

| imagine ...

Celebrating 20 Years of the
London Coordinating Committee to End
Woman Abuse

November 1, 2001

© 2001 London Coordinating Committee to End Woman Abuse

The London Coordinating Committee to End Woman Abuse is an integrated community response to end violence against women

We dedicate this commemorative booklet to the women and children whose stories help shape our vision and keep us moving forward

One of the challenges was watching the figures grow. People said “you’re doing all this and the problem keeps getting worse” and we said “no, the problem isn’t getting worse, we’re hearing about it now” and that was a hard battle because some of the committee members – a minority – were really apprehensive that we were creating more of a problem. That was good, though, because it meant we had to be prepared to justify within our own group what we were doing and that made it a lot easier when we had to tackle the rest of the world.

Marion Boyd

I feel like everyday working in this field is a social action.

Megan Walker

The Coordinating Committee is about doing constructive damage to the status quo and we do that in a way that is fun and healthy. ... Individually, the police can’t publicly criticize the government for its actions or a judge might have to declare a conflict of interest on a certain issue. Collectively, we can say “no.” Collectively, we can say, “this is a piece of crap!”

Jan Richardson

Acknowledgements

We meet today to celebrate the first 20 years of the London Coordinating Committee to End Woman Abuse, to acknowledge the contributions of about 200 people over those years, and to re-affirm the on-going need for a coordinated, integrated community response to end woman and child abuse.

Thanks are extended to the individuals and businesses who donated food and beverages to our celebration today: Little Red Roaster, Elaine and Jim Rae, Wittenshaw's, and Bellamare Country Market and Winery. We also thank WIL for organizing the room and Lisa Heslop of the Family Consultants and Victim Services Unit who created and printed the invitation and organized the plaques and certificates.

Several past and current members shared their recollections of the history of the Committee: Marion Boyd, Peter Jaffe, Trevor Jones, Barabara Jones-Warrick, Tim Kelly, Barb MacQuarrie, Jan Richardson, and Megan Walker. Preparation of this commemorative booklet was also aided by the work of Catharine Tombs and Stefany Froese, who collected and reviewed past minutes of the Committee meetings and who conducted the interviews. The Centre for Research on Violence Against Women and Children printed this booklet.

Finally, the London Police Service Honour Guard and the London Police Service Pipe Band made a very special contribution to the awarding of the John Robinson Award.

The Recognition Committee

Alison Cunningham

Lisa Heslop

Nora Shanahan

Joanne Sherin

Veronica Vanderborght

Table of Contents

Dedication	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vi
Introduction	1
Community Accountability Principles	5
Key Accomplishments of 20 Years	6
Challenges for the Future	8
Appendix A: Participating Agencies	9
Appendix B: Past and Current Members of the Committee	11
Appendix C: John Robinson Award Recipients	15
Appendix D: Chronology of Key Events	17

| imagine ...

Celebrating 20 Years of the London Coordinating Committee to End Woman Abuse

I am writing to invite you to join a Co-ordinating Committee on Family Violence for London and Middlesex. ... In order to realize any innovations in this field it is vital that the significant agencies dealing with family violence must co-ordinate their present resources and efforts in order to provide a coherent and understandable service delivery system for victims and offenders of this violence. ... I look forward to our first meeting and hope that our committee will be productive enough to meet on a monthly basis.

Sincerely yours, Peter Jaffe

Over lunch at 80 Dundas St. that day in September of 1980, the assembled participants heard family lawyer Dawn Adams present the case of Mrs. R. and her frustrating efforts to seek safety through the civil and criminal legal systems. Typical of many women in her circumstances, Mrs. R. initially believed her husband's promises to stop beating her, and she never told anyone about the violence. The children, ages three and eight, witnessed many incidents and emotional problems were already apparent as when, for example, the boy tried to strangle the family cat. A brutal beating during which her life was at risk prompted Mrs. R. to initiate divorce proceedings. Seeing the bruises, her lawyer advised her to lay charges.

In 1980, almost all women assaulted by intimate partners had to lay a complaint with a Justice of the Peace to commence a criminal prosecution. Here in London, a study by Peter Jaffe and Carole Anne Burris documented that police laid charges for only 3% of woman abuse cases in 1979, despite advising 20% of the women to seek medical treatment for injuries.

Because "common assault" was a summary conviction offence, the police were limited in their ability to lay charges for events not personally witnessed. Also operating at the time were powerful and widespread attitudes that condoned or rationalized the violence of

men, blamed women and kept them silent, and saw woman abuse as a private family matter in which society should not interfere.

The four meetings of the London Coordinating Committee on Family Violence in 1980 were attended by members of the key criminal justice groups: police (John Robinson), prosecution (Michael Martin), probation (Kai Delgati), and court administration from both the family (Arthur Harris) and criminal courts (Ron Trachy). Also represented was the local women's shelter, opened in 1978 (Barbara Beach), and the Police Family Consultants (Rosemary Broemling), a group formed in 1972 so counsellors could assist police officers with family crises such as violence. Only the judiciary was unrepresented at that point, although they were invited. Their feeling at the time was that the appearance of impartiality would be compromised by attendance.

The meeting had been initiated by a research team from the London Family Court Clinic, Peter Jaffe and Carole Anne Burris, who had received funding from the federal Ministry of the Solicitor General to study the legal system's response to woman abuse. It had become clear in London that the Police Family Consultants, while a progressive reform of the day, was not in and of itself able to resolve the myriad service and legal issues that prevented the system from responding in a sensitive and

effective manner to abused women and their children. The researchers felt that the project should not only document the situation but be a catalyst to affect change in the system. The action-oriented nature of the research demanded the input of those who could both devise solutions and implement them.

Woman abuse was a largely hidden phenomenon at that time, an enormous ice berg that lay below the public's view, save for the tiny glimpse afforded when a woman called the police for help. In one of the first initiatives of the new committee, a survey was distributed to 511 human service professionals: physicians, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, and members of the clergy. From the slightly more than 100 returned surveys, it was determined that few abused women were identified and treated/referred by the professionals they met. For example, physicians reported on average that 0.3% of the patients were abused women and 0.3% were abusive men, an absurdly low number. "Wife Battering: A well-kept Secret" was the title under which the study was published.

Indeed, in 1980, woman abuse was just emerging as a social issue of serious discussion outside the dedicated cadre of grassroots workers forging the way by opening rape crisis centres and shelters. Woman abuse was largely seen as the result of mental illness among a few men, the masochism of women, or the stresses that "women's lib" placed on men. Lenore Walker's book, *The Battered Woman*, had only been published the year before and Linda MacLeod had just published *Wife Battering in Canada: The Vicious Circle*. She concluded that "about one in ten married women – that's approximately 500,000 women – are battered each year in Canada, and yet no-one talks about wife battering." Laughter attended the announcement of this figure in the House of Commons. Only 71 transition houses and hostels were operating in all of Canada and those that existed struggled for funds to keep their doors open.

Focus of discussion around the Committee table in these early days was on the need to improve the legal response to woman abuse, then called "wife battery." Problems discussed by the Committee members centred on gaps in services, lack of coordination (and mutual understanding), and lack of awareness of the dynamics of woman abuse among some social service and mental health professionals. Specific problems included inexperienced prosecutors, absence of information sharing between civil and criminal systems, the ease with which a defendant could delay proceedings, and the delay in resolving cases, time during which women were at risk for further assaults.

Unbeknownst to the police, who were advising women to lay informations at the courthouse, the policy of the Justices of the Police was never to initiate a prosecution on the first complaint of the woman. There

was a "cooling off" policy whereby the JP would require the woman to come back a week later if she still wanted to take the matter to court. The low rate at which women returned was taken by court officials as evidence of the wisdom of the policy.

Generally, women who sought safety through the legal system – with restraining orders, calls to police, legal restrictions on access to the children – found a system that was slow, ineffective, and often blamed them for their own victimization. Men could evade service of court orders, avoid getting a lawyer and use other tactics to delay court proceedings. Restraining orders were rarely enforced by the courts and unenforceable by the police. Bail conditions were likewise unenforced in many cases. Most cases of assault were heard in the family courts rather than the criminal courts, reflecting the sense that woman abuse was not a real crime.

It became apparent that representatives of each justice and social service component needed to learn more about the others and needed to act in a coordinated way. It was also necessary to ground initiatives in an understanding of the dynamics of woman abuse, to create a comprehensive array of services and to verify the need for and benefit of those services with research.

Specific initiatives focused on in these early days were the encouragement of police charging, shorter court processes, better awareness of woman abuse among all professionals, removal of the abuser from the home rather than the women and children, public education and work with the schools, stronger support for women as complainants in the justice system, greater publicity about available resources, increased awareness of women's rights, better access to civil remedies, and therapeutic services for abusive men. There was also a push, only partially successful at first, to have these cases heard in criminal court.

The 1981 study undertaken by Carole Anne Burris and Peter Jaffe revealed the women's perspectives on the process for the first time. In summary, women's efforts to seek safety through the legal system had largely been frustrating and unsuccessful. Women endured many assaults, an average of 35, before ever reaching out for police assistance. Moreover, the police response they received in those days did little to encourage women to try again: 87% said they would not call the police again. They felt blamed. Indeed, in resigning from the Committee in the early 1980s, a key court official confirmed their perceptions:

I wonder if more effort could be directed toward marriage counselling for both men and women. It must surely be recognized that notwithstanding the wrongness of the assault, in many cases the violence is brought on by the provocations of the victim. ... I

am of the opinion that the best solution to an abused women situation is not necessarily laying a charge of a criminal offence. Should not a more realistic view be taken by the advocacy groups, counsellors, etc. in counselling women on how to handle family matters and problems without antagonizing the situation and bringing on unneeded violence. Judging from some of the highly antagonistic remarks made to me by some of these complainants which we hear in the interviews in this Provincial Court, it's a wonder some of them don't get socked more often than they do.

Faced with such attitudes, which were fairly common in those days, women were often perceived as wasting the court's time by recanting and reconciling with the abusers.

In response to the Jaffe/Burris research findings, the Committee made the following recommendations:

1. that the police lay charges in all cases of wife assault
2. that training occur with all criminal justice personnel in the issues surrounding woman abuse
3. that an advocacy service for women be developed
4. that a clearer distinction be made between civil and criminal processes in respect to wife assault cases
5. that a program for men be developed
6. that the community be made aware of the extent of the problem of woman abuse
7. that the Committee integrate its response to victims

Beginning in May of 1981, London police officers were directed to lay charges rather than leave the onus on the women to seek out a Justice of the Peace. In addition, officers were directed to give out "victim information cards" clarifying the actions they intended to take and outlining the options available to the woman. The London Police were the first police force to undertake such an initiative, one that is now nearly universal across Canada. The number of charges laid proactively by the police increased dramatically, as did women's satisfaction with the process.

And so began the London Coordinating Committee to End Woman Abuse, an initiative that would become a model to the world, grounded in knowledge from front-line advocacy, supported by research data and aimed at the complex array of factors that must be addressed if woman abuse is to be eradicated from society: crisis intervention with women, program development, integrated system response, awareness training, public education and political advocacy. Today, the Coordinating Committee is made up of over 30 local agencies and also private individuals that meet monthly. Key goals include promoting

coordination among multiple service sectors and ensuring a consistent approach to woman abuse among member agencies.

Community Accountability Principles

In 1992, the Committee reached a consensus that any services provided to those impacted by woman abuse must be based on a feminist philosophy which analyses the historical and structural basis of power, control and sexist socialization as expressed and enforced by the crime of woman abuse. Through many years of commitment and cooperative effort, it was been determined that a safety conscious, community response demands that policies and programs must reflect a commitment to the following standards of practice:

1. The safety of abused women and their children is the fundamental priority of intervention
2. "Service delivery" must extend beyond traditional concepts to include advocacy and political change
3. Services to abused women, their children and men must work within a coordinated framework
4. Women's choices and expertise related to their own situations must be respected. At the same time, service workers have the responsibility to
 - i) create conditions where a woman is given an opportunity to make informed choices
 - ii) create reasonable boundaries and safety provisions
5. The needs of abused women and their children are paramount, not the needs of her family, service providers, religious group(s) or the state
6. Service agencies must be responsible for critically reflecting on how their organizations' hierarchical structures, and the service providers related positions of power, may negatively impact the desired mutuality or the working relationship with the client
7. Services must recognize "symptoms" in abused women and their children as common adaptations to intolerable social and interpersonal situations of violence
8. Services must not collude with tactics of control used by abusers
9. A de-institutionalized, non-medical approach to intervention is to be employed along with the necessary and appropriate use of medical and psychiatric services

10. Services must be universally accessible, and will respond sensitively and appropriately to the needs of:
- diverse multicultural/multilingual communities
 - Aboriginal peoples
 - lesbians and gay men
 - persons with physical disabilities
 - persons with developmental disabilities
 - older persons
 - persons with HIV positive testing
 - persons with low literacy skills

- Training professionals in the dynamics of woman and child abuse
- Creating a multi-point access system for woman abuse services
- Designing research for action and advocacy
- Using language carefully by naming the issue
- Integrating men into the work
- Finding a place for children in anti-woman abuse initiatives
- Initiating prevention efforts and work with the schools
- Serving as a role model and mentor for other communities

Key Accomplishments of 20 Years

After 20 years, many gains have been made, some goals have remained elusive, and some past battles loom again on the horizon. Throughout this time, the ultimate goal has remained the same: the elimination of woman abuse. The Committee expanded from the initial focus on the legal system to epitomize a holistic conception of the root causes of woman abuse and the need to work at multiple levels. That said, however, the gains made in the criminal justice system were significant and led the way for other jurisdictions. A system designed to respond to abuse and trauma should not re-traumatize the woman it seeks to help. We now recognize the ways the "system" can be complicit in reproducing the abusive experience.

Another key accomplishment was the fostering of a common vision among partners that sometimes came from opposing perspectives. Initial distrust by some sectors of other sectors, while not completely abated, was confronted and addressed. It was decided that consensus could not be achieved in all cases and that any member could find her or himself in a conflict of interest situation vis-à-vis the majority.

Specific developments are listed in Appendix D. General observations of the key contributions are:

- Identifying gaps in services and lobbying for program development
- Maintaining feminist principles of operation
- Embracing conflicts by not demanding consensus
- Moving beyond conflict to be action oriented
- Harnessing the power of voluntary contributions
- Working through the media to educate the public

As in any initiative of similar scope, all has not been smooth sailing. Meetings were sometimes acrimonious and the tenor of the debate may have silenced some around the table. Some organizations have found themselves competing with each other for a limited and shrinking funding pool. There were periods when energy waned and effort was needed to kick start the movement forward. Programs for abusive men have not always been embraced. Likewise, some have felt that the safety of children has been pushed to the background. However, members and member agencies are always in a process of education about each other's work.

Challenges for the Future

Looking back over 20 years, we are poised to begin the next 20. Will the London Coordinating Committee to End Woman Abuse have realized its eponymous goal? What lies ahead? Certainly, the primacy of some issues never seems to abate: insufficient funding, gaps in services, and accessibility issues such as extending services to all rural areas, to name a few. All of us are challenged to reflect and understand London's growing diversity through cultural sensitivity and, perhaps, new models of outreach.

Vigilance is required to guard against erosion of past gains. The provincial government is poised to de-genderize the issue of woman abuse through the gender-neutral concept of "partner abuse." Moreover, the "victim" paradigm which now governs the provincial response could threaten the multi-point access concept. Focus on the criminal justice system as the key response to woman abuse would miss the majority of women because only a minority involve the police in the first place. This is especially true of victims of sexual assault, a group which has not historically been well served by the legal system.

The Committee itself will continue the perennial tasks of integrating new members, ensuring everyone has a voice, staying united, working cooperatively, and moving forward.

Appendices

Appendix A: Participating Agencies

Across Languages Translation and Interpretation Services
Adult Survivors of Child Sexual Abuse Committee
At'lohsa Native Family Healing Services
Big Sisters
Centre for Children and Families in the Justice System,
London Family Court Clinic
Centre for Research on Violence Against Women and Children
Changing Ways
Children's Aid Society of London and Middlesex
City of London
Craigwood Youth Services **
Crown Attorney's Office of London and Middlesex
Family Service London (formerly Family Counselling Centre)
Harmony House, Salvation Army
Information London
London Abused Women's Centre (formerly London Battered Women's Advocacy Centre)
London and District Catholic School Board
London East Community Mental Health Services
London Inter-community Health Centre
London Interfaith Counselling Centre
London Multicultural Youth Association **
London Police Services
London Police Services Family Consultants and Victim Services Unit
London Second Stage Housing (now a part of Women's Community House)
London Status of Women Action Group **
Madame Vanier Children's Services
Merrymount Children's Centre
Middlesex London Health Unit
Ministry of Community and Social Services
Ministry of Correctional Services, Probation and Parole
Mission Services / Rotholme Women's and Family Shelter
Multi-cultural Committee to End Woman Abuse
Sexual Assault Centre London
Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence Treatment Centre, St. Joseph's Health Care London
Thames Valley District School Board
United Way of London and Middlesex County
Victim/Witness Assistance Program, Ministry of the Attorney General

WIL Counselling and Training for Employment
(formerly Women Immigrants of London)
Women's Community House
Women for Action and Accountability and Against
Violence Everywhere **

In addition, various people have sat on the committee as private individuals.

** indicates past member

Appendix B: Past and Current Members

Acton, Wendy
Adams, Dawn
Ago, Pam
Aharan, Peter
Alexander, Susan
Arntfield, David
Ayim, Mary Ann
Bailey, Paul
Bainbridge, Jan
Barr, Brenda
Barton, Mary
Beach, Barbara
Bernard, Jean
Bewsky, Kim
Blew, Barbara *
Bonner, Deb
Book, Susan
Booker-Collins, Lynne *
Booth, Liz
Boyd, Marion
Broemling, Rosemary
Brooke, Warren
Buist, Margaret *
Burns, Joie
Burris, Carole Anne
Cameron, Sheila (past chair)
Campbell, Theresa
Champagne, Cheryl
Charissage, Cat
Chin, Elizabeth
Chiu, Cindy
Clarke, Dorothy
Commanda, Charlotte
Core, Judy
Crump, Brian
Cunningham, Alison *
Currie, Paul
Datars-Bere, Sandra *
DeJong, Deb
Delgati, Kai
DenBak, Marijke
Dibsdale, Geri
Dill, Susan
Dionysakopoulos, Mary (past chair)
Doerr, Leone
Dorrington, Barb
Doxator, Pauline
Drouillard, Tom *
Drouillard, Derrick *
Dufton, Bill (past chair)
Efron, Karen
Ellsley, Sandra

Esfandiari, Feri
Farmer, Brian
Finnigan, Anne *
Fischer, Linda *
Forsyth, Gail
Frew, Herb
Garber, Nathan *
Gascho, Karen
Gelinas, Kathy *
Gooding, Amicia (past chair)
Gough, Bob (past chair)
Gould, Kim
Graham, Eleanor
Gravelle, Lucy *
Greaves, Lorraine
Gullen, Joan
Hallberg, Rhonda
Ham, Linda
Hancock, Karen
Harris, Deb *
Harris, Arthur
Hart, Fiona
Hayman, Doug
Hazzan, Bella
Heslop, Lisa *
Highgate, Lisa
Hill, Jeanette
Hubert, Valerie
Hurley, Pam *
Huxtable, Kathy
Izumi, Janet
Jaffe, Peter (founding chair 1980/83) *
Johnson, Walter
Jones, Trevor (past chair)
Jones-Warrick, Barbara
Jubenville, Paul
Kazarian, Levonty
Kelly, Tim (present chair) *
Kierluk, Peter
Knight, Lynne
Laforet, Karen (past chair)
Lawlor, Joan
Lawrence, Shirley
Lee, Julie (past chair)
Lehmann, Peter
Lent, Barbara
Loft, Karen
Lowe, Helen
Lunham-Armstrong, Yvonne
MacDonald, Alison
MacDonald, Al
Mahabir, Roopa
Macphail, Susan *
MacQuarrie, Barb * (past chair)
Madden, James
Madison, Nancy
Marshall, Larry (past chair)

Martin, Michael
McGill, Marg
McGowan, Katie
McKenna, Katherine
McNee, Sandra
Melanson, Mary Ellen
Melgar, Nelson
Mepham, Karleen
Mezza, Brenda *
Miller, Jimmy
Miller, Nancy *
Montgomery, Colleen *
Moulton, David
Murphy, Al
Newell, Roger
Noel, Natalie
Noordermeer, Laurie
Osthoff, Bina
Pavlic, Anne
Pearson, Stephen *
Perkins, Bev
Pfaff, Linda
Potter, Mary
Preney, Lee
Quintero, Estela
Radcliffe, Shanthi
Rae, Jim
Ralyea, Susan * (past chair)
Ravenbover, Helen
Reid, Maureen *
Remple, Melitta
Richardson, Jan * (past chair)
Ritchie, Darlene *
Robertson, Elaine
Robinson, Abby
Robinson, John
Rollings, Peter
Rutherford, Ruth (past chair)
Samways, Gail Wilcox
Sauer, Mike *
Savage, Blanche
Savage, Sandra
Schieck, Elaine
Schnall, Eleanor *
Sears, Donna
Shanahan, Nora *
Sherin, Joanne *
Silveira, Evelina
Skowronski, John
Slywchuk, Janice
Snelgrove, Donna *
Snow, Charlene
Stalker, Carol
Stewart, Shelley
Sudermann, Marlies
Suk-Patrick, Karen
Swan, Joe *

Telford, Ann
Thomas, Ken
Thompson, Marlene
Trachy, Ron
Tucker, Bill
Turner, Virginia
Tuttle, Laurie *
Twyne, Al
Van Every, Rita
Van Klooster, Willy *
Vanderborgh, Veronica *
Villanueva, Gillian
Vogelsang, Henry
Walker, Megan * (past chair)
Wass, John *
Watson, Rod
Webber, Laura
Wey, Lois
Wiggins, Kate
Wilscher, Beryl
Wittstein, Aileen
Yokum, Gladys
Zaczek, Margaret

* Indicates current membership

We have endeavoured to include all past members and sincerely apologize to anyone inadvertently omitted.

Appendix C: John Robinson Award Recipients

The John Robinson Award is presented annually to an individual or organization in London who has made a significant contribution toward ending woman abuse. Inspector John J. Robinson of the London Police played a pivotal role in bringing the issue of woman abuse to the fore among the police community. He championed a policy that led to a 95% arrest rate for calls to woman abuse cases in the City of London. Inspector Robinson also took this message to other communities to promote vigorous arrest policies and to encourage a close working relationship between the police and community services providers working to end woman abuse. The inception of the Award in 1988 marked Inspector Robinson's retirement from the London Police Service and he was named its first recipient. Inspector Robinson has since passed away but the award continues to be given out in his name to recognize and honour the hard work and dedication of individuals or organizations in the London community working to end woman abuse.

- 1988 Insp. John J. Robinson
- 1989 Dr. Peter Jaffe
- 1990 Marion Boyd
- 1991 Jan Richardson
- 1992 Bob Gough
- 1993 Lorne Ave. Public School
- 1994 Sandra Savage
- 1995 Family Consultants Service, London Police Force
- 1996 Barbara Lent
- 1998 Margaret Buist
- 1999 Nathan Garber
- 2000 Larry Marshall
- 2001 Susan Macphail

Appendix D: Chronology of Key Events

- 1980 First meeting of the London Coordinating Committee on Family Violence was held on September 23 with 10 people in attendance. There were four meetings that year. Focus was on improving the legal response to woman abuse, then called "wife battery," and overseeing a research project conducted by the London Family Court Clinic.
- 1981 London Police became the first police service in Canada to lay charges in cases of woman abuse. The Committee grew with the addition of LSWAG and the Family Counselling Centre (now Family Service London). A survey was distributed to 511 community health and mental health professionals about their perceptions of and experience with woman abuse. The results were published in 1984 as "Wife Battering: A Well-Kept Secret," in the *Canadian Journal of Criminology*. Victim/Witness Assistance Program started for the provincial courts, operated by the Salvation Army. Proposal prepared for the creation of an Assailant Therapy Program. Committee approved in principle a proposal to create a Battered Women's Legal Clinic, although concerns were expressed about duplication of services.
- 1982 Assailant Therapy Program started through probation services. A conference on family violence held at UWO in April. VWAP joined. Mandatory charging policy mentioned in the House of Commons. The Battered Women's Advocacy Clinic received funding from Health and Welfare Canada and BWAC joined the Committee. Much media interest in the work of the Committee.
- 1983 BWAC started to accept referrals in February. Efforts begin to seek funding for the assailant program, by this point called Changing Ways. Mission Services and Ministry of Community and Social Services invited to join. The pros and cons of mandatory charging were discussed. Petition circulated requesting reforms to the Family Law Reform Act, especially concerning the enforcement of restraining orders.
- 1984 The Family Counselling Centre started a woman abuse program that included gender-specific groups and an education group for couples. Intake into the Changing Ways was suspended in March while the Ministry sought a private operator. Peter Jaffe received funding to continue the research into the effects of the mandatory charging policy. Changing Ways resumed intake in the fall. CAS joined the committee. Community service spots shown on CFPL. Distributed a survey to women about their experiences with restraining orders. A community workshop on "wife battery" was held. Other workshops held for school and criminal justice personnel.
- 1985 Five sub-committees created: programs for children; curriculum development; on-going research; public education / media; and professional development. Funding received for an intervention for children who witness violence. Work of the committee presented at UN conference on family violence in Italy. Assisted with the development of curriculum on family violence for the boards of education. Craigwood Youth Services joined.
- 1986 Committee helped establish Cultural Interpreters Program and Second Stage Housing. Needs analysis conducted for London services. Family violence training undertaken for local general practitioners and obstetricians.
- 1987 Madame Vanier Children's Services joins children's sub-committee and Sexual Assault Centre joins the main committee. Programs for children expanded to several service providers. Booklet with the history of the Committee produced.
- 1988 Adult Survivors of Child Sexual Abuse Sub-Committee established. Discussion paper produced: *Mandatory Reporting of Wife Abuse*. The John Robinson award created to recognize individuals and groups who had promoted substantial change related to the topic of woman abuse. Inspector Robinson was the award's first recipient.
- 1989 Report produced called *The Impact of Provincial Initiatives on Family Violence Service Provision in London and Middlesex*. Part-time Executive Assistant position created. Brief presented on Bill 124, to amend the Children's Family Law Reform Act. London Second Stage Housing, Board of Education and Madame Vanier Children's Centre joined. Participated on the planning committee of the first

	Provincial Conference for Coordinating Committees Against Wife Assault. Wife Assault Services Directory created and distributed.		December 6 th monument in Victoria Park.
1990	Funding received for a feasibility study on services for adult survivors of child sexual abuse. Name changed to the London Coordinating Committee to End Woman Abuse. Medical protocol ad hoc committee produced <i>Emergency Protocol for the Care and Management of Victims of Woman Abuse</i> . Participated in the Board of Education's staff development initiative on violence prevention. Chaired the planning committee for the 1990 provincial conference for coordinating committees on wife assault. Ministry of Community and Social Services began to provide a small operating grant to the Committee.	1995	Draft of strategic planning document prepared for discussion. Member of Committee joined city's Safety and Prevention Committee. Research on integrated model continued. Many member agencies – including coordinating committees – faced severe cuts in provincial funding.
		1996	Trillium funding received to develop a community-based accountability evaluation for male batterers programs and Phase I commenced. London Multicultural Youth Association, WAAAVVE and Merrymount Children's Centre joined. Implementation of strategic plan continued. Incorporation process began. Committee opposed Workfare reforms. Case record disclosure action plan developed.
1991	Over 800 surveys sent to service providers by Adult Survivors of Child Sexual Abuse sub-committee. London Family Court Clinic releases the final report of <i>Wife Assault as a Crime: The Perspectives of Victims and Police Offices on a Charging Policy in London Ontario from 1980-1990</i> . Children's sub-committee produced a report suggesting that there were over 7,000 local children exposed to woman abuse. Funding successfully sought for a counselling program for children exposed to violence.	1997	Response made to the McGuire Report. Men's walk against violence held in May with funds raised going to five member agencies. The Committee voted to adopt the Walk as an official activity of the Committee. International Conference on Children Exposed to Family Violence held in June. Big Sisters, United Way and City of London joined the Committee. Report given to Ontario Legal Aid Review committee called "Ontario Legal Aid Review Response to Public Consultation Paper from the Working Group on Family Matters on Legal Aid of the London Coordinating Committee to End Woman Abuse."
1992	Multicultural Sub-committee established. London awarded a 5-year grant to create the Centre for Research on Violence Against Women and Children. Strategic planning process began. Canadian Panel on Violence Against Women visited London. Base Principles for Service Delivery approved in June, including 11 community accountability principles. Booklet on the history of the Committee was revised.	1998	First component of the domestic violence court started operation in February and Domestic Violence Court Advisory Committee created. LCCEWA became an incorporated non-profit entity. A presentation was made to the Special Joint Committee on Child Custody and Access. Sub-committee on the sex trade created and lobbied the city to create the Sex Trade Task Force.
1993	Centre for Research on Violence Against Women and Children opened. Endorsed Media Violence Awareness Week. Adult Survivor Committee released a report on the needs of adult survivors of child sexual abuse.	1999	Ad hoc committee reviewed the Victims of Crime Office. Ad hoc committee reviewed the report card in the Joint Committee Report on the May/Illes inquest and identified priorities for local action. Research report on the integrated model released. It was decided that the Walk Against Male Violence no longer will be an event of the Committee. Committee supported the Task Force on the
1994	Began phase I of an analysis of the integrated model. Facilitator for strategic planning process was hired and started to develop an accountability protocol. Women's Monument Foundation raised money for a		

Health Effects of Woman Abuse in its search for funding. Strategic plan re-visited. First annual general meeting held.

- 2000 London was one of four sites selected to develop and test a community report card. Committee helped organized a public education campaign around the Promisekeepers conference.
- 2001 The early intervention component of the domestic violence court began in April. Committee was a co-host to the International Conference on Children Exposed to Family Violence in June. Compiled a written response to the custody, access and child support consultation of the federal government and sent delegates to the consultation. The 20th anniversary celebration organized.