

An Implementation Assessment of the  
Domestic Violence Probation Projects in  
Lake, Winnebago, and Kankakee Counties

---

January 2002

**Prepared by**

Scott H. Decker, Ph.D.  
Timothy S. Bynum, Ph.D.  
Dan Swift, M.S.  
James R. Coldren, Ph.D.

Justice Research Associates

and

James R. Coldren, Jr., Ph.D.  
Director, Center for Research in Law and Justice  
University of Illinois at Chicago

**Evaluation funded by**

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

This project was supported by Grant # 99-DB-VX-0017, awarded to the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, coordinates the activities of the following program offices and bureaus: Bureau of Justice Assistance, Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Institute of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office of Victims of Crime. Points of view or opinions contained within this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice or the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.

Printed by the Authority of the State of Illinois, January 2002  
Printing order number 02-170  
200 copies

## **Acknowledgments**

We would like to acknowledge the contribution and assistance provided by the many individuals who made this report possible. In order to produce this report it was necessary to work closely with each of the project sites. Each of the individuals made time for our visits and was extremely cooperative in providing us access to records and sharing their knowledge and experiences with us. Casey Farrow worked closely with us from Lake County, and Todd Schroeder from Winnebago County, and Rick Einfeldt from Kankakee County performed similar roles.

We are also indebted to Dr. Chip Coldren from the University of Illinois at Chicago. Chip assisted in the project coordination role, conducted interviews, and supervised data collection in Lake and Winnebago Counties. Dan Swift served as project liaison for Kankakee, a site in which he has worked with us in several other projects. In this role, he conducted interviews and data collection. Stacy Bowling served as our graduate assistant for Lake and Winnebago Counties and worked diligently to find case files, interpret the contents of these files, and code and input data.

Finally, we would like to acknowledge the contribution and support of Karen Levy McCanna from the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. Karen was always quick to respond to any issues that arose during this evaluation and through her diligence and conscientiousness communicated the Authority's belief in the importance of this project.

# Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	
Executive Summary	i - viii
Introduction	1
Illinois Domestic Violence Probation Program	4
Study Description	5
Methodology	6
Lake County Domestic Violence Probation Program	8
Introduction	8
Approach to Domestic Violence	8
Surveillance Component	12
Program Implementation Issues	14
Project Accomplishments	15
Case Outcomes	18
Description of the Domestic Violence Probation Population	19
Winnebago County Domestic Violence Probation Program	26
Introduction	26
Approach to Domestic Violence	28
Program Implementation Issues and Accomplishments	32
Description of the Domestic Violence Probation Population	36
Kankakee County Domestic Violence Probation Program	41
Introduction	41
Approach to Domestic Violence	42

Key Leaders	43
Relationships Among Key Leaders	50
Goals of the Program	51
Case Tracking Outcomes	52
Summary: Implications for an Outcome Evaluation	54
References	57
Appendix	59

## **Executive Summary**

In June of 1999, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority began an initiative to create and enhance domestic violence probation programs throughout the state. Building upon the promising results from a pilot project in Champaign County, 14 additional projects were initiated under this program. This report summarizes the findings from an assessment of the implementation of three of these projects in Lake, Winnebago, and Kankakee Counties. The goal of this assessment was to provide a description of the approaches to domestic violence and how project funds affected the handling of domestic violence cases in each of these jurisdictions.

### *Projects Were a Component of A Coordinated Community Response*

In each jurisdiction, the funded projects were a component of an overall coordinated response to domestic violence. At the initiation of the domestic violence probation project, each county had a structure upon which to create the project. In Lake County, this foundation consisted of a strong coordinating group, a domestic violence court, and an existing domestic violence probation program that was enhanced by the grant through the creation of a surveillance component. In Winnebago County, there was a domestic violence courtroom and limited probation services and the grant was used to establish a dedicated probation unit. Kankakee County had a domestic violence court with a dedicated judge and the project provided a full time probation officer for domestic violence cases.

Further, at the time of project implementation, each probation department had a strong working relationship with the domestic violence treatment community. Each jurisdiction had at least one certified batterers intervention program which was very involved with the probation department in providing treatment services. In addition, a domestic violence intervention coordinating body or planning group existed prior to the initiation of this intervention. These groups were active in creating and coordinating a wide variety of services, sanctions, and interventions for this offender population. Thus, in each jurisdiction there was a strong foundation upon which to establish the probation intervention.

#### *Similar Overall Philosophy*

Each jurisdiction espoused a similar approach to intervention with domestic violence offenders. This philosophy was based upon the principle of insuring victim safety throughout each component of the process. In addition, each project emphasized the coordinated community response approach to domestic violence, which involved a blend of sanctions, supervision, and treatment for these offenders within an active and ongoing monitoring of subsequent behavior. While there were differences across sites in the specific roles and structure of the court and the intensity of supervision of offenders, the overall goals and philosophy of these interventions were quite similar.

## *Implementation Issues*

A principal goal of this assessment was to ascertain specific issues that arose across these sites during the implementation period that may be relevant for these sites as they continue the implementation process as well as other sites considering adopting these interventions.

### Length of Implementation Period

A number of administrators indicated that the implementation period took quite a bit longer than had been anticipated. As this assessment was being concluded several noted that only recently had the concepts involved in their approach been fully implemented. In some cases, this was a result of a lengthy hiring process or staff turnover. In addition, it took some time to achieve a level of expertise through training and experience that was necessary to effectively supervise and work with this population of offenders.

### Difficulty of Victim Involvement

Although all of these jurisdictions adopted a victim centered model of operation, it remained quite difficult to engage victims in the probation process. The prevailing view was that the victim's perception that probation was more on the side of the offender as well as overall mistrust of the justice system hindered victim involvement. Several sites instituted specific strategies to enhance victim involvement with some degree of success. These approaches involved direct communication with the victim regarding what was involved in the probation process. In addition, through Lake County's



surveillance officers' frequent home visits there was an active demonstration of the enforcement aspect of this program as well as more frequent victim contact. As a result some victims had an increased level of involvement with probation. Yet overall victim involvement with the court and probation is difficult to achieve since by the time the offender is placed on probation, the victim may have moved, gotten back with the offender, or for some other reason is not interested in being involved.

### Overwhelming Caseloads

The numbers of individuals assigned to domestic violence probation have grown dramatically over the implementation period. There has been a considerable demand for this program and level of supervision for these offenders. In two of the jurisdictions domestic violence probation officers are carrying caseloads of 125 to 150 individuals. The program model in each of these locations specified that each probation officer was to have a caseload of 100 cases. These high caseloads constitute a potential threat to the integrity of the program and its ability to deliver the intensity of supervision and monitoring that is specified by this approach. In particular, probation officers have not been able to conduct home visits with the regularity that was anticipated. This demand for project participation may result in an adjustment of the levels through which individuals progress through the probation period or in adjustment of the screening mechanism.

### Serious Offender Population

Although the overwhelming number of individuals in these projects have been convicted of misdemeanor offenses, they nonetheless represent a chronic and serious offender population. Data on the prior record of these individuals were obtained in two jurisdictions. Almost half of these offenders (46% in Lake County and 47% in Winnebago County) had a prior conviction for domestic violence and a considerable number had served prison sentences (12% in Lake and 16% in Winnebago). In addition, about half (48%) of those in Lake County and two-thirds (68%) of those in Winnebago County had previously been on probation. Regarding other characteristics of the offender, about half (53%) of those in Lake County had a high school degree and a third (36%) of those in Winnebago County had achieved this level. Two-thirds (66%) of the offenders in Lake County were employed full time and less than half (43%) were similarly employed in Winnebago County. About 4 in 10 offenders in each county were reported to have a drug problem and many had previously participated in alcohol treatment (47% in Lake County; 38% in Winnebago).

### Violations of Probation Conditions

Since these programs had just begun, it was too soon for a systematic follow up of probationer performance. However, there is some indication that there are a considerable number of violations being detected. In most cases these violations are a result of non-compliance with conditions of probation such as failure to attend counseling. Given the increased level of surveillance and monitoring of these cases, it is not surprising to find that more violations may be being detected. Such a situation may point to the feasibility

of developing a system of graduated sanctions for probation violation short of revocation and the potential for the greater use of administrative sanctions.

#### Police Role May Be Underutilized

While all jurisdictions reported a good working relationship with the local police departments, there may be an expanded role that police agencies can play in these projects. Interviews with project personnel indicated a growing involvement of law enforcement in Lake County particularly regarding the surveillance component of probation. In addition, structured and regular contact with police agencies is an important aspect of the project in this jurisdiction. For those law enforcement agencies operating in a community policing approach, developing a routine method of not only information exchange but also periodic common operations is a natural partnership and may produce beneficial outcomes.

#### *Summary*

These three projects represent very viable interventions with domestic violence offenders on probation. In each jurisdiction, the project is a component of a coordinated response to domestic violence and builds upon ongoing efforts to effectively deal with the increasing numbers of these offenders in the criminal justice system. Thus, these probation interventions were not implemented in a vacuum. Each of them was a part of an overall broad based system of supervision, treatment, and sanctions for domestic violence offenders that had an orientation toward increasing victim involvement and insuring victim safety.

Although the response to domestic violence in each of these jurisdictions is at a different point of development, each of them is based upon a sound model and has a reasonable chance of attaining its desired impact. The Lake County effort is particularly unique in its creation of the surveillance unit to provide enhanced supervision and monitoring of offenders and potential increased level of victim contact.

During the initial implementation period of all projects, there are lessons learned that could be used to further refine project procedures and operations. This assessment has found that these three projects have learned a great deal during the implementation period that will be helpful in this regard. In particular, it may be advantageous to explore methods to handle the burgeoning caseloads that threaten the intensity prescribed by the program model. In addition, methods to effectively respond to the numbers of technical violations produced through the more intensive program expectations and monitoring may also prove beneficial. Overall, however, these projects have made a considerable contribution to forming a more comprehensive approach to responding to domestic violence in these jurisdictions.

## **Introduction**

The incidence of reported domestic violence is a major issue in our society and for the criminal justice system. Over one million women suffer nonfatal injuries at the hands of an intimate partner each year (BJS, 1996). Even more distressing is the fact that a large proportion of domestic violence goes unreported with estimates of four million women being victims of serious assaults annually (APA, 1996). These figures combined with the estimate that less than half of the victims report the incident to the police (Greenfeld, 1998), demonstrate the magnitude of this problem.

A recent national victimization study of domestic violence found that one-quarter of the women surveyed reported that they had been assaulted by an intimate partner. Eight percent of male respondents had also been similarly victimized (Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998). For all victims of assault, women were much more likely to be victimized by intimates while males were more likely to be assaulted by strangers. Almost two-thirds of women assaulted reported knowing their attacker (Bachman, 1994). Further demonstrating the magnitude of this social problem are the costs of medical services to victims. In 1991, the Domestic Violence for Health Care Providers reported that medical expenses for domestic violence victims was between three and five billion dollars annually.

There are increasing numbers of domestic violence incidents being reported in Illinois. From 1993 to 1996, there was a 23 percent increase in the number of women served by shelters (Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence, 1996). In addition, arrests for domestic battery rose 41 percent and the issuance of personal protection orders increased almost 30% (ICADV, 1996).

Historically, police agencies responded to domestic violence as a family matter and were hesitant to get involved. A common belief among law enforcement was that since the victim was often unwilling to prosecute and that these situations were often dangerous to the officer, many officers did not actively pursue these cases. Increasingly law enforcement agencies have, however, adopted a more vigorous approach to domestic violence. A growing body of research coupled with pressure from women's and victims advocacy groups has resulted in a significant change in the approach to these incidents. Many agencies now have special units devoted to domestic violence and the enforcement of protection orders along with pro or mandatory arrest policies. This approach to domestic violence has resulted in increased numbers of domestic violence offenders entering the criminal justice system.

Similar policy changes have occurred in the prosecution and correctional components of the criminal justice system. In response to the increasing numbers of domestic violence abusers entering the justice system, many prosecutors have established policies that prohibit the dropping or reduction of charges and many jurisdictions have created batterers intervention programs either as part of a prosecutorial disposition or probation supervision.

These developments are part of an increasing trend toward specialization in criminal justice responses to unique crime problems. Perhaps best embodied by the drug court movement, the specialized response seeks to create a uniform and comprehensive approach to the punishment, intervention and treatment of the offender. Prosecutors, judges, probation officers and in some instances police officers develop expertise in dealing with these types of cases and offenders. Building on the drug court momentum

many jurisdictions have established specialized courts to deal with domestic violence (National Association of Court Management, 1998). These approaches seek to establish a multi-dimensional and coordinated approach which involves the development of a range of sanctions to punish and deter the offender, treatment programs for batterers, and an emphasis on victim safety and involvement (Fritzler and Simon, 2000; Karan, Keilitz, and Denaro, 1999).

Often termed the coordinated community response, this approach was pioneered in Quincy, Massachusetts (Saltzman, 1994). Research on this program demonstrated that effective interventions for domestic violence need to address the specific offense behavior through group techniques involving cognitive or psychoeducational methods, emphasize offender accountability, and protection of victims (Crowe, 1995). Other evaluative studies of the coordinated response approach have also been encouraging (see Babcock and Steiner, 1999; Gamache, Edleson, and Schock, 1988, Gondolf, 2000; Syers and Edleson, 1992; Goldkamp, 1996, Orchowsky, 1999). A consistent finding across these studies was that recidivism was lowest for the offenders who participated in a coordinated response program. Several studies also found that offenders who did not experience court intervention follow up were most likely to commit subsequent offenses. Further, individuals who completed counseling programs were consistently found to be less likely to recidivate (Goldkamp, 1996; Orchowsky 1999). Based on these findings the coordinated community response has become a widely acknowledged approach to dealing with domestic violence.

Another principal approach has become known as the Duluth model. Originally formulated in 1981 in Duluth, Minnesota, this approach relies heavily on the involvement

of victims advocates in a broad based intervention involving both criminal justice and community agencies. Victim safety is a primary concern in this approach as is the treatment of the offender.

Probation is recognized as playing a critical role in a coordinated response to domestic violence. Healey and Smith (1998) argue that probation officers are the most crucial actor in the response against domestic violence. In their study, intensive probation supervision was the key element in the success of the intervention, it was even more effective when combined with a range of community and other criminal justice interventions (Healey and Smith, 1998).

Regardless of the specific model, effective domestic violence interventions tend to involve a comprehensive and multi-dimensional approach that adopts an approach that emphasizes monitoring and accountability of the offender, batterers treatment programs, community involvement, and a victim oriented perspective (Hart, 1992). These key components are the principal elements in the protocol for domestic abuse interventions. The emphasis in this protocol is upon a comprehensive approach involving a variety of community and criminal justice agencies. It is important that batterers programs have gender based and culturally specific orientations. Further, the Illinois protocol recognizes the central role that probation must play in any effective intervention (Illinois Domestic Violence Advisory Council, 1994).

### **Illinois Domestic Violence Probation Program**

In June of 1999, a major funding category for domestic violence probation programs was initiated by the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. Fueled by



a pilot project and implementation assessment of a domestic violence probation project in Champaign County, the Authority funded specialized domestic violence probation projects in 14 counties (The Compiler, 1999). Corresponding with the impetus to fund these interventions was a desire to determine how well they are working. Thus several parallel evaluation grants were funded. This report focuses upon the experience of three counties in implementing and enhancing their approach to domestic violence through this funding initiative.

### **Study Description**

The purpose of this study was to describe the approaches to domestic violence and how this funding has been able to affect the handling of domestic violence cases in Lake, Winnebago, and Kankakee Counties. These are among the largest counties in Illinois with Lake being the third largest, Winnebago the sixth largest, and Kankakee is the eighteenth largest. This implementation assessment has several goals. First it is important to describe how additional resources have affected the approach to domestic violence. Second, it can also be quite helpful to identify issues and concerns from the experience of these jurisdictions that can be helpful to other jurisdictions contemplating implementing similar interventions. Third, a description of the cases being handled by the project was obtained in each jurisdiction that will be useful in characterizing the nature and seriousness of the population being handled by these interventions. A final goal of this project was to conduct an evaluability assessment for each of these interventions. This project component will seek to provide information to the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority that will be useful in determining the feasibility of a more extensive evaluation in these project sites.

## **Methodology**

A major component of this assessment consisted of a series of site visits to each of the project sites by the principal investigators. Interviews were conducted with the project director and other key individuals during each of these site visits. These interviews focused upon the nature of these interventions, the changes brought about through the project, and significant implementation issues. There were at least four site visits made by the principal investigators to each project site. In addition, the evaluation team also included local staff who made periodic site visits and conducted interviews and collected additional data. A particular dilemma for this assessment is the fact that in each of the project sites the funding from this initiative provided an enhancement to activities that were already in place regarding domestic violence. Thus, the project does not represent in any of these jurisdictions a different strategy for handling domestic violence cases that can be compared to the period prior to the project when there was not a specialized approach taken with these cases. Thus, the challenge for this project was to describe the general approach to domestic violence and how the funded project changed this approach.

The data collection component of this project was viewed largely as a feasibility and exploratory study. If subsequent evaluation activities are funded it will be necessary to collect data both on individual characteristics as well as on outcomes of individual cases. Thus it was necessary to determine if these types of data are available and can be collected. In two sites (Lake and Winnebago) the data collection focused upon case file data while in Kankakee the data collection focused upon case tracking. The specific findings for each of these exercises are presented within each section of the report for the

specific county. However, it should be noted at this point that as this project component is largely a feasibility study, it is important to observe that the quality of the data is consistently high, the necessary data elements to support a full evaluation are present across all sites, and local sites were extremely cooperative in making their data available.

The data collection component in Lake and Winnebago counties focused upon obtaining a description of the types of cases being handled by the domestic violence probation project in each jurisdiction. Given the differences in size and implementation schedule a different sampling strategy was used in each project site. In Lake County, all cases that had been assigned to the domestic violence probation program between July and December 1999 were selected. This resulted in a sample of 161 cases. In Winnebago County a random sample of 205 cases assigned to probation between July 1999 and November 2000 were selected. Case file data were coded according to the data collection form in the Appendix. In Kankakee County the case tracking data were obtained on all cases assigned to the program as of November 2000.

It is important to acknowledge that although this assessment involved multiple project sites, it is in no way a comparative study. Each of these jurisdictions is at a different point of development in its approach to domestic violence. Each of these counties has been involved in this effort for a different length of time. Thus, it is important to reflect what is being conducted in each project site in a manner that considers this development and progression within the particular jurisdiction.

# Lake County Domestic Violence Probation Program

## **Introduction**

Lake County is situated just to the north of Cook County and has a population of 583,000 (1997, estimated). Much of Lake County can be characterized as affluent and suburban. This is reflected in a per capita income of \$35, 297 in 1995 and a median household income of \$52,983 in 1993. However, there are also low income and more urban population centers located within Lake County. There is also a significant minority population, notably Hispanic, in Waukegan and other communities in Lake County.

The funding from this initiative provided an enhancement to the previously existing domestic violence probation program in Lake County. This project provided support for adding two surveillance officers to work in cooperation with the domestic violence probation unit. The goals of the surveillance component are to provide greater supervision and monitoring of the domestic violence offenders, increase victim contact and cooperation, and promote victim safety.

## **Approach to Domestic Violence**

Lake County has a well-developed and highly coordinated approach to domestic violence. Although not following specifically any nationally recognized model such as the Duluth or Quincy approach, the Lake County Model approximates the coordinated community approach discussed earlier in this report.

Through the leadership of the Lake County State's Attorney, the Domestic Violence Council was formed a number of years ago. This body has been a leading influence in establishing this coordinated approach to the handling of domestic violence

cases. It is composed of judges, probation staff, treatment providers, assistant states attorneys, defense council, and police agencies and works to establish consistent cross agency policies about the approach and treatment of domestic violence. It also promotes training of those in the criminal justice system regarding domestic violence and has worked to develop standardized approaches to treatment and police reporting of domestic violence incidents. It meets every three months and serves as an overall coordinating body for the Lake County approach.

The domestic violence specialized probation program began in 1996 (March) with the assignment of three probation officers to this unit. At the time they carried a mixed caseload of about half domestic violence cases and half general caseload. After a short period of time, it was determined that having a caseload of exclusively domestic violence offenders would be preferable and all probation officers assigned to this unit began handling only domestic violence cases (both misdemeanor and felony). In 1997 (August), an additional probation officer was added and in 1998 (February) another officer was added, bringing the unit staff to its current level of five officers. A manual of procedures was developed that specified the expectations of offenders as well as probation officers in this unit.

The specialized approach was adopted for a number of reasons. The issue of domestic violence had become a major issue in the county and the numbers of prosecutions and convictions, (and thus probationers) was increasing. (At the time of the grant application, domestic violence offenders accounted for 13 percent of the entire probation caseload.) In general there was a heightened awareness of the importance of this issue across the various sectors of the criminal justice system. There was the

realization that domestic violence was a dangerous offense and needed to be treated as such by the criminal justice system. This involved the need to do something different and adopt a more innovative strategy. In addition, some probation officers had recently received training in the cycle of violence and victim issues and became more attuned to a victim oriented approach. Further, with the increasing numbers of these cases it became harder for a general probation officer to give these types of cases the specialized attention that was warranted.

Another important component of the Lake County approach is the domestic violence court. The domestic violence court has a single judge assigned to hear only domestic violence cases (but not protection orders). The perspective of those interviewed was that this allowed the judge to become familiar with the individual involved and maintain a degree of continuity of involvement as offenders passed through various stages of treatment and supervision. Although “status calls” in which there is frequent contact between the judge and offender are not held, there are standard dates (typically 90 days post sentencing) at which reports are provided to the judge regarding the compliance of the offender with the sanctions and terms of supervision.

The domestic violence probation unit supervises all felony and misdemeanor offenders placed on probation or “supervised supervision”. The latter disposition allows for an individual who successfully completes the program to have their record altered to reflect completion of court supervision (a more minor disposition). However, the individual’s record still reflects a conviction. The caseload of the domestic violence unit includes individuals who are convicted of intimate partner abuse as well as those who have victimized other family members (e.g., parents, siblings). In addition, individuals

who have some indication of domestic abuse behavior (e.g., plea to assault after an allegation of domestic battery) are also placed on these caseloads. At the time of this report caseloads were averaging about 120 cases per officer. This was reported to be higher than the 100 cases that were anticipated in the program design. There are approximately 550 individuals currently on the domestic violence probation caseload. The typical term of probation is 18-24 months. About 15-20 new domestic violence probation cases are added each month.

All cases are placed at the maximum supervision level at the time of probation assignment. This level of supervision requires reporting twice a month, one of which is an in-office contact, a home visit every other month, a monthly treatment program contact, and a police contact every 2 months. All individuals are required to participate in domestic violence treatment. This program consists of 18 weeks of counseling, 16 of these weeks are focused upon domestic violence issues and 2 weeks deal with parenting training. If the offender also has substance abuse problems, successful completion of drug or alcohol treatment is required prior to entry into the domestic violence treatment program. After completion of treatment and if there have been no new domestic violence arrests, the level of supervision is reduced to a once a month contact and a home visit every six months. Offenders typically spend the first six months on maximum supervision. Of the current 550 individuals on domestic violence probation approximately 40% (225) are on maximum supervision.

Violations of probation can be sanctioned within the probation department according to the administrative sanctions process once the prosecuting assistant state's attorney has been notified. This procedure allows for the imposition of increased

reporting, urinalysis, public service, or more frequent contacts as a response to violations. While these sanctions are authorized, the perspective of those interviewed was that in most cases revocation is pursued instead of these intermediate sanctions.

### **Surveillance Component**

The ICJIA grant provided a significant enhancement to an already well-developed and coordinated approach to domestic violence. This program component consists of two individuals who are responsible for providing increased surveillance for domestic violence probationers. This program component was created out of the perceived need for increased contact and knowledge of the compliance of these individuals with their conditions of probation. In addition, there was a desire to provide increased contact with victims that the probation officers did not have time to provide. This program component was modeled on a similar concept that had been used for sex offenders in this jurisdiction.

The surveillance officers also carry a caseload. All individuals on their caseloads are maximum supervision level and currently each surveillance officer has a caseload of approximately 100 individuals. Given the level of supervision and monitoring involved in this program it is apparent that these offenders are receiving many more contacts than they would if they were being supervised at the AOC standard maximum level of supervision.

The surveillance officers conduct unannounced home visits, treatment visits or workplace visits to determine if the individual is in compliance with program conditions. It should be noted that these contacts are in addition to the regular probation officer



contacts and field visits that they receive according to their supervision level. These officers work a flexible schedule including nights, weekends, and holidays in order to conduct visits during times in which violations are more likely to occur. It is also important for the surveillance officer to have afternoon office hours to meet with and provide information to the case carrying probation officers. Of principal importance in the home visits is victim contact (if there is a condition of no contact), and substance use. The surveillance officer conducts two visits per month for each individual on the caseload. There is an additional police contact each month with the law enforcement agency in the jurisdiction in which the individual lives to determine if there have been any complaints regarding this individual, calls to this address, or if the individual is wanted on a warrant. If there is a warrant for an individual who is on domestic violence probation, probation will assist in picking up the individual.

In a number of cases the surveillance officer will also see the victims. This is true both for victims who continue living with the offender as well as those who do not. The purpose of this activity is both to gather information regarding violations as well as to reinforce positive contact with the victim regarding the continuing handling of the case and supervision of the offender. This intangible component is viewed as being of principal importance in the communication to victims that their complaints and situations are being taken seriously by the system.

Three principal components of the role of the surveillance officer were identified: the Information Gathering Role, (what is the offender doing, police information, victim information, etc.), the Deterrence Role, close watching of the offender to deter future domestic violence, and the Enforcement Role, catching the offender in violations.

## **Program Implementation Issues**

Interviews with probation staff indicated a series of project accomplishments to date and implementation issues that could be of interest to other jurisdictions interested in this approach. As with any new project there is an implementation period in which the actual activities and program operations are clarified. This was also the case with the Lake County project. One individual indicated that it took the first year of the project to work out the specific procedures, integrate the surveillance function to the probation operation, and recruit and train competent surveillance staff. It was noted that now the project is functioning as it was intended but it took a good year to get to this point.

A key to achieving this degree of implementation is recruiting of staff who can perform the tasks associated with the surveillance role. The project experienced considerable turnover in individuals in this position during the first year. However, stability has now been achieved with the individuals who have been in these positions for the past year. One official indicated several specific skills that are important for a surveillance officer to have. These include not being afraid to go out after dark and work late hours contacting victims and offenders in their homes. This is a difficult responsibility for new employees as it often takes probation officers several years to become comfortable with this task. It is also important that surveillance officers have the ability to communicate with others. This is important both for the interaction with victims and offenders but also for the ability to interact with other probation staff and police agencies. It is also important to have knowledge of the county, and as with any probation position, be able to be both firm and fair in their treatment of probationers. Although not specifically a criteria that was used in selection, the current surveillance

staff both had prior work and life experiences that enhanced their ability to communicate with and supervise this population of offenders.

Training has also been an important aspect of implementation. Training on surveillance techniques and skills (e.g., how to locate individuals) was provided by the Repeat Offender Program (comprised of police officers from several Lake County police agencies). In addition, training on how to conduct record checks was also provided. Further, domestic violence training in how to work with victims was also important.

### **Project Accomplishments**

Several aspects of the project were identified that have been particularly fruitful. A principal achievement has been the improved relationships with the local police departments throughout the county. Through the routine monthly contact from the surveillance officers and police departments, stronger working relationships have been formed. Probation staff indicated that there is a greater flow of information and a better awareness of law enforcement regarding the issues of domestic violence as a result of these contacts.

A second positive outcome has been the increased information that is available for these cases. This information concerns the offender's behavior, compliance with the conditions of probation, and contact with the victim. It was their perspective that probation officers are simply too overburdened to obtain the level of information that is required to effectively supervise these offenders. Given the nature of these offenses, close monitoring is imperative for deterrence and detection of subsequent offenses as well as behaviors that may make the recurrence of domestic violence offenses more

likely. Conducting an unannounced home visit may result in the discovery of drinking, drug use, or associates that are forbidden as a condition of probation.

This increased information is somewhat of a double-edged sword. The probation staff indicated that since closer monitoring of these offenders is being conducted more violations are being detected. While this closer monitoring may yield a higher rate of violations and revocations, it may in the long run produce a lower level of intimate partner violence. Subsequent assessments of such interventions will need to be cognizant of this distinction in outcome measures.

Another positive outcome of the project reported by probation staff has been increased contact and participation of victims. Conducting home visits (where the offender continues to live with the victim) and collateral visits with the victim where there is a no contact condition, allows for greater participation and communication with the victim of these offenses.

There are also several important “intangibles” that are a result of the surveillance component. Probation staff observed that for years offenders have been told that their behavior would be monitored while they are on probation. Offenders, of course, do not believe this and are quite surprised to find that probation officers are serious about frequent contact and monitoring of individuals in this program. The communication of this message is quite important. The second and similar intangible message is the communication to victims that officers are serious about not tolerating this behavior and that victim safety is a paramount concern. This message is critical to the ability to assist victims in breaking the cycle of intimate partner violence.

Probation staff identified two principal keys to success for this type of program. The first, as noted above, is the selection of staff who are willing and capable to do this type of work. This requires an aggressive approach, working odd hours, and considerable communication skills. The second key is the visibility of the program. It is important that surveillance officers be highly visible to the offenders, victims, and law enforcement operations in order to obtain knowledge, detect inappropriate behavior, and catch violators. It is imperative that offenders know that someone is watching their behavior and that if violations are detected, they will be reported and acted upon.

### *Remaining Issues*

There were also several issues identified that would be helpful to address during the next phases of the project. First, a principal concern is the fact that it takes about a month from conviction before the initial surveillance contact is made. This is due to the time it takes to formulate a treatment and supervision plan and for the probation officer to make the initial home visit. This is an acknowledged concern and will likely be addressed in the next project phase.

Another concern is the high caseloads that have been generated for the surveillance officers. The current caseload size of over 100 is viewed as too great and it will be helpful to attempt to structure this in a manner to maximize the effort of the surveillance officer.

Another need that was identified was in the area of equipment. There is a considerable need to have accurate photographs of offenders available for the surveillance officers. When they make a cold call to a location and inquire about the presence of the offender, if they do not have an accurate description of the individual they

are at the mercy of those present to identify themselves. Having a digital camera and color printer would greatly assist this process.

There is also a continuing need for domestic violence training for law enforcement. This training should identify and communicate to officers what information is important to collect in domestic violence cases and the importance of developing consistency in reporting practice and exchange of information between probation and police.

Probation staff also indicated that it would be helpful to have greater guidance from the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. This input would be helpful on the programmatic side concerning what specifically the Authority wants from these projects as well as providing input on what statistics and performance measures will be needed during both the implementation and operations phases.

### **Case Outcomes**

The probation department provided some basic information on the numbers of cases assigned. Since the beginning of the grant period 366 new cases have been assigned to domestic violence probation and an additional 19 individuals were placed on “supervised supervision”. In addition, information was provided regarding the termination of probation cases during this time. Considerable caution must be used in the interpretation of this information. First, individuals who were terminated during the first part of program operations were not realistically part of the project since the majority of their probation period would have occurred prior to the enhancement provided by this grant. Second, information on only the terminated population (the data do not indicate the date of assignment to probation) will overweight the unsuccessful cases. Since

successful termination will take 18-24 months (the typical probation term) cases terminated prior to that point are more likely to be concluded due to violations of some type. There were 297 terminations from probation in the 18 months since the beginning of the project. This includes individuals who were already on the domestic violence caseload prior to the initiation of the surveillance unit. Focusing upon the terminations during the last six months of this time period (since June 1 - December 4, 2000) will somewhat reduce but certainly not eliminate the biases introduced by having terminations only data. These data do not have those who were assigned to probation during this time and are still performing well. During this time there were 97 individuals terminated from probation, 46 (47%) successfully completed probation compared to 51 (53%) who did not. Most of the terminations were for failure to attend treatment. If one compares this to the same information for the first six months of this time period (July 1 – December 31, 1999), there was only a 17% (15 out of 86) successful termination rate. Again one must not over interpret these data but these findings are encouraging since there is a much higher successful termination rate during the more recent period. An adequate assessment of this issue should include the tracking of a cohort of offenders assigned to probation during a single time period in which all offenders have an equal time at risk.

### **Description of the Domestic Violence Probation Population**

As noted previously, an important component of the implementation assessment was a review of the characteristics of the offenders assigned to probation during the project period. In Lake County, this included a review of all cases assigned to domestic

violence probation from July 1999 through December 1999. This selection resulted in a sample of 161 cases. Each of these case files were read and coded according to the data collection form in the Appendix. Table 1 presents the results of the descriptive analysis of these data.

The interpretation of these results is straightforward and this discussion will point out the more salient findings. While 22% of the victims reported being married to the offender, another 58% can be classified as being another intimate partner. Almost 6 in 10 victims (58%) lived with the offender at the time of the offense. Interestingly, about a third of the case files had an indication that there was a previous abusive incident involving the same victim. Given that in many instances this may not be mentioned in the police report or case file, the actual incidence will be much greater.

Also interesting is the finding that 76% of the offenders reported being employed at the time of the offense with most of these 66% (of all offenders) being employed full time and over half (53%) reported having a high school education or GED. About 1/3 of the offenders (32%) indicated they lived with a spouse or other intimate partner, another 1/3 (32%) lived with their parents, and the rest lived with another relative (18%), alone (15%) or with friends (3%). The proportion of offenders who were living with an intimate partner (32%) is a reflection of their current living situation while on probation compared to the fact that 58% of victims were living with the offender at the time of the offense.

Regarding the conditions of probation, 90% of the cases reviewed had an order to complete domestic violence treatment. Although as a matter of policy, all intimate partner violence cases are required to complete the batterers intervention program, a



number of individuals on the caseload have committed another form of family violence. In addition, in some cases this condition may not have been in the original probation order but could have been amended at a later date and thus not observed in the case file review process. For all intents and purposes, individuals supervised by the domestic violence probation unit are required to complete the batterers intervention program.

Three out of four offenders were also required to participate in another form of treatment, with this in most cases being substance abuse treatment. Only 1/3 (35%) of the cases included a no contact order and only 15% of the cases were required to perform public service.

Two thirds (67%) of the cases were convicted of Domestic Battery and 91% of the offenders were convicted of a misdemeanor charge. In 7 of 10 cases there was only one charge. In most cases (85%) there was no relationship of the offender to the criminal justice system at the time of the offense, however, 10% of the offenders were on probation at the time of the offense.

In most cases (88%) the weapon involved was the offender's fist and most offenses (80%) took place in the victim's house. Interestingly, in half (50%) of the cases the incident was viewed by other individuals.

The case files indicated that in 7 out of 10 cases alcohol was involved in the offense. There was also an indication that almost half (47%) of the offenders had a drug problem and almost 1 in 5 (18%) had a diagnosed mental health problem.

Perhaps most importantly, almost half (46%) had a prior conviction for domestic violence. Two thirds (67%) had a prior conviction of any type and almost half (48%) had been previously on probation. One in ten offenders had been to prison before. These

data indicate that although the majority of these individuals have been convicted of misdemeanor offenses, this is a serious offender population, a high proportion of who have had multiple convictions for intimate partner violence.

**Table 1**

**Lake County Probation Case Description**

(N=161)

Victim Characteristics

Age    Mean Age    29

Race

White            59%  
Black            27%  
Hispanic        13%

Gender

Male            15%  
Female          85%

Victim Offender Relationship

Spouse            22%  
Other intimate 58%  
Child            6%  
Other            4%

Living Arrangements

Lives with offender    58%  
Not living with off.    32%

Offender Characteristics

Age    Mean Age    32

Race

White            50%  
Black            33%  
Hispanic        13%

Gender

Male            91%  
Female          9%

Employment Status

Full Time        66%  
Part Time        10%  
Unemployed      22%  
Other            2%

Highest Grade Completed

Median            11<sup>th</sup>  
HS/GED            53%

Marital Status

Married            33%  
Single            50%  
Divorced/Sep.    17%

Living Status

Spouse            19%  
Other Intimate  
Partner            13%  
Parents            32%  
Other relative    18%  
Friends            3%  
Alone            15%

### Characteristics of Probation

Average length of probation 18 months  
Average Fine \$137

Actual Jail Time Served  
None 68%  
30 Days 6%  
Other 26%

Community Service  
None 85%

Order for Domestic Violence Treatment  
Yes 90%  
No 10%

Type of Domestic Violence Treatment  
Gates 28%  
IPDAV 51%  
Neville 7%

No Contact with Victim Order  
Yes 35%  
No 65%

Other Treatment Required  
Yes 76%  
No 24%

Type of other Treatment  
Substance Abuse 83%

### Offense Characteristics

Instant Offense  
Domestic Battery 67%  
Other Battery 18%

Charge Level  
Misdemeanor 91%  
Felony 9%

Number of Charges  
One 69%  
Two 28%  
Three 3%

Second Victim  
Yes 14%  
No 86%

Weapon Type  
Fists 88%

Location of Offense  
Victim's House 80%  
Public Place 7%  
Other 13%

Did Others View Incident  
Yes 50%  
No 50%

Previous Abuse of Same Victim  
Yes 30%  
No 62%  
Not Avail. 8%

Alcohol Involved  
Yes 71%  
No 29%

## Other Offender Characteristics

### Relationship to Justice System at time of the Offense

None	85%
Probation	10%
Bond/Bail	4%
Other	1%

### Prior Alcohol Treatment

Yes	47%
No	53%

### Drug Problem

Yes	47%
No	53%

### Type of Drug Problem

Marijuana	41%
Cocaine	49%

Mental Health Problem	Yes	18%
Prior Mental Health Treatment (lifetime)	Yes	17%
Enrolled in Mental Health Treatment at time of Offense	Yes	7%
Prior Domestic Violence Convictions	Yes	46%
Prior Convictions	Yes	67%
Prior Jail Sentence	Yes	11%
Prior Probation Sentence	Yes	48%
Prior Prison Sentence	Yes	12%

# **Winnebago County Domestic Violence Probation Program**

## **Introduction**

Winnebago County is located approximately 90 miles to the northwest of Chicago and in 1990 had a population of 264,873. Regarding overall crime rates, the county had a rate of assaults of 426 per 100,000 and 283 robberies per 100,000 in 1997. These rates are considerably higher than those of Kankakee (293 assaults, 130 robberies) or Lake (178 assaults, 74 robberies) counties. In 1995 the estimated per capita income was \$23,065 and the median household income in 1993 was \$34,652. These figures are more comparable to Kankakee County than Lake County.

At the beginning of the grant, Winnebago County Adult Probation supervised just over 6,000 individuals. At this time, a specialized domestic violence probation had been recently established but there was a lack of personnel to be assigned to these duties. The grant provided funds to enhance this newly created unit. The local Family Violence Prevention Coordinating Council had identified the development of such a unit as a major goal and was quite supportive of the creation of this project. The Domestic Violence Probation Unit is seen as a key player in implementing the Illinois Protocol for Partner Abuse Intervention Programs. The impetus for the origin of this effort came from the activities of the court as well as probation. The support from the bench, as well as from the prosecutor's office have been keys to development of the domestic violence intervention in this site. The original plan was for this jurisdiction to add three probation officers to form a full time domestic violence unit. The arrest and domestic violence statistics provided in support of this grant proposal provided solid evidence of the need

for such a unit. Two general goals were established for this unit: (1) to enhance probation contact with victims so as to more effectively involve them in the response to domestic violence, and (2) to enhance offender supervision and accountability to the court.

The Domestic Violence Probation Unit in Winnebago County consists of three and a half positions, three of which are grant-funded. The half-time position was filled by the grant coordinator, who shared responsibility for overseeing one group of cases as well as monitoring the grant activities within the court. This individual held the rank of Senior Probation Officer and has been working with domestic violence cases since April of 1997. He acted as the supervisor of the project from the beginning and has been the primary catalyst behind this intervention in Winnebago County. This arrangement emerged at the start of the grant period, but was changed near the end of calendar year 2000, when this individual was promoted to Deputy Clerk of the Court. He now plays a limited role in the project, a role that will diminish over time owing to the magnitude of his new responsibilities. His responsibilities for the domestic violence unit have been assigned to another probation officer placed in this position. Prior to the grant the project coordinator carried a full probation caseload, but his responsibilities in administering the grant cut into the available time to supervise a full caseload. He assumed responsibility for overseeing the "conditional discharge" cases, a large and important category of cases. This continues to be the situation with the new individual in this position. The chief judge at the time of the grant was also very supportive of the application and played a key role in seeing that the application was submitted. It was the perspective of the key

individuals in the development of this project that grant process was straightforward and not cumbersome.

### **Approach to Domestic Violence**

The model of intervention for this jurisdiction was not specific early in its development. That is, none of the national models (e.g., Quincy, Duluth) were directly adopted. Instead, the goal was to develop a realistic locally driven model that would work in Winnebago, one that was high on offender accountability, supervision of offenders, and victim safety. It is clear that the emphasis on victims was a key goal of this intervention. In addition, this jurisdiction is like many others in that it has high caseloads and high demand for its services. As a consequence, the ability to bring more resources to bear in a targeted manner was a welcome addition to the resource base. This is not to say, however, that the intervention lacked structure. Indeed, there is evidence of a well thought out probation intervention that is designed to meet the needs of victims, offenders and the justice system. The Winnebago County process focused upon developing a model of intervention that was both realistic and met local needs.

The 17<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit Family Violence Coordinating Council (FVCC) is a central component of the Winnebago County approach to domestic violence. It is composed of 25 members including the chief judge, three additional judges who hear family cases, the state's attorney, victim coordinators, police departments, the sheriff, shelter representatives, probation, jail, the jury commission, clerk of the court, and parole. It focuses on a variety of family abuse problems, including domestic violence, child abuse and elder abuse. This group holds quarterly meetings and provides input for the direction of the domestic violence probation intervention. This group was instrumental in



arguing for the availability of a dedicated courtroom that exclusively hears domestic violence cases.

The grant began in July 1999. However, in April 1998 the domestic violence courtroom began. Specialized probation supervision of cases began in February 1999. Orders of protection are central to the approach in Winnebago County and there is extensive use of this mechanism. The protocol in Winnebago County includes a no bond rule that incarcerates the offender and thus provides the victim a period of time to fully consider decisions relative to her living situation and choices about prosecution. There is also a 72 hour no contact rule that follows the initial court appearance regardless of the outcome of the hearing and the case. Most of the cases involve a victim and a batterer who live in the same house. In addition to full probation cases, there is a second category, conditional discharge orders. These cases have a reduced level of supervision and are monitored to determine if there is compliance with court ordered treatment and other conditions. The new unit supervisor is currently handling these cases.

Probation staff believe that their caseloads are the highest in the state, perhaps a reason why the grant was funded initially here. The biggest difference since the start of the grant has been in the cross training and joint understanding of the roles of the different participants in the domestic violence process. Cross training of the various participants was one of the highest priorities identified in the jurisdiction prior to the start of the grant.

The grant brought several new aspects to the domestic violence probation effort in Winnebago County. First, a victim contact sheet was developed. This was a separate sheet for notes taped to the back of case files. This placement of the sheet would protect

it from being visible in court but would be an informal means of tracking contacts. This provided the opportunity to provide contact information in court in an efficient fashion.

A second innovation to result from the grant was a classification sheet used by probation officers to move someone from Level I supervision to Level II. It is based on compliance on the part of the probationer. Such criteria as new offenses, meeting appointments, job experiences, accepting responsibility for their actions along with a subjective assessment by probation officers forms the basis for this sheet. Any score on this sheet less than or equal to 12 is a Level I case, offenders scoring more than 12 are Level II cases. Level I cases receive two visits per month and Level II cases are required to have only one visit per month with their probation officers. The service standard is to have two home visits per probationer per year. This means that probation officers need to be out of the office doing home visits at least one day per week. Over the course of the grant this became increasingly difficult as case numbers increased dramatically.

The third innovation brought about by the grant was monthly meetings with the domestic courtroom personnel to talk through the problems, issues and changes in the process. This was done with all three judges who hear domestic violence cases, all three domestic violence probation officers, the two state's attorneys with responsibility for domestic violence cases, the presiding judge, and the clerk's office.

The fourth major change brought about by the grant has been the continuing work with service providers to insure a uniform way of reporting case progress to probation officers. This has led to the development of a monthly form as well as a one-sheet report per week. This form is more of a checklist, but has proven important as it routinized contact with probation officers.

There were two primary types of domestic violence cases, misdemeanor and felony. Probation cases almost exclusively involved misdemeanors, domestic battery and orders of protection. Very few cases were felonies as it was estimated that between 80% and 90% of the cases were misdemeanors. There has been very little effort to enhance sentences and put them at a felony level. The sentiment among probation officers was that it was better to keep cases at a misdemeanor level because the court would have more control over such cases. This perception was due to the increased level of attention, monitoring and supervision that was given to these cases through the domestic violence court and the view that if these cases were handled by the felony court they would not receive as close supervision.

There were approximately 1,000 conditional discharge cases as of September 1999. A conditional discharge is typically granted to cases in which the offender has no priors and seems amenable to treatment. In these cases an initial interview is held after the court appearance, the court order is explained and referral to counseling occurs. A follow-up court visit is held in 90 days and treatment is monitored until completion or violation of some aspect of the court order. No other contacts are required. The requirements for these cases were that they meet with their supervising officer within two weeks of their sentencing date. These cases typically have a 12 month supervision period, a 90 day status call, a \$260 fine and some counseling requirement. The process essentially involves a ten-minute review of the case prior to the court hearing, a referral to counseling, and a review of the criminal and domestic violence history. The state's attorney plays the primary role in determining which cases are conditional discharge or full probation supervision cases. Their training in this regard is important. Regardless of

the nature of the case (conditional discharge or probation) the level of supervision has intensified under this grant.

The principal treatment provider in Winnebago County is Wave (Working Against Violent Environments), and this organization is also the local domestic violence shelter. Community awareness is a key issue in this effort. The WAVE counseling effort requires 16 weeks of group psycho-educational counseling. There is an initial orientation meeting followed by three individual meetings. Partner abuse is treated differently than other forms of domestic abuse within the WAVE philosophy.

Non-partner cases get referred to anger management services. Domestic violence is not necessarily included in all anger management services. Domestic violence treatment response includes power and control as well as gender roles.

### **Program Implementation Issues and Accomplishments**

Throughout the evaluation it became clear that a strong emphasis was put on the need for screening cases at the front end. That is, the intake interview and assessment was critical to the proper assessment and assignment for treatment of probationers. This was seen by the Winnebago Domestic Violence Probation Unit as a key to success in that it can enhance victim safety as well as insure an efficient processing of cases. One area in which local probation staff would appreciate assistance is in the area of assessment tools that had been validated and tested. This points to the need for training of personnel involved in the domestic violence process. Such training should include, at a minimum, judges, state's attorneys, probation officers and treatment providers.

The court holds a status call three times per week. Status calls are designed to check up on probationers and basically see how they are doing. Every probationer comes

in 90 days after a guilty plea, and it was the impression of probation staff that 85% of probationers appear in court for the initial call. At this appearance, a decision regarding the status date is made. If there are no new charges and attendance at treatment has been good, then the status calls will be reduced, or even ended. Every 90 days, however, they must appear unless they are doing well. It has been the experience of the Winnebago County Unit that status calls are necessary for insuring compliance with the requirements of treatment. The increased presence of probation officers in court has helped to develop both credibility and accountability, on the part of the domestic violence probation staff as well as the offenders. There is some evidence that the judiciary would like to see status calls reduced, however there is a perception that the use of "judicial scolding" in such sessions is effective. When a probationer completes their treatment, a requirement for status call is quite rare. It is important to note that the primary reason that status calls are held is to support and monitor the treatment and counseling progress and attendance.

As of January 2000, the number of conditional discharge cases was stable at approximately 1,000. The typical domestic violence probation term is 12 months. For October 1999, 13 new cases were added and 5 were discharged. In November, 14 were added and 2 were discharged. In December 1999, 17 were added and 4 were discharged. It is clear that this pattern of case management would lead to increasingly large caseloads. This is a net increase of 11 cases per month (new cases - discharges) that will increase over time. Clearly, dealing with the increasing caseload is an issue that this program, and others, must deal with.

Our December 2000 interviews indicated that this prediction did come true. At the start of the grant process there were 200 cases supervised within the unit across the

three probation officers. These were full probation cases. However, these caseloads grew dramatically across the period of the grant to levels that by December 2000 exceeded the capability of probation officers. Indeed two of the probation officers now carry caseloads between 125 and 150, when they were anticipated to have 100 cases. There is a concern that the supervision standards may be being compromised by these high caseloads. Of particular issue is the difficulty that probation officers are having in conducting home visits according to the prescribed schedule.

Another of the key issues in the Winnebago County domestic violence probation intervention is the emphasis on victim contact. It is clear that since the Spring of 1999 such contact has increased dramatically. This was accomplished through the use of a letter to victims that explained the process and the role of the domestic violence probation unit with regard to supervision and services. This letter has resulted in increased contact with victims and victim involvement throughout the probation process.

The treatment options in Winnebago County were apparently sufficient to meet the needs of offenders and the probation unit at the start of the grant. However, the perception of those interviewed was that the range of options and intensity of treatment could be enhanced. In addition, as the number of cases increased, the need for additional treatment placements increased. Further, the need to find state-certified treatment providers became more acute over the course of the project.

The Winnebago unit does not use Prober or Tracker, information systems that are widely used in Illinois to monitor probation cases. Instead they have a newly installed data system that can create reports and provide a daily list of probation cases. The information available on conditional discharge cases however, is much more limited. As

is often the case, the installation of this system was slower than anticipated and as of the conclusion of this evaluation it was not on line.

The grant process was characterized by local staff as being rather straightforward. The reporting requirements were also viewed as very reasonable, perhaps too reasonable in some regards, and they could understand how more information from project sites would be required. In addition, there was concern expressed at the local level concerning the lack of the development of a consistent reporting system. Indeed, this caused considerable concern as a reporting system was targeted for development but was not provided during the project. In addition, grantees were required to provide data without guidance about what data should be provided and in what format. There is clearly a role for the state to fulfill in this regard.

As a consequence of the grant a number of positive changes were noted. These included: (1) more experienced officers, (2) doing domestic violence probation better largely as a consequence of better training and communication throughout the response to domestic violence, (3) the ability to handle higher than anticipated case numbers, (4) increased reliance on the criminal justice system to handle cases, (5) an increase in the awareness and capability of treatment providers, (6) better communication between treatment providers and the court. One of the ongoing needs in the system is for better record management. This could possibly be accomplished with input from the AOIC.

The best practices to be gleaned from the Winnebago grant process include the following:

1. Set realistic caseloads and stick to them strictly.
2. Use strict and limited eligibility criteria for cases.
3. Establish a strong relationship with service providers that is based on knowledge of what each party is responsible for. It is especially important that information flow between the two groups.
4. A dedicated courtroom, prosecutor and judge are absolutely necessary.
5. The involvement of the police departments in understanding and responding to domestic violence cases is essential.

### **Description of the Domestic Violence Probation Population**

As noted previously data were collected on a sample of 205 cases that were assigned to domestic violence probation between July 1999 and November 2000. A descriptive analysis of the characteristics of the victim, offender, and the offense are presented in Table 2. The following discussion highlights the more salient aspects of this analysis.

About one-fourth of the victims indicated that they were married to the offender while an additional 68% were another intimate partner. Similarly about a fourth (24%) reported living with the offender at the time of the offense and three-fourths lived elsewhere.

About 58% of the offenders reported being employed at the time of the offense with most of these 43% (of all offenders) being employed full time. About one-third



(36%) had a high school degree or had received a GED. A considerable number of offenders reported living with their parents (22%), alone (18%), or with friends or another relative (18%).

The average term of probation imposed was 18 months (compared with the interview perception that the typical term was 12 months). Two-thirds of the offenders had no-contact orders as a condition of probation. Almost 6 out of 10 offenders (57%) were required to participate in treatment beyond the batterers intervention program.

Interestingly, while almost half (49%) of the offenders had no formal relationship to the criminal justice system at the time of the offense, over a third (36%) were on probation. One in ten cases involved a second victim, and it is also interesting to note that in three –fourths of the cases another individual witnessed the incident.

There was an indication that the offender had a drug problem in 42% of the cases and 21% of the cases there was an indication of a mental health problem. About 40% had received prior alcohol treatment.

It was clear that the population of domestic violence probationers represents a difficult group of chronic offenders in spite of the fact that the overwhelming proportion of them are convicted of a misdemeanor as their instant offense. Eighty percent had had a previous criminal conviction and almost half (47%) had a prior conviction for domestic violence. In addition, 16% had served a prior prison sentence.

**Table 2**

**Winnebago County Probation Case Description**

(N=205)

Victim Characteristics

Age    Mean Age    NA

Race                    NA

White  
Black  
Hispanic

Gender

Male            11%  
Female         89%

Victim Offender Relationship

Spouse            24%  
Other intimate 68%  
Child              8%

Living Arrangements

Lives with offender    24%  
Not living with off.    76%

Offender Characteristics

Age    Mean Age    32

Race

White            52%  
Black            39%  
Hispanic        8%  
Other             1%

Gender

Male            90%  
Female         10%

Employment Status

Full Time       43%  
Part Time       15%  
Unemployed    37%  
Other            5%

Highest Grade Completed

HS/GED        36%

Marital Status

Married        25%  
Single          55%  
Divorced/Sep. 20%

Living Status

Spouse         12%  
Other Intimate  
Partner        21%  
Parents        22%  
Other relative 13%  
Friends        5%  
Alone          18%  
Other          2%

### Characteristics of Probation

Average length of probation 18 months  
Average Fine \$277

Actual Jail Time Served  
None 35%  
30 Days 11%  
Unk. 54%

Community Service  
None 88%

No Contact with Victim Order  
Yes 66%  
No 34%

Other Treatment Required  
Yes 57%  
No 43%

### Offense Characteristics

Instant Offense  
Domestic Battery 80%  
Other Battery 1%

Charge Level  
Misdemeanor 85%  
Felony 5%  
Unk 10%

Second Victim  
Yes 11%  
No 89%

Weapon Type  
Fists 48%  
Other 52%

Location of Offense  
Victim's House 88%  
Public Place 4%  
Other 8%

Did Others View Incident  
Yes 76%  
No 24%

Previous Abuse of Same Victim  
Yes 9%  
No 6%  
Not Avail. 85%

## Other Offender Characteristics

### Relationship to Justice System at time of the Offense

None	49%
Probation	36%
Bond/Bail	4%
Other	11%

### Prior Alcohol Treatment

Yes	39%
No	61%

### Drug Problem

Yes	42%
No	58%

Mental Health Problem	Yes	21%
Prior Mental Health Treatment (lifetime)	Yes	16%
Enrolled in Mental Health Treatment at time of Offense	Yes	6%
Prior Domestic Violence Convictions	Yes	47%
Prior Convictions	Yes	80%
Prior Jail Sentence	Yes	27%
Prior Probation Sentence	Yes	68%
Prior Prison Sentence	Yes	16%

# **Kankakee County Domestic Violence Probation Program**

## **Introduction**

Kankakee County is located about 55 miles south of Chicago and had a population of just over 100,000 in 1990. Kankakee has experienced a considerable problem with crime and violence in the 1990s for a county of its size. However, these problems have been considerably attenuated over the past several years (ICJIA, 2000). Kankakee had a per capita income of \$19,901 in 1995 and a median household income of \$31,184 (1993). The 1990 census reflected that 16% of the population was African American and there is a growing Hispanic population.

Much of the activity around domestic violence in Kankakee grew out of its creation of a Domestic Violence Court in 1996. The idea for the creation of the court evolved from the specialized drug court that was already utilized in the county. Kankakee County Probation became involved with the domestic violence court in January 2000, when funding was granted to the probation department. This report provides a description of the role of the Kankakee County Probation Department in the Domestic Violence Court Diversion Program that focuses on process issues such as implementation and development.

## **Historical Development**

Between 1993 and 1997, the number of domestic violence cases referred to the Kankakee County Court increased dramatically, from 40 to 465 per year. In order to handle the enormous increase, a specific domestic violence court call was created in 1996. Despite this, the probation department was only staffed with five adult and six juvenile probation officers for its entire caseload. One of these probation officers

handled all of the drug cases (approximately 50-60 clients), and the remaining officers handled the rest of the probation caseload (approximately 160-170 clients each).

Therefore, the probation department was unable to handle both the volume of new cases as well as the specialized nature of the domestic violence cases.

In 1997, a statewide domestic violence symposium was held. The symposium was attended by a broad array of representatives charged with responding to domestic violence, from the police, to the victim. In 1998, Iroquois County, Illinois held a domestic violence symposium, and in 1999, a follow-up symposium was held. In part, because Kankakee County Probation had participated extensively in these symposiums and based on need for this intervention, it was awarded a domestic violence probation grant in 1999 by the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. This grant allowed the probation department to hire another officer that would be assigned only to the domestic violence cases.

### **Approach To Domestic Violence**

The Kankakee Domestic Violence Court differs from regular court in several key areas. First of all, it is a diversion program. When an individual is charged with domestic violence in Kankakee County, that person is offered a choice. They can choose to have their case settled in criminal court, or elect to have their case handled in the domestic violence court. Individuals who choose to have their domestic violence charge handled in the domestic violence court must first plead guilty to the charges. Then, upon successful completion of the diversionary program, all of the domestic violence charges against the individual are dropped.

Second, and more importantly, the Kankakee Domestic Violence Court differs from criminal court because the domestic violence court is more treatment oriented. Individuals who choose to have their cases heard in domestic violence court must complete both drug and alcohol treatment and anger management treatment before charges are dropped. By making this type of treatment a requirement, the domestic violence court attempts to address the domestic violence charge, but also to resolve the underlying problems that may be contributing to the domestic violence problem.

The Kankakee domestic violence probation differs from regular probation in several key areas. First, offenders placed in domestic violence probation are required to meet with their probation officer more frequently than regular probationers. Offenders are also required to complete evaluations and treatment (if necessary) for drug and alcohol dependency as well as anger management. Full-time employment is another requirement of offenders placed on domestic violence probation. Finally, the probation officer has more opportunities to apply sanctions for non-compliance in the domestic violence program.

### **Key Leaders**

Leadership of the domestic violence program in Kankakee County can be divided into three areas: the court, the probation department, and the treatment providers. All three of these areas work together in the daily operation of the domestic violence program, and each will be explained in this section.

#### *The Court*

All of the domestic violence cases are heard once a week on Wednesday mornings, in Room 309 of the Kankakee County Courthouse. There is one judge assigned

to this courtroom who handles all cases each week. Court begins with all of the successful graduations from the program. These individuals are brought in front of the court, and the judge gives them permission to express their feelings about graduation and the program in general. All of the cases involving private attorneys are heard next, because most of the lawyers have cases in other courtrooms. The judge then hears all of the cases that are up for review, and then new cases are heard last. This process is viewed as being important to allow the individuals with new cases to observe on one hand that they can succeed and on the other hand what can happen if they do not comply with program requirements. Cases involving individuals in custody are heard at 9:45 a.m., through the use of video cameras that are placed in the courtroom and the county jail.

While the judge is hearing all of the lawyer cases and review cases, individuals who have new cases are brought into a jury room, where the domestic violence diversion program is explained to them. Once the judge begins hearing new cases, she starts by explaining the diversionary program. All of the individuals must decide whether they want their case to be handled in the traditional criminal court, or in the domestic violence court. If an individual chooses to have his case heard in the criminal court, he must state whether he desires a bench trial or a jury trial. Those cases are then assigned to another courtroom.

If an individual chooses to have his case heard in the diversionary domestic violence court, several things must occur. The state's attorney must first decide whether or not an individual is eligible for the program. This decision is based upon criminal history and present offense. If an individual is eligible, they must sign a contract with the



court and agree to a number of terms. The individual must plead guilty to the domestic violence charges and waive their right to a trial. The individual must then agree to be evaluated for drug and alcohol dependency. If it is found that they have a dependency problem, then they must complete treatment for that addiction. After dependency treatment is completed, or if it is determined that the individual does not have a dependency problem, the individual must attend and complete an anger management program.

Upon successful completion of the drug/alcohol treatment and anger management treatment programs, the individual graduates from the diversionary program and all of the domestic violence charges are dropped. However, the judge can also impose severe sanctions, such as jail time, for non-compliance with any part of the diversionary programs. Offenders must also regularly check-in with the court. Usually, the judge assigns a 3 to 4 week continuance for cases where the individual still needs to be evaluated for dependency and anger management, and a 6 to 8 week continuance for cases where the individual is making good progress in the treatment programs. Individuals who are not making progress, or individuals who are frequently absent from treatment or court, are usually assigned a 1 or 2 week continuance.

#### *Probation Department*

The specialized probation officer handles domestic violence cases that originated in the criminal court or cases that were not originally eligible for the domestic violence diversion program but subsequently involve a domestic incident. For example, if an individual violates an order of protection, or commits a domestic battery offense while on probation for another offense, the offender is placed into the domestic violence probation

program instead of the regular probation program. The head of the adult probation department directly supervises the probation officer assigned to handle the domestic violence cases for Kankakee County. As of December 1, 2000, 40 individuals were assigned to the domestic violence probation program.

There are several differences between domestic violence probation and regular probation. First, unlike regular probation, domestic violence probation has three different phases of probation. Phase I is the highest level of supervision, and continues through the first three months of the probation. The probationer assigned to this level of supervision reports for an office visit at least once every two weeks, and at least one home visit is conducted each month. Phase II supervision begins during the third month of probation and continues until the ninth month. Probationers assigned to this level of supervision report for an office visit at least once a month, and one home visit is conducted a month. Phase III is the lowest level of supervision, and begins during the ninth month of probation. Probationers assigned to this level of supervision report for an office visit every other month, and a home visit is conducted every other month.

Movement from one phase of supervision to another is based entirely upon the discretion of the probation officer, and several factors can affect movement. For example, movement from Phase I to Phase II will not occur until the probationer has been referred to anger management classes. Conversely, a probationer can be moved from Phase II to Phase I supervision if a petition to revoke is filed.

Regardless of the level of supervision, individuals placed on domestic violence probation are also subject to stricter requirements and harsher sanctions than individuals placed on regular probation. Some of these requirements include more frequent office

visits and home visits. Offenders are also required to obtain full-time employment. In addition, they have stricter curfew hours and travel permits. Finally, domestic violence probationers must be evaluated and treated for drug and alcohol dependency and anger management, and are subject to random drug testing. Additional sanctions include the assignment of community service hours, the alteration of supervision levels, and the filing of petitions to revoke probation.

There are several reasons why a petition to revoke probation can be filed against an individual. Most commonly, an offender will commit a new offense while on probation. Offenders can also receive a petition to revoke probation for noncompliance with the treatment requirements of their case. Most often, noncompliance violations are issued for poor attendance or lack of cooperation. This is an obvious reason to file a petition to revoke, since the treatment program guidelines are clearly defined and known to the offender.

There are also several types of violations in which the probation officer is able to make a judgment regarding whether to request that the state's attorney file a petition to revoke probation. These violations include poor attendance at office visits, failure to obtain full-time employment, failure to schedule an evaluation at a treatment facility, or change of address without prior notification. More often than not, the probation officer will impose community service hours or other administrative sanctions, instead of filing a petition to revoke probation for these violations.

Once an individual is convicted of a domestic violence offense and placed onto domestic violence probation, his case is referred to the domestic violence probation officer. The first step is the assignment of an initial office visit date for the offender. The

offender is informed of the requirements of this visit in the courtroom, and is also reminded of the appointment with a letter. Next, the victim in each case is notified of the conviction against the domestic violence offender, and victim services are offered.

Once an individual arrives for the first office visit, several actions are taken. An intake form is completed, and a risk/needs assessment is originated. The offender is then given a referral for a drug and alcohol dependency evaluation at a treatment facility. Usually, the offender is given until the next office visit to complete the evaluation, or sanctions, such as community service hours, will be given by the probation officer. An address verification form is completed, and the offender signs a supervision form. If the offender is unemployed, he has until next office visit to obtain full-time employment.

If an offender is deemed to need drug and alcohol treatment, the process begins. If the treatment facility decides that treatment is not necessary, the offender is referred to the batterers intervention program. The probation officer maintains weekly contact with the treatment facilities during this process, in order to ensure offender attendance and cooperation.

Upon successful completion of the batterers intervention treatment, the offender is required to fulfill the remaining probation sentence. Office visits, court visits, and home visits are still required, and the offender cannot commit any new criminal offenses. As of December 2000, there had not been any successful completions of the domestic violence probation program.

Daily tasks for the probation officer vary from probationer to probationer. Some of the daily tasks include scheduling and performing office visits with the probationers, contacting the treatment providers for a status update, and attending weekly court

sessions. Because there is only one probation officer assigned to these cases, he must be present in court each Wednesday and provide the judge with an update of the cases that are up for review. He also conducts home visits to ensure address verification and assess living conditions. Finally, the domestic violence probation officer maintains contact with the state's attorney office whenever a case needs to be updated or when a petition to revoke probation needs to be filed.

In addition to the regular training that he received for probation services, the probation officer also received specialized domestic violence training. Since the beginning of this evaluation, he has attended several training sessions, including SARA (Specialized Abuse Risk Assessment) and the domestic violence training sponsored by the AOIC.

#### *Treatment Providers*

In Kankakee County, several different agencies provide drug and alcohol treatment. Domestic violence offenders are referred to Riverside Resolve Center, Duane Dean, Aunt Martha's, or St. Mary's Center for an evaluation. The geographic location of the offender's residence determines which treatment provider is utilized, and an effort is made to make travel as convenient as possible. Each one of these treatment providers has a representative in domestic violence court each week to receive referrals and to report on offenders currently in their programs. If they determine that the offender has a dependency problem, then treatment is provided through weekly group sessions.

The batterers intervention treatment program is provided by Harbor House. As with the dependency treatment providers, a representative from the batterers intervention program is in court each week to handle referrals and present progress reports. Harbor

House is the only DHS (Department of Human Services) certified treatment facility in Kankakee County. They run the Inward Bound Abuser Education Program, and are the key agency for domestic violence services. All of the victims of domestic violence whose offenders are placed into the domestic violence probation program are also offered the opportunity to receive treatment from this facility.

Both drug/alcohol and batterers intervention treatment providers require regular attendance for successful completion. An offender is only allowed two unexcused absences before he is unsuccessfully terminated from the program. Terminations can also be the result of the failure of the offender to cooperate with the treatment provider. Once an offender is terminated from the treatment program, the probation officer is notified, and a request for a petition to revoke probation is sent to the state's attorney.

### **Relationships Among Key Leaders**

As would be expected, all of the key members of the Kankakee Domestic Violence Program have frequent contact, and the probation officer serves as the lead individual for all the probation cases. All of the key members have a representative present in the domestic violence courtroom each week. This allows the judge to update and monitor the status of each offender. The probation officer contacts each of the treatment providers every time there is a referral for service, a status request, or a treatment violation.

Because of the close relationship between the key members, offenders are more likely to be honest with the probation officer. The probation officer can readily verify unlikely stories or questionable statements by the offender. Petitions to revoke probation also appear to be more frequent because of the close relationship between key members.

There seldom appears to be a breakdown in information between key members when an offender violates one of the probation stipulations.

### **Goals Of The Program**

Because, historically, there was little or no effort made to reduce recidivism, except through punitive means, the domestic violence court in Kankakee focused on treating the problems that cause domestic violence. Likewise, the Kankakee Domestic Violence Probation intervention designed a treatment-based program and identified several initial goals. These goals were to reduce recidivism, increase offender accountability, increase victim safety, and more effectively utilize community resources.

In order to achieve these goals, the Kankakee County Probation Department implemented several initiatives. First, they increased the number of offenders accepted into the Domestic Violence Probation Program. Selection was based upon a range of criteria including, prior convictions, current offense, previous participation in domestic violence court, previous probation performance, degree of injury to the victim, and weapon use in the offense.

Second, the Kankakee County Probation Department increased offender compliance with court ordered mandates through intensive supervision and increased sanctions. The number of offenders referred for substance abuse and anger management problems were also increased through court ordered mandates.

The Kankakee County Probation Department addressed victim safety by offering every victim the opportunity to attend a four-week educational program offered by one of the local treatment providers, Harbor House. This program educated victims on the

topics of court procedures, the importance of testifying, the cycle of violence, and the need for offender consequences.

Finally, the probation department increased the use of community resources through weekly contacts with service providers. The probation department also assigned community service hours to domestic violence offenders who were in violation of one of the terms of probation. Therefore, domestic violence offenders were exposed to some of the community agencies and the services that they provide.

### **Case Description and Tracking Outcomes**

As noted in Table 3, over three-quarters of the 40 domestic violence probation cases in Kankakee County had committed a violation of probation as of December, 2000. Although this finding may be viewed on one hand as a lack of success, on the other hand this may be seen as a consequence of close monitoring and supervision. It will be important in any subsequent evaluation to examine both community and case outcome data to be able to understand the reasons for this outcome. Even if the results of such an evaluation determined that domestic violence probation cases recidivated at high levels, this would not mean that the program is not necessary or worthwhile. It is well documented that these are very difficult types of cases involving socialization patterns or cultural practices that are difficult to alter. Further, many of these individuals have prior convictions for domestic violence making it even more difficult to alter the behavior of this group of offenders.



Table 3

**Kankakee County Probation Case Description  
(N=52)**

Offender Characteristics

Gender

Male 88%  
Female 12%

Age Mean Age 33

Race

White 40%  
Black 54%  
Hispanic 6%

Living Arrangements

Spouse 10%  
Other Intimate Partner 19%  
Parents 33%  
Alone 21%  
Homeless 2%  
Other 2%  
Unknown 13%

Need for Drug/Alcohol Treatment

Treatment Needed 60%  
Treatment not Needed 17%  
Unknown 23%

Probation Characteristics

Avg. Probation Term 17 months

Treatment Program Assigned

Duane Dean 55%  
Aunt Martha's 27%  
Harbor House 9%  
Other 9%

Probation Violations

(N=40 as of 12/00)

34 violations filed  
21 Technical Violations  
13 New Offenses

## **Summary : Implications for an Outcome Evaluation**

This study and report has two principal objectives. First, it sought to provide a description of the experiences of each of the project sites during the first year of implementation and operation. The preceding sections have provided a description of these activities and the current status of each of the domestic violence probation projects. The second goal of the project was to conduct an evaluability assessment for each of the project sites to determine the feasibility of conducting an outcome evaluation in these jurisdictions.

As noted earlier in this report each of these projects is at a different point in its development. Thus comparisons across sites would be inappropriate. However, some commonalities exist that have implications for potential subsequent evaluation activities. There are several principal issues that are important in conducting an evaluability assessment. First, is the program of sufficient quality to warrant being evaluated? Is the program based upon sound principles and consequently does it have a reasonable chance of achieving its desired impact. Does the program have sufficient breadth to be able to make a difference? Does the project select cases that it has a chance to be successful with? That is, does the match between client needs and intervention indicate that the intervention will change the behavior of individuals? In short, is the effort worth evaluating? A second issue concerns the availability of data from which to conduct subsequent impact assessments.

While each of these three projects involved domestic violence probation, it is important to note that none of these projects was being implemented and conducted in a

vacuum. Each of them was a part of an overall broad based system of supervision, treatment, and sanctions for domestic violence offenders with an orientation toward increasing victim involvement and insuring victim safety. While there were significant structural variations across sites, each jurisdiction has a type of domestic violence court and substantial attention and resources are devoted to handling these cases. Further, each project enjoys a strong and positive working relationship with the treatment community in their jurisdiction. It is clear that in each county a comprehensive approach to domestic violence is being implemented. It is apparent that each of these jurisdictions has taken major steps toward establishing a coordinated community response to domestic violence that previous research has demonstrated to be a viable and effective approach.

Analysis of data indicates that the individuals in these programs are an appropriately serious group of offenders. Most of the offenders in these programs have had previous convictions for domestic violence. This indicates that these interventions are dealing with an appropriate target population and not just focusing upon easy cases that may not warrant this degree of intensive involvement.

With regard to data, it appears that sufficient data will exist in each site that can be used in a more intensive evaluation. While specific data collection instruments will need to be designed for obtaining some additional information, the basic information exists and a tracking system for determining outcomes can be designed for each county. The data elements that we have examined are both valid and reliable indicators of individual characteristics, criminal justice experience, measures of the intervention, and client progress. As such, they form the basis for an appropriate and well conceived outcome evaluation.

Furthermore, and perhaps most important, there appears to be a sincere desire on the part of staff in each jurisdiction to obtain a systematic review of how their programs are operating and the impact that their efforts are having on this difficult population and this important criminal justice issue. This level of staff support and cooperation will be essential should further research on these programs be conducted. This is a key feature to successful outcome evaluations; indeed staff willingness to participate in an outcome evaluation is a necessary condition for being able to conduct such work. In summary, these programs appear to have sufficient structure, comprehensive involvement, and staff support to warrant further study to determine the degree to which they are contributing to the reduction of domestic violence in their communities.

## References

- American Psychological Association. 1996. *Violence and the Family: Report of the American Psychological Association Presidential Task Force on Violence and the Family*. New York.
- Babcock, J.C. and R. Steiner. 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*. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. 1996. *Preventing Domestic Violence Against Women*. Washington, DC.
- Complier. Spring 1999. "Domestic Violence Probation Keeps Close Tabs on Offenders, Helps Victims", Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.
- Crowe, A.H. 1995. Stopping Terrorism at Home. *State Government News*. pp 17-22.
- Fritzler R.B. and L.M. Simon. 2000. Creating a Domestic Violence Court: Combat in the Trenches. *Court Review*. 37:1, 28-39.
- Gamache, D.J., J.L. Edleson, and M.D. Schock. 1988. *Coordinated Police, Judicial, and Social Service Response to Woman Battering: A Multiple Baseline Evaluation Across Three Communities in G.T. Hotaling, D. Finkelhor, J.T. Kirkpatrick, and M.A. Strauss (Eds.) Coping With Family Violence: Research and Policy Perspectives*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Goldkamp, J.S. 1996. *The Role of Drug and Alcohol Abuse in Domestic Violence and its Treatment: Dade County's Domestic Violence Court Experiment. Final Report*. Crime and Justice Research Institute. Philadelphia, PA.
- Gondolf, E.W. 2000. Mandatory Court Review and Batterer Program Compliance. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 15:4, 428-437.
- Greenfeld, L A. 1998. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Factbook: Violence by Intimates. Analysis of Data on Crimes by Current or Former Spouses, Boyfriends and Girlfriends*. US Department of Justice. Washington, D.C.
- Hart, B. 1992. *Battered Women and The Criminal Justice System*. MIMCAVA, Number 5.

Healey K. and C. Smith. 1998. Batterer Intervention Program Approaches and Criminal Justice Strategies. Issues and Practices. National Institute of Justice. Washington, D.C.

Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence. 1996. Annual Statistics of the Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence for FY96. Springfield, IL. ICADV.

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. 2000. Evaluation of the Kankakee Metropolitan Enforcement Group. Chicago, IL.

Illinois Domestic Violence Advisory Council. 1994. Illinois Protocol for Domestic Abuse Batterers Programs. Springfield, IL. Illinois Department of Public Aid.

Karan A., S. Keilitz, and S. Denaro. 1999. Domestic Violence Courts: What are they and how should we manage them? *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, Spring, 75-86.

National Association for Court Management. 1998. The Courts' Response to Domestic Violence. National Association for Court Management. Williamsburg, VA.

Orchowsky, S. 1999. Evaluation of a Coordinated Community Response to Domestic Violence: The Alexandria Domestic Violence Intervention Project. Final Report. Applied Research Associates. Richmond, VA.

Saltzman, E. 1994. Note: The Quincy District Court Domestic Violence Prevention Program – A Model Legal Framework for Domestic Violence Intervention. *Boston University Law Review*, 74:2,329-364.

Syers, M. and J. Edleson. 1992. The Combined Effects of Coordinated Criminal Justice Intervention in Woman Abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 7:4, 490-502.

Tjaden, P. and N. Thoennes. 1998. Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey. National Institute of Justice. Washington, D.C.

## Appendix

### DV Probation Evaluation Case Review Form

Project ID Number \_\_\_\_\_ Site \_\_\_\_\_ Case Number \_\_\_\_\_ PO \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Birth \_\_\_\_\_ Gender \_\_\_\_\_ Ethnicity \_\_\_\_\_

Employment Full time \_\_\_\_\_ Part Time \_\_\_\_\_ Unemployed \_\_\_\_\_

Highest Grade Completed \_\_\_\_\_ Occupation \_\_\_\_\_

Does Offender have GED \_\_\_\_\_

Income (weekly) \_\_\_\_\_

Marital Status: Married \_\_\_\_\_ Single \_\_\_\_\_ Divorced/Separated \_\_\_\_\_

Lives with: Spouse \_\_\_\_\_ Paramour \_\_\_\_\_ Parents \_\_\_\_\_ Other Relatives \_\_\_\_\_

Friends \_\_\_\_\_ Alone \_\_\_\_\_

#### Current Offense

Instant Offense \_\_\_\_\_ Misdemeanor/Felony \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Offense \_\_\_\_\_ (MMDDYY) Date of Arrest \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Conviction \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Sentencing \_\_\_\_\_

Total number of Offenses in this incident \_\_\_\_\_ Misd. \_\_\_\_\_ Fel. \_\_\_\_\_

List other charges

\_\_\_\_\_

Did Offender have a relationship with the Criminal Justice System at the time of Offense:

None \_\_\_\_\_ On Bail/Bond/ROR \_\_\_\_\_ On Probation \_\_\_\_\_

Sanctions

Length of Probation \_\_\_\_\_ Fine \_\_\_\_\_ Treatment Fee \_\_\_\_\_ Restitution \_\_\_\_\_

Length of Active Jail Sentence \_\_\_\_\_ Length of Suspended Jail Sentence \_\_\_\_\_

Community Service \_\_\_\_\_

DV Treatment ordered? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ If so, specify program \_\_\_\_\_

Is there a no contact with victim order? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Other treatment ordered? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes what type of treatment? Substance abuse \_\_\_\_\_, Mental Health \_\_\_\_\_,  
other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Other condition of probation (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Victim Information

*Primary Victim*

Date of Birth \_\_\_\_\_ Gender \_\_\_\_\_ Ethnicity \_\_\_\_\_

Relationship to Offender : Spouse \_\_\_\_\_ other intimate partner \_\_\_\_\_

Child \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Does victim live with offender \_\_\_\_\_ If so, for how long \_\_\_\_\_

Previous victimization of same victim? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Nature of offense \_\_\_\_\_

Is victim participating in the program? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

*Secondary Victim*

Date of Birth \_\_\_\_\_ Gender \_\_\_\_\_ Ethnicity \_\_\_\_\_

Relationship to Offender : Spouse \_\_\_\_\_ other intimate partner \_\_\_\_\_

Child \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Does victim live with offender \_\_\_\_\_ If so, for how long \_\_\_\_\_



Previous victimization of same victim? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Nature of offense \_\_\_

**Offense Behavior**

Harm to Victim: None noted \_\_\_\_\_ Bruised \_\_\_\_\_ Cut \_\_\_\_\_ Shot \_\_\_\_\_  
Burned \_\_\_\_\_ Broken Bones \_\_\_\_\_ Threatened \_\_\_\_\_  
Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Medical treatment received? YES \_\_\_ NO \_\_\_,

IF YES, nature of treatment \_\_\_\_\_.

Instrument of Harm:

Fists \_\_\_\_\_ Feet \_\_\_\_\_ Knife \_\_\_\_\_ Gun \_\_\_\_\_ Club \_\_\_\_\_ Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Location of offense: Victim's Home \_\_\_\_\_ Street \_\_\_\_\_ Public Place \_\_\_

In Business Establishment \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Were others present at the time of the abuse? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Duration of Abuse

Date of First recorded abusive incident with this victim \_\_\_\_\_

Is there indication of prior abuse in the police report? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**Prior Adult Offenses (Arrests)**

Domestic Violence YES \_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_, IF YES Dates \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Arrest \_\_\_\_\_ Convicted Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

Date of Arrest \_\_\_\_\_ Convicted Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

Date of Arrest \_\_\_\_\_ Convicted Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

Nature of prior DV offenses Total Felonies \_\_\_\_\_ Total Misd \_\_\_\_\_

Other Prior Convictions:

Personal Felonies (not DV) \_\_\_\_\_ Personal Misd.(not DV) \_\_\_\_\_

Property Felonies \_\_\_\_\_ Property Misd \_\_\_\_\_

Drug Felonies \_\_\_\_\_ Drug Misd \_\_\_\_\_  
Weapons Offenses \_\_\_\_\_ Other Misd \_\_\_\_\_

Prior Sanctions /Treatment

Prior Jail Sentences \_\_\_\_\_ Prior Terms of Probation \_\_\_\_\_  
Prior Jail/ Probation Sentences (code only if jail sentence was active) \_\_\_\_\_  
Prior Prison Sentences \_\_\_\_\_

Substance Abuse

Offender has any indication of Alcohol Problem Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_  
Prior Treatment Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_ Offender in AA at time of Offense Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_  
Offender has any indication of Drug Problem Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Substance \_\_\_\_\_  
Prior Treatment Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_ Offender in NA at time of Offense Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_  
Any indication of Offender Mental Health Problem Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
Prior Mental Health Treatment Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
Was offender receiving mental health treatment at time of offense Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_