

159567

NCJRS

MAR 28 1996

ACQUISITIONS

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

Pursuant to Section 40292 of the
Violence Against Women Act of 1994

submitted to the
National Institute of Justice

by the
Justice Research and Statistics Association

September 5, 1995

Justice Research and Statistics Association

**Project to Assess State and Federal Data
on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault**

This project was mandated by Section 40292 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.
The enabling legislation is as follows:

TITLE IV-VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

SUBTITLE B-SAFE HOMES FOR WOMEN

CHAPTER 9-DATA AND RESEARCH

SEC. 40292. STATE DATABASES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**-The Attorney General shall study and report to the States and to Congress on how the States may collect centralized databases on the incidence of sexual and domestic violence offenses within a State.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**-In conducting its study, the Attorney General shall consult persons expert in the collection of criminal justice data, State statistical administrators, law enforcement personnel, and nonprofit nongovernmental agencies that provide direct services to victims of domestic violence. The final report shall set forth the views of the persons consulted on the recommendations.

(c) **REPORT.**-The Attorney General shall ensure that no later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the study required under subsection (a) is completed and a report describing the findings made is submitted to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The primary author of this report is James Zepp, Director of the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) National Computer Center. JRSA is indebted to the members of the Panel to Assess State Domestic/Sexual Violence Data Collection for their commitment to addressing the issues of domestic and sexual violence and to this project, and to the directors of the State Statistical Analysis Centers around the country who took the time to respond to the survey on State data collection efforts. We also appreciate the valuable comments and suggestions of the Justice Department officials who participated in this effort.

Joan C. Weiss, Executive Director
Justice Research and Statistics Association

This project was supported by Grant Number 95-IJ-CX-0010, awarded by the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	4
I. Project Purpose and Description	2
II. Project Findings and Recommendations	6
A. Increasing or Improving State and Local Reporting	8
B. Recognizing the Need for Multiple Indicators to Fully Capture the Extent of the Problem	9
C. Identifying Existing Commonalities in Data Definitions and Reporting Methods Across States	9
III. Data Collection Issues	9
A. Multidimensional Aspects of Domestic and Sexual Violence Offenses	10
1. Offense type - domestic and sexual violence	10
2. Service domains - criminal justice, health, and social services	11
3. Criminal justice domains - law enforcement, prosecution, courts (criminal and civil), corrections	12
4. Intergovernmental - Federal, State, and local governmental coordination	13
5. Multijurisdictional - multiple State and local agencies	14
6. Definitional aspects of domestic violence	14
B. Alternative Approaches to Data Collection by States	16
1. Single focus (domestic or sexual violence) law enforcement reporting systems ..	16
2. General crime incident law enforcement reporting systems	17
3. Crime victimization surveys	20
4. Other criminal justice domains	21
5. Multi-service domain data linkages	21
6. Special studies	21
C. Concerns About Reporting Alternatives	22
1. Incomplete coverage of all cases	22
2. Possible duplication across data systems	22
3. Incomplete reporting	23
4. Definitional issues	24

Appendix A - List of Project Participants

Appendix B - State Survey Form

Appendix C - List of Respondents to JRSA Survey of States and Territories

Appendix D - State Survey Results

Appendix E - FBI NIBRS Status Report as of 6/2/95

Appendix F - A Note on Terminology for Crime Statistics



Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

Executive Summary

This project's objective was to identify ways that States could centrally collect information on the incidence of domestic and sexual violence offenses. As a practical matter, this project focused on the current status of reporting in the States, which could serve as a starting point for future data collection improvement efforts. The project concentrated primarily on law enforcement-based indicators of domestic and sexual violence criminal offenses. Because of the complex nature of domestic violence as a community problem and the legislation's citation of centralized State databases, consideration was given to information sources outside of law enforcement and even the criminal justice system.

A panel of experts representing backgrounds in criminal justice statistics, law enforcement, and victim service providers as well as other related concerns met twice to provide comments and suggestions to the project staff. Information from all States and Territories on their data collection programs and issues was sought through a survey and follow-up interviews.

The most significant finding was that a majority of States are currently collecting some statistics annually on these offenses (35 for domestic violence; 30 for sexual violence). However, on closer inspection, there is a wide variation across the States in how each defines these offenses, determines what is counted, and measures or reports incidents. The variability across States also applies to the types of victims included in their reports. Since some States have adopted family violence, as opposed to domestic violence statutes, their statistics may include child victims along with adults. In addition, some State statutes apply regardless of the gender of the victims and the offenders while others are not as inclusive of all possible relationships and living situations. This results in State statistics that may not be comparable or suitable for aggregation at the national level for estimates of prevalence and severity. The reasons for these disparities include differences in State criminal codes, the characteristics of existing State information systems, and the relative attention to the concerns of domestic and sexual violence given by individual States.

This report discusses data collection issues raised by panel members and in the survey responses and suggests further actions for improving and expanding data collection and reporting by the States. The seriousness of these crimes is increasingly recognized by the States, and the need for better measures to inform policy and planning decisions is clearly evident. However, achieving the goal of improved reporting and more comprehensive statistics for domestic and sexual violence will require the cooperation and coordination of many governments and agencies. Both organizational and technical solutions are needed.

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

I. Project Purpose and Description

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) asked the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) to study "how the States may collect centralized databases on the incidence of sexual and domestic violence offenses within a State" as was specified in section 40292 of Title IV - Violence Against Women Act portion of the 1994 Crime Act. The project activities occurred between March and August 1995.

The availability of comprehensive and reliable statistical data on domestic and sexual violence is a critical imperative because decisionmakers at State and local levels are confronting questions concerning appropriate policies and effective procedures for addressing this problem and they need more information to guide their thinking. Since most of the laws and policies dealing directly with domestic and sexual violence offenses are passed by the States, it is appropriate that information systems are created or enhanced at this level of government.

A project panel of domestic and sexual violence and criminal justice experts generally agreed that because these problems are complex issues involving many different types of offenders and behaviors, statistical data are needed that can better inform policy decisions. The mixed results reported in the studies on mandatory arrest policies for domestic violence offenders were cited as indicative of the possible unknown dimensions on which more information may help to provide answers or explain inconsistent policy outcomes.¹

Depending on what information is collected, these data can help States in addressing questions such as:

- What are the characteristics of offenders and victims? This could help agencies in directing resources toward subpopulations particularly affected by these problems.
- Are there different behavior patterns evident among various offender subgroups? As policymakers and agency managers wrestle with finding appropriate strategies for dealing with domestic and sexual violence, the documentation of any behavioral differences may help to explain the relative effectiveness of various approaches.
- Are there differences in these offenses across communities? Unmet needs for crime prevention and treatment services could be identified for better planning and allocation of resources.

¹ Blumstein, Alfred and Joan Petersilia. "NIJ and Its Research Program," *25 Years of Criminal Justice Research - The National Institute of Justice* (NCJ-151287). December 1994.

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

- What trends are occurring in domestic violence? Do patterns vary over time by type of offender, victim, or offense?

Much of this project's efforts concentrated on how the States and other key agencies define and measure these offenses. Because several States had established incident-based crime reporting systems long before the Federal government began its efforts to implement a national system and many have been involved in addressing domestic and sexual violence issues, it is appropriate to study how other States can learn from this experience and be encouraged to collect data where questions remain about the prevalence and severity of these problems.

Due to the possible confusion over the various terms used for crime statistics, the reader should refer to Appendix F for a short discussion on terminology. For the purposes of this project, the legislation was broadly interpreted to mean an examination of crime statistics related to domestic and sexual violence. This may include measures of crime incidents, offenses, offenders, and victims. A narrower approach would have precluded many relevant aspects that are of probable interest to this report's readers. As noted in Appendix F, care in the use of terms for indicating what is being measured is very important when discussing specific data sets.

Because of the wide scope of the study's topics and the limited time and resources available to conduct it, the project could only generally characterize issues and methods of data collection. Subsequent investigation would be needed to identify concerns such as specific differences among individual Federal, State, and agency data elements; statutory or administrative powers; and legal definitions of domestic and sexual violence.

This project gathered input from two major sources: 1) a panel of experts representing a variety of backgrounds in domestic and sexual violence research and services, criminal justice statistics, and law enforcement, and 2) a survey of the States. The purpose of these efforts was to elicit information on the current status of data reporting, concerns about the quality of the data collected, and strategies for improving reporting on these offenses.

The 1994 Violence Against Women Act specified that this project seek input from experts with backgrounds in law enforcement, criminal justice statistics, and victims' services. In fulfillment of this mandate, a panel of individuals representing these diverse interests was recruited. To further broaden the perspectives reflected in the discussions and in recognition of other related research activities, additional participants from other segments of the criminal justice system and health research were also invited. Although this study's focus was on data collection at the State government level, it was important to consider relevant Federal data collection efforts in this subject area. States often adopt Federal data standards for compliance with funding or reporting requirements, comparability with other States, and ease

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

of adoption since no development time is required. Since the vast majority of the information generated on domestic and sexual violence incidents is from local agencies, and they generally have the primary role in implementing many criminal justice policies, their perspective on reporting concerns was important for this study. For this reason, participation by representatives from Federal and local governments was sought. Appendix A contains a list of the participants involved in the two panel meetings.

The project panel first met on April 10 and 11, 1995, in Washington, DC. The Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) directors from Alabama, Connecticut, Colorado, Massachusetts, and Michigan provided descriptions of domestic and sexual violence data collection efforts in their respective States. Representatives from domestic and sexual violence agencies discussed data collection systems to which they contribute information, concerns about existing statistics on these problems, and issues involving data sharing among service providers and criminal justice agencies. The law enforcement and other criminal justice representatives cited some of the problems and limitations that domestic violence incidents, in particular, present for the classification and processing of cases. Additional approaches to estimating domestic and sexual violence incidents were described by a researcher from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Staff from the Bureau of Justice Statistics and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) provided information on current Federal data collection systems and recent efforts to improve these data sets.

The panel members reviewed a draft survey instrument developed by the JRSA project staff to obtain information from the States and Territories on existing their domestic and sexual violence data reporting systems and on problems and solutions that they have experienced. Based on suggestions offered during the panel meeting and a field test by four States, the survey instrument was revised. In May, the final version (see Appendix B) was mailed to each State's or Territory's SAC director because this official was considered most likely to have experience with the broad range of data sources on which information was sought. If a State did not have an SAC, the respective State Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program Office received the survey as the next most appropriate agency. Responses were requested by June 5.

Forty-two responses were received by the initial survey deadline. Five additional completed surveys, for a total of 47 respondents, were received after reminder phone calls were made and additional copies of the survey instrument were sent to the nonrespondents. See Appendix C for a listing of responding jurisdictions. A summary of the survey responses is included in Appendix D.

The panel reconvened on June 29, 1995, in Washington, DC. The main purpose of this session was to review the State survey results. In addition, Bonnie Campbell, the newly appointed Director of the Violence Against Women Office, U.S. Department of Justice, spoke

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

to the panel on the need for reliable crime data on domestic and sexual violence. She indicated that as national policies are being decided on these issues, more data would help to inform these discussions. Additional comments were made by representatives from the National Institute of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Bureau of Justice Assistance, National Academy of Sciences, and the National Center for State Courts. The FBI representative also briefed the panel on the FBI Criminal Information Systems Advisory Committee's recent decision to review that agency's position on the National Incident-Based Reporting System. The comments and suggestions from the panel members were used in the preparation of this project report.

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

II. Project Findings and Recommendations

The major finding from this project is that many States are already collecting or are implementing systems to collect data on domestic and sexual violence offenses. According to the State survey results, 35 of 47 responding States and Territories annually collect domestic violence statistics; 30 respondents gather sexual violence statistics. However, there is wide variation among States that have systems in place or nearing completion with regard to what information is collected and how it is gathered.

The variability across States reflects differences in how they have approached these two issues and the existing structures for collecting general crime incident data. For example, some States have passed specific domestic or family violence statutes that clearly define this as an offense and may even have statewide reporting requirements. Other States have not designated domestic violence as a separate offense but have instituted reporting systems for cases that can be characterized as such. If a State already had an incident-based crime reporting system, then it may have simply added or derived domestic violence crime statistics from this. Lacking this capability, other States have had to create domestic violence-specific reporting systems.

Since law enforcement agencies are the primary point of first contact with the criminal justice system, and they are responsible for enforcing protection orders, their data are a major source for estimating the overall prevalence and severity of domestic and sexual violence problems known to the criminal justice system. Every State and Territory provides UCR crime data with about 16,000 agencies contributing data to this statistical data set. Discussions at both panel meetings focused on the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS), one of the major developments in law enforcement statistics in the last ten years. A later section will describe the concerns and issues raised about this data system's future.

Information from prosecutors, courts, and corrections can provide important insights into the processing and subsequent dispositions of cases. However, as can be seen in Table 1, comprehensive Statewide statistical databases from these sources are less frequently available than are law enforcement data sets. This may be due to the fact that most of these systems were originally created for operational information needs, i.e., case or agency management, and not necessarily for the production of statistical reports. Unless these capabilities were included in their initial system design or subsequently added, data on the characteristics of victims, offenders, offenses, and other related information may not be readily available.

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

Table 1 - States with Non-UCR Criminal Justice Databases for Domestic and Sexual Violence

Data Source	N=47	Domestic Violence Number of States (percent)	Sexual Violence Number of States (percent)
Protection order registries		10 (21%)	5 (11%)
Protection order issued		11 (23%)	4 (9%)
Community corrections		6 (13%)	5 (11%)
Corrections		7 (15%)	7 (15%)
State criminal history repository		14 (30%)	12 (26%)
Civil/criminal courts		13 (28%)	10 (21%)
Special databases or flagging systems		9 (19%)	10 (21%)

Source: See Appendix D - State Survey Results, Questions 12a, 12b, 12f, 12g, 12h, 12j, 12k, 13a, 13b, 13f, 13g, 13h, 13j, and 13k.

Although most States collect data on domestic and sexual violence, the State survey indicated that very few draw on noncriminal justice information sources. Table 2 displays the State survey results for the questions related to noncriminal justice databases for domestic and sexual violence. As with the discussion on the previous issue of criminal justice databases, unless specific statistical reporting capabilities have been built into these information systems, the data may not be easily obtainable for research and policy analysis purposes.

Table 2 - States with Non-Criminal or Civil Databases for Domestic and Sexual Violence

Data Source	N=47	Domestic Violence Number of States (percent)	Sexual Violence Number of States (percent)
Child protection services		8 (17%)	11 (23%)
Health care providers		5 (11%)	4 (9%)
Higher education institutions		3 (6%)	4 (9%)
Victim services providers		18 (38%)	10 (21%)

Source: See Appendix D - State Survey Results, Questions 12c, 12d, 12e, 12i, 13c, 13d, 13e, and 13i.

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

Despite the data collection difficulties cited in the project panel discussions and the State survey responses, the importance of having **reliable** and comprehensive indicators for domestic violence was repeatedly highlighted. Data are needed for basic research on the problems of domestic and sexual violence, for resolving debates over proposed legislation and budgets, for guiding administrative or managerial decisions over program policies and resources, and for informing the public about the seriousness and extent of these problems in their communities.

The following suggestions for future work on improving and expanding domestic and sexual violence data collection at the State level of government emerged from the panel discussions and survey responses.

A. Increasing or Improving State and Local Reporting

While the majority of States are collecting some form of information on domestic and sexual violence offenses, there is still a significant group of States that do not. In addition, there are substantial disparities in the types and quantity of data collected by the States. If the availability of reliable indicators for domestic and sexual violence at the State level is considered an important goal, then several strategies can be employed to improve and expand this reporting effort.

As a means of encouraging States to improve or establish a data reporting program for domestic and/or sexual violence offenses, various educational activities could be provided to increase State officials' awareness of successful efforts by other States. Either through publications or meetings, exemplary State programs could be highlighted as working models for other States to adopt. This would be a positive way to encourage State action on this issue.

An important factor in maintaining ongoing data collection programs is showing that the information being gathered is used for analyses or is worthwhile for decisionmaking. This feedback can be a strong motivating influence for the staff generating data. By providing examples of analyses and applications based on these data, policymakers may be more willing to allocate the authority and resources necessary to establish or continue collecting information on these concerns. These may be analytic approaches to policy alternatives, crime analysis systems for police, or planning tools for agencies to direct staff and other resources.

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

B. Recognizing the Need for Multiple Indicators to Fully Capture the Extent of the Problem

It was evident from this study that domestic and sexual violence offenders are not single populations, but rather consist of subgroups that may have distinct behaviors and motivations. While the reporting of aggregate statistical figures can provide some rough estimates of prevalence, important differences may be lost which could be significant for policy and planning decisions.

Therefore, consideration should be given to identifying indicators that could inform these discussions. Special studies could help to provide detailed information beyond general statistical data sets. This includes methods for estimating offender or victim characteristics not captured in general statistical reports, or examining individual histories for patterns of recidivism among offender subpopulations.

C. Identifying Existing Commonalities in Data Definitions and Reporting Methods Across States

A more in-depth analysis of State reporting systems could be conducted to identify existing commonalities in definitions, forms, and practices across the States. Although this study received materials from many of the States in response to the survey, not all States responded or provided all of the referenced items. The constraints of this project did not allow for a systematic comparison of individual data elements, procedures, and definitions across jurisdictions and agencies. Rather, a review was done of the available materials that looked for examples and general trends among the respondents.

A State-by-State analysis would serve as a good starting point for any national reporting standards or, at least, would help in compiling multi-State data on domestic and sexual violence incidents. By disseminating this analysis to the States, some may be persuaded to modify their current practices to increase the data comparability across States.

III. Data Collection Issues

The following presents issues and concerns raised during the two panel meetings, discussions with individuals involved with domestic and sexual violence problems or statistical information systems, and the responses to the State survey conducted as part of this project. Any data collection efforts by the States will have to grapple with many of these concerns in order to implement or expand their systems.

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

A. Multidimensional Aspects of Domestic and Sexual Violence Offenses

This section describes the many aspects related to domestic and sexual violence, such as possible data sources, point of case involvement or intervention, and definitional criteria that can determine what information may be collected and some of the consequent limitations. Recognizing these multiple dimensions is important for ensuring that the resulting data sets respond to the policy and other informational needs being raised. Because both domestic and sexual violence are complex issues involving many social and psychological forces, reliance upon a single statistical indicator does not present a complete picture of either problem.

1. Offense type - domestic and sexual violence

The legislation mandated that this project study data collection alternatives for both domestic and sexual violence offenses. These are separate crimes that usually have their own respective statutory definitions and reporting mechanisms. Although the concept of sexual violence has been expanded over time in many States to include a wider range of victimizations, its acceptance as a major criminal offense has been well-established. Recognition of domestic violence as a serious criminal offense is a more recent phenomenon.

An indication of the difference between these crimes is that forcible rape has been included in the State data compiled in the Federal Uniform Crime Reporting system since its inception in 1930, while estimates of domestic violence-related incidents can only be inferred from UCR statistics for murder and manslaughter. Victim-offender relationship information is not collected for the other crime categories, so no domestic violence estimates can be derived from these counts. The data standards published in 1988 for the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS), which is intended to replace the UCR system, broaden the definition of forcible rape and increase the sexual violence-related offense categories, but still not list domestic violence as an offense category or provide any other means for explicitly identifying these incidents.² It is possible to infer domestic violence incidents from NIBRS information by using the victim-offender relationship data. However, this could be challenged as including incidents that are not necessarily part of a violent relationship.

A further distinction between sexual and domestic violence incidents is their defining characteristics. Sexual violence is a crime that is generally determined by specifically

² Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice. *Uniform Crime Reporting: National Incident-Based Reporting System - Volume I: Data Collection Guidelines*. Washington, DC, July 1, 1988, pp. 5-16.

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

prohibited sexually related acts taken by a perpetrator against another person. On the other hand, domestic violence-related incidents not only require a criminal act but also must occur between individuals with an existing or prior close relationship. Because any violent act may be considered domestic violence-related if a legally accepted relationship exists between the offender and victim, and the definitions used vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, it is very difficult to collect consistent and reliable statistics for this offense. Furthermore, as with hate crimes, a distinguishing characteristic for domestic violence incidents may be the offender's intent in committing an act such as intimidation of the victim. In this instance, a relatively minor offense like vandalism of property may have a much greater significance when considered in the context of a violent domestic relationship.

Consequently, the approaches for collecting data on domestic violence are different from those for sexual violence. In general, domestic violence requires more data elements and greater detail to derive statistical estimates and differentiate the severity or nature of cases. While personnel generating incident reports need training to ensure accurate reporting for both offenses, domestic violence appears to present more difficulties for staff in the proper identification of these cases in the field. Other concerns that can affect accurate data reporting will be discussed in later sections.

2. Service domains - criminal justice, health, and social services

A truly comprehensive data collection effort for domestic and sexual violence incidents would involve multiple service domains. Because of the strong psychological and social impacts that domestic and sexual violence can have on victims, awareness and treatment of cases often may not originate in or involve the criminal justice system. Data from health and social service providers can be used to supplement prevalence estimates based on criminal justice sources.

Interest in integrating or sharing information across service domains to promote coordination of efforts has led to the Bureau of Justice Assistance's funding of three demonstration projects (Baltimore, MD; Santa Clara, CA; and the Commonwealth of Virginia) for this purpose. The experience from the Baltimore, MD, domestic violence demonstration project indicated that definitional differences as well as the varying responsibilities across agencies can create many significant problems for data collection and integration. Also, concerns about client confidentiality may prevent health and social service providers from sharing information on specific individuals with the criminal justice system. Even with individual case information, it may be impossible or extremely expensive to link data across agencies and service domains in order to avoid duplicate

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

counting of incidents or persons. Further, the disparate sources of data and uses for which they are intended may argue against their close integration.

A practical concern is that very few States indicated in their survey responses that there were noncriminal justice databases available for analyses. For this and the previously cited reasons, the active integration of criminal justice, health, and social services information systems may not be feasible or desirable. Among the alternatives raised in the panel discussions were special studies that could incorporate information across service domains and may provide some insights into the overall prevalence and handling of domestic violence cases.

Also, limited tracking of cross-service domain interactions may provide some estimates of this phenomenon without requiring an elaborate coordination of separate information systems. Examples of this are the New York State Domestic Incident Report form, which includes information on whether an officer made a referral to a protective or victim services agency, and the Wisconsin Domestic Abuse Report form, which tracks a case through sentencing and includes various forms of counseling/treatment as sentencing options and information on whether medical treatment was required. Since many States have mandatory referral laws for health and social service providers, report forms used for these referrals could provide some information on cases originating from noncriminal justice sources.

3. Criminal justice domains - law enforcement, prosecution, courts (criminal and civil), corrections

Within the criminal justice system, data collection is complicated by the division of responsibilities across many independent entities--law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, courts, and corrections. Although some local jurisdictions have established integrated criminal justice information systems, most criminal justice data are fragmented along operational boundaries. The continued difficulties in obtaining complete and accurate criminal history records were cited as one indicator of the inability to track individuals as they move through the criminal justice system or recidivate for subsequent crimes.

Improving this situation requires surmounting technical, procedural, and organizational obstacles across many agencies. Although this can be done, it is a lengthy, resource intensive process that requires coordination and cooperation at all levels of the participating organizations. Factors that work against achieving this goal and other forms of information systems integration are changing governmental priorities for information, short-term budget horizons, frequent personnel changes, the absence of or conflicting data

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

standards across information sources, and rapidly shifting technologies. Any major data collection effort should consider these issues as part of its planning.

4. Intergovernmental - Federal, State, and local governmental coordination

Even with a State-centered data collection effort, both the Federal and local levels of government need to be considered. Federal systems often influence the ways in which State agencies will design or implement their data systems. As was previously noted, the Federal Government has several major statistical data and records systems (UCR/NIBRS, NCIC 2000 the Project, National Crime Victimization Survey, National Criminal History Improvement Program) that provide data standards, funding, and national data sharing capabilities.

Although many States have developed their own information systems that are independent of any Federal effort, when feasible, planning for future data systems should try to maximize their usefulness and potential for piggybacking onto other reporting systems to avoid repetitive data collection or incompatible information systems. Some of the obstacles to the integration of State data with these Federal systems have been cited in the preceding section. In addition, because each State sets its own criminal code, there can be wide variations in offense classifications and procedures from State to State. This often requires a translation of State-generated information, such as offense codes, into a national coding scheme. The result may sometimes be a grouping of otherwise dissimilar cases. For example, in Louisiana an assault may be simply a verbal threat while other States require physical contact or injury by an assailant. Consequently, Louisiana may appear to have a greater problem with assaults than the other States when national compilations of State crime data are reviewed. Although automated criminal records systems can be programmed to perform many of these translations of reports, some cases may require an interpretation of circumstances that human judgment can best handle.

In these situations, the State agencies frequently find themselves in between Federal data standards and the applicable State and local practices. Even though the States generally determine criminal statutes, health and social service regulations, and many public services, it is local agencies that often implement or enforce these policies and programs. Consequently, local personnel are usually responsible for collecting information from victims and offenders and must process the reports for submission to the State agencies. Given these circumstances, most statewide data collection programs will involve substantial intergovernmental coordination and cooperation among a large number of agencies.

In the area of crime data, some of the larger States must collect and process data from 500 to nearly 1,000 different agencies. Gathering complete and accurate data across all of

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

these entities in a timely manner can be a challenging task that requires careful planning, adequate resources (particularly training of local staff in reporting procedures), and good communications at all levels of participation.

5. Multijurisdictional - multiple State and local agencies

Because of victim and offender mobility, increasingly agencies must be able to share information across State and local boundaries. There are several Federal and regional efforts under way to either provide mechanisms to do this or to encourage the development of these systems. However, achieving this goal will take time, and many technical and organizational obstacles will have to be overcome.

One situation where this has been identified as a serious problem is with court protection orders, since officials outside of the originating jurisdictions generally do not have ready access to the information required for enforcement. In addition, policies and standards for issuing court protection orders can vary from area to area, making enforcement across jurisdictional boundaries a complex issue for local authorities.

6. Definitional aspects of domestic violence

Because the recognition of domestic violence as a serious criminal offense is a relatively recent phenomena for many communities, the understanding of the problem is continuing to evolve. Hence, the legal definitions and procedures for this offense can vary widely from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. The following discusses two aspects of this problem and explains some of the differences in how domestic violence incidents are treated.

a. domestic abuse as a continuum of violent actions

Domestic violence often does not consist of a single incident but, rather, is a continual state of victimization.³ Therefore, recognizing and counting domestic violence incidents can be somewhat different from other types of crimes, which are generally limited in time and do not often involve the repeated victimization of the same person by an offender. In the National Crime Victimization Survey, this circumstance is acknowledged by the use of a "series crime incident" designation for situations in

³ Wiersma, B. "The Impact of Series Incidents on Estimates of Violent Victimization." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Phoenix. 1993.

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

which the respondent cannot identify the details for discrete victimization events and more than five occurred in the previous six months.

Because intimidation may also be part of the behavior exhibited by abusers, offenses that would not be otherwise considered violent may be characterized as part of an overall behavior pattern. This further complicates the recording of criminal events since it involves judging an offender's motivation.

With this concept of domestic violence as a continuum of behaviors rather than a discrete event, it is understandable why domestic violence statistics may include many different criminal actions that vary from relatively minor offenses to extremely serious ones. This situation particularly applies as the definition of domestic violence is made more inclusive of the range of abusive behaviors. Some of these may or may not be part of the governing statutes for any given State, which may make comparing data across States very difficult.

It also becomes a measurement issue as thresholds along this continuum must be established to determine whether and how any given event or action is counted. These decisions have obvious implications for the resulting statistical figures and observations.

b. a range of relationships from spouses to intimate acquaintances and nonrelatives

Some States are very inclusive in their definition of domestic violence as far as the range of victim-offender relationships allowed, while others require either a spousal relationship or a child in common for a criminal act to be considered domestic violence.⁴ As legal definitions of domestic violence expand to include more informal relationships such as current or ex-boyfriends/girlfriends, roommates, and cohabitants, the reporting systems must be modified to reflect these broader perspectives and differentiate the characteristics of these victim/offender subgroups within the general population. Otherwise, important details may be lost in working with aggregate statistics, which could blur this diversity among domestic violence victims and offenders.

⁴ See Appendix D, Question 38.

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

B. Alternative Approaches to Data Collection by States

In both the panel discussions and State survey responses, it was evident that the States have adopted a wide variety of approaches to collecting data on domestic and sexual violence incidents.⁵ This is largely explained by differences in statutory legal definitions and procedures, individual agency authority, and existing data and reporting systems.

For example, the State of Connecticut uses a separate form to collect family violence offense data since it does not have an operational general crime incident-based reporting system. This data collection program is mandated by a statute that also specifies much of the data items to be gathered. In the future the State intends to incorporate this information into the NIBRS data system that it is currently implementing.

1. Single focus (domestic or sexual violence) law enforcement reporting systems

Information specific to domestic and sexual violence offenses has often not been included in general criminal justice reporting systems. Because some State statutes call for reporting on these concerns, one approach used by several States has been the development of a special report form for either domestic violence or sexual violence incidents.⁶

In some instances this is a supplement to a State's Uniform Crime Reporting form (Kansas, Michigan, and Puerto Rico), while in others it is a completely separate reporting system (Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, Wisconsin). As States move from the aggregate data reporting system (UCR) to incident-based, NIBRS-type systems, many States operating separate reporting systems for domestic and sexual violence offenses (e.g., Connecticut) are planning to merge them into the general data collection program.

One advantage of a single-focus approach to data collection is that it allows gathering offense-specific information that may be more difficult to include in a general form intended for all possible crimes. The trade off is that specialized forms may be more difficult to implement on a statewide basis and may be considered an additional reporting burden.

⁵ See Appendix D, Questions 19, 20, 21, and 22.

⁶ See Appendix D, Questions 21d and 22d.

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

2. General crime incident law enforcement reporting systems

Incorporating domestic and sexual violence information into a general incident reporting system eliminates redundant data collection efforts and promotes integrated data systems. As noted in the previous section, this may come at the loss of some detail as it is not always possible to include everything that a specialized report would cover without making the general report form too unwieldy for field use.

Since 1930, the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) system has been the major national statistical series for crimes known to law enforcement agencies. All States have participated in this data collection program. However, this system only reported aggregate totals for crimes. These data were limited to indicating general trends in crime and not much more. In the 1980's the FBI conducted studies that led to the decision to replace the UCR system with the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS). The following sections discuss some of the issues and the implementation status of these data systems.

a. aggregate crime data

About 16,000 law enforcement agencies participate in the FBI's UCR system and almost every State has a functioning UCR Program Office. With its long history and stability, the UCR statistics are the most frequently cited data set for national, State, and local crime trends in this country. Unfortunately, as was previously noted, the weaknesses of the UCR are generally acknowledged, and its value for policy and planning decisions is extremely limited.

- At this time the majority of States still produce only UCR data reports. While most States are working toward implementing a statewide incident-based reporting system, only a minority have fully operational programs. Even among the States with operational systems, the data reported may reflect only a small proportion of the jurisdictions or crimes in that State.⁷

Although it would be technically feasible to add domestic violence to the offenses reported as aggregate statistics, there would potentially be some confusion with other offenses. As was previously noted, domestic violence can be any criminal act between persons having a legally recognized relationship for this purpose. Without additional refinements to the data reported, in an aggregate statistical reporting system it would be impossible to tell how many domestic violence incidents were murders, how many

⁷ See Appendix D, Questions 4 and 5.

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

were assaults, or even how many might be acts of intimidation that did not involve physical harm. Conversely, in an aggregate reporting system, the proportion of assaults that were related to domestic violence incidents could not be determined because only a single figure is given for each offense category.

Recognizing the dual nature of domestic violence, incidents could be counted for both domestic violence and whatever other offense categories are appropriate. But this practice would result in the problem of double-counting in the statistics with no way of clearly determining the extent of overlap between domestic violence and the other offense categories.

For sexual violence, more complete estimates from aggregate data systems could be derived by expanding the number of sexual violence offenses to include more than just forcible rape. These statistics would have the same limitations as other aggregate information. However, because of the complexity of domestic and sexual violence as interpersonal events and as crimes, aggregate statistics would be of minimal value for policy and planning decisions.

One solution to the problem of lack of detail in aggregate statistics is exemplified by a study conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), which reviewed individual nonfatal incident reports from the Atlanta Police Department to identify how many involve family or intimate assaults.⁸ Even though the department does not specifically record family or domestic violence as an offense, the CDC staff determined from a sample of cases reported in 1984 which ones could be classified as such. Based on the proportion of family and domestic violence incidents found in this sample, estimates by known offense category could then be calculated for the total reported crimes. Assuming that the rates found in this study are transferable to other jurisdictions and time periods, this approach could be used to estimate domestic violence incidents occurring in other areas. Similar studies could be conducted to assess the validity of these estimators for other jurisdictions and time periods.

b. incident-based data

As local agencies increasingly automate their records systems, more will have the ability to generate electronic data files that can be used for a variety of reports and analyses. This means that agencies will develop greater capabilities to conduct incident-based analyses. Although each agency may be able to electronically access

⁸ Saltzman, Linda E., James A. Mercy, et al. "Identification of Nonfatal Family and Intimate Assault Incidents in Police Data." *American Journal of Public Health*. July 1992; Vol. 62, No. 7, pp. 1018-1020.

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

individual records, the information may not be consistent across agencies. This can be due to a lack of State data standards, differences in software used, or local operational characteristics. Therefore, while improving the likelihood that States can obtain data from these sources, the automation of local agencies, by itself, will not guarantee ready input for centralized databases.

In 1988, the FBI published its NIBRS data standards. This system is the most prominent national effort to have States collect crime incident data and represents the most likely source of reasonably comparable State statistics on reported domestic and sexual violence incidents. However, NIBRS implementation by the States has been slow. As of June 2, 1995, the FBI has certified only 11 States as producing incident data files compliant with the NIBRS standards.⁹ According to the State survey responses, only eight of the 56 States and Territories have achieved operational NIBRS programs that are producing data reports.¹⁰

Furthermore, experience in producing NIBRS-based analyses is very limited. This is due to the relatively recent availability of NIBRS-compliant data as well as the characteristics of the data sets. Since the jurisdictions contributing NIBRS data tend to be smaller communities with generally lower levels of crime as compared to large urban areas (many of which are not yet producing NIBRS data), analysts are limited in what can be derived from this information that would be considered statistically significant results. NIJ has recently funded a project to analyze NIBRS data for Vermont, and other analytic work has been done in South Carolina. This situation is expected to improve as time passes.

While there are many difficulties with the NIBRS data standard, and its implementation will require expensive changes in the existing automated police records systems in some jurisdictions, NIBRS is probably the best opportunity for law enforcement-based statistics on crime incidents in every State. At this time, the FBI is reviewing its policy regarding NIBRS implementation because of concerns raised by State and local agencies. Under consideration are alternatives to having all 16,000 reporting agencies comply with the NIBRS standard, such as 1) using a sample group of 800 to 1,000 agencies from which national estimates would be based, or 2) making modifications to the NIBRS data standard that would ease the reporting burden. Since many States have based their data collection systems on the national standards, the FBI's decisions will have major implications for the direction of State data collection

⁹ See Appendix E.

¹⁰ See Appendix D, Question 2a.

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

as well as the future availability of national data on domestic and sexual violence incidents.

The JRSA State survey responses indicated that a majority of States (38, or 81 percent) have an incident-based system or plan to have one in the next two years.¹¹ Even before the national shift toward incident-based data, several States (Alabama, Florida, New York, Michigan) had incident-based reporting capabilities. These States already have historical data sets from which some analyses can be done. But because each effort arose independent of the others, the data collected may not be comparable across States.

3. Crime victimization surveys

Crime victimization surveys are a supplement to crime statistics generated by law enforcement agencies. Their purpose is to provide data about crimes that may not be reported by victims to police and to obtain detailed information that may not be collected in traditional police reports. The State survey responses show that only a few States (10, or 21 percent) conduct such surveys and only half of these (5, or 50 percent) collect domestic or sexual violence data.¹² Among the possible reasons for the low number of States that do these studies are the costs involved, controversies that can arise over the survey questions or methods, and resistance by government agencies to burden citizens with more information requests.

At the national level, the Bureau of Justice Statistics has recently revised the questions and procedures for the National Crime Victimization Survey to address concerns about the possible underreporting of domestic and sexual violence offenses.¹³ The discussions and comments that generated these revisions emphasize the difficulties of obtaining reliable data on events that have such highly charged psychological and social impacts. States conducting crime victimization surveys that include data on domestic and sexual violence will probably encounter similar problems.

¹¹ See Appendix D, Question 1.

¹² See Appendix D, Questions 7, 8, and 9.

¹³ Bachman, Ronet and Bruce M. Taylor. "The Measurement of Family Violence and Rape by the Redesigned National Crime Victimization Survey." *Justice Quarterly*, September 1994; Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 499-511.

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

4. Other criminal justice domains

In addition to law enforcement data, information from prosecutors, courts, and corrections can show charging practices, conviction rates, and sentencing patterns for these offenses. Further analysis of these data sources would go somewhat beyond the original scope of this project, which was to study how data on the incidence of domestic and sexual violence offenses could be collected. Obtaining information from these additional sources would expand knowledge about case dispositions, possible treatment outcomes, and recidivism among types of offenders.

Many of the data collection problems cited for police information also apply to these segments of the criminal justice system, i.e., lack of uniform data definitions and standards, incompatible computer hardware and software, and other organizational barriers. Another problem is that many of the records systems on which any statistical information is based were developed for internal processing of individuals or cases. Consequently, they may lack summary reporting capabilities. Finally, data quality may also be a concern, particularly for data items that are not required for the originating agency's information needs and, therefore, may not be thoroughly checked or verified before submission.

5. Multi-service domain data linkages

Although such an information system would present valuable data on victims and offenders, it would need to overcome substantial technical and organizational obstacles and would probably require greater funding resources than are currently available. As was previously mentioned, concerns such as client confidentiality would also prevent tracking individuals through multiple service systems.

6. Special studies

With the diversity of victim-offender subpopulations for both domestic and sexual violence offenses, no general data reporting system will be able to capture sufficiently detailed information for all possible analyses. Therefore, special studies that focus on specific victim-offender groups or behavior patterns may be a more reasonable solution for obtaining answers to policy questions that general statistical data sets may not be able to address. If properly planned, such special studies can supplement what is known from general crime statistical data and could be used to estimate specific characteristics that may be lost in larger data categories or groupings.

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

C. Concerns About Reporting Alternatives

Unfortunately, no single data reporting system will be able to find all instances of domestic or sexual violence. Each has weaknesses in definitional detail or implementation that can lead to uncertainties about possible under- or overreporting in the resulting statistics. The following sections explore some of these concerns.

1. Incomplete coverage of all cases

No data source will be able to capture all possible instances of domestic and sexual violence. Victims' refusal to report crimes to or cooperate with public officials will contribute to the underreporting of problems. Any failures by police, prosecutors, and service providers to recognize or accurately record domestic and sexual violence offenses will also result in underestimates of prevalence in agency-generated statistics. Surveys and victim self-reports may suffer from errors stemming from how the survey questions are phrased or administered, or from the respondents' unwillingness or inability to answer accurately.

Prevalence estimates, which may be based on samples or indirectly derived from crime statistics, may be affected by these and other measurement errors. Unfortunately, because of the realities imposed by data collection resources and methods and the nature of the crimes being studied, it is not always possible to eliminate or control for all of these concerns. Consequently, any analyses of these statistics must simply acknowledge these limitations and, when available, use alternate measures that may provide additional support for these indicators.

2. Possible duplication across data systems

Individual victims and offenders may come into contact with several different criminal justice, health, and social service agencies. Also, within an agency, the same person may be involved in multiple incidents or service events. Without a universal personal identifier for victims and offenders, it is extremely difficult and expensive to track individuals across records that are usually organized around cases or incidents. The task is even harder when multiple agencies are involved, since records systems may not be compatible. Given that domestic abuse and sexual violence are behaviorally motivated crimes, there is a tendency for these offenders to recidivate. This may result in the duplication of individuals in statistical figures based on agency records. Depending on the nature of the analysis, this may or may not be important. For example, research related to mandatory arrest policies require specific followup information on known abusers to

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

identify intervention points and subsequent behaviors. Studies looking at other aspects of victim-offender characteristics may not be so dependent on the elimination of duplicate records.

3. Incomplete reporting

Failures to provide complete and accurate data plague most information gathering efforts. Criminal offense reporting may be affected by factors such as victim noncooperation and agency failures to collect data or properly implement procedures. The level of difficulty that these problems create for statewide data collection was indicated in the State survey (see Table 3).

Table 3 - Data Collection Concerns for State Survey Respondents

Data Collection Concerns	N=47 Number of States (percent)	Some Problem Number of States (percent)
High error rates in local agency submissions	2 (4%)	31 (66%)
Incomplete local agency submissions	6 (13%)	33 (70%)
Nonparticipation by local agencies	6 (13%)	27 (57%)

Source: See Appendix D, Question 33.

Because domestic and sexual violence victims can face a heavy burden of embarrassment, possible reprisals by the offenders, and other repercussions, obtaining their cooperation can be extremely difficult for law enforcement and other agencies. The act of reporting domestic violence and some sexual violence incidents may be considered by the victims as a last resort or making an irreparable break with someone that they have been trying to sustain a relationship with. Consequently, the victims may perceive reporting as an admission of personal failure that they cannot face or they believe is avoidable.

Also, the problem of adequate training of personnel in handling these cases was often cited in the project panel discussions and survey responses. As many jurisdictions are recognizing the seriousness of these offenses, new laws and policies are being adopted, which may require time to fully implement and train all relevant staff in new procedures.

For all the above reasons, the underreporting of domestic and sexual violence can be more of a problem than for other types of offenses. Although efforts can be made to overcome

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

some of the factors hindering reporting, some barriers may never be completely surmounted given the nature of these crimes and the social and behavioral issues involved.

4. Definitional issues

With any statistical data set, it is important to be aware of what definitions are used to determine what cases or persons are being included or excluded. Both domestic and sexual violence can be viewed from different perspectives, such as the frequency of abuse, level of abuse, categories of victims, or types of offenders. Obviously, what is counted will affect the resulting statistical figures. This situation should be recognized in any discussion of the prevalence of these social problems.

The panel members and the State survey responses indicated that there are many definitions for both domestic and sexual violence. This is due in part to statutory differences across the States. But it also reflects an evolving understanding of domestic and sexual violence that is occurring in society in general and is reflected in the policies and practices of various agencies around the country. Because domestic and sexual violence are being treated as much more serious criminal offenses than in the past, these differences can result from some jurisdictions adopting more aggressive or comprehensive approaches than others.

Unfortunately, this makes collecting uniform and consistent data across jurisdictions much more difficult. During the second panel meeting, the representative from the Washington Metropolitan Police Department announced that a new sexual assault law had been recently passed by his government. This highlighted the challenge of trying to implement statistical measures for events for which the relevant criminal laws may be rapidly changing.

Because identifying domestic violence crimes may involve consideration of a criminal act, the relationship between the victim and offender, and the offender's motive for committing the act, properly classifying cases can be more difficult than for other types of offenses. For example, a crime incident that would normally be considered a property crime (e.g., a burglary, motor vehicle theft, larceny, or vandalism) could be classified as a domestic violence incident if the perpetrator's intent is to harass or intimidate the victim. This may require the investigating officers to go beyond the facts initially presented for a complaint to its possible underlying circumstances.

An additional complication for data reporting is that some States do not have a specific domestic violence offense for charging. In these instances, offenders are charged with other offenses but their case may be flagged as a domestic violence case for reporting

Report on State Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

purposes. Other States have broader family violence statutes that include domestic violence.

In summary, different definitions, legal procedures, and records management systems that are used to identify domestic violence and sexual assault complicate data collection efforts. Jurisdictional and agency differences can contribute to problems that prevent the compilation of reliable and uniform national estimates for these offenses. At the State level, definitional differences between service domains such as law enforcement agencies and victim services providers, along with incomplete sharing of information, speak to the importance of States using multiple sources of data to develop a comprehensive understanding of the problem.

Appendix A

List of Project Participants



Justice Research and Statistics Association

***Panel to Assess State and Federal Data
on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault***

Yoshio Akiyama, Ph.D.
Chief Statistician
Program Support Section
Criminal Justice Information
Services Division
Federal Bureau of Investigation
10th and Pennsylvania, NW
Washington, DC 20535
Phone: (202) 324-3821
Fax: (202) 324-2258

Bernard V. Auchter
Program Manager
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531
Phone: (202) 307-0154
Fax: (202) 307-9907

Noël Brennan
Deputy Assistant Attorney General
Office of Justice Programs
U. S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, NW, Room 1300
Washington, DC 20531
Phone: (202) 307-5933
Fax: (202) 514-7805

Debra Bright
Project Coordinator
Mayors Coordinating Council on
Criminal Justice
10 South Street, Suite 400
Baltimore, MD 21202
Phone: (410) 396-4370
Fax: (410) 625-2107

Timothy Bynum, Ph.D.
Michigan Justice Statistics Center
School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University
560 Baker Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824
Phone: (517) 355-2197
Fax: (517) 432-1787

Bonnie J. Campbell
Director
Violence Against Women
U. S. Department of Justice
10th & Constitution, NW, Room 5302
Washington, DC 20531
Phone: (202) 616-8894
Fax: (202) 307-3911

Nancy Crowell, Research Associate
Commission on Behavior and Social
Science and Education
National Academy of Sciences
2101 Constitution Avenue, NW
Suite HA156H
Washington, DC 20418
Phone: (202) 334-2000
Fax: (202) 334-3829

Kim English
Director
Office of Research & Statistics
Colorado Division of Criminal Justice
700 Kipling Street, Suite 3000
Denver, CO 80403
Phone: (303) 239-4453
Fax: (303) 239-4491

Mai Fernandez
Special Assistant to the Deputy
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, NW, Room 1300
Washington, DC 20531
Phone: (202) 307-5933
Fax: (202) 514-7805

John Firman
Director of Research
International Association of Chiefs
of Police
515 North Washington Street, 4th Floor
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: (703) 836-6767
Fax: (703) 836-4543

Therese Ford
Director
Alabama Criminal Justice Information
Center
770 Washington Avenue, Suite 350
Montgomery, AL 36130
Phone: (334) 242-4900
Fax: (334) 242-0577

Gilford Gee
Survey Statistician
Programs Support Section
Criminal Justice Information
Services Division
Federal Bureau of Investigation
10th and Pennsylvania, NW
Washington, DC 20535
Phone: (202) 324-3869
Fax: (202) 324-2258

Sgt. Scott Gibson
Patrol Division
Alexandria Police Department
2003 Mill Road
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: (703) 838-4938
Fax: (703) 838-6309

Adele Harrell, Ph.D.
Director
Program on Law and Behavior
The Urban Institute
2100 M Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20037
Phone: (202) 833-7200
Fax: (202) 659-8985

Barbara Hart
Legal Director, PA Coalition Against
Domestic Violence, and
Associate Director, Battered Women's
Justice Project
6400 Flank Drive, Suite 1300
Harrisburg, PA 17112
Phone: (800) 537-2238
Fax: (717) 545-9456

Gwen Holden
Executive Vice President
National Criminal Justice Association
444 North Capitol Street, NW, Suite 618
Washington, DC 20001
Phone: (202) 347-4900
Fax: (202) 508-3859

William Holmes, Ph.D.
Director
Statistical Analysis Center
Executive Office of Public Safety
Division of Programs
100 Cambridge Street, Room 2100
Boston, MA 02202
Phone: (617) 727-6300
Fax: (617) 727-5356

Jann Jackson
Associate Director
House of Ruth
2201 Argonne Drive
Baltimore, MD 21218
Phone: (410) 889-0840
Fax: (410) 889-9347

Neal Kauder
Research Associate
National Center for State Courts
300 Newport Avenue
Williamsburg, VA 23187-8798
Phone: (804) 253-2000
Fax: (804) 220-0449

Susan Keilitz
Senior Research Associate
National Center for State Courts
300 Newport Avenue
Williamsburg, VA 23187-8798
Phone: (804) 253-2000
Fax: (804) 220-0449

Jackie McCann
Program Specialist
Office for Victims of Crime
U. S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20531
Phone: (202) 616-2145
Fax: (202) 514-6383

Patti Dobbs Medaris
Branch Chief
Violence Against Women
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U. S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20531
Phone: (202) 307-0907
Fax: (202) 307-2019

Ann Menard
Director
National Resource Center on Domestic
Violence
6400 Flank Drive, Suite 1300
Harrisburg, PA 17112
Phone: (800) 537-2238
Fax: (717) 545-9456

Richard Moore
Administrator
Statistical Analysis Center
Criminal & Juvenile Justice Planning
Lucas State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319
Phone: (515) 242-5816
Fax: (515) 242-6119

Lisa Doyle Moran
Associate Director for Legal Affairs
National Criminal Justice Association
444 North Capitol Street, NW, Suite 618
Washington, DC 20001
Phone: (202) 347-4900
Fax: (202) 508-3859

Mary Morgan
Deputy Assistant Attorney General
Office of Policy Development
U. S. Department of Justice
10th & Constitution, NW, Room 4242
Washington, DC 20530
Phone: (202) 514-0052
Fax: (202) 514-5715

Ashley Oliver
Presidential Management Intern
Office for Victims of Crime
U. S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20531
Phone: (202) 616-3570
Fax: (202) 514-6383

Carol Petrie
Director, Planning and Management Division
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Room 854
Washington, DC 20531
Phone: (202) 307-2942
Fax: (202) 514-6212

Cathy Poston
Senior Counsel
Office of Policy Development
U. S. Department of Justice
10th & Constitution, NW, Room 4242
Washington, DC 20530
Phone: (202) 514-0052
Fax: (202) 514-5715

Dolly Reed
Director
Office of Policy and Management
80 Washington Street
Hartford, CT 06106
Phone: (203) 566-3522
Fax: (203) 566-1589

Benjamin H. Renshaw, III
Deputy Director
Bureau of Justice Statistics
U. S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, NW, Room 1144
Washington, DC 20531
Phone: (202) 307-0750
Fax: (202) 307-5846

Stephen Rickman
Director, Crime Bill Support Division
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U. S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, NW, 4th Floor
Washington, DC 20531
Phone: (202) 307-6184
Fax: (202) 307-2019

Emanuel Ross, Jr., Ph.D.
Operations Research Analyst
Metropolitan Police Department
300 Indiana Avenue, NW, Room 3142
Washington, DC 20001
Phone: (202) 727-4174
Fax: (202) 727-0826

Elisabeth Sachs
Senior Counsel
Office of Policy Development
U. S. Department of Justice
10th & Constitution, NW, Room 4242
Washington, DC 20530
Phone: (202) 514-0052
Fax: (202) 514-5715

Linda Saltzman, Ph.D.
Senior Scientist
Family and Intimate Violence
Prevention Team
Centers for Disease Control
Mail Stop K60, 4770 Buford Highway
Atlanta, GA 30341-3724
Phone: (404) 488-4410
Fax: (404) 488-4349

Kathy Schwartz
Administrator
Violence Against Women Program
U. S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, NW, 4th Floor
Washington, DC 20531
Phone: (202) 307-6026
Fax: (202) 307-2019

Edwin Zedlewski, Ph.D.
Director
Office of Criminal Justice Research
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
Phone: (202) 307-2953
Fax: (202) 307-6394

JRSA Staff

Justice Research & Statistics Association
444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 445
Washington, DC 20001
Phone: (202) 624-8560
Fax: (202) 624-5269

Joan C. Weiss
Executive Director

Jim Zepp
Computer Center Director

Karen Maline
Assistant Director for Information Services

Appendix B

State Survey Form



Status of Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Reporting in the State:

INTRODUCTION - Section 40292 of the Violence Against Women Act mandated that the Attorney General study and report to the U.S. Congress on the feasibility of collecting domestic and sexual violence data at the state level. A panel of law enforcement, criminal justice statistics, and domestic violence professionals is working with the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) to identify the issues involved in gathering this information.

As background for this report, JRSA is requesting your assistance in assessing the current status of state-level incident reporting and in raising concerns that affect this situation. Our focus is on the prevalence of state data collection efforts and the identification of strategies which may be useful for other states. Consequently, although some differences among states may be a matter of degree, some questions have only Yes/No responses in order to minimize the questionnaire's complexity. Since the Federal legislation specifies state-level data collection, discrepancies in items such as reporting formats across states are not critical issues for this study. We encourage you to consult any other relevant agencies and staff in your state for this subject.

Please return this document to **JRSA, 444 North Capitol Street, Suite 445, Washington, DC 20001, (202) 625-5269 fax by no later than June 5th.** If you need a clarification on any questions or additional information, please contact Jim Zepp at JRSA, (202) 624-8560. Thank you for your cooperation.

State: _____ Agency Name: _____

Contact Person: _____ Phone: () _____ - _____

I. CURRENT STATUS OF DATA SOURCES

- | | | | |
|--|----|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Does your state have or plan to have within the next two years an incident-based reporting system for local law enforcement agencies? | 1. | Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> | No
<input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|----|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|

(If Yes, please answer Questions 2 through 6. If No, please skip to Question 7.)

2. Which of the following best describes this incident-based reporting system's current level of implementation? *(Check all that apply.)*

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 2. | |
| a. developing state-wide data standard | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. implementing data collection among local agencies | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. applying to FBI for NIBRS data submission certification | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. producing incident-based reports but not NIBRS certified | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. producing incident-based reports and NIBRS certified | <input type="checkbox"/> |

3. If data reports are **not** currently available from this system, by what date would any reports be expected? 3. _____

4. If data reports are currently available, indicate the percentage of your state's local jurisdictions that contribute information. *(Check the most appropriate categories.)*

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | 0 to
25% | 26 to
50% | 51 to
75% | 76 to
100% |
| 4. | | | | | |
| a. major cities (>50,000 population) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. medium to small cities (<50,000 population) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. suburban communities | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. rural areas | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

5. What percentage of all reported crimes in your state do the incident-based statistics represent?

5. ____%

6. What percentage of law enforcement agencies in your state record victim/offender relationship information for non-homicide offenses?

	0 to 25%	26 to 50%	51 to 75%	76 to 100%
6.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. Does your state conduct a crime victimization survey?

	Yes	No
7.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8./9. If yes to Question 7, does it include data on domestic and/or sexual violence incidents?

Domestic Violence Data Reporting		Sexual Violence Data Reporting	
	Yes	No	Yes
8.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9. <input type="checkbox"/>

10./11. Does your state collect domestic and/or sexual violence data from non-UCR reporting systems?

	Yes	No	Yes
10.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	11. <input type="checkbox"/>

12./13. If yes to Question(s) 10 or 11, please check all of the following that apply.

- a. protection order registries
- b. protection order issued
- c. child protection services
- d. health care providers (e.g., individual practitioners, hospitals)
- e. higher education institutions
- f. community corrections (e.g., probation, parole)
- g. corrections (e.g., prison, residential facilities)
- h. state criminal history repository
- i. victim services providers
- j. civil/criminal courts
- k. special databases or flagging systems (e.g., gun registries, child sex offender registries)

12.		13.	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	a.	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	b.	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	c.	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	d.	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	e.	<input type="checkbox"/>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	f.	<input type="checkbox"/>
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	g.	<input type="checkbox"/>
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	h.	<input type="checkbox"/>
i.	<input type="checkbox"/>	i.	<input type="checkbox"/>
j.	<input type="checkbox"/>	j.	<input type="checkbox"/>
k.	<input type="checkbox"/>	k.	<input type="checkbox"/>

14./15. Is your state required to disseminate the domestic and/or sexual violence data that it collects to specific audiences or agencies?

	Yes	No	Yes
14.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	15. <input type="checkbox"/>

16. If Yes to Question(s) 14 or 15, please identify these audiences or agencies. (Specify if your comments only apply to one offense type.)

II. REPORTING ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE OFFENSES

	Domestic Violence Data Reporting		Sexual Vi Data Rep
17./18. Are annual statistics on domestic and/or sexual violence offenses collected in your state?	Yes	No	Yes
17.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	18. <input type="checkbox"/>
(If No, please skip to Question 33.)			
19./20. These statistics are produced as part of: (Check the most appropriate category.)			
19.			20.
a. aggregate crime statistics (e.g., UCR)	<input type="checkbox"/>		a. <input type="checkbox"/>
b. incident-based crime statistics (e.g., NIBRS)	<input type="checkbox"/>		b. <input type="checkbox"/>
c. both a. and b. above	<input type="checkbox"/>		c. <input type="checkbox"/>
d. other, please specify _____	<input type="checkbox"/>		d. <input type="checkbox"/>
21./22. How are these statistics derived?			
21.	Yes	No	22.
a. a specific offense code is entered on incident reports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	a. <input type="checkbox"/>
b. a non-offense code or special box is marked on incident reports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	b. <input type="checkbox"/>
c. violent offenses are sorted by victim-offender relationship	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	c. <input type="checkbox"/>
d. domestic/sexual violence specific incident forms are collected	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	d. <input type="checkbox"/>
e. other methods are used for identifying domestic and/or sexual violence cases, please specify _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	e. <input type="checkbox"/>
23./24. Are victim characteristic data available?			
23.	Yes	No	24.
a. age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	a. <input type="checkbox"/>
b. race	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	b. <input type="checkbox"/>
c. ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic/Non-Hispanic)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	c. <input type="checkbox"/>
d. gender	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	d. <input type="checkbox"/>
e. relationship to offender	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	e. <input type="checkbox"/>
f. other, please specify _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	f. <input type="checkbox"/>
25./26. Are offender characteristic data available?			
25.	Yes	No	26.
a. age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	a. <input type="checkbox"/>
b. race	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	b. <input type="checkbox"/>
c. ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic/Non-Hispanic)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	c. <input type="checkbox"/>
d. gender	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	d. <input type="checkbox"/>
e. relationship to victim	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	e. <input type="checkbox"/>
f. other, please specify _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	f. <input type="checkbox"/>
27./28. Can the incidents be categorized by related offense information (e.g., murder, aggravated assault, rape, etc.)?	Yes	No	Yes
27.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	28. <input type="checkbox"/>

	Domestic Violence Data Reporting		Sexual Violence Data Reporting	
29./30. Is any information on related injuries (e.g., apparent broken bones, possible internal injuries, severe lacerations, etc.) available?	Yes 29. <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes 30. <input type="checkbox"/>	
31./32. Is any information on weapons used (e.g., handgun, knife, fist, etc.) available?	Yes 31. <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes 32. <input type="checkbox"/>	

III. DATA COLLECTION ISSUES

33. Please rate the following data collecting concerns as significant problems for your state:

	33. Serious	Some	None
a. lateness of local agency data submissions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. high error rates in local agency submissions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. incomplete local agency submissions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. incompatible automated information systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. nonparticipation by local agencies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. lack of adequate local agency staff training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. ambiguous or inconsistent definition(s) of domestic violence offenses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. ambiguous or inconsistent definition(s) of sexual violence offenses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. no state authority to collect these data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. inadequate funding to implement data collection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

34. What are the major impediments to state-wide collection of domestic/sexual violence data? (Please specify if comments apply to only one offense type.)

35. Are there any resource issues that affect or will affect the collection of domestic/sexual violence data in your state? (Please specify if comments apply to only one offense type.)

36. Please briefly describe any strategies that your state has successfully employed for improving data reporting by agencies.

37. If your state has legal definitions for domestic and/or sexual violence offenses, please attach a copy.

38. If your state has a legal definition for domestic violence offenses, does it apply to the following victim groups. *(Check all that apply.)*

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------|
| a. female spouses | 38. | |
| b. male spouses | a. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. same sex partners | b. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. common law partners | c. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. ex-spouses | d. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. parents | e. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. persons having a child in common | f. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h. boyfriends/girlfriends | g. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i. ex-boyfriends/girlfriends | h. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j. children | i. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| k. other, please specify _____ | j. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| l. not applicable | k. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | l. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

39. Does your state's legal definition for sexual violence offenses apply to the following victim groups. *(Check all that apply.)*

- | | | |
|-------------------|-----|--------------------------|
| | 39. | |
| a. adult females | a. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. adult males | b. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. minors | c. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. not applicable | d. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

40. Please attach copies of the data forms used for collecting domestic violence and sexual violence information.

We would also appreciate receiving any recent reports or studies that your state has produced on the incident of domestic and/or sexual violence. Please return this document to **JRSA, 444 North Capitol Street, Suite 4 Washington, DC 20001, (202) 624-5269 fax by no later than June 5th.** Thank you again for your help.



Appendix C

List of Respondents to JRSA Survey of States and Territories



States and Territories Responding to
JRSA Survey on Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Collection

Alabama
Alaska
Arizona
Arkansas
California
Colorado
Connecticut
Delaware
District of Columbia
Florida
Georgia
Hawaii
Idaho
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Louisiana
Maine
Maryland
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Missouri

Montana
Nebraska
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New York
North Carolina
North Dakota
Northern Mariana Islands
Ohio
Oklahoma
Pennsylvania
Puerto Rico
Rhode Island
South Dakota
Tennessee
Texas
Utah
Virgin Islands
Washington
West Virginia
Wisconsin
Wyoming



Appendix D

State Survey Results



Status of Domestic and Sexual Violence Data Reporting in the States

SURVEY RESPONSES WITH PERCENTAGES

Please note the following:

- Normal typeface indicates absolute values for responses; italics are used to delineate percentage figures for total responses.
- The N value for each question indicates the total number of responses on which the percentage figures are based.
- Some questions may have less total responses than there were for the overall survey because of negative responses to qualifying questions.
- The percentages given for some questions may not add to 100 due to either rounding error or multiple choice responses.

I. CURRENT STATUS OF DATA SOURCES

1. Does your state have or plan to have within the next two years an incident-based reporting system for local law enforcement agencies?

N=47	Yes	No
1.	38 81%	9 19%

(If Yes, please answer Questions 2 through 6. If No, please skip to Question 7.)

2. Which of the following best describes this incident-based reporting system's current level of implementation? *(Check all that apply.)*

- a. developing state-wide data standard
- b. implementing data collection among local agencies
- c. applying to FBI for NIBRS data submission certification
- d. producing incident-based reports but not NIBRS certified
- e. producing incident-based reports and NIBRS certified

N=38	#	%
2.		
a.	15	40%
b.	16	42%
c.	13	34%
d.	12	32%
e.	8	21%

3. If data reports are **not** currently available from this system, by what date would any reports be expected?

<u>State</u>	<u>Response</u>
Alabama	
Alaska	
Arkansas	undetermined
Colorado	1-1-96
Connecticut	1-1-96
D.C.	9/96
Delaware	
Florida	
Georgia	
Idaho	
Indiana	unknown
Iowa	
Kansas	
Louisiana	1-1-96
Maine	
Maryland	July 1996
Massachusetts	current
Michigan	
Montana	1/1/96
Nebraska	1996
New Hampshire	6/96
New Jersey	7/1/96
New York	1997
North Carolina	6/96
North Dakota	
Northern Mariana Islands	12/95
Ohio	
Oklahoma	
Pennsylvania	1997
Rhode Island	6/97
South Dakota	
Tennessee	NIBRS
Texas	it is in a test mode
Utah	
Virgin Islands	

4. If data reports are currently available, indicate the percentage of your state's local jurisdictions that contribute information. *(Check the most appropriate categories.)*

	N=21	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	No Response
a. major cities (>50,000 population)	8	38%	4 19%	1 5%	8 38%	0 0%
b. medium to small cities	3	14%	5 24%	4 19%	8 38%	1 5%
c. suburban communities	3	14%	4 19%	4 19%	5 15%	5 15%
d. rural areas	6	29%	4 19%	2 10%	7 33%	2 10%

5. What percentage of all reported crimes in your state do the incident-based statistics represent?

	Range	Frequency	Percent
	1-25%	7	31.8%
	26-50%	3	13.6%
	51-75%	2	9.1%
	76-100%	10	45.5%
Tota responses		22	100.0%

6. What percentage of law enforcement agencies in your state record victim/offender relationship information for non-homicide offenses?

N=31

	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
	10 32%	4 13%	3 10%	14 45%

7. Does your state conduct a crime victimization survey?

N=47	Yes	No
7.	10 21%	37 79%

8./9. If yes to Question 7, does it include data on domestic and/or sexual violence incidents?

Domestic Violence Data Reporting			
N=10	Yes	No	NR
8.	5 50%	5 50%	0 0%

Sexual Violence Data Reporting			
N=10	Yes	No	NR
9.	5 50%	5 50%	0 0%

10./11. Does your state collect domestic and/or sexual violence data from non-UCR reporting systems?

N=47	Yes	No	NR
10.	31 66%	15 32%	1 2%

N=47	Yes	No	NR
11.	22 47%	20 43%	5 11%

12./13. If yes to Question(s) 10 or 11, please check all of the following that apply.

- a. protection order registries
- b. protection order issued
- c. child protection services
- d. health care providers (e.g., individual practitioners, hospitals)
- e. higher education institutions
- f. community corrections (e.g., probation, parole)
- g. corrections (e.g., prison, residential facilities)
- h. state criminal history repository
- i. victim services providers
- j. civil/criminal courts
- k. special databases or flagging systems (e.g., gun registries, child sex offender registries)

N=31		
12.	#	%
a.	10	32%
b.	11	36%
c.	8	26%
d.	5	16%
e.	3	10%
f.	6	19%
g.	7	23%
h.	14	45%
i.	18	58%
j.	13	42%
k.	9	29%

N=23		
13.	#	%
a.	5	22%
b.	4	22%
c.	11	48%
d.	4	17%
e.	4	17%
f.	5	22%
g.	7	30%
h.	12	50%
i.	10	44%
j.	10	44%
k.	10	44%

14./15. Is your state required to disseminate the domestic and/or sexual violence data that it collects to specific audiences or agencies?

N=47	Yes	No	NR
14.	19 40%	26 55%	2 4%

N=47	Yes	No	NR
15.	10 21%	27 57%	10 21%

16. If Yes to Question(s) 14 or 15, please identify these audiences or agencies. (Specify if your comments only apply to one offense type.)

(See attached listing for responses to this question.)

II. REPORTING ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE OFFENSES

	Domestic Violence Data Reporting				Sexual Violence Data Reporting			
17./18. Are annual statistics on domestic and/or sexual violence offenses collected in your state?	N=47	Yes	No	NR	N=47	Yes	No	NR
	17.	35 76%	12 26%	0 0%	18.	30 64%	17 36%	0 0%
<i>(If No, please skip to Question 33.)</i>								
19./20. These statistics are produced as part of: <i>(Check the most appropriate category.)</i>	N=35				N=30			
	19.				20.			
a. aggregate crime statistics (e.g., UCR)	a.	15	43%		a.	13	43%	
b. incident-based crime statistics (e.g., NIBRS)	b.	10	29%		b.	8	27%	
c. both a. and b. above	c.	8	23%		c.	9	30%	
d. other, please specify <i>(See attached listing for responses to this question.)</i>	d.	14	40%		d.	7	23%	
21./22. How are these statistics derived?	N=35				N=30			
	21.	Yes	No		22.	Yes	No	
a. a specific offense code is entered on incident reports	a.	9 27%	25 74%		a.	17 57%	13 43%	
b. a non-offense code or special box is marked on incident reports	b.	6 17%	29 83%		b.	2 7%	28 93%	
c. violent offenses are sorted by victim-offender relationship	c.	13 37%	22 63%		c.	12 40%	18 60%	
d. domestic/sexual violence specific incident forms are collected	d.	16 46%	19 54%		d.	6 20%	24 80%	
e. other methods are used for identifying domestic and/or sexual violence cases, please specify <i>(See attached listing for responses to this question.)</i>	e.	8 23%	27 77%		e.	3 10%	27 90%	

Domestic Violence Data Reporting

Sexual Violence Data Reporting

23./24. Are victim characteristic data available?

N=35

23.	Yes	No
a. age	29 83%	6 17%
b. race	26 74%	9 26%
c. ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic/Non-Hispanic)	17 49%	18 51%
d. gender	29 83%	6 17%
e. relationship to offender	28 80%	7 20%
f. other, please specify (See attached listing for responses to this question.)	4 11%	34 89%

N=30

24.	Yes	No
a.	20 67%	10 33%
b.	21 70%	9 30%
c.	14 47%	16 53%
d.	21 70%	9 30%
e.	20 67%	10 33%
f.	2 7%	28 93%

25./26. Are offender characteristic data available?

N=35

25.	Yes	No
a. age	27 77%	8 23%
b. race	25 71%	10 29%
c. ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic/Non-Hispanic)	18 51%	17 49%
d. gender	28 80%	7 20%
e. relationship to victim	24 69%	11 31%
f. other, please specify (See attached listing for responses to this question.)	4 11%	31 89%

N=30

26.	Yes	No
a.	21 70%	9 30%
b.	21 70%	9 30%
c.	18 60%	12 40%
d.	21 70%	9 30%
e.	18 60%	12 40%
f.	3 10%	27 90%

27./28. Can the incidents be categorized by related offense information (e.g., murder, aggravated assault, rape, etc.)?

N=35

27.	Yes	No
27.	27 77%	8 23%

N=30

28.	Yes	No
28.	19 63%	11 37%

29./30. Is any information on related injuries (e.g., apparent broken bones, possible internal injuries, severe lacerations, etc.) available?

N=35

29.	Yes	No
29.	21 60%	14 40%

N=30

30.	Yes	No
30.	15 48%	16 52%

31./32. Is any information on weapons used (e.g., handgun, knife, fist, etc.) available?

N=35

31.	Yes	No
31.	26 74%	9 26%

N=30

32.	Yes	No
32.	21 70%	9 30%

III. DATA COLLECTION ISSUES

33. Please rate the following data collecting concerns as significant problems for your state:

- a. lateness of local agency data submissions
- b. high error rates in local agency submissions
- c. incomplete local agency submissions
- d. incompatible automated information systems
- e. nonparticipation by local agencies
- f. lack of adequate local agency staff training
- g. ambiguous or inconsistent definition(s) of domestic violence offenses
- h. ambiguous or inconsistent definition(s) of sexual violence offenses
- i. no state authority to collect these data
- j. inadequate funding to implement data collection

N=44

33.	Serious	Some	None
a.	4 9%	37 84%	3 7%
b.	2 5%	31 72%	10 23%
c.	6 14%	33 75%	5 11%
d.	12 27%	21 47%	12 27%
e.	6 13%	27 60%	12 27%
f.	4 9%	35 80%	5 11%
g.	8 19%	15 35%	20 47%
h.	4 10%	16 40%	20 50%
i.	7 17%	10 24%	25 60%
j.	21 50%	13 31%	8 19%

34. What are the major impediments to state-wide collection of domestic/sexual violence data? (Please specify if comments apply to only one offense type.)

(See attached listing for responses to this question.)

35. Are there any resource issues that affect or will affect the collection of domestic/sexual violence data in your state? (Please specify if comments apply to only one offense type.)

(See attached listing for responses to this question.)

36. Please briefly describe any strategies that your state has successfully employed for improving data reporting by agencies.

(See attached listing for responses to this question.)

37. If your state has legal definitions for domestic and/or sexual violence offenses, please attach a copy.

(See attached listing for responses to this question.)

38. If your state has a legal definition for domestic violence offenses, does it apply to the following victim groups. *(Check all that apply.)*

- a. female spouses
- b. male spouses
- c. same sex partners
- d. common law partners
- e. ex-spouses
- f. parents
- g. persons having a child in common
- h. boyfriends/girlfriends
- i. ex-boyfriends/girlfriends
- j. children
- k. other, please specify *(See attached listing for responses to this question.)*
- l. not applicable

N=47

38.

- a. 36 77%
- b. 35 75%
- c. 24 51%
- d. 29 62%
- e. 32 68%
- f. 31 66%
- g. 32 68%
- h. 25 53%
- i. 22 47%
- j. 29 62%
- k. 6 13%
- l. 2 4%

39. Does your state's legal definition for sexual violence offenses apply to the following victim groups. *(Check all that apply.)*

- a. adult females
- b. adult males
- c. minors
- d. not applicable

N=47

39.

- a. 31 66%
- b. 29 62%
- c. 30 64%
- d. 3 6%

40. Please attach copies of the data forms used for collecting domestic violence and sexual violence information.

(See attached listing for responses to this question.)

Question 16. If Yes to Question(s) 14 or 15, please identify these audiences or agencies. (Specify if your comments only apply to one offense type.)

<u>State</u>	<u>Response</u>
Alaska	Governor, Legislature, community service providers, native organizations, other state agencies
California	Summary domestic violence data is collected and reported in the Department's annual publication, "Crime and Delinquency in California".
Colorado	Law enforcement, victims groups, policy analysts (reported in annual State Crime report).
Connecticut	Published in annual report.
D.C.	U.S. Attorney, private citizens, women groups, advocacy groups (i.e., Georgetown Law School attorneys who represent victims of such crimes.
Florida	Governor and legislature; and by request, under our public records law, to any entity requesting such data. Certain categories, such as our child abuse registry, are exempt.
Georgia	GCIC is mandated by state law to provide an annual report on Domestic/Family Violence only
Idaho	all criminal justice agencies
Louisiana	Joint Legislative Workgroup on treatment and Prevention of Sex Offenses
Maine	All UCR data (including domestic violence and sexual violence) is to be submitted annually to the Governor, Legislators, and all law enforcement agencies.
Montana	To Federal agencies
New Jersey	Reports provided to law enforcement agencies and to any agency or person who requests a copy.
Northern Mariana Islands	Office of Victims of Crime (OVC), U.S. Department of Justice, CNMI Legislature, and any interested agencies or individuals.
Pennsylvania	Report to Legislature on Child Abuse
Puerto Rico	Comisión para los Asuntos de la Mujer, Oficina del Gobernador
South Dakota	Information must be made available to SD law enforcement
Texas	Department of Public Safety
Utah	Department of Human services Report on Child Abuse
Washington	WASPC will begin collecting domestic violence related Part I crimes at the direction of the Legislature. We will provide the Legislature mid year and annual statistics. Other distribution the report will be provided to local state law enforcement agencies and other governmental groups. Collection will begin July 1, 1995.

West Virginia	UCR information required to be in annual report submitted to Legislature, law enforcement and Governor's Office.
Wyoming	to the public upon request

Questions 19./20. These statistics are produced as part of: *(Check the most appropriate category.)*
d. other, please specify

<u>State</u>	<u>Response</u>
California	summary reporting form, "Domestic Violence Related Calls for Assistance"
Connecticut	Family Violence Reporting Program
Kansas	through a special report from the Kansas State Attorney General
Louisiana	Sentencing/Corrections
Maryland	State UCR Reports
Nevada	statewide reporting requirements per statute
Northern Mariana Islands	Federal requirement and SAC activity
Puerto Rico	other statistical reports required by law
South Dakota	criminal history statistics
Tennessee	currently done through Judicial Council - eventually by NIBRS
West Virginia	WV Coalition Against Domestic Violence
Wisconsin	Prosecutor reporting; law enforcement reporting
Wyoming	State DV Collection Program

Questions 21./22. How are these statistics derived?

e. other methods are used for identifying domestic and/or sexual violence cases, please specify

<u>State</u>	<u>Response</u>
California	summary form submitted.
Colorado	per NIBRS requirements
D.C.	Non-offense code for domestic violence arrest
Missouri	The contributing agency determines how to identify these types of offenses. They may use one or more of the methods described above.
New Hampshire	crisis center statistics
South Dakota	fingerprint cards
Utah	NIBRS and Child Abuse Registry
West Virginia	UCR and Domestic Violence Coalition reports

Questions 23./24. Are victim characteristic data available?
f. other, please specify

<u>State</u>	<u>Response</u>
Alabama	weapon, injury, location, time of day
Colorado	per NIBRS requirements
Connecticut	children involved/present, injury type
Michigan	injury
Northern Mariana Islands	location
Ohio	height, weight, hair, eyes
West Virginia	if victims was complainant

Questions 25./26. Are offender characteristic data available?

f. other, please specify

<u>State</u>	<u>Response</u>
Connecticut	liquor/drugs involved, prior court orders, weapons used, offense type
Michigan	weapon, arrest type, clearances
Northern Mariana Islands	location
Ohio	height, weight, hair, eyes
West Virginia	types of abuse, factors in abuse

Question 34. What are the major impediments to state-wide collection of domestic/sexual violence data? (Please specify if comments apply to only one offense type.)

<u>State</u>	<u>Response</u>
Alabama	UCR summary downgrades male sexual assault victims to an assault. Part I offenses lose criminal mischief and vandalism. Data is not centralized.
Alaska	Funding
Arizona	No authority is major problem.
Arkansas	Willingness of local agencies to increase reports. This would be a separate program in addition to UCR and has not really been addressed.
California	Funding for IBR when legislation is passed.
Colorado	"Ruralness" - turnover in small departments - training unavailable (closed state training center five years ago) - large number of small (n=<5) law enforcement agencies
Connecticut	We want to implement NIBRS to replace current Family Violence Reporting Program and to begin collecting data on sexual violence incidents/offenders/victims. Resources are an issue.
D.C.	Domestic Violence - better training and report writing by officers in the field.
Delaware	No statutes relating specifically to domestic violence.
Georgia	Lack of training
Hawaii	1. no standard definition of domestic violence for all agencies 2. no agency assigned to collect data 3. no funding to implement a multi-agency data collection system
Illinois	A consistent definition of domestic violence and related offenses is needed for adoption by all reporting law enforcement agencies. Many revisions need to be made within the current UCR reporting program to better capture domestic related incidents.
Indiana	Non-UCR state
Iowa	Both types of offenses - non-participation of agencies. Some agencies don't count cases if the county attorney decides not to prosecute.
Kansas	Lack of training and awareness of officers to identify the specific situation.
Louisiana	Funding for data collection
Maine	Accurate and complete data collection for both types of offenses rests in the success or failure of NIBRS implementation. Congress can mandate, but it is the State UCR Programs and local police agencies that must struggle to make implementation a reality.
Maryland	Domestic violence definitions are geared to criminal law violations and are constrained-they do not lend themselves completely to data collection. Funding and other different programs stretching beyond limits of staff.

Massachusetts Non-reporting of domestic violence by non-NIBRS departments.

Michigan With NIBRS, drawing data off by VOR doesn't guarantee that if your definition says to be a domestic, you must have "resided" together or had a child in common (this is one definition but widely used) that this will be the case. You could be a boyfriend or girlfriend and never lived together.

Minnesota Resources to implement NIBRS and definitions of domestic/sexual violence offenses.

Missouri There is no mandatory requirement to report domestic/sexual violence data to the State. Our crime incident information systems are based on a voluntary reporting standard.

Montana Incompatibility between local and State data collection systems.

Nevada Sexual violence - no statutory authority. Domestic violence - no focus to program, lack of use of data collected, limited data collection/analysis because of staffing. Both offenses - no Statistical Analysis Center

New Jersey None, once all local police departments are automated and participate in IBUCR.

New York Historically, aggregate counts of domestic violence known offenses were reported through UCR. However, reporting was sporadic and premised on no common definition of domestic violence. In 1994, legislation was enacted to require police departments to complete a uniform report on all incidents of "domestic violence" which was defined as criminal conduct between members of the same family or household.

North Carolina Incident based crime reporting is not operational in the larger urban departments which represent almost half of the reported crimes. The primary source of data is the criminal case filings and dispositions in the court system but there is no specific offense classification.

North Dakota Data is collected through NIBRS program. Not all agencies report in incident-based format, therefore data is not statewide. Also, NIBRS data would only reflect incidents brought to attention of law enforcement.

Northern Mariana Islands Some data donors are not automated nor linked to SAC.

Oklahoma Domestic abuse is collected on a form "as mandated" which collects only date, time, type of offense.

Pennsylvania Essentially domestic violence is an assault or sexual offense which occurs in a domestic setting. Without IBR we cannot identify these offenses as domestic violence.

Puerto Rico Lack of funding commitment
Lack of human resources

Rhode Island The funding of a full-time position at the State's Centralized Domestic Violence Unit to process and analyze data. The VAWA funds will add but \$10,000 towards the initiative. The SAC will, however, lend data collection and analysis assistance.

South Dakota 1. NIBRS reporting is not mandatory in SD.
2. When using FPC's, there is currently no way to determine if a simple assault charge is related to domestic violence or not

Utah	NIBRS still needs to be implemented in the larger jurisdictions.
Virgin Islands	Need to have automated data collection
Washington	Unknown at this time.
West Virginia	Switch to IBRS -- serious problems with local agency ability to comply, especially with info on sexual violence. Domestic violence info is o.k.
Wisconsin	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Incompatible local systems -- automated- Some non-reporting/non-cooperation- The more variables collected, the more errors and/or the more time in correcting them.

Question 35. Are there **any** resource issues that affect or will affect the collection of domestic/sexual violence data in your state? (Please specify if comments apply to only one offense type.)

<u>State</u>	<u>Response</u>
Alabama	Developing communications procedures to get data from one state computer system to another. Presently, courts have civil filings which include restraining orders. Courts have their own computer network and it is not the same as the State's system.
Alaska	Lack of funding
Arizona	Agencies are reluctant to provide data absent clear legislative mandate when additional resources are required to gather data.
Arkansas	Yes, we do not have the resources at this time to add the collection of these two types of data.
Colorado	- training - need computers and software
Connecticut	Yes. Resources are needed for local agencies to switch to NIBRS reporting, particularly the larger cities which account for the highest proportion of cases.
D.C.	Budget constraints have limited MPD's efforts to implement Automated Reporting System, which will capture data elements.
Delaware	Lack of data entry funds make late reporting a major issue. Training, especially for new staff is difficult.
Florida	Turnover rate of personnel who handle data causes need for constant training.
Georgia	Lack of implementation funding for Sexual Violence. Funding was just implemented in Jan. '95 for Domestic Family Violence.
Hawaii	Hawaii needs adequate funding and leaders who are willing to implement a data collection mechanism for the State regarding domestic violence and general violence.
Illinois	Currently there are several problems within the offense and arrest reporting system in Illinois which do not allow for complete collection of necessary statewide data. These problems need to be alleviated before additional mechanisms to collect specific domestic/sexual offense data can be put in place.
Iowa	Both types of offenses - software concerns and lack of personnel.
Kansas	Data is being collected, entered, - but funding is not available that allows for additional staff to complete statistical programs and to eliminate an existing backlog.
Maine	Adequate funding to assist local agencies to initially become automated and/or upgrade current software to be NIBRS compliant.
Maryland	The UCR Program already captures domestic violence and has no plans for a separate reporting of sexual violence. Funding for agencies to report NIBRS. MD Program will collect domestic violence, child abuse and sufficient detail on sex crimes to generate adequate information.
Massachusetts	Greater use of software for collecting NIBRS data.

Michigan	No more so than implementation costs to begin submitting NIBRS data (training, materials, programming, etc.)
Minnesota	Lack of funds to implement NIBRS.
Missouri	The high costs for reporting complete and accurate crime incident data to the State is always a serious concern and adversely affects the possibility of complete collection of these data.
Montana	No.
Nevada	Both offenses - lack of staff/program funding
New Hampshire	high caseloads/lack of personnel; no access to fax machines, etc.
New York	A statewide database is currently under development.
North Carolina	No, it is more of a standards issue of data definition and incident based automation in the local agencies.
North Dakota	Resources at local level for law enforcement agencies to acquire software capable of providing incident data. Also staff time to enter data. Resources for training/re-training officers ref. incident-based reporting.
Northern Mariana Islands	Inadequate funding
Oklahoma	NIBRS, when implemented, will give us much more detail without changing mandate.
Pennsylvania	The move to IBR has been funded adequately to date. Funding of protection order registry is unresolved.
Puerto Rico	No data available for sexual violence, except for forcible rape
Rhode Island	See previous (question's) response
Tennessee	Large agencies feel modifying their information systems is prohibitively expensive.
Virgin Islands	Lack of computers/automation, need for additional training and failure to implement (fully) domestic violence team throughout the Territory
Washington	Unknown at this time
West Virginia	Money, software, equipment lacking, especially at local agency level.
Wisconsin	Resources and standards for automation systems and applications -- particularly local.

Question 36. Please briefly describe any strategies that your state has successfully employed for improving data reporting by agencies.

<u>State</u>	<u>Response</u>
Alabama	In crime reporting we use a 4 digit code similar to NCIC codes instead of a 3 digit code. This allows us to add new codes as we need to.
Alaska	Attempting to set standards
Arizona	None have been particularly successful.
Arkansas	None--Other than extensive quality control of measures and one to one training - both by telephone and at local agencies.
Colorado	provided equipment
Connecticut	In the current Family Violence Reporting Program, staff in the Crime Analysis Unit at State police review each form for accuracy and completeness and then take the necessary steps to correct them.
D.C.	Training of officers, advocacy groups being involved in training, participation of the Metropolitan Police Department on task forces that are concerned with the issues.
Delaware	Used Federal funds to fill in missing and late data.
Florida	FDLE has an aggressive training program which serves the entire state. Help is available by phone for specific questions by agencies.
Georgia	Increased the number of training sessions for users; creation of newsletters with information about procedural changes and issuance of quarterly updates on procedural or systematic changes.
Illinois	The Illinois Domestic Violence Act of 1986 requires law enforcement agencies to forward reports of domestic violence incidents and information pertaining to orders of protection to the Illinois State Police.
Indiana	In process of implementing NIBRS and upgrading CCH.
Iowa	Both types of offenses - always have on-going training; paper submission option for agencies that cannot afford hardware, software, and personnel.
Kansas	Newsletter.
Maine	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. assisted local depts. with NIBRS-based police forms and in-service training 2. worked closely with software vendors on NIBRS-compliant standards 3. targeted Federal and State justice assistance grants toward record-information improvement 4. used special interest groups (victim service agencies) to be NIBRS advocates with police.
Maryland	We have an additional Battered Spouse Report associated with our summary UCR Program. This report is incident based and will evolve into a Domestic Violence Report 1/96. This report will capture crimes and relationship.
Massachusetts	Grants to buy NIBRS software.

Michigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better definitions - Better training/resource manual - Expanded VOR/mandatory to complete - No defaulting of incomplete data
Missouri	In other criminal justice related information systems , the State has used video training tapes to promote completeness, uniformity and accuracy in field reporting.
Montana	None
Nevada	Implemented/completed CHRI baseline assessment Implemented III Implemented UCR in 1994
New Jersey	Reporting has always been good in New Jersey.
New York	Enactment of legislation mandating a uniform report on all alleged incidents of domestic violence
North Carolina	We are presently working with the NC Administrative Office of the Courts to create a database criminal cases based on the offense and the last name or address of the complainant and the defendant. This should give us some good information on cases filed -- disposition and sentences of "domestic violence" cases.
North Dakota	So far, low cost things like calling on phone to remind agencies to get their data in -- or providing training upon request. Also train all new officers at academies.
Northern Mariana Islands	We have developed a statistical worksheet to be used by our VOCA subgrantees, automate criminal records, establish criminal history records , and link several criminal justice organizations
Oklahoma	We have been working for several years on NIBRS . Have developed a universal report form, software, and collection procedures . We hope to get FBI certified this year.
Pennsylvania	Funded and assisted in development of IBR software for police.
Rhode Island	(a) Assisting in the design of the state domestic violence reporting form , i.e., DV-1. (b) The move to make the state 90 to 100% IBR/NIBR participants. (c) The negotiating (successfully) for statistical data collecting and activities for the State's DV Unit.
Utah	NIBRS grant -- Central Repository plus 50 agencies
Virgin Islands	Tying funding to improved data reporting
Washington	WASPC conducts annual statewide training seminars . We apply extensive editing procedures to every report received by the Uniform Crime Reporting Section . We have also invited agencies to our office for any emergency training at the request of any agency.
West Virginia	UCR/IBR had best results with legislative mandate for reporting, mandated training for IBRS , and providing training .
Wisconsin	Timely and consistent feedback and error checking (time consuming)
Wyoming	Some training of law enforcement officers and the implementation of IBR will give a better picture of these types of violence .

Question 37. If your state has legal definitions for domestic and/or sexual violence offenses, please attach a copy.

<u>State</u>	<u>Response</u>
Alabama	State statutes on protection from abuse, domestic violence facilities, Family violence protection order enforcement, reporting of child abuse or neglect, and child abuse generally.
Alaska	State statutes defining domestic violence for civil laws pertaining to restraining orders
Arizona	State statutes on sexual and family offenses
Arkansas	State statutes on family law definitions; offenses involving family, dependents, etc.; offenses against children or incompetents; offenses against the person; and sexual offenses.
California	State statutes on response to domestic violence
Colorado	State statutes on domestic violence
Connecticut	State statutes on family violence prevention and response: definitions, investigation of family violence by peace officer, family violence response and intervention units, and family violence offense report.
Florida	State statutes on sexual battery
Georgia	State statutes on family violence
Hawaii	State statutes on abuse of family and household members, sexual offenses, and child State statutes on domestic violence crime prevention
Illinois	Illinois Domestic Violence Act of 1986
Iowa	State statutes on domestic abuse, sex act, sexual abuse definitions
Kansas	State statutes on domestic violence criminal procedure and Suggested Law Enforcement Domestic Violence Policy
Maine	State statutes on protection from abuse
Maryland	MD House Bill 140 - Domestic Violence Act
Michigan	multiple definitions were indicated but copies were not sent
Minnesota	MN Domestic Abuse Act
Missouri	State statutes on abuse--adults and children--shelters and protective orders and sexual offenses
Nevada	State statutes on domestic violence
New Jersey	State statutory definitions of sexual offenses and domestic violence.
New York	NY Family Protection and Domestic Violence Act of 1994 and State statutes on NY State Office for the Prevention of Domestic Violence
North Dakota	State statutes on adult abuse and gross sexual imposition

Oklahoma	State statutes on domestic abuse, forcible sodomy, rape, and sexual battery
Puerto Rico	PR Domestic Abuse Prevention and Intervention Act
Rhode Island	RI Bill 88-H 8719 Domestic Abuse Prevention Act
Texas	Texas Family Code definition of Family Violence
Virgin Islands	VI statutes on domestic violence, rape, and unlawful sexual contact
Washington	State statutory domestic violence definitions and domestic violence reporting -- training, powers duties
Wisconsin	WI Domestic Abuse Mandatory Arrest Law and Sexual Assault Statutes
Wyoming	State statutes on family violence protection

Question 38. If your state has a legal definition for domestic violence offenses, does it apply to the following victim groups. *(Check all that apply.)*

k. other, please specify

<u>State</u>	<u>Response</u>
Connecticut	ever lived together
Florida	anyone who lives, or has lived, together.
Hawaii	persons residing or formerly residing in the same dwelling unit
Iowa	The assault is between persons who have been family or household members residing together within the past year and are not residing together at the time of the assault.
Kansas	No legal definition
Michigan	dependent upon which one of multiple statutory definitions is applicable to a given case.
Montana	in-laws
North Dakota	any family member
Northern Mariana Islands	The CNMI does not have a domestic violence statute but existing laws include these victim groups.
Oklahoma	Anyone living or who has ever lived under the same roof
Tennessee	current or former household members
West Virginia	people residing together now or in past
Wisconsin	same household or former same household

Question 40. Please attach copies of the data forms used for collecting domestic violence and sexual violence information.

<u>State</u>	<u>Response</u>
Alabama	AL Uniform Incident/Offense and Arrest Report Forms
Alaska	AK Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault's Client Intake Report Form
Connecticut	CT NIBRS Form
D.C.	MPD Incident-Based Reporting Form
Florida	State Hate Crime Statistical and Uniform Crime Reports Incident Report Forms
Georgia	GA Family Violence Incident Report Form
Iowa	IA Incident, Arrest, and Supplemental Report Forms
Kansas	KS Standard Arrest/Juvenile and Standard Offense Report Forms
Maine	ME State Police Field, Person/Entity Detail, and Arrestee/Suspect Details Report Forms
Maryland	MD Supplementary Battered Spouse Report Form
Michigan	MI MCR-1 Incident Report Form
Missouri	MO Crime Index Report Form
Montana	MT Department of Family Services Domestic Violence Report Form
Nevada	NV Domestic Violence Arrest Report
New York	NY Standardized Domestic Incident Report
Northern Mariana Islands	CNMI Victim Statistics Worksheet
Oklahoma	OK Domestic Abuse Report Form
Puerto Rico	PR Police Department Domestic Violence Incident Report Forms
Rhode Island	RI DV-1 Domestic Violence Reporting Form
South Dakota	SD Incident Report
Tennessee	TN Domestic Violence Investigations Law Enforcement Log Sheet
Virgin Islands	VI Police Department's Offense Report and Domestic Violence Supplementary Report Forms
Washington	WA Domestic Violence Related Part One Offenses Report Form
West Virginia	WV Monthly Domestic Violence Report Form

Wisconsin

WI Domestic Abuse and Sexual Assault Report Forms

Wyoming

WY Domestic Violence Reporting Form

Appendix E

FBI NIBRS Status Report as of 6/2/95

State or Federal Agency	Date NIBRS Testing Started	Actual**		Projected					
		Number of Agencies	Population Represented	1995		1996		1997	
				Number of Agencies	Population Represented	Number of Agencies	Population Represented	Number of Agencies	Population Represented
Operational:									
Colorado	5/91	1	1%	1	1%	251	100%	251	100%
Idaho	12/90	115	96%	116	99%	117	100%	117	100%
Iowa	5/91	175	75%	175	75%	187	80%	188	85%
North Dakota	1/89	84	82%	84	82%	84	82%	84	82%
South Carolina	11/89	339	100%	339	100%	339	100%	339	100%
Utah	5/90	30	27%	50	45%	75	75%	100	85%
Vermont	10/92	18	58%	18	58%	30	75%	30	75%
Virginia	10/92	130	0.3%	130	0.3%	170	36%	200	49%
Testing:									
Arkansas	2/90			3	2%	9	12%	15	22%
Delaware	6/91			62	100%	62	100%	62	100%
Indiana - (NS)	10/93			3	5%	3	5%	3	5%
Louisiana	1/95			12	30%	25	40%	31	50%
Maine	1/95			50	45%	75	65%	100	90%
Massachusetts	8/90			50	40%	100	55%	150	70%
Michigan	2/94			550	80%	551	91%	551	91%
Montana	6/93			113	100%	113	100%	113	100%
Nebraska	5/91			8	6%	15	9%	15	9%
New Hampshire	12/93			0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
New York	10/92			50	5%	200	15%	300	70%
Ohio - (NS)	12/92			1	1%	3	4%	7	9%
Oklahoma	11/91			25	27%	148	46%	229	75%
Oregon	2/94			25	78%	25	78%	25	78%
Pennsylvania	5/95			140	5%	150	8%	150	8%
Tennessee - (NS)	11/93			2	1%	3	2%	3	2%
Texas	7/92			50	20%	150	40%	275	46%
Washington	1/91			27	18%	67	40%	75	45%
West Virginia	7/94			153	50%	229	75%	306	100%
Wisconsin	8/92			50	25%	100	35%	120	45%
Dept. of Commerce									
Office of Insp. General	11/94								
FBI	3/93								
Plans to test in 1995:									
D.C.				3	100%	3	100%	3	100%
Guam				1	100%	1	100%	1	100%
Connecticut				3	50%	69	66%	99	96%
Kansas				375	100%	375	100%	375	100%
New Jersey				16	4%	16	4%	16	4%
New Mexico - (NS)				6	40%	15	50%	15	50%
South Dakota				50	70%	55	75%	55	75%
Dept. of Defense									
Developmental:									
Alabama*				316	100%	316	100%	316	100%
Hawaii				0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Illinois*				687	73%	687	73%	842	100%
Kentucky				0	0%	558	100%	558	100%
Maryland				0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Minnesota				321	100%	321	100%	321	100%
Nevada				27	93%	35	100%	35	100%
North Carolina				0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Rhode Island				0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Wyoming				0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

State	Date NIBRS Testing Started	Actual**		Projected					
				1995		1996		1997	
		Number of Agencies	Population Represented	Number of Agencies	Population Represented	Number of Agencies	Population Represented	Number of Agencies	Population Represented
No Formalized Plan:									
Alaska									
Arizona									
California									
Florida									
Georgia									
Mississippi - (NS)									
Missouri - (NS)									
Total***				4,092	22%	5,732	31%	6,475	39%

*Previously certified to submit NIBRS. Returned to developmental status due to computer program design problems.

**Counts are based on UCR participating agencies and corresponding populations.

***Totals represent all 4 stages (operational, testing, planning, and development) of NIBRS implementation.

Operational - NIBRS data submitted to the FBI.

Testing - submitting test data from various agencies within the state to the FBI.

Plans to test - agency has employed a consulting firm to design software or agency is conducting intrastate testing of data.

Developmental - agency is in the process of designing and implementing various levels of data collection.

No formalized plan - agency has indicated there is no formal plan and/or no current interest in participating in NIBRS.

NS - Non-program state - not a centralized repository for state UCR data collection.

Appendix F

A Note on Terminology for Crime Statistics



A Note on Terminology for Crime Statistics

In any discussion of domestic and sexual violence crime statistics, it is important to be precise in the terminology used to describe the crime data being collected and analyzed. Otherwise, what appear to be conflicts between various prevalence or severity indicators may be actually due to the use of different units of measure.

A distinction should be made between the terms "incident" and "offense." According to the FBI's National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) data standards,

An "incident" is defined for NIBRS reporting purposes as one or more offenses committed by the same offender, or group of offenders acting in concert, at the same time and place.¹⁴

From the above definition, certain relationships are evident among the terms used, i.e., an incident is a single event during which multiple offenses or crimes may be committed and with which several victims and offenders may associated. Consequently, a jurisdiction's statistics for offenses, victims, and offenders may be greater than its number of reported incidents.

Also, the number of offenses, victims, and offenders may be different from one another since each is an independent phenomenon. In other words, a single offender may have multiple victims or may commit multiple offenses against a single victim. Or multiple offenders may attack a single victim.

A further refinement is that most crime incident data sets rarely have the ability to distinguish between first-time offenders and recidivists. This would require examining criminal history records to determine whether someone is a repeat offender when reporting every crime incident. Since the offender is often unknown when a crime is first reported, this information would have to be retroactively added when a case is cleared. Since this happens at arrest, subsequent prosecutorial or judicial actions may invalidate the assignment of a crime to an individual. Tracking these decisions and updating personal records and higher level statistical data sets requires more of a resource commitment than most jurisdictions are willing to make. As a result, the number of offenders reported in incident-based data sets may be greater than the actual criminal population. This would be particularly true when studying offenses such as domestic and sexual violence that are behaviorally motivated crimes and so these offenders may have a greater tendency to recidivate.

All of this means that the use of specific statistical figures in discussing prevalence or severity of domestic and sexual violence problems should be done with a full awareness of what they represent. In addition to concerns about under or overreporting problems, there may be legitimate reasons for discrepancies across various data sets because of differences in the definitions and procedures data collection employed in each.

¹⁴ Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice. *Uniform Crime Reporting: National Incident-Based Reporting System - Volume I: Data Collection Guidelines*. Washington, DC, July 1, 1988, p. 17.

