

# UCI Initiative to End Family Violence

*Annual Conference*



# THE POLITICIZATION OF SAFETY

April 6 and 7, 2017

Critically exploring  
political dimensions and  
movement politics of  
interventions in family violence

Arnold and Mabel  
Beckman Center  
of the National Academies  
of Sciences and Engineering



**EVENT  
PROGRAM**

# Featured Speakers



## APRIL 6

**PUBLIC LECTURE AND RECEPTION**

**BEVERLY GOODEN**

6:00 - 8:00 p.m. • Beckman Center, UC Irvine

Ms. Gooden is a victims' rights advocate who created the viral hashtag #WhyIStayed following public response to Janay Palmer and Ray Rice. She holds degrees in Communications and Social Justice and now speaks to audiences across the country about domestic violence sensitivity, social justice, and the power of storytelling. Ms. Gooden's story has been profiled on Good Morning America, CNN, TIME, The Washington Post, Mic, HLN, Inside Edition, and more.

**Introduction by:**

**Dean Erwin Chemerinsky, UCI School of Law**

## APRIL 7

**KIMBERLÉ CRENSHAW**

**UCLA Law, Columbia Law School**

**Inaugural IEFV Change-Maker Award Recipient  
speaks on *The Urgency of Intersectionality***

4:15 - 5:00 p.m. • Beckman Center, UC Irvine

Kimberlé Crenshaw, Professor of Law at UCLA and Columbia Law School, is a leading authority in the areas of Civil Rights, Black feminist legal theory, and race, racism, and the law. Her work has been foundational in two fields of study that have come to be known by terms that she coined: Intersectionality and Critical Race Theory.



**UCI** Initiative to  
End Family Violence

# April 7 Program

Welcome to the UCI Initiative to End Family Violence's first annual conference, "The Politicization of Safety." This conference critically explores political dimensions of and movement politics regarding interventions in or failures to intervene in domestic violence. We will consider multiple meanings of politicization and politics across a range of contexts. Various legislative battles illuminate partisan politics and growing divisions while surfacing values motivating different policies. Our theme posits that policies about family violence should be driven by survivors' needs, rather than politics, but the Trump Administration's actions so far show the vulnerability of protections from abuse and make this topic of current and future relevance. The conference also examines politics and tensions within the anti-domestic violence movement and evaluates this movement's position in relation to other social issues and progressive concerns. The politics of advocacy and narratives surrounding victim/survivors are also implicated. As we come together, we wish to challenge participants to question assumptions, expand perspectives, and consider larger justice issues.

Professor Jane Stoever, Director, UCI Initiative to End Family Violence

## 9:00 - 9:50 a.m. Welcome and Panel I: Introductory Panel on the Politics of Safety and Justice

Moderated by **Emily Thuma**, Professor of Gender and Sexuality Studies and History, University of California, Irvine School of Humanities

- **Jane Stoever**, Director, UCI Initiative to End Family Violence, Professor and Director, Domestic Violence Clinic, University of California, Irvine School of Law, "Welcome and Introduction of the Conference Theme"
- **Mimi Kim**, Professor of Social Work, California State University, Long Beach, "Decoupling Safety from Crime Control: Current Trends in the Feminist Anti-Violence Movement"
- **Deborah Weissman**, Reef C. Ivey II Distinguished Professor of Law, University of North Carolina School of Law, "The Community Politics of Domestic Violence"

## 9:50 - 10:50 a.m. Panel II: Intersectional Needs for Safety and Justice

Moderated by **Kaaryn Gustafson**, Professor and Co-Director, Center on Law, Equality and Race, University of California, Irvine School of Law

- **Donna Coker**, Professor, University of Miami School of Law, "Crime Logic and Feminist Politics about Campus Sexual Assault"
- **Jessica Cabrera**, Graduate Student, University of California, Irvine School of Social Sciences, "Interpreting Law in Campus Sexual Assault Response"
- **Sid Jordan**, Graduate Student, University of California, Los Angeles Luskin School of Public Affairs, "Critical Trans Perspectives on Antiviolence Advocacy"
- **Natalie Nanasi**, Professor and Director, Hunter Legal Center for Victims of Crimes Against Women, SMU Dedman School of Law, "The U Visa's Failed Promise for Survivors of Domestic Violence"

# April 7 Program

10:50 - 11:00 a.m. Break

11:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. Panel III: Responses to Gender-Based Violence in the Trump Era

Moderated by **Jane Stoever**, Director, UCI Initiative to End Family Violence, Professor and Director, Domestic Violence Clinic, University of California, Irvine School of Law

- **Carrie Bettinger-López**, White House Advisor on Violence Against Women (March 2015-January 2017), Professor of Clinical Legal Education and Director of the Human Rights Clinic at the University of Miami School of Law
- **Michele Bratcher Goodwin**, Chancellor's Professor and Director, Center for Biotechnology and Global Health Policy, University of California, Irvine School of Law
- **Jennifer Koh**, Professor and Director, Immigration Clinic, Western State College of Law at Argosy University
- **Elizabeth MacDowell**, Professor and Director, Family Justice Clinic, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

12:00 - 1:00 p.m. Lunch

1:00 - 2:00 p.m. Panel IV: Militarization, Firearms, and the Family

Moderated by **Dr. Christopher Kahn**, Professor, Director of Fellowship in Emergency Medical Services & Disaster Medicine, Director of Emergency Preparedness & Response, Chief of Division of Emergency Medical Services, University of California, San Diego

- **Leigh Goodmark**, Professor and Director, Gender Violence Clinic, University of Maryland Carey School of Law, "Hands Up at Home: Militarized Masculinity and Police Officers Who Commit Intimate Partner Abuse"
- **Jane Stoever**, Director, UCI Initiative to End Family Violence, Professor and Director, Domestic Violence Clinic, University of California, Irvine School of Law, "Playing Politics with Firearms and Family Violence"
- **Mary Fan**, Henry M. Jackson Professor of Law, University of Washington School of Law, "Preventing Ordinary and Extraordinary Violence"
- **Carolyn Ramsey**, Professor, University of Colorado Law School, "Firearms in the Family"



# April 7 Program

## 2:00 - 3:00 p.m. Panel V: Multiple Systems, Standards, and Dilemmas

Moderated by **Kirk Williams**, Professor of Criminology, Law and Society, University of California, Irvine School of Social Ecology

- **Alisa Bierria**, University of California, Berkeley and **Colby Lenz**, University of Southern California, “Judicial Fictions: Maneuvering Agency in ‘Failure to Protect’”
- **Cynthia Godsoe**, Professor, Brooklyn Law School, “Rethinking Parental Prerogatives”
- **Amy Magnus**, Graduate Student, University of California, Irvine School of Social Ecology, “Crossed Over or Crossed Out? A Critical Assessment of Specialized Juvenile and Family Justice Initiatives”

## 3:00 - 3:15 p.m. Break

## 3:15 - 4:15 p.m. Panel VI: Moving Forward and Considering Science-Informed Solutions

Moderated by **Candace Burton**, Professor, University of California, Irvine School of Nursing

- **Jamie Abrams**, Professor, University of Louisville Brandeis School of Law, “The Externalities of Family Violence”
- **Courtney Cross**, Visiting Professor, University of Denver, Sturm College of Law, “Harm Reduction in the Domestic Violence Context”
- **Carrie Bettinger-López**, White House Advisor on Violence Against Women (March 2015-January 2017), Professor of Clinical Legal Education and Director of the Human Rights Clinic at the University of Miami School of Law, “Creating a National Plan of Action on Violence Against Women and Gender-Based Violence: A Human Rights Approach”

## 4:15 - 5:00 p.m. Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, Inaugural Change-Maker Award

Address on “The Urgency of Intersectionality”

# Abstracts

## Welcome and Panel I: Introductory Panel on the Politics of Safety and Justice

**Jane Stoever**, Director, UCI Initiative to End Family Violence, Professor and Director, Domestic Violence Clinic, University of California, Irvine School of Law  
Director's Welcome and Introduction of the Conference Theme

**Mimi Kim**, Professor of Social Work, California State University, Long Beach  
“Decoupling Safety from Crime Control: Current Trends in the Feminist Anti-Violence Movement”

In the past several years, the U.S. feminist anti-violence social movement's reliance on criminalization has weakened under the weight of mounting criticism of what is now known as “carceral feminism.” Kim examines contemporary dynamics between mainstream feminist social movements and anti-carceral counter movements and the resulting articulation of movement fissures, emerging alignments, and implications for violence prevention and intervention practices and policies. The historical development of feminist pro-criminalization responses to gender violence is contrasted to contemporary mainstream engagement with alternative political frameworks, proposed local and national decarceration policy initiatives, and innovative anti-carceral intervention strategies. Comparative analysis reveals current trends and trajectories signaling significant shifts in U.S. feminist approaches to safety.

**Deborah Weissman**, Reef C. Ivey II Distinguished Professor of Law, University of North Carolina School of Law  
“The Community Politics of Domestic Violence”

Gender violence has long been identified as a crisis of epidemic proportions and one without an effective solution. Decades of law reform notwithstanding—including increased social services and public health interventions—rates of gender violence appear not to have appreciably declined. Within the realm of gender violence, domestic violence, often referred to as intimate partner violence and most frequently characterized by the phenomenon of the male perpetrator and the female victim, has gained the greatest attention. In that context, the most significant developments have been in the realm of criminalization and punishment, circumstances about which there has been much scholarly and activist debate. The field of domestic violence is itself in somewhat of a crisis, and it has been difficult to discern the best way forward. Despite its intellectual and practical engagement, the domestic violence movement seems unable to shift from the paradigmatic neoliberal responses that emphasize the features attendant to the carceral state while appearing indifferent to the structural issues at the source of this social problem. Reliance on the criminal justice system has tended to fracture the domestic violence movement and marginalize disenfranchised populations.

Weissman explores a case study of a particular incident that occurred between the sheriff of San Francisco and his wife in December 2011. She discusses how the legal and community responses that ensued serve to set in relief the contradictions and tensions emblematic of the current crisis gripping the domestic violence movement. Ross Mirkarimi, who was at the time the sheriff-elect of the city of San Francisco, while arguing with his wife, Eliana López, grabbed her arm, causing a visible bruise. Elected largely as a result of the support of marginalized communities, immigrant rights advocates, environmental justice

# Abstracts

organizations, labor groups, and other progressive organizations, Mirkarimi was charged with domestic-violence-related crimes and faced additional charges of official misconduct by the mayor to remove him from the office of sheriff. López, who had immigrant status at the time of the incident, did not seek and strongly opposed criminal justice intervention, objected to the characterization of the event as an incident of domestic violence, and contested efforts by the mayor to depose Mirkarimi as sheriff. The criminal charges against Mirkarimi, and charges of official misconduct heard during the San Francisco Ethics Commission and Board of Supervisors proceedings, spilled from the courts and city hall into neighborhoods, households, and meeting places of community organizations throughout the city. Both the legal and public citizen commentary offered throughout months of proceedings against Mirkarimi provide a unique opportunity to consider the problems of domestic violence anew, investigate old premises and presumptions, and reconsider responses. The Mirkarimi-López case, idiosyncratic as it may be, offers the opportunity to reexamine the very definition of domestic violence as well as the criminal justice and community responses to this problem.

## Panel II: Intersectional Needs for Safety and Justice

**Donna Coker**, Professor, University of Miami School of Law  
“Crime Logic and Feminist Politics about Campus Sexual Assault”

Feminist work to end sexual assault and intimate partner violence has become increasingly focused on criminal sanctions and criminal justice reform. The entrenchment of “governing through crime” as a social phenomenon—that is, the popularity of punitive and crime-like responses to social problems—coupled with the impact of neoliberal ideology has resulted in a feminist embrace of a set of attitudes Coker refers to as “crime logic.” Crime logic embraces (1) a focus on individual culpability rather than collective accountability; (2) a hostility to attention to social determinants of behavior; (3) a preference for narratives of bad actors and innocent victims; and (4) a preference for punitive or exile responses over rehabilitation.

The impact of crime logic is apparent in the feminist politics and discourse regarding campus sexual assault. For example, in the aftermath of Brock Turner’s sexual assault conviction, Stanford University adopted new rules to prevent the excessive drinking that both Turner and the victim engaged in on the night he assaulted her. Despite empirical evidence that limiting access to alcohol results in fewer sexual assaults, feminist activists responded negatively to Stanford’s new policy because it “sends the message that alcohol causes rape, rather than rapists cause rape.”

Coker discusses the impact of crime logic on the politics and discourse of feminist activism regarding campus sexual assault and the impact this feminist discourse has on Title IX regulation and campus administrations.

**Jessica Cabrera**, Graduate Student, University of California, Irvine School of Social Sciences  
“Interpreting Law in Campus Sexual Assault Response”

Using the case of campus sexual violence and harassment response, Cabrera’s research examines how role

# Abstracts

conflict and ambiguity impact the behaviors of university employees required to report instances of sexual violence. It confronts the myth of the “Rapist Hunter”—that administrators responsible for sexual violence response are acting swiftly, aggressively, and too powerfully in identifying violence and removing perpetrators. Cabrera conducted 15 semi-structural interviews at a public university in Southern California. Additionally, she examined three reporting policies with differing requirements—the university’s Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment under Title IX, the Clery Act, and the California Penal Code. Cabrera found that university structure and multiple reporting policy requirements contributed to role conflict and ambiguity for university employees. Amidst their confusion, reporters felt fear that their possible lack of compliance would cost them social and legal consequences, and possibly their jobs. Reporters also used their knowledge of mandated reporting policy under the California Penal Code to make sense of Title IX reporting requirements. Their understanding of the logic of mandated reporting—as an intervention in the abuse of a powerless child—shaped their perception of Title IX Policy in a way that led them to protest the policy, as they felt it undercut survivors’ power, as adults, to seek resources themselves.

**Sid Jordan**, Graduate Student, University of California, Los Angeles Luskin School of Public Affairs  
“Critical Trans Perspectives on Antiviolence Advocacy”

The 2013 reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) is one of the first federal statutes to explicitly extend anti-discrimination protections based on gender identity and to name transgender survivors as underserved beneficiaries. Although trans people are particularly vulnerable to intimate partner and sexual violence, they are less likely to access services funded under VAWA, including law enforcement, medical care, advocacy, and shelters. In fact, some trans people report mistreatment, discrimination, and even further violence at the hands of helping professionals. Jordan examines recent efforts to respond to the 2013 VAWA mandate. Based on in-depth interviews with trans people working in mainstream and LGBTQ antiviolence organizations in seven cities, Jordan explores the current barriers, tensions, and opportunities for transgender inclusion in the field of intimate partner and sexual violence advocacy and prevention. Common strategies for achieving trans inclusion within mainstream services (such as non-discrimination policies and changing forms) were seen as both important and also woefully insufficient. Jordan concludes that attending to the complexities of violence in the lived experiences of marginalized trans survivors will require substantive shifts in organizational cultures and theories of practice.

**Natalie Nanasi**, Professor and Director, Hunter Legal Center for Victims of Crimes Against Women, SMU Dedman School of Law  
“The U Visa’s Failed Promise for Survivors of Domestic Violence”

Recognizing the unique vulnerabilities of immigrant victims of crime, Congress enacted the U visa, a form of immigration relief that provides victims, including survivors of domestic violence, a path to legal status. Along with this humanitarian aim, the U visa was intended to aid law enforcement in efforts to investigate and prosecute crime, based on the notion that victims without legal status might otherwise be too fearful to “come out of the shadows” by reporting offenses to the police. Although these two goals



# Abstracts

were purportedly coequal, in practice, by requiring survivors to cooperate with law enforcement in order to obtain U nonimmigrant status, the benefits to police and prosecutors are achieved at the expense of the victims Congress sought to protect, exacerbating the very vulnerabilities the U visa was intended to address.

Nanasi posits that this marginalization of immigrant victims' interest should have been foreseen, as U visa requirements are analogous to other mandatory interventions in cases of domestic violence that have disempowered and destabilized survivors, particularly poor women of color. In tracing the history of the public response to domestic violence, from the time when spousal abuse was ignored or condoned to the overcorrection that has led to compulsory state involvement in women's lives, it becomes clear that the U visa has perpetuated the swing of the pendulum away from victim autonomy and toward an aggressive criminal justice response to domestic violence. Nanasi details why such a shift is particularly damaging for immigrant survivors—due to language barriers, complicated relationships with police, familial ties, and economic constraints—and proposes novel solutions that mitigate the harmful effects of the U visa certification requirement and break away from ineffective conventions surrounding assistance for survivors of domestic violence.

## Panel III: Responses to Gender-Based Violence in the Trump Era

## Panel IV: Militarization, Firearms, and the Family

**Leigh Goodmark**, Professor and Director, Gender Violence Clinic, University of Maryland Carey School of Law  
“Hands Up at Home: Militarized Masculinity and Police Officers Who Commit Intimate Partner Abuse”

The history of police brutality toward women is well documented; most of that literature, however, captures violence by police acting in their public capacity, as officers of the state. Goodmark examines the violence

and abuse perpetrated by police in their private lives against their intimate partners, although the public and private overlap because the power and training given to police officers by the state makes them significantly more dangerous. Intimate partner abuse by police officers is a systemic, structural issue created and fueled by the ways in which police officers are socialized and trained. Police officers are more likely to abuse their partners and, as a result of their training and their state imprimatur, police abuse of partners is more problematic and potentially more dangerous than abuse by civilians.

Despite the high rates of intimate partner abuse by police officers, each incident is treated as an isolated event, rather than part of a systemic problem, and officers are largely able to act with impunity because of their centrality in the law and policy response to intimate partner abuse in the United States. The U.S. response to intimate partner abuse relies heavily on the criminal justice system to enforce domestic violence laws, but there is some question as to whether criminalization can succeed as a policy when police officers are disproportionately committing intimate partner abuse.

**Jane Stoeber**, Director, UCI Initiative to End Family Violence, Professor and Director, Domestic Violence Clinic, University of California, Irvine School of Law

# Abstracts

## “Playing Politics with Firearms and Family Violence”

Alarming numbers of women and children are murdered by family members with firearms each year in the United States. This national emergency, fortunately, has a solution: many domestic violence fatalities could be prevented through commonsense gun laws, such as requiring background checks, which have been proven to reduce domestic violence gun murders by 46%. Unfortunately, safety as related to firearms and family violence has become highly politicized. For example, on the heels of the National Rifle Association’s endorsement of President-elect Donald Trump, Governor Christie again vetoed legislation that would have put reasonable gun control measures in place for domestic abusers whom courts have deemed dangerous. He instead proposed to expedite abuse victims’ access to firearms, a move destined to increase lethality to victims, abusers, and their children.

Playing politics continues despite extensive research establishing the deadly combination of family violence and access to firearms. Domestic abusers are five times more likely to murder their intimate partners when they have access to guns. One well-known study found that approximately three-quarters of domestic violence victims living in households with firearms were threatened or harmed with guns by their abusers. And accidental and intentional gun deaths involving children present all-too-common tragedies in the United States.

Stoever frames the discussion of the politics of firearms with an exploration of the gendered nature of the firearms debate, including how women are portrayed and the gender identities of the most prominent voices for gun rights and gun control. Given the stark and brutal realities of firearms and family violence, politicians across the ideological spectrum should readily agree that people who violently attack or threaten family members should be subject to practical and measured restrictions on their access to firearms. Stoever identifies measures that states can enact to address the loopholes that allow domestic abusers to acquire firearms even after they have been convicted of felony abuse, often to deadly effect.

**Mary Fan**, Henry M. Jackson Professor of Law, University of Washington School of Law  
“Preventing Ordinary and Extraordinary Violence”

The paradigm of the armed and dangerous mass killer in public opinion and gun control legislation is a homicidal-suicidal stranger hunting in crowded public places. Yet half of all incidents of firearms-related homicide take place in the home, typically among intimates and people known to the slain rather than strangers. Drawing on data from the National Violent Death Reporting System, this chapter shows that even in the context of extraordinary violence by the homicidal-suicidal, the major early red flags and risk factors involve seemingly ordinary smaller-scale assaults and domestic disturbances. Perpetrators are very likely to have committed interpersonal violence in the month before the homicide—yet never entered the legal system, thereby evading current firearms restrictions screens triggered by adjudications. Firearms possession laws prevent individuals convicted of crimes of domestic violence or placed under court-issued restraining orders from possessing firearms. The problem is that many perpetrators never come to the attention of a court. Based on these findings regarding what current legal screens miss, Fan discusses how police discretion and scene-of-the-assault procedure for “ordinary” domestic violence can help prevent escalation to fatal violence, including the feared extraordinary violence of homicidal-suicidal mass killings.

# Abstracts

**Carolyn Ramsey**, Professor, University of Colorado Law School  
“Firearms in the Family”

This presentation considers firearms prohibitions for domestic violence offenders in light of recent Supreme Court decisions and the larger national debate about gun control. Unlike other scholarship in the area, it confronts the costs of ratcheting up the scope and enforcement of such firearms bans and argues that the politicization of safety has come at the expense of a sound approach to gun control in the context of intimate partner abuse.

Both sides in the gun control debate rely on starkly contrasting, gendered images: the helpless female victim in need of state protection, including strictly enforced gun laws, and the self-defending woman of the National Rifle Association’s “Refuse to Be a Victim” campaign. Neither of these images accurately describes the position of many domestic violence victims whose partners have guns, and neither image responds effectively to the heterogeneity of conduct leading to a protection order or a misdemeanor domestic violence conviction that triggers federal and state firearms bans. The emphasis the National Rifle Association and other pro-gun organizations place on a woman’s right to carry a firearm in self-defense ignores the most common homicide risks women face, as well as structural inequalities that contribute to gender violence. Yet significant problems afflict an uncritically anti-gun approach, too. First, gun control advocates tend to ignore the reality of intimate partner abuse—a reality in which some women fight back, some family livelihoods depend on jobs for which firearms are required, not all misdemeanants become murderers, and victims have valid reasons for wanting to keep their partners out of prison. Second, to the extent that proponents of strict gun regulation also exhibit distaste for racialized crime-control policies, they fail to acknowledge that zealously enforced gun laws aimed at preventing domestic violence would put more people—including more men and women from vulnerable communities of color—behind bars.

The current framing of the argument for tougher firearms laws for abusers is derived from public health research on domestic violence that makes a reduction in intimate homicide rates its chief goal. Yet, since hundreds of thousands of domestic violence misdemeanants are thought to possess illegal guns, reformers should also consider the potential costs to victims and their families of a move to sweeping and rigorous enforcement. Changes in gun laws and their implementation in the context of intimate partner abuse ought to cure over- and under-breadth problems, provide greater autonomy to abuse victims and protections for those who resist their batterers, reconsider the lack of an exemption to the misdemeanor ban for firearms required on-duty, and include a better mechanism for restoring gun rights to misdemeanants who have shown the capacity to avoid reoffending.

## Panel V: Multiple Systems, Standards, and Dilemmas

**Alisa Bierria**, Associate Director, Center for Race and Gender, University of California, Berkeley and Graduate Student, Stanford University and **Colby Lenz**, Graduate Student, American Studies and Ethnicity Department, University of Southern California  
“Judicial Fictions: Maneuvering Agency in ‘Failure to Protect’”

# Abstracts

How is the agency of domestic violence survivors, batterers, and judicial systems reconstructed through the practice of using “failure to protect” laws to punish survivors? Bierria and Lenz build from Ann Cahill’s analysis that survivors of sexual assault are not objectified as non-subjects in the context of rape, but are instead rendered as subjects who are derivative to the person who rapes them. They contend that judicial systems similarly render domestic violence victims’ agency derivative to their abusers’ actions through 1) the practice of punishing victims for “failure to protect” children who are harmed by their abusers, and 2) the inventive fictions and logical contradictions courts employ in judicial arguments attempting to justify why survivors should be held culpable for harms caused by others.

Exploring the prosecutions of domestic violence survivors Kelly Ann Savage in California and Tondalao Hall in Oklahoma, Bierria and Lenz consider arguments used by judges and prosecutors that render the agency of survivors as derivative to abusers, which prevents survivors from being understood as “ontologically distinct” subjects in the eyes of the law and, thus, officiates their violent erasure in the narrative of their own victimization. Through the criminalization of survivors, courts ultimately appropriate the role of domestic violence perpetrator by extending the blaming and punishing aspects of domestic violence past the agentic acts of batterers. This creates an ironic derivation-based relationship between batterers and judicial systems, but also a different kind of subject erasure—battering with no batterer.

**Cynthia Godsoe**, Professor, Brooklyn Law School  
“Rethinking Parental Prerogatives”

The treatment of family violence continues to enforce a very traditional vision of family, one that is highly gendered, heteronormative, and hierarchical. Although most critiques of this pattern of state intervention/noninterference have focused on intimate partner violence, this pattern is even more problematic in the case of parents and children. The parental discipline privilege allows a wide swath of adults—including many with no parental rights or obligations—to beat children in the name of discipline. At the same time, incest laws largely punish sex only between biologically related, opposite-sex parents and adult children, leaving stepparents and other parental figures free to exploit and coerce sex from young adults they have raised.

Punishing these harms requires reinterpreting privacy to protect all family members, rather than as a shield for intra-familial abuse. Reimagining child abuse as a more public problem would also allow courts and legislatures to approach corporal punishment in a more holistic and systemic way, avoiding the narrow vision of the state’s role outlined in *Deshaney v. Winnebago Cty*, 489 U.S. 189 (1989). Punishing child abuse also entails robustly employing the state *parens patriae* power to justify state interventions, which is not without critique.

Recent shifts in our approach to several related crimes suggest some optimism for change. Here Godsoe points to the recent eradication of school corporal punishment in a majority of states, the growing trend to assess sexual consent through the lens of power differentials, and the increased limitations on parents’ rights to refuse vaccines or other medical treatment for their children.

# Abstracts

**Amy Magnus**, Graduate Student, University of California, Irvine School of Social Ecology

“Crossed Over or Crossed Out? A Critical Assessment of Specialized Juvenile and Family Justice Initiatives”

“Specialized justice” is deeply rooted in a movement toward socializing crime and justice. This movement structurally influenced courts to maintain their bureaucratic and law-upholding purposes while simultaneously operating as a public service to communities in need. Based on this ideological and structural shift, specialized justice via specialty courts is one mechanism through which citizens should be able to access justice, therapeutic jurisprudence, and restorative forms of justice. Magnus examines alternative and specialized justice initiatives, their historical roots, and the potential collateral consequences of specializing justice for youth and families within the juvenile delinquency and child welfare systems.

Currently, there are approximately two million children in the United States who have been identified as “crossover youth”—those simultaneously involved with the child welfare system, such as dependency and foster care, and the juvenile delinquency and criminal justice systems. Magnus posits some of the challenges of crossover youths’ experience with alternative justice initiatives and how rationales given by court administrators may conflict with, and sometimes even facilitate, the extension of another arm of the criminal justice system. Further, the conflicting logics provided by stakeholders about the social control of families and the protection of children are presented in light of recently developed specialized justice models to articulate the disjuncture among so-called progressive justice initiatives, their theoretical underpinnings, and their practical realities.

## Panel VI: Moving Forward and Considering Science-Informed Solutions

**Jamie Abrams**, Professor, University of Louisville Brandeis School of Law

“The Externalities of Family Violence”

Abrams reveals the absence of “externalities” in conducting domestic violence risk assessments and in framing domestic violence itself. Risk factors for family violence are myopically politicized around internal family factors such as pregnancies, mental health, drug or alcohol abuse, weapon access, and recency of incidents. This framing creates insider-outsider politics, positioning the victim as the party accountable for risk assessment and casting the state in a supporting role coming to her aid. This framework ignores the ways in which state actors in the judicial and law enforcement process might provoke or exacerbate risks of family violence.

What is missing from this political framing of domestic violence within the internal family dynamic is a broader understanding of triggers for hyper-masculine acts of violence, such as job acquisition and retention, social and economic wealth, and court-mandated custody loss or perceived parenting setbacks. It compromises the extent of state interventions; fictionalizes the family as an isolated unit separated from other political and social systems; and reverses state actors as universally working to end family violence, thus ignoring the possibility that state action can also sometimes provoke or exacerbate violence.

The roles of the state as a possible “provoker” or “preventer” are critical to acknowledge and develop in



# Abstracts

political accounts of domestic violence. Through a masculinities analysis, this presentation reveals the role and power of externalities in family violence. Abrams proposes sensitizing state actors, particularly law enforcement and family courts, to masculine imperatives and hyper-masculine expressions of violence; revising domestic violence lethality assessments to consider externalities; and revising Batterer's Intervention Programs content. These externalities to family violence and the vulnerable masculinities they expose are critical to add to existing political accounts of domestic violence.

**Courtney Cross**, Visiting Professor, University of Denver, Sturm College of Law  
"Harm Reduction in the Domestic Violence Context"

Harm reduction is a public health philosophy that prioritizes reducing risks for individuals engaging in potentially harmful activities, rather than eliminating the behavior itself. Harm reduction has developed in the context of drug use; rather than requiring addicted individuals to abstain from drug use immediately and completely, harm reduction is premised on the notion that it is better to attempt to eliminate collateral risks associated with drug use and support individuals' own path to safety, if not recovery. One prime example of harm reduction is needle exchange for heroin users: because sharing or reusing needles is a major source of disease and infection, providing heroin users with clean needles will reduce the dangers they may be exposed to, even though they have not ceased their drug usage.

Applying harm reduction principles to the domestic violence context may be viewed as controversial, given its association with behaviors like drug use, smoking, and high-risk sexual activity. In all of these behaviors, the beneficiary of harm reduction is also the agent choosing to engage in behaviors dangerous to his or her own health and well-being. In mainstream conceptions of abusive relationships, the survivor is often seen as the passive recipient of abuse. In many legal proceedings, however, the survivor is blamed and punished for staying in an abusive relationship. Given various ways of conceptualizing domestic violence relationships, Cross posits that analogies can be drawn between remaining in an abusive relationship and engaging in other potentially harmful behaviors.

Cross argues that principles of harm reduction should be adopted in legal settings in which a survivor's decision to remain in an abusive relationship may be scrutinized and held against her. Many court systems have adopted other social or psychological models to aid in judges' understandings of domestic violence, most notably the cycle of violence and the power and control wheel. While these models attempt with varying accuracy to describe what domestic violence looks like, they provide little insight into how courts should interpret survivors' responses to the abuse. Employing principles of harm reduction would enable judges to reconceive survivors' decisions and respond in a more nuanced and less automatically punitive manner.

**Carrie Bettinger-López**, White House Advisor on Violence Against Women (March 2015-January 2017), Professor of Clinical Legal Education and Director of the Human Rights Clinic at the University of Miami School of Law  
"Creating a National Plan of Action on Violence Against Women and Gender-Based Violence: A Human Rights Approach"

# Abstracts

Over the past two decades, international human rights treaties and monitoring bodies have called upon governments to formulate and implement national plans of action to eliminate violence against women. Such action plans constitute strategic, long-term, multi-sectoral “blueprints” or programs of activity designed to address the underlying causes of violence against women and strengthen the systems that respond to it—as opposed to more reactive approaches. Many countries have heeded these calls and have adopted dedicated plans on violence against women. In some countries, plans focus on a particular form of violence, such as domestic violence, trafficking, female genital mutilation/cutting, and forced marriage. Many national action plans on violence against women set out measures in support of victims/survivors; prevention, including awareness-raising and education; training and capacity-building efforts; prosecution, punishment, and rehabilitation of perpetrators; and research. Some countries have even developed second or third generation action plans, which contain lessons learned or impact assessments of earlier efforts. These subsequent plans often focus attention on specific groups of women or different forms of violence not addressed in the first plan. Action plans and strategies to address violence against women are also increasingly adopted at the provincial and local levels, as well as by independent public and private institutions, such as universities. Many countries also have incorporated targets and activities to combat violence against women in other existing national action plans on, for example, health, HIV/AIDS, development/social inclusion, and integration/migration.

Despite being a global leader in the violence against women arena, the U.S. has never developed a national plan of action to combat violence against women. When pressed on this point by international bodies, the U.S. has argued that the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), originally passed in 1994 and reauthorized three times—in 2000, 2005, and 2013—is effectively our national action plan, since VAWA constitutes “a comprehensive legislative package” that has invested billions of dollars toward protecting victims and preventing and responding to violence against women. The 2013 reauthorization of VAWA took the legislation in an increasingly progressive direction that addressed multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination and disadvantage by adding provisions to address violence against marginalized women, including Native Americans, immigrants, LGBT individuals, and students. Despite VAWA’s substantial contributions, it does not contain some of the core features of a national action plan—such as a strategic vision for ending violence against women in the United States, or a declaration that violence against women is a human rights violation and a form of sex discrimination, or a set of goals or benchmarks to measure progress.

By contrast, the United States has developed national action plans on violence against women outside the U.S. and in other thematic areas within the U.S. Take, for instance, the United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally (“GBV Strategy”), whose goal “is to marshal U.S. expertise and capacity to prevent and respond to gender-based violence globally.” The GBV Strategy is based on three guiding principles—protection prevention, accountability—and four detailed strategy objectives—coordination, integration, research, and programming. Another example is the United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security, whose goal is “to empower half the world’s population to act as equal partners in preventing conflict and building peace in countries threatened and affected by war, violence, and insecurity.” Moreover, the U.S. has adopted a National HIV/AIDS Strategy/Federal Action Plan for the United States, which contains a vision statement, an implementation

# Abstracts

strategy, action items, and goals.

Bettinger-López examines the key elements of national action plans (NAPs) on violence against women, as identified by international bodies and as implemented in specific countries. She further identifies where VAWA and other U.S. law and policy initiatives do and do not comport with these elements. Bettinger-López concludes by contextualizing this inquiry into the current landscape, examining the utility of advocating the development of a U.S. National Action Plan on Violence Against Women when an administration, such as the current one, may be unfriendly to many of VAWA's aspects (and perhaps its essence). Should advocates turn their gaze during the Trump era toward state, local, and/or private/public action plans on violence against women? Here, lessons learned from the implementation of action plans at the provincial and local levels and by public and private institutions—in the U.S. and in other countries—will be especially instructive.

## Posters

**Nik Warren**, Graduate Student, University of California, Irvine School of Public Health  
“Campus Violence and Aggression: A Study at the University of California, Irvine”

Campus violence and aggression are a threat to the health and well-being of people in communities across the country. Stories of various forms of violence and aggression are at the forefront of news media on a daily basis and, as most crimes go unreported, this media attention is a small representation of reality.

A cross-sectional, anonymous survey of 701 participants at the University of California, Irvine was conducted from February to March in 2016. Participants included a purposive sample of faculty, staff, and students, ages 18 and older.

Ninety-five survey respondents reported being threatened 143 times on campus. Regarding sexual assault or sexual misconduct, 30.3% of survey respondents cited that UCI officials would be likely to take a report extremely seriously, and 42.5% indicated that officials would take such a report very seriously. Additionally, participants felt that UCI officials would be extremely likely (19.6%) or very likely (40.4%) to conduct a fair investigation. Furthermore, 15.5% of survey respondents cited that students would be extremely likely to support the person making a report and 45.5% cited that students would be very likely to support the person making a report.

This gap in faith regarding campus crime reporting, investigation, and support indicates an unmet need at UCI. The growing public health problem of campus violence and aggression must be addressed in a welcoming and systematic format that considers the needs of the entire community through reporting services, investigation procedures, prevention programs, survivor support, and potential policy change. Additional research and evaluation is necessary to further address the issue.

**Jaimie Wu**, Community Service Programs, Inc.  
“‘We Can Overcome’ Domestic Violence Public Health Media Campaign”

# Abstracts

As a strategy of the Domestic Violence & Health Collective-Orange County (DVHC-OC), Community Service Programs (CSP) led the development of the “We Can Overcome” Public Health Campaign (PHC), an Orange County campaign that aims to raise awareness of domestic violence (DV), reduce stigma associated with DV, and increase awareness of Orange County DV resources. The PHC targets the general population as well as three subpopulations that are disproportionately affected by DV: low-income individuals; lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender persons; and perinatal individuals. To inform the development of the campaign, CSP collaborated with an evaluation consultant to conduct formative research, which included three rounds of focus groups with general and target subpopulations. In total, 17 focus groups were conducted, including a total of 133 participants. Participants in focus groups indicated that, out of the different sample advertisements shown, the advertisements that resonated most strongly with them featured testimonial style messaging, images of strong individuals who are part of the solution to DV, the tagline “We Can Overcome Domestic Violence,” and a call to action directing viewers to a hotline or web portal. Across all populations, online and social media advertisements were more memorable than television and radio advertisements. Accordingly, campaign messaging will be featured on Pandora radio and on the campaign’s social media sites. Smaller print media will be distributed to community sites county-wide, but the campaign’s large media effort will focus on Santa Ana and Anaheim, two Orange County cities identified during formative research as having the highest number of DV-related calls for assistance.

# Speaker Bios

## **Jamie Abrams, Professor, University of Louisville Brandeis School of Law**

Professor Abrams teaches Torts, Family Law, Legislation, and Women and the Law. Her research focuses on reproductive and birthing decision-making, gendered citizenship, legal protections for immigrant victims of domestic violence, and legal education pedagogy. Her most recent law review articles include “Debunking the Myth of Universal Male Privilege,” published as the lead article in the University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform, and “The Feminist Case for Acknowledging Women’s Acts of Violence” in the Yale Journal of Law & Feminism. Her chapter in *Feminist Judgments* (Cambridge University Press) provides historical commentary on *Rostker v. Goldberg*, a U.S. Supreme Court case considering the constitutionality of women’s exclusion from the draft. She co-directs the Brandeis Human Rights Advocacy Program, which works actively with other nonprofits and stakeholders in the community to advance the human rights of immigrants, refugees, and noncitizens. Current initiatives focus on language access, access to education and health care, and media rhetoric.

## **Carrie Bettinger-Lopez, White House Advisor on Violence Against Women (March 2015-January 2017), Professor and Director of the Human Rights Clinic at the University of Miami School of Law**

Caroline Bettinger-López is a Professor of Clinical Legal Education and Director of the Human Rights Clinic at the University of Miami School of Law. She recently completed a two-year term in the Obama Administration as the White House Advisor on Violence Against Women and Senior Advisor to Vice President Joe Biden. In fall 2014, she was a Visiting Associate Clinical Professor and Acting Director of the International Human Rights Clinic at the University of Chicago Law School.

Bettinger-López’s scholarship, practice, and teaching concern international human rights law and policy advocacy, violence against women, gender and race discrimination, immigrants’ rights, and clinical legal education. She focuses on the implementation of human rights norms at the domestic level, principally in the United States and Latin America. Bettinger-López regularly litigates and engages in other forms of advocacy before the Inter-American Human Rights system, the United Nations, and federal and state courts and legislative bodies.

## **Alisa Bierria, Associate Director, Center for Race and Gender, University of California, Berkeley and Graduate Student, Stanford University**

Alisa Bierria is the Associate Director of the Center for Race and Gender at UC Berkeley and a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Philosophy at Stanford University. Her dissertation explores the role of social and political recognition in human agency. She is the recipient of the Diane J. Middlebrook Prize for Graduate Teaching and has years of experience writing, teaching, and organizing on issues of violence and redress. Other research interests include social ontology, critical legal studies, feminist of color theory, speculative theory of the body, and popular culture. Bierria is a member of INCITE!, the Free Marissa Now



# Speaker Bios

Mobilization Campaign, and the Survived And Punished project. She is co-editor of *Community Accountability: Emerging Movements to Transform Violence*, a special issue of *Social Justice: A Journal of Crime, Conflict, and World Order*.

## **Candace Burton, Professor, University of California, Irvine School of Nursing**

Dr. Burton is an Assistant Professor of Nursing Science at the University of California, Irvine and a former domestic violence advocate. She became a nurse in hopes of increasing understanding of the impact of relationship-based abuse and trauma on women's health. Her most recent research focuses on the biobehavioral and biological health effects of intimate partner violence, including genomic and epigenomic changes.

## **Jessica Cabrera, Graduate Student, University of California, Irvine School of Social Sciences**

Jessica Cabrera is a second-year Ph.D. student in the Department of Sociology at the University of California, Irvine. Cabrera's research interests are in the areas of violence against women, gender, and the sociology of culture. She earned her undergraduate degree from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, where she double majored in Sociology and Women's and Gender Studies. Cabrera's interest in her current research endeavors stems from her involvement as a domestic violence center hotline volunteer and her previous ethnographic work with a rape crisis center. Her current project on role conflict and ambiguity recently won an Honorable Mention from the Ford Foundation. Cabrera's research has benefitted greatly from talks and conferences such as the COE UC Global Health Initiative retreat in San Francisco, the UC Women's Caucus Leadership Conference, and many of the events organized by the IEFV.

## **Donna Coker, Professor, University of Miami School of Law**

Professor Coker examines the connection between economic vulnerability and intimate partner violence; restorative justice approaches to intimate partner violence and sexual assault; gender, race, and class bias; and criminal justice policy and law. She is a leading critic of the disproportionate focus on criminal justice responses that characterizes U.S. domestic violence policy. Her widely cited research illustrates the negative impact of this focus on women marginalized as a function of poverty, race, or immigration status. Her empirical study of the adjudication of domestic violence cases in Navajo Peacemaking Courts has influenced work in the fields of restorative justice and domestic violence in the United States and abroad.

## **Courtney Cross, Visiting Professor, University of Denver, Sturm College of Law**

Prior to joining the Civil Litigation Clinic at Sturm College of Law, Courtney Cross was a Clinical Teaching Fellow in the Domestic Violence Clinic at Georgetown University Law Center. During this fellowship, she taught and supervised law students representing indigent survivors of domestic violence while earning her LLM in Advocacy and participating in the Women's Law and Public Policy Fellowship Program. Before she began teaching, Cross was an Equal Justice Works Fellow and staff attorney at a women's reentry

# Speaker Bios

organization where she represented formerly incarcerated DC women in domestic violence and family court proceedings and represented incarcerated women in parole revocation hearings. She also conducted legal clinics and legal education classes at DC's women's jail and provided advice and assistance on matters including housing, public benefits, and record sealing.

## **Mary Fan, Henry M. Jackson Professor of Law, University of Washington School of Law**

Professor Fan's research and teaching are informed by her experiences as a federal prosecutor and as an associate legal officer at a United Nations criminal tribunal. Fan's expertise includes U.S. and international criminal law and procedure, evidence, privacy, immigration, and epidemiological criminology. She also collaborates on interdisciplinary violence prevention research as a core faculty member at Harborview Medical Center's Injury Prevention & Research Center.

Fan was elected to the American Law Institute (ALI) in 2012 and is an Advisor to the ALI's Model Penal Code: Sexual Assault and Related Crimes Project. She was elected as a fellow of the American Bar Association in 2014. She is a two-time recipient of the Dean's Medal for excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.

## **Cynthia Godsoe, Professor, Brooklyn Law School**

Cynthia Godsoe teaches courses in family law, criminal law, children and the law, professional responsibility and public interest lawyering. Her scholarship centers on the regulation of intimate behavior and gender roles through family and criminal law, encompassing topics including the path to marriage equality, the designation of victims and offenders in intimate violence, and the criminalization of non-conforming girls. Her recent work has appeared in the Yale Law Journal Forum, Washington and Lee Law Review, Tulane Law Review, and California Law Review Circuit, among others. The media, including The New York Times and Time Magazine, have consulted Godsoe on juvenile justice and family law issues. She was chair of the Juvenile Justice Committee of the New York City Bar from 2008 to 2011 and continues to participate in pro bono work on a variety of children's rights issues.

## **Leigh Goodmark, Professor and Director, Gender Violence Clinic, University of Maryland Carey School of Law**

Leigh Goodmark is a Professor of Law at the University of Maryland Carey School of Law. Goodmark directs the Gender Violence Clinic, which provides direct representation in matters involving intimate partner abuse, sexual assault, and trafficking, and teaches Family Law and Gender and the Law. Goodmark's scholarship focuses on domestic violence. She is the co-editor of *Comparative Perspectives on Gender Violence: Lessons from Efforts Worldwide* (Oxford 2015) and the author of *A Troubled Marriage: Domestic Violence and the Legal System* (New York University 2012), which was named a CHOICE Outstanding Academic Title of 2012. Goodmark is a graduate of Yale University and Stanford Law School.

# Speaker Bios

## **Michele Bratcher Goodwin, Chancellor's Professor and Director, Center for Biotechnology and Global Health Policy, University of California, Irvine School of Law**

Professor Michele Goodwin is a Chancellor's Professor of Law at the University of California, Irvine with appointments at the School of Law, Program in Public Health, Departments of Criminology, Law, & Society, Gender & Sexuality Studies, and Center for Psychology & Law. She is the Founder and Director of the Center for Biotechnology and Global Health Policy at UC Irvine and its internationally acclaimed Reproductive Justice Initiative. Her publications include five books and over 70 articles and book chapters on law's regulation of the human body, including civil and criminal regulation of pregnancy and reproduction, reproductive technologies, and human trafficking, among other topics. She has been a featured guest on HBO's Vice, NPR, To the Contrary, Point Taken, Radio Times with Marty Moss-Coane, and On Point with Tom Ashbrook, and she is regularly featured in The Huffington Post. Her book Policing the Womb is due out in 2017.

## **Kaaryn Gustafson, Professor and Co-Director, Center on Law, Equality and Race, University of California, Irvine School of Law**

Professor Gustafson's research and scholarship is interdisciplinary and explores the role of law in remedying inequality—and in reinforcing inequality. Her research over the last decade focused on the expanding administrative overlap between the welfare and criminal justice systems, as well as the experiences of those individuals and families caught in those systems. Her current research explores the history of law in regulating African American families and in regulating labor among poor people of various ethnic backgrounds.

## **Sid Jordan, Graduate Student, University of California, Los Angeles Luskin School of Public Affairs**

Sid Jordan is a Ph.D. student in the Social Welfare Doctoral Program at UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs. Jordan previously led a federally funded national demonstration to increase LGBTQ access to victim services with the Coalition Ending Gender-based Violence and the Northwest Network of Bi, Trans, Lesbian, and Gay Survivors of Abuse in Seattle, Washington. Jordan provides training and technical assistance to organizations investing in LGBTQ access and is a member of the steering committee for the national LGBTQ Institute on IPV. His research interests focus on advancing the health, well-being, and self-determination of LGBTQ youth and survivors of violence.

## **Christopher Kahn, Professor, Director of Fellowship in Emergency Medical Services & Disaster Medicine, Director of Emergency Preparedness & Response, Chief of Division of Emergency Medical Services, University of California, San Diego**

Dr. Christopher Kahn, MD, MPH, FAEMS, serves as the fellowship director for Emergency Medical Services and chief of the Division of EMS/Disaster Medicine within the UCSD Department of Emergency Medicine. Other responsibilities include service as the base hospital medical director and medical co-director for

# Speaker Bios

the emergency management program at the UCSD Health System. Research is a priority for Kahn, who maintains research interests in mass casualty triage, ambulance safety, and application of information technology to EMS. He is a member of DMAT CA-4, and contributes as a reviewer for several journals in addition to being an EMS section co-editor for the Western Journal of Emergency Medicine and the section editor for “NHTSA Notes” in the Annals of Emergency Medicine. Kahn is board-certified in Emergency Medical Services (as well as Emergency Medicine) and works diligently to advocate for EMS patients and agencies.

## **Mimi Kim, Professor of Social Work, California State University, Long Beach**

Dr. Kim recently joined the CSU, Long Beach School of Social Work faculty as a tenure-track Assistant Professor in fall 2014. Kim’s research is in the area of social movements and community organizing with an emphasis on domestic violence and sexual assault in communities of color. She is a long-time anti-domestic violence advocate in Asian immigrant and refugee communities and remains active in the promotion of community organizing, community accountability, and transformative justice approaches to violence intervention and prevention. Kim currently teaches social work policy and supervises MSW thesis projects.

## **Jennifer Koh, Professor and Director, Immigration Clinic, Western State College of Law at Argosy University**

Professor Koh is an expert on immigration law and clinical teaching, and has devoted much of her career to promoting and protecting the rights of immigrants across the country. Her scholarship focuses on the immigration consequences of crime, the procedural rights of noncitizens facing deportation, and teaching methodologies throughout the law school curriculum. Her work has appeared in journals such as the Southern California Law Review, Wisconsin Law Review, North Carolina Law Review, Florida Law Review, and Georgetown Immigration Law Journal. The United States Supreme Court cited Koh’s immigration scholarship in its majority opinion (written by Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg) in *Mellouli v. Lynch*, 135 S. Ct. 1980 (2015), a case involving the intersection of immigration and criminal law. Koh currently serves on the Board of Editors for the Clinical Law Review and is a member of the blogging team for the Immigration Law Professors’ Blog.

## **Colby Lenz, Graduate Student, American Studies and Ethnicity Department, University of Southern California**

Colby Lenz is a legal advocate with the California Coalition for Women Prisoners. Lenz has been working with people imprisoned in California women’s prisons for the past 14 years. This work includes survival and release support, building leadership power with currently and formerly imprisoned people, and developing community-based responses to violence that do not rely on or reinforce the prison-industrial complex. Lenz organizes with the Survived And Punished project, a national organizing project to end the criminalization of survivors of sexual and domestic violence. Lenz is a Ph.D. candidate in American studies and ethnicity at the University of Southern California where she studies criminalization, imprisonment, and

# Speaker Bios

social movements against life and death sentencing. Lenz is committed to collaborative scholarship focused on refining and strengthening social movement strategy.

**Elizabeth MacDowell, Professor and Director, Family Justice Clinic, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada, Las Vegas**

Professor MacDowell is Director of the Family Justice Clinic, a legal clinic focusing on the intersection of family law with criminalization, child welfare, and other forms of state intervention into families. Her research focuses on intersectional issues of race, class, and gender; domestic violence; and access to justice. She recently received a Fulbright Scholar Award to study access to justice for domestic violence survivors in Turkish family courts, and will be a Senior Researcher at Anadolu University in Eskişehir, Turkey, in 2017-2018. Previously, the American Association of Law Schools named her a Bellow Scholar for her empirical study of domestic violence self-help clinics in the United States. MacDowell joined the UNLV faculty from Chapman University School of Law, where she developed and taught a clinical course in the Chapman Family Violence Clinic and taught courses on family law and domestic violence law and policy.

**Amy Magnus, Graduate Student, University of California, Irvine School of Social Ecology**

Amy Magnus is a Ph.D. student in Criminology, Law and Society at UC Irvine. Her research interests include: critical and feminist criminology and socio-legal studies, social inequality, specialized/alternative justice initiatives and their collateral consequences, access to justice, social control, and the carceral net.

**Natalie Nanasi, Professor and Director, Hunter Legal Center for Victims of Crimes Against Women, Southern Methodist University Dedman School of Law**

Professor Nanasi is the Director of the Judge Elmo B. Hunter Legal Center for Victims of Crimes Against Women. Her work involves teaching and supervising students who represent survivors of gender-based violence in a broad range of legal areas, including immigration claims, family law matters, and post-conviction relief. Prior to joining the faculty at SMU, Nanasi was the Director of the Domestic Violence Clinic at American University, Washington College of Law and a Senior Attorney at the Tahirih Justice Center, where she represented immigrant women and girls fleeing human rights abuses such as female genital mutilation, domestic violence, human trafficking, forced marriage, honor crimes, and sexual abuse. Nanasi's research interest is at the intersection of immigration, gender, and feminist legal theory. She received her J.D. from Georgetown University Law Center.

**Carolyn Ramsey, Professor, University of Colorado Law School**

Carolyn Ramsey is Professor of Law at the University of Colorado Law School. She teaches courses in criminal law, criminal procedure, domestic violence, gender issues, and legal history. She graduated from Stanford Law School with Distinction and clerked for Chief Judge Marilyn Hall Patel of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California and Judge Paul J. Kelly, Jr., of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the



# Speaker Bios

Tenth Circuit. In addition to her law degree, Ramsey received graduate training as a social historian at Stanford University. She is widely published on historical and modern aspects of criminal law, criminal procedure, domestic violence, and other gender issues and is writing a book about the legal history of public responses to intimate partner abuse. She also serves as the Reporter for the Tenth Circuit Criminal Pattern Jury Instructions Committee.

## **Jane Stoever, Professor and Director, Domestic Violence Clinic and UCI Initiative to End Family Violence, University of California, Irvine School of Law**

Professor Stoever has extensive experience teaching domestic violence clinics and engaging in scholarship in the areas of domestic violence law, family law, feminist legal theory, and clinical legal theory. As Director of the UCI Law Domestic Violence Clinic, she supervises law students representing abuse survivors in civil, criminal, and immigration interventions in abuse. She is also Director of the UCI Initiative to End Family Violence, which unites faculty from over 20 departments at UCI with community partners in research, education, and clinical care endeavors. Stoever additionally teaches Family Law at UCI, has a faculty appointment in the UCI Center for Psychology & Law, and co-chairs the Orange County Domestic Violence Death Review Team. Her scholarship has appeared in the *Vanderbilt Law Review*, *Washington Law Review*, *North Carolina Law Review*, and *Harvard Journal of Law & Gender*, among other journals. She previously taught at Georgetown University Law Center, American University Washington College of Law, and Seattle University School of Law. Stoever received her J.D. from Harvard Law School and her LL.M. from Georgetown University Law Center.

## **Emily Thuma, Professor of Gender and Sexuality Studies and History, University of California, Irvine School of Humanities**

Professor Thuma is an Assistant Professor of Gender and Sexuality Studies and History at UC Irvine. She researches and teaches in the areas of feminist and LGBT studies; U.S. social, cultural, and legal history; critical prison studies; and social movements. Thuma's book-in-progress, tentatively titled *No More Cages: Gendered Violence, Feminist Mobilization, and the U.S. Carceral State*, is a history of feminist activism against interpersonal and state violence from the late 1960s through the 1980s in the context of the U.S. prison buildup. Her work has appeared in the journals *Women's Studies Quarterly* and *Feminist Formations* and has been supported by such institutions as the American Association of University Women, the Center for Lesbian and Gay Studies at the CUNY Graduate Center, and the Sallie Bingham Center for Women's History and Culture at Duke University.

## **Deborah Weissman, Reef C. Ivey II Distinguished Professor of Law, University of North Carolina School of Law**

Professor Weissman was the Director of Clinical Programs at the UNC School of Law from January 2001 through July 2010. Weissman teaches the Human Rights Policy Lab, Gender Violence and the Law, and the Lawyer as Public Citizen. She has taught the Immigration/Human Rights Policy Clinic, Civil Lawyering Process, and the Civil Litigation Clinic. She serves as an Executive Committee member for The Consortium

# Speaker Bios

in Latin American Studies, at UNC at Chapel Hill and Duke University, and as a member of the Advisory Board with The Institute for the Study of the Americas at UNC. In 2013, she received the Frank Porter Graham Award from the North Carolina American Civil Liberties Union for outstanding civil rights work.

Coker was co-chair of the 2014 national conference Converge! Reimagining the Movement to End Gender Violence (<http://repository.law.miami.edu/umrsjlr/vol5/iss2/>); co-investigator of the 2015 national survey Responses from the Field, reporting responses from 900+ advocates on policing, domestic violence, and sexual assault (<https://www.aclu.org/feature/responses-field>); and co-creator of the Reimagining the Movement to End Gender Violence web project (<http://mediaforchange.org/reimagine>).

## **Kirk Williams, Professor of Criminology, Law and Society, University of California, Irvine School of Social Ecology**

Professor Williams joined the Department of Criminology, Law and Society in the School of Social Ecology at UC Irvine in 2016. He previously was the Chair of the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice at the University of Delaware. He has published widely on the determinants of homicide rate variation and the causes and prevention of youth violence and intimate partner violence. He has received numerous grants from federal and state funding sources, in addition to private foundations, to support his research. He also has worked extensively with community-based groups, schools, and agencies in violence prevention planning, implementation, and evaluation.

## **Poster Session Bios**

## **Nik Warren, Graduate Student, University of California, Irvine School of Public Health**

Nik Warren is a Public Health Policy student at the University of California, Irvine. Two years of her time at UCI have been spent researching campus violence and aggression. Under the guidance of her research advisor, Dr. Miryha Runnerstrom, and through the Program in Public Health Honors Research Program, Warren was able to realize a dream of immersing herself in a subject near to her heart. Before working on campus violence and aggression, her work focused on Vietnamese women and children and the violence they endured and sacrifices and contributions they made during the Vietnam Conflict. Prior to attending UCI, she worked with victims of sexual assault and domestic violence. Her goal is to continue her work on violence in a doctoral program so that she may find ways to help mitigate this public health crisis.

## **Jaimie Wu, Community Service Programs, Inc.**

Jaimie Wu is a Program Coordinator for Community Service Programs, Inc. – Project PATH. She coordinates the development, implementation, and evaluation of the “We Can Overcome” campaign, an Orange County, CA, public health media campaign on health and domestic violence. She also provides prescription drug abuse prevention education for youth, adults, and school staff in the Saddleback Valley Unified and Placentia Yorba Linda Unified school districts. Wu earned her Bachelor of Arts in Exercise Biology and a minor in Art History from the University of California, Davis.

# UCI Initiative to End Family Violence



## THE PROBLEM OF FAMILY VIOLENCE

Family violence causes untold suffering for millions of people worldwide. Physical, sexual, psychological, or financial abuse and other forms of violence occur at all ages of the lifespan, from infancy through late adulthood. When such violence is perpetrated by family members, intimate partners, or caregivers, it typically increases in frequency and severity in the absence of effective intervention.

UCI's Initiative to End Family Violence unites an unprecedented range of disciplines and experts in violence prevention and treatment across the lifespan. Faculty from over 20 departments at UCI join with community partners in research, education, and clinical interventions to address this multifaceted problem that has wide-ranging societal impacts.

*Envisioning a world in which people of all ages are safe within their relationships*

## GIVING

Please consider supporting the work of the Initiative to End Family Violence:

**Clinical Care Collaborations:** facilitate interdisciplinary interventions with family violence survivors (ex: art or dance therapy, medical-legal responses)

**Workshops:** on-campus presentations by a local speaker or researcher

**Graduate Student Fellows Program:** sponsor a Fellow's research on family violence

**Survivor Series:** lectures by survivors of family violence

**Trainings:** train local advocates, therapists, attorneys, and medical professionals in the latest on family violence prevention

**Distinguished Lectures:** host a national or international expert

**Interdisciplinary Research Grants:** sponsor an interdisciplinary, groundbreaking research project (ex: Modeling Brain Trauma in Children)

**Curricular or Collaborative-Building Grants:** create new courses or community-partnered projects

[endfamilyviolence.uci.edu](http://endfamilyviolence.uci.edu)