

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

**Document Title: Evaluability Assessment of the President's
Family Justice Center Initiative**

Author(s): Meg Townsend, Dana Hunt, William Rhodes

Document No.: 212278

Date Received: December 2005

Award Number: GS-10F-00864

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

**Opinions or points of view expressed are those
of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect
the official position or policies of the U.S.
Department of Justice.**



Abt Associates Inc.

Cambridge, MA
Lexington, MA
Hadley, MA
Bethesda, MD
Chicago, IL

Abt Associates Inc.
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

**ANALYTIC SUPPORT
PROGRAM CONTRACT:**

**Evaluability
Assessment of the
President's Family
Justice Center
Initiative**

**Contract GS-10F-00864
Task Order 2004TO179
Task Requirement
T-004**

Final

September 30, 2005

Prepared for
Nicole Gaskin-Laniyan
U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
National Institute of Justice
810 Seventh Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531

Prepared by
Meg Townsend, M.A.
Dana Hunt, Ph.D.
William Rhodes, Ph.D.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

This project was supported by National Institute of Justice funds (and sponsored by the Office on Violence Against Women) awarded to Abt Associates Inc. under the BPA, 2004-TO179, task requirement number T-004. Opinions or points of view expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Contents

1.0	Introduction.....	1
2.0	Brief Summary of Relevant Site Status Information.....	2
3.0	Linking Program Logic Models to Evaluation Design	6
3.1	FJC Program Activities	6
3.1.1	Individual Client Focused Activities	7
3.1.2	Community Focused Activities	7
3.1.3	Systems Focused Activities	10
3.2	Challenges to Development of Measures	10
3.2.1	Data Safety and Data Sharing.....	10
3.3.2	Interpretation of Change Data and Its Relationship to Program Goals	12
4.0	Measuring Program Processes: Intermediate Outcomes	13
5.0	Measuring Program Impact.....	19
5.1	Measuring Victim Safety.....	16
5.2	Establishing The Counterfactual: Interrupted Time Series.....	26
5.3	Statistical Analysis	27
6.0	Summary.....	30
	References	31
	Appendix: Interim Report, July 2005.....	25

1.0 Introduction

The domestic violence field has long been concerned that services for battered women and their families are fragmented, leaving victims to piece together needed resources on their own. Too often this requires shuttling between multiple locations and cutting through a variety of administrative red tape at a time when a family is in crisis and the issue of safety is immediate (Hart, 1995; Shepard, 1999). In response to this need, the President's Family Justice Center Initiative (PFJCI) was established as a pilot program for planning and implementing comprehensive domestic violence services for victims. In October, 2003 President George W. Bush announced that this program would provide \$20 million in 2004 to 15 grantees who were charged with bringing together both governmental and non-governmental advocacy agencies, law enforcement, the courts, prosecutors, forensic medical professionals, victim service organizations, legal advocates and other community based organizations dealing with domestic violence. The goal of the initiative was to coordinate multiple local providers in 15 pilot sites to establish support and justice services in one physical location, providing "one stop shopping" for victims in need of service. The intended result was community level change in awareness, and service coordination.

Abt Associates was awarded a contract by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), with sponsorship from the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), and charged with two tasks: assessment of the evaluability of the 15 pilot programs and design of the most rigorous evaluation possible for those programs. The Interim Report submitted in June 2005 addressed the first task. It provided a literature review and a description of each site's plans, program logical model, staffing, and progress toward implementation. This report (Appendix A) was based on reviews of grantee applications and telephone interviews with staff at each site. The status of the 15 sites varied at the time of the report, ranging from those who were still in the earliest stages of working out partner agreements to those estimating client intake for early in the summer of 2005. However, even those sites furthest along were not ready for evaluation nor were ready for a full site visit to collect data. Therefore, NIJ and OVW determined that it would be most useful for Abt staff to move to the second task, to develop a prototype evaluation design for use in both individual site and cross site evaluation when all sites are fully operational and ready for scrutiny.

This report documents the second task. It is based on a review of logic models for each site, examination of the development of data management systems (as reported in the spring of 2005), conversations and a site visit to the San Diego Family Justice Foundation, a technical assistance provider under the initiative, and discussion and on-site observation of training in the New York City site on data management and confidentiality by the National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV), also a PFJCI technical assistance provider. We do not repeat the review of literature and include only site-specific data from the Interim Report that is relevant to the design. More specific detail on each site can be found in the Interim Report.

This report will discuss:

- Section 2.0 Brief Summary of Relevant Site Status Information
- Section 3.0 Linking Program Logic Models to Evaluation Design
- Section 4.0 Measuring Program Processes
- Section 5.0 Measuring Program Impact
- Section 6.0 Summary

2.0 Brief Summary of Relevant Site Status Information

Site progress as described in the Interim Report represents the site's status as of the Spring of 2005. Below we summarize some of the important implementation issues most relevant to evaluation design plans: expected date of first client intake, current estimation of clients to be served annually, and whether an MIS system is in place and local evaluation is planned. We also include each award amount for reference.

Table 2.1 displays this information. As this table indicates, six sites were not anticipating first client intake until the summer of 2005 at the earliest; five anticipated a start in the fall or winter of 2005 and three were too early in the process to make a firm determination of a client intake start date. Two programs had completed the development of their program MIS and others were in progress, but were not yet completed. A number of sites had been anticipating using the prototype intake system developed for the SDFJCF by an outside contractor. However, this proved impossible, as the developer considered the product proprietary; this delayed the plans for full implementation of information systems in many sites. Three sites had planned local evaluations, while the majority of the others either had not yet planned a local evaluation or were unsure as to whether they would mount one.

Throughout the spring and summer sites received technical assistance from the TA providers (SDFJCF and NNEDV) on fundamental issues they grapple with during planning and implementation. Notably, issues of importance were safety of data, confidentiality protocols, procedures for partner data sharing, creation of consent forms, use of emails and wireless phones for client information, and development of and limitations of partner MOUs. Many of the confidentiality issues addressed in training were also summarized for sites in a report, "Confidentiality, Information Sharing, and Privacy Protocol Recommendations," drafted by the two TA providers in August 2005.

The implications of site status are discussed further in our presentation of an evaluation design. In summary, based on the evaluability assessments of each of the fifteen sites, it is apparent that there are a number of potential challenges to evaluative work in the future. It is also apparent that as the PFJCI matures, some of these issues may get resolved while new ones may be created. The issues that emerged include:

- Whether co-located agencies/services agree with and collaboratively pursue the overarching goals of the PFJCI.

The agencies participating in the PFJCI were still in the planning or the early implementation stages of their projects. In many cases, key staff was still being hired, partners were still being confirmed, policies and procedures were not yet drafted, and the organization and structure of the Centers were still being established. Therefore, in most cases, the goals and objectives of the Centers had not been discussed or agreed upon by co-locating agencies. We should note that the outcomes and goals listed in site logic models often reflected the opinion of the site contact at the time, and may no longer be reflective of the Center's goals. The continued development of each of the Centers needs to be tracked to document its development and how it has organized itself to achieve its

objectives, and to determine whether those objectives are consistent with the overarching goals of the PFJCI.

Table 2.1

Site Status

Sites	Planned Date of Intake ^a	N to be Served Annually	MIS in Place	Evaluation Planned	Funding
Alamada, CA	6/05	6,000	No	DK	\$1,227,250
Bexar County, TX	5/05	5,000	Yes	DK	\$1,216,981
Boston, MA	7/05	3,500	No	No	\$1,046,880
Defiance, OH	7/05	1,000	DK	DK	\$1,214,086
Erie County, NY	11/05	3,000	DK	No	\$945,712
Hillsborough County, FL	DK	DK	No	Yes	\$1,098,008
Knoxville, TN ^b	10/05	DK	No	DK	\$1,077,000
Nampa, ID	6/05	100	No	Yes	\$915,566
New York, NY	7/05	7,000	Yes	No	\$1,227,000
Quachita Pansh, LA	7/05	1,000	Yes	No	\$1,184,220
Sitka Tribe, AK	11/05	60–90	No	Yes	\$1,115,000
Somos Family Institute, NM ^b	DK	250	No	No	\$726,470
St. Joseph County, IN	DK	500–600	No	No	\$1,094,265
St. Louis, MO ^b	12/05	1,000	No	DK	\$1,250,695
Tulsa, OK	1/06	DK	No	DK	\$1,079,321

^a These data, except where noted, are current as of April 2005.

^b These data were updated September 2005.

“DK” = site did not know or was unsure of the information at the time of the telephone interview

- Confusion about whether individual sites need to conduct internal evaluations or whether there will be a national evaluation.

Almost all of the sites included funds in their original funding request to cover the costs of a local evaluator. In almost every case, the Federal government disallowed evaluation funds and sites were informed that evaluation activities would be supported by OVW. As a result, a number of sites are pursuing *pro bono* evaluations, which may be minimally useful in the long-term. Additionally, sites engaged in evaluative work with a local evaluator may be resistant to participating in additional evaluation efforts at the cross-site or national level.

- Difficulties associated with intake database development and data entry

In most cases, partnering agencies have maintained agency-specific client management systems. The implementation of a FJC presents a new data challenge. The issue is how to track FJC clients generally and the services they receive specifically. Related to this is what information should be tracked and who should have access to that information. A number of sites were planning to utilize a database created for the national TA providers, which would have provided a model of how to handle these issues, but found out that there was a restriction on dissemination of the database because the developers considered it proprietary.

- Differences in data collection priorities and confidentiality concerns presented by partnering agencies, which include government and non-government service providers, as well as criminal justice agencies

Many of the agencies partnering to establish a local FJC have not worked together in the past and, even those who have, may not have experience sharing data. Therefore, there may be a lack of understanding of the restrictions different agencies are under in terms of client-level data. There also may be confusion as to whether the same protections that may have applied at the host agency apply when agency personnel are working at the FJC. The issue is whether introducing a third party – the FJC-- pierces privilege and client data may, therefore, be considered part of public record. The national TA provider and its consultants have been working with the sites and OVW to address these issues and develop acceptable standards for PFJCI to follow; however, it is clear that there are some fundamental differences in the interpretation of confidentiality and, therefore, the risk that systematically collected data may pose a risk to client safety. The result has been instructions that render systematic data collection of evaluative data assessing the effectiveness of the PFJCI to be difficult at best.

- Whether desired outcomes (as identified in site specific logic models) can be measured given the data collection priorities and confidentiality concerns

Some of the sites' goals include, but are not limited to: increasing victim safety, increasing offender accountability, increased coordination of response, increased usage of services, increased reporting of violence, and increase use of multiple services. In many cases, measurement of these goals requires client-level data collected over time using shared identifiers to match clients receiving multiple services. A sites ability to measure some of their outcomes will depend on what advice sites take when designing intake and case management systems.

- Whether differences in data collection priorities and confidentiality concerns may result in increased burden to victims

As a result of the above concerns over the propriety of data collected by the PFJCI, there may be increased reliance on data collected directly by each service provider because shared or networked data systems are not implemented. This would counter one of the primary goals of co-location. Co-location is designed to limit the time and travel

associated with obtaining multiple government and non-government services, but is also intended to minimize the trauma of repeating one's story multiple times, which would be required if there is no centralized database of client intake information.

In the sections that follow we present an evaluation plan based on as basic a "common denominator" of goals, services, and available data as seems productive for such an effort. While evaluations can have many forms, depending on the stage of development of a program (formative, process oriented, and/or outcomes focused), we have assumed that the FJCs will be at a level of implementation that a formative evaluation is not desirable. However, we assume that programs would benefit from a *process evaluation* to determine how the service is being delivered and the level of implementation achieved, as well as an *impact evaluation* to determine the effectiveness of programming and have outlined a plan for each evaluation component.

3.0 Linking Program Logic Models to Evaluation Design

Ultimately, evaluations are designed to answer the central question of “Is the program working, and can its effects be isolated from other factors that may have produced them?” Behind all programs are the ideas that their designers believe link the choice of activities to the outcomes they want to see. These ideas are the building blocks of all aspects of the program and provide the framework for any evaluation. We constructed a blueprint or logic model generic to FJCs to begin to link program activities to their expected outcomes. By establishing that link, we identify data needed to fully describe a program and to verify that it has been implemented (process data) and data supportive of program success based on expected outcomes (impact data). We will refer to this model or blueprint throughout our discussion of the proposed evaluation design.

Each of the FJC sites is charged with creating a community-wide intervention to 1) increase service access and 2) enhance safety for victims of domestic violence. This type of intervention is to result in a coordinated community response designed to “improve interagency coordination and lead to more uniform response to domestic violence cases” (Shepard, 1999:1) through the co-location of services. In the Interim Report we developed program logic models for each FJC site based on their applications and telephone interviews with program directors. While these models show variation in specific activities, there is a common set of core activities intended to create a coordinated community response. We have compiled those activities that are common across sites into a generic FJC model (Figure 3.1). In the sections that follow, we use this model as reference for discussing suggested process and impact evaluation designs and the measurements they imply for the larger evaluation.

As this figure shows, we divide programs activities and outcomes into three levels:

- Client level: program activities that target individual clients and their families
- Community level: program activities targeting the community as a whole
- Service delivery system level: program activities targeting changes in the service delivery system

Using the logic model (Figure 3.1), one can trace the inputs or resources utilized by FJC sites in creating their programs; activities at each level that are the vehicles for reaching program goals; intermediate outcomes or process markers; and impact of inputs and activities. For example, based on a foundation of partnership agreements, data sharing plans and co-location of services, a FJC offers coordinated case management of services to victims. The intermediate outcome is an increase in service access and utilization to victims, which should ultimately impact victim safety. In the sections that follow, we look at FJC activities and how they relate to evaluation measures.

3.1 PFJCI Program Activities and Outcomes

In responding to the Presidential Initiative, PFJCI grantees are developing a set of activities that are designed to create change on three levels: client, community, and service delivery system.

3.1.1 Individual Client Focused Activities

The activities shown in the first tier of activities on Figure 3.1 are those that focus on providing services to individual victims and their families. They focus on advocacy services (safety planning, crisis counseling, court accompaniment), social services (housing assistance, financial assistance), law enforcement assistance (restraining orders, enforcement, warrants) or basic support (medical care, clothing, transportation). The intermediate outcomes associated with these activities reflect the site's ability to put into operation those services as planned; that is, more victims using crisis advocacy services or law enforcement assistance than before the center opened. Ultimately, client level outcomes or impacts are increased victim safety and offender accountability.

As the figure indicates, increased access to services is both an intermediate outcome and an impact. We have placed this in both places for several reasons. First, the ultimate goal of victim safety or accountability for offenders cannot be realized without increasing the access and utilization to victim services the FJCs provides. However, a central goal of all PFJCI programs, independent of any other effect, is to increase the numbers of victims accessing victim services by placing these services in a single coordinated location. Therefore, in the program logic models, access to services is both an intended impact and an intermediate step.

3.1.2 Community Focused Activities

Activities sites plan that are directed at the community at large include: media campaigns, prevention programming in schools or other such venues, engaging volunteers, and production of informational material for distribution. Intermediate outcome measures for these activities might include indications of saturation of the community (how many reached with material or public service programming) or numbers of trained, working volunteers. Ultimate impacts of these activities would be increased community wide awareness of the Center and its mission (% of persons who know about the program), as well as increased awareness about domestic violence in general. Sites are at varying stages of developing these activities. Many are focusing on delivering services to victims first, before beginning extensive community education or awareness activities. However, most sites have planned or are in the process of creating informational material for distribution, both on the subject of domestic violence in general and on the availability of the FJC in particular.

Figure 3.1

Generic Family Justice Center Logic Model

Inputs	Activities	Intermediate Outcomes	Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confidentiality agreements • Partnership agreements • Data sharing agreements • Cultural competency • Co-location of services 	<p><u>Individual/Client Level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case management/referral services • Emergency/Permanent restraining orders • Legal assistance • Medical assistance • Screening, needs assessments • Counseling/support groups (faith-based) •Chaplainry services •Reporting/investigating incidents • Prosecution • Housing assistance/shelter services • Emergency food/clothing/transportation • 24-hour helpline • Emergency financial assistance • Translation services 	<p><u>Individual/Client Level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased access to services • Increased service utilization • Increased use of multiple services • Increased victim reporting of domestic violence • Increased offender accountability • Increased victim satisfaction with services • Increased access to victim advocacy services 	<p><u>Individual/Client Level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased victim safety • Increased access to DV services
	<p><u>Community Level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FJC informational materials development and distribution • Community trainings • Volunteer programs • Advocacy 	<p><u>Community Level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased number of community members knowledgeable about DV and FJC services • Increased number of professionals/service providers knowledgeable about DV issues 	<p><u>Community Level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased level of community awareness about DV • Decreased levels of domestic violence
	<p><u>Systems Level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration between government and non-gov't providers • Cross-training • Establish/improve case tracking systems 	<p><u>Systems Level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased formal DV policies and procedures in service community • Increased coordination of services • Development of coordinated CJ response teams • Increased number of trained DV service providers 	<p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved institutional response to DV • Timely case processing

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

3.1.3 Systems Focused Activities

A critical program goal for the FJCs is the increase in collaboration between agencies dealing with DV victims. This is to be accomplished through successful co-location of services, cross training, linking victims to agencies, and formal agreements for coordinated service provision between agencies. The intermediate outcomes of those activities would be reflected in evidence of an increase in multiple services available, memoranda of understanding between agencies, development of teams for a coordinated response, cross-agency training, and new written policies and procedures on DV response. Ultimately, the goal of systems change might be such things as decreased or more timely case processing time, reflecting greater system efficiency in handling cases as well as increased capacity for serving victims.

3.2 Challenges to Measuring Program Outcomes and Impacts

One of the most important benefits of developing program logic models is to link activities with program goals and objectives. Once the outcomes and impacts have been identified, the next step is to identify how to measure them through a process and impact evaluation. Before presenting our suggested process and impact evaluation designs, we wanted to briefly describe some of the issues unique to FJCs that played a prominent role in deciding what would be feasible and therefore worthy of suggesting for cross-site or national evaluation work.

3.2.1 Differences in Service Provision

Programs offer a range of services under the overarching goal of placing comprehensive victim services in one physical location. Case management services are common to all sites, though the off-site referrals services vary considerably. In most sites the intent is co-location of a range of service activities (case management, legal assistance, medical assistance, counseling, food/clothing transportation, etc.). In some FJCs, co-location permits the center to serve a triage function so that clients are assessed during an intake procedure and sent to receive needed or requested services located on site or through referral. In this case, the FJCs act as service umbrellas, but do not necessarily link or track the services provided at one partner (e.g., obtaining a restraining order) with another (counseling) for reasons of data confidentiality. These differences will be important for programs to consider during their evaluations as they will affect available sources of client monitoring data and potentially the level of impact that might be expected through the establishment of a FJC.

3.2.2 Data Safety and Data Sharing

Any program evaluation rests on data—data about clients served, data about numbers and types of services, and data about behaviors or attitudes changed as a result of the program intervention. The presence and quality of these data present a special issue in the case of FJCs. For FJCs, even basic data acquisition about victims (sign in logs, services needed or requested, etc.) can present a safety threat. Consequently, the issue of data safety and client confidentiality is a critical one, not only for FJC implementation and operations, but also as it imposes limitations for research. Sites have struggled with the conflicting need to protect the most basic client data (name, demographics) and the need to verify client receipt of services.

In August of 2005 a draft document of the recommendations for confidentiality, information sharing and privacy protocols was distributed to FJC sites for their use. This document was prepared by the NNEDV, the SDFJCF and the OVW. This document was developed to provide a set of guiding principles and recommendation for sites to use in creating systems for management and protection of data collected as part of their program. The document presents conflicting recommendations from NNEDV and SDFJCF in some areas. For example, NNEDV argues that identifying information on clients should not be maintained in a centralized MIS, but only held by individual partner agencies and that services should be provided to clients completely anonymously, if requested. In addition, NNEDV recommends that some data fields in client records be purged regularly (every 24, 48, or 72 hours) to guarantee record safety. On the other hand, the SDFJCF recommends that sites maintain information on all clients and does not recommend eliminating any records or fields in the database. In addition, they do not recommend allowing clients to receive services anonymously at FJCs. For programs adopting the SDFJCF model, basic information (demographics, needs assessment of information) is maintained in perpetuity in a confidential data management system.

Using these recommendations as guidelines, each FJC can develop their own policies and procedures in establishing information systems, working with partners in the collaborative on what data are collected, where they are stored and what are shared between partners. Many sites have received training from one or both of the TA providers on how to approach data security, including how to deal with intake, triage of clients, physical location of different partners, state laws on data destruction, etc. The SDFJCF had originally planned to distribute a data management system developed for them by an outside IT contractor, but found that due to proprietary rights, this was not possible. Consequently, each site is now pursuing the creation of its own MIS.

Even with guidelines from the contractors and template protocols provided by NNEDV, sites are not required to use a standard MIS for data management. Each site has spent considerable time debating issues such as use of the Internet, computer networking, logs, even the placement of secure fax machines. In addition, grantees have found that there are different levels of data protection needed among their partners; for example, partners dealing with transportation needs may require less data protection than legal, police or probation partners. In almost all cases, the solutions to data sharing issues appear to be each partner “owning” its own data, rather than a centralized FJC system. Site solutions to client safety and/or anonymity have ranged from visitors using first names only, use of “Jane Doe” names, or no names to full identification at intake with data contained in a FJC based network. Security logs or sign ins for services are recommended as optional by NNEDV and may be purged periodically. The NNEDV also recommends that clients be allowed to opt out of providing *any* identifying information and/or having it stored in a computer at any time.

Both NNEDV and SDFJCF have provided procedures for client consent for use of data requested from the FJC by its partners. These procedures involve handling informed consent by the client, including detailing the implications for information sharing. NNEDV suggests a limited release form that has a fixed time period and allows verbal withdrawal at any time. SDFJCF recommends a general release form after a consent process with no time limitations. OVW is working with the TA providers to provide guidance in areas of apparent conflict. Both technical assistance providers recommend that partner agencies not have access to intake records with names or demographic identifiers. Further, if the FJC is using a network computer system, they recommend that client level data be stored only on external drives. The recommendations do suggest, however, that non-identifying, demographic information can be provided to evaluators.

These restrictions, while essential for client safety, place serious restrictions on the type of data that can be collected for evaluation purposes. The numbers of clients served, for example, can only be obtained if all who receive services register in some form. An unduplicated count of those served is also only possible if each client uses the same identifying information (name, number, “Jane Doe” name) each time they enter and/or receive services. In addition, if partners do not share data across systems to match need to services provided or even to count people served, it is impossible to accurately determine level or intensity of services provided without compromising the privacy of the client. These are issues that are still being resolved.

3.2.3 Interpretation of Change Data and Its Relationship to Program Goals

One of the most challenging aspects in creating a design for FJC sites is identifying measures of change that are both meaningful in relation to the program goals and can serve as indicators of progress. For example, some FJC sites may be more focused on law enforcement goals (increase offender accountability through prosecutions, implementation of pro-arrest policies, etc.), while others may be more focused on social service or supportive services (client sense of safety, financial or housing services, etc.). In fact, many sites have conflicting goals; that is, advocacy groups within the partnership may struggle with law enforcement partners to stress what the victim wants (social service assistance, temporary housing), rather than what police may see as critical (filing a complaint, issuing a restraining order or an arrest warrant). These conflicts carry over into what measures of success a program would like to see used. For example, increased prosecutions through building better, more quickly developed cases over time may be paramount to law enforcement partners, while client sense of safety, satisfaction and increased use of support services may be more critical to other partners. Each site is working to balance these goals to allow all participating partners to carry out their objectives without unnecessary conflict. The program balance should be articulated in discussions with the evaluator and reflected in outcomes emphasized.

4.0 Measuring Program Processes

Describing program processes is the method by which the story of what a program does is told. Through process evaluation, researchers document how programs have developed, what they look like and how they function. They create a narrative on the program history and development of activities, highlighting barriers to implementation and methods devised to overcome them. This description is a narrative not only about what the program intends to do, but also what actually occurred in the execution of plans, i.e., how was it designed, how were resources identified and allocated relative to plans, how does the operation match the initial program design.

Process evaluation data will include both qualitative and quantitative data on the history, development and operations of the programs. These data provide both the description of the program and its activities and measures of program inputs and intermediate outcomes. Intermediate outcomes are those critical steps or processes that must be accomplished before any impact or ultimate outcomes can be realized. Measuring these intermediate outcomes is often part of a regular program monitoring function; that is, part of administrative “counting” to see how a program is operating. How many staff have been hired or trained? How many clients have been seen? Answers to questions like these are part of the building blocks of the process evaluation.

This part of the program evaluation is particularly relevant for an initiative that is a new organizational structure such as the PFJCI sites. PFJCI grants are planning and implementation awards and their success rests on the ability both to plan and make operational a new community response structure. This includes creation of a new physical location, development of community cooperative arrangements, new staffing, and moving existing staff from multiple entities into the new location. Collecting data on progress in these activities is a counting exercise, but one which is not always easily undertaken. OVW progress report forms used in other OVW programs contain some of the elements useful for determining staffing, purpose areas, numbers of people (including partners, volunteers, etc.) trained, victim services provided, and interagency agreements. An evaluation of the PFJCI programs might usefully review current reporting requirements such as this for sources of process-oriented data. It is likely, however, that additional data will be needed to trace in greater detail where programs are in reaching goals as well as data to describe each program’s unique history and experience. There are three areas the process portion of the evaluation should cover: describing the program history and development; describing the inputs or resources available; and measuring activities and/or intermediate outcomes. These include the first three columns of the logic model introduced earlier.

Describing program history and development. Data describing the program and the development of its model can be gathered in interviews with staff, stakeholders, advisory groups covering how the program model was created; the development of the funding applications; other agencies, funders, etc, involved in articulation of the model; problems encountered in implementing the model as planned; local factors relevant to successful implementation. In addition the evaluator would look to things such as the minutes of meetings of agencies and stakeholders to build the picture of program history, narrative developed by program creators describing the logic or theoretical underpinning for the activities proposed.

Describing resources available. A description of program resources or inputs is also an essential part of the process evaluation. Inputs include all resources available to the program to meet its objectives--

- people, materials or products, space and equipment, existing policies and procedures, funding and partnerships. Describing these resources involves documenting each in both narrative and where possible countable form. For example, staffing of each FJC would be documented in numbers of staff at each level, their assignments, level of effort for each, workload, training, number and workload of volunteers. These data are generally available in program personnel files, through payroll or accounting systems and in the program MIS. Descriptions of space, materials available, and equipment can also be collected from grants management or in discussion with the financial staff of the program.

Many of the FJCs receive funding from other sources (local contributions, in-kind contributions, foundations). These resources are another important element to assess from program financial staff if the evaluation is to cover any cost effectiveness issues or if programs are to be examined across FJC sites. Table 4.1 provides some types of data and possible data sources to document resources.

Table 4.1

Documenting Resources

Program Resources	Potential Data Sources
Staffing, including staff capacity: hours needed and filled of staff, volunteers, other participants	Employment records, time sheets, staff and other participant schedules, budgets
Staff skills, recruitment, experience, training	Resumes, interviews, program policy, training records
Space, equipment, including any relevant space provided by partners	Program accounting system, observation
Materials, curricula, protocols, operations guides	Program records
Program partnerships: interagency, community, and stakeholder/partnership agreements, data sharing and confidentiality agreements, communication ties	Interviews with staff and stakeholders, records of agreements, minutes of collaborator meetings, review of written policy/protocols regarding collaborations
Funding: Sources, costs breakdown	Grants management, budget review, payroll, workload analyses /

Measuring activities and intermediate outcomes. The process evaluation includes a description of all program activities and documentation of how those activities are executed (intermediate outcomes). As mentioned earlier, the activities of each FJC differ somewhat, though there are a set of core goals and activities that seem to be common across sites. Based on the review of programs and the original intent of the funding, we have selected six generic program outcomes that would be documented in the process data collection:

- Increased provision of comprehensive services
- Increased access to those services
- Formal coordination of DV services
- Co-location of services

- Implementation of a management information system, and
- Increased awareness of both FJC and issues related to DV.

In Table 4.2, we identify what activities are linked to program outcomes and how one might measure their implementation and execution.

Outcome	Program Activity	Measure	Data Source
Increase provision of comprehensive services for victims: medical, legal, social services, law enforcement	Development of new services for victims of DV	Comparison of numbers and types of services in target community for victims of DV before FJC and after FJC	Review of social service and law enforcement network of services before and after FJC (service directories, telephone interviews) Interviews with staff, community stakeholders
Increase access to and utilization of comprehensive DV services	Coordination and co-location of services in same facility Development of outreach and case development procedures to identify and reach victims of DV for service	Number of victims served in each partner agency over time Client report of increased access Evidence of outreach policy, protocols within agencies dealing with DV victims	Aggregate MIS data from partner agencies over time Client focus groups, anonymous on-site client surveys
Formal coordination of DV services	Development of interagency agreements, MOUs	Presence of agreements, MOUs in site files	Site visit Records review
Co-location of DV services	Identification and operationalization of physical space for FJC Placement of representatives of identified services in FJC	Presence of representatives of relevant agencies in FJC with regular hours of operation/staffing	Site visit observation of site, review of on-site staffing schedules
Implementation of information systems for FJC	Development of data management systems according to protocols developed on data safety and confidentiality	Operating MIS for FJC and/or partners Evidence of data sharing and confidentiality agreements	MIS documentation including data safety procedures
Increase awareness of services for DV victims, increased awareness of the FJC and issues of DV	Public service announcements, fairs, mall/other public distribution or placement of literature; marketing at provider agencies	Number of community members with knowledge of/recognition of FJC, DV victim services	Random digit dialing community surveys, mall intercept surveys

As the Table suggests, for each of these outcomes there can be multiple sources of data: observation of operations during site visits, administrative data or other records review, focus groups or interviews, community and client surveys, interviews with stakeholders or community members. Each outcome is discussed in more detail below.

- Increase provision of comprehensive services

A primary goal of the FJCs is to increase the availability of a full range of services for victims and their families. This includes medical, legal, social, financial, law enforcement, transportation and housing. Part of the FJC implementation assessment should include a review of the services available to DV victims through the Center, using for example a simple checklist of services provided (as an indicator of providing comprehensive services) or through a more comprehensive review of the network of services available before FJC and after FJC (as an indicator of change). The evaluation would include increases in the type of services (expanded depth of service) as well as increases in the number of slots for service (expanded capacity).

- Increase access to services

In many instances there may be no new services developed through FJC, as a charge of the grant was to *reconfigure* existing services to better serve the target population. Therefore, a critical objective to assess is the ability of the FJC to increase victim access to existing services. The program activity linked to this outcome is coordination and co-location of services in the same facility and coordination of activities through agreements, referrals, etc. at that location. These activities should increase the number of victims served as well as the number of services accessed by each victim. MIS data from the partner agencies before and after the FJC implementation can provide relevant data. Does, for example, a victim advocacy group serve more DV victims after coordination with the FJC than before? While unduplicated counts of persons served relies on a system that both protects the safety and identity of the client, several sites have worked through mechanisms to overcome those barriers (i.e., consistent Jane Doe names, client number systems). Programs might also look at whether victims report (in anonymous surveys or focus groups) that they received more types of service since using the FJC than before its operations or now had greater access to services.

- Formal coordination of DV services

Closely linked to the goal above is the assessment of formal coordination of services. This coordination is easily tracked through the presence of MOUs, referral patterns, shared training, etc. between partner agencies. Progress reports to OVW that include frequency of referrals among services would also be useful for this analysis.

- Co-location of services

For most sites the goal of co-location of services is becoming a reality. In a few others the new physical location holds at a minimum scheduled representation of some but not all of the services, or contains a system of referral to those outside the FJC. Implementation of this objective is assessed in on-site observation, examination of schedules of partner agency operations and service agreements.

Interviews with program organizers can add context to the process of co-location; that is, what were the barriers to setting up co-location operation and how did the site overcome them.

- Implementation of management information system

The fifth outcome we have identified is the implementation of an information or data management system. The difficulties sites have experienced were discussed earlier. However, evidence of the documentation of such a system and its viability for program accountability could be assessed as part of a process evaluation. This evidence could be gathered through site visits observation of the system or in interviews with partner staff.

- Increased community awareness of both the FJC and DV issues

Most FJC programs stated that increasing community awareness of both their operations and the issue of DV in general are important objectives for changing rates of domestic violence in their communities. The activities they are planning include public service announcements, informational materials, literature placement, etc. Evaluating the effectiveness of reaching the public and victims in need of services can be assessed through community surveys (random digit dialing telephone surveys) or mall intercept surveys. These surveys provide information on increased community knowledge and awareness as the program grows, as well as data on saturation of outreach efforts.

5.0 Measuring Program Impact

Assessing the impact of a program in community-based settings is far more challenging than assessing process. To be able to determine whether FJC or any other community based intervention “works” the evaluator has to match program activities to their objectives and to clear indicators or measures of effect that can be isolated as much as possible from other influences that could have created those effects. In a community setting the number of other influences or “noise” in the system that can produce or influence those effects is daunting. One commonly used method of looking at impact, comparing one community (with the intervention) to another (without the intervention), is often tempting, but introduces even more noise to the interpretation of any effects found. No two communities are alike, even those matched demographically. Therefore, the challenge in this case is to create an impact evaluation design that reflects feasible and available measures of the FJC primary objectives and presents a way to compare changes on those measures that makes sense. Achieving this goal would enable a site to have confidence when attributing changes in the measured effect to the implementation of the FJC.

Figure 5.1 identifies some of the measures we suggest using to measure some of the primary goals or long-term outcomes of the program: increase victim safety; increase access to and utilization of domestic violence services, increase public awareness of domestic violence, and increase the number and efficiency of DV prosecutions. We have not repeated the inputs and activities the FJCs provide (they can be found in Figure 3.1 and Table 4.1), but have tried to identify multiple measures of these goals and to point to potential sources of data.

Other impacts measures may be of interest to sites in developing their own evaluations. We have selected the following categories as examples of long-term outcome or impact measures and outline a design that could be used, but these categories or suggested impacts are not by any means exhaustive.

- Increase victim safety

One of the most important objectives of the FJC is to reduce violence perpetrated against women by their partners. Although, the means of achieving this goal are varied, their commonality is providing victims with an environment that helps them address and deal with abusive relationships. This may require a criminal justice response; it may require a social service response; it may simply require a response from a caring, understanding individual.

Unfortunately, the literature shows that most domestic violence is unreported. Although in theory a well-designed *survey* might estimate the prevalence of domestic abuse, community surveys suffer from three problems: underreporting would almost certainly be high, even in a well-designed survey; well-designed surveys would be prohibitively expensive¹ to execute; and a survey cannot collect data retrospectively. The latter problem is especially problematic because establishing what would happen absent the program (what evaluators call the counterfactual) likely depends on a time-series,

¹ Part of the expense derives from the facts that domestic abuse is relatively rare and underreported in the general population. Consequently, suitably powerful estimates of changes in the prevalence of domestic abuse would require large samples; reliable survey responses may also require face-to-face interviews. These requirements result in expensive surveys that would require at least one replication to be useful.

comparing the prevalence of violence before and after the implementation of the family justice centers.

Therefore, we suggest the use of measures available from public records in formats that make them appropriate for consideration. In this case we will walk through using police calls for domestic violence assistance in targeted areas, DV calls involving injury and repeat calls as indicators of changes in levels of domestic violence in an area. Others (number of successful prosecutions, number of restraining orders issued, etc.) might also be considered in light of a program's specific goals. All measures of reports to the police, whether in calls for service or arrests and convictions, are subject to changes in culture or reporting due to the new awareness the FJC brings and thus open to interpretation as to whether they reflect changes in prevalence. For example we may find that the number of calls to the police for assistance increases if the FJC is effective at making victims more aware of protective services and more willing to use them. This in itself is an important finding. We include these measures, however, as it is important to attempt to look at some measure of safety in addition to measuring increased access to services.

The measures we have chosen to discuss reflect directly on victim safety. They are: calls to police for assistance in DV cases, calls to police for assistance in DV cases that involve serious injury and repeat DV calls to the police to the same address. Victims of domestic violence are safer if they are calling police when threatened. In the next sections, we provide an example of how one might measure the impact of the FJC using public records.

- Increase access to and utilization of domestic violence services

As stated earlier, one of the primary assumptions underlying the FJC model is that co-locating services may increase the number of services in the community and encourage more domestic violence victims and their families to seek and utilize existing services. The implicit theory underlying the PFJCI is that increased access to victim services will increase victim safety through decreasing secondary victimization and increasing the likelihood of prosecuting of perpetrators. As discussed earlier, some programs are not focused on prosecutorial goals and would not support this as a relevant outcome measure. All, however, have increasing access to service as an important goal.

Existing records may be used to track the number and type of services available in the community, as well as the number of clients accessing the FJC and its partnering service providers before and after implementation of the FJC. However, because of the complications discussed earlier associated with tracking clients and the potential differences between actual and perceived services available, focus groups or on-site surveys may be used to get a better understanding of any changes in perceptions among domestic violence victims and service providers. An important note is that perceptions of victims and providers would have to be measured before the FJC is implemented, as well as after, which may be difficult depending on the timing of the evaluation.

- Increase public awareness of domestic violence

For FJCs to be successful, the community needs to be knowledgeable of the dynamics of domestic violence and the negative impact on victims and their families, as well as the services available in the community (including FJCs) for assistance. Measuring knowledge about and attitudes toward domestic violence and available services is best done through community surveys that are repeated during implementation stages of the FJCs to look at changes in awareness/information over time. The

high cost of community surveys may be offset by using another option like mall intercept surveys that rely on a more confined or smaller population.

Table 5.1

Impact Evaluation

Implementation Goal	Measures	Data Source
Increase victim safety, increased DV reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of police calls for domestic violence assistance in target areas • Number of police calls for domestic violence assistance involving injury (ER visit, paramedic) • Number of repeat police calls from domestic violence assistance to same location 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police call logs before and after FJC • Census tract identifiers
Increase access to and utilization of domestic violence services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of victims receiving domestic violence, advocacy and legal services from FJC and each partner • Number of domestic violence services available in target area before and after FJC • Percentage of victims accessing multiple victim services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partner MIS before and after FJC • Service directors interview with service providers, volunteer clients • Client focus groups, anonymous on-site surveys
Increase public awareness of domestic violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge about/attitudes toward domestic violence • Knowledge about/attitude toward domestic violence services, including FJC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Random digit dialing community survey • Mall intercept survey
Increase numbers of successful prosecutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numbers of convictions/pleas in domestic violence cases before and after FJC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uniform Crime Report
Decreased time to successful prosecutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average time from DV arrest to conviction in DV cases before and after FJC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Court MIS

5.1 Measuring Victim Safety

Deciding how to measure specific implementation goals and the available data sources is an important step in designing an impact evaluation. There are a number of factors to consider, including timing and cost. For example, as discussed earlier, service providers may be unwilling or unable to provide information on the victims served before and after implementation of the FJC. Additionally, the cost of a community survey may be prohibitive, forcing a site to rely on alternative approaches. For these reasons, we focus the next few sections on what we feel should be measured at a minimum, given its reliance on public records. In the next few sections we discuss the research question, measures, and analysis plan for an impact evaluation relying solely on public records to measure an increase in victim safety.

From a public policy perspective, one test of the effectiveness of a Family Justice Center is that it reduces violence against women by their partners. All research questions are posed as a null hypothesis; that is, the straw man assertion that the intervention will have no effect. The challenge for the program is to refute that assertion of no effect. There can be many hypotheses tested in the evaluation as it is assumed that institution of the FJCs will have a number of different effects on the community --- increase reporting, decrease revictimization. We walk through one hypothesis below.

We suggest a null hypothesis for this evaluation can be stated as:

H0: Providing battered women and their families with access to the Family Justice Center will have no effect on domestic violence in the community.

Rejecting this null hypothesis, the alternative hypothesis is:

H1: Providing battered women and their families with access to the Family Justice Center will reduce domestic violence in the targeted community.

A test of the null hypothesis requires the answer to two questions: How can evaluators validly measure the occurrence of domestic violence against women? And, can evaluators devise a valid comparison to serve as the counterfactual so that they can infer the level of violence that would have prevailed had the Family Justice Center not been in place? We address both questions below.

There are two important constraints on the evaluation design. The first is that random assignment is not recommended in this context. It is both not likely to be acceptable to the programs and is impractical, given the way that FJC programs are designed and administered.² The second is that we cannot identify and track specific outcomes for FJC clients because their records may either be destroyed or inaccessible due to safety measures in place that remove identifiers of any kind. The consequences of these constraints are: (1) evaluators must collect data on domestic violence at the community level, and (2) they must design a strong quasi-experiment to evaluate how the Family Justice Center reduced trends in domestic violence in the community.

² Family Justice Centers operate by central assignment of crisis services which are specialized in handling domestic violence or by walk-in participation of women in crises. Withholding the attention of those specialized services is seen as posing a danger for the control group.

One possible measure of change in the incidence of domestic violence comes from police calls for assistance. One advantage to using service calls is that they are easily collected; they are typically stored electronically and saved for multiple years, providing a baseline.³ In addition, they provide the address for the event, and so can provide a basis for monitoring repeated events at the same location.

However, there are some disadvantages to using calls for service. Domestic violence, like most crimes, is underreported. If reporting rates remained constant over time, underreporting is not a problem for judging whether or not Family Justice Centers reduced domestic violence; it would simply be a conservative estimate. The problem, however, is that the Family Justice Centers may *increase* women's willingness to report abuse, leading to the anomalous finding that calls for service actually increase after a Family Justice Center becomes operational.

Despite the disadvantages, we believed the number of reports to the police was a more benign measure of impact than other measures and, therefore, potential relevant to more FJCs. We also suggest coupling it with other measures that when combined with police record data may begin to demonstrate the true impact of the FJC on victim safety. For example an increase in the number of protection orders filed may be a better indicator of victim safety; however, change in the measure may also be effected by a change in the filing procedures that may have been made as a result of the FJC (e.g., requiring victims to visit the FJC to complete paperwork rather than at the police station). Similarly, some FJCs may feel that an increase in the number of prosecutions and the subsequent confinement of perpetrators may decrease revictimization. While others may believe the best measure of victim safety is a change in the level of violence reported by victims themselves, recognizing that official DV estimates are plagued by underreporting. However, community-wide surveys are expensive and many communities won't have a baseline from which to measure change. For many FJCs the primary goal may simply be to increase access to and/or satisfaction with services for victims and their families, with the further hope that service usage will increase. Although, the confidentiality and data concerns with victim service records described earlier and the lack of a baseline measure of satisfaction may compromise these otherwise straightforward measures of FJC achievements.

Nevertheless, we maintain that calls for police assistance can still be a good common measure of the potential long-term impact of FJCs. If calls for assistance decrease after a Family Justice Center has been adopted, then that reduction in calls would seem to be an unambiguous indicator that the Family Justice Center was effective at reducing domestic violence,⁴ and would reject the null hypothesis. An increase in calls for police assistance would not provide clear evidence for rejecting the null hypothesis, nor would such a trend provide evidence for accepting the null hypothesis that the Family Justice Center is ineffective at reducing domestic violence. On the other hand, if police calls for service increased, we would have compelling evidence that the Family Justice Center encouraged women to be more willing to report victimization, and this itself would be an important finding.

³ If the FJC believes other official data may be a better indicator, it may apply the same analytic approach, provided the data has been collected consistently over time.

⁴ It is not unambiguous if there is a possibility that the Family Justice Center causes women to be *less* willing to report domestic abuse. This seems unlikely, but we cannot altogether dismiss the possibility that intervention can have a perverse effect. The instrumental variable approach to evaluation—discussed subsequently—provides some protection against making an erroneous inference based on a reduction in reported incidents of domestic abuse.

There is the possibility that domestic violence could decrease while the frequency of calls for service increased for the remaining incidents, so that the two trends were offsetting. Although it seems unlikely that the two would be completely offsetting, increased willingness to report incidents of domestic violence will always bias downward any measure of domestic violence based on police incidence reports. We recognize this possibility, and suggest additional methods for measuring domestic violence.

Reports of incidents that involve serious injuries provide a second measure of victim safety. Such incidents are identified in police reports as involving transport to the hospital, or by emergency service reports that paramedics or an ambulance were dispatched to the scene. Clearly this measure understates the amount of reported domestic violence, most of which requires no medical attention or involves the treatment of bruises and minor cuts. Still, incidents that result in injury would be an additional good indicator of *trends* in domestic violence, if there were no change in the rate at which such events are reported. Given that a serious injury provides less latitude for reporting, we expect that reporting rates should remain comparatively constant before and after implementation of the Family Justice Center. Therefore, for evaluation purposes, incidents with serious injury are a good complement to general police calls for assistance regarding domestic violence.

We also suggest the evaluation criterion might include a reduction in repeated calls for police assistance. This seems an especially good indicator if the Family Justice Center works best at reducing subsequent incidences of violence once an initial incident has come to the attention of the center. The ideal way to track repeated incidents is to identify abused women and monitor their repeated victimization, but this is impractical for reasons of confidentiality and safety. Our discussions with sites show that care providers will refuse to provide identifiers, understandably placing a higher evaluation on protecting abused women than on evaluation research. An alternative approach is to use police records to base the analysis on the occurrence of repeated events at the same address. This approach will miss repeat events that happen following a residential change, but if residential changes (followed by repeated domestic violence) remain constant after institution of the Family Justice Center, a valid trend analysis can be based on repeated events.⁵

Using these operational measures of domestic violence, the basic unit of analysis is the number of domestic violence events in a neighborhood or targeted area during a period of time. By “neighborhood” we mean a cluster of one or more city blocks, or otherwise geographically targeted area tracked in police data sources. The convenience of using city blocks in this definition is that the U.S. Census provides block-level data, which can be used as control variables in our statistical analysis. To summarize, three suggested outcome measures are:

- The number of police calls for assistance regarding domestic violence that occurs in a neighborhood during a period of time.

⁵ Participation in Family Justice Centers services may initiate a residential change for the victim, but this is not a problem for the inference. From an evaluation perspective, reducing victimization by removing the victim or the perpetrator from the residence is correctly measured as reduced victimization. The problem referenced in the text is that the Family Justice Center could result in residential changes without reducing victimization. Although this is possible, it is not a serious challenge to the validity of the evaluation findings.

- The number of police calls for assistance regarding domestic violence with serious injury that occurs in a neighborhood during a period of time.
- The number of repeated calls for assistance that occurs in a neighborhood during a period of time.

While the first three measures treat the target area or neighborhood as the unit of analysis, a fourth measure treats an address with a known report of domestic violence as the unit of analysis:

- The probability that a call for assistance from a specified address repeats within a fixed period of time.

The next section describes how we would use these measures to draw inferences about the effectiveness of Family Justice Centers at reducing recidivism; that is, the question of “Compared the what?” Again, other measures may be useful to consider. The limitations we see lie in the need to use public records information that can be assembled in a time series format. Relevant records that reflect the goals of some of the programs (prosecutions, arrests) may also be utilized in a time series annalistic strategy.

5.2 Establishing The Counterfactual: Interrupted Time Series

Every evaluation is charged with establishing a counterfactual for comparison; that is, what would have prevailed had there been no Family Justice Center? A counterfactual is never actually observed, and instead, evaluators search for a comparison that can represent the outcome under the counterfactual condition. There are two ways to establish a counterfactual for this study.

The first method has already been implied by the above discussion. Police calls for assistance (in general, limited to those that result in serious injury or limited to repeated events) provide the measure of domestic abuse we use in this example. If willingness to report domestic abuse remains constant, then we would expect fewer police calls for assistance after implementation of the Family Justice Center than would have been observed before its implementation. In this way an interrupted time-series provides the basis for a counterfactual.

We discuss the statistical analysis behind an interrupted time-series in the next subsection, but first review the logic of the approach. Logically, we would not expect an abrupt change in the calls for assistance. Family Justice Centers is likely to experience a startup period during which caseloads are relatively small. Thereafter, we would expect caseloads to grow, perhaps reaching relatively fixed level of service delivery. Caseloads might even fall after a point, especially if the program were successful at reducing domestic violence, and we would expect the prevalence of domestic abuse to follow a conformable pattern. Therefore, before initiation of the Family Justice Center, domestic abuse would likely follow some trend, and after the Family Justice Center opens, we would expect to see a modest interruption in that trend, commensurate with the small number of clients served by the Center during its formative days. Thereafter, we would expect to see a much larger change in the domestic abuse trend as the Center continues to expand its operations.

We might observe a sharper break in the time-series by examining the prevalence of repeated incidents of domestic abuse, because the Family Justice Center should have its greatest effect on

women who have at least one reported incident of domestic abuse reported to the police, as this event may have stimulated participation in the justice center activities. We cannot observe repeated reported victimization definitively, because all we know is the address in a police report. Nevertheless, the inference is strong that interruptions to the trend in repeated events (defined as calls for assistance to the same address) imply that the Family Justice Center reduced repeated events of domestic abuse. It would be possible to observe a statistically significant reduction in repeated events but no significant reduction in all events taken together if the Family Justice Center is especially efficacious at reducing the former.

In this way, a time-series provides a basis for establishing the counterfactual. We can improve on the time-series by applying it to multiple cross-sections, specifically, to the “neighborhoods” or target areas discussed earlier. A combination of time-series and cross-section data is often called *panel data*, in this case studying a time-series across multiple neighborhoods. This provides a means to study differences in how the Family Justice Centers operate, for example, across different socio-economic settings—using block-level data to distinguish socio-economic settings.

Basing the inferences about treatment effectiveness on panel data is suitable for the first three outcome measures: calls for assistance in a neighborhood, calls for assistance that involve serious injury, and calls for assistance that involve repeated events. The fourth outcome measure (repeated events at the same address) requires a different analysis strategy.

We define a “first event” as the first occurrence of a call for assistance originating at a given address. Because the data are not of infinite length, an operational definition of “first” is that a previous call for assistance had not originated from the same address during the previous two years. A two-year criterion is arbitrary, and an alternative could be substituted. We define a “second event” as a second occurrence of a call for assistance originating at the same address within two years of the first event. The unit of analysis is whether or not a first event resulted in a second, or repeated, event. This would be coded as a dichotomous variable: 1 if a second event (the repeated event) occurred and 0 if it did not. We would judge the effectiveness of the Family Justice Center by the test of whether or not it reduced repeated events. The logic of this test could be extended to a third and subsequent events.

5.3 Statistical Analysis

In this section we discuss the analysis strategy that might be used to test the null hypothesis that the Family Justice Center is ineffective at reducing domestic violence. This requires in statistical tools that are appropriate for performing an interrupted time-series analysis using panel data.

There is a vast literature on the analysis of time-series data. Fin using a time series model, the evaluator models the underlying trend that occurred prior to the “interruption” or intervention (in this case, the Family Justice Center) that would persist into the future if the intervention had not occurred or had no effect.. The analytic task is to explain the trend in terms of observable variables (such as the general level of violence in the neighborhood), and also in term of unobservable variables. The unobservable variables are captured by error terms in the analysis. One of the challenges in using time series or panel data is the fact that events over time can be correlated with each other; that is, a measure at Time 4 may be correlated with that measure at Time 3 and 2 and 1. In the analysis

discussed here statisticians would need to be familiar with the methods developed to deal with autocorrelation, as ignoring the issues will bias any test statistics.

The overall analysis strategy is a regression. In the example we have provided, potential dependent variables are the number of calls for assistance in the neighborhood during a period, the number of calls that result in serious injury, and the number of calls that involve a repeated event. Independent variables are:

- Block-level census data for the address⁶
- Other measures known about the neighborhood, for example, data from city planning data or other community data.
- The level of implementation of the Family Justice Center. These variables might distinguish among the conditions “not operational,” “not fully operational” and “fully operational,” or in other finer measures.

The dependent variables are “countable,” meaning that we would typically expect to observe a range zero events in a neighborhood during a period to a level of N events.

Analysts often use regression models to analyze dependent variables such as these. If neighborhood were large,⁷ then other regression models might be useful, although almost certainly the researcher would have to take censoring into account because at least some neighborhoods would have zero events during one or more periods. There is considerable justification for using a fixed effect model, essentially by providing a dummy variable for each neighborhood. Conditional Poisson models are sometimes used for this purpose.

Turning to the fourth outcome measure (repeated events), a probit or logistic model (or alternative) would be appropriate, as this is a binary dependent variable. Using probit or logistic regression to analyze repeated events is a simpler estimation problem. Although an analyst might be concerned with auto-correlation or spatial-correlation or both, most statisticians would probably choose to ignore these issues. The occurrence of the first event identifies a study subject. The occurrence or nonoccurrence of a second event is the outcome measure. Explanatory variables for this analysis are:

⁶ We suggest that the analyst use a fixed-effect model. Block-level census data would not be used in the regression when there are fixed-effects for the neighborhoods because the fixed-effects control for any variable that does not change over the time within a neighborhood.

⁷ This presumes that neighborhoods are defined as comprising one or a few census blocks. By increasing the size of the neighborhood, of course, we would expect to observe more events per period.

- Block-level census data for the address
- Other measures are known about the neighborhood, for example, from city planning data or from other community data
- Whatever facts are reported by the police about the first event. This information can be taken into account because the occurrence of the second event is being studied conditional on the occurrence of the first event.
- The timing of the first event with respect to the implementation operation of the Family Justice Center.

It is important to note that there is no variable denoting whether or not a victim used the Family Justice Center as a resource. Including such a variable, while not feasible for safety reasons, also risk selection bias, and is unnecessary for drawing an inference about program effectiveness, particularly in looking at a coordinated community response effort such as FJC.

For this analysis, we would expect that there would be fewer repeated events when the first event follows implementation of the Family Justice Center, and that the reduction would be highest when the first event occurred after the Family Justice Center was fully operational.

6.0 Summary

The OVW funded Family Justice Centers took on a unique challenge. In 15 sites in major urban areas they are attempting to bring varied service providers, law enforcement agencies and the courts to a common table to coordinate the safety and welfare of victims of domestic violence. In addition, the FJCs are charged with increasing public awareness of domestic violence through informational outreach and to establish prevention programming in the communities they serve.

The first step in this process was granting planning funding for these sites almost two years ago. During this phase sites were to develop agreements, identify a physical site for co-location of services, train providers, create a data management system that protects the safety of clients and begin intake. This job is underway in all of the sites interviewed, but not fully implemented in most. This presents a challenge to developing an evaluation plan for sites in their early stages. Other issues emerged during the assessment that may present additional challenges to future evaluation work, including the ultimate goals of the FJCs; participation in local pro-bono evaluations; and differences in data collection priorities and confidentiality concerns that may prevent or complicate the collection of client-level data.

The plan we have suggested is, therefore, based on the progress and problems sites have faced early on and the implications of their experiences and the challenges that have emerged for a full evaluation.

We have suggested a two-part evaluation of sites involving a full process component covering the steps in establishing the Centers, barriers and successes, costs utilization, community cooperation and history. In addition, *when programs begin serving clients*, we add the creation of simple counts of clients to serve both as a monitoring and a research function. Because of the variety of programming activities across the sites we suggest that simple impacts reflecting victim safety be utilized, outcomes that do not rely on identification of clients but instead reflect changes in events across the target served over time. We have used types of police calls for service (DV call, call involving injury and repeat calls to the same address) as a measure common to all sites and available from police records. Others may be added based on the emphasis of a site's program model; that is, programs focusing on offender accountability might also use numbers of successful prosecutions or time to prosecution as important measures for that model. In all cases, the needs of victims and their families, increasing their access to services and protection of their safety is the primary focus of all FJCs and the guiding principle in developing both the process and impact portion of this approach.

References

Shepard, M. F. (1999). Advocacy for battered women: Implications for a coordinated community response. In M. F. Shepard, & E. L. Pence (Eds.). *Coordinating Community Responses to Domestic Violence: Lessons from Duluth and Beyond*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Shepard, M. (1992). Predicting batterer recidivism five years after intervention. *Journal of Family Violence*, 7 (3), 167–178.

Shepard, M., Falk, D. with Raschick, M (2000). Final Report of the Evaluation of the Enhanced Domestic Abuse Intervention Project. Submitted to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (U50/ccu511327).

Appendix

Interim Report, July 2005



Abt Associates Inc.

Cambridge, MA
Lexington, MA
Hadley, MA
Bethesda, MD
Chicago, IL

Abt Associates Inc.
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

**Interim Report:
Evaluability
Assessment of the
President's Family
Justice Center Initiative**

**Task Order
2004TO179 – Task
Requirement T-004**

July 2005

Prepared for
Nicole Gaskin-Laniyan
National Institute of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Washington, DC

Prepared by
Meg Townsend
Dana Hunt
Caity Baxter
Peter Finn

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

This project was supported by National Institute of Justice funds awarded to Abt Associates Inc. under the BPA, 2004-TO179, task requirement number T-004. Opinions or points of view expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Contents

1.0	Introduction.....	1
2.0	Brief Summary of Relevant Site Status Information.....	2
3.0	Linking Program Logic Models to Evaluation Design	6
3.1	PFJCI Program Activities and Outcomes	6
3.1.1	Individual Client Focused Activities	7
3.1.2	Community Focused Activities	7
3.1.3	Systems Focused Activities	10
3.2	Challenges to Measuring Program Outcomes and Impacts	10
3.2.1	Differences in Service Provision	10
3.2.2	Data Safety and Data Sharing	10
3.2.3	Interpretation of Change Data and Its Relationship to Program Goals	12
4.0	Measuring Program Processes.....	13
5.0	Measuring Program Impact.....	19
5.1	Measuring Victim Safety.....	23
5.2	Establishing The Counterfactual: Interrupted Time Series.....	26
5.3	Statistical Analysis	27
6.0	Summary.....	30
	References	31
	Appendix	32
	Interim Report, July 2005.....	32
1.	Executive Summary	1
2.	Introduction.....	3
3.	Background	3
3.1.	Coordinated Community Responses to Domestic Violence.....	5
3.2.	Evaluations of Coordinated Community Responses	5
3.3.	Family Justice Centers.....	7
4.	Contacts with National Faculty Members	8
5.	Evaluability Assessment	13
5.1.	County of Alameda, CA.....	13
5.2.	Bexar County, TX	20
5.3.	City of Boston, MA	27
5.4.	Defiance Municipal Court, OH	34
5.5.	County of Erie, NY.....	42
5.6.	Hillsborough County, FL.....	49
5.7.	City of Knoxville.....	55
5.8.	City of Nampa, ID	62
5.9.	City of New York, NY	68

5.10.	Ouachita Parish, LA.....	76
5.11.	Sitka Tribe of Alaska	82
5.12.	Somos Familia Family Institute, Inc. NV	89
5.13.	St. Joseph County, IN.....	94
5.14.	City of St. Louis, MO.....	99
5.15.	City of Tulsa, Ok.....	106
6.	Conclusion	112

1. Executive Summary

Abt Associates Inc. was contracted by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to conduct an evaluability assessment of the fifteen grants awarded under the President's Family Justice Center Initiative (PFJCI). The purpose of this interim report is to provide an overview of what has been learned about the grantees participating in the initiative through conversations with national faculty members, staff from the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), and grantee representatives.

Domestic violence is a major problem in the United States that has social and economic repercussions for both victims and their children. It has been demonstrated that this damage may be minimized if victims seek services for themselves and their families. Unfortunately, underreporting of the crime and problems accessing services that are often scattered throughout the community leave many victims without the critical help they need. Since the 1990s communities have been trying to overcome these problems through a number of different strategies to coordinate government and non-government services for victims. More recently, communities are further expanding their efforts to coordinate services through co-location of services at Family Justice Centers. The OVW established the President's Family Justice Center Initiative as a demonstration program in fiscal year 2004 to support the implementation of Family Justice Centers in fifteen communities across the country. As communities continue to become interested in efforts to support integrated service delivery through co-location, formal evaluations of the Family Justice Centers become invaluable. To date, there are three operating Family Justice Centers (located in the cities of San Diego and Indianapolis and Hennepin County), none of which have undergone any type of formal or rigorous evaluation. A comprehensive evaluation that addresses whether the Family Justice Centers are meeting their goals and measures the impact of the centers on survivors, their families, the community, and the system is critical to any decision whether to continue supporting Family Justice Centers in other communities.

Contacts with the National Faculty

In addition to funding fifteen communities to plan and implement FJCs, the OVW also contracted with the San Diego Family Justice Center Foundation to be the national technical assistance provider and established a national faculty to advise the Foundation. National faculty members were contacted as part of the assessment to discuss the goals and objectives of the initiative and its potential for formal evaluation.

National faculty members made a number of observations, based on their familiarity with the project and understanding of individual grantees' implementation plans. Many of their observations focused on potential challenges grantees may face, while others addressed the direction some grantees were taking with their Family Justice Centers. These concerns included the philosophical underpinnings of the centers; promotion of San Diego as the "model" FJC; background and training of FJC intake staff; ability to maintain local interest in the initiative; and sustainment of the centers.

Based on their own experience with community initiatives to address domestic violence, faculty members were able to identify a number of potential areas of grantee technical assistance, including: providing civil legal assistance; diversity and cultural competence; governance; physical design of the centers; design and architecture of the intake data system; handling children of victims; and, situations where FJC providers also serve batterers.

Most faculty members reported that an evaluation of the initiative should include a process and outcome assessment. Faculty members felt a process assessment would facilitate replication and focus on systems and culture change, which would provide a context for future impact or outcome evaluation. A process assessment would also help explain the difference between co-location and how the various services were provided in the community previously. Although faculty members were cognizant of the importance of an outcome evaluation, members voiced concern with the choice of specific outcome measures and the length of time that would be required to measure changes in outcomes, feeling that the field may not be patient enough to wait for the results of a formal impact evaluation.

Evaluability Assessment

Although the goal of the assessment was to assess whether it is feasible to formally evaluate a given program prior to embarking on an actual evaluation of the program, the grantees were not sufficiently implemented to make this assessment. As is clear through the table provided below, the grantees are at various stages of implementation and none of them were operational at the time of our contact, which prevented us from making an conclusions regarding their evaluability.

Grantee	Date of contact with site*	Program director has been hired	Other principal staff have been hired	Implementati on stage	Grantee received NEPA clearance	Expected service delivery intake date	Anticipated annual case load
County of Alameda	3/25/05	No	No	Early implementation	No	June 2005	6,000
Bexar County	3/18/05	Yes	No	Implementation	Yes	May 2005	3,500 – 5,000
City of Boston	4/15/05	Yes	No	Early implementation	No	July 2005	3,000
Defiance Municipal Court	4/1/05	No grant staff	No grant staff	Early implementation	Partial	July 2005	1,200
County of Erie	2/17/05	In process	No	Early implementation	No	November 2005	3,000
Hillsborough County	2/24/05	Yes	No	Planning	No	April 2006	No estimate
City of Knoxville	4/22/05	No	No	Planning	No	October 2005	No estimate
City of Nampa	2/28/05	Yes	No	Early Implementation	Yes	June 2005	100
City of New York	3/17/05	No	No	Early implementation	No	Summer 2005	7,000
Ouachita Parish	3/10/05	Yes	No	Early implementation	Yes	July 2005	1,000
Sitka Tribe of Alaska	2/22/05	Yes	No	Early implementation	Yes	November 2005	60 – 90
Somos Familia Family Institute	2/17/05	Yes	No	Early Implementation	Yes	March 2005	250
St. Joseph County	4/14/05	Yes	No	Planning	No	No estimate	500
City of St. Louis	2/28/05	No	No	Planning	No	September 2005	1,000
City of Tulsa	3/1/05	No	No	Planning	No	February 2006	3,500-4,000

* Note: Information is accurate as of the date of our contact.

As stated above, the grantees participating in the PFJCI were not sufficiently operational to support any further assessment of their evaluability. The issue is that the information required to

determine whether the grantee can support an evaluation and the most appropriate design for that evaluation is based on a review of data collection systems, client flow, service provision, and FJC capacity, which will not be available for any grantees during the life of this task order. Although some grantees indicated a possibility of being operational at some point during the summer of 2005, the reality of the grantee achieving this goal is unlikely and, even so, would not provide sufficient experience serving clients to assess evaluability. Therefore, an assessment of the evaluability of grantees participating in the PFJCI would be premature at this time.

2. Introduction

Abt Associates Inc. was contracted by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to conduct an evaluability assessment of the fifteen grants awarded under the President's Family Justice Center Initiative (PFJCI). The purpose of an evaluability assessment is to assess whether it is feasible to formally evaluate a given program prior to embarking on an actual evaluation of the program. This assessment began with discussions with various actors engaged in the Initiative, including two staff from the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), representatives from the organization hired as the national technical assistance contractor for the initiative (San Diego Family Justice Center Foundation), and national faculty members. These conversations were conducted to collect background information on personal involvement in the initiative, perceptions of the initiative's goals and objectives, and recommendations for future evaluation activities. A summary of the feedback received from the national faculty is provided below.

The above activities were followed by an assessment of evaluability of each grantee. This process involved a review of the grant applications for all fifteen sites, conversations with OVW Site Program Managers, and phone conversations with representatives from each grantee. The goal of these screening activities was to update information contained in grant applications by collecting information on the history of the grant project, the grantee's goals and objectives for the initiative, and grant implementation progress. A parallel goal was to allow decisions to be made on whether a site visit should be conducted to more formally assess the grantee's readiness and ability to support a formal evaluation. Because the grants awarded under this initiative are not far enough along to make this determination, we are presenting the results of our initial screening efforts through this interim report.

3. Background

Domestic violence is a major problem in the United States. One out of every 26 American wives, a total of 1.8 million women a year, are beaten by their husbands (Straus et al., 1980: 40). More recent studies have estimated incidents of marital rape at 12 per 1,000 and incidents of any kind of domestic violence at 116 per 1,000 (NRC, 1998). The 1995-1996 National Violence Against Women (NVAW) survey found that 76 percent of raped and/or physically assaulted women had been assaulted by a current or former husband, cohabitating partner, or date; and 1 out of 4 women had experienced some kind of intimate partner violence in their lifetime (Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998). The National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) reported that in 2001 almost 600,000 women ages 12 and older were victimized by intimate partners (Rennison, 2003). The actual number of domestic violence incidents is likely even higher, since data on domestic violence is largely based on self-reported information.

Domestic violence has social and economic repercussions, including both physical and psychological damage to victims and their children, higher divorce rates (Adragna, 1991), and

increases in health care, social service, and criminal justice costs (Healy et al., 1998). Victims of domestic violence also are more likely to suffer from Major Depressive Disorder (MDD), Post-Traumatic Stress Disorders (PTSD) (Stein and Kennedy, 2001), and drug and alcohol abuse (Kilpatrick et al., 1994). Children in households with intimate partner violence are also more likely to perpetrate domestic violence subsequently in their own households (Widom, 1992). The Family Violence Survey, the first national study of family violence, found that men who witnessed their parents physically attack each other were close to three times more likely to hit their own wives (32%), compared to men who did not have violent parents (11%) (Straus et al., 1980).

Researchers generally agree that victims are much less likely to report incidents of intimate partner violence than violence perpetrated by strangers, however few studies definitively prove this link. The 1992 NCVS found that 18% of women victimized by intimates did not report the incident to police, compared to 3% of women victimized by strangers. Primarily, victims of intimate partners did not report due to the fear of retaliation by the offender (Bachman, 1994). However, the same survey also found that black victims, victims who sustained injuries, and first-time victims were more likely to report the incident to the police (Bachman and Coker, 1995). In addition to fears of retaliation, women often do not contact the police because they consider the incident private or embarrassing, or because they do not think that the police would be able to resolve the situation.

More recent data from the NCVS estimates that approximately half of the intimate partner violence against women from 1993 to 1998 was reported. Reasons for *not* reporting included the personal nature of the incident (35%); fear of retaliation (19.8%); and perception of the incident as a minor crime (7%) (Rennison and Welchans, 2000). Reasons given *for* reporting the incident included self-defense, the perception of the incident as a serious crime, and the belief that the police will consider it serious as well (Felson et al., 2002). Other research has found that fear of involving law enforcement, family embarrassment, distrust of the criminal justice system, previous negative encounters with law enforcement, and economic dependency contribute to underreporting and lack of service utilization (Fischer and Rose, 1995; Felson et al., 2002; Buzawa and Buzawa, 1996). Victims who are immigrants face additional barriers to reporting. Davis and Erez (1998) found that 67 percent of surveyed law enforcement officials said that immigrants report crime less frequently than other victims, especially domestic violence. In addition to language barriers, and unfamiliarity with the U.S. legal system, immigrants may depend on a spouse for resident status, which may contribute to their underreporting (Healy et al., 1998).

In addition to reporting difficulties, many victims of domestic violence also have problems with access to social services. Women either cannot access the services they need because the services do not exist or adequately provided, or they don't seek existing services because they are either not aware of them or find them difficult to access because they are scattered throughout the community (Koss and Harvey, 1991; Gamache and Asmus, 1999; Madigan and Gamble, 1991). Hart (1995) estimates that up to one in five domestic violence victims are not able to access appropriate social services because these services are not adequately funded. In other cases, victims are hesitant to access available services due to economic constraints. Victims may fear the potential cost of social services, in addition to the cost of time off from work, additional transportation costs, and the cost of childcare while they access services (Hart, 1992). However, Orchowsky (1999) found that when victims utilized offered services, they found them to be "very helpful."

3.1. Coordinated Community Responses to Domestic Violence

In the 1990s, health and human services organizations and criminal justice agencies began to coordinate responses to victims of domestic violence as a way to address the problems of underreporting and access to services. Coordinated Community Responses (CCRs) aim to improve communication between different agencies responsible for responding to domestic violence victims to provide a more effective response to the victim, and to prevent secondary victimization (National Advisory Council on Violence Against Women, 2001; Pence and Shepard, 1999). In addition to helping individual agencies and organizations be more effective, CCRs also aim to make the response of all responders more effective. Furthermore, many CCRs also attempt to reduce the number of domestic violence incidents in their community through education and community outreach (Burt, 1980; Okun, 1986). As a result, CCRs have become a core strategy for implementation of VAWA programs.

Gray (1985) describes the following five stages of growth for community collaboration, which can be applied to the CCR development model: (1) co-existence, when organizations become aware of other organizations in the community; (2) communication, when the organizations start to communicate with each other informally and learn about the processes each organization uses to address the problem; (3) cooperation, when relationships between organizations become more formal; (4) coordination, when the organizations formally work together to prevent redundancy and increase effectiveness in serving the target population; and (5) collaboration, which involves long-term strategy and formalizing a system designed to engender coordination. Some CCRs may not have collaboration as the end goal, and prefer to stop at coordination so that organizations preserve their autonomy (Gamache and Asmus, 1999:74).

3.2. Evaluations of Coordinated Community Responses

There have been very few systematic evaluations of CCRs for domestic violence, largely due to the difficulties associated with such an evaluation (Shepard, 1999). For example, change in one part of the CCR might not necessarily impact other parts of the CCR in the way researchers expect. As a result, most evaluations focus on the criminal justice system, as opposed to prevention or coordinated community response activities (Hamby 1998; Shepard 1999). The few evaluations of CCRs that have been conducted have focused on specific activities or programs implemented rather than the CCR's effect as a whole. For example, many studies have focused on the impact of arrests (Weisz, 1996; Whetstone, 2001), and batterer treatment (Gondolf, 1997). Not surprisingly, the results of evaluations focused on individual components of CCRs have been largely inconclusive (Jaffe et al., 1993; Tolman and Weisz, 1995).

One of the most well known CCRs, the Duluth Domestic Abuse Intervention Project (DAIP) has served as a model for many other CCRs (Tift, 1993). However, formal evaluations of the DAIP model have been limited, focusing on client satisfaction and the batterer intervention program (Shepard, 1992; Pence and Shepard, 1999; Shepard et al., 2000), as opposed to an overall evaluation of the coordinated community response (Shepard, 1999). Similarly, in an evaluation of another CCR in Alexandria, VA, Orchowsky (1999) focused primarily on client satisfaction. While client satisfaction is certainly an important measure of a CCR's effectiveness, it is by no means a measure of the CCR's overall impact. Researchers believe that a thorough evaluation of a CCR would include both qualitative and quantitative methods, account for the entire program as well as individualized components, and measure outcomes including victim safety and self-reliance, offender recidivism, the effectiveness of the program for different cultural groups, as well as community change (Hart, 1995).

In a discussion on CCR evaluation, Shepard (1999) describes three different types of coordination focusing on future evaluation efforts: community intervention projects, criminal justice system reform, and coordinating councils. Although each type may be used together in one CCR, Shepard argues that they have different goals and should therefore be evaluated with different measures.

Community intervention projects focus on the community response as opposed to the criminal justice response. According to Shepard, there are eight major elements of a community intervention project: an approach focused on victim safety; developing specific protocols to improve victim safety; building better links between social service organizations; implementing methods for monitoring; victim advocacy within the criminal justice system and the community; abuser rehabilitation; repairing damage done to children who witness domestic violence; and evaluation of victim safety and offender outcomes. Gamache et al (1988) and Pence (1985) found that community intervention projects increase arrests and successful prosecutions of batterers. Other evaluations found that recidivism rates were lower among men ordered to treatment programs after arrest (Syers and Edleson, 1992).

Criminal justice system reform projects focus on modifying the existing criminal justice response to domestic violence. Evaluations of such projects have found that arrest is an effective deterrent to domestic violence for up to 18 months after arrest (Tolman and Weisz, 1995), and that offenders who receive rehabilitation treatment are less likely to recidivate (Babcock and Steiner, 1999).

Coordinating councils focus on increasing communication between agencies responsible for domestic violence response. Clark et al. (1996) examined the operations of coordinating councils qualitatively, and found that leadership, focusing events on systemic problems, and attitudinal shifts were important to community change. Quantitative evaluations of coordinating councils have not been undertaken largely due to limited data (Shepard, 1999).

When considering evaluation of co-location as a strategy to improve CCRs, one might look toward other efforts to co-locate service delivery that have been applied to other populations.

Community Assessment Centers (CAC), which have been supported by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), are one such initiative. The CAC model seeks to coordinate and integrate the various systems that deal with juvenile delinquents (Oldenettel and Wordes, 2000). OJJDP has funded four communities to develop or enhance existing assessment centers. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) formally evaluated the Community Assessment Center model in 1999. Important outcomes focused on in this evaluation were prevention of delinquency, decreased delinquency recidivism, increased agency communication, and decreased time for social services to become involved after arrest (NCCD, 1999). Overall the NCCD evaluation showed that Community Assessment Center model improved the juvenile justice system through increased cooperation and partnerships. Weaknesses in the sites studied included an underutilization of best practices, and insufficient personnel levels.

Another initiative designed to promote coordination and integrated service delivery through co-location is the Child Advocacy Centers. Child Advocacy Centers bring law enforcement, child protective services, medical professionals, and other social services together in one central location to address child abuse. Although a formal comprehensive evaluation of the Child Advocacy Center model is ongoing (CCRC, 2005), researchers have conducted an outcome evaluation of the model. Jones et al. (2001) found that the most important outcomes for children

and families were a decrease in child stress and a decrease in the likelihood of repeat victimization. The most important outcomes for social service agencies included protecting more children likely to be victimized, an increase in prosecuted cases, and increased number of convictions and confessions from perpetrators. Lastly, important community-level outcomes included an increase in child abuse resources within the community and an increased public awareness of the problem.

3.3. Family Justice Centers

Family Justice Centers are another strategy for communities interested in expanding coordination efforts through co-location. The President's Family Justice Center Initiative (PFJCI) offers an opportunity for communities to take collaboration to the next level; that is, by bringing together government and non-government service providers into one centralized location and provide a "one-stop shop" for victims of domestic violence. The PFJCI was established by The Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), as a demonstration program in fiscal year 2004. Fifteen sites were funded (Alameda County, CA; Bexar County, TX; Boston, MA; Defiance, OH; Erie County, NY; Hillsborough County, FL; Knoxville, TN; Nampa, ID; New York, NY; Ouachita Parish, LA; Sitka, AK; Las Vegas, NV; St. Joseph County, IN; St. Louis, MO; and Tulsa, OK) through the demonstration program. Three existing Family Justice Centers, the San Diego, Indianapolis, and Hennepin County Family Justice Centers were awarded technical assistance grants to assist the grantees in developing their own Family Justice Centers. The PFJCI attempts to expand on the CCR model by providing all relevant services (medical, law enforcement, prosecution, social services, community-based organizations, etc.) in one location, making it less burdensome on victims who would otherwise have to travel from location to location to access services. Family Justice Centers are also designed to achieve the goal of collaboration that has been somewhat difficult for CCRs to achieve, resulting in improved efficiency of the system.

As communities become more and more interested in efforts to support integrated service delivery through co-location, formal evaluations of the above programs, including the Family Justice Centers are invaluable. To date, there are three operating Family Justice Centers and none of them have undergone any type of formal or rigorous evaluation. A comprehensive evaluation that addresses whether the Family Justice Centers are meeting their goals and measures the impact of the centers on survivors, their families, the community, and the system is critical to any decision whether to continue supporting Family Justice Centers in other communities.

The implementation of a Family Justice Center is not without controversy. There are legitimate concerns about the ability of these centers to meet the needs of all victims, particularly immigrant and minority populations, who are less likely to seek services through formal channels. There is also concern about the effect co-location will have on a victim's willingness to seek services, especially among those not interested in involving government agencies in the situation. For these reasons, center design becomes as important as what services they are offering. For example, a center that does not consider privacy when making decisions on where to locate criminal justice and victim advocate agency representatives may unintentionally discourage women from seeking services through the center. It is critical to the success of the movement that issues like center design is studied through formal evaluation activities.

Therefore, an evaluation of the grantees participating in the President's Family Justice Center Initiative would be extremely valuable. A comprehensive evaluation can identify whether and how these centers may be established in a wide range of community settings, as well as the potential impact of the Centers on the clients, their families, the community, and the legal, medical, and social service systems. The PFJCI is not designed to establish new services in the

community, but to integrate existing services under one roof. Therefore, any evaluation would focus on the outcomes associated with co-location and the resulting impact on such measures as victim satisfaction, service usage among the victim population, the number of protection orders issued, the number of successful prosecutions, the amount of time to process criminal cases, among others.

In addition to the Office on Violence Against Women and other federal policymakers, representatives from local communities would be very interested in the results of any evaluation activities. This would include representatives from agencies participating in the PFJCI, who could use the results to generate funds to sustain their efforts, as well as communities considering implementing a Family Justice Center in their own community, who could use the findings to improve services and generate local support.

4. Contacts with National Faculty Members

A national faculty was established by the Office on Violence Against Women to advise the San Diego Family Justice Center Foundation in its role as the primary technical assistance provider. Before presenting a summary of what was learned, we would like to thank the national faculty members for their candor during our discussions, without which we would not have been able to present the information below.

In general, the national faculty reported that they had not played a significant role in the initiative to date. Their involvement has been limited to attendance at one or more of the following events: a grantee kick-off meeting, a dinner at the Office on Violence Against Women's Annual Symposium, and the 120-day learning exchange in Tampa, FL. In general, faculty members expressed an interest in having a more significant role in the initiative and felt this would be possible with more clarity on the expectations for the faculty and advance notice for events.

Overall, faculty members were positive about the design of the initiative and how it was being managed. Faculty members made a number of observations, based on their familiarity with the project and understanding of individual grantees' implementation plans. Many of their observations focused on potential challenges grantees may face, while others addressed the direction some grantees were taking with their Family Justice Centers. These concerns are summarized below.

- Faculty members questioned whether some of the grantees were developing a FJC with the appropriate philosophical underpinnings. In particular, they felt the criminal justice agencies may have too prominent a role in the FJC. One concern was that the leadership at these centers may not understand the importance of advocacy and may, therefore, not pay as much attention to the confidentiality and autonomy critical to the design of the FJC. A more prevalent concern was that a criminal justice focus may prevent the Family Justice Center from becoming a trusted resource in the community, particularly among immigrant and minority populations who have had issues with the criminal-legal community in the past.
- Similarly, faculty members were concerned with the promotion of San Diego as the model FJC. Although they believed having a model was advantageous for the grantees as they struggle to design their own Family Justice Centers, they were concerned that grantees are not getting sufficient guidance on how much flexibility they have to tailor or modify the approach taken by San Diego to meet their community's needs. This was of

particular concern for sites that were providing services to a community much smaller or less urban than San Diego.

- Faculty members expressed concern that community-based advocates or those trained by community-based advocates may not be the staff doing intake at some Family Justice Centers. Their concern was that law enforcement or another representative from the criminal justice system, untrained volunteers, or other inappropriate staff may perform intake, which would counter any efforts to establish a victim-centered environment upon entry into the Family Justice Center.
- A few faculty members believe that some grantees may have difficulty maintaining local interest in the initiative, because of the time required to plan and design the Family Justice Center. This issue was of more concern for communities that may have created local expectations that a Family Justice Center would be operational soon after award. For these communities, grantees may need assistance in how to market and manage perceptions of the Family Justice Center. A concern was also expressed that wavering local interest can impact sustainment efforts, because contributors may have anticipated a more rapid return on their investment.
- The above issue is related to another challenge identified by a number of faculty members—sustainment of the Family Justice Center. A concern expressed by some faculty members is that because of the time required to become operational, some of the grantees will be in need of alternative sources of funding just as they become operational, which means they won't yet have "proof" of their effectiveness or importance to the community. Another concern was that the need to sustain the Family Justice Centers may result in local competition for resources, particularly if communities are not seeking funding from a diverse array of funding sources (e.g., federal, state, foundation, corporate).

Based on their own experience with community initiatives to address domestic violence, national faculty members were able to identify a number of potential areas of grantee technical assistance, including:

- Providing civil legal assistance (e.g., immigration, landlord/tenant) in addition to assistance with criminal legal actions.
- Diversity and the importance of providing a culturally competent program designed to serve all members of the community. Faculty members felt grantees struggling with this issue may need assistance on how to do outreach in diverse communities.
- How to address tense relationships among partner agencies, particularly between community-based providers and criminal justice and social service agencies. Some grantees may also be in need of assistance addressing relationships between FJC partners and community-based advocates that are not in support of the Family Justice Center.
- Addressing issues around governance, which can include politics, rivalries, and power struggles among partners.
- Designing the actual layout of the FJC to promote confidentiality, safety, and a comfortable atmosphere.
- Design and architecture of the intake data system, including identifying data that may be collected, shared, protected.
- Handling custody, child witnesses, and any other situation where the needs of the mother and child might be at odds.

- Providers who also serve batterers would need assistance on how to manage competing demands between the two populations.

One faculty member suggested that the national technical assistance contractor might want to consider developing a problem-solving function that would allow sites to pose these issues and others and receive free consultation from faculty members and possibly even other grantees on how to address them.

Perceptions of the goals of the PFJCI

National faculty members identified a number of goals for the Family Justice Centers. In particular, faculty members focused on goals for the participating agencies and the system as a whole, believing that co-location could result in less fragmentation of services and, therefore, less duplication of services and easier access to services. Some faculty members also believed that co-location could produce culture change within organizations, which could produce an increased ability of individual organizations to affect change on their clients (now that they have the support of other service providers) through cross-referrals and an increase in the variety of services accessed by victims.

National faculty members also felt that Family Justice Centers have the potential to have a profound impact on victims in the community. For example, the availability of a center in the community could result in an increase in the number of victims seeking help; the number of women who access services, particularly multiple services; and promote economic restoration and other changes that are likely to give victims the confidence to take criminal or civil legal action and/or to remove themselves and their families from the violent situation.

The anticipated long-term goals identified by faculty members included a reduction in domestic violence and domestic violence-related crimes, an increase in offender accountability, and a decrease in the number of children who witness domestic violence or go on to commit violent acts themselves.

Faculty members also believed that the public awareness and educational activities in which some of the Family Justice Centers plan to engage may produce an increased awareness of domestic violence in the community and, in some cases, a culture change that could result in the community being more supportive of victims seeking help.

A number of faculty members identified a goal for the entire initiative, which is to promote replication of FJC in other communities across the country.

Some of the faculty members also identified potential unintended consequences of the Family Justice Center Initiative, which could include:

- over-management of victims to the point where they lose all decision-making autonomy;
- some victims in the community do not feel comfortable visiting the Family Justice Center and are therefore receiving less services than they had in the past; and
- use of the Family Justice Center as a tool to increase victim involvement with the criminal-legal community.

A number of faculty members felt strongly that the goal of the FJC should not be as a broker for victim involvement in the CJ system (i.e., to increase the number of criminal cases or women involved in prosecution) and feared the goals of the Center would be driven by which agency is leading the Family Justice Center.

Faculty members also identified a number of key elements they believed critical to the success of the Family Justice Center, the primary one being the actual co-location of services. Other critical elements identified include the process of informing victims of services; the climate of the Family Justice Center; victim autonomy; pooling resources across providers; changes to policies and procedures to promote a standardized response; community education; timely provision of services; and, when referring, the provision of an actual referral—not just handing a victim a card.

The impression among most faculty members is that it would take time for grantees to realize these goals, namely three to five years or longer.

Perceptions of an evaluation of the PFJCI

In terms of an evaluation, most faculty members reported that an evaluation should include a process and outcome assessment, particularly since many did not feel the field could wait for the results of an impact evaluation. They felt process assessments should facilitate replication and focus on systems and cultural change, which would provide a context for any outcome or impact evaluation. One member suggested doing network interviews with the various actors in the system (both within and outside the Family Justice Center) to compare experiences providing and marketing services before and after the implementation of a FJC. A number of faculty members believe this or any other strategy for measuring changes to the process is the only way to help explain the difference between co-location and how the various services were provided in the community before the FJC. The faculty was fairly unanimous in the need to hear from victims (both clients and non-clients of FJC) through focus groups or victim surveys. Many also felt strongly about including focus groups with advocates (both those involved in the Family Justice Center and not) and looking at community perceptions.

When asked about an impact evaluation, some faculty members were concerned with the identification of impact measures (i.e., the focus would be only on criminal justice outcomes), while others were concerned with the length of time required to measure changes in outcomes and whether evaluation participants and the field would be patient.

Some of the faculty members had spent some time thinking about potential impact measures, which are listed below:

- Service usage;
- victim safety;
- number of cross-referrals;
- DV-related serious crime rates;
- DV-related homicides;
- calls for services;
- the number of successful prosecutions;
- time it took to prosecute case;
- temporary/permanent protection orders requested/issued;
- batterers completing batterer intervention programs;
- status of relationship between victim and partner; and
- victim quality of life.

Other outcome measures identified included looking at the impact of the Family Justice Center on children of victims, while other members were interested in community change, specifically on community knowledge and perceptions of domestic violence as a social problem. Other faculty members were interested in systems change, which might include measuring how well services

are linked; changes in the variety of services offered; how smooth the transition is from one service to the other; and how much autonomy women have in the process. A few faculty members expressed an interest in looking at cost-savings through less duplication of services. A smaller minority felt that the measures used should cover impacts on victims, the community, and batterers (not just any single group) to avoid misinterpreting the impact of the program. For example, there was concern that measuring impact only on victims and not batterers would exclude the impact an increase in prosecution had on the self-sufficiency of victims and their need to access other government and non-profit services (e.g., public assistance).

When asked about the feasibility of a national evaluation, most faculty members felt there was enough similarity across sites (in terms of major goals) to support a cross-site comparison, but cautioned there were also a number of differences across sites (which could be measured as “doses”—critical components or activities implemented). One member went on to argue that part of making the FJC concept a successful one is by demonstrating that there are elements of FJC that are applicable across communities.

National faculty members reported that the primary audience for an evaluation of the PFJCI would include OVW and the grantees themselves, but other interested parties might include non-profit agencies involved in the battered women’s movement, Congress, providers in other communities interested in implementing Family Justice Centers, and those who are cynical of the FJC movement.

5. Evaluability Assessment

5.1. County of Alameda, CA

1. Grantee

County of Alameda

LAV: Family Violence Law Center

Duration: 1/01/2005 – 6/30/2006

Current Award: \$1,227,250; LAV \$149,967

Funding History: None

Information is based on a review of the grant application and conference call with Nancy O'Malley (Chief Assistant District Attorney for Alameda County) that took place on 3/25/05.

2. Project Summary

This is a project with the goal of providing services, protection, and choices to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, elder abuse, and stalking, to enhance victim safety and increase offender accountability. The grantee hopes to design the FJC to ease the confusion, intimidation, and stress for victims of domestic violence who are proceeding through the court system, reduce the residual trauma to victims during the reporting and investigation process, readily provide victims of domestic violence with the services they need to end the cycle of violence, and ease the burden on victims by streamlining and coordinating services between the various partners. A significant portion of the grant award (a little over 45%) is to support personnel who will be managing and staffing the center. This includes a project coordinator, security coordinator, volunteer coordinator, office manager, and administrative assistant. The remainder of the award is to support travel, equipment, supplies, rent, and consultant costs (including a consultant to create a case management system).

The County of Alameda is the lead agency taking fiscal responsibility for the grant, and has donated a county building for the FJC. The Alameda County District Attorney's Office (DA) has been taking the lead on implementing the grant. Alameda County, and the DA in particular, have a long history of bringing together government and non-government entities to increase safety for victims and accountability for offenders in domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking cases. Beginning in 1992, the DA formed a number of specialized units joining district attorneys, investigators, and victim advocates in the prosecution of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and elder abuse cases. The DA also created the first Victim-Witness Assistance Program in the state. The County saw the opportunity to implement a FJC as the way to begin to truly coordinate relevant government and non-government agencies to provide comprehensive services to domestic violence victims and their families.

As outlined in the grant application, the proposed goals of the project are to: (1) help domestic violence victims and their children live safe, violence free, and healthy lives by (a) providing victim safety at all times, (b) appropriate psycho social services, (c) opportunities to work towards becoming independent and self-sufficient, (d) providing stronger offender accountability, and (e) easing the confusion, intimidation, and stress for victims proceeding through the court system; and (2) helping to break the cycle of intergenerational victimization or domestic violence and

leading to a violence free community by providing services to address the needs of children who witness or experience violence.

A number of government and non-government service providers signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) committing them to support the implementation of a Family Justice Center. Partners who signed the MOU include: Oakland Police Department, Oakland Police Clergy Together, Alameda County Association of Chiefs of Police, the Sheriff and District Attorney representing all seventeen police departments in Alameda County, Oakland Department of Human Services, Family Violence Law Center, Alameda County Bar Association Volunteer Legal Services Corporation, UC Berkeley Boalt Hall School of Law, East Bay Community Law Center, the Women Lawyers of Alameda County, Charles Houston Bar Association, International Institute of the East Bay, SAVE shelter, A Safe Place, Building Futures for Women and Children Shelter, Emergency Shelter Program, the Bay Area Women Against Rape (BAWAR), Safe Exchange, Safe Passages, the Alameda County Medical Center, Departments of Medical Social Work, Substance Abuse Treatment Services and Emergency Medicine, Children's Hospital & Research Center at Oakland, the National Latino Health Organization, the Alameda County Domestic Violence Collaborative, the CALICO Center, the Oakland Private Industry Council, the Legal Language Access project, Alameda County District Attorney's Office, Alameda County Sheriff's Department, Alameda County Social Services Agency, Alameda County Health Care Services Agency, Alameda County Department of Probation, Alameda County Department of Child Support Services, and the General Services Administration. The grantee said that there are other agencies that are being added to the MOU.

The DA will be hiring the staff that will be assigned to the FJC, and is planning to relocate some of its staff to the FJC. A number of other partners plan to provide on-site staff support, including the Oakland Police Department, Family Violence Law Center, BAWAR, Children's Hospital, Alameda County Behavioral Health, Alameda County Social Services Agency, Maternal, Child, and Adolescent Health, Alameda County Medical Center, Alameda County Department of Probation, Alameda County Sheriff's Office, CALICO, Deaf-Hope, A Safe Place, Building Futures for Women and Children, East Bay Law Clinic, Oakland Private Industry Council, and Allen Temple Baptist Church (this list reflects new partners).

The grantee plans to provide the following services on-site: central intake, assistance with police reports and restraining order paperwork, safety planning, investigations, referral for shelter and emergency housing, legal representation, civil legal assistance, dating violence education, peer support groups and parenting classes, 24-hour crises line, food and transportation vouchers, medical care, forensic exams, referral for on-going care, crises intervention for children exposed to domestic violence, assistance with public assistance, rape crises services, counseling for victims and children, probation information regarding the batterer, legal advocacy, child care, mental health and substance abuse assessments and referral for treatment, interpretation and translation services, faith-based services, and job training. Additional services will be available through referral (e.g., shelter, on-going medical care).

3. Initial Project Screening

Is the grantee interested in being evaluated?

Yes.

Is there a local evaluation? If so, summarize methods and findings.

The grantee is planning for evaluation assistance from a few sources. First, part of its contract with a strategic planner is for the planner to provide strategic implementation updates, which will serve as a form of self-evaluation for the grantee. The grantee is also currently negotiating with a local social scientist and Kaiser Hospital Foundation to conduct evaluation activities pro bono. The grantee has asked both the researcher and Foundation to provide suggestions as to how they might contribute to an evaluation of the initiative.

What is the background/history of this project?

The grantee pointed out that Alameda County was one of the first to start batterer intervention programming and continues to be at the forefront of developing specialized and coordinated responses to domestic violence (e.g., specialized units in the DA's Office). However, the grantee also discussed the results of an assessment that was done of access to domestic violence services in the county. The assessment found that women had to go to 25 different agencies to get the various services she might be interested in. It also found that women were more likely to continue going to one type of service provider and not seek other services in the community. For example, the study identified a number of cases where women filed and went to court for civil restraining orders without ever having a criminal complaint issued. What this told the grantee was that the relationships were there, but the coordination was not; i.e., the county was not doing a good job offering comprehensive services. The County decided that a FJC would help them correct this problem.

At what stage of implementation is it?

At the time of our contact, the grantee was in the early implementation phase. It was undergoing the NEPA review, and hoping OVW will give approval for them to start wiring and making other minor renovations to the space while they awaited final approval. O'Malley expected to have a final draft of their strategic plan by April 15, 2005. At the time of this discussion, the grantee was also in the process of hiring staff (including a project director) and asking off-site partners to specify language for a revised MOU. It has also been and will continue to conduct survivor focus groups to help inform the design of the FJC. The grantee's plan is to conduct 8-10 focus groups with 10-12 survivors participating in each. The grantee has also done one focus group with approximately 35 members of the clergy.

The grantee expects to be open and operational in mid to late June 2005, assuming the building renovations are not delayed. It also plans to locate a hub Family Justice Center in Oakland and a satellite FJC in Fremont.

When do they anticipate being fully operational?

The grantee anticipates opening the doors of the FJC in Oakland in June 2005 and hopes to serve approximately 6,000 clients a year. It bases this number on the number of domestic violence cases being handled in the criminal justice system, the number of restraining orders issued, and the volume of visitors to the Family Violence Law Center.

Describe staffing.

Until a project director is hired, Nancy O'Malley (Chief Assistant District Attorney) will continue to lead the implementation of the FJC. She relies on a core group of partners to discuss most

decisions (e.g., hiring the strategic planner), but otherwise uses multiple forms of information dissemination to ensure all partners (on and off-site) remain involved. The core group of partners includes the strategic planner, representatives from the Family Violence Law Center, a former victim advocate, and a representative from the shelter community. There are also a number of working groups partners self-selected to participate on. The working groups are organized around the following areas: survivor focus groups, strategic planning, security/safety, children services, fund development, and facilities.

Partners are kept involved in planning and implementation activities through the 3 or 4 all-day meetings, two all day grantee strategic planning sessions, bi-monthly newsletters, e-mail, a list-serve hosted on the initiative's website (www.glensprice.com), and by posting information, updates, and materials for review on the website.

A management team (still being formed) will serve as an advisory board to the project director. The board will consist of approximately 10 people, including representatives from the DA's Office (O'Malley), the shelter community, the batterer intervention program, the disability field, Oakland Police Department, Alameda County Sheriff, Family Violence Law Center, and Children's Hospital.

The grantee anticipates there will eventually be about 90 staff working at the FJC on a full or part-time basis. The staff will include full-time FJC staff (the project coordinator, security coordinator, and volunteer coordinator (had planned to hire support staff and an office manager, but these positions will be funded by the City of Oakland's Human Resources Department) and relocated staff, which will include domestic violence and elder abuse prosecutors, at least one victim advocate, at least one staff-person from the victim-witness program, and 2-3 inspectors from the DA's Office; the special victims unit (40 staff) from the Oakland Police Department; 6 attorneys and 2 paralegals from the Family Violence Law Center to provide civil legal assistance; a legal clinic staffed by interns from Boalt School of Law; 1 part-time attorney from the International Institute of East Bay to provide training on immigration assistance and help staff the clinic; 7 staff from BAWAR to provide rape crises services; 2 staff from Children's Hospital and Research Center at Oakland (DOVES) to provide crises intervention, assessment, and counseling services for children exposed to violence; staff from two other partners for children's services (new partners); staff from the Alameda County Department of Behavioral Health to do substance abuse and mental health assessments; someone from Social Services to do a preliminary assessment of benefits; staff from Maternal, Child, and Adolescent Health to link victims to cash assistance and vouchers; a physician assistant from Alameda County Medical Center to coordinate domestic violence and sexual assault forensic exams; a probation officer from the Department of Probation to link the FJC to information from the batter intervention program; 2 officers from the Alameda County Sheriff to provide on-site security; trained interviewers from CALICO to staff a forensic child interview room, which will also be used for elderly victims and victims with disabilities; staff from Deaf-Hope to provide services to victims who are deaf; representatives from two shelters that will link victims to any of the shelters in the county; an attorney 2 ½ days a week from the East Bay Law Center to provide non-DV related legal assistance; staff to provide on-site job training from the Oakland Private Industry Council; and a clergy coordinator from Allen Temple Baptist Church to coordinate faith-based services. (The above represents changes to the MOU submitted with the grant).

Describe stability of the program over time.

The program has not provided services to date.

Describe the target population.

The target population will include victims of domestic violence and domestic violence-related sexual assault and stalking. A special emphasis will also be placed on victims of elder abuse and women with disabilities. The grantee is also very focused on providing services to children exposed to violence in the home. The County implemented a Child Advocacy Center (CAC) and the grantee plans to replicate some of the services provided by the CAC at the FJC.

What are project's outcome goals in the view of the project director?

According to the grantee, the goal of the Center is to provide all victims with an array of services that are available to them at a single location. This will make services easier to access and increase the likelihood that victims will seek multiple services, which the grantee hopes will increase victim self-sufficiency. The grantee hopes to encourage self-sufficiency by offering services that expand beyond crises intervention, for example, job training, emergency housing, and assistance accessing public assistance. The grantee believes the FJC will also result in less domestic violence-related deaths because of the increased self-sufficiency among the population. The grantee is also very focused on the impact of the FJC on children and teenagers. It plans to help children and teenagers deal with the psychological issues in their lives through counseling and therapy services that address issues that go beyond the exposure to violence.

The grantee also believes the FJC will result in increased coordination among the partner agencies and result in a more efficient system. The grantee believes that having advocates working with police and prosecutors will improve the system's response and the sensitivity of the people working within that system. The grantee also believes that if survivors are treated more respectfully, the result may be more successful civil and criminal actions.

Does the personnel/director describe key project elements?

The grantee believes that a critical component of the FJC is having advocates working at the FJC, because it ensures that the initial response is victim-centered. The grantee also believes that being able to conduct mental health, substance abuse, and other assessments on-site is important because it allows the FJC to provide a more effective response. The grantee also believes providing childcare is important because victims will not come to the FJC if they are not confident their kids will be safe.

Do they describe how the project's primary activities contribute to the goals?

Since the services that will be available at the FJC have always been available in the community, how they contribute to the goals of the FJC is directly related to how those same services are provided at the FJC. The grantee described the following as critical to the effective design and implementation of the FJC:

- A safe environment for victims and their children;
- comfortable and non-threatening atmosphere;
- easy flow through the FJC; that is, the grantee wants clients to maneuver through the center on their own without escort; and,
- confidentiality in terms of where clients are going and what services they are accessing.

For example, they are considering putting colored lines on the floor to direct clients to particular types of services and will be keeping the name of the building as Central Health Building and not renaming it the Family Justice Center.

Can you sketch the logic by which activities affect goals?

Alameda Family Justice Center Logic Model

<u>Inputs</u>	<u>Activities</u>	<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Impacts</u>	<u>Goals</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •On-site partners •Intake systems •Client management process •Space design •Site location 	<p><u>FLC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Case management •Assistance with restraining orders •Assistance with police reports •Legal assistance •Advocacy •Medical care •Forensic exams •Assessments and referral for treatment •Counseling •Safety planning •Emergency food/cash/transportation •Referral for shelter and other on-going care •Assistance with public assistance •24-hour helpline •Parenting classes •Child care •Rape crises services •Faith-based services •Job training •Translation services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Early intervention and prevention programming •FJC informational materials <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Collaboration between government and non-gov't providers •Improve access to batterer information 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase likelihood to access services •Increase demand for services •Increase usage of services •Increase frequency of cross-referrals or use of multiple services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase knowledge of DV/SA/Elder Abuse •Increase awareness of services available <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve DV policies and procedures •Increase understanding of each other's services •Increase coordination of services 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reduce tendency to blame oneself for abuse •Reduce conditions prevent women from leaving •Increase likelihood of reporting incident •Increase likelihood of request for temporary/permanent restraining orders •Increase likelihood of participating in prosecution <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase awareness of FJC •Decrease social tolerance for VAW <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve institutional response to DV •Decrease secondary trauma •Increase assurance of victim safety •Increase the number of successful criminal legal actions •Increase the number of successful civil legal actions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease incidents of DV <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decreased repeat victimizations •Decreased seriousness •Hold offenders accountable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease repeat offenders •Break cycle of violence

Is the logic supported by empirical evidence?

The Family Justice Center initiative does not change the services previously available in the community through government and non-government agencies, but changes the way in which the same services are being offered to victims and their families. Although the benefits of accessing specific services have been studied, the Family Justice Center concept offers an opportunity to examine whether co-location produces a synergy or additional benefits (intended and unintended) to victims, their families, and the community, as well as to the participating agencies and the system itself. An evaluation of the PFJCI would help provide this kind of evidence.

Are there apparent contradictions or conflicts between certain activities and outcomes expected?

There are no apparent contradictions.

What data systems exist that would facilitate an evaluation?

The grantee is talking to a vendor about developing a data system, but has been waiting to see if San Diego is going to provide its system as a prototype. Although this is a way to save funds, the grantee is also wondering if it should not move ahead because the NNEDV training identified some weaknesses of San Diego's intake system.

What are the key data elements that are contained in these systems?

Although the grantee is still in its design phase, it does know that it plans to keep the data collected through the intake system to a minimum. It will be collected at the client level and include some identifier (that will match to names through another system), demographics, service information, follow-up information, and potentially some other variables the grantee has not decided on yet, including measures that might shed light on cost (e.g., how long it took to get a restraining order). After a recent call with NNEDV, the grantee is aware of the importance of keeping shared information very limited. Although the partners will have access to the intake system, the grantee is not going to network with partner databases; each partner will be responsible for maintaining their own protected case management systems.

The grantee also mentioned it has to include variables to respond to OVW progress reports and the reporting required by the California legislature (it has not identified these variables yet).

Some of the variables identified clearly would have to come from victims, but the grantee has not decided how best to collect information from victims (e.g., survey or focus groups) and partners have different opinions on which options would provide the most reliable information.

Are there data to estimate unit costs of services or activities?

See above.

Are there data about possible comparison samples?

It is unclear at this time, without getting more information on partner databases.

In general, how useful are data systems to an impact evaluation

Until the grantee completes the design of its data system, it is not possible to determine this at this point.

5.2. Bexar County, TX

1. Grantee

Bexar County

LAV: Texas Rio Grande Legal Aid

Duration: 10/1/2004 – 4/30/2006

Current Award: \$1,216,981; LAV: \$165,000

Funding History: None

Information is based on a review of the grant application, a conversation with Myrta Charles (OVW Program Monitor) that took place on 3/10/05, and a conference call with Bettina Richardson (Executive Director of the Family Justice Center) that took place on 3/18/05.

2. Project Summary

This is a project with the primary purpose of expanding existing efforts between law enforcement, prosecution, non-profit, faith-based, and other non-governmental victim advocacy groups to investigate and prosecute incidents of domestic violence, as well as offer assistance to those in crises by centralizing and co-locating these entities. Roughly a third of the grant award is to support personnel who will be managing and staffing the center (an executive director, two intake advocates, an office assistant, and systems program manager). Remaining funds are to support travel, equipment (computer equipment and office furniture), supplies, construction costs, a case management system, and rent.

The grantee views the opportunity to implement a Family Justice Center as a way to apply the success it has had addressing child victims of abuse to victims of domestic violence. Its work with child victims of abuse began in the 1980s when city and county leaders, local citizens, and several agencies dedicated to keeping children safe from abuse and neglect came together and formed the Interagency Child Abuse Network (ICAN). Through ICAN, the University Health Center—Downtown Clinic became the Alamo Children’s Advocacy Center, which provides a one-stop location for medical and counseling services, as well as offers assistance from the Texas Department of Protective and Regulatory Services/Child Protective Services, San Antonio Police Department, and the District Attorney’s Office. The Family Justice Center will be located in the same building where the Child Advocacy Center was first located and includes many of the same partners who have been working together for over twenty years through ICAN.

As outlined in the grant application, the proposed goals of the project are to: (1) improve access to the array of services for victims of domestic violence; (2) integrate information systems and data collection regarding domestic violence; (3) develop culturally-competent education and prevention strategies for domestic violence with an emphasis on breaking the cycle of domestic violence with children who witness it; and (4) create a Bexar County Domestic Violence Council and 501c(3) foundation.

A number of government and non-government service providers signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) committing them to work with the City to support the implementation of a Family Justice Center. Partners who signed the MOU include: Bexar County District Attorney’s Office, San Antonio Police Department, Bexar County Sheriff’s Office, University Health System, Texas Rio Grande Legal Aid, Family Violence Prevention Services, Rape Crises Center, San Antonio City Attorney, Patrician Movement, Department of Family and Protective Services,

Center Health Care Services, Catholic Charities, San Antonio Community of Churches, SAMMinistries, Gay & Lesbian Community Center of San Antonio, Christus Santa Rosa, and Alamo Area Resource Center.

The grantee plans to have over 35 staff plus volunteers working at the FJC. New staff that will be hired by the District Attorney's Office include an executive director, two intake advocates, office assistant, and systems program manager (the grantee is currently negotiating with OVW to hire a program manager instead of two intake advocates). A number of other partners plan to provide support staff, including the Bexar County District Attorney (10 advocates, 2 attorneys, and a misdemeanor intake attorney); San Antonio Police Department (its Crises Response Team unit, a detective liaison, and a full-time representative from the Family Assistance Crises Team); Bexar County Sheriff (a crime victim liaison); Texas Rio Grande Legal Aid (a full-time attorney and a paralegal); Family Violence Prevention Services (four bilingual counselors to serve as outreach specialist to do risk assessments and safety plans); Rape Crises Center (a full-time staff member); San Antonio City Attorney (a part-time intake prosecutor); Patrician Movement (one staff member to provide chemical dependency treatment services); Department of Family and Protective Services (a counselor on a rotational basis); Catholic Charities (on-site childcare offered as needed); Community of Churches (a full-time chaplain to provide services and coordinate volunteers); SAMMinistries (one case worker on call); Gay & Lesbian Community Center (a full-time case manager). Additionally, the Center will be located in the University Health Systems building along with various other agencies that can provide on-site care, including behavioral and substance abuse treatment through the Center for Health Care Services; WIC services through CHRISTUS Santa Rosa; and food pantry, computer training, and transportation through Alamo Area Resource Center.

It is the grantee's expectation that all of the partners will fulfill the commitments described in the MOU, which will enable them to provide the following services on site: intake; assistance completing police reports and obtaining protection orders; medical and health services; assistance with public assistance; civil legal services; crises intervention and counseling; military victim advocates; emergency shelter and transitional housing; chemical dependency treatment; behavioral health and substance abuse treatment; on-site child care; WIC services; food and transportation; faith-based counseling; and referral for support groups and Texas Workforce Centers.

3. Initial Project Screening

Is the grantee interested in being evaluated?

The grantee believes evaluation is very important. The director has been talking to two researchers in the Violence Prevention Center at the University of Texas Health Services Center School of Nursing. The director said that the researchers (and their interns) are willing to provide evaluation assistance pro bono. The director said that both researchers are committed to helping the grantee in some way, but she is still negotiating with them on the specific services they will provide.

Is there a local evaluation? If so, summarize methods and findings.

The director would like the researchers to help them decide on outcome measures and the best way to collect the data. She plans on using a pilot data system for the first six months, so they can continue to make revisions (e.g., applying input from the researchers) before finalizing the data system.

What is the background/history of this project?

The director described Bexar County as an extremely collaborative community, not only in domestic violence, but in other areas as well. However, the collaborations that have taken place to improve the community's response to domestic violence have been informal and focused more on city and county agency resource efficiency than making it easier for victims. After working to implement a Child Advocacy Center (CAC) in the community, agencies began to realize the strength in numbers and wanted to bring this approach to domestic violence in the community. The FJC provides them with the opportunity to implement the same one-stop collaborative approach to a different population. Many of the same organizations that are involved in the CAC are working on the FJC initiative.

At what stage of implementation is it?

At the time of our contact, the grantee was in the early implementation stage. It has a facility that has received NEPA clearance and is in the process of renovating it. In the meantime, it was finishing the design of their intake system and working with OVW to make some adjustments to the budget (they would like to hire a program manager to manage the different grants instead of the two intake advocates). The grantee was also in the process of drafting the policy and procedures manuals, confidentiality agreement, data sharing plan, and information disclosure form. The director is sharing all of these plans with the on-site partners to get feedback before finalizing.

When do they anticipate being fully operational?

The director plans to open the doors of the FJC in May 2005. She expects the FJC to serve a minimum of 3,500 victims and feels this number can grow to as high as 5,000 a year.

The grantee anticipates opening and marketing the center in two phases. The first phase will target the population of victims currently seeking protection orders (3,500 a year), by referring all victims seeking protection orders to the FJC. During this time period, other partners will also be able to refer existing clients that need follow-up and clients who walk into their agencies seeking services they can't provide. This would be the primary population for the first four months. The second phase would begin after this initial period and involve intensive marketing through TV, radio, and print advertisements, as well as through Walmart and other major food chains.

Describe staffing.

The planning and implementation of the grant has been a solo operation by the director to date. She said that she is able to call representatives from the partner agencies at any time for input (she said they don't mind that the DA's Office has been taking the lead). Although the director does not host partner meetings, she keeps partners informed on relevant issues, for example, service provision, intake procedures, and data sharing concerns.

The grantee anticipates there will be 35-40 people working on-site at the FJC, not including volunteers. This number includes the staff hired by the DA's Office through the grant, which includes the executive director, an office assistant, program manager, and information systems program manager. Partners relocating staff include: the Bexar County District Attorney (10 advocates, 2 attorneys, and a misdemeanor intake attorney); San Antonio Police Department (its Crises Response Team unit, a detective liaison, and a full-time representative from the Family

Assistance Crises Team); Bexar County Sheriff's Department (a crime victim liaison); Texas Rio Grande Legal Aid (a full-time attorney and a paralegal); Family Violence Prevention Services (four bilingual counselors to serve as outreach specialist to do risk assessments and safety plans); Rape Crises Center (a full-time staff member); San Antonio City Attorney (part-time intake prosecutor); Patrician Movement (one staff member to provide chemical dependency treatment services); Department of Family and Protective Services (a counselor on a rotational basis); Catholic Charities (on-site childcare as needed); Community of Churches (a full-time chaplain to provide services and coordinate volunteers); SAMMinistries (one case worker on call); Gay & Lesbian Community Center (a full-time case manager); DOD victim advocates from Randolph AFB, Fort Sam Houston AB, Brooks AFB, and Kelly AFB; and Baptist Child and Family Services (at least one counselor to provide parenting classes). Additionally, because the Center will be located in the University Health Systems building other services will be available on site to clients, including behavioral and substance abuse treatment through the Center for Health Care Services; WIC services through CHRISTUS Santa Rosa; and assistance with food pantry, computer training, and transportation through Alamo Area Resource Center.

Describe stability of the program over time.

The program has not provided services to date.

Describe the target population.

The target population includes victims of domestic violence and domestic-violence related sexual assault living in the San Antonio metropolitan area. The grantee also views domestic violence as a family issue and is interested in serving the whole family that has been exposed to violence.

What are project's outcome goals in the view of the project director?

The director believes the primary goal of the FJC is to change the way services are provided to victims. Currently the many services that are available to victims are fragmented. The goal of the FJC is to bring these services together and serve the entire family, which will allow for more unification and increase family strength. For the victim, the director believes the FJC will help to recognize and validate the challenges she and her family face, and empower her to make changes in her life. This will decrease the likelihood that children exposed to violence will become victims or perpetrators, therefore breaking the cycle of violence.

The director also believes the Center will result in more collaboration among service providers, enhance the services that are offered, and encourage the client to continue seeking services. She also thinks the FJC will help increase the community's ability to access federal and non-federal funding.

Does the personnel/director describe key project elements?

The director believes the key elements of the FJC are offering victims the ability to obtain protection orders and providing access to counseling services. She believes protection orders are critical because they empower victims, are a reality check for the perpetrators, demonstrate action by the victim, and provide an opportunity for them to leave the situation if they want to. Counseling is important because it supports long-term change and is the least often followed-up referral.

Do they describe how the project’s primary activities contribute to the goals?

As the FJC is being designed, the director believes the most important elements are the safety of the victim and staff, ease of service, and victim’s perception that she is in charge. The director does not want victims to feel that they are being placed on a conveyor belt of services, and are trying to be sold on services whether they like them or not. Her goal is to quickly and painlessly introduce them to what is available and help them develop their own service plan. She believes the FJC needs to be a place that is comfortable and inviting and allows victims to leave with something tangible.

Can you sketch the logic by which activities affect goals?

Bexar County Family Justice Center Logic Model

<u>Inputs</u>	<u>Activities</u>	<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Impacts</u>	<u>Goals</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •On-site partners •Intake systems •Client management process •Space design •Site location 	<p><u>ELC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Case management •Emergency/Permanent restraining orders •Legal assistance •Advocacy •Medical and health assistance •Risk assessments/safety planning •Screening, assessments and treatment •Counseling •Housing assistance •Emergency food/transportation •Referral services •Shelter services •Assistance with public assistance •Child care •Faith-based services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Culturally competent prevention programming •Multi-media campaigns •FJC informational materials •Community trainings •Volunteer programs <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Collaboration between government and non-gov’t providers •Cross-training •Establish/improve tracking systems •Integrate domestic violence Information systems 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increased likelihood to access services •Increase demand for services •Increase usage of services •Increase use of multiple services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase knowledge of DV/SA •Increase awareness of services available <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve DV policies and procedures •Increase understanding of each other’s services •Increase coordination of services •Create Bexar County Domestic Violence Council and 501c(3) foundation 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reduce tendency to blame oneself for abuse •Reduce conditions prevent women from leaving •Increase likelihood of reporting incident •Increase likelihood of request for temporary/permanent restraining orders •Increase likelihood of participating in prosecution <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase awareness of FJC •Decrease social tolerance for VAW •Increase access to federal funding <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve institutional response to DV •Decrease secondary trauma •Increase assurance of victim safety •Increase successful prosecution of batterers •Decrease case processing time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease VAW in the community •Decrease Repeat victimizations •Decrease seriousness •Hold offenders accountable •Decrease repeat offenders •Break the cycle of violence

Is the logic supported by empirical evidence?

The Family Justice Center initiative does not change the services previously available in the community through government and non-government agencies, but changes the way in which the same services are being offered to victims and their families. Although the benefits of accessing specific services have been studied, the Family Justice Center concept offers an opportunity to examine whether co-location produces additional benefits (intended and unintended) to victims, their families, and the community, as well as to the participating agencies and the system itself. An evaluation of the PFJCI would help provide this kind of evidence.

Are there apparent contradictions or conflicts between certain activities and outcomes expected?

There are no apparent contradictions.

What data systems exist that would facilitate an evaluation?

The grantee is in the process of developing an intake system. They plan to use a paper intake form, which will include information OVW requires them to collect, a unique identifier, demographic information, information on the nature of the relationship, family structure, employment, and some outcome information, like whether they ever reported violence before, ever filed a protection order, how they were referred, etc. This information will only be entered into the system if the victim authorizes data entry. If the client does not provide authorization, the grantee will count the client as a visit, but will not input information on the client into the system (The director expects most victims to say yes. Although, this is based on the willingness of victims to input data at the DA's Office when filing for orders of protection). Intake counselors will work with victims to develop a service plan. Services that are provided will be tracked through an exit interview and by the case manager when scheduling follow-up.

Partners will track their own case management information. They will have their own confidential part of the system to make notes or entries, but it will be up to them whether they use it or rely solely on their own systems (which will be available through the network). Partners will have clearance to view certain data elements, for example names, demographics, and date of incident, but will not be able to see any confidential information or the client's service plan.

What are the key data elements that are contained in these systems?

As stated above, the intake system will include data already included on its paper intake forms and any other information required by OVW and other grants. The grantee is also interested in tracking data that will help them self-evaluate the Center, for example, number of clients, numbers of services provided and which ones, whether or not clients return for follow-up visits, and whether clients take advantage of services that are focused more on life enrichment. The grantee also plans to conduct focus groups with clients often to collect information on their experiences and needs that were not fulfilled.

Are there data to estimate unit costs of services or activities?

The director said she had not considered tracking costs, but may consider it.

Are there data about possible comparison samples?

The director was not sure about a possible comparison sample. We talked about victims and families that visit partner agencies, but do not go on to the FJC and whether these cases could be tracked. The director said this might be complicated by the fact that it is up to the victim to be tracked at the FJC and comparing lists of clients can be time consuming (although she did not think it would be in violation of the data sharing agreement).

In general, how useful are data systems to an impact evaluation

In terms of data systems, there will be the intake system maintained by the FJC, which will include basic client information for those who agree to have their information maintained electronically (we don't know at this time how many might refuse); the data systems maintained by each partner agency (some of which are not electronic); and data systems maintained by SAPD Crises Response Teams (CRT). The director identified this last dataset as being potentially useful because it maintains data on victims the CRTs come in contact with and will be referring to the

FJC. The director thought she might be able to task the CRTs with following up with victims to see if they visited the FJCs.

5.3. City of Boston, MA

1. Grantee

City of Boston

LAV: Greater Boston Legal Services, Inc.

Duration: 10/01/2004 – 3/30/2006

Current Award: \$1,046,088; LAV \$165,000

Funding History: None

Information is based on a review of the grant application, a discussion with Anne Hamilton (OVW Program Manager) that took place on 3/29/05, and a conference call with Cathy Greene (Director of the Suffolk County Family Justice Center) that took place on 4/11/05 and 4/14/05.

2. Project Summary

This is a project with the goal of “enhancing the effectiveness of offender accountability and victim services by co-locating them in one building and creating a victim-centered intervention and prevention model that promotes a multi-disciplinary collaboration, cultural competence, information sharing, improved communication, and cross-training.”

The City of Boston is the lead agency taking fiscal responsibility for the grant, and has donated a building for the FJC. The FJC will serve Suffolk County, which has a ten-year history of government and non-government collaborations to provide enhanced services, reduce victimization, and hold batterers accountable. Examples of successful collaborations include the Comprehensive Community Response project and Boston’s No Next Time increased offender monitoring project. The County is also home to the Dorchester Domestic Violence Court where specially trained judges, prosecutors, and probation officers coordinate work to hold offenders accountable and link victims to needed services. In early 2000, a commander in the Boston Police Department’s Domestic Violence Unit became familiar with San Diego’s Family Justice Center and spoke with the Suffolk County District Attorney’s Office (just as it was creating its Family Protection and Sexual Assault Unit) and the City of Boston about the possibility of developing a Family Justice Center in Suffolk County. The group decided to move forward with the concept and the President’s Initiative was announced soon after. The City applied for funding, but planned to move forward with the creation of a Family Justice Center using city funds, regardless of whether federal funds were awarded.

As outlined in the grant application, the proposed goals of the project are to: (1) coordinate existing services for victims to meet their needs for safety, justice, and healing; (2) expand existing efforts between law enforcement officers, prosecutors, non-profit victim advocacy groups, and others to investigate, prosecute, and prevent incidents of domestic violence and sexual assault; (3) develop policies, educational programs, and training for all partners to improve tracking of cases involving domestic violence and sexual assault; (4) centralize and coordinate police enforcement, prosecution, or judicial responsibility for domestic violence cases in groups or units of police officers, prosecutors, probation and parole offices, or judges; and (5) coordinate computer tracking systems to ensure communication between police, prosecutors, parole and probation officers, and criminal and family courts.

A number of government and non-government service providers signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) committing them to support the implementation of a Family Justice Center. Partners who signed the MOU included: Boston Police Department; Chelsea Police

Department; Boston University Police Department; Northeastern University Police; Emmanuel College Police; Emerson College Police; Suffolk County District Attorney's Office; Judicial Oversight Demonstration Project; Probation Department; Department of Corrections; Committee for Public Counsel Services; Boston Area Rape Crises Center; Casa Myrna Vazquez; Elizabeth Stone House; HarborCOV; The Network/La Red; Asian Task Force Against DV; Renewal House; Women's Educational & Industrial Union; Gay Men's DV Project; Boston Medical Center; Child Witness to Violence Project; Massachusetts General Hospital; Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital; Brigham & Women's Hospital; Children's Hospital; Dimock Community Health Center; Fenway Community Health Center; Tufts School of Dentistry; Center for Community Health, Education, Research, & Education; Executive Office of the Governor; Executive Office of Public Safety; Massachusetts Office of Victim Assistance; Massachusetts Commission on the Status of Women; Department of Public Health; Department of Social Services; Department of Transitional Assistance; Department of Revenue; Department of Youth Services; Office of Child Care Services; City of Boston; City of Chelsea; City of Revere; Rep. Peter Katoujian; Greater Boston Legal Services; Victim Rights Law Center; Women's Bar Association; Northeastern Law School; Safe Havens; RELM, Inc.; Children's Advocacy Center of Suffolk County; Massachusetts Prevention of Cruelty to Children; Family Services of Greater Boston; Trauma Center; Association of Haitian Women; Massachusetts Alliance of Portuguese; Common Purpose; International Institute of Boston; Friends of Shattuck Shelter; Close to Home; Link-Up; and Hothouse Productions. Although all of the above agencies signed the MOU, the executive director said that the grantee is in the process of finalizing partners and partnership commitments at this time. Therefore, the commitments made through the MOU that was submitted with the grant application may change as the site becomes operational.

In addition to the staff that will be hired through the grant, the following partners have committed to providing on-site staff: Boston Police Department; Suffolk County District Attorney's Office; Suffolk County Child Advocacy Center; Gay Men's Domestic Violence Program; Dress for Success; Department of Transitional Assistance; The Network/La Red; Phoenix House; Safe Haven; Child Witness Violence Project; Greater Boston Legal Services; and Victim Rights Law Center. The grantee is in the process of committing other partners to provide on-site staff, including: additional community-based domestic violence providers; representatives from the medical community; Family Trauma Center; Child to Witness; Boston Area Rape Crises Center; and the Department of Social Services.

At the time of this report, the grantee was still in the process of confirming commitments from its partner agencies and developing new partnerships. Assuming the executive director's plans are achieved, the grantee will provide the following services on-site: central intake, advocacy, on-site counseling, forensic medical services, specialized care for traumatized children, limited medical services with links to more extensive services, child care, food vouchers/WIC, assistance with police reporting, opportunities to obtain restraining orders, legal services for victims, access to CAC services, faith-based counseling, civil legal assistance, referrals to emergency housing, referrals for substance abuse and mental health treatment, rape crises services, and volunteers with training in dynamics of domestic violence.

3. Initial Project Screening

Is the grantee interested in being evaluated?

Yes.

Is there a local evaluation? If so, summarize methods and findings.

The grantee included funds in its grant application to support local evaluation activities, but these funds were not awarded. The director said she did not pursue a local evaluation further because OVW told the grantees that any evaluation would be handled at the national level.

What is the background/history of this project?

As stated above, Suffolk County has been developing a strong coordinated community response to domestic violence for the past ten years. It was one of the first to develop specialized domestic violence units in social service and welfare departments. It also participated in the Judicial Oversight Demonstration Initiative, has family violence units within the police departments and District Attorney's office, has had a Child Advocacy Center for the past ten years, and created one of the first domestic violence specialty courts. Therefore, it has a strong foundation from which to build a Family Justice Center. Additionally, it has had the support of the City of Boston, the Boston Police Department, and Suffolk County District Attorney's Office from the beginning. As stated earlier, the City planned to move forward with the initiative regardless of the outcome of its request for federal funding. The sponsors viewed the Family Justice Center as a way to formalize the informal networking and collaborations that had been occurring across government and non-government service providers through committee and commissions.

At what stage of implementation is it?

The director submitted FJC recommendations to the District Attorney's Office on March 22, 2005 for the District Attorney's review and approval (in consultation with the Boston Police Department and the Mayor's Office). The director is waiting for approval from the District Attorney before the grantee can begin developing policies, procedures, forms, data systems, etc. She is also considering hiring contractual staff to assist in the implementation of the recommendations, having recognized the amount of free time working group members dedicated to develop the recommendations. In the meantime, she has scheduled a meeting with all the partners for April 25, 2005 to provide a project update, and a timeline and benchmarks that would need to be met in order to open the Suffolk County FJC in July 2005. The grantee has also begun renovations at the site, and has almost completed the NEPA clearance process.

The director pointed out that the next two weeks will help to inform the grantee's next steps. In particular, the outcome of the decisions on the working group recommendations will be important to the direction the FJC will be taking. Second, the grantee is in the process of establishing the FJC as a non-profit and must make some decisions on the composition of the board. The community is concerned that it will not be sufficiently represented on the board, especially if city government officials are making decisions on who should sit on the board. There is also concern that, depending on how the non-profit is organized, that it could impact the ability of other community-based groups to raise funds.

When do they anticipate being fully operational?

The grantee anticipates opening the doors of the FJC in July 2005 and hopes to serve between 250 and 300 clients a month.

Describe staffing.

As stated earlier the District Attorney, Mayor's Office, and Boston Police Department had already decided in November 2003 that it would support the development of a Suffolk County Family Justice Center, even offering the use of a city building rent-free for five years. At that time, however, community-based domestic violence providers had not been engaged in the decision and were not unanimous in their support of a Family Justice Center. When the director began working on the initiative in December 2003, she became aware of this situation and created eleven affinity groups (e.g., law enforcement, community-based advocates, faith-based leaders, criminal justice) and held three three-hour meetings with each group. The first meeting was to identify challenges and barriers to the concept of a FJC and possibilities for overcoming the identified issues. The second meeting took place after the PFJCI RFP was announced and was, therefore, focused on what was needed from the partners to apply for the grant. The third meeting was focused on what next steps would need to be taken to create a FJC (regardless of whether or not the city received federal funds). The director took the feedback from these meetings and made recommendations to the District Attorney's Office, which was spearheading the initiative at the time.

In April 2004, the grantee began planning a conference to bring all the partners together to begin problem-solving some of the issues and concerns that had been identified by the affinity groups. The director and strategic planner named a conference planning committee of approximately 15 people that reflected a cross-section of the different partners. The conference was held in June 2004 and included 72 people. Unfortunately, the conference did not go as planned and a small minority of partners (some of whom were represented on the planning committee) used the conference as an opportunity to protest the creation of a FJC and circulate petitions at the conference. Generally, this group included mainstream community-based domestic violence service providers. [The director said she is trying to get these groups on board as partners, but has not been entirely successful. However, representatives from some of these agencies have volunteered to sit on some of the working groups tasked with issues they are concerned about, e.g., fund raising, confidentiality, central intake, etc.]

Despite the protests that occurred during the conference, the conference planners were able to get the attendees to identify eleven areas of concern that should be addressed during the planning of the FJC. The conference attendees also nominated leaders (co-leaders in some cases) for each working group who would be responsible for leading discussions of the issues/concerns raised and making recommendations to the District Attorney on how they should be handled. The eleven areas were collapsed into the following seven working groups: confidentiality and central intake; governance and fund raising; site development; cultural responsiveness; kids and adolescence; the intersection of domestic violence and child abuse; and overarching principles of the FJC. The director oversees the working groups and attends all the meetings. The strategic planner attends some of the meetings, as needed. Working groups met between September 2004 and January 2005 to develop recommendations that were submitted to the District Attorney on March 22, 2005.

The director created a process management team that will work in consultation with the strategic planner and the learning exchange team. The team is made up of 12-15 people and includes representatives from the police, district attorney, Child Advocacy Center, Jane Doe (a coalition of all domestic violence programs), two community-based on-site partners, two off-site healthcare partners, two state agencies, and civil legal services. The director is hoping the team will provide guidance as the grantee begins implementation of the FJC and alert her to concerns that are being raised in the community.

The District Attorney, Boston Police Department, and Mayor's Office will continue to have oversight of the grant and final decision-making power.

At present, the director anticipates there will be 75 on-site partners and 15 volunteers working at the Family Justice Center. This number includes the Family Justice Center staff that will be hired through the grant. Although the executive director is still finalizing staffing, she believes the following positions will be supported through the grant: executive director, administrative assistant, central intake person, development director, child-care specialist, volunteer coordinator, community outreach specialist, and contractors for translators and other similar services. Partners providing staff on-site include: the Boston Police Department's Family Justice Division; prosecutors from the Suffolk County District Attorney's Office; the Suffolk County Child Advocacy Center, counselors from the Gay Men Domestic Violence Program; representative from Dress for Success; representatives from the Department of Transitional Assistance; counselors from The Network/La Red; counselors from Phoenix House; faith-based counselors from Safe Haven; service providers from Child Witness Violence Project; probate attorneys from Greater Boston Legal Services to assist victims of domestic violence with housing, immigration, and benefits issues; and attorneys from Victim Rights Law Center to provide civil and legal assistance to victims of sexual assault. The grantee is currently working with additional community-based domestic violence programs to incorporate an emergency housing component; the medical community to include a SANE and PediaSANE program; Family Trauma Center to include mental health and substance abuse referrals; Child to Witness Program to oversee child care; the Boston Area Rape Crises Center to provide crises response to rape victims; and a representative from the Department of Social Services' Domestic Violence Unit.

Describe stability of the program over time.

The program has not provided services to date.

Describe the target population.

The target population will include victims of domestic violence and domestic violence-related sexual assault and their families. Additionally, because the CAC will be co-located at the Family Justice Center, the target population will include victims of child abuse.

What are project's outcome goals in the view of the project director?

According to the executive director, the goal of the Family Justice Center is to allow clients to be able to walk in and access all the services s/he needs or wants, whether on-site or through coordinated referrals. Part of achieving this goal is making each client's service plan individualized and not require victims to access specific services. It is also important that victim's feel that accessing services has been made easier through the FJC.

From a systems point of view, the grantee is hoping the FJC will help break down barriers that exist between agencies, particularly criminal justice and advocacy groups. By addressing the existing tension between agencies, the grantee is hoping agencies will begin to understand what each other do, which will enhance coordination and cross-referrals. For example, the director felt that over time there is the possibility that advocates might even suggest to a victim to seek out criminal justice services.

In terms of long-term impact, the grantee believes that if they are successful with the above, they might begin to see impacts on offender accountability through better coordination and increased

trust in the criminal justice system, which will produce more complaints and follow through on convictions, which will result in a decrease in incidences of domestic violence in the community.

Does the personnel/director describe key project elements?

The grantee believes that a critical component of the FJC is having a central intake system that is able to identify the primary services victims want to access. The executive director also believes that it is important that when the doors open, the FJC is ready to provide desired services to any victim coming to the Center (which requires that all critical on-site services are in place and the FJC is prepared with translators and other needed services to handle victims with language needs, with children, without money, etc.). This is important because the grantee believes that victims and the community won't give the FJC a second chance, especially since the success of the FJC will be built on word of mouth and referrals from off-site providers. In terms of services that should be in place before the FJC opens, the executive director believes the following are vital: emergency response to handle victims in crisis; community-based counseling; child care; access to police; access to the DA's Office; access to civil legal services; access to welfare benefits, housing, vouchers, and transportation; and referral services in case victims are in need of shelter or medical care.

Do they describe how the project's primary activities contribute to the goals?

Since the services that will be available at the FJC have always been available in the community, how they contribute to the goals of the FJC is directly related to how those same services are provided at the FJC. The grantee has two working groups who have made recommendations on the overarching principles for the FJC and on the development of the site, which identify what should be achieved through the design of the FJC and how to make it consistent with what they are trying to accomplish through the FJC. The working groups identified safety as important to site development, as well as that the FJC is physically and aesthetically welcoming, reflective of the community it services, inspires hope, is confidential and private, promotes collaborative work, and reflects a tight-knit community.

Can you sketch the logic by which activities affect goals?

Suffolk County Family Justice Center Logic Model

<u>Inputs</u>	<u>Activities</u>	<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Impacts</u>	<u>Goals</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-site partners Intake systems Client management process Space design Site location 	<p><u>ELC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case management Assistance with protection orders Assistance with police reports Legal assistance Advocacy Forensic medical services Medical assistance Counseling Faith-based services Housing assistance Emergency food/clothing/transportation Referral for treatment services Care for traumatized children Rape crises services Child care Translation services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FJC informational materials Volunteer programs <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaboration between government and non-gov't providers 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase likelihood to access services Increase demand for services Increase usage of services Increase frequency of use of multiple services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase awareness of services available <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve DV policies and procedures Increase understanding of each other's services Increase coordination of services 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce tendency to blame oneself for abuse Reduce conditions prevent women from leaving Increase likelihood of reporting incident Increase likelihood of request for temporary/permanent restraining orders Increase likelihood of participating in prosecution <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase awareness of FJC <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve institutional response to DV Decrease secondary trauma Increase assurance of victim safety Increase successful prosecution of batterers Decrease case processing time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decrease incidents of DV Decrease repeat victimizations Decrease seriousness Hold offenders accountable Decrease repeat offenders Break cycle of violence

Is the logic supported by empirical evidence?

The Family Justice Center initiative does not change the services previously available in the community through government and non-government agencies, but changes the *way* in which the same services are being offered to victims and their families. Although the benefits of accessing specific services have been studied, the Family Justice Center concept offers an opportunity to examine whether co-location produces additional benefits (intended and unintended) to victims, their families, and the community, as well as to the participating agencies and the system itself. An evaluation of the PFJCI would help provide this kind of evidence.

Are there apparent contradictions or conflicts between certain activities and outcomes expected?

There are no apparent contradictions.

What data systems exist that would facilitate an evaluation?

Although a data system has not been developed, the director reported that the central intake working group has made a lot of progress already. For example, the working group conducted an analysis of the laws related to confidentiality and privilege that should be taken into account when designing a system, and applied this information to its recommendations for information sharing, confidentiality protections, and elements that could be incorporated in an intake system. At this point, the director feels they are ready to hire a contractor who can take the principles the working group established and meet with each of the partners to review their intake process, and draft a central intake for the FJC.

What are the key data elements that are contained in these systems?

The director said the grantee is starting to identify variables it does and does not want to be included in an intake system. It has recognized that the information available to the FJC as a non-profit will be less than what is available to its partners who have more protection against subpoena. The grantee has developed a central intake form. The grantee is not tracking information by name. Each client will be assigned an identifier (e.g., April-113), but the identifier will not be linked to the client's name.

Are there data to estimate unit costs of services or activities?

The grantee has not determined this at this time.

Are there data about possible comparison samples?

It is unclear at this time, without getting more information on partner databases.

In general, how useful are data systems to an impact evaluation

Until the grantee completes the design of its data system, it is not possible to determine this at this point.

5.4. Defiance Municipal Court, OH

1. Grantee

Defiance Municipal Court

LAV: Legal Aid of Western Ohio

Duration: 8/01/2004 – 1/31/2006

Current Award: \$1,214,086; LAV \$165,000

Funding History: None

Information is based on a review of the grant application, a conversation with Anne Hamilton (OVW Program Manager) that took place on 3/29/05, and a conference call with Pam Weaner (Managing Attorney, Legal Aid of Western Ohio) that took place on 4/1/05.

2. Project Summary

This is a project with the goal of providing comprehensive centralized services in one location to victims and their families to promote victim safety, perpetrator accountability, and long-term stabilization. The grantee believes that this requires collaboration of partners at the local, regional, state, and federal level. The grantee applied to implement six Family Justice Centers (a hub and five satellites) in different counties in Northwestern Ohio. A small portion (less than 20%) of their award is to support personnel who will be managing and staffing the center. This includes a bi-lingual advocate, two intake specialists (one full-time and one part-time), grant administrator, and three part-time project directors. The remainder of the award is to support travel, equipment (close to half the budget), supplies, renovation, and consultant costs (for training).

There are six counties involved in this initiative: Defiance, Fulton, Henry, Williams, Putnam, and Van Wert. The Municipal Court of Defiance County is the grantee applicant and the FJC in this county will serve as the main FJC. Defiance is also the county with the most experience implementing countywide initiatives to improve its response to victims of domestic violence. For example, in 1993 it created the Defiance County Domestic Violence Task Force, which involved multiple county criminal justice, legal aid, and advocacy groups. The Task Force developed a countywide protocol on domestic violence has trained all relevant county agencies on the protocol and subsequent revisions. More recently, Fulton and Van Wert Counties have developed domestic violence task forces and protocols on domestic violence. The grantee views the FJC initiative as a way to expand these county-specific efforts by developing multi-county protocols, information sharing systems, training, case management processes, and task forces to support the efficient provision of services to victims and their families across the six counties.

As outlined in the grant application, the proposed goals of the project are to create: (1) a Family Justice Center with five satellite facilities; (2) multi-county state of the art information sharing system to coordinate computer tracking systems; (3) multi-county cross disciplinary training; (4) enhanced investigation and prosecution of domestic violence, stalking, sexual assault, and enforcement of protection orders; (5) multi-county case management team and emergency response team; (6) multi-county task force on domestic violence, stalking, and sexual assault; (7) civil legal services to expand efforts to provide holistic civil legal assistance; (8) access to affordable housing, childcare, and transportation; and (9) public awareness and community education campaigns.

Since submitting the grant, the grantee has decided to change its plan from creating a hub and five satellite FJCs to creating six FJCs in the different counties participating in the grant. It also plans

to implement a seventh FJC coordinated by the Rural Opportunities Migrant Rest Camp, which is in Henry County. The Migrant Rest Camp is a shelter that provides services to migrant farm workers and has agreed to serve as a FJC to provide intake to any non-English speaking immigrant victims who are in need of translation/interpretation services. It will be considered a FJC like any of the other six (i.e., provide the same services and adhere to the same policies and protocols), but will serve victims from across any of the six counties.

A number of government and non-government service providers from each of the counties signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) committing them to support the implementation of Family Justice Centers. Partners who signed the MOU include:

Municipal Court of Defiance County; police departments in the cities of Defiance, Napoleon, Bryan, Wausen, Ottawa, and Van Wert; the Sheriffs' Offices; Prosecutor's Offices; Probation in the Counties of Defiance, Fulton, Henry, Williams, Putnam, and Van Wert; Department of Jobs and Family Services in the Counties of Defiance, Henry, Williams, Fulton, Putnam, and Van Wert; Center for Child and Family Advocacy; Women and Family Services; Sarah's House of Defiance County; Sarah's House of Williams County; Williams County Victim Assistance; Van Wert County Crime Victim Services; Crises Care Line/House of Transition; Putnam County Crime Victim Services; Legal Aid of Western Ohio; Rural Opportunities Inc.; Antonia Jensen & Associates; Northwestern Ohio Community Action Commission; Van Wert County Community Action & Regional Planning Commission; Putnam County Crises Emergency Network; The Ability Center; Rural Opportunities; The Defiance College; New Home Development Company, Inc.; NHDC-1 Inc.; PATH; Habitat for Humanity of Defiance County; Williams County Economic Development Company; Five County Alcohol/Drug Program; Northwest Ohio Dog Trainers; Pastor Keith Hunsinger; Four County Family Center; and Lutheran Social Services. The grantee mentioned that other partners were being added to the team and a new MOU would be drafted to include the new partners.

The grantee is revising the budget and will no longer be using grant funds to hire FJC staff. The grantee is planning to split the funds allocated to personnel among different non-profit agencies that will be coordinating each of the FJCs. Additionally, because of the rural nature of each of the counties and the fact that the partnering agencies are very small, there will be few staff re-located to the FJC. The goal is to provide immediate crises intervention on-site, and to provide sustained services through other agencies on an on-call or as needed basis. Therefore, most of the services will be coordinated by the FJC, but not provided at the FJC.

The grantee plans to provide the following services on-site or through referral at each FJC: central intake; assistance obtaining emergency resources (e.g., food stamps, Medicaid, cash assistance, emergency housing assistance, child care, and other emergency services); on-site legal assistance; transportation and advocacy; primary physical care; sexual assault forensic evidence collection; mental health counseling; substance abuse treatment; support services for children; support groups; childcare services; case management services to assist with housing, employment, education, healthcare, etc; case management and emergency response teams for safety planning and court advocacy; relocation services; faith-based counseling; hair and nail salon, professional clothes closet; housing assistance; employment assistance; and volunteer programs. This is in addition to off-site pet care and supervised visitation.

3. Initial Project Screening

Is the grantee interested in being evaluated?

Yes.

Is there a local evaluation? If so, summarize methods and findings.

The grantee had a brief discussion with a few researchers (from Defiance College and Bowling Green University) regarding an evaluation, but nothing formal was negotiated because the grantee does not have funding to support evaluation activities.

What is the background/history of this project?

The grantee viewed the initiative as a way to expand on existing efforts to improve its response to domestic violence, improving coordination both within and across counties.

According to the grantee, the fact that each of the county's have some history of collaboration across government and non-government entities has helped to avoid any planning delays that might have occurred due to politics or turf issues.

As described earlier, among the counties, Defiance County has the longest history of collaborating across county agencies to improve its response to domestic violence. Therefore, one of the primary goals of the initiative for the grantee is to bring all the counties to the same level through the development of multi-county task forces. The grantee is hoping the FJC initiative will increase communication across providers and encourage partners to share resources and have case management discussions across county lines. The grantee is also hoping the initiative will result in the development of common protocols, which will reduce inefficiencies that occur when staff at a single agency has to handle cases differently, depending on the county. The development of common protocols might also prompt agencies to standardize their care across counties (presently, there are cases where the same agency is providing one service in one county and not in the other). Cross-county information sharing is also important to the grantee because it believes there are a number of clients who cross county lines because of where they work and live or because they move frequently, and the lack of shared information management systems, especially criminal justice data, puts the safety of the victim at undue risk.

The grantee believes that at present the level of coordination and communication within each county is good, but some counties are a lot more organized or proactive than others. For example, in Defiance County, relationships across providers have been developed such that staff at the Legal Aid of Western Ohio contacts other service providers to coordinate delivery of needed services. While in another county, this level of cooperation may only exist on the civil legal side and not the criminal side. The result is uneven service provision, where victims get more services in some counties (i.e., Defiance, Van Wert, Putnam) than others.

Therefore, the issue the grantee is most interested in addressing through this initiative is the inconsistency in response across counties and how this might be improved with shared protocols, information management systems, etc., as well as promoting shared goals across the counties to address long-term stability issues and not just focus on the victim's immediate needs.

At what stage of implementation is it?

At the time of our contact, all of the counties except Defiance were ready to start renovations (which should take a total of 60 days at each site) and, upon completion, begin seeing clients. The location in Defiance County received NEPA clearance, but the bid fell through, so the site must identify another location and re-apply for clearance. This process will hold up the other sites, because the grantee needs its special condition to be lifted to pay for the renovations at the other sites. When the renovations begin, the grantee plans to open the FJCs as they are ready to become operational; therefore, the FJCs will likely become operational at different points in the grant. In the meantime, the grantee has begun to develop FJC policies and procedures (which will be common across the FJCs). They are using San Diego's forms (e.g., policies, procedures, intake, confidentiality) as prototypes. They have also begun training partners to foster a shared understanding of the law, dynamics of domestic violence, diversity issues, etc. The grantee was also visited by San Diego TA providers in February and asked them to arrange for technical assistance from NNEDV on the development of their intake systems (this training has not been arranged thus far).

When do they anticipate being fully operational?

The grantee hopes that at least some of the FJCs will start seeing clients in July 2005. The grantee anticipates that Defiance will see the greatest number of clients in a year (300) and the other sites will see closer to 150 clients a year.

Describe staffing.

An executive committee, led by Pam Weaner from Legal Aid of Western Ohio, is overseeing implementation of the grant. The executive committee is made up of the site coordinator for each of the seven FJCs and a prosecutor, judge, and law enforcement representative from each participating county. Pam represents the legal aid community for all sites. The site coordinators for each site are responsible for representing their site at the executive level, getting each site operational, and coordinating and keeping all the site partners informed through partner meetings. The executive committee is responsible for overall implementation and developing the first drafts of documents (e.g., policies, procedures, forms, strategic plans) for review. The grantee plans to continue coordination at these two levels and to add a multi-county task force with members selected by partners at each site to discuss broader issues like training and best practices.

A number of partners signed the MOU (listed earlier), but these partners will be combined with a number of new partners in an updated MOU.

As was mentioned earlier, the grantee has also changed its plan to implement one FJC in Defiance County with five satellite facilities. The grantee is now planning to implement six separate FJC in each county, as well as a seventh specialized FJC. Also, because most of the partner agencies don't have the staff to station someone at the FJC, there will be no more than 20 staff at any FJC, which means that most services will be offered on an on-call basis. Each FJC will be coordinated by one agency (a private non-profit) that will be responsible for managing the intake process and service delivery at that FJC. The focus of on-site services will be immediate crises intervention, with additional services being available through referral (case managers at each FJC, not the victim, will be responsible for coordinating appointments and arranging for transport or, in some cases, arranging for representatives to come to the FJC to provide services).

Each FJC will be coordinated by a non-profit agency that will maintain a full-time presence at the FJC. The coordinating agency will be supported by a few partner agencies, either on a full or part-time basis.

Legal Aid of Western Ohio will coordinate the Defiance County FJC and maintain a full-time presence on site. The Defiance FJC will also have prosecutor staff on-site full-time, law enforcement representatives part-time, court advocates full-time, Crime Victim Services staff part-time, Four County Family Center staff part-time, and access to a number of county social service providers (these providers are located in a building across the street from the proposed FJC location).

The Fulton County FJC will be coordinated by Women and Family Services, which will have a full-time presence on site, along with its Rape Crises Center. The FJC will also have law enforcement representatives on-site full-time and representatives from Legal Aid of Western Ohio on-site on a part-time basis.

The Williams County FJC will be coordinated by Sarah's House, which will maintain a full-time presence on site. Sarah's House will be supported by Legal Aid of Western Ohio on a part-time basis. Women and Family Services will have a full-time presence on-site, while its Rape Crises Center will have a part-time presence. The Williams County FJC will also be walking distance from a county building that houses most of the county social services agencies, making it convenient for case managers to coordinate service delivery for clients.

The Center for Child and Family Advocacy will coordinate the Henry County FJC and have a full-time presence on site. Legal Aid of Western Ohio will maintain a part-time presence, while representatives from Five County Alcohol/Drug Program will be on-site full-time

The Putnam County FJC will be coordinated by Crime Victim Services, which will maintain a full-time presence on site. Legal Aid of Western Ohio will be on-site part-time, along with Putnam County Mental Health agency.

Crime Victim Services will also coordinate the Van Wert County FJC. Representatives from Crime Victim Services will be on site on a full-time basis. Representatives from Legal Aid of Western Ohio will be on site part-time, as will representatives from Crises Care Line/House of Transition. The FJC will also be located in the same building as a number of social service agencies, which will be accessible to FJC clients.

In all cases, but in Defiance County, the location of the FJC will be same as the non-profit service provider. The grantee said that although the location will be shared, the FJC will be a distinct operation from the non-profit's traditional services (which are not all targeted to victims of domestic violence). The exception is in Williams County because the non-profit only serves victims of domestic violence and sexual assault so all services are relevant for the FJC population (the grantee was not sure at the point of our discussion how the existing services would or would not be merged with the new FJC).

The FJC coordinated by the Rural Opportunities Migrant Rest Camp will be staffed full-time by its staff and supported by the Legal Aid of Western Ohio on a part-time basis.

The grantee anticipates there will be about 20 staff working at the Defiance County FJC and approximately 10 at the other FJCs.

Describe stability of the program over time.

The program has not provided services to date.

Describe the target population.

The policies, procedures, and target population will be consistent across the FJCs. All will be looking to serve victims of domestic violence and domestic violence related sexual assault and stalking and their families.

What are project's outcome goals in the view of the project director?

According to the grantee, the goal of the FJCs is to promote healing, safety, justice, restitution, and economic stabilization among victims of domestic violence. Its intended effect on the system is to promote zero tolerance for domestic violence and sexual assault, as well as change the way the counties do business through coordination across the multiple FJCs.

Does the personnel/director describe key project elements?

The grantee believes that a critical element of the FJC is the safety planning with the victims. It also believes that long-term stabilization is critical to being a successful survivor, which is why it is important that the FJC offer assistance with housing, health care, transportation, job training, and access to income. The grantee believes that you can be successful survivor without, for example, going through the criminal justice system, but not without a plan for long-term stabilization.

Do they describe how the project's primary activities contribute to the goals?

Since the services that will be available at the FJC have always been available in the community, how they contribute to the goals of the FJC is directly related to how those same services are provided at the FJC. The grantee described the following as critical to the effective design and implementation of the FJC. The first is the safety of the FJC, in addition to the confidentiality the clients can expect as they take advantage of the services offered. The grantee also feels it is important to consider, as they design the process of accessing services, that clients have autonomy to make their own decisions about their care and that they are creating their own service plans and the FJCs are not doing it for them. The other important element in the design phase is respect and integrity, for the FJC staff not to forget that they are dealing with a whole person, and that all options are discussed so that clients are fully informed.

Can you sketch the logic by which activities affect goals?

Northwest Ohio Family Justice Center Logic Model

<u>Inputs</u>	<u>Activities</u>	<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Impacts</u>	<u>Goals</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •On-site partners •Intake systems •Client management process •Space design •Site location 	<p><u>FLC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Case management •Legal assistance •Safety planning •Advocacy •Medical assistance •Forensic examinations •Substance abuse treatment •Counseling/support groups •Housing, employment, education, and healthcare assistance •Emergency food/clothing/transportation •Referral services •Shelter services •Faith-based services •Support services for children •Child care •Translation services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Public awareness campaigns •Community education •Volunteer programs <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Collaboration between government and non-gov't providers •Cross-training •Multi-county information sharing system •Multi-county case management •Multi-county task force 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase likelihood to access services •Increase demand for services •Increase usage of services •Increase frequency of cross-referrals or use of multiple services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase knowledge of DV/SA •Increase awareness of services available <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve DV policies and procedures •Development of cross-county protocols •Increase understanding of each other's services •Increase coordination of services within and across counties 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reduce tendency to blame oneself for abuse •Reduce conditions prevent women from leaving •Promote long-term stabilization •Increase likelihood of reporting incident •Increase likelihood of request for temporary/permanent restraining orders •Increase likelihood of participating in prosecution <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase awareness of FJC •Decrease social tolerance for VAW <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve institutional response to DV •Decrease secondary trauma •Increase assurance of victim safety •Increase successful prosecution of batterer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease incidents of DV •Decrease repeat victimizations •Decrease seriousness •Hold offenders accountable •Decrease repeat offender

Is the logic supported by empirical evidence?

The Family Justice Center initiative does not change the services previously available in the community through government and non-government agencies, but changes the way in which the same services are being offered to victims and their families. Although the benefits of accessing specific services have been studied, the Family Justice Center concept offers an opportunity to examine whether co-location produces additional benefits (intended and unintended) to victims, their families, and the community, as well as to the participating agencies and the system itself. An evaluation of the PFJCI would help provide this kind of evidence.

Are there apparent contradictions or conflicts between certain activities and outcomes expected?

There are no apparent contradictions.

What data systems exist that would facilitate an evaluation?

The grantee is in the early stages of designing a system.

What are the key data elements that are contained in these systems?

The grantee is interested in developing a shared intake systems that will protect the confidentiality of the client. At this time, the grantee plans to allow each FJC to access only the information relevant to their clients, but wants the system to be shared across FJCs to allow access to common forms and for the grantee to be able to collect statistics across FJCs. It also needs to be networked in some way because some of the partners are providing services across FJCs, e.g., Legal Aid of

Western Ohio. Also, in light of the possibility that clients may be seen across counties, it would like the system to support sharing of information (if the client gives permission).

Data elements that have been discussed include assigning a numerical ID number (which will be used to protect confidentiality, while also allowing FJC staff to track clients and make appointments for them), identification of what services have already been received, agencies the client is interested in receiving services from, demographic information, and some other variables that the grantee knows may be included, but have not had enough discussion to identify.

The grantee reported it is also interested in developing some internal reporting capabilities. It plans to review and adapt a report that one of its partners has been doing on criminal justice outcomes for its agency. The agency reports on information related to the case and its outcome, for example, whether an arrest was made, demographics of the victim and perpetrator, outcome of the case, length of sentence, whether a protection order was issued/enforced. The grantee is also interested in short and long term victim outcomes like whether the services were successful and produced healing, which could be collected by asking clients whether she has a better understanding of the services, feels she has a greater sense of control, etc. The grantee is also interested in outcome indicators like the date the client came to the FJC, when they completed receiving services, and how they are a year later.

Are there data to estimate unit costs of services or activities?

Not at this point.

Are there data about possible comparison samples?

Legal Aid of Western Ohio covers 32 counties in the state and has been talking about collecting data that helps them compare services it is able to provide to the six counties involved in the initiative, compared to what is provided in the other counties. The grantee also pointed out that all partners collect some data because they have to satisfy their own grant requirements, so they might want to review these systems and see what other comparisons might be made.

In general, how useful are data systems to an impact evaluation

Until the grantee completes the design of its data system, it is not possible to determine this at this point.

5.5. County of Erie, NY

1. Grantee

Erie County Coordinating Council on Children and Families

LAV Co-Applicant: Neighborhood Legal Services

Duration: 10/01/2004 – 4/31/2006

Current Award: \$945,712; LAV: \$150,000

Funding History: None

Information provided is based on a review of the grant application, a conversation with Karen Joyce-McMahon (OVW Program Monitor) that took place on 2/4/05, and a conference call with Susan Davidson and Mary Kay Comtois that took place on 2/17/05.

2. Project Summary

This is a project with the goal of bringing together advocates from non-profit, non-governmental domestic violence victims services organizations, law enforcement officers, prosecutors, probation officers, governmental victim assistants, forensic medical professionals, civil legal attorneys, chaplains, legal advocates, and representatives from community-based organizations in one centralized location.

The grantee expects the funding to allow initiation of a multidisciplinary community effort to begin realizing an improved system of coordination focused on victim's needs. The development of a Family Justice Center will culminate a community process previously underway (see below) that sought to increase responsiveness, effectiveness, victim safety, and batterer accountability, and to assist victims with long-term stability.

The grantee's budget anticipates spending a significant portion of the award (approximately 54 percent) for personnel. The remainder of the award is to support travel for training, equipment (notably, nine computers with software and five copier-fax machines), rent (\$336,000), and other costs.

Roles and responsibilities of the partners are clearly outlined in a Memorandum of Understanding demonstrating evidence of collaboration among the 32 partnering agencies. The MOU stipulates that the signatories agree "TO PARTICIPATE AS JOINT AND EQUAL PARTNERS" [emphasis in the original].

The grantee plans to provide the following services on-site (the first 12 are required by the solicitation): central intake; on-site information sharing; on-site counseling; opportunities to obtain restraining orders; legal assistance for issuing orders of protection and doing case investigation; civil legal representation in family proceedings; links to medical and mental health; limited medical services; child care; transportation; food vouchers; a strong volunteer component; chaplain service; interpretation and translation; medical care to include forensic medical exams and pediatric care; and treatment for substance abuse. The grantee is planning to provide the following additional services on a referral basis: resources to children who witness family violence; outreach to pregnant victims; parenting classes; supervised visitation; outreach to teens experiencing dating violence; drop-in child care program; and early intervention and prevention efforts.

The grantee reports it intends to provide training to law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges, and probation officers to improve judicial handling of domestic violence cases. For this purpose, the grantee plans to make use of both OVW grant funds and monies the district attorney has made available for training purposes.

Finally, the grantee expects to conduct a public relations and public awareness campaign through television, radio, and billboards to educate the public that domestic violence is a public health and community health issue, promote zero tolerance for domestic violence, and publicize the Family Justice Center. The grantee expects a developer it plans to hire to obtain grant funds for these and other activities and to help ensure the program continues after federal funding ends. The grantee expects to be successful in securing grants to sustain the program because foundations are looking for collaborative proposals, and the FJC will be able to submit proposals that have strong collaborative MOUs.

Partners that have agreed to co-locate staff at the center include: Child & Family Services Haven House; Crisis Services; Hispanics United of Buffalo; Community Services for the Developmentally Disabled; Neighborhood Legal Services; Buffalo Police Department; Erie County District Attorney's Office; Court Administration of the Eighth Judicial District; Erie County Probation; Erie County Sheriff's Office; University of Buffalo Family Medicine; YWCA of Buffalo & Erie County; and Episcopal Diocese of Western New York. Other partners that are expected to co-locate at the center include: Baker Victory; Erie County Bar Association Volunteer Lawyers Project; International Institute; State University of New York at Buffalo School of Law; Erie County Social Services; Erie County Senior Services; and State University of New York at Buffalo School of Social Work. Overall, the project director estimates that there will be 34 staff working on site at the FJC either full- or part-time.

Where appropriate, the following community partners are expected to participate off-site, if doing so does not compromise victim safety or result in hardship to victims: Horizon Health Services; Child & Adolescent Treatment Services; Central Police Services; Buffalo Prenatal/Perinatal Network; Catholic Health System; Catholic Charities; Salvation Army; Every Person Influences Children; Erie County Health Department; Erie County Community Coordinating Council on Children and Families; Erie County Coalition Against Family Violence; and United Way of Buffalo & Erie County.

The project director expects the program to incorporate as a 501(c)3. By-laws have been drafted and, once approved by the 32 partners at a meeting on February 17, 2005, the project director will apply to the IRS for incorporation. (The grantee is aware that many communities nationwide are wondering whether there are already too many nonprofits given the fixed amount of funding available for all nonprofits. As a result, the grantee is planning to create a FJC that will not cost much—that is, will not siphon off much money from other nonprofits. However, somewhat contradicting this strategy, the grantee also talked about hiring a developer to help the center secure grant funding, including money from foundations [see above].)

3. Initial Project Screening

Is the grantee interested in being evaluated?

Yes.

Is there a local evaluation? If so, summarize methods and findings.

No. The grant monitor reported that she had arranged for university researchers to develop an evaluation plan and a costing for inclusion in the grant application, but it was not funded. The grantee has no other plans for local evaluation.

What is the background/history of this project?

According to the grant manager and program manager, the FJC reflects the culmination of a grass-roots movement that began as early as 1978 when the community formed the Erie County Coalition Against Domestic Violence. In 1995, the community developed its first strategic plan to coordinate family violence services in the county. In 2001, three years before OVW issued its FJC solicitation, an environmental scan was conducted to evaluate the current response to family violence in the community.

As a result of the environmental scan, the community organized seven planning teams in October 2001 consisting of over 100 community members to develop and implement an action plan—outcomes—along the points of the continuum of service. Six national integrated models were researched, local baseline data and potential funding sources identified, and legal mandates studied.

An Integrated Services Implementation Team, one of the seven teams, worked over the course of the next 18 months to develop a response that would address the service gaps that still existed in the at-the-time partially coordinated service delivery system. In the summer of 2003, the team recommended three “one-stop” centers for victims of domestic violence.

There was considerable pre-existing collaboration in Erie County designed to serve victims of domestic violence. For example, there was already a victim advocate at the Buffalo Police Department and an advocate and social worker at the adult court. In addition, a Child Advocacy Center provides coordinated services to victims of child abuse and their families. However, these examples of co-location did not encompass the entire spectrum of needed domestic violence services at one location, forcing victims to navigate the system themselves.

Shortly after the team had recommended one-stop centers, OVW coincidentally issued a Request for Proposals for the PFJCI. The initiative, intended to assist communities in the planning and development of comprehensive domestic violence victim service and support centers, matched closely the goals identified by the Integrated Services Implementation team. As a result, the team recommended applying for a grant. “The stars were aligned,” the grant manager said, referring to the timing of the grant opportunity, because the team had been wondering how it would fund such centers. (In its proposal and current plans, the grantee evidently changed its original plan of developing three centers to a single center.)

At what stage of implementation is it?

The site completed its planning process on December 31, 2004 and at the time of our contact was in its early implementation phase. The program has three immediate goals:

- (1) Recruit a board of directors. The planners are in the process of recruiting a board of directors, to whom the executive director will report.

(2) Find a new site. The grantee had a facility but there was concern that, because it was not located close to the courts and child protective services, lack of access could be a barrier to some cultural groups. The planners have identified new office space near the court and expect to have a lease by the middle of March. The program will then have to go through the NEPA review process, but hopes to be eligible for an expedited review.

(3) Hire an executive director. The planners have completed their search for an executive director and will be conducting final interviews with three candidates, with plans to hire one by the middle of March.

After hiring the executive director, the grantee will develop an implementation plan, in collaboration with the new executive director, including hiring staff, and other planning related to opening the center. The grantee has already developed 11 sub-plans for how to implement the center to the point of opening its doors for clients.

When do they anticipate being fully operational?

The grantee expects to begin serving clients by November 1, 2005. Because there are 4,000 arrests for domestic violence a year in the county, the grantee expects to serve around 3,000 clients a year.

Describe staffing.

The program manager from the Erie County Coordinating Council on Children and Families, together with a staff person from The United Way, has taken the lead in program planning and implementation to date.

Mary Kay Comtois, vice president for human services and on loan almost full time from the United Way of Buffalo and Erie County, has been working on the center's strategic plan and will continue as the program manager responsible for staffing the program until an executive director has been hired. When the director is hired, Comtois will leave her current position to serve on the community-based steering committee that will be formed.

Once hired, the executive director will be responsible for sustaining the FJC, managing relations among the partners, coordinating services, and supervising the database. The executive director will have an office manager.

Susan Davidson, Coordinator of the Erie County Coordinating Council on Children and Families, is and will remain the grant manager. Davidson's relationship with the executive director, once the FJC begins providing services, has not yet been defined, but she will continue to provide some type of oversight to the center.

Lieutenant David Mann with the Buffalo Police Department is a catalyst behind the program, keeping activities moving with his "can-do" approach and commitment to the center.

Davidson and Comtois hope to use volunteers for many positions in order to have a "mean and lean" staff that, by enabling the center to operate inexpensively, will facilitate sustaining it over time. For example, they hope that some of the 60 victim advocates in the community will co-locate at the FJC to do intake so the program does not have to hire intake staff. Similarly, they hope that each participating partner will provide a staff person to act as a receptionist for the

program one day a week or month to reduce “infrastructure” costs. “It’s a major priority for us to create something that is independent but doesn’t cost too much,” Davidson reported.

The program plans to appoint a temporary three-person board of directors soon.

Describe stability of the program over time.

The program has not provided services to date.

Describe the target population.

The center’s target population will be victims of domestic violence who live in Erie County, particularly at-risk families of minority descent or low socioeconomic status. The program will also target developmentally disabled and mentally ill victims. Children of victims of domestic violence are also targets for services, but grant funds will not be used to provide these services. Program planners are still thinking about whether the FJC will provide services to male victims of domestic violence.

What are project’s outcome goals in the view of the project director?

According to Davidson and Comtois, the program’s goal is to provide “one-stop” shopping for victims by co-locating services in order to minimize the need for victims to repeat the nature of their problems to several service providers, provide improved accessibility to services by reducing the need to travel to different providers for help, and promote a coordinated response to domestic violence that will prevent cases from falling through the cracks. In addition, the intake assessment will provide victims with a better understanding of the available services and ensure that they are referred to the right services. The grantee application also emphasizes how providing a safe environment for victims at the center (which will be located in a county building with security provided by the sheriff’s office) and developing an individual safety plan for each client will help reduce revictimization and increase victims’ willingness to prosecute batterers.

The program’s intended effect on the system is to speed up services to clients. The grant manager observed that, after providers of services for children of abuse began collaborating at the Child Advocacy Center, the time it took to prosecute cases fell from 12-18 months to 3-6 months. She expects a similar reduction in the time to prosecute domestic violence cases after the FJC has become established.

By providing services to children who witness violence among family members (but without using grant funds for this purpose), the project director also intends for the program to break the cycle of domestic violence that results in some children becoming abusers when they grow up. The grantee also hopes to foster a zero tolerance attitude toward domestic violence throughout the community through a public awareness program (see above).

Taken together, the achievement of these goals is expected to increase reporting and prosecution, thereby holding offenders more accountable and, as a result, reducing both revictimization and new victimization.

Does the personnel/director describe key project elements?

Yes. The grantee describes the key project elements of providing “one-stop” shopping for meeting almost all victim needs, ranging from needs for assistance related to the law, emotional

distress, safety, medical treatment, and immediate emergency material needs (transportation, food). The grantee also describes the program component designed (not using grant funds) to provide services to children exposed to domestic violence as critical to breaking the cycle of violence. Finally, the grantee describes its planned public awareness and training activities as important to promoting zero tolerance in the community.

Do they describe how the project’s primary activities contribute to the goals?

Yes. The grantee emphasizes how providing a safe environment for victims at the FJC (which will be located in a county building with security provided by the sheriff’s office) and developing individual safety plans for each client will help reduce revictimization and increase victims’ willingness to prosecute batterers. Susan Davidson and Mary Kay Comtois also explain how the FJC’s public awareness and training activities will result in both increased awareness of the nature of domestic violence and increased sensitivity for victims. These results should, in turn, promote the center’s goals of zero tolerance—and offender accountability—and also increased receptivity on the part of victims to file for protection orders and support prosecution of offenders. By providing services to children who witness violence among family members (but without using grant funds for this purpose), the project director intends for the program to break the cycle of domestic violence that results in some children becoming abusers when they grow up.

Can you sketch the logic by which activities affect goals?

The grantee presented a type of logic model in its proposal, identifying four goals and related objectives and tasks/activities. A revision of that “model” based on talking with the grantee is provided below.

County of Erie Family Justice Center Logic Model

<u>Inputs</u>	<u>Activities</u>	<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Impacts</u>	<u>Goals</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •On-site partners •Intake systems •Client management process •Space design •Site location 	<p><u>FLC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Case management •Assistance with protection orders •Legal assistance •Advocacy •Medical assistance (limited) •Assessment and treatment •Counseling •Forensic medical evidence collection •Emergency food/transportation •Referral services •Shelter services •Child care •Children’s services •Individual safety plans •Chaplain services •Off-site supervised visitation •Interpretation and translation services •Parenting classes <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Public education •Early prevention and education •Multi-media public awareness campaigns •Volunteer programs <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Collaboration between government and non-gov’t providers •Training partners •Mandatory and pro-arrest policy advocacy •Improve tracking systems 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase likelihood to access services •Increase reporting of DV •Increase usage of services •Increase frequency of cross-referrals or use of multiple services •Increase victim safety •Reduce victims’ need to repeat story •Improve investigations •Improve meeting of victim’s needs <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase knowledge of DV/SA •Increase awareness of services Available •Increase zero tolerance for DV <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve DV policies and procedures •Increase coordination of services 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease time it take to meet victim’s needs •Reduce conditions prevent women from leaving •Increase likelihood of reporting incident •Increase likelihood of request for temporary/permanent restraining order •Increase follow-through with seeking orders and prosecuting <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase awareness of FJC •Increase cultural sensitivity of treatment of victims <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve institutional response to DV •Increase assurance of victim safety •Increase successful prosecution of batterers •Decrease case processing time for orders of protection and prosecution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease VAW in the community •Decrease repeat victimizations •Decrease seriousness •Hold offenders accountable •Decrease repeat offenders •Break the cycle of violence

Is the logic supported by empirical evidence?

The Family Justice Center initiative does not change the services previously available in the community through government and non-government agencies, but changes the *way* in which the same services are being offered to victims and their families. Although the benefits of accessing specific services have been studied, the Family Justice Center concept offers an opportunity to examine whether co-location produces additional benefits (intended and unintended) to victims, their families, and the community, as well as to the participating agencies and the system itself. An evaluation of the PFJCI would help provide this kind of evidence.

Are there apparent contradictions or conflicts between certain activities and outcomes expected?

No.

What data systems exist that would facilitate an evaluation?

There are none as of yet. The grantee will develop a data system as part of the pre-implementation phase that it has now entered. The grantee plans to talk to the county about hooking into the county server. The grantee is hoping to use San Diego's software as a prototype to avoid the expense of developing a new program of its own.

What are the key data elements that are contained in these systems?

Considerations of confidentiality will limit what information the program can collect, according to the grant manager. She expects the center to collect the same information that San Diego collects, i.e., "not a lot of information." The grantee expects to collect client level and aggregate data, but the information will be limited with regard to the client—demographics and address, for example, but not case notes in any shared database.

The law enforcement agencies will bring their own databases to the center, and protocols will have to be developed to access them. "We will need an interface between the center's and police department's databases."

The grantee expects to prepare periodic, if not routine, reports of specific data for purposes of community awareness, for informing the county legislature, to justify requests for additional money in grant proposals, and for planning purposes.

Are there data to estimate unit costs of services or activities?

The grantee does not yet know whether there will be data for estimating unit costs of services or activities.

Are there data about possible comparison samples?

The grantee does not yet know whether there will be data for purposes of comparison samples.

In general, how useful are data systems to an impact evaluation

Until the grantee designs its database system, it will not possible to determine this.

5.6. Hillsborough County, FL

1. Grantee

Hillsborough County Board of Commissioners

LAV: Bay Area Legal Services

Duration: 10/01/2004 – 4/1/2006

Current Award: \$1,498,508; LAV: \$165,000

Funding History: None

Information is based on a review of grant application, conversation with Karen Joyce McMahon (OVW Program Monitor) that took place on 2/8/05, and conversations with Venita Garvin (FJC director) and Mike Bedke (FJC board member) that took place on 2/24/05 and 3/1/05, respectively.

2. Project Summary

This is a project with the goal of expanding existing collaborative efforts in the local domestic violence community to provide a one-stop shop to advocate for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking and their families. Its primary goal is to improve access and safety for victims by reducing the distance and locations to which they must travel for assistance. A significant portion of the grant award (a little over 80%) is to support personnel who will be managing and staffing the center. The remainder of the award is to support travel, equipment, supplies, rent, training equipment, and consultant costs for domestic violence training. This is in addition to the \$165,000 provided to Bay Area Legal Services to provide criminal legal advocacy services at the FJC.

The non-profit agency taking the lead in the implementation of the grant is the Spring of Tampa Bay Inc (hereafter “Spring”). The Spring has played a significant role in Hillsborough County’s long history of collaboration among domestic violence service providers and its efforts to implement coordinated community responses in different regions of the county. It also has experience successfully co-locating services at its hub and satellite facilities. For example, one its satellites has co-located its shelter with the Crises Center of Tampa (providing forensic medical exams and sexual assault programs) and Bay Area Legal Services. Another example is work the Spring is doing with Hillsborough County Sheriff, Plant Police Department, Bay Area Legal Services, and Catholic Charities to provide a coordinated response to domestic violence in a rural part of the county. The county saw the FJC concept as an opportunity to involve additional partners in its efforts and take the coordinated community responses already existing in the county to a new more comprehensive level.

From the grant application, it is clear the county conceptualized the FJC as an extension of services already being offered by the Spring, even suggesting that the FJC be located in an existing Spring facility. However, after award, the grantee shifted its approach and now considers the FJC a stand-alone operation in the county. Its criminal justice partners and their concern that the FJC be located in close proximity to the police department and U.S. Attorney’s Office primarily drove this shift. As a result, the Spring is looking to locate the Center downtown in close proximity to its criminal justice partners. Therefore, rather than the FJC serving as an extension of Spring, as originally planned, the FJC will be a stand-alone institution that Spring, as with the other FJC partners, will refer clients.

As outlined in the grant application, the proposed goals of the project are to expand existing efforts to: (1) investigate and prosecute incidences of domestic violence; (2) develop policies, educational programs, and training in police departments to improve tracking of cases involving domestic violence and dating violence; (3) centralize and coordinate police enforcement, prosecution or judicial responsibility for domestic violence cases in groups or units of police officers, prosecutors, probation and parole officers, or judges; (4) develop coordinated computer tracking systems to ensure communication between police, prosecutors, and probation and parole officers in both criminal and family courts; (5) provide community-based domestic violence education and prevention strategies; and (6) provide legal assistance for domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and sexual assault victims.

A number of government and non-government service providers signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) committing them to work with the county to support the implementation of a FJC. Partners who signed the MOU include: Hillsborough County Board of County Commissioners; Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office; Tampa Police Department; Plant City Police Department; Hillsborough County State Attorney's Office; U.S. Attorney for the Middle District of Florida; Salvation Army Probation; Florida Department of Corrections; the Family Advocacy Program at the MacDill Airforce Base; Tampa Community Health Centers; The Spring of Tampa Bay, Inc.; Abuse Prevention Psychotherapy Learning & Education (APPLE) Services at Crises Center of Tampa Bay; Bay Area Legal Services, Inc.; Carlton Fields Attorneys at Law; Hillsborough County Domestic Violence Task Force; Clerk of the Circuit Court of Hillsborough County; Center of Women, Inc.; Child Abuse Council, Inc.; Gulf Coast Jewish Family Services Inc.; The James & Jennifer Harrell Center at the University of South Florida College of Public Health; Hispanic Jail Ministry; Mental Health Care Inc.; Metropolitan Ministries; and Northside Mental Health Center, Inc.

Based on the MOU, Hillsborough County is taking responsibility for fiscal oversight of the program and the Spring is the lead agency tasked with implementation of the FJC. The Spring is taking responsibility for providing most of the services and hiring the full-time staff that will be working at the FJC. The other partners the Spring believes will be contributing staff include the Circuit Court; Hillsborough County State Attorney; Bay Area Legal Services; Tampa Community Health Centers; and possibly the Family Advocacy Program at the MacDill Air Force Base. As a result, the Spring is relying on many of the Center's services to be provided through referral or in-kind contribution of staff on an as needed basis.

It was clear from the director that the grantee is still struggling to confirm commitment from its key criminal justice partners (i.e., Tampa Police Department, Hillsborough County Sheriff, and the Hillsborough County State Attorney's Office). Otherwise, it is their expectation that all other partners will follow through with commitments they made in the MOU, which would allow it to provide the following services: intake, counseling, assistance to victims seeking to obtain restraining orders and complete police reports, links to medical and mental health professionals, limited medical services, child care, assistance with emergency transportation, food vouchers, faith-based programming, interpretation and translation services, outreach to medical facilities, treatment for substance abuse, resources for children witnessing violence, parenting classes, and early intervention and prevention efforts, as well as a public awareness campaign and a strong volunteer component. The original plan was to provide these services to victims and their families throughout the county using a hub and spoke strategy, but the grantee is currently focusing on establishing the hub FJC through this grant. It is currently unclear which services will be provided on-site and which will be provided through referral.

3. Initial Project Screening

Is the grantee interested in being evaluated?

The grantee had planned to work with the James & Jennifer Harrell Center for the Study of Family Violence, University of South Florida College of Public Health to conduct a needs assessment, design an evaluation plan, conduct data collection and analyses, and develop reports. This component was not funded through the grant, but the Spring has negotiated with the Harrell Center to conduct some form of an evaluation (messages left for Sue Spitz (the Spring's executive director) to get more detail have not been returned).

Is there a local evaluation? If so, summarize methods and findings.

There appears to be a local evaluation planned, but specifics were not available.

What is the background/history of this project?

One of the key members of the grantee team was on the President's National Advisory Council and at the White House when the President announced the FJC initiative. This enabled Hillsborough County to begin preparing for the solicitation before it was released. The county's proposal was benefited by the fact that the Spring had already taken a number of steps toward co-location and developing coordinating community responses throughout the county. For example, the Spring had already co-located a few agencies at its satellite facilities. Additionally, the Spring, Hillsborough County Domestic Violence Task Force, Bay Area Legal Services, Harrell Center, Crises Center of Tampa, MacDill Airforce Base Family Advocacy Program, and the Salvation Army had been cooperating and in some cases co-locating for years. Therefore, the County saw the FJC as an opportunity to bring in additional partners and take its efforts at coordinating its response to domestic violence to the next level. One example of the County's efforts at expanding its existing efforts has been its recognition that its faith communities had not been involved in prior initiatives, so the team has been working hard since receiving its award to incorporate them into the FJC planning effort.

At what stage of implementation is it?

At the time of our contact, the site was still in the planning stage. At that point, they had not received grant funds because they were waiting for OVW to draft a letter to the County releasing them from any obligations on the first \$125,000 if the FJC does not materialize. They are also addressing a few major issues at this time. One issue is that the Tampa Police Department, the State Attorney's Office, and the Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office (three agencies the director considers key partners in the initiative) are not fully committed to the program. Although they all signed the MOU, the current issue is what is meant by "co-location" and whether that means that officers and attorneys have to be physically located at the FJC or can be available on an on-call basis. When signing the MOU, the criminal justice agencies did not interpret "co-location" as having to be physically located at the FJC and are not sure they can commit full-time staff if this is the requirement. The director is working with these agencies to negotiate an arrangement that would be acceptable to them, for example moving the location of the Center to be more convenient to their offices. The director is also working with OVW to get specific guidance on how it defines "co-location." A downtown location has been identified, but the director is seeking approval from these three criminal justice agencies, Bay Area Legal Services, and Spring before moving forward on the space. Only after getting agreement from all parties will the director start the NEPA clearance process.

In the meantime, the director is hosting a meeting with all partners in the beginning of March 2005 to discuss agency commitments and conduct a staff utilization survey to determine who the partners are, the number of staff they anticipate locating at the FJC, what their staff needs are, how much space they would need, and whether they intend to expand over time. Once they have this information from the partners, they will start negotiations on who will be located at the FJC and what services will be provided.

When do they anticipate being fully operational?

Given the above, they are not sure when they might be operational, but have been told by OVW that they should be operational by the end of the grant.

Describe staffing.

There are a number of government and non-government service providers that signed a MOU in support of the FJC. However, up to now, a few key members have been playing a significant role in planning and implementation. This group was initially assembled by Mike Bedke (the person who brought the FJC concept to Hillsborough County after participating on the President's National Advisory Council) to develop a response to the PFJCI RFP. He had been on the board of the Bay Area Legal Services and later on the board of the Spring, which is how Sue Spitz (Executive Director of Spring) and Jim Hengelerok and Dick Wolfmann (Bay Area Legal Services) became involved. He also engaged Dennis Ross from the Crises Center of Tampa, Lyel Roberts from the Hillsborough County Sheriff's Department, and Beth Waters (President of the volunteer board at the Spring). This group developed the grant proposal and has led the planning process, which included selecting the FJC Executive Director. In general, this group has been making the day-to-day decisions that couldn't obviously be made by a group of over 22 partners and now, since hiring the director, serves as the Board of Directors to the FJC.

At this time, the director is not sure about the number of people who will staff the FJC. She is confident about the 5-6 positions funded by the grant, but until they complete the staff utilization survey and confirm partner commitments, she does not feel comfortable estimating the number of staff that may work on-site. Although, the director did estimate it could be as high as 30.

Describe stability of the program over time.

The program has not provided services to date.

Describe the target population.

The target population is victims of domestic violence and sexual assault in Hillsborough County and their families. The grantee is considering expanding its definition to include families in crises. The director said she has no sense of the number of clients the FJC might see in a year.

What are project's outcome goals in the view of the project director?

The director describes the primary goal of the FJC as assuring that any and all services that victims could need are available to him/her at the FJC. In terms of impact on the victims and their families, the director said they want the FJC to save lives and to prevent the generational impact on children exposed to domestic violence. She also pointed out the importance of the victim seeing the community taking the issue seriously, not blaming them, and trying to fully address

their needs, which might result in more women seeking help. In terms of impact on the system, the director explained that the FJC will help them do what they were already doing more efficiently through increased coordination and blending of services. Changes in the process of getting help can, for example, result in a reduction in homicides because women are not sent home to think about whether or not they want to file a protection order and potentially confront the offender again in the meantime.

Does the personnel/director describe key project elements?

The director identified the key elements of the FJC in terms of the process of providing services, namely that the services that are offered are victim-centered and that partners acknowledge the fact that it is the victims who decide what their needs are and when they will receive certain services. She also felt it would be important for the FJC staff to be continuously educated on the dynamics of domestic violence so that they can remain focused on the FJC’s mission. She also feels the FJC won’t be successful unless the different partners put aside turf issues and are open to sharing the common goal of the FJC, which is to serve its clients and to continuously address what is and is not working.

Do they describe how the project’s primary activities contribute to the goals?

Since the services that will be available at the FJC have always been available in the community, how they contribute to the goals of the FJC is directly related to how these same services are provided at the FJC. Again, the director felt that the goals could not be met unless the FJC is successful in providing a victim-centered environment where clients have the autonomy to decide how their needs will be met.

Can you sketch the logic by which activities affect goals?

**Hillsborough County Family Justice Center
Logic Model**

<u>Inputs</u>	<u>Activities</u>	<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Impacts</u>	<u>Goals</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •On-site partners •Intake systems •Client management process •Space design •Site location 	<p><u>FLC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Case management •Assistance with police reports and restraining orders •Legal assistance •Advocacy •Medical assistance •Substance abuse treatment •Counseling/support groups •Faith-based programs •Housing assistance •Emergency food/clothing/transportation •Referral services •Parenting classes •Translation services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Early intervention and prevention programming •Multi-media campaigns •Volunteer programs <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Collaboration between government and non-gov’t providers •Cross-training •Establish tracking systems 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase likelihood to access services •Increase demand for services •Increase usage of services •Increase frequency of cross-referrals or use of multiple services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase knowledge of DV/SA •Increase awareness of services available <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve DV policies and procedures •Increase understanding of each other’s services •Increase coordination of services 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reduced tendency to blame oneself for abuse •Reduce conditions prevent women from leaving •Increase likelihood of request for temporary/permanent restraining orders •Increase likelihood of participating in prosecution <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase awareness of FJC •Decrease social tolerance for VAW <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve institutional response to DV •Decrease secondary trauma •Increase assurance of victim safety •Increase prosecution of batterers •Increase case processing time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease VAW in the community •Decreased Repeat victimizations •Decreased seriousness •Hold offenders accountable •Decrease repeat offenders •Break the cycle of violence

Is the logic supported by empirical evidence?

The Family Justice Center initiative does not change the services previously available in the community through government and non-government agencies, but changes the *way* in which the same services are being offered to victims and their families. Although the benefits of accessing specific services have been studied, the Family Justice Center concept offers an opportunity to examine whether co-location produces additional benefits (intended and unintended) to victims, their families, and the community, as well as to the participating agencies and the system itself. An evaluation of the PFJCI would help provide this kind of evidence.

Are there apparent contradictions or conflicts between certain activities and outcomes expected?

There are no apparent contradictions. However, without clarity on the services that will be available at the FJC versus referred and the process by which referrals will be made and followed up, it is difficult to be confident in strong links between the provision of services and their intended outcomes.

What data systems exist that would facilitate an evaluation?

The site is in the process of developing its data systems. It recently participated in a conference call arranged by the NNEDV that addressed privacy and confidentiality concerns regarding access to and sharing of data. An IT staff-person from Spring was on the call, since s/he will be designing the system. They have not had any internal discussions regarding data systems otherwise.

What are the key data elements that are contained in these systems?

She is not clear on what existing data systems are available and the systems the intake system may want to network, or the specific data elements that should be included in the FJC's system.

Are there data to estimate unit costs of services or activities?

At this point, there are not.

Are there data about possible comparison samples?

At this point, there are not.

In general, how useful are data systems to an impact evaluation

Until the grantee completes the design of its system, it is not possible to determine this at this point.

5.7. City of Knoxville

1. Grantee

City of Knoxville

LAV: Legal Aid of Tennessee

Duration: 7/01/2004 – 12/31/2005

Current Award: \$1,077,000; LAV \$165,000

Funding History: None

Information is based on a review of the grant application, a conversation with Myrta Charles (OVW Program Manager) that took place on 2/23/05, and a conference call with Janet Brewer (Interim Program Manager of the FJC) that took place on 4/22/05.

2. Project Summary

This is a project with the goal of uniting partners and mobilizing resources in a coordinated, comprehensive approach that makes the community's response to domestic violence more effective. In particular, the grantee is hoping the Family Justice Center will ensure the safety of domestic violence victims, address their material, economic, and resource needs, and eliminate the barriers and service gaps victims encounter in the community. A small proportion of the grant award (a little over 10%) is to support personnel who will be managing and staffing the center. This includes a Family Justice Center Program Manager, Volunteer Coordinator, and Office Assistant. The remainder of the award is to support travel, equipment, supplies, renovations, networking costs, consultant costs (strategic planner), and other costs that account for close to half the award (rent and computer and other equipment).

The City of Knoxville is the lead agency taking administrative and fiscal responsibility for the grant, including hiring FJC staff, but project oversight will be provided through the Knoxville Police Department. Knox County has been committed to establishing a coordinated community response to domestic violence since 1985 when the Knox County Task Force Against Domestic Violence was created as a means to share information across local agencies responsible for serving victims of domestic violence and train agency personnel. This work evolved into a partnership between advocates and legal aid attorneys to work with victims on orders of protection, and has further evolved to include other community groups. In January 1997, the task force became the Community Coalition on Family Violence (CCFV) and a non-profit that serves as the umbrella for all government and non-government services to victims of family violence. The CCFV has been instrumental in developing a 24-hour helpline, creating a partnership between YWCA advocates and the Knoxville Police Department, and hosting on-going awareness campaigns and cross-training efforts. The county has also established a Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team. It also requested a Domestic Violence Safety Audit, which revealed a list of recommendations to improve services to victims of domestic violence. The county views the FJC as a way to bridge the gaps in communication that exist between domestic violence providers and child protective service workers, as well as an opportunity to build a new level of coordinated services for victims of domestic violence.

As outlined in the grant application, the proposed goals of the project are to: (1) provide a "one-stop shop" to advocate for victims seeking help; (2) include DV survivors in the planning process to ensure that services are victim-centered; (3) ensure victim safety by holding offenders

accountable through criminal justice efforts; (4) strengthen direct legal services to victims; and (5) increase awareness of available resources through a multi-media campaign.

A number of government and non-government service providers signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) committing them to support the implementation of a Family Justice Center. Partners who signed the MOU include: the City of Knoxville, Knoxville Police Department, Knox County Government, Knox County Sheriff's Department, Knox County District Attorney's Office, Knox County Probation, State of Tennessee Board of Probation and Parole, Community Alternatives to Prison Program, Child & Family Tennessee, YWCA of Knoxville, Sexual Assault Crises Center, Legal Aid of East Tennessee, University of Tennessee College of Law, Community Coalition of Family Violence, Child Support Services of Tennessee, Compassion Coalition, "A Hand up for Women" – Knox County Christian Women's Job Corps, Knox County Health Department, Knox County Housing Authority, Knoxville's Community Development Corporation, Knoxville-Knox County Community Action Committee, Knoxville Fire Department, Rural/Metro Corporation, Salvation Army, University of Tennessee Department of Child and Family Studies, University of Tennessee College of Nursing, and University of Tennessee College of Social Work. This is in addition to the 36 off-site partners.

The City of Knoxville is hiring the staff that will be assigned to the FJC. A number of other partners plan to provide staff support, including the Knoxville Police Department, Knox County Sheriff's Department, Knox County District Attorney's Office, Knox County Probation, State of Tennessee Board of Probation and Parole, Community Alternatives to Prison Program, Child & Family Tennessee, YWCA of Knoxville, Sexual Assault Crises Center, Legal Aid of East Tennessee, University of Tennessee College of Law (law school volunteers), Community Coalition of Family Violence, Child Support Services of Tennessee, Compassion Coalition, "A Hand up for Women" – Knox County Christian Women's Job Corps, Knox County Health Department, Knox County Housing Authority, Knoxville's Community Development Corporation, Knoxville-Knox County Community Action Committee, Knoxville Fire Department (when available), Rural/Metro Corporation (when available), Salvation Army, University of Tennessee Department of Child and Family Studies (student interns), University of Tennessee College of Nursing (student interns), and University of Tennessee College of Social Work (student interns).

The grantee plans to provide the following services on-site: central intake; assistance with police investigations; assistance with orders of protection; advocacy; safety planning; assistance applying for victim compensation funds; information on probation and parole status; referral for shelter and emergency housing; legal representation; civil legal assistance; chaplain services; 24-hour crises line; food and transportation vouchers; medical care; crises intervention; emergency financial assistance; emergency and professional clothing; sexual assault crisis services; counseling; translation services; and referral for employment, life skills training, parenting classes, residential services, intervention and prevention services, and drug and alcohol assessments and treatment. Additional services will be available through off-site partners.

3. Initial Project Screening

Is the grantee interested in being evaluated?

Yes.

Is there a local evaluation? If so, summarize methods and findings.

The grantee included funds in its application to support a local evaluation, but the funds were disallowed by OVW, indicating to the grantee that any evaluation would be supported at the national level.

What is the background/history of this project?

CCFV hosted a retreat about a year before the PFJCI RFP was released to discuss the “one-stop” service concept, among other strategies for improving service delivery. After the retreat, CCFV and representatives from the city and county contacted San Diego to learn more about its Family Justice Center. After talking to San Diego, the group was definitely interested and felt Knoxville had the collaborations to support the implementation, but did not have the funds. Therefore, when CCFV learned of the RFP, it came to the city and county to ask if they would sponsor the application. The mayors of the city and county met and agreed to apply for the grant.

The grantee believes that Knoxville has established strong collaborations in the community, but not a lot of coordinated service delivery. Victims seeking services are left on their own to maneuver the system and seek out each service individually. Exceptions to this have been YWCA advocates working at the Knoxville Police Department and agencies setting up information booths at the courthouse when family violence cases are heard to market their services. Besides these two examples, Knoxville has no system currently in place to help victims become knowledge of and access multiple services.

At what stage of implementation is it?

At the time of our contact, the grantee was still in its planning stages and will likely remain in this stage until the program manager is hired and the grantee receives NEPA clearance. The position announcement for the program manager is closing April 30th and the site has received verbal notice that it has cleared NEPA, but has not received anything in writing from OVW and its funds have, therefore, not been released.

The grantee hired its strategic planner in March 2005 and hosted a strategic planning meeting in April, inviting representatives from the 63 partner agencies. The purpose of the meeting was to organize its work teams around key implementation issues and have them begin working on task timelines and producing recommendations in preparation for implementation. The grantee has also developed confidentiality policies and submitted them to OVW for review and approval, identified potential fund-raising strategies, and is currently working on the layout of the building.

When do they anticipate being fully operational?

The grantee does not expect to be operational until October 2005. It is not sure how many clients to expect at the FJC.

Describe staffing.

Until the program manager is hired, Janet Gorman will continue to lead the implementation of the FJC. She relies on a core group of partners who have been active partners since the beginning of the grant to participate in the day-to-day decision-making. The core group of partners includes: Deputy Chief Paidousis (Knoxville PD) who has taken on leadership of the core team (representing the executive team); Lamont Bishop (Knox County Mayor’s Office) who chairs the

building team; Joe Terry (Executive Director of CCFV) who chaired the former marketing and public relations team; Kathy Hatfield (Child & Family Services) who chairs the on-site team; David Kidts (KPD, DV Unit) who chairs the personnel committee; Dave Yoder (Legal Aid); Darryl DeBusk (Public Information Officer from the Knoxville PD); and Chief Owen (Knoxville Police Department).

The core team is supported by work teams, which each have a chair and are made up of members of the 63 partner agencies. The work teams are organized to address personnel, on-site management, sustainability, community outreach, building, and governance issues. The chairs from each of the work teams meet weekly with program manager and the strategic planner. Each team has developed plans and timelines to accomplish the specific goals of the team.

The grantee also has an executive board that serves as an oversight committee, reviewing and approving important policy and operational decisions. For example, even through the personnel team developed the position description and interviewed candidates for the strategic planner position, the executive board had final say over who was to be hired. The executive board is made up of the Mayor of Knox County, the Mayor of the City of Knoxville, the Sheriff, Knoxville Police Chief, the Executive Director of CCFV, a representative from Legal Aid, and the District Attorney. The executive team meets every other month with Janet.

The grantee anticipates there will be about 33 staff working at the FJC on a full-time basis (it is still working on the number of staff working part-time). The staff will include full-time FJC staff (the FJC program manager, volunteer coordinator (although the grantee may make this position a deputy program manager), and office assistant) hired by the City of Knoxville and relocated staff, which will include 9 full-time DV Unit personnel, a volunteer coordinator, and a chaplain coordinator from the Knoxville Police Department; six full-time Family Crises Unit personnel, volunteer coordinator, and chaplain coordinator from the Knox County Sheriff's Department; one full-time prosecutor and other staff on an on-call basis from the Knox County District Attorney's Office; one part-time liaison from Knox County Probation; one part-time staff from the State of Tennessee Board of Probation and Parole; one part-time staff from the Community Alternatives to Prison Program; one DV advocate, one elder abuse advocate, and one part-time DV therapist from Child & Family Tennessee; three DV advocates, one part-time DV court liaison, and one advocate supervisor from the YWCA of Knoxville; one part-time sexual assault advocate from the Sexual Assault Crises Center; one or two full-time attorneys, one full-time paralegal, and one quarter-time legal secretary from the Legal Aid of East Tennessee; law student volunteers from the University of Tennessee College of Law; one full-time executive director from the Community Coalition on Family Violence; one full-time staff from Child Support Services of Tennessee; one staff person or volunteer from Compassion Coalition; one part-time staff person from "A hand Up for Women;" part-time Violence Prevention Coordinator and nurse practitioner from the Knox County Health Department; one part-time case worker from the Knox County Housing Authority; part-time case worker from Knoxville Community Development Corporation; one part-time case worker from the Knoxville-Knox County Community Action Committee; as needed medical assistance from the Knoxville Fire Department and Rural/Metro Corporation; one part-time advocate from the Salvation Army; and student interns from the University of Tennessee Department of Child and Family Studies, College of Nursing, and College of Social Work. This is in addition to a number of off-site agency commitments.

Describe stability of the program over time.

The program has not provided services to date.

Describe the target population.

The target population will include victims (male or female) of family violence and their children. Family violence includes domestic violence (to include stalking and sexual assault) and elder and child abuse.

What are project's outcome goals in the view of the project director?

According to the program manager, the goal of the FJC is to improve the quality of life among victims seeking service. The grantee is also hopeful that the FJC will help victims to leave a situation faster than would have been the case had services been more difficult to obtain. It is also hopeful that the population of victims seeking service will be broadened over time to include groups that don't historically seek services (e.g., upper class victims). The grantee is also hopeful the FJC will increase community awareness of domestic violence. In terms of the system, the grantee is hopeful the FJC will result in higher quality services being providing to victims in a timely manner, as well as the development of a more systematic and coordinated referral process, particularly among non-profit agencies that provide similar services.

Does the personnel/director describe key project elements?

The grantee believes there are two critical components to the FJC, both related to providing victims with the tools to have an impact on their lives. The first is ensuring that law enforcement and the courts are represented at the FJC because they are link to protection and to other service providers. The other is that there is someone to provide the basic services victims needs to leave a situation (i.e., safety planning, food, shelter, and clothing). The program manager also feels it is important the FJC is prepared to connect clients to medical crisis intervention services. The grantee feels it is also important the FJC is prepared for the fact that clients coming to the FJC will be at different points in the timeline of victimization and are, therefore, likely to have different needs. Because of this, she believes all services are ultimately important.

Do they describe how the project's primary activities contribute to the goals?

Since the services that will be available at the FJC have always been available in the community, how they contribute to the goals of the FJC is directly related to how those same services are provided at the FJC. The grantee described the following as critical to the effective design and implementation of the FJC. The first was the location of the FJC and that it is on a bus line and a location where victims feel comfortable approaching. The program manager said it is also important that the FJC is safe, welcoming upon entry, comprehensive in the services and information it has available, has a home environment rather than an office environment, and offers free parking. She also mentioned the important of separating criminal justice and other service providers so clients do not feel any pressure to seek specific services.

Can you sketch the logic by which activities affect goals?

Knoxville Family Justice Center Logic Model

<u>Inputs</u>	<u>Activities</u>	<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Impacts</u>	<u>Goals</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •On-site partners •Intake systems •Client management process •Space design •Site location 	<p><u>FLC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Case management •Assistance with protection orders •Assistance with police reports •Legal assistance •Advocacy •Safety planning •Medical assistance •Sexual assault crisis services •Referral for assessment and treatment •Counseling •Emergency money/food/clothing/transportation •Referral for employment, life skills training parenting classes, and residential services •24-hour helpline •Chaplain services •Translation services 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase likelihood to access services •Increase demand for services •Increase usage of services •Increase frequency of cross-referrals or use of multiple services 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reduce conditions prevent women from leaving •Increase likelihood of reporting incident •Increase likelihood of request for temporary/permanent protection orders •Increase likelihood of participating in prosecution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease incidents of DV <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease repeat victimizations •Decrease seriousness •Hold offenders accountable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease repeat offenders •Break cycle of violence
	<p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Early intervention and prevention programming •Multi-media campaigns •FJC informational materials •Volunteer programs 	<p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase knowledge of DV/SA •Increase awareness of services available 	<p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase awareness of FJC •Decrease social tolerance for VAW 	
	<p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Collaboration between government and non-gov't providers •Cross-training •Improve access to probation/parole tracking systems 	<p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve DV policies and procedures •Increase understanding of each other's services •Increase coordination of services 	<p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve institutional response to DV •Decrease secondary trauma •Increase assurance of victim safety •Increase successful prosecution of batterers •Decrease case processing time 	

Is the logic supported by empirical evidence?

The Family Justice Center initiative does not change the services previously available in the community through government and non-government agencies, but changes the way in which the same services are being offered to victims and their families. Although the benefits of accessing specific services have been studied, the Family Justice Center concept offers an opportunity to examine whether co-location produces additional benefits (intended and unintended) to victims, their families, and the community, as well as to the participating agencies and the system itself. An evaluation of the PFJCI would help provide this kind of evidence.

Are there apparent contradictions or conflicts between certain activities and outcomes expected?

There are no apparent contradictions.

What data systems exist that would facilitate an evaluation?

The program manager said the grantee has not developed any type of data system yet. It knows the infrastructure will be supported and maintained by the city, but have not purchased any software or designed any system. The program manager admitted that there was a lot of internal confusion on this issue and she has asked San Diego to provide them with some technical assistance. The grantee sat in on the NNEDV call regarding confidentiality issues and felt that

NNEDV did not send any clear message on what could be done, so they came away feeling that they were very limited in what data could be collected. Therefore, the grantee has placed the design and development of any system on hold until it gets more guidance.

What are the key data elements that are contained in these systems?

The policy and procedures work team has developed an intake form, which identifies some of the key variables the site is interested in collecting. What it has not decided is how the information will be tracked and maintained and who will have access to the form. The program manager said that she would like, at a minimum, to be able to report on aggregate data that helps them track implementation and identify areas in need of improvement, for example, number of clients serviced, number referred to specific service providers, number who received specific services, time frames when victims arrive at the FJC, and when services are received.

Are there data to estimate unit costs of services or activities?

The grantee could not answer this question.

Are there data about possible comparison samples?

It is unclear at this time, without getting more information on partner databases.

In general, how useful are data systems to an impact evaluation

Until the grantee completes the design of its data system, it is not possible to determine this at this point.

5.8. City of Nampa, ID

1. Grantee

City of Nampa

LAV Co-Applicant: Idaho Legal Aid Services

Duration: 10/01/2004 – 3/31/2006

Current Award: \$915,566; LAV: \$150,000

Funding History: None

Information is based on a review of the grant application, a conversation with LaTanya Watson (OVW Program Monitor) that took place on 2/1/05, and telephone calls with Rebecca Lovelace (FJC executive director) that took place on 2/10/05 and 2/28/05.

2. Project Summary

The grantee, which is the City of Nampa, will not be establishing new services for victims of domestic violence. Rather, the project will co-locate several existing agencies under one roof to improve services to victims of domestic violence, reduce the number of victims who “fall through the cracks,” and increase the efficiency of service delivery, thereby increasing the number of offenders who are prosecuted. By minimizing the number of times victims have to repeat their stories, and by eliminating logistical problems accessing services, the program is expected to reduce the number of victims who drop out of the process of seeking protection orders and prosecuting the batterers.

Victims will continue to report the crime to the police department. However, the police will now refer the victim to the FJC, which will be located one block from the station house. As a result, if the crime occurs in the city, the case will automatically go through the Family Justice Center.

Irrespective of any improvement in prosecution rates, the grantee also expects the FJC to meet victims’ needs on the day they come to the center—whether it is getting an order of protection or simply talking to a clergy person. Because, the grantee reports, some victims are discouraged from going to the police station because they are concerned about any contact with law enforcement, the layout of the building that will house the FJC has been designed such that law enforcement services will be provided in a part of the building that is physically separate from where support and advocacy services will be offered.

Using two trainers who have been certified by the National Center for State and Local Law Enforcement Training at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLTC), the grantee plans to provide education programs for high school students addressing teenage dating violence and offer family violence training to community leaders, business owners, and clergy. The grantee also plans to provide training to police officers, prosecutors, and parole officers, addressing the nature of domestic violence, legal issues, confidentiality, child abuse, sexual assault, and other topics.

The roles and responsibilities of the 11 partners are clearly specified in a Memorandum of Understanding.

The grantee plans to provide the following full-time services and related staff on-site: project coordination (1 director full-time); bi-lingual intake (1 person full-time); investigation and case

preparation by the Nampa Police Department Crimes Against Persons Unit (4 detectives full-time); case preparation and prosecution by two prosecutors and a victim-witness coordinator from the city attorney's office (3 persons full-time); counseling provided by Valley Crisis Center (1 person full-time); legal assistance and representation through Idaho Legal Aid (1 attorney full-time); services to children through the State Health and Welfare's Child Protection Unit (1 person full-time); migrant worker assistance, translation services, counseling, and outreach to the Latino community through the Idaho Migrant Council (Salud Y Provecho) (1 person full-time); pastoral counseling and spiritual support through Nampa Ministerial Alliance (volunteers part-time); children's mental health, substance abuse, and employment-related counseling by Easter Seals Goodwill for Medicaid-eligible victims (1 person part-time); assistance securing food stamps and other welfare benefits from an Idaho State Health and Welfare self-reliance worker (1 person part-time); counseling and advice for military families by air force base personnel (1 person part-time); and information about probation and monthly status reports concerning offender compliance from the County Probation Department (possibly on site).

The grantee is planning to provide the following two additional services on a referral basis: 24-hour intake and crisis intervention (including emergency shelter) through the Valley Crisis Center and forensic medical examinations by an on-call nurse practitioner (there will be a dedicated medical examination room for this purpose) through the Saint Adolphus Regional Medical Center. The grantee is anticipating providing additional services on a referral basis but does not yet know which services will be needed. The grantee also expects some service providers that are not now involved in planning and implementing the FJC to offer to provide their services. Overall, the project director estimates that there will be 13 full-time and at least 3 part-time staff working on site at the FJC and an as-yet undetermined number of volunteers.

The grantee expects to develop a major volunteer component. Volunteers will provide "hospitality" services on-site such as baby-sitting and distribution of clothing; administrative services such as answering phones; escort to court; transportation to off-site service providers; and assistance with fundraising. Some volunteers may be recruited from the Retired and Volunteer Senior Program (RSVP). In addition, Boise State University may be able to provide criminal justice and social work interns. The police department's citizens' academy may be another source of volunteers. The grantee will provide a three-day, 24-hour training programs for the volunteers led by a local certified trainer (who will also provide training for the partners).

The grantee's budget anticipates spending roughly 40% of the award for personnel. The remainder of the award is to support equipment (\$416,309 for medical room equipment, furniture, telephones and installation, computers, duplicating machines, building security, desk/computer work stations, and other expenses), other supplies, and travel for training.

3. Initial Project Screening

Is the grantee interested in being evaluated?

Yes.

Is there a local evaluation? If so, summarize methods and findings.

The grantee is planning to conduct an in-house evaluation, perhaps by the strategic planner or through a subcontract.

What is the background/history of this project?

While a Canyon County Domestic Violence Task Force has operated in Nampa since 1997 focusing on issues related to domestic violence (e.g., developing a high school curriculum, drafting pertinent legislation), service delivery has been fragmented. In the past, each agency provided services to victims on its own. Typically, victims went to the Nampa Police Department to report the crime, and the department would refer them to other agencies for further assistance. Victims were shuttled back and forth among service providers, as well.

At what stage of implementation is it?

At the time of our contact, the grantee was in the early implementation phase. A steering committee that had been formed consisting of all FJC partners to provide guidance in planning the FJC has been disbanded. Two other committees have been formed. A board of directors has been assembled consisting of the executive directors of most of the full-time on-site partners. The grantee expects to expand the board to include business leaders once the FJC begins providing services, so that there are some “outside” people looking at the program. The board’s responsibilities include supervision of FJC operations. An executive committee has also been formed and is co-chaired by a detective and assistant city attorney; a representative from the City of Nampa is treasurer. The other members will come from the city, crisis center, migrant council, and victim-witness community. This committee, to which the board of directors and center director will report, will make final decisions on all FJC matters of significant importance and enforce its determinations with the board of directors and center director.

The city has dedicated a nearly 9,000 square foot city facility for the FJC. The city has also awarded the center over \$250,000 in CDBG funds to pay for the building’s rehabilitation. Having just received NEPA approval on March 1, 2005 (which took four months), the grantee will be issuing a Request for Proposals to remodel the building. The remodeling is expected to take 90 days.

When do they anticipate being fully operational?

The grantee expects to begin providing services in early June 2005.

Describe staffing.

The city hired Rebecca Lovelace as the FJC executive director. The director reports to the Nampa Department of Community Development director, who in turn reports directly to the Mayor. A strategic planner contracted by the center, Phil Eastman, has been working, and will continue to work, with the director in planning the FJC.

Describe stability of the program over time.

The program has not provided services to date.

Describe the target population.

The center’s target population will be all victims of domestic violence and children of these victims. The coordinator expects the program to serve 100 families during its first year and

expand in subsequent years; based on the fact that 700 domestic violence reports are made to the police department each year.

What are project's outcome goals in the view of the project director?

The grantee expects the FJC to decrease revictimization by expediting the process of providing services, including access to shelters, orders of protection, and prosecutions. In the past, after reporting an offense to the police department, the victim had to make an appointment to see a prosecutor a week later. Similarly, the court requires victims who request an order of protection to attend a class—offered on another date by another provider 15 miles from the courthouse—on what to expect at the hearing. The FJC will end problems of “distance and time” by providing immediate access to assistant district attorneys and, it hopes, by providing the hearing class at the center.

However, the most basic program goal is provide victims with the services they want, whether that be prosecution of the offender or a protection order, or simply talking to a minister or attorney or finding shelter for a night. Victims will decide what services they want to use. Prosecution is therefore not the only goal; meeting the victim's needs—for that day—is the primary goal.

The grantee expects the center to change the criminal justice system by increasing the number of prosecutions—and number of successful prosecutions—of offenders by 10 percent the first year of operation.

Does the personnel/director describe key project elements?

The grantee will not be establishing new services for victims of domestic violence. Rather, the project will co-locate several existing agencies under one roof. However, the program will have some distinctive features. First, the area in which victims receive support services will be physically separated within the building from the area in which they can receive law enforcement services (orders of protection, support for prosecution). Second, the grantee describes how two federally certified trainers will teach about dating violence to high school students and offer family violence training to community leaders, business owners, and clergy, as well as criminal justice system practitioners. Third, the grantee describes a planned major volunteer component involving trained volunteers who will provide on-site baby-sitting and clothing, phone answering, escort to court, transportation, and assistance with fundraising.

Do they describe how the project's primary activities contribute to the goals?

Since the services that will be available at the FJC have always been available in the community, how they contribute to the goals of the FJC is directly related to how those same services are provided at the FJC. For example, the program will provide support and advocacy services in an area of the building that is physically separated from law enforcement services, so victims concerned about any contact with law enforcement won't be discouraged from visiting the FJC. Additionally, the education and training activities are designed to encourage zero tolerance for domestic violence and improved treatment of victims that will contribute to the grantee's goal of holding offenders accountable. The grantee also expects to better meet victims' needs and increase their likelihood of reporting abuse and following through with seeking protection orders and prosecuting offenders by providing on-site services specifically targeted to migrant workers, including doing outreach to the Latino community through the Idaho Migrant Council, and by providing counseling and advice for military families by air force base personnel.

As a result of all the above arrangements, combined with the standard victim services that all centers will provide, the grantee expects to achieve its second goal of meeting the needs of victims based on those services victims themselves wish to make use of.

Can you sketch the logic by which activities affect goals?

Nampa Family Justice Center Logic Model

<u>Inputs</u>	<u>Activities</u>	<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Impacts</u>	<u>Goals</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •On-site partners •Intake systems •Client management process •Space design •Site location 	<p><u>FLC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Case management •Investigation and case preparation •Assistance with protection orders •Legal assistance •Victim advocacy •Forensic medical exams •Counseling services •Child care •Transportation services •Assistance with public assistance •Translation services •Spiritual counseling •Migrant worker assistance <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Early intervention and prevention programming •Community trainings •Volunteer programs <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Collaboration between government and non-gov't providers •Cross-training •Access offender tracking systems 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase likelihood to access services •Increase demand for services •Increase usage of services •Increase frequency of cross-referrals or use of multiple services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase knowledge of DV/SA •Increase awareness of services available <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve DV policies and procedures •Increase understanding of each other's services •Increase coordination of services 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase likelihood of meeting victim's needs •Reduce conditions prevent women from leaving •Increase likelihood of reporting incident •Increase likelihood of request for temporary/permanent protection order •Increase likelihood of participating in prosecution <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase awareness of FJC •Decrease social tolerance for VAW <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve institutional response to DV •Decrease secondary trauma •Increase assurance of victim safety •Increase successful prosecution of batterers •Decrease case processing time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease VAW in the community •Decrease repeat victimizations •Decrease seriousness •Hold offenders accountable •Decrease repeat offenders •Break the cycle of violence

Is the logic supported by empirical evidence?

The Family Justice Center initiative does not change the services previously available in the community through government and non-government agencies, but changes the way in which the same services are being offered to victims and their families. Although the benefits of accessing specific services have been studied, the Family Justice Center concept offers an opportunity to examine whether co-location produces additional benefits (intended and unintended) to victims, their families, and the community, as well as to the participating agencies and the system itself. An evaluation of the PFJCI would help provide this kind of evidence.

Are there apparent contradictions or conflicts between certain activities and outcomes expected?

No.

What data systems exist that would facilitate an evaluation?

There are none as of yet. The coordinator reported that San Diego is trying to provide software to the new Family Justice Centers but, because this is not happening, the grantee will use an HMIS software data system and modify it to suit the FJC's needs. The grantee's application indicates that the development of an integrated data system that allows each provider to share information and track victim progress is a high priority. The grantee is working with the NNEDV to address issues of confidentiality and security among partner agencies.

What are the key data elements that are contained in these systems?

The FJC case manager will keep a record of the services each client requested and accessed. However, various partner agencies, which will keep their own records of services provided, will not share each other's databases.

Are there data to estimate unit costs of services or activities?

The grantee does not yet know whether there will be data for estimating unit costs of services or activities.

Are there data about possible comparison samples?

The grantee does not yet know whether there will be data for purposes of comparison samples. While the grantee expects that it will be able to obtain recidivism data, it is not as confident in its ability to successfully follow-up with clients six months or a year after visiting the center.

In general, how useful are data systems to an impact evaluation?

Until the grantee designs its database system, it will not possible to determine this.

5.9. City of New York, NY

1. Grantee

The City of New York

LAV: Sanctuary for Families (sub-contract to South Brooklyn Legal Services)

Duration: 10/01/2004 – 3/31/2006

Current Award: \$1,500,000; LAV: \$150,000

Funding History: None

Information is based on a review of the grant application, a conversation with Darlene Averick (OVW Program Monitor) that took place on 2/24/05, and a conference call with Monique Imbert (Deputy Commissioner, Mayor's Office to Combat Domestic Violence) and Amy Barasch (Director of the Domestic Violence Response Teams, Mayor's Office to Combat Domestic Violence) that took place on 3/17/05.

2. Project Summary

This is a project with the goal of making it easier for domestic violence victims, particularly immigrant victims, to obtain vital services. The FJC will create efficiencies in time spent by victims, lawyers, and advocates, by physically integrating criminal and civil legal assistance, and essential social, faith-based, medical, and language support under one roof. Roughly a third of the grant award is to support personnel who will be managing and staffing the center (a project director, an assistant project director, a training/volunteer coordinator, a childcare/art therapy coordinator, and two bilingual receptionists). The remainder of the award is to support travel, equipment (computer equipment and office furniture), supplies, renovations, rent, and consultant costs.

The two city agencies taking the lead on this grant are the Mayor's Office to Combat Domestic Violence and the Kings County District Attorney's Office. In November 2001, the Commission to Combat Domestic Violence (created by an Executive Order in 1994) was made into a permanent office of City government, headed by a Commissioner. This office oversees and coordinates the domestic violence services of all city agencies and is responsible for developing mechanisms to ensure accountability. In particular, the Office launched a pilot program, the Domestic Violence Response Teams (DVRT), in the fall of 2002 to more effectively integrate the City's response to domestic violence. Under the DVRT program, a team of representatives from City agencies and community based organizations conduct monthly reviews of the level of services provided to a small number of high-risk victims in selected precincts and make recommendations to enhance services for these victims. The Office has also hosted focus groups with immigrant women and women of color to discuss service delivery improvements to these populations, which resulted in a training and reference guide, "A Medical Providers' Guide to Managing the Care of Domestic Violence Patients within a Cultural Context," which was published in October 2003. The King County DA's Office has established a Domestic Violence Bureau to focus specifically on the prosecution of criminal domestic violence cases. Additionally, since 1990, the DA's Office has collaborated on a number of projects, including the City's first specialized Domestic Violence Court, one of the first victim/witness programs, and is leading the field in the use of digital 911 recording technology. Both agencies saw the FJC as way to expand upon the City's efforts to coordinate and improve the provision of services to victims of domestic violence and their families.

As outlined in the grant application, the proposed goals of the project are to: (1) expand existing efforts between law enforcement, prosecutors, non-profit, and others to investigate and prosecute domestic violence; (2) develop policies, educational programs and training to improve case tracking; (3) centralize and coordinate police enforcement and prosecution of domestic violence with police, prosecutors, probation and parole officers, and judges; (4) coordinate computer tracking systems; (5) collaborate with the community to develop education and prevention strategies; (6) implement mandatory arrest programs for domestic violence and violations of orders of protection; (7) educate judges to improve handling of cases; (8) provide technical assistance and equipment to facilitate enforcement of orders of protection; and (9) expand legal assistance by organizations with a history of providing direct legal or advocacy services.

A number of government and non-government service providers signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) committing them to work with the City to support the implementation of a Family Justice Center. Partners who signed the MOU include the: New York City's Mayor's Office to Combat Domestic Violence; King County District Attorney's Office; New York City Police Department; New York City Department of Probation; Office of the Criminal Justice Coordinator; New York City Department of the Aging; New York City Human Resources Administration; Health and Hospitals Corporation; Sanctuary for Families and South Brooklyn Legal Services; Arab American Support Center, Inc; ArtStart; Barrier Free Living; Caribbean Women's Health Association; Center Against Family Violence; Church Avenue Merchants Block Association; Dwa Fanm; Haitian Violence Prevention/Intervention Project; Health Industry Resources Enterprise; Help Roads/Help USA; Jewish Association for Services for the Aged; Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services; Metropolitan Council on Jewish Poverty; New York City Gay and Lesbian Anti-Violence Project; New York Asian Women's Center; New York Association of New Americans, Inc.; Ohel Children's Home and Family Services; Puerto Rican Family Institute; Rape Crises Intervention/Victims of Violence Program; Safe Horizon; STEPS to End Family Violence; Turning the Corner; Women Working for a Better Community/ Hope Gardens; Association of Hispanic Ministers; Catholic Charities; Christian Cultural Center; Global Ministries in Christ; Long Island College Hospital Chaplaincy Program; New York Board of Rabbis; Brooklyn Law School; City University of New York; Columbia University; Long Island University; and New York City Technical College. The grantee is also currently negotiating with the Crime Victim's Board to have someone on site at the FJC, which would help victims get their reimbursements more quickly, and be a resource for potential funding opportunities. Other local agencies have requested to join the FJC and the grantee is accepting proposals for future consideration.

The grantee plans to have over 150 staff plus volunteers working at the FJC. New staff that will be hired by the Mayor's Office include a project director, an assistant project director, a training/volunteer coordinator, a childcare/art therapy coordinator, and two bilingual receptionists. A number of other partners plan to provide support staff, including the Brooklyn District Attorney's Office (relocating its 68 person Domestic Violence Bureau); the New York City Police Department; Department of Probation; Department for the Aging; Human Resources Administration; Sanctuary for Families and South Brooklyn Legal Services; Health and Hospitals Corporation and Long Island College Hospital; Arab American Family Support Center; ArtStart; Barrier Free Living; CAMBA; Caribbean Women's Health Association; Center Against Domestic Violence; Dwa Fanm; Haitian Violence Prevention; Jewish Association for Services for the Aged; Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services; Long Island College Hospital Rape Crises Intervention; Metropolitan Council on Jewish Poverty; New York Asian Women's Center; Ohel Children's Home and Family Services; Safe Horizon; Women Working for a Better Community/Hope Gardens; Association of Hispanic Ministers; Catholic Charities; Christian

Cultural Center; Global Ministries in Christ; Long Island College Hospital Chaplaincy program; and New York Board of Rabbis.

Many of the non-government providers listed above are providing similar services on site (primarily case management and counseling), but are, by the nature of their organizations, targeting specialized populations. These same agencies are providing on-site support on a part-time basis, which means that their services will not be available all the time. The grantee recognizes the potential problem with too much specialization among the non-government providers and the need for generalized services to be available. Therefore, all of the non-government providers have agreed to make their dedicated staff available as generalists for intake and to provide specialized case management services for cases assigned to their agency.

It is the grantee's expectation that all of the grantees will fulfill the commitments described in the MOU, which will enable them to provide the following services on site: intake; on-site case management; counseling; legal assistance; opportunities to obtain restraining orders; links to medical and mental health professionals; limited medical services; child care; emergency transportation assistance; assistance with access to public assistance; vouchers for public transportation and food; mandatory training program for volunteers; on-site chaplains; counseling; interpretation services; and outreach.

3. Initial Project Screening

Is the grantee interested in being evaluated?

The grantee is currently in discussions with two researchers from Columbia University, Dr. Kathryn Conroy and Dr. Miriam Ehrensaft to provide pro bono evaluation support. Up to now, the grantee has only had initial conversations with the researchers, but is hoping that the researchers will help the grantee identify outcomes for the FJC and what data sources may be used to measure those outcomes. Because the work would be done pro bono, the grantee expects minimal evaluation support, which would not include any kind of analysis or interpretation of the data collected. However, both the grantee and the researchers themselves would be interested in additional funding to support a formal outcome evaluation of the Brooklyn FJC. The grantee is very interested in this and feels Brooklyn is a site worth the investment because it has the caseloads to support a strong evaluation design.

Is there a local evaluation? If so, summarize methods and findings.

The grantee feels it can expect some consultation from the researchers, but recognizes that it can't expect a lot, given they are not financially supporting any evaluation efforts.

What is the background/history of this project?

As mentioned above, the Mayor's Office supported a pilot program, the Domestic Violence Response Teams (DVRT) in two precincts in the fall of 2002. The initiative involves 11 city agencies and eight community-based organizations (all of which are involved in the FJC) that work together to coordinate the services provided to high-risk victims of domestic violence in two NYPD precincts. Participation in the program is voluntary. Victim advocates present cases at monthly team meetings and the DVRT develops an action plan and dates when services will be provided, and the advocate provides that information back to the victim. Although the program is very small (only 10 cases are reviewed a month), the Mayor's Office views this program as having successfully helped not only the victims, but has strengthened relationships among city

agencies and identified gaps and problems with policies that prevent services from being provided efficiently, which has resulted in policy changes. The grantee views this program as a virtual FJC and believes the implementation of a FJC in Brooklyn will continue to develop the synergies that have been created among the participating agencies.

The grantee also feels the FJC is a way to continue to build upon collaborative efforts in the DA's Office and by community-based service provider organizations.

The grantee mentioned that a team of students from NYU did an evaluation of the community-based organizations participating in the FJC to assess their strengths and weaknesses, expertise, and expectations about joining the FJC, which the grantee will use as it is designing the FJC. Another result of the project was a grid showing existing partnerships between the community-based organizations and other partner agencies, which demonstrated the high degree of collaboration already present in the community.

At what stage of implementation is it?

At the time of our contact, the grantee was in the early implementation phase. It is no longer in the planning stage, where it is identifying needs and gathering recommendations, but is entering implementation. Its work teams are developing targeted policies and recommendations and beginning in April the key partners will begin using the targeted recommendations to develop an overall policy for the FJC, which will allow them to develop protocols and training manuals, and then begin recruiting staff and volunteers. They are also in the process of getting NEPA clearance for their start-up location (one floor in the building the DA's Office is currently located), have just posted adds for the director and assistant director positions, and are drafting job descriptions for the other positions.

When do they anticipate being fully operational?

The grantee is hoping to open their doors this summer, but recognizes this might not be realistic.

The grantee anticipates seeing about 20 clients a day. The FJC caseload will start with existing cases in the DA's DV unit and a smaller number of cases brought over from other partner agencies. In general, they don't anticipate a shortage of clients, and plan to start slowly with existing clients (for the first few months). The grantee also believes the FJC is not limited by what the providers can offer at the FJC, because, combined, they have 970 other people at their primary locations who can provide services to victims off-site. It views the FJC as a place to learn about services available in the community.

Describe staffing.

The grantee's strategic planner has organized the planning into two phases. The first phase involves a number of different work teams that represent all of the partners and represent different areas of operational planning. There are nine work teams addressing reception, intake, counseling, case management, civil legal, criminal justice, clergy, offsite partners, and university partners. Each work team has had a two-month period to develop policy recommendations that will be submitted to the core team for review and consolidation into an overall policy for the FJC. Each work team has a leader from one of the FJC partners and is supposed to include government and non-government partners. The teams meet every other week on average and all report to the strategic planner. The grantee feels this approach has been a good one and has kept each of the partners focused and engaged during the planning process. The second phase is for all the various

recommendations to be reviewed and integrated into one policy. This consolidation will begin in April and will be done by the core team. The core team includes a representative from the Mayor's Office (Yolanda Jimenez), the King County District Attorney's Office (Wanda Lucibello), Sanctuary for Families and South Brooklyn Legal (Dorchen Leidholdt), Dwa Fanm (Farah Tanis), NYPD (Chief Kathy Ryan), and the strategic planner (Jane Ambrose). This group serves as a steering committee for the FJC and each person is on one of the work teams, so they can report on work team progress at monthly meetings.

The development of the FJC policy will also be based on the results of victim survivor focus groups, which have been held to get input on the FJC.

The grantee anticipates that there will be about 136 staff working at the FJC on a full or part-time basis, not including volunteers. Full-time grant-funded positions include a project director, an assistant project director, a training/volunteer coordinator, a child care/art therapy coordinator, and two receptionists. Relocated full and part-time staff will include: 68-person staff of the Brooklyn DA's Domestic Violence Bureau; 1 full-time Domestic Violence Officer from the NYPD; an on-site liaison from the Department of Probation; 1 full-time staff person with elder abuse experience from the Department for the Aging; a staff person from the Human Resources Administration; 4 full-time attorneys, 1 full-time paralegal, pro bono matrimonial attorneys, and law school interns from Sanctuary for Families and South Brooklyn Legal Services; medical staff, a midwife coordinator, and a chemical dependency coordinator from Health Hospitals Corporation; a number of part-time social work, counseling, case management, staff members, and volunteers from the various community-based organizations will be at the FJC on part-time rotating bases; and part-time faith-based leaders from the various faith-based organizations partnering on the project.

Describe stability of the program over time.

The program has not provided services to date.

Describe the target population.

The target population is victims of domestic violence in Brooklyn. However, the grantee has had discussions about the potential situation where a victim lives in a different borough and is seeking shelter in Brooklyn or has active cases in the Bronx and Brooklyn and will want to receive services through the FJC. At this point, they are going to try to take all cases, but may ultimately (depending on case load) have to refer cases to partners in other boroughs or agencies that provide services city-wide.

What are project's outcome goals in the view of the project director?

The grantee's goal is for the FJC to make the victims of domestic violence safer than they would otherwise be, because they are engaging in more services than they would have in the past. They believe the co-location of services will be much more helpful to victims than receiving multiple phone numbers for the different resources available in the community. The grantee hopes this would encourage survivors to seek services from multiple providers in the community. A recent survey conducted by Safe Horizons highlighted this issue, showing that most of its clients have never been anywhere else to receive services. The grantee also hopes that service providers themselves will become more aware of other services available in Brooklyn and the rest of the city. Additionally, the hope is that the new collaborations among government and non-government service providers will create synergies that will make the whole process of providing

services more efficient. The grantee is also hopeful that victims will be more satisfied with the services available through the FJC and are hoping to collect this information through victim entry and exit surveys.

The partners are also hoping to raise awareness at both the statewide and national level of the benefits of establishing a FJC in their communities.

Does the personnel/director describe key project elements?

In terms of key elements, the grantee identified housing as the primary need among victims and their families. The FJC intends to address this with the six housing specialists at the Center and is considering creating an automatic link from the FJC to the housing hotlines. Because they recognize housing as a key priority among victims, they are trying to make it a primary element of the FJC. Another key element identified by the grantee is that the FJC provide accurate information upon entry. Access to civil legal assistance is another important element of the FJC, because many of the main services providers do not have experts on housing, immigration, etc. Having language abilities under one roof is also critical, given the diversity of the population in Brooklyn, which is why the grantee is ensuring that it has trained staff available that can serve as both advocate and interpreter.

Do they describe how the project's primary activities contribute to the goals?

Since the services that will be available at the FJC have always been available in the community, how they contribute to the goals of the FJC is directly related to how those same services are provided at the FJC. Therefore, the important element, at least in the short-term, is that the FJC is designed to foster a confidential environment. Also, because the start-up site is in the same building as the District Attorney's Office, the grantee considers it a challenge to design something that looks like a FJC and not an extension of the DA's Office. This is in addition to the challenge of designing a physical space that is victim-centered and does not compromise the discovery process or increase liability among partners. The grantee also wants to be sure clients know that the FJC is not an add on to the criminal justice system, that each partner has an active voice, and that victims will not be pressured into accessing one service or another.

Can you sketch the logic by which activities affect goals?

Brooklyn Family Justice Center Logic Model

<u>Inputs</u>	<u>Activities</u>	<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Impacts</u>	<u>Goals</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •On-site partners •Intake systems •Client management process •Space design •Site location 	<p><u>FLC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Case management •Assistance with protection orders •Assistance with police reports •Legal assistance •Civil legal assistance •Advocacy •Medical assistance •Screening and assessments •Chaplain services •Housing assistance •Emergency food/clothing/transportation •Referral services •Assistance accessing public assistance •Translation services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •FJC informational materials •Community outreach •Volunteer programs <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Collaboration between government and non-gov't providers •Improve tracking systems 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increased likelihood to access services •Increase demand for services •Increase usage of services •Increase frequency of cross-referrals or use of multiple services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase knowledge of DV/SA •Increase awareness of services available <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improved DV policies and procedures •Increased understanding of each other's services •Increased coordination of services 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reduce tendency to blame oneself for abuse •Reduce conditions prevent women from leaving •Increase victim satisfaction with services •Increase likelihood of reporting incident •Increase likelihood of request for temporary/permanent restraining orders •Increase likelihood of participating in prosecution •Increased satisfaction with services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase awareness of FJC •Decrease social tolerance for VAW <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve institutional response to DV •Increase variety and quality of services •Improve efficiency of service delivery •Decrease secondary trauma •Increase assurance of victim safety •Increase successful prosecution of batterers •Decrease case processing time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease VAW in the community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease repeat victimizations •Decrease seriousness •Hold offenders accountable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease repeat offenders •National awareness of FJC as a tool to reduce violence in the community

Is the logic supported by empirical evidence?

The Family Justice Center initiative does not change the services previously available in the community through government and non-government agencies, but changes the way in which the same services are being offered to victims and their families. Although the benefits of accessing specific services have been studied, the Family Justice Center concept offers an opportunity to examine whether co-location produces additional benefits (intended and unintended) to victims, their families, and the community, as well as to the participating agencies and the system itself. An evaluation of the PFJCI would help provide this kind of evidence.

Are there apparent contradictions or conflicts between certain activities and outcomes expected?

There are no apparent contradictions.

What data systems exist that would facilitate an evaluation?

The grantee is planning very minimal data collection by the FJC. An evaluation would have to rely on existing data systems at each of the partner organizations. The Mayor's Office is a central repository for DV-related data collected by city agencies, but has no control over partner data collection or databases (not all partners maintain electronic records).

What are the key data elements that are contained in these systems?

The grantee is very concerned with the data collected at intake and is not planning to develop any type of case management system, only a case scheduling system. At present, they are envisioning something that would say, "Mary came in and was referred to 5 partner providers." Because they are not anticipating collecting identifying information, there will be no follow-up tracking and, therefore, the potential for duplication in any aggregate counts will exist. They had been waiting on San Diego to identify the maximum collectable data at the client level and OVW to decide on whether they were going to develop a progress reports for the PFJCI, but have been waiting too long now and may move ahead without either piece of information (although they recognize the importance of having at least the progress report information prior to designing any data collection system). The reason they are keeping the data collection to a minimum is because of the potential for subpoena – if there are no case notes then there are no data for discovery. They are planning to do an exit survey, but may not even data enter it so that the information is not available for discovery.

Are there data to estimate unit costs of services or activities?

Because the system is so large in NY, the grantee feels looking at cost would involve a separate study, unless something computerized was developed to help them estimate savings. They agree that cost benefits are possible, through less serious crimes being prosecuted, reduction in recidivism, savings on transportation costs among partners through less repeat visits, and other savings they probably have not considered.

Are there data about possible comparison samples?

As stated above, the Mayor's Office is the repository for all city data related to domestic violence. Therefore, there is the possibility of comparing Brooklyn to the other boroughs, at least on some level. It may be more difficult to get comparable data from community-based organizations that may not be organized at the borough level (some may provide services city-wide and don't track information by borough) and across boroughs because of specialization among providers.

In general, how useful are data systems to an impact evaluation

Until the grantee completes the design of its data system, it is not possible to determine this at this point, but it looks like government-level data will be available for the city and over time. What is of question is what type of information would be available from community-based organizations and the FJC itself.

5.10. Ouachita Parish, LA

1. Grantee

Ouachita Parish Police Jury

LAV: None

Duration: 8/01/2004 – 1/31/2006

Current Award: \$1,184,220

Funding History: None

Information is based on a review of the grant application, conversation with Kimberly Woodard (OVW Program Monitor) that took place on 2/25/05, and a conference call with Tammy Slawson (Director of FJC), Janet Danklefsen (Assistant Director of the FJC), Tessa Lechard (Administrative Assistant for FJC), and Alicia Turner (Information Management Systems Coordinator) that took place on 3/10/05.

2. Project Summary

This is a project with the goal of expanding upon current efforts to improve the community's response to domestic violence by enhancing the existing system to make it more efficient and effective. The community believes that a one-stop shop for local domestic violence victims and their families would serve this purpose. A significant portion of the grant award (a little over 65%) is to support personnel who will be managing and staffing the center. This includes a project coordinator, an administrative assistant, three victim advocates, a counselor, an information management systems coordinator, two child advocates, a part-time nurse practitioner, a full-time attorney, and a legal assistant. The remainder of the award is to support travel, equipment, supplies, rent, and consultant costs (including \$4,000 for a research consultant).

The non-profit agency taking the lead in the implementation of the grant is Wellspring Inc. (formerly YWCA). The Wellspring has played a leadership role in Ouachita Parish's SAFE (Stopping Abusive Family Environments) Task Force since its inception in 1988. The Task Force was organized for the purpose of supporting ongoing interagency cooperation and collaboration in addressing the issue of domestic violence. It has active representation from law enforcement, prosecution, judiciary, probation and parole, FBI, the medical community, social services, the educational community, the faith community, service providers, victims' advocates, and survivors of domestic violence. One of its most recent accomplishments was the development and publication in 2002 of the *Ouachita Parish Domestic Violence Community Response Manual*, which details and attempts to standardize existing policies, procedures, protocols, services, and training, as well as providing research and a foundation for future planning. When the Wellspring saw the PFJCI RFP, it felt that establishing a Family Justice Center was the natural next step toward promoting a coordinated community response in Ouachita Parish.

As outlined in the grant application, the proposed goals of the project are to expand existing efforts to: (1) ensure victim access to community resources by establishing a FJC; (2) improve tracking of cases; (3) expand and strengthen existing efforts between law enforcement officers, prosecutors, non-profit non-governmental victim advocacy groups, and other related parties to investigate and prosecute incidents of domestic violence; and (4) to better hold batterers accountable for behavior.

A number of government and non-government service providers signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) committing them to work with the Parish to support the implementation of a Family Justice Center. Partners who signed the MOU include: the 4th Judiciary District Office of Probation; 4th Judicial District Attorney's Office; Monroe Police Department; Ouachita Parish Police Jury; Ouachita Parish Sheriff's Office; West Monroe Police Department; Legal Services of North Louisiana; LSU Regional Medical Center; Monroe Regional Office of Community Service; and the Wellspring. The FJC director said that they are working to add Primary Healthcare Services and a representative from the faith community to the MOU.

The Wellspring is hiring the staff that will be assigned to the FJC, and is planning to relocate all of its non-residential staff and services to the FJC. A number of other partners plan to provide staff support, including the Monroe Police Department, Ouachita Parish Sheriff's Office, Office of the District Attorney for Ouachita Parish, Legal Services of North Louisiana, and Primary Healthcare Services. The director is currently working with the faith community to establish a chaplaincy program on site. Other partners will provide staff on an as-needed basis.

It is the director's expectation that all of the MOU partners will follow through with commitments made in the MOU, which would allow it to provide the following services on-site: intake, safety planning, domestic violence education, protection orders, counseling, legal assistance, child care, transportation assistance, food vouchers, chaplaincy services, translation services, financial empowerment services, referrals for housing and other community resources, police reports, investigators to review cases and follow-up with victims, forensic medical exams, limited medical exams, ability to talk to a district attorney about a case, and court escorts. The director said they are also trying to set up video conferencing capabilities so that victims can participate in trials without having to go to the courthouse. Additional services will be available through referral (e.g., shelter, emergency room care).

3. Initial Project Screening

Is the grantee interested in being evaluated?

The grantee included \$4,000 in its budget for a local researcher to conduct an evaluation. These funds were approved and the director is, therefore, planning to hire a local research consultant to develop an evaluation plan that identifies outcomes and how they might be measured. The director is also interested in having the consultant review the FJC intake system to see if there is any other information the FJC should be tracking (e.g., homicides, major injuries).

Is there a local evaluation? If so, summarize methods and findings.

A local evaluator has not been contracted with yet, so there has been no agreement made on the scope of the evaluation activities (which will be for \$4,000).

What is the background/history of this project?

As mentioned earlier, the Wellspring heads the SAFE Task Force, which meets at least once a month to discuss how the partners can continue to improve the coordination of services to the domestic violence community. At the time the RFP for the PFJCI was released, the Task Force had just completed developing and implementing a community protocol designed to standardize provider response to victims. The Parish felt it was, therefore, ready for co-location, which would help bring its efforts toward standardization to the next level. This work will also build upon its smaller-scale coordination efforts, i.e., legal advocates from Wellspring working with the District

Attorney's Office to make sure victims have assistance filling out forms for protection orders. The Wellspring also has a contact at the Monroe Police Department that it can call to have someone investigate victim allegations that police officers responding to an incident did not follow protocol. Since starting the process of implementing a FJC, the Parish has also received funding to open a Child Advocacy Center that will be adjacent to and connected to the FJC.

At what stage of implementation is it?

At the time of our contact, the director described the grantee as being in the early implementation phase. They had received NEPA clearance, so the special condition has been lifted on their grant funds. They hope to open the Center some time in July 2005 and, in the meantime, are working on renovating the space, developing policies and procedures, writing job descriptions, designing the organization (e.g., developing flow charts, etc.), and having their different planning subcommittees review issues as they arise. Since October of 2004, Wellspring has also been discussing the FJC with survivors who attend its monthly survivor meetings, asking them about the barriers to service, ideas on how the flow of service should occur at the FJC, and other information that would help guide the steering committee.

When do they anticipate being fully operational?

The director anticipates opening the doors of the FJC in July 2005 and hopes to serve approximately 1,000 clients a year.

Describe staffing.

Since becoming the FJC director (she was a former employee of Wellspring), the director has taken the responsibility for planning the FJC and leading the steering team (although she pointed out that all the partners have an equal voice). Each of the partners (those who signed the MOU) has assigned a representative to participate on the steering committee, which meets bi-weekly to discuss FJC business and hear reports from each of its five sub-committees. The sub-committees are organized around facility, security, medical, technological, and legal issues. Representatives from the SAFE Task Force advise the planning committee.

The director anticipates there will be about 20 staff working at the FJC on a full or part-time basis. The staff will include the newly hired staff (the director, the assistant director, an administrative assistant, an information management systems coordinator, counselor, outreach coordinator, attorney and legal assistant (attorney was required by OVW)) and relocated staff, which will include case managers from Wellspring; one full-time and one part-time investigator from the Monroe Police Department; a part-time investigator, clerical assistant, and grant manager from the Sheriff's Office; a part-time assistant DA from the District Attorney's Office; a part-time staff attorney from Legal Services of Northern Louisiana; and the grantee is hoping to have a part-time nurse practitioner from Primary Healthcare Services and chaplains through a faith-based community partner on-site.

Describe stability of the program over time.

The program has not provided services to date, although the team seems to be well organized.

Describe the target population.

The target population is victims of domestic violence and domestic violence-related sexual assault in Ouachita Parish, which includes the cities of Monroe and West Monroe.

What are project's outcome goals in the view of the project director?

According to the director, the goal of the FJC is to co-locate existing services into one building to make services more convenient to survivors and to improve collaboration between partners. The longer-term goal is to not let victims or batterers fall through the cracks. When pressed on the type of impact they would like to see the FJC have on victims, they identified that they are hoping the visibility of the FJC would encourage more victims to seek services, which may result in less re-victimization, less victim blaming, a feeling of empowerment among victims, and the removal of some barriers to leaving. The site is also very focused on system change outcomes, believing that the FJC will facilitate a greater understanding among partners, resulting in cross-referral (where victims who were previously only interested in justice services may seek out advocacy services and vice versa). They are also hoping that the partners will become more aware of holes in the system and work together to fix them.

Does the personnel/director describe key project elements?

The director stated that in order to successfully provide services to victims through co-location, the planning team needs to focus on the partnerships itself, specifically on training, flexibility, confidentiality issues, keeping a positive attitude, sustainability, and the importance of continuing to strive for efficiency. The director feels that what makes the co-location different from the current situation (each partner doing their own thing) is making the process of accessing services easier to maneuver and having an impact on how each partner serves victims. Additionally, the director pointed out that the partners are not just co-locating, but they are also connecting electronically in a lot of ways. For example, they are establishing a system to help improve the tracking of batterer cases (they are implementing a system where the court will enter information on the status of batterer cases so law enforcement and other criminal justice partners can have information on, for example whether warrants have been issued, immediately), which will ultimately allow them to help victims more effectively (pick a perpetrator up on a warrant more quickly).

Do they describe how the project's primary activities contribute to the goals?

Since the services that will be available at the FJC have always been available in the community, how they contribute to the goals of the FJC is directly related to how those same services are provided at the FJC. Therefore, according to the grantee the important elements, at least in the short-term, are activities like training, setting up confidential procedures and systems, and other strategies to design safe and more efficient service delivery.

Can you sketch the logic by which activities affect goals?

Ouachita Parish Family Justice Center Logic Model

<u>Inputs</u>	<u>Activities</u>	<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Impacts</u>	<u>Goals</u>
	<p><u>FLC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Case management •Assistance with protection orders •Safety planning •Legal assistance •Advocacy •Medical assistance •Forensic medical exams •Counseling services •Referrals for housing •Emergency food/clothing/transportation •Referral services •Faith-based services •Child care •Financial empowerment services •Translation services 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •On-site partners •Intake systems •Client management process •Space design •Site location 		<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increased likelihood to access services •Increase demand for services •Increase usage of services •Increase frequency of cross-referrals or use of multiple services 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reduce tendency to blame oneself for abuse •Reduce conditions prevent women from leaving •Increase likelihood of request for temporary/permanent restraining orders •Increase likelihood of participating in prosecution 	
	<p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •FJC informational materials •Community trainings •Volunteer programs 	<p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase knowledge of DV/SA •Increase awareness of services available 	<p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase awareness of FJC •Decrease social tolerance for VAW 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease VAW in the community •Decrease repeat victimizations •Decrease seriousness •Hold offenders accountable •Decrease repeat offenders
	<p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Collaboration between government and non-gov't providers •Cross-training •Access to offender tracking systems 	<p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve DV policies and procedures •Increase understanding of each other's services •Increase coordination of services 	<p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve institutional response to DV •Decrease secondary trauma •Increase assurance of victim safety •Increase prosecution of batterers •Decrease case processing time 	

Is the logic supported by empirical evidence?

The Family Justice Center initiative does not change the services previously available in the community through government and non-government agencies, but changes the *way* in which the same services are being offered to victims and their families. Although the benefits of accessing specific services have been studied, the Family Justice Center concept offers an opportunity to examine whether co-location produces additional benefits (intended and unintended) to victims, their families, and the community, as well as to the participating agencies and the system itself. An evaluation of the PFJCI would help provide this kind of evidence.

Are there apparent contradictions or conflicts between certain activities and outcomes expected?

There are no apparent contradictions.

What data systems exist that would facilitate an evaluation?

The site is planning to use ThinkStream to track perpetrators, which will be available to its criminal justice partners at the FJC (to improve offender accountability). They also plan to use ServicePoint, a web-based community case management program that is currently being used by Wellspring. They still need to develop an intake system, but plan to build one from ServicePoint. The information management systems coordinator is working on the intake system now and

reviewing the case management system to see what changes might be made to the version being used at Wellspring. She attended the on-line discussion on confidentiality issues hosted by NNEDV.

What are the key data elements that are contained in these systems?

The case management system includes demographic information (DOB and, in some cases, social security number), services received, client goals and whether they have been met, whether the client was partially or fully served, and others that the IT coordinator could not remember. She was able to say that the information is tracked at the client level and allows case managers to return to the file to update client information on return visits. In terms of the intake system, they are still designing this and are focused on ensuring that the information required for the OVW Progress Report is included, as well as the data required of them to collect through special condition. These variables are: number of persons served; number of persons seeking services who could not be served; number and percentage of arrests relative to the number of police responses to domestic violence incidents; number of protection orders issued; and number of victim advocates supported by grant funding. The director thinks they would also be interested in tracking the number of times the partners meet, coordination activities, and times ThinkStream is used (as an indicator of holding batterers accountable).

Are there data to estimate unit costs of services or activities?

When asked, the director said not at that point, but she could see how this would be very interesting data.

Are there data about possible comparison samples?

There may be, but it is hard to determine the size of the comparison population at this point. The population may include women who walked into the Wellspring and did not go on to seek services at the FJC. The Wellspring will continue to run the crises hotline and will refer all victims who are not seeking residential services to the FJC (referring only those seeking shelter to the Wellspring because it plans to relocate all its non-residential services to the FJC). But, if someone walks into the Wellspring (which is likely since it has been an established avenue for help since 1954), they will be seen at the Wellspring regardless of their needs and may not go on to the FJC.

In general, how useful are data systems to an impact evaluation

Until the grantee completes the design of its data system, it is not possible to determine this at this point.

5.11. Sitka Tribe of Alaska

1. Grantee

Sitka Tribe

LAV Co-Applicant: Alaska Network on Domestic Violence

Duration: 10/01/2004 – 3/31/2006

Current Award: \$1,115,000; LAV: \$150,000

Funding History: None

Information provided is based on a review of the grant application, a conversation with Darlene Averik (OVW Program Monitor) that took place on 2/15/05, and a telephone call with Chris Dunbar that took place on 2/22/05.

2. Project Summary

The grantee proposes to provide culturally sensitive “one-stop” services to victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. The grantee’s principal goal is to provide victims with the services they need. The grantee also intends to provide culturally sensitive services that will create the trust and demonstrate the respect necessary to encourage Native Americans experiencing domestic violence and sexual assault to come to the FJC. Finally, the grantee expects to provide public education about domestic violence through radio and television public service announcements, at community forums and tribal meetings, and at schools.

The grantee hopes to be able to become a model for a Family Justice Center that other rural areas in the State with a large Native American population can adopt or adapt.

The FJC will have seven full-time on-site staff: the program coordinator; an outreach worker/victim advocate; a Sitka Police Department police officer; a counselor from the Sitka Tribe; a Native American healer; a tribal attorney; an assistant district attorney, and a receptionist. Because the partnering agencies are so small in this sparsely populated area (the city of Sitka has a population of 8,000), not all partnering agencies will be able to provide staff at the center, but will instead be available on-call and use shared space at the facility. Including on-site staff and on-call service providers, there will be as many as 12 staff at the center at any one time.

Victims who appear at the police department, tribe, or shelter to report domestic violence will be transported to the FJC where an advocate will conduct an intake interview to determine which off-site partner agencies—for example, a prosecutor or a counselor—need to be brought in to help the victim. The program coordinator expects these individuals to be able to come to the center within 15 minutes or as soon as possible. For other services—for example, linking a victim with a workforce development person—the FJC will provide the initial hook-up between a victim and a provider at the center, but the victim will need to meet at the provider’s location for further assistance. The center will offer transportation, as needed.

The grantee plans to offer the following services on-site provided either by the full-time center staff or by part-time on-call providers from the community: case reporting and investigation through the on-site Sitka Police Department Domestic Violence Unit officer; case preparation and orders of protection through the FJC’s tribal attorney and prosecutor; support from Native American healers (one full time on site and a second available on call); legal assistance and representation through the on-site tribal attorney; shelter placement and advocacy through on-call

staff from Sitkans Against Domestic Violence; medical needs provided by on-call State Public Health Service nurses; and mental health assessments and counseling provided on call by three counselors from Sitka Counseling and Prevention Services

The center will provide the following services by referring clients to off-site providers: needs assessment of children and families and referrals for follow-up help through the State Office of Children's Services (the in-house advocate may also make this determination and make referrals); support from a third Native American healer (in addition to the full-time on-site and part-time on-call healer); case preparation and orders of protection through a second prosecuting office attorney (in addition to the two on-site attorneys); mental health assessments and counseling provided by referral (as well as by the three on-call counselors) from Sitka Counseling and Prevention Services; and help with obtaining public assistance and employment through the State Division of Public Assistance and the State Workforce Development Agency.

Other partners in the FJC will include: State Division of Juvenile Justice; Juvenile and Adult Probation Offices; Sitkans Against Family Violence (for prevention and education materials and training); the State Office of Public Health (to help develop education and prevention strategies); and Alaska Network on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (for advice, training, and educational materials).

The roles and responsibilities of the 10 principal partners are clearly specified in a Memorandum of Understanding. The grantee's budget anticipates spending a relatively low portion of the award for personnel (approximately 22 percent). The remainder of the award is to support travel for training, equipment and supplies, renovation expenses (\$300,000), indirect costs (\$312,900), and other costs.

3. Initial Project Screening

Is the grantee interested in being evaluated?

Yes.

Is there a local evaluation? If so, summarize methods and findings.

The grantee plans to arrange for an independent, pro bono evaluation by university professors and graduate students 6, 12, or 18 months after the center has been open. The director has been able in the past to arrange for professors to provide pro bono evaluations of other programs.

What is the background/history of this project?

There was no coordination of services to victims of domestic violence in Sitka before the Family Justice Center. In the past, Sitka Police Department officers made arrests and its Domestic Violence Unit took cases to court, but victims had to access other services on their own.

At what stage of implementation is it?

The program experienced delays when it failed to close on two properties it had identified for housing the FJC—because property is scarce in Sitka and other bidders secured the locations sooner. The FJC is currently temporarily located in a shelter. The FJC will eventually be housed in an old day care center. However, three months were lost in renovating the FJC because the former occupants could not move out on time when construction of a new day care center to

house them was delayed. Renovations will begin on September 1, 2005. The site has already received an expedited NEPA approval.

Chris Dunbar, the center director, was officially hired February 1, 2005, although he began work January 3 in order to be able to attend FJC training. While all the desired partners have been identified and have agreed to participate, other agencies continue to join the effort.

The grantee has established a board of directors, consisting of the tribal director, a police representative, the shelter director, and the counseling center director. The program coordinator has invited representatives of the city council, district attorney's office, and school district to join, as well. The board is responsible for immediate oversight of the center. The grantee has also set up an oversight or steering committee, comprised of all interested partners, that is responsible for providing guidance to the center.

The grantee has drafted FJC policies and procedures, along with floor plans for the center that Dunbar presented to the board of directors on February 23, 2005. The board approved the plans with minor changes.

When do they anticipate being fully operational?

The center director reported he hopes to open the center by November 1, 2005, but is not certain he can meet even this deadline.

Describe staffing.

Three individuals have been most active in planning and implementing the program to date.

Chris Dunbar, the full-time program coordinator is a former 15-year veteran police officer in Alaska. He will report to the oversight committee (see above). In addition to being the Center's operations officer, he will prepare cases for prosecution. (Robi Craig, deputy director of the Sitka Tribe, was responsible for program coordination until Dunbar was hired, at which time she relinquished her responsibilities.)

Louise Brady, social services director of the Sitka Tribe, is the planner for the program. Dunbar and she meet almost every day for planning purposes. Brady, who serves on both committees, will also supervise the native healers.

Lieutenant Sheldon Schmitt of the Sitka Police Department has participated in every phase of the program's planning and implementation.

Although the current team has been working effectively, the grantee has had difficulty finding Native Americans to serve as staff or in an administrative capacity on the team—Native Americans have either been unwilling to participate or have not been qualified. However, the program coordinator reported that three Native Americans will be providing services full time at the center—a tribal healer, attorney, and counselor.

Describe stability of the program over time.

The program has not provided services to date.

Describe the target population.

The FJC's three target populations will be: victims of domestic violence; victims of sexual assault regardless of whether the offender is a family member; and children who witness domestic violence or sexual assault. The program will serve male as well as female victims.

The center director estimates the program will serve roughly 60–90 clients a year. This assumes that many Native American victims who previously did not report their victimization to the police will be willing to come to the FJC, given the Sitka Tribe's sponsorship of the program and the three full-time on-site Native American providers.

What are project's outcome goals in the view of the project director?

The grantee's goal is to make sure victims receive the services they need—whether the victim supports prosecuting the offender or not. For example, by providing counseling and parental training, the grantee may be encouraged to end the cycle of violence.

Another client goal is to help victims become self-sufficient and thereby avoid the economic dependence that impels some women to continue to live with the person who is battering them. The grantee expects to reduce revictimization not only by enabling victims to leave their batterers, but also by enabling victims not to fear following through with prosecution.

The grantee's goal for the system is to hold the batterer accountable through arrest and, depending on the circumstances, prosecution. The program director realizes that, once an offender has been arrested, it will be up to the district attorney, the tribe, and the batterer to determine whether there will be a prosecution. For example, in some instances the district attorney may elect to postpone prosecution if the batterer agrees to certain conditions of probation (such as participating in counseling) and then drop the charges if the person successfully fulfills the conditions.

Does the personnel/director describe key project elements?

The grantee believes that the co-location of services is critical to improving access and to use of services; providing transportation to referred services will be important to increasing the potential for victims to actually use services, and having Native Americans on staff and supporting a culturally sensitive FJC will increase the legitimacy of the FJC and be critical to it achieving its goals.

Do they describe how the project's primary activities contribute to the goals?

By co-locating services, thereby significantly reducing the need to go from agency to agency, the grantee expects more victims will be willing to support prosecution, resulting in improvements in holding batterers accountable and therefore reduced domestic violence. Whenever FJC staff refer victims to off-site service providers, the center will attempt to provide any needed transportation in this rural area where services can be miles apart.

As noted above, the grantee expects that, by helping victims to become self-sufficient so that they feel they can leave an abusive partner, feel confident about following through with prosecution, or both, the level of domestic violence in the community will decline as offenders have less access to their victims and are held accountable.

The grantee expects that offering services by Native Americans who are familiar with and respectful of the culture of the many victims who are Native Americans will result in more victims reporting abuse and following through with prosecution. Even if Native American victims are not willing to support prosecution, the cultural sensitivity of program staff and services is expected to increase the number of victims who come to the FJC to receive other services, helping to achieve the grantee’s goal of meeting victim needs regardless of whether they choose to support prosecution.

Another approach the center will use to facilitate reporting will be to videotape the intake interview and then share the tape with other service providers so that victims do not have to repeat their stories over and over again.

Irrespective of any victim support for prosecution, co-location of services and transportation to off-site service providers are expected to facilitate the grantee goal of meeting victims’ needs. The grantee also expects to track services to make sure the victim is being helped.

Can you sketch the logic by which activities affect goals?

Sitka Tribe Family Justice Center Logic Model

<u>Inputs</u>	<u>Activities</u>	<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Impacts</u>	<u>Goals</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •On-site partners •Intake systems •Client management process •Space design •Site location 	<p><u>FLC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Case management •Assistance with protection orders •Legal assistance •Advocacy •Medical assistance •Mental health assessment and counseling •Assistance with employment and public assistance •Referral services •Shelter placement •Children’s services •Native American healing services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Public education <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Collaboration between government and non-gov’t providers •Improved tracking systems 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase likelihood to access services •Increase reporting domestic violence •Increase usage of services •Increase frequency of cross-referrals or use of multiple services •Increase victim safety <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase knowledge of DV •Increase awareness of services available <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve DV policies and procedures •Increase coordination of services 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Victim’s needs are being met •Reduce conditions prevent women from leaving •Increase likelihood of request for temporary/permanent restraining orders •Increase likelihood of participating in prosecution <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase awareness of FJC •Increase cultural sensitivity of treatment of victims <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve institutional response to DV •Increase assurance of victim safety •Increase prosecution of batterers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease VAW in the community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease repeat victimizations •Decreased seriousness •Hold offenders accountable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease repeat offenders •Break the cycle of violence

Is the logic supported by empirical evidence?

The Family Justice Center initiative does not change the services previously available in the community through government and non-government agencies, but changes the *way* in which the same services are being offered to victims and their families. Although the benefits of accessing specific services have been studied, the Family Justice Center concept offers an opportunity to examine whether co-location produces additional benefits (intended and unintended) to victims, their families, and the community, as well as to the participating agencies and the system itself. An evaluation of the PFJCI would help provide this kind of evidence.

Are there apparent contradictions or conflicts between certain activities and outcomes expected?

No.

What data systems exist that would facilitate an evaluation?

The grantee is in the process of developing a data system. Because of concerns about confidentiality (“confidentiality keeps coming up as a barrier,” the program coordinator said), the coordinator is waiting for San Diego to provide help with developing a data system—“I am waiting for word from the experts for what I can do by way of data collection.”

Once technical assistance becomes available, the grantee will ask an information technology staff person who works for the city to build a database (the person has already agreed to do so on a pro bono basis).

The grantee expects to develop two intake systems. The first, which will be a paper record system only, will record information about individuals who come to the center. The second will be computerized and will track clients who agree after their intake interview to have their names recorded in a database. The center will share the second database with partner agencies, which will each maintain their own databases.

The development of tracking systems will be difficult for this grantee because it does not have the hardware or software needed to do so. In particular, there are few direct electronic connections on Baranof Island where Sitka is located and everything in Alaska is expensive (the site’s application reports that the cost of living in Alaska is about 30 percent higher than the national average).

What are the key data elements that are contained in these systems?

The grantee expects to track services and clients. The director does not yet know what data elements the systems will contain.

Are there data to estimate unit costs of services or activities?

The grantee doubts there will be data that can do this because to generate estimates he would need feedback from individual agencies that he does not expect them to be able or willing to provide.

Are there data about possible comparison samples?

The director believes there a comparison could be made on the total number of victims served before the center opens with the number served afterwards.

In general, how useful are data systems to an impact evaluation

Until the grantee designs its database system, it will not possible to determine this.

5.12. Somos Familia Family Institute, Inc. NV

1. Grantee

Somos Familia Family Institute Inc.

LAV: None

Duration: 10/01/2004 – 3/31/2006

Current Award: \$906,670

Funding History: None

Information is based on a review of the grant application, a conversation with LaTanya Watson (OVW Program Monitor) that took place on 1/27/05, and a conference call with Martin Lopez (FJC executive director) that took place on 2/8/05. Mr. Lopez provided additional information on 2/17/05.

2. Project Summary

This is a project with the goal of expanding existing collaborative efforts in the local domestic violence community to provide a one-stop shop to advocate for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, child victimization, and their families. The grantee is looking to use project funds to establish a FJC that can meet immediate safety and crises needs in the community on a 24-hour basis seven days a week and follow this up with the effective delivery of clinical and criminal justice intervention. A significant portion of the grant award (a little over 50%) is to support full-time and part-time personnel who will be managing and staffing the center. The remainder of the award is to support travel, equipment, supplies, rent, and consultant costs for legal services and the development of a computer tracking system.

The community is hoping to build upon the success of the Domestic Violence Community Alliance and its commitment to addressing the lack of services in the community. One of its successes was getting the Las Vegas Health Trust to donate space for a much-needed domestic violence shelter. As a result of the grant, the site considered further developing the space to co-locate coordinated services to victims through a Family Justice Center. The FJC's focus is to provide services to a low-income rural population in three counties that surround the city of Las Vegas. Without the FJC, victims of domestic violence and their families would have to travel great distances to receive social and criminal justice services.

The Domestic Violence Community Alliance (hereafter "Alliance"), through Somos Familia Family Institute (hereafter "Somos"), applied for the funding in collaboration with the following four other non-profit victim service providers: Rio Grande Treatment Centers, Samaritan House, New Mexico Legal Services, and Las Vegas Health Trust. As outlined in the grant application, the proposed goals of the project are to: (1) provide the primarily Hispanic, rural, tri-county area with a Family Justice Center offering comprehensive one-stop services, including treatment, counseling, and legal assistance; (2) expand existing collaborative efforts in the Domestic Violence Community Alliance to investigate and prosecute domestic violence incidents; (3) develop policies, educational programs, and training for local law enforcement to improve tracking of cases involving incidences of domestic and dating violence; (4) centralize and coordinate police enforcement and prosecution for domestic violence cases into a group of police officers, prosecutors, and probation and parole officers; and (5) develop coordination of computer tracking to ensure increased communication between law enforcement and prosecution entities.

A number of government and non-government service providers signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) committing them to work with Somos to support the implementation of a Family Justice Center. Based on the MOU, it is clear Somos is the lead agency tasked with implementation, taking responsibility for providing most of the services and hiring the only full-time staff that will be working at the FJC. The other staff that will be working at the Center are part-time and include an attorney from New Mexico Legal Services, a Community Health Specialist from the Public Health Office, an administrative aide from the Las Vegas Housing Authority, and clinical counseling staff from the Rio Grande Treatment Center. As a result, Somos is relying on many of the Center's services to be provided through referral or in-kind contribution of staff when needed.

It was clear from the director that he is still working with the District Attorney's Office on the details of its partnership with the FJC. Otherwise, his expectation is that all other partners will follow through with the commitments made in the MOU, which would allow it to provide the following services: intake, counseling, emergency shelter, development of a tracking system, victim advocacy, provision of emergency protection orders, tracking recidivism of batterers, legal assistance, medical services, family planning, assistance with access to public assistance, emergency housing, mental health treatment, substance abuse screening and counseling, and emergency food and assistance. Although not included in the MOU, the director mentioned that referrals will be made for an after-school program and for individuals requesting faith-based counseling, and that the Department of Children, Youth, & Families has been actively engaged in the grant because of their interest in keeping families together.

3. Initial Project Screening

Is the grantee interested in being evaluated?

The grantee is interested in being evaluated. The director has considered approaching a local university, Highland University, to discuss its willingness to do some sort of an evaluation. They are also hopeful that the San Diego FJC or the other grantees might share some tools they have developed to assess client satisfaction levels as a way to self-evaluate the implementation of the FJC.

Is there a local evaluation? If so, summarize methods and findings.

There is currently no local evaluation planned, although, as stated above, the grantee is considering approaching a local university to discuss its willingness to conduct some sort of evaluation. The grantee has not considered what specifically it would look for from a local evaluation and does not have funds to support evaluation activities.

What is the background/history of this project?

At the time the grant solicitation for the Family Justice Centers was released, the Alliance had been struggling to identify a strategy for providing services to San Miguel and other rural counties outside of the city of Las Vegas. This was of particular concern because a satellite facility that served as both a treatment center and shelter to these communities lost its funding and closed in 2001, which meant that, for example, victims would have to be willing to travel for over an hour to Santa Fe, NM to receive the services that had been provided in the community previously.

At what stage of implementation is it?

At the time of our contact, the grantee was in the early implementation stage. It did not have a lease signed on a location yet, and was still in the process of hiring most of its staff.

When do they anticipate being fully operational?

The grantee is currently reviewing the specifications for a space and plans to sign a lease by February 20, 2005. If this happens, it hopes to be operational (receiving clients) by March 20, 2005.

Describe staffing.

There are a number of government and non-government service providers that signed a Memorandum of Understanding in support of the Family Justice Center. Up to now, these partners have participated as part of a local learning exchange group, which the director tries to organize once a month. The Alliance also serves as an advising partner and meets with a core team from the FJC every other week. This core team is made up of a representative from the local city health department who serves as a strategic planner for the team; a representative from Community that Cares (a city agency) to assist the group with sustainability issues; the executive director of Somos who provides vision and project oversight; the FJC director responsible for Center operations; a captain with the State Police who has helped negotiate the site costs; and a member of the Alliance who also provides direction and leadership and is a member of the national advisory group.

When the FJC opens, the grantee plans to have nine full-time staff and five part-time staff working at the Center.

Describe stability of the program over time.

The program has not provided services to date.

Describe the target population.

The target population is victims and family members affected by domestic violence, dating violence, and child victimization that reside in a rural tri-county area – Guadalupe, Mora, and San Miguel counties. Based on figures on the number of cases handled by the domestic violence unit within the DA's Office, the project director estimated that the FJC would serve 250 clients a year.

What are project's outcome goals in the view of the project director?

According to the director, the goal is to provide a place where victims and their families can come without having to travel to multiple locations and where their needs can be met in a private and confidential manner. The director would like to see the FJC become a safe haven or sanctuary for victims and their families and hopes that by making services accessible, the culture or norms in this rural Hispanic community will change to make domestic violence less acceptable and the community less likely to blame the woman. A related goal is for the establishment of a FJC to demonstrate and educate the community on the seriousness of the domestic violence problem and the importance of the community's financial support for the Center and moral support for victims and their families.

Does the personnel/director describe key project elements?

The director described the importance of establishing a safe and confidential intake process through proper design, computer systems, policies, and hiring processes. He believes all of these must be consistent with the idea of respect and privacy for victims and their families. He believes that without this, the Center will not be considered a legitimate and trusted haven for support and assistance.

Do they describe how the project’s primary activities contribute to the goals?

Since the services that will be available at the FJC have always been available in the community, how they contribute to the goals of the FJC is directly related to how those same services are provided at the FJC. The director was consistent on the importance of creating an atmosphere of respect and privacy to develop trust in the community that the FJC can be a place to go for help. He feels this is the only way victims will come to the FJC to get help and realize the goals of accessing services, increasing prosecution, and preventing the cycle of violence.

Can you sketch the logic by which activities affect goals?

Las Vegas Family Justice Center Logic Model

<u>Inputs</u>	<u>Activities</u>	<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Impacts</u>	<u>Goals</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •On-site partners •Intake systems •Client management process •Space design •Site location 	<p><u>FLC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Case management •Emergency protection orders •Legal assistance •Advocacy •Medical assistance •Screening, assessments and treatment •Counseling/support groups •Medication assistance •Housing assistance •Emergency food/clothing/transportation •Assistance accessing public assistance •Referral services •Emergency shelter services •Family planning •Faith-based services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Community trainings •Volunteer programs <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Collaboration between government and non-gov't providers •Cross-training •Establish batterer tracking systems •Track batterer recidivism 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase likelihood to access services •Increase demand for services •Increase usage of services •Increase frequency of cross-referrals or use of multiple services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase knowledge of DV/SA •Increase awareness of services available <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve DV policies and procedures •Increase understanding of each other’s services •Increase coordination of services 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reduce tendency to blame oneself for abuse •Reduce conditions prevent women from leaving •Increase likelihood of reporting incident •Increase likelihood of request for temporary/permanent protection order •Increase likelihood of participating in prosecution <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase awareness of FJC •Decrease social tolerance for VAW <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve institutional response to DV •Decrease secondary trauma •Increase prosecution of batterers •Decrease case processing time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease VAW in the community •Decrease repeat victimizations •Decrease seriousness •Hold offenders accountable •Decrease repeat offenders •Break the cycle of violence

Is the logic supported by empirical evidence?

The Family Justice Center initiative does not change the services previously available in the community through government and non-government agencies, but changes the way in which the same services are being offered to victims and their families. Although the benefits of accessing specific services have been studied, the Family Justice Center concept offers an opportunity to examine whether co-location produces additional benefits (intended and unintended) to victims, their families, and the community, as well as to the participating agencies and the system itself. An evaluation of the PFJCI would help provide this kind of evidence.

Are there apparent contradictions or conflicts between certain activities and outcomes expected?

There are no apparent contradictions. However, without clarity on the services that will be available at the FJC versus referred and the process by which referrals will be made and followed up, it is difficult to be confident in strong links between the provision of services and their intended outcomes.

What data systems exist that would facilitate an evaluation?

The grantee is in the process of developing its data systems. It recently participated in a conference call with the NNEDV (arranged by the national technical assistance provider) that addressed privacy and confidentiality concerns regarding access to and sharing of data. Therefore, it has limited its systems development to establishing an intake system and will be working with its consultant to further develop the system, in light of the data protection issues.

What are the key data elements that are contained in these systems?

The current system is designed to capture information at the aggregate level and the grantee has not yet addressed how individual-level data will be stored or shared. It has not considered any type of reporting functions yet and is seeking help from the technical assistance providers on further development of its data systems.

Are there data to estimate unit costs of services or activities?

At this point, there are not.

Are there data about possible comparison samples?

At this point, there are not.

In general, how useful are data systems to an impact evaluation

Until the grantee completes the design of its system, it is not possible to determine this at this point.

5.13. St. Joseph County, IN

1. Grantee

St. Joseph County

LAV: none

Duration: 10/01/2004 – 4/30/2006

Current Award: \$1,243,642

Funding History: None

Information is based on a review of the grant application and conference call with Patricia Yapp (Executive Director of the Family Justice Center) that took place on 4/14/05.

2. Project Summary

This is a project with the goal of “geographically co-locating and coordinating all area victim services to provide family violence victims with a safe and accessible area to obtain assistance.” Roughly a quarter of the grant award is to support personnel who will be managing and staffing the center. This includes two advocates, an administrative assistant, and two civil attorneys (although the grantee is making changes to the staffing hired through the grant). The remainder of the award is to support travel, equipment, supplies, construction, rent, and office furniture.

The grantee believes victims have been relying on just the two major services in the area for assistance- the Family Violence and Special Victims Unit of the Prosecutor’s Office and the YWCA Women’s Shelter. It is therefore hoping that the Family Justice Center will help ensure victims have access to the complete continuum of services needed to help break the cycle of violence in their lives.

As outlined in the grant application, the proposed goals of the project are to: (1) expand existing efforts in investigation and prosecution of domestic violence; (2) develop policies, educational programs, and training to track domestic violence cases; (3) centralize and coordinate handling of DV cases in the criminal justice system; (4) coordinate computer-tracking systems to ensure communication among parties; (5) establish efforts to provide legal assistance for victims of DV; (6) educate judges about the handling of DV cases; and (7) cooperate with the community to develop education and prevention strategies.

A number of government and non-government service providers signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) committing them to support the implementation of a Family Justice Center. Partners who signed the MOU include: Alcohol and Addictions Resource Center, the CASIE Center, the Center for Social Concerns, City of Mishawaka Police Department, City of South Bend Police Department, Community Corrections Advisory Board, Family and Children’s Center, Goodwill Industries of Michiana, Inc./WorkOne System, Indiana University-South Bend, Ivy Tech State College, Madison Center and Hospital, Notre Dame Security Police Department, Office of the Prosecuting Attorney of St. Joseph County, Robinson Community Learning Center, St. Joseph Adult Probation Department, St. Joseph County Police Department, United Religious Community, and the YWCA of St. Joseph County.

The grantee anticipates the FJC will house about 50 staff members, including a forensic nurse practitioner from Memorial Hospital; staff from the CASIE Center to provide child care and conduct child interviews; a civil legal attorney from Indiana Legal Services; part-time

representative of Goodwill Industries to provide job training and employment assistance; part-time therapist, substance abuse specialists, and child and adolescent therapist from Madison Center and Hospital; FVSVU staff (14 investigators (from participating police departments), 4 advocates, 6 deputy prosecutors, 2 paralegals, and a secretary); an on-site chaplaincy program from the United Religious Community; a case manager/pre-natal/post-natal care specialist from Women's Care Center; a case manager from the YWCA of St. Joseph County; and an executive director, civil legal attorney, volunteer coordinator, and an administrative assistant hired through the grant. The grantee also plans to have a strong volunteer component (from Center for Social Concerns at the University of Notre Dame, among others).

The grantee plans to provide the following services on-site: central intake, legal assistance/victim representation, assistance to restraining orders, emergency transportation, access to shelters, limited medical care, counseling, child care, criminal investigations, advocacy, access to probation information, assistance accessing public assistance, substance abuse services, translation services, mental health assessments, links to medical and mental health assistance, resources for children who witness domestic violence, outreach to pregnant women, on-site chaplaincy services, access to employment and training opportunities, and a volunteer program. Off-site services and programs include inpatient treatment for substance abuse and mental health issues, traditional medical programs, parenting for teens, anger management classes, and emergency food.

3. Initial Project Screening

Is the grantee interested in being evaluated?

Yes.

Is there a local evaluation? If so, summarize methods and findings.

The executive director does not believe the site is ready to explore any evaluation opportunities, until it identifies the goals and objectives of the Family Justice Center. When it does, the director will explore resources in the community that might be interested in supporting local evaluation activities (e.g., University of Notre Dame).

What is the background/history of this project?

St. Joseph County does not have a long history of developing a coordinated response to domestic violence in its community. It has made some progress within the past five years with the co-location of services for child victims of abuse through the CASIE Center, which the grantee feels demonstrates that the community has the capacity to come together and address service deficiencies. The county developed a Family Violence and Special Victims Unit that brings together prosecutors, law enforcement, and advocates to provide a coordinated response to victims of domestic violence; however, the unit has not made progress including community partners in its efforts to improve the system's response. Therefore, the county saw the FJC grant as a way to begin providing victims with the complete continuum of services.

At what stage of implementation is it?

At the time of our contact, the grantee was still in the planning stage. The director had just completed a space assessment to identify what partners are providing what services and with how many staff, which enables them to begin looking at space. The grantee was also in the process of

figuring out the organizational structure, e.g., decision-making, role of board (if one is created), responsibilities of an operations council, responsibilities of the director, etc. It was also beginning to consider client flow and design.

When do they anticipate being fully operational?

The director is not sure when the FJC will become operational. First it needs to find a location and apply for and receive NEPA clearance. They have not established the number of clients that might visit the FJC in a year, but the director estimated 500-600, based on the number of calls for service received by the Police Departments.

Describe staffing.

The director said that when she was hired there were twenty committees that had been organized to plan and implement the FJC. Although a representative from the Prosecutor's Office was trying to oversee the committees, a number of the committees were floundering because of lack of leadership or a sense of direction. Now there are seven committees (addressing program, public relations, sustainability, facility, data, volunteers, and personnel) and an executive committee. The committees are made up of partners (those who signed the MOU) and are overseen by the director.

To date, the executive committee has not been acting as a true executive or oversight committee. For example, it has not developed policies or had any involvement with the other committees. The director is in the process of working to reconfigure this group, but she is waiting on the outcome of discussions regarding the development of a 501c(3) and its board. Ideally, she would like the executive committee to become an operations council and be exclusive of a true executive board for the non-profit.

The grantee anticipates the FJC will house about 46 on-site staff, including a forensic nurse practitioner from Memorial Hospital; staff from the CASIE Center to provide child care and conduct child interviews; a civil legal attorney from Indiana Legal Services; part-time representative of Goodwill Industries to provide job training and employment assistance; part-time therapist, substance abuse specialists, and child and adolescent therapist from Madison Center and Hospital; FVSVU staff (14 investigators (from the three participating PDs), 4 advocates, 6 deputy prosecutors, 2 paralegals, and a secretary); an on-site chaplaincy program from the United Religious Community; a case manager/pre-natal/post-natal care specialist from Women's Care Center; a case manager from the YWCA of St. Joseph County; and an executive director, civil legal attorney, volunteer coordinator, and an administrative assistant hired through the grant. The grantee also plans to have a strong volunteer component (from Center for Social Concerns at the University of Notre Dame, among others).

Describe stability of the program over time.

The program has not provided services to date.

Describe the target population.

The grantee is still working on defining its target population. They are currently addressing the lack of uniform definition of domestic violence across agencies and making a decision on how domestic violence will be defined for the FJC.

What are project’s outcome goals in the view of the project director?

According to the director, the goal of the FJC is to promote systems change. She would like the FJC to result in more misdemeanor prosecutions, a standardized appropriate response from first responders, improved sensitivity among the judiciary, and expanded knowledge of family violence in general among all partners. The director is hoping the FJC will promote different relationships among partners, for example, where advocates don’t consider it selling out to have a relationship with the criminal justice community. The director believes there is already recognition among partners that they did not fully understand what the other does, which caused them to think an agency could do x, y, and z, when it could not.

If the FJC had this kind of impact on the system, the director believes victims will feel more protected by the system because they will feel less patronized by it and that agencies are actually trying to help them.

Does the personnel/director describe key project elements?

The grantee believes that a critical component of the FJC is that victims have a neutral person at the FJC they can talk to about what is going on in their lives. Although the police, attorneys, therapists and others are going to be available, the director feels it is important that victims can talk to a faith-based or other type of counselor that can help them sort out their options.

Do they describe how the project’s primary activities contribute to the goals?

Since the services that will be available at the FJC have always been available in the community, the grantee has no doubt that the FJC will provide services, but feels it is critical that partners have a mutual understanding of the goals of the FJC and agree to work together. Additionally, because of the fact that the community is small and, by its nature, less anonymous, confidentiality is critical to building trust in the community.

Can you sketch the logic by which activities affect goals?

**St. Joseph County Family Justice Center
Logic Model**

<u>Inputs</u>	<u>Activities</u>	<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Impacts</u>	<u>Goals</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •On-site partners •Intake systems •Client management process •Space design •Site location 	<p><u>FLC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Case management •Assistance obtaining protection orders •Legal assistance •Advocacy •Medical assistance •Forensic exams •Counseling/ •Faith-based services •Housing assistance •Emergency food/clothing/transportation •Child care •Resources for child witnesses •Employment assistance •Job training •Translation services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Early intervention and prevention programming •Multi-media campaigns •FJC informational materials •Volunteer program <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Collaboration between government and non-gov’t providers •Cross-training •Establish/improve tracking systems 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase likelihood to access services •Increase demand for services •Increase usage of services •Increase use of multiple services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase awareness of services available <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve DV policies and procedures •Increase understanding of each other’s services •Increase coordination of services 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reduce tendency to blame oneself for abuse •Reduce conditions prevent women from leaving •Increase likelihood of reporting incident •Increase likelihood of request for temporary/permanent restraining orders •Increase likelihood of participating in prosecution <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase awareness of FJC <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve institutional response to DV •Decrease secondary trauma •Increase assurance of victim safety •Increase successful prosecution of batterers •Decrease case processing time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease incidents of DV •Decrease repeat victimizations •Decrease seriousness •Hold offenders accountable •Decrease repeat offender

Is the logic supported by empirical evidence?

The Family Justice Center initiative does not change the services previously available in the community through government and non-government agencies, but changes the *way* in which the same services are being offered to victims and their families. Although the benefits of accessing specific services have been studied, the Family Justice Center concept offers an opportunity to examine whether co-location produces additional benefits (intended and unintended) to victims, their families, and the community, as well as to the participating agencies and the system itself. An evaluation of the PFJCI would help provide this kind of evidence.

Are there apparent contradictions or conflicts between certain activities and outcomes expected?

There are no apparent contradictions.

What data systems exist that would facilitate an evaluation?

The director said discussions began about the data system, but they the group stopped meeting because there were no goals or objectives set for the FJC, so they were not clear on what they were trying to design a system to measure. They are still making a decision about whether to develop an intake system or case management system, because they are not sure how an intake system only would prevent a victim from having to repeat their story over and over.

What are the key data elements that are contained in these systems?

They are not ready to talk about data elements until they decide on some of the fundamentals identified above.

Are there data to estimate unit costs of services or activities?

Not at this point.

Are there data about possible comparison samples?

It is unclear at this time, without getting more information on partner databases.

In general, how useful are data systems to an impact evaluation

Until the grantee completes the design of its data system, it is not possible to determine this at this point.

5.14. City of St. Louis, MO

1. Grantee

City of St. Louis

LAV: Legal Services of Eastern Missouri

Duration: 10/01/2004 – 3/31/2006

Current Award: \$1,250,695; LAV: \$141,305

Funding History: None

Information provided is based on a review of the grant application, a conversation with Marylouise Kelley (OVW Program Manager) that took place on 2/4/05, and a conference call with Bill Flowers (Department of Public Safety) and Kathy Tofall (St. Louis Circuit Attorney's Office) that took place on 2/28/05.

2. Project Summary

This is a project with the goal of contributing to the prevention of future violence by establishing a Family Justice Center that will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the criminal justice system and other comprehensive interventions to help families break the cycle of violence in their lives. The grant budget provides funding for personnel (a project manager and intake specialist), travel, equipment (includes costs to outfit a forensic medical exam room), supplies, construction (to renovate the site), and consultants (to access the Regional Justice Information Service, design the intake system, and to support Corrections Medical Services staff).

A committee within the City of St. Louis Family Violence Council (FVC) is taking the lead in the implementation of the grant, as part of its continuing efforts to improve the city's response to domestic violence. The FVC was established in 1993 out of a shared concern for the welfare of the victims of family violence and a conviction that the coordination of services provided by police, prosecutors, attorneys providing civil representation, judges, probation officers, and health care providers together with the specialized services for victims provided by battered women's advocates, child welfare advocates, and advocates for the elderly, as well as mental health professionals with special expertise working with family violence perpetrators and victims would result in better services for victims and a transformation of systems such that family violence becomes more visible and less tolerated. The FVC board made one of its primary missions the development of coordinated community responses to domestic violence. The FVC views the grant as an opportunity to build upon existing collaborations, like the Domestic Violence Intervention Project (DVIP), which offers advocate assistance to victims in contact with the St. Louis Police Department, encouraging victims to seek legal assistance, counseling/support groups, prosecution and victim advocacy assistance. The St. Louis Police Department and St. Louis Circuit Attorney's Office also receive funding from OVW for their specialized domestic violence units. The FVC believes the FJC would provide an opportunity for providers to go beyond their office doors and take each step with the victim so she is not alone.

As outlined in the grant application, the proposed goals of the project are to: (1) increase the number of domestic violence cases reported to law enforcement and the number of victims seeking assistance through domestic violence hotlines; (2) ensure that domestic violence perpetrators are prosecuted with fewer cases being dismissed for failure to prosecute; (3) enhance services to children exposed to domestic violence; (4) provide appropriate medical care to victims of domestic violence; (5) offer legal assistance to victims of domestic violence; (6) offer a variety

of supportive services through on-site and off-site partners; and (7) coordinate the tracking of domestic violence data that reflects the scope of the problem and service delivery in St. Louis.

A number of government and non-government service providers signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) committing them to work with the City to support the implementation of a Family Justice Center. Partners who signed the MOU include: Legal Advocates for Abused Women; Legal Services of Eastern Missouri; St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department; St. Louis Circuit Attorney's Office; Missouri Department of Corrections, Board of Probation and Parole; Missouri Children's Division; Correctional Medical Services; People of Faith United to End Family Violence; Redevelopment Opportunities for Women; and YWCA St. Louis Regional Sexual Assault Center. All of these partners committed to an on-site presence. A few other partners agreed to provide a part-time presence and include: ALIVE; Catholic Legal Assistance Ministry; Civil Justice Clinic from Washington University; Children's Advocacy Services of Greater St. Louis; Leadership through Education and Advocacy for the Deaf; The Vet Center; and Women's Place. The MOU also identifies 13 off-site partners that will provide services through referrals. The grantee is also currently working to add some additional partners (Sexual Assault Center and the Child Advocacy Center) and is currently developing a partnership agreement that will reflect all partners.

It is the grantee's expectation that all of the MOU partners and the new partners will follow through with commitments, which will allow it to provide the following services on-site: intake; ability to complete police reports, request orders of protection, and warrants; economic advocacy; advocacy; child care; medical services and referral for treatment; substance abuse services; chaplaincy; deaf interpreter and language line; legal services; child abuse services (through separate funding); and access to the Veteran's Administration for victims connected to the military. Off-site services will include referrals for counseling, hotline, shelter, child sexual abuse interviews, life source consultations, transitional housing, crime victim advocacy, support services for elderly victims, chaplain service, SART (Sexual Assault Response Teams), and fostering for animals.

3. Initial Project Screening

Is the grantee interested in being evaluated?

The grantee is interested in evaluation support, but is not actively pursuing anything at this point.

Is there a local evaluation? If so, summarize methods and findings.

A researcher from Washington University had volunteered to do a local evaluation, but the person who volunteered became the strategic planner for the grant. The grantee has not spoken to the strategic planner or Washington University regarding an evaluation and its design, but feels there is also a possibility that a researcher someone at St. Louis University might be interested.

What is the background/history of this project?

As mentioned earlier, the Family Violence Council's mission since its inception has been to develop a coordinated community response to domestic violence in the St. Louis area. As a result, there have been a number of different suggestions for coordination suggested by the domestic violence groups in the area and different strategies have been implemented (see above). When someone from the U.S. Attorney's Office brought the FJC RFP to Ms. Tofall's attention, she immediately brought it to the FVC board to consider as a strategy for moving beyond networking

activities across domestic violence groups to the development of an actual physical location for all partners to work together.

The grantee also mentioned that the city has experience bringing non-government and government entities together through its development of a Child Advocacy Center and Prince Hall (a site that co-locates juvenile probation/parole, child advocates, and the Division of Family Services). There has also been some collaboration among the partners involved in the FJC. For example, victim advocates have been working at the police department and the FVC got funding to establish a DVIP to bring together five different groups to collaborate on cases from the start to the end of the criminal justice process. In addition government and non-government domestic violence agencies pooled resources so that volunteers for any agency can attend a DV101 course that is offered multiple times a year.

At what stage of implementation is it?

At the time of our contact, the grantee was still in the planning stages. The NEPA clearance has caused delays because the site they are looking at is an historic building. The grantee was working to assemble all the necessary paperwork to get its NEPA clearance. In the meantime, the FVC was on the second round of interviews for the project manager, and the intake sub-committee was working on the various aspects of the flow into the facility (e.g., where partners will sit, how to meet the needs of partners on site), as well as the confidentiality issues related to the intake system.

When do they anticipate being fully operational?

Without NEPA clearance, the grantee can't draw down funds (beyond the initial \$125,000), which has prevented them from making significant progress. However, in the meantime, they are starting to develop protocols and conducting cross-trainings. If they do receive NEPA clearance in the next few months, they are hoping to have a lease signed by April 30, start the renovations, and hopefully move in July or August, and start seeing clients in September 2005.

The grantee was not sure how many clients they expect to serve in a year, but did note that the number of cases in the Attorney's Office has dropped significantly in 2004. As far as an estimate, Ms. Tofall said the Attorney's Office opened 600 new prosecution cases in 2004, so she would expect to see at least 600 government cases. She also pointed out that the domestic violence hotline receives more than 9,000 calls a year, so if 10% of those calls result in a visit to the FJC, then she would be hopeful that the FJC would serve 1,000 clients a year.

Describe staffing.

A leadership team has been charged by the FVC to oversee implementation of the FJC. All of the partners who signed the MOU (there were 38 off and on-site partners who signed) met to decide who should be on the leadership team (12 members) and should chair the various sub-committees. The 12 agencies represented on the leadership team include: Women's Support and Community Service; ALIVE; Redevelopment Opportunities for Women; Legal Advocates for Abused Women; Legal Services of Eastern Missouri; St. Louis Police Department; Circuit Attorney's Office; Missouri Children's Division; City of St. Louis Department of Human Services; Correctional Medical Services; People of Faith United to End Family Violence; and a representative from the FVC.

All partners can attend the leadership meetings, but only representative from the 12 partners listed above can vote. All partners can also participate on as many sub-committees as they would like. The seven sub-committees were organized to each focus on specific issues related to the site, intake, civil legal issues, criminal legal issues, medical issues, sustainment, and children. The grantee is considering adding two more sub-committees, one focused on education and the other on training.

The grantee estimated that there will be 18–20 full and part-time staff working at the Center. In addition to the project manager and intake specialist (hired through the grant) at the FJC, relocated staff will include: a case manager from Redevelopment Opportunities for Women; one attorney from Legal Advocates for Abuse Women; one attorney and a receptionist from Legal Services of Eastern Missouri; the 3–4 detectives that make up the DART Unit at the police department; an attorney, two advocates, and a part-time investigator from the Circuit Attorney's Office; a case worker from the Missouri Children's Division; contracted personnel from Correctional Medical Services to staff the medical exam room; and counselors from the Sexual Assault Center and CAC. There will also be a number of volunteers working at the Center on a part-time basis.

Describe stability of the program over time.

The program has not provided services to date, although the development of a leadership team seems to have kept such a large team organized during the planning stages.

Describe the target population.

The target population is victims of domestic violence and domestic violence-related sexual assault and stalking in the city of St. Louis and surrounding counties. However, the grantee is in the midst of discussions about the legal definition of domestic violence, because the criminal justice partners follow the statutory guidelines strictly, while the advocate community is more open in its interpretation. There is also a concern about accepting male victims, for fear they might be trying to manipulate the system to gain access to their female partners. Lastly, the grantee is considering adding victims of sibling or elder abuse to the target population in the future.

What are project's outcome goals in the view of the project director?

The grantee reported that it is looking to follow the model established by San Diego to implement a one-stop shop that will serve as a primary connector for the partners who will be working both on and off-site. The grantee sees the FJC as an opportunity to provide a safe place for victims to walk in and seek whatever agency's support they are looking for (e.g., chaplains, legal assistance, counseling) and get as much help as they need.

More specifically, the government partners believe the FJC will help them be more effective at getting criminal cases started because victims will feel more supported by the system and may therefore be more likely to participate with the prosecution. Increased participation will allow warrants to be issued more quickly and increase the likelihood of prosecution (regardless of whether the victim participates), because victims receiving services are more likely to remain connected to the system (one of the current problems is victims disappearing without providing enough information to pursue the case). The non-government partners feel that the FJC will help victims get interventions more quickly, which will contribute to the victim's safety and well-being. It also means that even if the victim and batterer reconcile, the victim may still be more likely to access services, which will improve her overall health for the long-term (seeking medical

attention at the FJC may prompt women to seek treatment), as well as encourage their partners to participate in batterer intervention programs. The grantee also believes the FJC can have an impact on children who witness domestic violence, because women are more likely (because of the counseling and other services available) to understand how domestic violence may affect their children and may, therefore, be prompted to make a change earlier.

Does the personnel/director describe key project elements?

When asked about the key elements of the FJC that are critical to achieving outcomes, the grantee identified that the confidentiality of the process is important, as well as the processes for getting orders of protection and warrants, that there is assistance for all types of legal action, medical services, advocate and counselor services, a chaplaincy program, and a children’s advocacy piece. Ms. Tofall said that, from a prosecutor’s perspective, getting a victim to the FJC to get medical attention could help increase accuracy of records for prosecution (if victims go to an emergency room it is hard to get hospitals to release records), because they sign a medical release at the time of the exam.

Do they describe how the project’s primary activities contribute to the goals?

Ms. Tofall identified the key activities as those that are related to how the Center will be designed and the services that will be available, and the resulting impact on how services that had previously existed in the community will be offered to victims. Since the services that will be co-located were previously available, the goal is for the co-location to increase the magnitude of the positive impact of services on victims and to create systems change. Therefore, successful linking between services available and the goals of the FJC is directly related to how the FJC is designed and operated. According to the grantee, this would depend on how successful they are at providing a safe and confidential environment that promotes more efficient and effective service delivery.

Can you sketch the logic by which activities affect goals?

St. Louis Family Justice Center Logic Model

<u>Inputs</u>	<u>Activities</u>	<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Impacts</u>	<u>Goals</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •On-site partners •Intake systems •Client management process •Space design •Site location 	<p><u>FLC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Case management •Emergency/Permanent restraining orders •Legal assistance •Advocacy •Medical assistance •Screening, assessments and treatment •Counseling/support groups (faith-based) •Housing assistance •Emergency food/clothing/transportation •Referral services •Shelter services •24-hour helpline •Emergency financial assistance •Translation services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Early intervention and prevention programming •Multi-media campaigns •FJC informational materials •Community trainings •Volunteer programs <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Collaboration between government and non-gov’t providers •Cross-training •Establish/improve tracking systems 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase likelihood to access services •Increase demand for services •Increase usage of services •Increase frequency of cross-referrals or use of multiple services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase knowledge of DV/SA •Increase awareness of services available <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve DV policies and procedures •Increase understanding of each other’s services •Increase coordination of services •Development of coordinated CJ response teams 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reduce tendency to blame oneself for abuse •Reduce conditions prevent women from leaving •Increase likelihood of reporting incident •Increase likelihood of request for temporary/permanent restraining orders •Increase likelihood of participating in prosecution <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase awareness of FJC •Decrease social tolerance for VAW <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve institutional response to DV •Increase variety and quality of services •Decrease secondary trauma •Increase assurance of victim safety •Increase prosecution of batterers •Decrease case processing time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease incidents of DV •Decreased repeat victimizations •Decreased seriousness •Hold offenders accountable •Decrease repeat offenders •Break cycle of violence

Is the logic supported by empirical evidence?

The Family Justice Center initiative does not change the services previously available in the community through government and non-government agencies, but changes the *way* in which the same services are being offered to victims and their families. Although the benefits of accessing specific services have been studied, the Family Justice Center concept offers an opportunity to examine whether co-location produces additional benefits (intended and unintended) to victims, their families, and the community, as well as to the participating agencies and the system itself. An evaluation of the PFJCI would help provide this kind of evidence.

Are there apparent contradictions or conflicts between certain activities and outcomes expected?

There are no apparent contradictions.

What data systems exist that would facilitate an evaluation?

The grantee has just begun working with a contractor to develop an intake system. Because they can't access funds beyond the initial \$125,000 at this point, they can't ask the contractor to start designing anything. In the meantime, the contractor has been attending strategic planning meetings and attended the training session hosted by NNEDV, so s/he is aware of the confidentiality and data sharing issues. The grantee has also been delaying development because it thought San Diego might be sharing a prototype of its data system. It has since decided not to wait for this possibility, because the grantee feels it needs to design its own system.

The grantee also talked about the need to link or network with other data systems to support the police department and circuit court, and may need to link with some other systems for legal services. It also needs to connect to the Regional Justice Information System for their criminal justice partners.

What are the key data elements that are contained in these systems?

Without having anything designed, the grantee reported that the system will include basic demographic information, an identifier (they are deciding on a name versus a number), data elements required for progress reports to OVW, and what information is on their basic intake form. The grantee also mentioned that the data will be collected at the client level and that they have not considered any required reports besides the progress reports. The grantee admitted it has not designed much beyond the basic elements at this point.

Are there data to estimate unit costs of services or activities?

The grantee has not considered data to help estimate costs to date.

Are there data about possible comparison samples?

Without more information on marketing and catchments (how much of St. Louis County will be involved), this is difficult to say. Access to the Regional Justice Information Sharing system is promising, though it is likely to provide only criminal justice data on the perpetrator population.

In general, how useful are data systems to an impact evaluation

Until the grantee completes the design of its data system, it is not possible to determine this at this point.

5.15. City of Tulsa, Ok

1. Grantee: City of Tulsa

LAV Co-Applicant: None

Duration: 10/01/2004 – 3/31/2006

Current Award: \$1,079,321

Funding History: None

Information is based on a review of the grant application, a conversation with Kimberly Woodard (OVW Program Monitor) that took place on 2/3/05, and a conference call with Felicia Collins Correia (DVIS executive director), Tim Gray (director of DVIS legal services), and Chan Hellman (evaluation researcher with the University of Oklahoma) that took place on 3/1/05.

2. Project Summary

The City of Tulsa, the grantee, has subcontracted with Domestic Violence Intervention Services (DVIS), a nonprofit community-based organization, to serve as the administrative coordinator for the FJC. The city chose DVIS as the coordinator because it is the primary domestic violence service provider in Tulsa, offering shelter, legal services, counseling, advocacy, children's services, and batterers' treatment.

The grantee plans to provide comprehensive services in one location. The grantee will coordinate and integrate other resources that are precluded from being housed at the FJC, for example because staff constraints prevent them from providing personnel for co-locating. In addition, while service agencies in Tulsa have historically had good relationships with each other, by being physically housed together at the FJC they will be able to meet easily to plan "holistically" around specific events, such as a domestic violence-related homicide or abducted child. Currently, such planning is sporadic.

The grantee plans to have the following full-time staff at the FJC providing the identified services: 6 detectives from the Tulsa Police Department's Family Violence Unit to take case reports; 4-5 DVIS staff to provide civil legal assistance; 3-4 DVIS staff providing help with obtaining protection orders; 1 prosecutor from the DA's Family Violence Unit to help with preparing and securing protection orders; 1 staff person from Tulsa County Medical Society to coordinate (pro bono) medical services; 1 chaplain from Tulsa Metropolitan Ministry; and 1 translator (Spanish and Russian) from the YWCA's Intercultural Service Center. A member of the Tulsa Police Department's Sexual Assault Unit may also be co-located at the center. Overall, the grantee estimates that there will be 22-25 full-time staff working on site at the FJC and an as-yet undetermined number of volunteers.

Volunteers from the Retired and Volunteer Senior Program (RSVP), which already collaborates with DVIS, will provide court watch volunteers and accompaniment to court. Interns from the University of Oklahoma Applied Health Research Center will assist with intake, counseling, transportation, and data collection.

The grantee is planning to provide several additional services on a referral basis from at least three nonprofit center partners, including parental education by the Parent-Child Center, children's services by Family Children's Services, and drug abuse counseling by the Palmer Drug Abuse Program. In addition, the Department of Health Services' Child Support Enforcement

Agency has expressed interest in receiving referrals. The Tulsa County District Court is, in effect, although not formally, a partner in the center, including its probation office.

The grantee plans to provide training to a number of different audiences.

It plans to work with the Bank of Oklahoma, a financial supporter of DVIS, not only to secure funding for the FJC after the Federal grant ends but also to provide training for employees of other businesses in how to support and not penalize victims of domestic violence (the bank has a model program for its own employees in this area).

The grantee hopes to provide training on domestic violence to emergency medical services staff (EMTs) and fire departments (whose fire fighters act as first responders in many domestic violence incidents).

The grantee expects to train Tulsa and Broken Arrow police officers on issues related to domestic violence. Along with the sergeant in charge of the department's domestic violence unit, a DVIS advocate has already trained all 800 Tulsa police officers on dealing with mutual orders of protection.

The grantee expects to have service providers train other service providers in their respective areas of expertise.

The grantee plans to make the public aware of the FJC and its services. The Mayor's Office has already publicized the FJC at a press conference and plans to hold another press conference to publicize the center as soon as it opens. The grantee also plans to design and implement a public awareness campaign in collaboration with the Mayor's Greater Tulsa Area Family Violence Council, which has its own public relations campaign (called FACES) and an expert consultant. The grantee sees the need to target state and local public officials with information as part of its effort to sustain itself after Federal funding ends.

The grantee's budget anticipates spending a relatively significant portion of the award—approximately 50 percent—for personnel. The remainder of the award is to support equipment (\$230,000 for furniture, telephones, computers and fax machines, duplicating machines, and other expenses), rent (\$50,000), other supplies, and travel for training.

3. Initial Project Screening

Is the grantee interested in being evaluated?

Yes.

Is there a local evaluation? If so, summarize methods and findings.

No, but the grantee plans to secure grant funding to hire researchers from the University of Oklahoma's Applied Health Research Center. The center's Dr. Chan Hellman has already been looking at data for DVIS related to judges' decisions regarding batterers, finding that dismissals are most common in cases of the most severe abuse. He has also been looking at DVIS data related to batterer violations of their orders of protection. The grantee expects to track events at the FJC to see how long it takes for clients to receive services. Other than that, the grantee is "still thinking" about what kind of evaluation to conduct.

What is the background/history of this project?

In the past, the services victims received depended on the manner in which they entered the “system,” which could have been via outpatient providers, shelters, rape crisis centers, the courts, and the two municipal police departments in Tulsa County (the Tulsa Police Department and Broken Arrow Police Department). For example, a victim who went to the police departments might never be referred to—or be referred to but not access—DVIS. A victim who goes to the district attorney’s office gets sent only to the police department. Victims may also get referred back and forth among agencies. Furthermore, they may be referred for inappropriate or irrelevant services. For example, if a victim never tells a provider that she is the victim of domestic violence, she may end up in marriage counseling.

There are currently advocates working in both police departments (Tulsa and Broken Arrow) and the Tulsa County Court. In 2003, the mayor reconvened a Family Violence Council that had first met in 1993, but the group is not typically used as a forum to address specific incidents but rather, on only a monthly basis, to discuss domestic violence issues.

At what stage of implementation is it?

At the time of our contact, the grantee was still in the planning phase. For example, the grantee was conducting focus groups with victims to identify needed services and obstacles victims experience accessing services. However, with the March 2, 2005, cut-off date for submitting resumes for the FJC director position having passed, the grantee expected to hire a director within a month.

By contrast, the grantee has experienced a serious set back in securing a facility. On March 1, 2005, NEPA declined to even evaluate the facility the grantee had chosen because the building had had previous environmental problems. As a result, the grantee must begin the search to find another location and secure NEPA approval for it.

When do they anticipate being fully operational?

The grantee feels it may still be possible to begin providing services in January or February of 2006.

Describe staffing.

Felicia Collins Correia, the DVIS executive director, has been overseeing the planning and implementation of the center, since the city has subcontracted with her organization to administer the grant. However, she expects that in time the center will become a separate organization from DVIS. Although, she also expects that 90 percent of DVIS’s legal assistance program staff will physically relocate to the FJC. Collins Correia is concerned that if DVIS continues to supervise the center as part of its own operation—as some community members want—DVIS would become the only spokesperson for the issue in the city.

Collins Correia’s role will also be reduced dramatically when a FJC director has been hired. However, she expects to supervise the center director, since the city has subcontracted with DVIS to administer the grant.

Other individuals who have played, and will continue to play, a significant role in the center are Tim Gray (head of DVIS’ legal services), William Wells (Tulsa Police Department Deputy

Chief), Marny Kawano (director of the district attorney's Family Violence Unit), and Judy Lane (director of economic development for the city).

There are also two groups actively involved in advising the program. One is a management or executive team, already set up, which includes all the individuals named above. The other group (that has not been established yet) will be a collaborative team, consisting of the members of the Mayor's Family Violence Council. The management team is responsible for hiring FJC staff and for addressing operational issues related to the configuration of the FJC. The grantee is still working out the management team's other responsibilities and those of the collaborative team.

Describe stability of the program over time.

The program has not provided services to date.

Describe the target population.

The center's target population will be all victims of domestic violence, victims of sexual assault (the latter will be served through funds from United Way, Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) grants, the University of Oklahoma, and other sources), and children who are victims of, or who witness, domestic violence. The grantee expects the program to serve between 3,500-4,000 victims a year.

What are project's outcome goals in the view of the project director?

Many victims do not follow through after reporting their victimization—for example, they do not go to a shelter. The FJC will be designed to facilitate victims' accessing services. For instance, the grantee reports that the courts have committed themselves to fast filing of protection orders (e.g., ex parte). At present, there is always a rush every morning with victims coming before the judge. In addition, the grantee hopes to arrange for filing charges against batterers more quickly than is now the case, because the Tulsa Police Department's Family Violence Unit and an assistant district attorney will be housed together at the FJC where they can expedite both the charging of offenders and the preparation of applications for orders of protection.

At present, it is very complicated for victims to figure out how to stay safe and what to do because of the dispersed nature of the services and the emotionally vulnerable state of most victims. The FJC, with its co-location of services and collaboration among service providers, will improve the ability to increase victim safety and at the same time increase accountability for offender.

Does the personnel/director describe key project elements?

Yes. They describe them as providing comprehensive victim services in a single location and coordinating and integrating other services that cannot be co-located at the center. They also describe extensive training for a variety of audiences that the center will be expected to provide, along with a publicity campaign to promote awareness and understanding of the center's services. Finally, the grantee has plans for an extensive volunteer component, including RSVP volunteers and university interns.

Do they describe how the project's primary activities contribute to the goals?

Since the services that will be available at the FJC have always been available in the community, how they contribute to the goals of the FJC is directly related to how those same services are provided at the FJC. Therefore, the grantee plans to provide training to a number of different

audiences, including training of businesses, first responders, police officers, and service providers. The training is expected to increase the sensitivity and expertise with which victims are treated, thereby increasing the likelihood that victims will be willing to report their abuses, in turn increasing offender accountability. At the same time, the training will be designed simply to help victims feel less stigmatized and troubled.

The grantee believes that many victims do not follow through—and experience danger—after reporting their victimization because of the long time it takes to see results. The grantee reported that it has already arranged for the courts to commit themselves to fast filing of protection orders (e.g., ex parte). The grantee also hopes that co-locating police and prosecutors will make it possible to file charges against batterers more quickly than is the case now, again increasing the proportion of cases that are prosecuted and number of batterers who are held accountable.

Can you sketch the logic by which activities affect goals?

By providing comprehensive services in one location, more victims will come forward and, therefore, more victims will be better protected against being revictimized because it will be possible to arrange for their safety and hold batterers accountable.

Oklahoma has a high rate of homicides related to domestic violence. Yet most victims of domestic violence homicide have little or no interaction with the domestic violence system, whether the criminal justice system or service providers. The center is expected to bring in more victims, which will result in increased protection for them and, as a result, a reduction in homicides involving domestic violence.

Tulsa Family Justice Center Logic Model

<u>Inputs</u>	<u>Activities</u>	<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Impacts</u>	<u>Goals</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •On-site partners •Intake systems •Client management process •Space design •Site location 	<p><u>FLC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Case management •Assistance with police reports and protection orders •Civil legal assistance •Advocacy •Medical assistance •Screening and assessments •Substance abuse counseling •Parental education •Children’s services •Chaplain services •Referral services •Shelter services •Emergency financial assistance •Translation services <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Public awareness campaign •FJC informational materials •Community trainings •Volunteer programs <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Collaboration between government and non-gov’t providers •Cross-training •Establish/improve tracking systems 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase likelihood to access services •Increase demand for services •Increase usage of services •Increase frequency of cross-referrals or use of multiple services •Increase victim safety <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase knowledge of DV/SA •Increase awareness of services available <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase understanding of each other’s services •Increase coordination of services •Development of coordinated CJ response teams 	<p><u>Victims</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reduce tendency to blame oneself for abuse •Reduce conditions prevent women from leaving •Increase likelihood of reporting incident •Increase likelihood of request for temporary/permanent protection order •Increase likelihood of participating in prosecution <p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase awareness of FJC •Increase sensitive treatment of victims <p><u>Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Improve institutional response to DV •Decrease secondary trauma •Increase successful prosecution of batterers •Decrease case processing time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decrease VAW in the community •Decrease repeat victimizations •Decrease seriousness of incidents •Decrease domestic violence related homicides •Hold offenders accountable •Decrease repeat offenders

Is the logic supported by empirical evidence?

The Family Justice Center initiative does not change the services previously available in the community through government and non-government agencies, but changes the *way* in which the same services are being offered to victims and their families. Although the benefits of accessing specific services have been studied, the Family Justice Center concept offers an opportunity to examine whether co-location produces additional benefits (intended and unintended) to victims, their families, and the community, as well as to the participating agencies and the system itself. An evaluation of the PFJCI would help provide this kind of evidence.

Are there apparent contradictions or conflicts between certain activities and outcomes expected?

No.

What data systems exist that would facilitate an evaluation?

The grantee expects that DVIS will upgrade its existing internal system for tracking clients using an existing planning grant from a foundation and a consultant (Jump Technologies) and then use that system at the FJC. The FJC will be able to track the services clients receive.

Confidentiality will limit how much data can be shared among partners. What data are collected at the individual level will be shared in aggregate form only.

What are the key data elements that are contained in these systems?

Prior orders of protection will be included and possibly self-reported revictimization. The grantee says it will have no way of getting revictimization data from the courts, however.

Are there data to estimate unit costs of services or activities?

There might be—DVIS already does this.

Are there data about possible comparison samples?

The grantee does not know yet.

In general, how useful are data systems to an impact evaluation?

Until the grantee designs its database system, it will not possible to determine this.

6. Conclusion

Based on the results from the initial assessment of the grantees participating in the PFJCI, we have concluded the grantees are not sufficiently operational to support any further assessment of their evaluability. The issue is that the information required to determine whether the grantee can support an evaluation and the most appropriate design for that evaluation is based on a review of data collection systems, client flow, service provision, and FJC capacity, which will not be available for any grantees during the life of this task order. Although some grantees indicated a possibility of being operational at some point during the summer of 2005, the reality of the grantee achieving this goal is unlikely and, even so, would not provide sufficient experience serving clients to assess evaluability. Therefore, there is no benefit to conducting a site visit with any of the grantees to collect more detailed information. As a result, we are interested in building on the above information through further data collection from operational Family Justice Centers (not funded through the PFJCI) and conversation with the technical assistance providers to develop national and local evaluation design options that would be appropriate for these grantees in the future.

References

Adragna, M. (1991). Wife Abuse: an overview of the EAP. *EAP Digest*, 12(1), 29-35, 55-56.

Babcock, J., & Steiner, R. (1999). The relationship between treatment, incarceration, and recidivism of battering: A program evaluation of Seattle's coordinated community response to domestic violence. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 13, 46-59.

Bachman, R. (1994). Violence Against Women: A National Crime Victimization Survey Report. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (NCJ145325).

Bachman, R., & Coker, A. (1995). Police involvement in domestic violence: The interactive effects of victim injury, offender's history of violence and race. *Violence and Victims*, 10(2), 91-106.

Burt, Martha R. (1980). "Cultural Myths and Supports for Rape." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(2), 217-230.

Buzawa, E.S., & Buzawa, C.G. (1996). *Domestic Violence: The Criminal Justice Response*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Clark, S. J., Burt, M. R., Schulte, M. M., & Maguire, K. (1996). *Coordinated community responses to domestic violence in six communities: Beyond the justice system*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Crimes Against Children Research Center (CCRC). (2005). National Evaluation of Children's Advocacy Centers (CACs). Last retrieved on April 5, 2005 from http://www.unh.edu/ccrc/projects/national_evaluation.htm

Davis, R., & Erez, E. (1998). *Immigrant Populations as Victims: Toward a Multicultural Criminal Justice System*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Felson, R.B., Messner, S.F., Hoskin, A.W., & Deane, G. (2002). Reasons for reporting and not reporting domestic violence to police. *Criminology*, 40(3), 617-647.

Fischer, K., & Rose, M. (1995). When "enough is enough:" Battered women's decision making around court orders of protection. *Crime & Delinquency*, 41(4), 414-429.

Gamache, D., & Asmus, M. (1999). Enhancing networking among service providers: Elements of successful coordination strategies. In M. Shepard, & E. Pence (Eds.), *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence: Lessons from the Duluth Model*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gamache, D. J., Edleson, J. L., & Schock, M. (1988). Coordinated police, judicial and social service response to woman battering: A multi-baseline evaluation across three communities. In G. T. Hotaling, D. Finkelhor, J. T. Kirkpatrick, & M. Straus (Eds.), *Coping with family violence: Research and policy perspectives* (pp. 193-209). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gondolf, E. W. (1997). Batterer programs: What we know and need to know. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12 (3), 83-98.

Gray, B. (1985). Conditions facilitating inter-organizational collaboration. *Human Relations* 38:911-936.

Hamby, Sherry L. (1998). Partner violence: Prevention and intervention. In *Partner violence: A comprehensive review of 20 years of research*, ed. Jana L. Jasinski and Linda M. Williams:210–258. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hart, B. (1992). Battered Women and the Criminal Justice System. [Minnesota Center Against Violence and Abuse](#), St. Paul, MN.

Hart, B. (1995). Coordinated Community Approaches to Domestic Violence. Presentation at the Strategic Planning Workshop on Violence Against Women, National Institute of Justice, Washington D.C.

Healey, K., Smith, C., & O’Sullivan, C. (1998). Batterer Intervention: Program Approaches and Criminal Justice Strategies. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice (NCJ-168638).

Jaffe, P. G., Hastings, E., Reitzel, D., & Austin, G. W. (1993). The impact of police laying charges. In N. Z. Hilton (Ed.), *Legal responses to wife assault* (pp. 62-94). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Jones, Lisa M., Cross, Theodore P., Walsh, Wendy A. (2001). “What Outcomes Are Important for CACs?: Survey Results and Implications”. Presented at the 7th International Family Violence Research Conference, July 22-25, 2001.

Kilpatrick, D.G., Resnick, H.S., Sanders, B.E., & Best, C.L. (1994). “Survey of Research on Violence Against Women: Results from the National Women’s Survey”. Paper presented at the 46th Annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, November 11, Miami, FL. National Crime Victims Research and Treatment Center, Medical University of South Carolina.

Koss, M. P., & Harvey, M. R. (1991). *The rape victim: Clinical and community interventions* (second edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Madigan, Lee and Gamble, Nancy. (1991). *The Second Rape: Society's Continued Betrayal of the Victim*. New York: Free Press.

National Advisory Council on Violence Against Women. (2001). *Toolkit to End Violence Against Women*. <http://toolkit.ncjrs.org/>.

National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD). (1999). [National Evaluation of Community Assessment Centers \(CAC\)](#). http://www.nccd-crc.org/nccd/pubs/final_cac_report.pdf

National Research Council. (1998). *Violence in Families: Assessing Prevention and Treatment Programs*. Washington DC: National Academy Press.

Okun, L. (1986). *Woman abuse*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Oldenettel, Debra, and Wordes, Madeline. (2000). The Community Assessment Center Concept. *OJJDP Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/178942.pdf>

Orchowsky, Stan J. (1999). Evaluation of a Coordinated Community Response to Domestic Violence: The Alexandria Domestic Violence Intervention Project – Final Report. National Institute of Justice, Washington D.C. <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/179974.pdf>

Pence, E. (1985). *Criminal justice response to domestic assault cases: A guide for policy development*. Duluth, MN: Domestic Abuse Intervention Project.

Pence, E.L., & Shepard, M.F. (1999). An Introduction: Developing a Coordinated Community Response. In *Coordinating Community Responses to Domestic Violence: Lessons from Duluth and Beyond*, edited by Shepard, M.F., & Pence, E.L. Sage Series on Violence Against Women. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Rennison, C.M. (2003). Intimate Partner Violence, 1993-2001. Bureau of Justice Statistics Crime Data Brief, U.S. Department of Justice. Office of Justice Programs (NCJ197838).

Rennison, C.M. (2001). Intimate Partner Violence and Age of Victim, 1993-99. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, U.S. Department of Justice. Office of Justice Programs (NCJ187635).

Rennison, C.M., & Welchans, S. (2000). Intimate Partner Violence: Special Report. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Department of Justice, Washington DC. May (NCJ 178247).

Shepard, M. F. (1999). Advocacy for battered women: Implications for a coordinated community response. In M. F. Shepard, & E. L. Pence (Eds.). *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence: Lessons from Duluth and beyond*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Shepard, M. (1992). Predicting batterer recidivism five years after intervention. *Journal of Family Violence*, 7 (3), 167-178.

Shepard, M., Falk, D. with Raschick, M. (2000). Final Report of the Evaluation of the Enhanced Domestic Abuse Intervention Project. Submitted to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (U50/ccu511327).

Stein, M.B. & Kennedy, C. (2001). Major Depressive and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Comorbidity in Female Victims of Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 66: 133-138.

Straus, M.A., Gelles, R.J., & Steinmetz, S.K. (1980). *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in American Families*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Syers, M., & Edleson, J. L. (1992). The combined effects of coordinated criminal justice intervention in woman abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 7, 490-502.

Tift, L.L. (1993). *Battering of women*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (November 1998). Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey. U.S. Department of Justice.

Tolman, R. M., & Weisz, A. (1995). Coordinated community intervention for domestic violence: The effects of arrest and prosecution on recidivism of woman abuse perpetrators. *Crime & Delinquency*, 41, 481-495.

Weisz, A. (1996). Spouse abuse replication program: Studies of effects of arrest on domestic violence. (Published by VAWnet, a project of the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence. Available: http://www.vawnet.org/DomesticViolence/Research/VAWnetDocs/AR_arrest.php).

Whetstone, T.S. (2001). Measuring the Impact of a Domestic Violence Coordinated Response Team. *Policing*, 24, 371-397.

Widom, C.S., (October, 1992). The Cycle of Violence, Research in Brief. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.