

British Columbia
JUSTICE SUMMIT

FIFTH JUSTICE SUMMIT

NEXT STEPS IN SECTOR INNOVATION

Trauma-informed justice system responses

*Coordination and information-sharing where
family justice, criminal justice and child
protection intersect*

NOVEMBER 6-7, 2015

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

This page intentionally left blank.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY _____ 1

PREPARATION OF REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS _____ 3

BRITISH COLUMBIA JUSTICE SUMMITS _____ 4

BACKGROUND TO THE FIFTH BC JUSTICE SUMMIT _____ 5

 Revised Summit approach: taking time to consider next steps _____ 5

 Governance and planning _____ 6

 Agenda development _____ 7

 Summit method: a two-stage discussion to reach recommendations _____ 7

SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS: DAY ONE _____ 9

 Summit opening _____ 9

 Session One: A trauma-informed justice system response to victims of violent crime __ 9

 Panel discussion _____ 9

 Initial small group discussions and plenary _____ 12

 Session Two: Better coordination and information sharing in and across family justice, criminal justice, and child protection proceedings _____ 14

 Panel discussion _____ 14

 Initial small group discussion and plenary _____ 17

SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS: DAY TWO _____ 19

 Session Three: Key sector updates _____ 19

 Access to Justice BC _____ 19

 Family justice _____ 19

 Performance measurement _____ 20

 Plenary comment _____ 21

FIFTH JUSTICE SUMMIT REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

Session Four: Summit recommendations for action _____	24
Recommendation 1: Design and deliver a common educational curriculum to create a trauma-informed justice and public safety sector _____	24
Recommendation 2: Review existing justice and public safety sector policies and programs to ensure they are consistent with a trauma-informed approach _____	25
Recommendation 3: Consider the feasibility of piloting specialized trauma-informed processes for violence-related cases _____	26
Recommendation 4: Establish a cross-sectoral steering committee to guide development of a trauma-informed approach in the justice and public safety sector _____	27
Recommendation 5: Promote a culture of legal information sharing where family, domestic violence and/or child protection proceedings intersect _____	27
Recommendation 6: Develop the means to share key information where family, domestic violence and/or child protection proceedings intersect via database innovations and other information technology _____	28
Recommendation 7: Consider the feasibility of formal role specialization and/or coordination of process where family, domestic violence and child protection intersect _____	29
Recommendation 8: Establish a Ministry-led steering committee to improve information sharing and coordination across family, domestic violence and child protection proceedings _____	29
Summit closing _____	30
Future Justice Summits _____	30
APPRECIATION _____	31
SUMMIT FEEDBACK _____	32
APPENDIX 1: SUMMIT AGENDA _____	33
APPENDIX 2: SUMMIT PARTICIPANTS _____	36
APPENDIX 3: STEERING COMMITTEE AND WORKING GROUP _____	40

FIFTH JUSTICE SUMMIT REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

Steering Committee _____	40
Working Group _____	42
APPENDIX 4: JUSTICE AND PUBLIC SAFETY COUNCIL _____	44

This page intentionally left blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Fifth BC Justice Summit took place at UBC's Faculty of Law on November 6th and 7th, 2015. It was the first Fall Summit to adopt the approach of revisiting previously-raised issue areas from past Summits, with the specific intent of recommending a practical plan of action. The two topics identified by the Summit Steering Committee for discussion and potential recommendation included:

- A trauma-informed justice system response to victims of violent crime; and
- Better coordination and information sharing in and across family justice, criminal justice, and child protection proceedings.

Session One required participants to consider how contemporary research on the neurobiological impact of violent trauma may inform BC justice system responses to victims of violence and to consider what positive steps might be taken in the near future to provide benefit from this understanding.

Session Two required Summit participants to explore ways in which the justice system can move towards better coordination across family, criminal, and child protection proceedings in order to improve safety, access to justice, and administration of justice. The focus was specifically on coordination between court proceedings to make sure that decision makers and professionals have the information they need to make informed decisions that support safe outcomes for families impacted by family violence.

The Summit also included brief updates on a number of areas of broad interest to Summit participants, including Access to Justice BC, family justice, and performance measurement. Participants provided feedback on each of these topics.

The Summit made the following recommendations. The reader should note that consistent with Summit practice, the listing of any particular recommendation does not necessarily imply complete consensus among participants.

FIFTH JUSTICE SUMMIT REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

1. Design and deliver a common educational curriculum to create a trauma-informed justice and public safety sector
2. Review existing justice and public safety sector policies and programs to ensure they are consistent with a trauma-informed approach
3. Consider the feasibility of piloting specialized trauma-informed processes for violence-related cases
4. Establish a cross-sectoral steering committee to guide development of a trauma-informed approach in the justice and public safety sector
5. Promote a culture of legal information sharing where family, domestic violence and/or child protection proceedings intersect
6. Develop the means to share key information where family, domestic violence and/or child protection proceedings intersect via database innovations and other information technology
7. Consider the feasibility of formal role specialization and/or coordination of process where family, domestic violence and child protection intersect
8. Establish a Ministry-led steering committee to improve information sharing and coordination across family, domestic violence and child protection proceedings

The 2016 Spring Justice Summit (June 10-11) will address the theme of mental health and the justice and public safety sector.

PREPARATION OF REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

This Report of Proceedings was prepared for the Honourable Suzanne Anton, Attorney General and Minister of Justice; the Honorable Mike Morris, Minister of Public Safety and Solicitor General; the Honourable Chief Justice Robert Bauman, Chief Justice of British Columbia; the Honourable Chief Justice Christopher Hinkson, Supreme Court of British Columbia; and the Honourable Chief Judge Thomas Crabtree, Provincial Court of British Columbia.

BRITISH COLUMBIA JUSTICE SUMMITS

Justice Summits are convened by Ministerial invitation at least once a year to facilitate innovation in, and collaboration across, the justice and public safety sector. As indicated in s. 9 of the *Justice Reform and Transparency Act*, a Summit may:

- a. review and consider initiatives and procedures undertaken in other jurisdictions in relation to the justice system in those jurisdictions;
- b. provide input to assist the Justice and Public Safety Council of British Columbia in creating a strategic vision for the justice and public safety sector;
- c. make recommendations relating to priorities, strategies, performance measures, procedures and new initiatives related to the justice and public safety sector;
- d. assess the progress being made in justice reform in British Columbia; and
- e. engage in any other deliberations that the Justice Summit considers appropriate.

On the conclusion of its meeting, the Summit must report to the Ministers on the outcome of those deliberations. By agreement between the executive and judicial branches of government, the Summit report is simultaneously submitted to the Chief Justice of British Columbia, to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia, and the Chief Judge of the Provincial Court of British Columbia.

BACKGROUND TO THE FIFTH BC JUSTICE SUMMIT

The *Justice Reform and Transparency Act* provides for the convening of a British Columbia Justice Summit by Ministerial invitation at least annually. Five Summits have now been held since the Act was passed in 2013. Summits are intended to encourage innovation and facilitate collaboration across the sector by providing a forum for frank discussion between sector leaders and participants about how the system is performing and how it may be improved. As the Act also established a Justice and Public Safety Council, appointed by Ministerial order, to develop a vision and an annual plan for the sector across the province, Summits represent a key source of input and recommendations into the Council's planning process, and are a forum to assess the plans and the progress made under them.

The first two Summits, in March 2013 and November 2013, focused on criminal justice. The third Summit, in May 2014, addressed the family justice system. The fourth Summit, in November 2014, focused on better responses to violence against women. The deliberations of these Summits have previously been summarized in publicly available Reports of Proceedings.

Revised Summit approach: taking time to consider next steps

While the 2014 Summits succeeded in deepening the dialogue, past participants have expressed a desire for further maturation of the Summit process – in particular, by enhancing the degree to which Summit discussions lead to collaboration and innovation, which are the legislated principal objectives of the Summits.

Accordingly, by Ministerial direction, each Fall Summit will now take up one or more topics which have attracted support at a previous summit. The Fall Summit will provide an opportunity to consider what can be done collaboratively within the sector to make progress in that area; and, wherever possible, to make recommendations intended to facilitate real and demonstrable innovation in the justice and public safety sector.

FIFTH JUSTICE SUMMIT REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

While the Fall Summit events are now designed to promote action on previously-considered topics, the Summit process nevertheless continues to rest on the voluntary participation of those representing various independent roles, positions and responsibilities within the sector, many of whom are sworn to champion and uphold the integrity and fairness of our adversarial system of justice. It is recognized that the constitutional, statutory or operational obligations of some participants may require that important caveats or restrictions be attached to any particular recommendation.

Spring Summits will continue to engage the leadership in initial discussions of key issues confronting sector participants. They are designed as larger events, but will continue to bring substantial subject-matter expertise into the dialogue to ensure discussions are well informed and connected to the broader community.

Governance and planning

On behalf of the Minister of Justice, the Summit agenda and participation was developed by a Steering Committee co-chaired by representatives of the Justice and Public Safety Council, and with representation from the executive branch of government, Aboriginal peoples, the Legal Services Society, the Law Society of British Columbia, the Canadian Bar Association (BC Branch), and independent legal service providers. The Steering Committee included observer participation from the Court of Appeal for British Columbia, the Supreme Court of British Columbia, and the Provincial Court of British Columbia.

The Committee was supported by a Working Group under the guidance of the Justice and Public Safety Council's Secretariat (see Appendix 3).

The Steering Committee met between August and November 2015. Its principal tasks were to develop an agenda for the Summit; settle on a representative list of participants; and reach agreement on facilitation, location, and other planning matters.

The Fifth Justice Summit was the first Fall Summit to address next steps in previously-raised issue areas. The two topics identified by the Steering Committee for discussion and potential recommendation included:

FIFTH JUSTICE SUMMIT REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

- A trauma-informed justice system response to victims of violent crime; and
- Better coordination and information sharing in and across family justice, criminal justice, and child protection proceedings.

The Summit also included brief updates on a number of areas of broad interest to Summit participants.

As is the case at all Summits, the Committee agreed that, consistent with protocol in similar gatherings in other jurisdictions to encourage free expression, no comments made by participants during the Summit would be attributed to those individuals or to their organizations in the Summit report, without explicit consent being granted to the Committee to make such attribution.

Agenda development

The agenda for this Summit was built specifically to draw on promising discussions at the first four Summits. As identified by the Steering Committee, the main goals of this Summit were:

- to consider how contemporary research on the neurobiological impact of violent trauma may inform BC justice system responses to victims of violence, and to consider what positive steps might be taken in the near future to provide benefit from this understanding; and
- to explore ways in which the justice system can move towards better coordination across family, criminal, and child protection proceedings in order to improve safety, access to justice, and administration of justice, and to propose practical suggestions for how we can make progress towards this goal.

Summit method: a two-stage discussion to reach recommendations

The methodology employed at this Summit involved two stages of discussion. On Day One, following presentations by subject matter experts, participants were invited to discuss next steps for implementation with respect to each of the two main issues under consideration. These discussions occurred in small groups of individuals with a mix of

FIFTH JUSTICE SUMMIT REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

roles and positions across the sector, followed by plenary discussion. The initial plenary discussions were summarized by the Summit Working Group. On Day Two, participants reviewed the summary, considered the various options identified on the previous day, and discussed in plenary which options might best be implemented as actions, together with their views on who should lead and participate in these actions. The Summit Working Group was tasked with summarizing the Day Two plenary in the form of recommendations to be included in this Report of Proceedings.

SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS: DAY ONE

Summit opening

The Summit was brought to order by the Summit Moderator. Participants were welcomed to Musqueam territory by Elder Mary Charles, of the Musqueam Indian Band, who offered a prayer for the success of the Summit, and were welcomed to the University of British Columbia by Dr. Janine Benedet of the Faculty of Law.

The Summit was officially opened by the Honourable Suzanne Anton, Attorney General and Minister of Justice, who gave a welcoming address to participants.

Session One: A trauma-informed justice system response to victims of violent crime

At the Fourth BC Justice Summit (Better Responses to Violence against Women), as recorded in the Report of Proceedings, common themes reported included the following with respect to trauma-informed practice:

Participants were broadly supportive of incorporating findings from health and psychological research on the effects of trauma into training of first responders and other justice and public safety professionals who work with victims of violence. Training and practice should be trauma-informed across the sector, and criminal law needs to catch up with scientific understanding of victims' behaviour in cases of sexual violence and domestic violence.

Session One required participants to consider how contemporary research on the neurobiological impact of violent trauma may inform BC justice system responses to victims of violence and to consider what positive steps might be taken in the near future to provide benefit from this understanding.

Panel discussion

The first panel discussion was organized around a primary presentation on the neurobiology of trauma. Key concepts revisited from the Fourth Summit included the

neurobiology of traumatic experience, in which trauma interferes with victims' memory and capacity to provide a linear account of an assault; tonic immobility (rape-induced paralysis), which tends to confound social expectation that cases of 'real' sexual violence should show resistance by the victim; and nervous system effects of trauma which alter context for memories and distinction between past and present. The traditional indicia of credibility, for police and for the court, are nearly impossible for trauma victims, including the ability to remember and relate detail; to be able to recount events in a linear, chronological fashion; and to exhibit expected affect.

This information is relevant to criminal justice operations in numerous ways. For police operations, a trauma-informed system requires knowledge about the complexity of trauma responses. Profound change is required in individual attitudes and responses. Training is required on neurobiology of trauma, Forensic Experiential Trauma Interviews (FETI), and related change management. Implications for police practice include recommendations to delay statement taking; changes in methods of interviewing; and documenting victims' emotional and physiological responses as important evidence.

The policing policy implications of such changes are significant, as for police to delay interviewing is a deviation from typical practice. Under questioning in court, police officers can explain that they have had trauma-informed training and as a result have improved practice and procedures. Policy changes need not be restricted to detective work, but can apply to all personnel (emergency call responders, victim support workers, and other team members) who may form judgments and exercise influence with respect to system responses to victims of violence. A communications strategy around policy change may encourage sexual assault victims to come forward, and have other positive effects on general understanding of trauma in sexual assault and other violent crime.

For prosecutors, counsel who understand the impact of trauma on victims' behavior are able to view cases through a new lens, potentially allowing them to prosecute cases previously thought of as hard to believe or lacking in evidence. Crown counsel benefit from understanding complex trauma responses in victims as they are then able to make victim responses comprehensible to legal fact finders; to lead evidence more effectively

to explain complexities of trauma responses; to support vulnerable victims throughout the process; and to re-create the reality of the crime for the court.

For the judiciary, trauma-informed judges are very conscious about making sure that victim witnesses and defendants feel safe rather than intimidated (*e.g.* allowing use of therapy dogs). Judicial demeanor is a critical factor in determining whether a victim feels safe. Trauma victims can experience poor memory retrieval if they encounter disbelief, dismissal or intimidation in response. When judges are able to create a supportive environment for traumatized victims, there is greater likelihood of accurate and complete testimony allowing for findings of fact.

Participants then heard reflections on the primary presentation from three expert panelists. First, these remarks included a discussion of recent police training efforts under way in British Columbia regarding trauma-informed investigations, which incorporated reflections on the practical ways in which traditional police operations are affected by such a transition. These efforts involve not only police officers, but all employees in first-response roles as regards violent crime. The most significant focus is clearly on the means and manner in which statements are taken from victims. The training addresses the ways in which standard practices can lead to erroneous conclusions as regards the credibility of victim statements, conclusions which may then seriously damage the likelihood of conviction.

Secondly, participants heard a discussion of the role and responsibility of criminal legal defence in cases where neurobiological trauma may be in scope for consideration by the court, regarding the responsibility to balance the rights and requirements of traumatized victims with right of the accused to full answer and defence. The importance of avoiding wrongful convictions, and the duty of all involved to acknowledge and preserve of the presumption of innocence, cannot be lost, even as we take steps to ensure that complainants are provided with sufficient support to give evidence which is an appropriate reflection of their experience.

Third, participants were reminded of the depth and enduring nature of the impact of trauma on victims of violence within the Aboriginal community but also more broadly. In

the Aboriginal community, the effects of violent trauma on victims' engagement with the justice system are compounded by additional historical difficulties in seeking justice and support from the criminal justice system and related institutions, as well as by the intergenerational traumatic effects of residential schooling.

Initial small group discussions and plenary

Following the panel presentations, three questions were posed to participants for small group discussion:

- 1. What would a trauma-informed justice system look like in British Columbia?*
- 2. What are the key challenges to moving towards a trauma-informed justice system? What caveats or concerns should we acknowledge in considering such an approach?*
- 3. Identify up to three concrete actions that could be done over the next 12 months to make the BC justice and public safety sector more trauma-informed. Who might lead and participate in this activity?*

Small group discussions were followed by each table reporting out to the plenary. Using comment and materials from this first plenary discussion, the working group supporting the Summit developed an initial summary of principles and potential actions raised by participants, to be considered in full on Day Two.

The following common themes emerged in the Summit's initial discussion regarding implementation of trauma-informed practice in BC's justice system. The reader should note that, consistent with Summit practice, inclusion of any particular point should not necessarily be taken as reflecting complete consensus among the participants.

A common curriculum. The key to a broad adoption of a trauma-informed approach to justice is commonly informed, coordinated, and multi-disciplinary education and training.

A supportive environment for victims. Among the chief benefits of a trauma-informed justice system, is more sensitive treatment of victims and their families.

Specific focus on Aboriginal victims of trauma. A broad recognition of the intergenerational impacts of unresolved trauma on BC's Aboriginal peoples, particularly related to the residential school experience, is necessary.

Operational recognition of cultural diversity. A trauma-informed justice system needs to take into account cultural differences to be effective in delivering supportive services.

System change is necessary for operational service changes. To move to a trauma-informed justice system, change will need to occur at all levels from front-line to leadership.

Importance of collaboration in reforming practice. A trauma-informed justice system depends on system-wide cooperation and collaboration.

Making the public aware of changing practice. Awareness of a trauma-informed approach to justice is necessary to increase victim and public trust in the justice system.

Learning from other systems. Successful transition to a trauma-informed justice system must be informed by best practices and promising programs and services here and elsewhere.

Importance of measuring progress. The goals of a trauma-informed justice system should be identified and progress towards those goals should be measured, in order to ensure that training reforms are indeed producing intended benefits.

Session Two: Better coordination and information sharing in and across family justice, criminal justice, and child protection proceedings

Reporting of common themes at the Fourth BC Justice Summit included the following summary note regarding coordination and sharing of information related to such proceedings:

Participants expressed support for efforts to streamline and/or coordinate multiple court proceedings in situations where criminal proceedings, family law proceedings and/or child protection proceedings occurred simultaneously, recognizing the caveats and challenges associated with such a change.

Session Two required Summit participants to explore ways in which the justice system can move towards better coordination across family, criminal, and child protection proceedings in order to improve safety, access to justice, and administration of justice. The focus was specifically on coordination between court proceedings to make sure that decision makers and professionals have the information they need to make informed decisions that support safe outcomes for families impacted by family violence. The objective of the Session was to propose practical suggestions for how the sector can make progress towards this goal.

Panel discussion

Participants heard a presentation on a recent study of information sharing concerns relating to family violence and the risk of future harm that BC's *Family Law Act (FLA)* was designed to address, including especially those dealing with multiple court proceedings. The presenters considered two related broad questions:

- What information about family violence and the risk of future harm is available to judges when making best interests of children decisions and protection orders in family law cases, and judicial interim release and sentencing decisions in criminal cases?

FIFTH JUSTICE SUMMIT REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

- What information about family violence and the risk of future harm is shared when there are both criminal and civil cases going on at the same time relating to the same people?

Study participants reported a need to ensure that decisions made about family violence and its impact are made with all relevant information about the nature of family violence and the risk of future harm – but that this is not actually happening. It is not common for judges to get the relevant information from lawyers and if they do not, they are not asking for it. Missing information includes information about, at a minimum, other related court proceedings and court orders, and may be at all stages of the judicial process. If the question of the risk of future harm is raised, it is usually by way of arguments made to the judge (submissions), and not by expert or other evidence. Many of these concerns relating to individual proceedings and to the sharing of information when multiple proceedings exist still apply, despite implementation of the *FLA* and its emphasis on family violence.

Concrete actions suggested by the presenters included attention to information sharing in granting and enforcement of protection orders; a working group on case management, privacy issues and consequent pilot development; a collaborative response to Roadmap for Change recommendations on unified family court and on acquisition of expertise in family law, including family violence; Law Society consideration of its position on specialization in legal areas involving family violence; examination in an educational setting of a more active role for judges and lawyers in facilitating equality-based justice as contemplated by the Canadian Judicial Council; the recommendation for direct judicial communication to occur between judges within a province or territory when there are multiple proceedings; and increasing the speed with which reasons for judgment in both family law and criminal law cases involving family violence are made available.¹

¹ Full report now published at <http://www.fredacentre.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Observatory-Martinson-Jackson-Risk-Report-FINAL-January-14-2016.pdf>

FIFTH JUSTICE SUMMIT REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

Following the primary presentation, participants heard reflections from an expert panel. First, information sharing and access to information from the perspective of the private bar was considered, including a case study of a series of court decisions and associated outcomes affecting one family in a British Columbia community in which the best interests of the parties involved (including children) were not served. In this case, unnecessary risks were incurred by vulnerable persons as an unintended consequence of incomplete information. This occurred despite the best intentions of the legal professionals involved in the various related proceedings.

Second, participants heard suggestions regarding the means of effecting useful, practical information sharing practices in a complex legal environment with multiple processes, clients and stakeholders, drawing on experiences and practices developed at Vancouver's Downtown Community Court. These included early and continuing dialogue and engagement with the Office of the Privacy Commissioner for British Columbia as information sharing practices were considered and then established. This institutional reassurance regarding appropriate, licit information sharing behaviour may be a critical step in achieving the culture change required to match the intention of the legislative provisions.

Third, participants were advised of a number of the information sharing challenges confronted by counsel for the office of the Director of Child Welfare. While there are strong legislative provisions permitting the obtaining of personal information to ensure the safety of vulnerable parties, the Director is often frustrated however when attempting to find out if there are past or present family law or criminal proceedings or orders that may impact work with a family. Important innovations would include access to searchable online court services information, regulated sharing of pleadings and disclosure between the child protection family and criminal proceedings (and sharing of police records), written reasons for judgment, notification to the Director of Family or criminal court appearances in those DV or sexual abuse cases where the Director is involved with a family, specialized family court judges and mandatory courses for lawyers practicing in this area of the law, and a more active role for judges hearing matters involving children.

Initial small group discussion and plenary

Following the panel presentations, three questions were posed to participants for small group discussion:

- 1. What kind of information sharing and coordination between criminal and family proceedings should ideally be in place? Are the requirements any different with respect to child protection proceedings?*
- 2. What do you see as the biggest barriers or challenges to implementing the ideal scenario? As a group, rate these barriers.*
- 3. What model(s) should we be seeking to establish? Identify up to three concrete actions that could be done over the next 12 months to make progress in this area. Who might lead and participate in this activity?*

Small group discussions were followed by each table reporting out to the plenary. Using comment and materials from this plenary discussion, the working group supporting the Summit developed an initial summary of principles and potential actions raised by participants, to be considered in full on Day Two.

The following common themes emerged in the Summit's initial discussion regarding better coordination and information sharing in and across family justice, criminal justice, and child protection proceedings. The reader should note that, consistent with Summit practice, inclusion of any particular point should not necessarily be taken as reflecting complete consensus among the participants.

Timely, relevant, accessible information. Participants underscored the importance of timeliness, relevance (to avoid over-sharing), and accessibility of information, in order to increase safety.

Accurate risk assessment. While risk assessment is exercised by many of the key actors in these cases, there is a need to ensure comprehensive and accurate risk assessment to minimize risk of future harm.

Jordan's principle. Application of Jordan's principle ensures that when a jurisdictional dispute arises, the government of first contact with the child funds the service and the jurisdictional dispute is resolved later. This principle keeps a focus on what is best for the family rather than the system.

Holistic approach. Progress in ensuring informed decision making and improved safety outcomes requires a holistic and integrated approach to move beyond silos.

Avoiding a culture of risk aversion. Too little sharing of relevant information occurs despite existing legislative authority to share. Participants urged recognition of the need for full and accurate information and overcoming unfounded aversion to perceived risks of sharing.

Building on success. Innovation has already occurred in BC and in other jurisdictions to address some of these challenges. There is a need to expand (or explore further) models and approaches that have been shown to work.

Support of victims. In improving coordination and sharing of information in concurrent matters, ensuring victim support throughout is central to success.

Role recognition. Participants felt that early progress may be achieved through deepening recognition and understanding of roles assigned by legislation, such as set out in the *FLA*.

Taking action now. Participants expressed a sense of urgency around making immediate progress, which in a number of areas participants felt was possible through simple and practical steps, notwithstanding limited resources.

SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS: DAY TWO

Session Three: Key sector updates

At the outset of Day Two, the Summit heard three separate presentations relating to important recent developments of broad interest to participants.

Access to Justice BC

Participants were provided with an overview of Access to Justice BC, formed recently in furtherance of the work of the National Action Committee on Access to Justice in Civil and Family Matters. Access to Justice BC, drawing on a broad membership, has taken as its initial focus matters of family justice, and has a triple aim that balances improved experience of users of the justice system, improved population outcomes, and sustainability.

The work of Access to Justice BC will be typified by commitment to a common agenda, the use of both “top down” and “bottom up” approaches, a willingness to take chances in innovation and in doing so accepting the risk of making mistakes, a philosophy of continuous improvement, and a disposition towards cross-system collaboration and learning.

Family justice

Following from the work of the Third BC Justice Summit, participants heard an update regarding work on needs assessment, early triage, mandatory mediation and consensual dispute resolution in family justice matters conducted by the Exploratory Group on “Mandatory Consensual Dispute Resolution.” The Group includes mediators, collaborative practitioners, family lawyers, a self-represented litigant, and a representative of the women/immigrant serving NGO sector. In examining the relevant key points of the Third Summit, the Group has concluded that:

- The use of the term “mandatory” mediation or “mandatory” consensual dispute resolution (MCDR) is understating what is required, which instead is a redesign of court system for family matters.

- The redesign should have integrated education, assessment, CDR and judicial intervention components.
- There should exist a (rebuttable) presumption in favour of CDR.
- The new approach should be tried now in a limited number of registries.

Performance measurement

Participants had received earlier, as part of the Summit materials, an advance copy of the Justice and Public Safety Council's *Performance Measurement Update for the Justice and Public Safety Sector*.² Participants heard a brief address summarizing feedback the cross-sector External Review Committee on Performance Measurement had given to the Council on its work in this area.

This summary contained two key points. First, although it should be recognized that the measures identified to date had been considered and agreed upon by numerous participants across the sector, the measures themselves were not particularly novel as regards the BC justice system; moreover, they spoke in too few cases to the greatest current areas of concern within the system. This has the effect of leaving the reader wondering when more useful indicators will emerge in the interests of stimulating and measuring the effectiveness of reform. Second, it is likely that in order to address this shortcoming, it will be necessary to identify new methods and/or new data sources from which to draw inferences about system performance. Resolving these related challenges will be necessary to recapture the momentum on performance measurement identified in the 2012 White Paper on Justice Reform.

² The document has since been published online and is available for reference at <http://www.justicebc.ca/shared/pdfs/pm-nov-2015.pdf>.

Plenary comment

In the plenary discussion which followed the three presentations, participants made the following observations.

- **Diverse perspectives in the access to justice dialogue.** As the Access to Justice BC committee continues to take shape, it is important to determine how the committee should work with key constituencies and existing institutions. The committee takes these matters to be a high priority.
 - *Aboriginal participation.* It was noted that Aboriginal justice is one of the four main priorities of Access to Justice BC. While there is already a degree of involvement, the committee is actively considering further inclusion of Aboriginal representatives and/or other means of effective engagement with Aboriginal justice organizations.
 - *Violence against women.* There are as yet no representatives on violence against women. It was agreed this connection between the committee and the NGO sector was a significant one and that there were some near-term opportunities to ensure this linkage is made.
 - *Children and youth.* It is important to determine how the rights of children and youth are being considered in the ongoing justice system. This is a significant component of Access to Justice BC's work and exactly the kind of forum sought.
- **Refreshing the performance measurement approach.** The current structure (relying primarily on Ministry staff for substantive work, with non-government participation largely restricted to the review function) is not conducive to addressing the shortcomings identified.

- *Governance.* The committee structure (governance and working level) needs to bring together the various parts of the system working on these issues. The senior committee could be given authority to request the development of certain measures.
- *Road map.* The identification and development of measures needs to become more systematic. The sense of urgency present in 2012-13 needs to be recaptured. Every part of the sector is dealing with how to measure performance, and in many cases measuring things in multiple ways and over time. It is time to bring this expertise and experience together to compare learnings so that the sector can move to next level. A road map is required, together with goals and expectations so that measurements have context.
- *Missing measures.* Some specific and urgent areas of performance measures are lacking. The Justice and Public Safety Council's update does not currently include measures of domestic and sexual violence, which continue to be of great concern. An important gap in measures is in relation to persons in community-based mental health treatment and their intersection with police or the criminal justice system. Can these be addressed over the next year? Can this work dovetail with the government's work on mental health and substance abuse?
- **Finding a way forward for mediation.**
 - *Mediation in situations of violence.* There are certain categories of family justice cases with domestic violence present that are not appropriate for mandatory mediation, but some other types of cases with a domestic violence history may in fact be addressed effectively through mediation. Recognizing this, we should explore how experts on violence against women, mediation experts, academics and others can come together in a

focused setting to discuss what could be done collaboratively to determine a more secure way to move forward.

- *Urban/rural services.* Mandatory mediation programming should apply across the whole province: not simply in larger communities where resources are more abundant, but in remote communities where there are significant resource challenges in family justice. There is a need to explore remote mediation.
- *Access to justice while incarcerated.* Inmates are often involved in litigation, particularly in the federal system, and are often unrepresented.

Overall, the discussion was taken by participants as a reflection of how such updates are an important and unique opportunity for the leadership of the sector to receive current information and offer feedback on key sector initiatives.

Session Four: Summit recommendations for action

Having received materials which summarized the plenary discussions from Day One, the Summit participants then engaged in small table discussions to consider which elements from those discussions should be brought forward as recommendations. Participants were also asked about how to make their priority choices happen: “Should there be a cross-sectoral steering committee to oversee the implementation of the priority recommendations? If so, who should be represented on this committee?”

Returning to plenary, the following recommendations emerged from discussion. The reader should note that, consistent with Summit practice, the inclusion of any particular recommendation should not necessarily be taken as reflecting complete consensus among the participants.

Recommendation 1: Design and deliver a common educational curriculum to create a trauma-informed justice and public safety sector

Development and delivery of commonly informed, coordinated, and multi-disciplinary trauma education, with the following characteristics:

- a) Trauma education should be developed for the British Columbia context in a manner which draws on reliable research and practice from any source (local, national or international), but which also recognizes and builds on established good practice in British Columbia. Understanding of existing research and practice should precede delivery, bearing in mind the clear will to move forward with trauma education in a timely manner.
- b) Trauma education should focus on the practical implications of trauma in justice settings for the exercise of justice professionals’ functions, methods and procedures, and particularly as it applies to violence against women, and sexual violence. In doing so, sector participants should remain aware that violence is cyclical and that many offenders are themselves traumatized.
- c) Acknowledging the function-specific training and continuing education opportunities that exist within each profession, trauma education should at every appropriate opportunity be delivered to cross-professional audiences, to

encourage understanding of impacts of and responses to trauma in different settings, and to highlight the importance of collaborative responses.

- d) Trauma education should, wherever possible, be designed and delivered in ways which engage and sustain operational partnerships with actors outside the justice and public safety sector, and in particular with the health system.
- e) Trauma education should be developed and delivered in consideration of the particular circumstances of Aboriginal persons, of recent immigrants, of those exposed to significant institutional/societal traumas (e.g. residential schools, refugee status etc.), and of other vulnerable persons.
- f) Trauma education within the justice and public safety sector should be accompanied by on-going public education, to raise awareness of these efforts, to encourage confidence in justice system responses to violence, and to address widely-held myths concerning expected or “normal” behaviour of victims of violent crime.

Recommendation 2: Review existing justice and public safety sector policies and programs to ensure they are consistent with a trauma-informed approach

Such a review should have the following characteristics:

- a) The review, while it may be coordinated at a provincial level, would be conducted according to existing organizational jurisdiction, encompassing policies, standards, and ethics; and be delivered against an inventory of support programs and existing strategies (e.g., operational, cultural and preventative).
- b) Any review should be preceded by the initial step of a trauma impact assessment on practice and processes, including a review of traditional methods of establishing credibility of e.g. complainants, witnesses or accused.
- c) Consideration of such a review should not be limited to the boundaries of the criminal justice system, as complex trauma may profoundly affect the behaviour of individuals involved in family court processes; and thus, the review should engage family justice specialists.

- d) Any such review should consider, as being in scope, those recommendations among the 18 justice-applicable recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report which are related to trauma, and in such interpretation rely on consultation with Aboriginal organizations at the provincial level.

Recommendation 3: Consider the feasibility of piloting specialized trauma-informed processes for violence-related cases

On completion of the policy and program review identified in Recommendation 2, immediate consideration should be given to the feasibility of specialized trauma-informed process, as follows:

- a) Consideration should be given to the establishment of one or more dedicated court processes appropriately designed to manage cases involving violent trauma (or specifically, violence against women), which may also include integration of appropriately trained professionals (e.g. Crown, police, support workers, duty counsel), independent legal counsel for victims; and/or designated courtroom(s) to accommodate these cases and the special needs of participants
- b) Any specialized court option(s) which may be piloted should consider enhanced accommodations for complainants and support for victims; e.g., support from Aboriginal Elders where appropriate, technology-based accommodation, or use of trauma dogs.
- c) Specialization of Crown and other functions, within or outside a dedicated court process or location, should be approached with caution and considered via a rigorous cost benefit analysis, as over-specialization may have negative effects on capacity to address other areas of criminal law, and/or create burnout.
- d) Any projects piloted should be appropriately evaluated, including of an urban and rural component, to allow assessment as to whether the approach should (and can) be made available throughout the province.

Recommendation 4: Establish a cross-sectoral steering committee to guide development of a trauma-informed approach in the justice and public safety sector

To ensure timely and coordinated application of the steps outlined in Recommendations 1-3, and to facilitate mutual support and consistent communication, the steering committee should have the following characteristics:

- a) The steering committee should include senior participation from elements of the sector responsible for relevant operations (i.e. representatives of government, prosecution, RCMP and municipal policing, professional bodies, Aboriginal organizations, victim support organizations, corrections, health research, and mental health professionals);
- b) The steering committee should be able to commit to or facilitate those activities reasonably in scope such as training, review of policies and procedures, and communications;
- c) The steering committee should accommodate and engage the judiciary up to the level of full participation (or otherwise as appropriate, in dialogue);
- d) The steering committee should set and communicate timelines to the leadership of the sector to ensure awareness of progress, and may choose to use future Summits as one opportunity to provide updates.

Recommendation 5: Promote a culture of legal information sharing where family, domestic violence and/or child protection proceedings intersect

Immediate steps should be taken to promote the culture and practice of legal information sharing where this is in the interest of vulnerable persons in family, domestic violence and/or child protection proceedings, as follows:

- a) A necessary condition for enhanced and expanded information sharing is clear communication of the existing framework of policy and law on such sharing, to provide a solid basis for judges, counsel and other staff to act. The framework should identify barriers which cannot be transcended, but should also identify situations/types of information where more sharing reasonably should or can

occur. A small expert group should provide this outline, based on which other activity may be founded.

- b) As sharing is critical and lives are at stake, practical solutions should be pursued while longer-term technological solutions are developed.
 - i. Interagency Case Assessment Teams offer significant practical, legal means of information sharing in the interests of the vulnerable and should be explored as a model when considering the intersection of family justice, criminal justice and child protection.
 - ii. A variety of practical courthouse informal solutions can be exploited within minimal startup time or investment. These may include a specific role for duty counsel in collecting files and sharing with the court, joint meetings/case conferences over family and criminal files, learning from police 'co-location' experience regarding sharing of information, physically flagging files with a domestic violence component, or identification for the court by the court clerk (or a simple request by a judge at first appearance to determine) if parallel or concurrent matters are taking place.

Recommendation 6: Develop the means to share key information where family, domestic violence and/or child protection proceedings intersect via database innovations and other information technology

The Ministry of Justice Court Services Branch should identify ways in which sharing of legal information may be accelerated and/or automated via technology where family, domestic violence and/or child protection proceedings intersect, including but not limited to, and where permissible:

- a) Explore, and if feasible implement, linking records on individual parties across databases; create a central database or designing tools to search multiple databases; and create a justice ID or using the current Care Card info to ensure common records of specific individuals.

- b) Further effect cross-sector access to systems.³ Identify leads to support individuals in other organizations in navigating the IT systems they will use only on rare occasions.

Recommendation 7: Consider the feasibility of formal role specialization and/or coordination of process where family, domestic violence and child protection intersect

Acknowledging the significant challenges inherent in coordinating court processes across civil and criminal law, serious consideration should be given to these approaches in light of similar application elsewhere in Canada (e.g., Ontario).

Some participants clearly expressed the need for caution over Crown specialization, over the preservation of judicial independence, and over linked family/child protection matters where mediation is occurring but in which the interests of the child are paramount.

Recommendation 8: Establish a Ministry-led steering committee to improve information sharing and coordination across family, domestic violence and child protection proceedings

To ensure timely and coordinated application of the steps outlined in Recommendations 5-7, and to facilitate mutual support and consistent communication, the steering committee should have the following characteristics:

- a) The steering committee should include senior participation from elements of the sector responsible for relevant operations (i.e. representatives of the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Children and Family Development, prosecution, policing, professional bodies, Aboriginal organizations and victim support organizations)
- b) The steering committee should be able to commit to or facilitate those activities reasonably in scope such as training, review of policies and procedures, and communications.

³ Examples used were Ministry of Social Development and Ministry of Justice staff having access to MCFD records, and granting family justice counsellors access to the JUSTIN and Integrated Case Management databases.

- c) The steering committee should accommodate and engage the judiciary up to the level of full participation (or otherwise as appropriate, in dialogue).
- d) The steering committee should set and communicate timelines to the leadership of the sector to ensure awareness of progress, and may choose to use future Summits as one opportunity to provide updates.

Summit closing

Participants heard a closing address from the Honourable Suzanne Anton, Attorney General and Minister of Justice of British Columbia.

The Minister echoed comments of the Chief Justice regarding the need of BC's justice leadership to champion change and put "all hands on deck," noting that all in the room including the Ministry would need to contribute to make the recommended changes a reality.

The Minister gave thanks to the organizing group for their work, to the facilitator, and to participants for their contributions to the event.

The Moderator then declared the Summit adjourned.

Future Justice Summits

The 2016 Spring Justice Summit (June 10-11) will address the theme of mental health and the justice and public safety sector. Further Summit themes will be developed and communicated in due course, further to dialogue with sector participants.

APPRECIATION

The Steering Committee would like to express its thanks to the participants at the Fifth British Columbia Justice Summit, whose continuing commitment and goodwill contributed greatly to the event.

The Steering Committee would like to thank the Musqueam Indian Band, and Elder Mary Charles, for the warm welcome and good wishes extended to Summit participants.

For assistance in the development and realization of this Summit, special thanks are due to: the Court of Appeal for British Columbia, the Supreme Court of British Columbia, the Provincial Court of British Columbia, the Law Society of British Columbia and the Canadian Bar Association (BC Branch).

A deep thank you to invited participants and guests who made time to prepare presentations for the Summit, including Dr. Lori Haskell, Cita Airth, Paul Pearson, Jeannette MacInnis, the Honorable Donna Martinson, Margaret Jackson, Linda Thomas, Kelly Connell, Katherine LeReverend, the Honourable Robert Bauman, Jane Morley, Dan VanderSluis, and Yvon Dandurand.

The Steering Committee would also like to thank Dean Catherine Dauvergne and staff of the University of British Columbia, Faculty of Law, for their generosity and flexibility in once again creating an excellent setting for the Summit. The Steering Committee is also appreciative of the support it received from executive and staff from various branches of the Ministry of Justice, from the Provincial Office of Domestic Violence, from the Minister's Advisory Council on Aboriginal Women, and from the Legal Services Society of British Columbia.

Finally, the Steering Committee would like to thank the Summit facilitator, George Thomson; the Summit moderator, Tim McGee; Michelle Burchill, Dan Silverman, and Ryan Elias of UBC Faculty of Law, and the many individual employees of public and private justice and public safety organizations, agencies and firms in British Columbia who made direct personal contributions to the success of the Justice Summit.

SUMMIT FEEDBACK

Comments on this *Report of Proceedings* and the Summit process are encouraged and may be emailed to the Justice and Public Safety Secretariat at jps@justicebc.ca. Written communication may be sent to:

Dr. Allan Castle
Executive Lead
Justice and Public Safety Secretariat
Province of British Columbia
1001 Douglas Street
Victoria, BC V8W 3V3
Attention: Justice Summit

FIFTH JUSTICE SUMMIT REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPENDIX 1: SUMMIT AGENDA

Friday, November 6

Time	Event	Lead
8:00	Registration and coffee	
8:30	Introduction	Tim McGee (Summit Moderator), Law Society of BC
	Greeting	Elder Mary Charles, Musqueam First Nation
	Welcome from UBC	Dr. Janine Benedet, UBC Faculty of Law
	Welcome to participants	The Honourable Suzanne Anton, Minister of Justice
	Summit overview	George Thomson (Summit Facilitator)
Topic 1 Towards a “trauma-informed” justice system response to victims of violent trauma		
9:00	Panel	<p>The purpose of the session is twofold:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remind participants of the advances made in neurobiology with respect to victims’ provision of reliable information • Examine specific implications for (a) police techniques, (b) introduction of evidence and management of criminal process, (c) support of victims <p>Speakers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Lori Haskell (University of Toronto) • Insp. Cita Airth (Vancouver Police Department) • Paul Pearson (Mulligan, Tam, Pearson) • Jeanette MacInnis (BC Association of Aboriginal Friendship Centres)
10:15	Small groups discuss (Note: refreshments available throughout)	<p>Table facilitators</p> <p>Small groups will be given a concrete set of questions which guide conversation towards the viability of further work to advance a coordinated response, and if viable, regarding the leadership, participation, consultations and timelines of any deliverable</p>
11:30	Small groups report out	Facilitator

FIFTH JUSTICE SUMMIT REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

12:00	Summary of potential recommendations	Facilitator Plenary commentary will be summed up as a general set of instructions to the summit support team to craft text to be revisited the following day
12:15	Lunch	
Topic 2 Towards better coordination and information sharing in and across family justice proceedings, criminal justice proceedings, and child protection proceedings		
1:15	Panel	The purpose of the session is twofold: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remind participants of the key arguments made in favour of increased coordination, and risks of not proceeding • Examine specific suggestions for how we may overcome known obstacles Speakers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donna Martinson and Margaret Jackson (Simon Fraser University) • Linda Thomas (Linda D. Thomas Law) • Kelly Connell (Lead defense counsel, Downtown Community Court) • Katherine LeReverend (Legal Services Branch – legal counsel for Director of Child Welfare)
2:30	Small groups discuss	Table facilitators Small groups will be given a concrete set of questions which guide conversation towards the viability of further work to advance a coordinated response, and if viable, regarding the leadership, participation, consultations and timelines of any deliverable
3:45	Small groups report out	Facilitator
4:15	Summary of potential recommendations	Facilitator Plenary commentary will be summed up as a general set of instructions to the summit support team to craft text to be revisited the following day
4:30	Adjourn for day	

FIFTH JUSTICE SUMMIT REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

Saturday, November 7

Time	Event	Lead
8:00	Coffee	
9:00	Key sector developments	<p>Updates on one or more key areas of on-going work for benefit of summit participants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of Access to Justice Committee and mandate: Chief Justice Honourable Robert Bauman • Exploration of Needs Assessment, Early Triage, Mandatory Mediation and Consensual Dispute Resolution: Jane Morley (independent consultant) and Dan VanderSluis (Family Justice Services) • Reflections on development of JPSC performance measures to date: Yvon Dandurand <p>(Note: This session will take the form of three sequential presentations, rather than a panel)</p>
9:45	Plenary	<p>Facilitator</p> <p>Opportunity for plenary feedback on any of the items raised as updates</p>
10:00	Small groups	<p>Facilitator briefly summarizes the draft text in front of participants (distributed at start of day, from prior day's work) and outlines task for small group work.</p> <p>In small groups, participants respond to draft text and develop any suggestions where appropriate.</p>
10:45	Plenary	<p>Facilitator</p> <p>Small groups report out on responses to the draft text, including any suggested inclusion or alterations, or general commentary or guidance.</p>
11:30	Recap of Summit recommendations	Facilitator summarizes plenary discussion regarding instructions as to the preparation of the report and its recommendations.
11:45	Closing remarks	Minister Anton
11:55	Final remarks/thanks	Moderator
12:00	Summit concludes	

APPENDIX 2: SUMMIT PARTICIPANTS

Cita Airth	Inspector, Domestic Violence and Criminal Harassment Unit, Vancouver Police Department
Hon. Suzanne Anton	Attorney General and Minister of Justice
Leah Bailey	Director, Legislation and Legal Support, Ministry of Children and Family Development
Hon. Robert Bauman	Chief Justice, Court of Appeal for British Columbia
Mark Benton	Executive Director, Legal Services Society
Patricia Boyle	Assistant Deputy Minister, Community Safety and Crime Prevention, Ministry of Justice
Craig Callens	Deputy Commissioner, Commanding Officer, E Division RCMP
Lynda Cavanaugh	Assistant Deputy Minister, Court Services Branch, Ministry of Justice
Jay Chalke	BC Ombudsperson
Jennifer Chow	President, Canadian Bar Association (BC Branch)
Kelly Connell	Lead Defence Counsel, Downtown Community Court
Hon. Thomas Crabtree	Chief Judge, Provincial Court of British Columbia
David Crossin	First Vice-President, Law Society of British Columbia Board
Yvon Dandurand	Professor, Senior Associate at the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy and Associate Vice-President, Research and Graduate Studies, University of the Fraser Valley
Chastity Davis	Chair, Minister's Advisory Council on Aboriginal Women
James Deitch	Acting Assistant Deputy Minister, Justice Services Branch, Ministry of Justice
Joyce DeWitt-Van Oosten	Assistant Deputy Attorney General, Criminal Justice Branch, Ministry of Justice

FIFTH JUSTICE SUMMIT REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

Beverley Dicks	Assistant Deputy Minister, Provincial Office of Domestic Violence and Strategic Initiatives, Ministry of Children and Family Development
David Dundee	Barrister and Solicitor, Canadian Bar Association (BC Branch) representative
Richard Fyfe	Deputy Attorney General, Ministry of Justice
Deanne Gaffar	Chair, Criminal Defence Committee, Trial Lawyers Association of British Columbia
Peter German	Regional Deputy Commissioner, Correctional Service Canada
Lori Haskell	Assistant Professor, Department of Psychiatry, University of Toronto
Hon. Christopher Hinkson	Chief Justice, Supreme Court of British Columbia
Carly Hyman	Director, Policy Legislation Issues Management, Court Services Branch, Ministry of Justice
Margaret Jackson	Co-Director, FREDA, Simon Fraser University
Gene Jamieson	Legal Officer, Provincial Court of British Columbia
Grand Chief Edward John	Senior Advisor on Aboriginal Child Welfare
Leonard Krog	MLA, Opposition Critic for Attorney General
Tara Laker	Crown Counsel, Criminal Justice Branch, Ministry of Justice
Derren Lench	Deputy Chief, Central Saanich Police & Chair, BC Association of Chiefs of Police
Katherine LeReverend	Legal Counsel, Legal Services Branch, Ministry of Justice
Jeannette MacInnis	Director of Health and Ending Violence Initiatives, BC Association of Aboriginal Friendship Centres
Sherry MacLennan	Director, Public Legal Information and Applications, Legal Services Society
Hon. Donna Martinson	Adjunct Professor, Simon Fraser University (Justice, BC Supreme Court, retired)

FIFTH JUSTICE SUMMIT REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

Heidi Mason	Director, Legal Advice and Representation, Legal Services Society
Christine Massey	Assistant Deputy Minister, Policy and Provincial Services, Ministry of Children and Family Development
Heidi McBride	Legal Counsel, Supreme Court of British Columbia
Brent Merchant	Assistant Deputy Minister Corrections Branch, Ministry of Justice
Jane Morley	Strategic Coordinator, BC Access to Justice Committee
Caroline Nevin	Executive Director, Canadian Bar Association (BC. Branch)
Paul Pearson	Barrister and Solicitor, Canadian Bar Association (BC. Branch) representative
Clayton Pecknold	Assistant Deputy Minister, Policing and Security Programs Branch, Ministry of Justice
Tracy Porteous	Executive Director, Ending Violence Association
Steve Rai	Deputy Chief Constable Vancouver Police Department
Melanie Randall	Faculty of Law, University of Western Ontario
Wayne Robertson	Executive Director, Law Foundation
Sheila Robinson	Executive Director, Provincial Practice, Ministry of Children and Family Development
Sally Rudolf	Legal Counsel, Office of the Chief Justice, Court of Appeal for British Columbia
Kurt Sandstrom	Assistant Deputy Attorney General, Legal Services Branch, Ministry of Justice
Darlene Shackelly	Executive Director, Native Courtworkers and Counselling Association of B.C.
Mark Sieben	Deputy Minister, Ministry of Children and Family Development

FIFTH JUSTICE SUMMIT REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

Christine Smith-Martin	Executive Director, Vancouver Transformative Aboriginal Justice Services Society
Linda Thomas	Lawyer, Linda D. Thomas Law Corporation
Simon Thomson	Deputy Administrative Crown, Criminal Justice Branch, Ministry of Justice
Holly Turton	Sergeant, Vulnerable Persons Unit, Surrey RCMP
Dan VanderSluis	Executive Director, Family Justice Services Division, Justice Services Branch, Ministry of Justice
Ken Walker	President, Law Society of BC
Lori Wanamaker	Deputy Solicitor General and Deputy Minister, Justice, Ministry of Justice
Ken Watts	Vice-President, Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council; representative, BC Aboriginal Justice Council
Karen Whonnock	Lawyer, Whonnock Law Firm
Daryl Wiebe	Superintendent, Vancouver Police Department

APPENDIX 3: STEERING COMMITTEE AND WORKING GROUP

Steering Committee

Members:

Clayton Pecknold (co-chair)	Assistant Deputy Minister, Policing and Security Programs Branch, Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General
Kurt Sandstrom (co-chair)	Assistant Deputy Attorney General, Legal Services Branch, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General
Mark Benton	Executive Director, Legal Services Society of British Columbia
Patricia Boyle	Assistant Deputy Minister, Community Safety and Crime Prevention Branch, Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General
Chastity Davis	Chair, Minister’s Advisory Committee on Aboriginal Women
James Deitch	Acting Assistant Deputy Minister, Justice Services Branch, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General
Beverly Dicks	Assistant Deputy Minister, Provincial Office of Domestic Violence and Strategic Initiatives, Ministry of Children and Family Development
David Dundee	Canadian Bar Association, BC Branch, Family Section
Annita McPhee	Consultant and Past President, Tahltan Nation
Jane Morley	Jane Morley, QC
Paul Pearson	Partner, Mulligan, Tam, Pearson

FIFTH JUSTICE SUMMIT REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

Observers:

Gene Jamieson	Legal Officer, Office of the Chief Judge, Provincial Court of British Columbia
Heidi McBride	Legal Counsel, Office of the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of British Columbia
Sally Rudolf	Legal Counsel, Office of the Chief Justice, Court of Appeal for British Columbia

Summit Facilitator:

George Thomson	Director, National Judicial Institute
----------------	---------------------------------------

Summit Moderator:

Tim McGee	Executive Director, Law Society of British Columbia
-----------	---

Ex-officio:

Allan Castle	Executive Lead, Justice and Public Safety Secretariat, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General and Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General
Nancy Pearson	Manager, Stakeholder Relations, Justice Services Branch, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General

FIFTH JUSTICE SUMMIT REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

Working Group

Allan Castle	Executive Lead, Justice and Public Safety Secretariat, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General and Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General
Gord Comer	Crown Counsel, Criminal Appeals & Special Prosecutions, Criminal Justice Branch, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General
Oriole Courcy	Program/Policy Analyst, Justice Services, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General
Rosalind Currie	Director, Office to Combat Trafficking in Persons, Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General
Bruce Deacon	Director, Justice Business Intelligence, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General and Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General
Shelley Eisler	Director, Planning and Performance, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General and Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General
Darlene Kotchonoski	Planning Analyst, Corporate Policy and Planning Office, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General and Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General
Michael Lucas	Manager, Policy and Legal Services, Law Society of BC
Nancy Pearson	Manager, Stakeholder Relations, Justice Services, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General
Jodi Roach	Senior Policy Analyst, Civil Policy and Legislation Office Justice Services Branch, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General

FIFTH JUSTICE SUMMIT REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

Clark Russell Director, System and Service Coordination, Provincial Office of Domestic Violence, Ministry of Children and Family Development

Lucie Vallieres Analyst, Policing and Security Programs Branch, Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General

Special assistance provided by:

Rhonda Mead Executive Administrative Assistant, Justice Services Branch, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General

Tiny Vermaning Administrative Assistant, Justice Services Branch, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General

APPENDIX 4: JUSTICE AND PUBLIC SAFETY COUNCIL

Under provisions of the *Justice Reform and Transparency Act*, Council members are appointed by Ministerial order and may include: an individual who is in a senior leadership role in the government and who has responsibility for matters relating to the administration of justice in British Columbia or matters relating to public safety, and includes any other individual the minister considers to be qualified to assist in improving the performance of the justice and public safety sector. The Council is supported by the Justice and Public Safety Secretariat. The current membership includes:

Lori Wanamaker (Chair)	Deputy Solicitor General, Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General
Richard Fyfe (Vice-Chair)	Deputy Attorney General, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General
Lynda Cavanaugh	Assistant Deputy Minister, Court Services, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General
Joyce DeWitt-Van Oosten	Assistant Deputy Attorney General, Criminal Justice, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General
Brent Merchant	Assistant Deputy Minister, BC Corrections, Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General
Clayton Pecknold	Assistant Deputy Minister, Policing and Security Programs, Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General
Bobbi Sadler	Chief Information Officer, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General and Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General
Kurt Sandstrom	Assistant Deputy Attorney General, Legal Services, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General
Mark Sieben	Deputy Minister, Ministry of Children and Family Development