower for people who received the DV Housing First Model. Mental health also improved. So, we saw depression, anxiety, and PTSD all go down at higher rates for those who received DVHF. And children's prosocial behaviors went up. Those are behaviors that kids have about likeability; ability to get along with other people. So that was exciting, and we wanted to then see if effectiveness differed for survivors based on race, ethnicity, or maybe, by whether the services were offered in a rural versus urban agency. The short answer to that is we found no differences.

>> DR. SULLIVAN: (After a pause). So, what we really want to talk about today is for the people who received DV Housing First --

Oh! Did it matter if agencies were being trauma-informed and culturally-responsive? As a Movement we've talked a lot about the importance of trauma-informed practice and being culturally-responsive. But, we don't have a lot of research showing if it makes a difference in survivors' outcomes. (Next slide) So first, when we look at trauma-informed services; and we only look at 6 and 12 months. First, we didn't expect that this would make a difference any longer than that. But, we also wanted to look at this right away. We will see if this goes out any further. But basically, if these are just for people who received the Domestic Violence Housing First Model, those who said that the agency's staff were more trauma-informed had greater improvements at both 6-and 12 months on housing stability, domestic violence, including economic abuse, depression, anxiety, PTSD, and quality of life.

>>Dr. Cris Sullivan: Improvements at only six months were shown on children's school attendance and at 12 months on children's prosocial behaviors. We honestly don't know what to make of this. The differences were significant, but they weren't large, so I am not sure these are that critical. But we are continuing to look at it. But we are seeing that if they said the staff were trauma-informed that at both 6- and 12-months greater housing stability, safety, and well-being. So, what about cultural responsiveness and inclusivity? We had a scale of culturally-responsive and inclusive services. And that's a scale with items like staff understand how discrimination impacts

people's everyday experience. And survivors answered on a scale of not true at all to very true. And we did this again because few studies have examined whether this has an impact on survivors' outcomes. What we found is that at both 6 and 12 months, if survivors said the services were more culturally-responsive and inclusive they had greater housing stability. We did not find the same at 6 and 12 months for safety, mental health, and well-being. We did find improved safety at six months. So, at six months, but not at 12, we had lower domestic violence and lower child behavior problems. And then at 12 months, but not at six months, lower financial strain of survivors. And that was a measure of how much do you think you're going to have a problem meeting -- making ends meet in the coming six months? So somewhat different outcomes, than what we saw, with trauma-informed services, but interestingly, housing stability comes up for both 6 and 12 months. There were no group differences on other measures of financial stability or on economic abuse, or on use of the children as a form of abuse, mental health, alcohol or drug use, children's school attendance, or performance. So, we have a lot more that we want to look at. But we really are interested in what these findings mean. So, in summary....

>> DR. SULLIVAN: What we're finding is that the DVHF model met its primary goal of increasing housing stability, safety, and mental health, and well-being over two years. The model seems to work well across race, ethnicity, and geographic region of the agency providing services. And, this is, again, within people who received the model, whether services were trauma-informed, and/or culturally-responsive made a big difference for survivors. They both led to greater housing stability at both 6 and 12 months. Trauma-informed services also led to less domestic violence at 6 and 12 months, and fewer mental health problems, and greater quality of life. We didn't see that with culturally-responsive services and we're trying to figure out why that might be, and whether it might be related to survivors not receiving services after that time. We're wondering if survivors thought this is not a culturally-responsive, inclusive agency, did that mean they didn't, then, continue using the services? We'll be looking at that. So, I want to thank you, all, and hope that we have really an interesting conversation, after this. This has been an incredible team effort and I appreciate everyone as well as especially, the survivors, for whom this wouldn't have -- this study wouldn't have happened. (Concludes remarks),

>> Dr. Cris Sullivan: And now, I believe, I am turning this over to Shenna.

>> SHENNA MORRIS, Director of Policy: Go ahead, Marlena, I was going to pause us for the Q&A, go ahead.

>> MARLENA MOORE: Okay, hello, everybody, my name is Marlena, I use they/them pronouns, and I am a Black nonbinary femme, in their mid 30s with medium length curly hair and I'm wearing a black cardigan with large black glasses. I just wanted to let everybody know, if you have any questions for any of our presenters, and would like to voice them out loud, please raise your hand, and, we will enable you to speak. Otherwise, please enter into the chat, or, into the Q&A feature. Thank you. (A pause), (3:40:55 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time) Okay, there was a question that did come in, and the question was how did you define trauma-informed and I think that question is for Dr. Sullivan. (An electronic tone),

>> Dr. Cris Sullivan: Thank you, and I did put the link to the DV housing-first toolkit, in the chat. I worked closely with the Washington State Coalition, Against Domestic Violence and their leadership has been amazing in this area; and we've created a toolkit, for anyone who wants to learn more and all of our findings will be there as well. There is a measure of trauma-informed practices called "trauma-informed practices scale", which, I can also send you a link to, it's on the National Resource Center's DV Evidence Project website, it's available for free, in both English and Spanish. And it has been validated, as a strong measure of trauma-informed practices. And we tried to make it useful not just to researchers, but to agency staff, who wanted to evaluate their own services. (A pause), and I will try to find that link and put that in the chat. As well. Although my guess is Funmi's already beating me to it.

(A pause), >>MARLENA MOORE: All right, the next question that popped up, is, how are victims of DV handled when the perpetrator is not Native American or Indigenous? And I'm assuming that is for you, Caroline.

>> CAROLINE LAPORTE: How are victims of DV handled when the perpetrator is not Native American? Well, it depends on where you are, right? And if this kind of specifically, like, -- let's say that you're -- that has to be a jurisdiction question for criminal jurisdiction I assume, right? For housing it's not necessarily going to have a huge impact. Other than what I can say is that, maybe where there's court involvement, like, even in the civil court, it might cause some sort of, like, maybe misunderstanding, if the judge is not necessarily up to speed on

civil and criminal jurisdiction. But the way that it impacts Native survivors when they're in Indian Country, right? -- specifically, when they're on trust land, is that due to a Supreme Court case, *Oliphant v. Suquamish*, tribes have been stripped of their inherent authority to prosecute non-Indians for any sort of crimes that are committed on tribal land and this, of course, includes gender-based violence. There was a fix to this, partially, in the Violence Against Women Act 2013, where tribes that wanted to participate in what was previously-known as special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction, could prosecute non-Indians for crimes, like - there were only three, it was dating violence, domestic violence, and then criminal violations of protection order. And then in, you know, of course, that left out, right? Stalking, sexual assault, human trafficking, co-attendant crimes like assaults on law enforcement or maybe there was a substance abuse issue going on, especially if there's family violence occurring, and, some of that for the most part was addressed, in this most recent reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. You know, but, of course, like you have to look at the number of implementing tribes there, right? I think, like, maybe -- and don't quote me on this because originally it was very small, there were only three and then it jumped to, like, 18 and I think from there it went to, like, 20 something. Again, not really a huge percentage of the 574 federally recognized tribes, right? Other ways that I think it can impact, has to do with when, like, the jurisdiction -- or, like, criminal case involvement is tied to receiving services, I think that that can have a huge impact. But, you know, in terms of housing I really think it's going to depend on where somebody is, and what they have got there -- what they have access to, rather than, right? -- who the perpetrator or the person that is -- is causing harm is doing. I hope that answers your question, if not, please, like, repost, and I will make sure to clarify.

>> MARLENA MOORE: Thank you, Caroline, and then we have two more that have come in for Dr. Sullivan, I will read the first one out. It says, Dr. Sullivan, how expensive is DV housing first? How much money is required to support the survivors adequately?

>> DR. SULLIVAN: That's a great question. You know, everybody's doing this differently. It actually doesn't have to cost that much because what you need is an advocate who is spending time with the survivor, helping them in the community get the resources that they need. So, ideally, you would want that person, working with maybe, no more than 12 or 15 people, so you

could do the math on what that would cost. And then, the flexible funding, you know, we looked at how much people received, and on average, at most of the time points, it was around \$1,500, to \$2,000 that somebody received. Now, over time, we saw fewer people receive money, but when they did receive it, it was a lot more money, and that was because the agencies were paying for rent. And rent was pretty high. So, you know, flexible funding, it can be a little bit more expensive, but, you know, I remember Peg HacsKaylo, when she was running an agency in Washington, D.C. she certainly said, "It's a lot cheaper than having a family in shelter for a year." It's much cheaper and it's what people are looking for to make sure that they're getting the funding that they need to stay in the community. So, I don't have an exact figure for you, but, to me it hasn't seemed like it would really be that expensive, given that we know it results in stable -- more stable housing and less abuse. And we know how expensive it is when people are being abused. And how expensive homelessness and unstable housing is.

(Pause), >> MARLENA MOORE: Thank you, and then the next one is was there a similar scale for cultural responsiveness and I think that was related to the tips scale.

>> DR. SULLIVAN: Yes, if you look in the tips scale, one of the subscales, is the scale of cultural responsiveness and inclusivity. I believe there is eight items. But I can't swear to that off the top of my head, but it is in the tips -- larger scale, and it's available in both English and Spanish.

>> MARLENA MOORE: All right, thank you, and then... The next one is for, also for you, Dr. Sullivan, (various electronic tones), how will the Housing First research and centering of racial equity across our work inform changes to the 2013 theory of change? And how do domestic violence programs promote survivors' social and emotional well-being? And all the other foundational documents for our work? And, we're actually going to invite Kelly to actually expand upon this question, so that it can be answered >> So we're going to invite you to unmute yourself.

>> Kelly: Thanks all, so Cris, thanks so much for all this work and to everybody today for contributing. I'm just super curious about, as we've evolved over the last decade, is there any thought to going back? Because I think the theory of change, early -- I think it was 2013 was so helpful, but it feels like

there needs to be some pretty significant shifts, so are you talking about that? Thinking about that?

>> DR. SULLIVAN: You know, I had thought about going back and looking at that. We're in the process right now of updating the DV Evidence Project website, and updating all of the reviews of evidence around shelter, advocacy, counseling, and adding a lot more resources. And part of that, you know, certainly should be going back and looking at that model, but, we haven't specifically talked about a timeline for that. That was a project of the NRCDV. And it was funded through the FVPSA office, so I guess that's more a question for Shawndell and Farzana, but I would be happy to go back and look at that and see -- you know with others, obviously -- and see if there are things we ought to think about updating with it.

>> Kelly: Absolutely and I think also with just the centering of race equity could really begin to shift that document in really meaningful ways to help shift the field so just, yeah, so think about it.

>> Dr. Sullivan. Thank you, Kelly.

>> HEIDI NOTARIO: Hi Cris, this is Heidi. I'm wondering, too, because I saw that Kelly used "Housing First" in her question, do you want to talk a little bit about the differences between Housing First and DV Housing First?

>> DR. SULLIVAN: Sure. Housing First came out of the homeless housing movement. Because, originally, traditionally, for many years in dealing with people who were chronically homeless, providers.... Thought that people should work on things like mental health, addictions, various other issues; and then they would be housing-ready. So there was a sense of you have to do this, and then we'll decide you're housing ready, and we will help you get housing and then, a number of researchers, and activists came along and said this makes no sense, we have to have housing first, you have to get somebody stabilized in housing first, and then they can deal with mental health, addictions, et cetera. So, it was really -- it came out of the movement, primarily working with single adults. Single adult men, chronically homeless, and it -- the evidence was strong that, yes, people need permanent housing, and that should not be something they have to earn. They should get that first. Those of us in the domestic violence movement, came along, and said, we agree, but survivors -- sometimes, are asking for, shelter, they're asking for transitional-housing; so, we are not

determining that this is what they need. But if they need a safe place, that's very -- um -- secure, if they need a place with a lot more support, where they can deal with maybe significant trauma, or whatever, then we need to modify the model so that it fits domestic violence survivors. So, for instance, instead of harm reduction, we talk about safety-planning, and the social -- social and emotional well-being. And so, Linda Olson and I wrote an article, about that; that is published, and you can find it, it's open-access, you can find it at the toolkit website. That describes these differences. Between Housing First, and Domestic Violence Housing First.

(Pause), >> MARLENA MOORE: All right -- go ahead, Heidi.

>> HEIDI NOTARIO: No, go ahead, Marlana.

>> MARLENA MOORE: Oh, I was going to go to the fact somebody had their hand raised. Is that okay?

>> HEIDI NOTARIO: Right. Of course.

>> MARLENA MOORE: Okay. So, I think it's Shelah. I think your hand is raised but also you had a question in the chat, are they the same?

>> Shelah: Yes, yes. I just wanted to clarify, of course, I couldn't write as fast as I needed to. So, listen, we focus on youth particularly, those that are graduating from the foster care system. A lot of the numbers, and discussion today, appear to focus on the entire spectrum of everyone that's DV. I was mostly interested in the foster care system, because a lot of our homeless youth, are -- they have different issues because of the fact that they grew up in foster care. So, I was wondering in particular for Dr. Sullivan, did you have an opportunity to take a look at just that young-age group, let's say from 18 through 24?

>> DR. SULLIVAN: We did not. We did ask people if they had been in foster care, and quite a few had, so we have that. And we can now look at people by age. We may have enough people who are young adults, who aged out. But that was not a significant portion of the people in our sample. So, I don't know that we're going to have much to say about that. I think it's a great question, though, for the other panelists, I know that this -- is important to Caroline, and STTARS, as well as FreeFrom, so I'll pass it on to anyone else who may want to deal with this question.

>> Shelah: Thank you.

>> CAROLINE LAPORTE: Yeah, I am just going to speak anecdotally because I am an attorney, and I'm very bad at doing anything at math so research is not my, cup of tea, but what I will say, is that, I cannot overstate, the importance of that vulnerability in particular, and especially in reference to Native youth, right? So, you have the -- you've got disparate representation, of Native youth as you likely know, in the foster care system. You have state welfare systems who are removing Native children, disparately, either due to, like, motivation for federal funding, right? I think most people are aware that there's an increase in dollars, for certain barriers being addressed. And, or, right? Like, related to historical policies. And I'm talking, of course, about United States boarding schools, and then I'm talking about state welfare systems sort of taking over in that space, once the -- once the last boarding school closed in 1983. And, I really, like, even in my time in Law School, I had the opportunity, to work with the children and youth law clinic, I was also for a period of time a family attorney, And then after that I worked at CASA, in Texas, the -- the aging out of foster care range, right? -- I think that those children, it's, like a -- like a particular point in time, that I think they're really falling through, like, multiple systems' cracks, either Social Security, Disability, or just in general, through basic case management, within the Child welfare system, And then they're over penalized when they're in that system, right? So, it's not normal for an 18 to 22-year-old to constantly have to check in with a case manager or with another individual, but that is -- that is what those kids are required to do. And simply by virtue of them sort of not complying with those spaces, because they're not going to, that's not -- (laughing) that's not a sense of normalcy, right? They get removed from these programs. And they don't have anybody. And I think that that's just, really a giant failure of multiple systems coming into play, really intimately impacting kids in our spaces but I know for Indigenous youth this is very clearly a particular issue, again, I don't have data on this. I think, actually, like, the -- the lack of data is part of the issue. But there's a direct tie there, also to missing and murdered, right? And human trafficking. And so, I think that, I think that that is a space that, like, again, like, just we cannot overstate how important it is to start thinking about, about that age range, and about that specific issue of aging out at that time. So, I think that's -- that is what I can add to this, but I --

of course, don't have data. I've got plenty of policy recommendations. But -- I will pass it off to FreeFrom.

>> Shelah: Thank you.

>> Kirkley Doyle: Hi, there, yeah, I can share a little bit about this particular report we were talking about, our Support Every Survivor report. 7.3% of our sample indicated reported to us that they had spent time in foster care, but we did not do any specific analysis by harm type, in the data. Our sample is quite young, it was -- we had folks from -- our safety fund is not currently open to survivors under the age of 18, but this -- so the sample for this report was 18 all the way to 81. It was our oldest grant recipient with average age of 31, and median age of 29, so it skews quite young. But we did not do -- you know, again, sort of similar to Caroline, I don't have sort of specific data on this, but just wanted to kind of, share those two points if it's helpful. At all, to sort of know those -- those points about this report. Certainly, it's something we have talked about, you know, at FreeFrom. I know there was a -- a study which I can try to dig-up, that was looking at economic abuse among teenagers. And so this is really paying attention to, and thinking about the impact of young folks is something that we're certainly on our radar as an organization, but we don't have any specific data on this, but I can try to share that -- that -- I don't know that the -- the report on economic abuse in teens is related to folks in foster care specifically but it is a resource, thinking about some of these issues with that younger population, if that's helpful at all. But, yeah, not anything super specific from us.

>> Shelah: Thank you. Thank you.

>> MARLENA MOORE: There was a question in -- that came up in the chat space, and I think it's directed towards you, Caroline, so, is there any systems or organizations that exist to assist possibly?

>> CAROLINE LAPORTE: So, one space that I know of -- and I guess I will just speak to this very generally, right? I think that resources, like, Ain Dah Yung are very clearly impacting at least Native youth in regards to this space. And there's a lot of others, too, right? Gwen and I who is my partner on this project, had the opportunity to tour Covenant House in Anchorage where at any given point in time, 60 -- I think she said, like, 60 to 70% of the youth that are in her shelter are Native or kids who -- Kids who come from remote villages to Anchorage and

are there, right? And it's sort of, like, a central space, but, it's very disconnected. Other systems, that I think are responsive -- and this is going to sound a little random. Clinics at law schools, there are a lot of clinics, at law schools, that focus on -- Children, and youth, law, and they typically take on cases that are with -- with kids who are in that 18-22 age range; There's a host of reasons for that. But very specifically, it teaches would-be lawyers, right? How to do agency advocacy and systems advocacy, within the Child welfare system, and also -- also within SSI. And I think -- I think that tracking down a clinic like that, and partnering with them, is honestly probably one of the better practices that I could uplift. And I -- you know, that's kind of selfish on my part because I had the opportunity to spend multiple years in a clinic that did that work; and I think that, (pause), it felt -- it felt very -- I don't know, like, transformative, and impactful to what we were doing, and, of course, you're doing that work, under the supervision of a licensed attorney. So, you know, inasmuch as legal advocacy is helpful in those spaces, and I think it is, in particular, with reference to kids aging out of foster care, I think looking at law school clinics is a really good option.

I don't know if anybody else has other organizations they would suggest. I mean, obviously, in Indian Country, we have NICWA, which is the National Indian Child Welfare Association, and then as judges there are different places where we go to have these conversations and work towards making changes. And I guess, to follow up that would be -- I see that you're asking about pro pro bono -- and that would be pro bono.

>>MARLENA MOORE: Great, thank you. I do see that there are no more questions. In the chat, I do just want to read out what Shawndell had put into the chat as well, the FVPSA program has lifted up the need for research and evaluation funding so that we can update the shelter study, the supportive services study, the culturally specific study -- or specific services study -- and the DV evidence project. The 2.5% and federal program administration budget for the FVPSA program is not able to support ongoing research and evaluation that is needed. We are looking forward to the FVPSA reauthorization -- or we are looking forward to what the FVPSA reauthorization may bring. And I think that is it for our questions, and I am going to pass it over to Shenna.

>> SHENNA MORRIS, Director of Policy: Thank you so much, Marlana. And thank you, everyone, for that very rich Q&A

session. Hello, everyone. My name is Shenna Morris and I am the Director of Policy at the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence. I use she/her pronouns and identify as Black. If you would, I -- I invite you to take a moment to hook your two index fingers together, if you are able. And this is the pattern that is formed currently by my flat, what is called, two-strand twisted, natural brown hair. And I am wearing a Black jacket with a fuchsia shirt today.

>> SHENNA MORRIS, Director of Policy: So, let's take a moment to bring this all together. What you have witnessed in all of the rich research and information and solutions, that have been shared today, is our living into the commitments you see here. If I could get the next slide, thank you. Our policy stance at NRCDV being expansive in our policy thinking and efforts, cocreating solutions with survivors and communities most impacted, and addressing root causes of violence. And advancing policy solutions that will make meaningful change for Black and Brown communities, Indigenous communities, trans and nonbinary survivors, survivors with disabilities, immigrant survivors, and those most traumatized and harmed by what are called, and referred to as, carceral systems and responses. Next slide please. Just to give an overview again you've heard alignment from various different angles today of policy recommendations to provide flexibility, in policy language and implementation, in order to best-meet survivors' needs; shift away from policy-making that reinforces racist, oppressive, and carceral responses, and survivor narratives. And increase development of policy solutions, that create direct pathways, to resources such as access to direct cash assistance and safe housing. Let's stay on this slide for a moment, please.

>> SHENNA MORRIS, Director of Policy: This broad picture of what has been shared today further aligns with what you see here as NRCDV's policy priorities. To, one, build and support the capacity of survivors to engage in policy and systems advocacy. Next slide, please. (Pause). Two, promote survivor-centered, equitable, and just policies. Next slide, please. Three, ensure increased economic security for survivors, their families, and communities. Next slide, please. Four, promote family and community-centered policies that sees the humanity in all. Next slide, please. Five, increase survivors' access to and broaden the range of affordable housing options. Next slide, please. And six, build advocates' capacity to engage in policy efforts across the country. Now, the slides with specific recommendations, the recording of this briefing, and a written policy brief that complements the NRCDV Needs Assessment, that you-all heard about, will be shared with you all. Specifically, in the NRCDV written Policy Brief that I just mentioned, which

is connected to the earlier Needs Assessment findings that were presented by Dr. Ayeni, you'll find concise details on concrete steps that can be taken to address housing barriers and challenges for survivors. And, again, you'll receive the information that talks about the policy recommendations I am getting ready to share. So, these include policy recommendations to leverage existing funding sources and allocate additional funding to increase equitable, longer-term, and permanent housing solution -- options. By modifying allowable uses of existing funding resources, both public and private, greater flexibility is encouraged and the opportunity to use these resources for maximum and best use emerges. Another recommendation is to identify diverse and revolving funding sources in order to strengthen sustainable, permanent housing solutions.

>> Shenna Morris: As you'll see, discussed in the full report, diversified and rotating funding sources can meet survivors' needs in the ways they define and support their access to broader, permanent housing options. A recommendation heard from other partners on today's call and highlighted in the Report includes increasing federal legislative efforts to address housing discrimination against survivors and other housing barriers in all types of housing. Addressing racism and oppression by weaving accountability and equity-based practices into the fabric of policies contributes to dismantling housing discrimination. And finally, there is a recommendation to increase support for cross-sector collaborations across formal service systems in order to improve survivors' access to housing resources. By providing both federal and state resources, that encourages cross-movement collaboration, survivor-centered and trauma-informed practices are allowed to emerge. We hope that you can dig further into all of this information and use it to support and strengthen your work on behalf of survivors. We look forward to what is ahead and continuing to work with allied partners, and all of you, to encourage shifts in policy through the research and recommendations that you've heard today. So, with that, I'll now turn the floor back over to NRCDV's Vice President of Strategic Partnerships and Systems Change for our closing, Heidi.

>> HEIDI NOTARIO: Thank you so much Shenna Morris and the rest of the team at NRCDV and our partners for our briefing today. I just wanted to provide a general overview of all the jewels that are being shared as we gather together. We heard about the importance of culturally-specific responses to meet survivors' needs especially in the context of housing insecurity and

gender-based violence. We learned about looking at housing as a human right from our Native relatives and also, I heard -- the terrible reality that grandmothers are represented among the unhoused population that Native Folks are reporting. We heard about the importance of access to culture and traditions, as healing tools, for survivors.

And we also learned that for Native survivors, there is a -- a need to increase the number of shelters that are run by Natives -- their Native relatives; so culturally-specific shelters. We also learn about the importance of centering people with lived experiences and that experience additional marginalization because of their identities. And that we need to concentrate on innovative housing solutions that center racial equity, culturally responsive, and holistic approaches to service provision. We hope that this briefing served to highlight our message for Domestic Violence Awareness -- Awareness Month of "No Survivor Justice Without Racial Justice" and that we continue to work to support creative solutions that center those with lived experience.

>> HEIDI NOTARIO: We heard about innovative strategies like housing cooperatives, and other models, non-traditional binding strategies done in communities that support survivors in securing housing. We also heard about the critical need for direct cash assistance and how gender-based violence is an economic justice issue that does not occur in a silo. We also learned more -- more than once in this discussion about the disproportionate impact of racism, ableism, queer- and transphobia by systems. So, when we think about responding to gender-based violence, our interventions need to go beyond the partner that is causing the harm. We also heard about the importance of trusting survivors, which is a message highlighted by our colleagues at FreeFrom. And then we learned about the efficacy of the Domestic Violence Housing First Model. One of its components is flexible funding. So once again, we saw that this strategy contributed to increase in housing stability, safety, and decrease in mental health symptoms. And lastly, we learned from Shenna, that it's important that our policy solutions center on those strategies that will advance meaningful change for Black, Indigenous People of Color, transgender, nonconforming, person with disabilities, and others living on the margins. With that, we would like to remind you to please take advantage of all the resources that have been shared here today. Reports, access to our briefs, access to the toolkit, and the (Domestic Violence) Housing First Model, and other things that were shared by presenters today. Please reach out to NRCDDV if you need additional information. Our contact information is here on the screen. And lastly, to remind you, to

complete the survey, that is going to be accessible to all of you at the conclusion of this presentation. Last but not least, I would like to thank our Interpreters for helping us make this event accessible and for assisting us in creating a multilingual space. And I would also like to thank our funders and our colleagues at NRCDV for your support. And all of you for joining us as we continue to observe Domestic Violence Awareness Month. Thank you all and have a wonderful rest of the day.