

Evaluation of the Judicial Oversight Demonstration Initiative: Implementation Strategies and Lessons

Adele Harrell
Lisa Newmark
Christy Visher
Christine DeStefano

This research was sponsored by the National Institute of Justice under Cooperative Agreement 99-WT-VX-K005. The opinions and conclusions expressed in this document are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Department of Justice, The Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders.



The JOD initiative is jointly funded and managed by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs' Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), and the National Institute of Justice. In addition to the programmatic initiatives at each site, there are two components: a comprehensive national evaluation and a centralized technical assistance effort. The national evaluation is being conducted by the Urban Institute (UI) in Washington, D.C. The Urban Institute's work is informed by the National Institute of Justice's National Evaluation Program Board and UI's close collaboration with each site's local evaluator.

The technical assistance is led by the Vera Institute of Justice in New York, N.Y. To provide this assistance, Vera and the OVW have assembled a team of national associates—active practitioners and experts grounded in practice—who work in consultation with the sites to help them navigate the political, financial, and bureaucratic obstacles that frequently block system change. Associates offer on-site consultations, training, and educational opportunities within and across sites, as well as providing direction to the national partners.



URBAN INSTITUTE
Justice Policy Center

2100 M STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20037
www.urban.org

The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to The Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
The Judicial Oversight Demonstration Model	2
Planning and Managing JOD	3
Background and Overview	3
Dorchester, MA.....	6
Milwaukee, WI	6
Washtenaw County, MI	7
Technical Assistance.....	8
Lessons on Implementation	10
Enhancing Offender Accountability	15
JOD Plans	15
Strategies Implemented	16
Judicial Monitoring.....	16
Court Operations	19
Enhanced Prosecution	22
Probation Supervision	24
Batterer Intervention	26
Law Enforcement.....	28
Lessons on Offender Accountability	31
Preliminary Findings: JOD Staff Views	33
Enhancing Victim Services	35
JOD Plans	35
Strategies Implemented	36
Dorchester, MA.....	36
Milwaukee, WI	36
Washtenaw County, MI	37
Lessons Learned on Victim Services.....	38
Appendix A: Multi-Site Technical Assistance, February 2000–August 2002	43

Introduction

In 1999, the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) awarded funds for the Judicial Oversight Demonstration (JOD) to three communities—Dorchester, Massachusetts; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and Washtenaw County, Michigan—to integrate enhanced judicial oversight into existing coordinated responses to intimate partner violence. The demonstrations involve strengthening existing partnerships and building new ones between the court and other agencies, including the prosecutor’s office, victim service providers, batterer intervention programs, police, and probation. The goals are to enhance victim safety and access to services and increase offender accountability. Under a separate award from the National Institute of Justice, the Urban Institute is conducting an evaluation of JOD, which includes both process and impact evaluations.

For the past two years, the demonstration sites have worked to implement a coordinated, multiagency initiative to reduce or stop domestic violence, enhance victim safety and well-being, and hold batterers accountable. This report describes the strategies and services at each site and examines the lessons learned to identify practices and principles of implementation for use by other jurisdictions that wish to pursue JOD goals. As an interim report, this review of lessons learned extends an earlier report, *Evaluation of the Judicial Oversight Demonstration Initiative: Baseline and Implementation Report* (DeStefano, Harrell, Newmark, and Visher 2001), by comparing the experiences of the three sites to identify strategies for introducing the JOD model. More detailed information on site plans and characteristics is available in the earlier report, which reviews the constellation of services and collaborative arrangements in each site prior to JOD and during the first year of implementation.

This report was organized around the major goals of JOD: (1) building a network of partner agencies (project planning and management), (2) enhancing offender accountability, and (3) responding to the needs of victims in criminal and civil intimate partner violence cases. Within these sections, the report documents JOD accomplishments—summarized in exhibits that list activities in each domain by site. The text highlights JOD changes; identifies service gaps, challenges, and solutions; compares experiences across sites; and draws lessons for policymakers and practitioners. These findings are based on conference calls, site visits, observations of JOD operations, and reports submitted by the sites.

The Judicial Oversight Demonstration Model

The Judicial Oversight Demonstration (JOD) Initiative tests the idea that, when intimate partner violence occurs, a coordinated community response, a focused judicial response, and a systemic criminal justice response can improve victim safety and offender accountability. The priorities of the JOD initiative include:

- victim safety and well-being;
- a strong judicial commitment to positively affect victim safety and offender accountability;
- improvement in the availability of victim services and advocacy and providers' coordination with all segments of the criminal justice system and the community; and
- development or enhancement of grassroots community and justice system partnerships designed to assist offenders in changing abusive behavior.

The Judicial Oversight Demonstration “model” seeks to advance these priorities by promoting:

- uniform and consistent initial responses to domestic violence offenses, including pro-arrest policies, arrest of primary aggressor, and coordinated response by law enforcement and victim advocates;
- coordinated victim advocacy and services, including contact by advocates as soon as possible after the domestic violence call; an individualized “safety plan” for the victim and children (if appropriate); and provision of needed services such as shelters, protection orders, and other assistance;
- strong offender accountability and oversight, including intensive court-based supervision, referral to appropriate batterer intervention programs, and administrative and judicial sanctions and incentives to influence offender behavior;
- rigorous research and evaluation component to gauge the initiative’s effects on victims, offenders, the criminal justice system, and the community; and
- centralized technical assistance to aid sites in planning, implementation, and problem solving.

Planning and Managing JOD

BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

All three JOD sites had a history of interagency collaboration to meet the needs of domestic violence victims. JOD represented an extension of existing services in these communities undertaken to add to existing service gaps and bring the courts into a more active role in the community response to intimate partner violence. This chapter provides a brief overview of the history and structure of responses to domestic violence in each location, described in the earlier *Baseline and Implementation Report*.

The general approach to planning and managing JOD is similar across the three sites. Although awards are made to specific agencies, JOD activities are guided by a committee or board of senior representatives of each partner agency. These executive committees have established working groups (subcommittees) of staff from selected partner agencies to develop the policies and practices needed to implement JOD strategies. The grant recipient and partner agencies are listed in exhibit 1.1. Partner agencies participate in planning meetings and collaborate in responding to intimate partner violence. To assist in management of the interagency partnership, each employs a Project Director. To assist in the research on the demonstration, the sites also employ a site evaluation coordinator to collect data, prepare analyses to assist in JOD planning, and facilitate the national evaluation.

The management of JOD evolved at each site, influenced by prior working partnerships, existing services, perceived service gaps, and, in some cases, the constraints posed by budgets, hiring regulations, and other local circumstances. Exhibit 1.2 illustrates the strategic planning process sites used to bring partner agencies together for joint planning, and the list of subcommittees appointed to work on detailed planning in specific areas. The following sections provide a description of these activities in each site.

Exhibit 1.1. JOD Partner Agencies in Dorchester, Milwaukee, and Washtenaw County

	Dorchester	Milwaukee	Washtenaw County
Grant Recipient(s)	<p>Massachusetts Trial Court, Dorchester District Court (funds for Probation and Clerk's Office)</p> <p>City of Boston, Boston Police Department (all other funds)</p>	Milwaukee County District Court	Washtenaw County Prosecutor's Office
Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asian Task Force Against Domestic Violence • Association of Haitian Women in Boston • Boston Police Department • Boston Public Health Commission • Casa Myrna Vazquez • Clerk-Magistrate Office, Dorchester District Court • Close to Home • Center for Community, Health Education, Research, and Service • Committee for Public Counsel Services • Common Purpose • Dorchester Division of Massachusetts Probation Service • Dorchester Community Roundtable • Justices of the Second Session, Dorchester District Court • Massachusetts Prevention Center • Northeastern University School of Law • Safe Havens Interfaith Partnership Against Domestic Violence • Suffolk County District Attorney's Office • Transition House • United States Attorney's Office 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asha Family Services • County Executive's Office • County Board of Supervisors • Milwaukee Commission on Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault • Milwaukee County District Court • Milwaukee County District Attorney's Office • Milwaukee County Law Enforcement Executive Association • Milwaukee Police Department • Milwaukee Women's Center • Public Defender's Office • Sojourner Truth House • Task Force on Family Violence • West Allis Police Department • Wisconsin Division of Community Corrections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives to Domestic Aggression (ADA) • Ann Arbor Police Department • Family Independence Agency • Pittsfield Township Police Department • Probation Domestic Violence Unit • Prosecuting Attorney's Office • Private Defense Bar • Public Defender Office • SAFE House • Washtenaw County District Courts • Washtenaw County Prosecutor's Office • Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department • Ypsilanti Police Department • Ypsilanti Township Prosecuting Attorney's Office

Exhibit 1.2. Strategic Management Activities and Committee Structure in Dorchester, Milwaukee, and Washtenaw County

	Dorchester	Milwaukee	Washtenaw County
Strategic Planning Meetings (SPM)	<p>Two SPMs attended by 50+ representatives of partners.</p> <p>April 2000 meeting on project goals, caseflow mapping, agency roles, key issues, and next steps.</p> <p>June 2001 meeting on progress, challenges, and next steps.</p>	<p>August 2000 implementation meeting at which partner agencies presented their plans to the group.</p>	<p>Fall 1999 planning retreat. Planning group identified five gaps that must be filled in order for Washtenaw County to achieve success.</p> <p>May 2000 SPM on JOD Phase 1: Defining and Measuring Success—Meeting involved all JOD partners to develop mission statement and set goals.</p> <p>October–September 2001 SPM on JOD Phase 2: Meeting of Executive Committee in two sessions to assess implementation of JOD and set goals for the remainder of the project.</p>
Committees and Subcommittees	<p><i>Advisory Board</i>, chaired by District Court First Justice, meets every other Wednesday morning. Includes JOD project staff and senior staff of partner agencies.</p> <p><i>Subcommittees</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefing Sessions for Defendants in Restraining Order Proceedings • Re-Integrating Offenders into the Community • Prosecution • Victim Services • Batterer Intervention • Police Procedures • Police/Prosecutor Interface • Education for Defense Bar • Space in the Courthouse • Job Descriptions/Hiring Project Director and Site Evaluation Coordinator • Sustainability (being established) 	<p><i>Judicial Oversight Initiative Advisory Board</i> is responsible for the general oversight of the projects. Meetings are convened by the Chief Judge approximately four times a year to get updates on progress, give advice, and vote on the overall direction of the project. Includes JOD project staff and senior staff of partner agencies. The court processing subcommittee meets regularly on project issues.</p> <p><i>Subcommittees</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victim Service Advisory Board • Court Processing Committee • Probation Monitoring and Tracking Committee • Prosecutor Defense Subcommittee • E-filing committee • Sustainability Committee 	<p><i>Executive Committee</i>, convened but not chaired by the Project Manager, meets every other week to discuss grant implementation and give final policy approval. Includes JOD project staff and representatives from key partner agencies (courts, police, victim services).</p> <p><i>Subcommittees</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant Team • Public Education Subcommittee • Pretrial Subcommittee • Weapons Subcommittee • New committee on offender intervention for dating violence

Dorchester, MA

In Dorchester, JOD built on a history of collaboration between the courts and advocacy agencies. The Dorchester Court Roundtable, formed in 1991, obtained a Coordinated Community Response grant from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) in 1996 and grew into the Dorchester Community Roundtable. The Roundtable is a coordinated community response project that brought victims' advocates in community health centers from half-time to full-time positions and established full-time advocates in the District Attorney's Office, Carney Hospital, and Boston Medical Center. These advocates provided crisis intervention, referrals, counseling, safety planning, support groups, and criminal justice system advocacy. Roundtable members include representatives of many different segments of the community, including victim advocates, judges, police, prosecutors, probation officers, health care providers, mental health and substance abuse service providers, and batterer intervention programs. The judge who initiated the Roundtable also chairs the Massachusetts District Court Professional Development Group for Abuse Prevention Proceedings, which developed the Trial Courts' Guidelines for Judicial Practice in Abuse Prevention Proceedings.

All JOD funds are awarded to the Boston Police Department, with the exception of the funds for the JOD probation officer positions, which are awarded to the Massachusetts Trial Court Administrative Office. However, actual management of the JOD project is delegated to an advisory board. This board is chaired by the First Justice of the Dorchester District Court and is composed of representatives from all partner agencies. It meets every other Wednesday morning, and meetings are facilitated by the Project Director. This meeting has been firmly institutionalized and is generally well attended by representatives of partner agencies and sometimes by other community agencies interested in the initiative. These meetings provide a forum for identifying and troubleshooting problem issues, exchanging information among agencies, and sharing accomplishments.

The Advisory Board formed a number of subcommittees (listed in exhibit 1.2) to focus on planning and troubleshooting in specific areas. Committee membership generally consists of Advisory Board members representing relevant agencies as well as other representatives from concerned agencies where appropriate. These subcommittees have met as needed (some approximately monthly and others for a short planning period) and most have produced reports to the Advisory Board containing products and recommendations.

One of the management challenges faced by JOD in Dorchester was a lengthy delay in the award of funds, resulting from administrative issues. As a result, the project was unable to hire a Project Director and other staff for nearly a year after the site was selected. During this crucial early phase of the project, the Assistant U.S. Attorney, who had been active in developing the JOD proposal, acted as interim Project Director for the first year of the project, adding these responsibilities to her existing ones.

Milwaukee, WI

Milwaukee has a long history of proactive responses to domestic violence. In 1979, Milwaukee formally established its coordinated community response in the form of the Commission on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault. A pro-arrest policy was initiated in Milwaukee in 1986, with mandatory arrest adopted by the state in 1989. In 1994, Milwaukee initiated specialty court dockets for domestic

violence, and in 1997 Milwaukee received a five-year grant from the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) for two specialized domestic violence prosecutors, three victim/witness specialists, and contractual payments to community-based victim service organizations to enhance services and advocacy to victims. In 2000, Milwaukee received \$194,840 in grant funding from Wisconsin STOP (Services, Training, Officers, Prosecutors) for one prosecutor, one victim/witness specialist, two hourly process servers for subpoenas in domestic violence cases, and one sexual assault victim advocate. Also during this period, the victim service agencies, under a grant from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to the Milwaukee Women's Center, began a five-year domestic violence prevention demonstration which included funding for batterer intervention program services and evaluation.

With this foundation in place, the Milwaukee District Court was able to quickly begin implementation upon receipt of the JOD award in 1999 and was thereby able to start judicial review hearings for offenders on probation in May 2000. The Advisory Board, comprised of representatives from all partner agencies, created subcommittees charged with developing plans to implement other components of JOD outlined in the grant application to OVW. Implementation plans were developed by the subcommittees rather than in multiagency strategic planning meetings and were presented at a meeting of all JOD partner agencies in August 2000. Challenges facing Milwaukee JOD management during the first two years included delays and limitations on hiring key staff and a turnover in Project Director and local evaluator.

Washtenaw County, MI

Formal services to address domestic violence in Washtenaw County began in 1974 with the founding of the Domestic Violence Project, Inc./Safe House, a nonprofit agency that provides services and emergency shelter to survivors of domestic violence and their children. In 1987, the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department became the first police agency in Michigan to adopt mandatory and pro-arrest policies and took the lead in establishing a statewide statute allowing domestic violence arrests without warrants. Washtenaw County also initiated statewide marital rape legislation (1987) and anti-stalking legislation (1994). In 1992, the county passed the only property tax millage in the country dedicated to the construction and maintenance of a new shelter for survivors of domestic violence and their children. The \$3.2 million raised through property taxes funded the construction of a new facility including a 50-bed shelter, children's center, education center, and offices for the Domestic Violence Project, Inc./Safe House. The STOP (Services, Training, Officers, Prosecutors) Technical Assistance Office has chosen Washtenaw County as a program to highlight so that other programs in the country may learn from its work. In 1998, due to the solid foundation of community commitment to the prevention of domestic violence, Washtenaw County received an award under the federal Grant to Encourage Arrest Policies and Protection Orders Program.

In Washtenaw County, JOD funds were awarded to the county and are managed by the Prosecuting Attorney's Office. From the start, the JOD proposal was developed by a coordinating committee, which became the JOD Executive Committee. Original members include the Washtenaw County Prosecuting Attorney's Office, the 15th District Court judge (representing all judges in the county courts), the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department, and Safe House. Executive Committee

membership has expanded over the course of the project to include the Pittsfield Township Department of Public Safety as well as a 14A District Court Judge, the JOD project manager, the grant coordinator, and the local evaluation coordinator in the role of ex-officio members. The Executive Committee meets biweekly to discuss grant implementation and give final approval to policy changes. During the first 18 months, the Vera Institute led a strategic planning session of all JOD partners to develop a mission statement and set goals. The Executive Committee held a second planning session in fall 2002 to assess JOD implementation and set goals for the remainder of the project.

The JOD Grant Team includes representatives from all JOD partner agencies and meets monthly to develop protocols implementing the objectives of the grant, including development of the public education materials, the Weapons Seizure Protocol, and the Conditional Pretrial Release Form. Subcommittees have been established over the course of the project to work on specific issues including the public education subcommittee, the pretrial subcommittee, and the weapons subcommittee. A new committee has met to explore intervention options for offenders convicted of dating violence who may not meet the classic batterer profile (a new offense in the state). In addition, the Executive Committee has recently taken on the role of developing a sustainability plan.

Technical Assistance

The sites received considerable help during planning and early implementation in the form of technical assistance provided by the Vera Institute under contract to OVW. The first major event was a kick-off conference in February 2000. This was followed by the Batterer Intervention Institutes held in May 2000 and August 2000 to assist in expanding court-ordered services for offenders. A Judicial Institute held in February/March 2001 was widely cited as helpful to judges in increasing their understanding of intimate partner violence and preparing them for their role in monitoring offenders. Project Directors' meetings in October 2000 and January 2001 provided opportunities for sites to exchange ideas and engage in joint problem solving. Further cross-site sharing of ideas took place at evaluation meetings in July 2000, January 2001, and October 2001. On site visits, judges, prosecution, law enforcement, victim services, and probation staff have expressed an interest in additional peer learning opportunities, such as site visits to other JOD sites or other promising practices sites. In addition, sites have requested and received additional technical assistance, as outlined in exhibit 1.3.

Exhibit 1.3. Technical Assistance to JOD in Dorchester, Milwaukee, and Washtenaw County

	Dorchester	Milwaukee	Washtenaw County
Technical Assistance (TA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November 2000. Pre-Engagement Planning Meeting—Judicial Institute. On-site consultation. • June 2001. Cultural competency training. On-site TA. • June 2001. Prosecutor Skills Training. On-site TA. • July 2001. Probation Pre-Engagement Planning Session. On-site consultation. • July/August 2002. Training and site visit to Men Stopping Violence focusing on working with African-American men who batter and working across racial, class, and gender lines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 2000—Implementation Planning. On-site TA. JOD partners and project staff presented implementation plan to national partners for feedback. • March 2001. Cultural Awareness Training. On-site TA. • April 2001. Domestic Offender Service Provider Meeting. On-site TA. • May 2001. Law Enforcement and Victim Advocate Partnerships. Telephone consultation. • June 2001. Probation Pre-Engagement Planning Session. On-site consultation. • August 2001. Domestic Violence Advocates and Batterer Intervention Services Providers. On-site TA. Vera Institute organized a meeting between the two groups. • August 2001. Record keeping and confidentiality issues. Telephone consultation. • November 2001. Working with Asha Family Services. On-site TA. Associates observed Asha, which provides services to both victims and perpetrators of domestic violence in the African-American community, and made recommendations. • February 2002. Pros and Cons of Specialty Units in Policing—Telephone Consultation. Strategized ways to create specialized domestic violence unit in Milwaukee. • April 2002. Representing Clients in Domestic Violence Cases. On-site engagement. Associates met with Milwaukee County Public and Private Defense Bar. • July 2002. Protocol for Victim Contact during Pretrial Phase—Telephone Consultation. Strategized ways to create standard operating procedures assuring safety for victim contact during pretrial period. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November 2000. Pre-Engagement Planning Meeting—Judicial Institute. On-site consultation. • April 2001. Probation Pre-Engagement Planning Session. On-site consultation. • May 2001. Promising Practice Site Visit to Brooklyn Domestic Violence Court. Consultation and Observation. Observed Brooklyn Court’s technology system. • Funding for artist to design web-based probation database.

LESSONS ON IMPLEMENTATION

LESSON: Successful management of JOD depends on a structured approach.

According to the sites, the core requirements are a full-time Project Director, regular meetings of a senior management team, and frequent ad hoc or regular meetings of subcommittees to work out the details of interagency collaboration. The executive committees or boards of the JOD project meet regularly to set policy and resolve problems. However, enacting change involves a myriad of details and expertise in specific areas. The projects all use subcommittees representing various agencies (including the Public Defender's Office) to help develop protocols and policies in specific topic areas.

The projects have also found that the management committees need to take an active role in problem solving and joint policy development. Meetings at which plans are presented without inviting input are not effective. The Washtenaw experience typifies lessons on how the management team needs to work. After early meetings, attendance at grant team meetings dropped off sharply because the focus was on partner agencies giving reports. The Executive Committee decided to change the focus to give partners opportunities to engage in collaborative problem solving. As a result, attendance has again risen and remains steady.

All projects agree that a full-time Project Director is essential and that the project struggled during times when this key position was empty. The Project Directors manage the relationships with all of the providers, raise funds, solve problems in the court process, set up systems, and monitor their efficient operation. They are free to enter into policy discussions in areas avoided by the judges, who remain mindful of the need to maintain a separation of power between their judicial responsibilities and debates on policies and practices of other JOD partners, including the public defenders and the prosecuting attorneys.

LESSON: Formal strategic planning is needed.

Sites need a formal strategic planning process in which agency representatives meet to identify objectives, the roles for each agency, the changes required within and across agencies, and responsibility for developing and implementing new policies and procedures. Even in communities with a history of coordinated responses to domestic violence, gaps in knowledge on the operations of partner agencies can be wide and deep. Strategic planning helped avert unanticipated implementation problems that arise when agencies do not have a solid understanding of the resources required, the existing practices, and the limitations of other partner agencies. The annual Strategic Management Planning sessions held in Dorchester in the first two years of operation were eye-opening events as agencies learned of the constraints and challenges faced by their partner agencies. The first session allowed for cross-training on agencies' roles, policies, and practices; and for collaborative identification of project goals, issues, and next steps. The second session celebrated successes and identified remaining issues and future directions. The meetings helped identify strategies and reduced misunderstandings as the project moved forward.

Milwaukee developed implementation plans in small subcommittees rather than involving all JOD partners in its strategic planning of the overall program. The subcommittee approach to planning, while efficient, may have led to a lack of understanding of how the partner agencies would coordinate on specific project components. For example, lack of concrete involvement by law enforcement in developing

the on-scene crisis response plans for victims of domestic violence led to difficulties in arranging for officers to accompany advocates to meet with victims shortly after arrest. Unexpected logistical problems have required several major shifts in JOD plans, which are still under revision nearly three years into the project.

LESSON: Partnerships need to be cultivated.

Developing partnerships among agencies is critical and requires ongoing attention. Since implementation, each demonstration site has developed multiple governmental and nongovernmental partnerships working to address domestic violence. JOD partners include victim advocacy organizations, local law enforcement agencies, prosecution offices, courts, probation and parole offices, representatives from the private and public defense bar, batterer intervention services, and other governmental and nongovernmental social service providers—all working to create long-term sustainability of positive local innovations.

New plans and opportunities mean that new partner agencies may wish to participate. The list of partner agencies has grown in every site and involvement by partner agencies has intensified.

But partnership participation cannot be taken for granted. Change in leadership of partner agencies can create problems. For example, as agency directors/judges/prosecutors/sheriffs/chiefs change, the priorities and goals of their agencies may shift, requiring a response from JOD. While some key positions in partner agencies have changed personnel, these changes have occurred fairly recently and their impact on JOD has yet to be fully felt. Changes or delays in filling the JOD Project Director position in several sites have made it difficult to keep JOD activities running smoothly at all times.

Several sites noted how valuable it was to include representatives of the defense bar in the planning process. While obviously most concerned with protecting the clients they defend and often resistant to JOD pretrial intervention, their understanding and input into processes designed to hold offenders accountable has raised important legal issues and helped ensure the integrity of the justice process during the reform efforts.

LESSON: JOD should be planned as an enhancement to partnerships addressing domestic violence.

Many communities have coordinated community responses (CCRs) to domestic violence. Merging JOD into the existing coordination efforts may or may not come readily, so special efforts may be needed to implement coordination at this level. The court may be the newcomer in a CCR to domestic violence that had a long history and existing structures and plans. In Milwaukee, coordination between JOD and the existing formal structure of the CCR (the Milwaukee Commission) has been slow to develop. In part, this was because the judges did not have formal membership on the Commission (defined legislatively) until April 2002, and the Commission's focus during the early period of JOD remained victim advocacy, not court process or linkages. In Washtenaw County and Dorchester, JOD grew out of, and fell naturally into, the ongoing operations of the existing CCR. In Dorchester, for example, the Court Roundtable grew into the Community Roundtable, which served as a springboard for various JOD initiatives (such as the new Triager position). The First Justice of Dorchester's JOD court session was a driving force behind the Court Roundtable when it was first established more than 10 years ago.

LESSON: Project staffing must accommodate local hiring regulations.

County and state rules governing recruiting and funding of new positions can slow the start of a new project and limit hiring options. When these obstacles are encountered, creative approaches may be needed to mitigate their effects. In Dorchester, the award was initially given entirely to the police department. However, the funds for enhanced probation had to be returned to the OVW and re-awarded to the Massachusetts Executive Office of Public Safety for the Massachusetts Trial Court for the first round of funding. In the second funding round, the Trial Court has been able to receive funds directly from OVW, due to changes in Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) provisions. Partner agency personnel showed extraordinary dedication in keeping the project moving forward when funding was not available and key staff were not yet on board (until October 2000).

Milwaukee also encountered challenges in staffing key JOD positions. County hiring freezes and seniority rules delayed the hiring of a Project Director and limited the pool of candidates who could be considered for key positions. Similarly, the selection of the probation officer to staff the new pretrial monitoring unit was governed by the Division of Community Corrections seniority rules, which resulted in appointment of an individual whose performance undermined the effectiveness of the new program. Moreover, when vacancies occurred during implementation, the long process required to replace staff disrupted the momentum of the project. Subsequently, Milwaukee has shifted more JOD-funded positions under court management.

LESSON: JOD projects need cross-agency management information systems.

None of the sites began JOD with cross-agency information systems that could be used to monitor offender contacts and status by partner agencies charged with holding them accountable. The critical role of information sharing is highlighted by the dramatic increase in cross-agency collaboration in Dorchester that accompanied the implementation of a high-risk/repeat offender database. The database, managed by the Police Department, is shared with the District Attorney and Probation and used to track the history and status of problem cases.

Washtenaw viewed improvement in data sharing as a key JOD activity, especially for tracking offenders' progress during probation. Washtenaw JOD was hampered during its first year by the lack of a data system for tracking offenders and the fact that its JOD funding did not provide for database development and data entry. Having to rely on paper files that subsequently had to be entered into electronic databases that had to be created required a huge investment for the project and hampered abilities to effectively track and monitor defendants. In response, Washtenaw has created a secure Internet-based application for tracking probation cases, bond conditions on pretrial cases, referral to batterer intervention programs using the secure web site, compliance reporting by batterer intervention programs to probation, and viewing of cases by judges. The county subsidized the development by contributing a web designer/programmer and a database consultant for the transfer of the information stored in a Microsoft[®] Access database to the web application. However, development required a long time and was expensive. It was implemented in the fall of 2002, and is expected to demonstrate its value in the next year.

Dorchester experienced delays in purchasing and installing of computers; not all partners have access to e-mail or the Internet. As a result, an integrated, cross-agency management information system was discussed but tabled on feasibility grounds. However, data from some partner agencies are collected on paper forms and entered into a database. This database is used to respond to local requests and to submit data to the

Urban Institute for the national evaluation. The process is labor intensive and is not used by the partner agencies for monitoring offenders. This makes the survival of data collection after the demonstration period questionable. A shared database for use by victim services providers is under development.

In Milwaukee, the Batterer Intervention Programs, probation officers, and court exchange information and court reports by phone and e-mail. The Probation Department's case management system, a statewide database, does not have a field for flagging domestic violence cases. Probation agents are responsible for tracking upcoming court dates and sending reports to the court the week of the probationers' reviews. Problems in existing data systems make it difficult for probation officers to identify the domestic violence offenders on their caseloads. The process of monitoring new arrests and restraining orders is not automated. No system of tracking cases from arrest to probation was available.

In order to track JOD activities, a Microsoft® Access database was designed to track cases in the pretrial program and paper forms were developed for agencies and the courts to use in submitting data. Unfortunately, staff turnover delayed the completion of the database and entry of data. As a result, a large number of paper coding forms on court activities accumulated and, when finally entered, had to be cross-checked with the court calendars for accuracy. This took months of staff time and the records were so delayed that they were not initially available for use in program operations when needed. However, beginning in mid-2002, monthly statistics are being submitted for evaluation and will be used to monitor program operations in the future.

Lesson: Planning for sustainability should begin early in the project.

Threats to funding are a significant challenge and can have a destabilizing effect on long-term planning for JOD. Efforts to enhance sustainability after federal funding ends should begin well before the end of the funding period. It takes a leap of faith to hire staff and make long-term commitments in the face of funding uncertainty. Milwaukee had to rework project plans when two sources of federal VAWA funds were combined, reducing the overall dollar amount available to partner agencies for domestic violence activities. In Dorchester, state partner agencies, including the Court, the Clerk's Office, Probation, and Prosecution, are challenged to maintain the resources needed to support JOD functions and goals by the severe budget crisis facing the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Some agencies have lost staff while others have been forced to assign JOD staff non-JOD responsibilities, resulting in heavier workloads for everyone. For example, the Probation Department's Domestic Violence Unit has not lost staff, but those officers have had to take non-domestic violence cases to compensate for staff losses in other sections of Probation. Vacancies in the Clerk's Office and Probation are creating significant backlogs in data entry into computerized records used by partner agencies to monitor offenders and cases.

One response has been an early start on planning for funding after the end of the demonstration period. Milwaukee has begun inviting individuals from the local funding community to participate in a sustainability committee. Washtenaw has begun developing a sustainability plan with members of the Executive Team. The Project Director has also briefed the county commissioners and met with county executives about sustaining JOD. The Education Subcommittee is working on a communications strategy to help raise community and nonprofit agency interest in the goals of JOD. Dorchester is in the process of establishing a sustainability subcommittee, comprised of local leaders, political activists, and representatives of the funding community.

LESSON: Training and technical assistance by an outside provider are essential.

JOD partner agencies repeatedly emphasized the critical role of specialized training and technical assistance in helping them understand the problems facing victims, offenders, and the professionals who interact with them. In Milwaukee, judges, prosecutors, and service providers all spoke of the value of the special training they received, stating that it gave them the knowledge and confidence to move beyond existing practices and broke down local barriers of mistrust stemming from differences in professional orientation and experience. Representatives from all the sites' many partner agencies have participated in a variety of training activities, both local and national. The kinds of assistance cited as helpful include formal off-site training, visits to other jurisdictions to learn from them, and individualized technical assistance (TA) from experts on particular problems facing the site. Weekly rotating conference calls between JOD site personnel and national partners, and Project Director and Site Evaluation Coordinator meetings have been held regularly. The Vera Institute also assists site personnel in identifying and attending OVW-approved TA events hosted by other providers.

Enhancing Offender Accountability

This section describes the original plans JOD sites proposed for enhancing offender accountability, the changes and additions made during the first 18 months, and lessons from their experiences. These new activities built upon the programs and services in place at each site at the start of JOD, as described in the earlier report, *Evaluation of the Judicial Oversight Demonstration Initiative: Baseline and Implementation Report* (DeStefano, Harrell, Newmark, and Visser, 2001).

JOD PLANS

Dorchester identified five objectives around the goal of increased offender accountability. JOD planned to:

- create a specialized domestic violence court session to manage all civil restraining orders, misdemeanors, and lower-level felony criminal cases, including post-disposition reviews of probationers;
- expand the domestic violence unit in the District Attorney's Office by implementing vertical prosecution and facilitating evidence-based prosecution through improved case preparation and staff training;
- train police officers in advanced case investigation, improve procedures for identifying high-risk cases, improve information sharing by developing new reporting systems, and use overtime for case preparation;
- enhance the probation office's domestic violence unit by doubling staff, reducing caseloads, and providing intensive supervision to all domestic violence probationers;
- develop and implement an educational program for restraining order respondents in conjunction with the defense bar, batterer intervention programs, and victim services;
- expand the availability of batterer intervention services to indigent and Haitian Creole speaking offenders; and
- provide training to other JOD partners and work more closely with probation officers and victims.

Milwaukee plans for improving the system oversight of offenders included:

- addition of a dedicated, five-days-a-week domestic violence Court Commissioner in a separate court to handle all pretrial appearances (after initial appearance) and to oversee intensive pretrial monitoring of defendants;
- expanded prosecution capacity from a domestic violence team of about 7 Assistant District Attorneys to 11 (addition of 2 each for misdemeanor and felony prosecutions);
- introduction of specialized domestic violence detectives and investigative equipment;
- revision of deferred prosecution agreements and training for defense bar;

- implementation of specialized pretrial supervision unit for cases originating in two of the seven police districts through the hiring and training of two pretrial agents;
- expansion of capacity for community service providers to assist domestic violence victims and offenders by providing subcontracts to four existing service agencies;
- appointment of a new domestic violence court resource monitor to manage domestic violence caseload after conviction and sentencing to ensure that judges' orders are implemented; and
- initiation of post-conviction, in-court probation reviews 60 to 90 days after sentencing.

Washtenaw County planned to create new systems including:

- a centralized Domestic Violence Prosecution Unit consisting of five dedicated domestic violence prosecutors, two government victim advocates, and two domestic violence investigators;
- a Domestic Violence Probation Unit consisting of five dedicated domestic violence probation agents and a dedicated domestic violence probation supervisor;
- dedicated domestic violence dockets in all district courts in the county;
- enhanced bond conditions for defendants in domestic violence cases;
- post-conviction review hearings for domestic violence offenders on probation;
- increased contact between batterer intervention programs and probation officers; and
- a batterer intervention program within the county jail for incarcerated offenders (both those held pending trial and those serving sentences).

STRATEGIES IMPLEMENTED

The four core components of enhanced offender accountability in all three sites are:

- new judicial monitoring;
- enhancements in prosecution;
- expanded probation monitoring; and
- expanded use of batterer intervention programs.

To support these activities, JOD has worked closely with law enforcement agencies to build a stronger basis for prosecution and enforcement of probation conditions. In the exhibits in the following sections, site activities in these areas are described and those introduced as part of JOD are shown in bold.

Judicial Monitoring

Judicial monitoring at the three sites is described in exhibit 2.1. Regular probation review hearings are a major feature of the demonstration projects. Defendants placed on probation attend post-disposition hearings to review their compliance with probation conditions. Probation conditions almost always include enrollment in a Batterer Intervention Program and may include other conditions such as payment of fees, alcohol and drug evaluation, drug testing, employment, community service,

and restitution. Based on the report from probation and testimony at the hearing, sanctions may be imposed if violations have occurred or offenders may be congratulated on their progress. In Milwaukee, the judge will consider lifting the no-contact order for probationers (which is imposed at intake) if the offender has complied with Batterer Intervention Program requirements, the victim approves, and the probation officer recommends the change. In other sites, the no-contact order typically ends at sentencing.

In Dorchester, hearings are scheduled at 30, 60, and 120 days after sentencing, and at the end of probation. These hearings take place before the JOD judge who adjudicated¹ and sentenced the case. Probation officers report progress and status based on input from their contacts with the probationer, victims, Batterer Intervention Programs, and other collateral sources. Judges use this information to sanction or commend the probationers as needed. In addition to these periodic reviews, “surrender hearings” are held when a possible violation is reported. There is a commitment to swift sanctions, so these hearings may or may not occur in front of the same judge who handled the case (depending on judges’ availability).

In Milwaukee, hearings are set at the discretion of the judge and generally occur between 90 and 180 days after sentencing. Probation officers e-mail their reports to the judge the Wednesday before the Friday afternoon hearings. This has recently been changed to the Monday before Friday review hearings. Probation officers appear in person or send a liaison. A supervisor from the Wisconsin Department of Corrections often attends the review hearings in person to emphasize the importance of the hearings and support the officers, because the program is new; the probation department is large (more than 400 agents, all of whom can supervise domestic violence offenders); and staff turnover is high.

In Washtenaw County, hearings in two of the three domestic violence courts are scheduled for 30 days after sentencing; depending on circumstances, another hearing is held about 60 days after sentencing. Additional hearings are scheduled depending on the individual case. In the third county court, one hearing occurs about six months to one year after sentencing. Probation agents attend all review hearings. Judges receive written compliance reports from probation officers in the week before the hearing. In addition, judges often ask questions of the officers during the hearing.

In our interviews with them, JOD judges have stressed the importance of preparing judges for assignment to domestic violence courts and teaching them the importance of regular review hearings. Most of the JOD judges have attended the National Judicial College before or early in their assignment and report that it was extremely valuable. Judges have also participated in local training; observed the courtrooms of other domestic violence judges; developed protocols for use at arraignment and sentencing; and met to discuss issues as they arise. The challenge of judicial preparation has been most pressing in Milwaukee, because judges are regularly rotated, bringing new judges into the court every year or two. However, the policy of rotation is expanding the number of judges with in-depth familiarity with domestic violence.

¹ The small number of cases that are disposed by jury trial are tried by other judges in separate trial court sessions.

Exhibit 2.1. Judicial Monitoring in Dorchester, Milwaukee, and Washtenaw County

	Dorchester Services/ JOD Innovations	Milwaukee Services/ JOD Innovations	Washtenaw County Services/ JOD Innovations
Judicial Review	<p>Creation of a new domestic violence court session, staffed by two to three judges 40 hours or more per week.</p> <p>Probation review hearings scheduled at 30 days post-disposition, 60 days, 120 days, and at the end of the probationary period. Prior to JOD, post-disposition court appearances only happened when there was a probation violation or a new arrest.</p>	<p>Probation review hearings scheduled 3–6 months after sentencing. Probation agents prepare and submit electronically to the judge a supervision status report that includes information on Batterer Intervention Program referral and attendance; alcohol or drug abuse, and mental health testing, assessment, and treatment; job training and employment; continued education; victim information and wishes regarding the no-contact order; and general adjustment to probation.</p> <p>Consolidation of the domestic violence felony charges from the general court to the domestic violence courts.</p>	<p>Creation of dedicated Domestic Violence dockets in all district courts in the county with judges routinely issuing no-contact orders prior to trial.</p> <p>Standardized judicial policies and procedures so that domestic violence is responded to consistently across the county (e.g., arraignment script for judges).</p> <p>Initial probation review hearing scheduled for 30 days after sentencing.</p> <p>Court orders developed to retrieve, store, or destroy a weapon confiscated during a domestic violence arrest.</p> <p>Domestic violence web application for monitoring probation and Batterer Intervention Program compliance with court-ordered conditions. Judges will be able to view compliance with their orders; Batterer Intervention Programs to receive referrals from and provide compliance information in a searchable application; and the evaluator to analyze pretrial and probation information in a readily accessible format.</p>

Court Operations

Sites made a number of operational changes to support the additional court workloads (see exhibit 2.2). All judges report that the assignment to the domestic violence court is demanding, but are gratified at the results they see.

In Dorchester, three judges share the domestic violence cases by taking alternating days in a newly established session (the domestic violence courtroom). One of the judges has recently been transferred to another district and a new judge has been assigned. Cases are vertically adjudicated from pretrial through the probation review hearings, although surrender hearings, with an emphasis on swift sanctions and efficiency of probation operations, may not be heard before the same judge. Also, this session handles civil restraining orders as well as misdemeanor and lower-level felony criminal cases. Prior to JOD, these cases were heard across a number of different sessions.

The caseload is very high and judges often work long days to clear the docket. Because this is a busy court, it can sometimes be difficult to assemble all parties at once, so that an action can go forward. Efforts have focused on identifying ways to make the court session operate more efficiently.

In the Milwaukee District Court, which previously had specialized domestic violence misdemeanor courts, the three domestic violence courtrooms were moved to be adjacent to facilitate sharing staff, scheduling attorneys, and working with victims. The dockets expanded to include the felony domestic violence cases previously heard in other criminal courts. The three judges hear cases scheduled for trial (a relatively large portion) and conduct the probation review hearings. The judges rotate assignments, typically every two years, so that the number of different judges with the assignment is now growing. One judge is assigned as a lead for the domestic violence courts to ensure continuity and mentor new domestic violence judges. As part of the court reorganization, a new Intake Court was created to begin early assistance to victims and monitor offenders awaiting case disposition. A domestic violence Intake Court Commissioner, a position funded by JOD, sets bail conditions and handles pretrial hearings for domestic violence offenders not in custody at the time of the first hearing. Those released after the first appearance are then scheduled for pretrial hearings before the commissioner. A pretrial monitoring program was established in the Commissioner's court to enhance offender accountability and protect victim safety during the early phases of the case.

Several changes have been made to the pretrial monitoring program. Initially, two probation officers, supported by JOD, were assigned to the Intake Court to monitor defendant compliance with no-contact orders and check on victim safety. From the start, the plan to monitor defendants was hampered by the lack of a stable location, no system for tracking offender status, the absence of clear, written operational policies, and resistance from the defense bar. The defense bar filed a challenge to the plan to place defendants arrested in two police precincts in the monitoring program, arguing that they were unfairly singled out for scrutiny and not treated like other defendants. When this challenge was upheld, JOD shifted to targeting higher-risk defendants (identified on the basis of criminal history of domestic violence) for monitoring. In March 2002, monitoring was suspended due to serious problems with the performance of one of the probation officers. Currently, the Commissioner schedules three pretrial review hearings with eligible defendants who appear before him with defense attorneys to review their compliance with bail conditions. JOD has hired one county employee who assists in the compliance monitoring of defendants but the maximum number of

defendants that can be monitored is currently only 30. In Dorchester and Washtenaw, active pretrial monitoring as part of JOD was not feasible.

In Washtenaw County, dedicated domestic violence dockets were created in each of three county courts with dedicated judges assigned to these cases in each court. Each court has designated one day per week as the day for domestic violence cases. On these days, all matters are scheduled, including pretrial hearings, pending motions, sentencing, and probation reviews. (However, jury selections occur on a different day.) Although there is not a formal rotation policy for judges in the county courts, there have been some judges added since JOD began.

**Exhibit 2.2. Changes in Court Operations in
Dorchester, Milwaukee, and Washtenaw County**

	Dorchester Services/ JOD Innovations	Milwaukee Services/ JOD Innovations	Washtenaw County Services/ JOD Innovations
Pretrial Monitoring	Because of inadequate court resources and strong defendants' rights laws in the state, this does not occur (except very rarely) in Dorchester District Court cases. This is unchanged from the pre-JOD period.	<p>Creation of an Intake Court (September 2000). The Intake Court Commissioner sets bond and bail conditions and schedules pretrial proceedings.</p> <p>Pretrial monitoring (September 2000–April 2002) replaced in June 2002 by the Bail Monitoring Program where the focus shifted from offender monitoring to victim safety staffed by a bail monitor who is an employee of JOD.</p>	<p>Pretrial monitoring. Development of new Order of Conditional Release form, which defendant is required to sign, acknowledging conditions of release. Defendants may be ordered to submit to urine tests for drug use. However, formal monitoring in the pretrial period does not occur. The new form was also printed in Spanish.</p> <p>New Bond Review group meetings to explain bond conditions held by Domestic Violence Probation Unit. Defendants are required to attend a meeting at the Domestic Violence Probation Unit during which the general conditions of release and any specific requirements are explained. Immediate bench warrant request developed for persons failing to schedule or appear at this meeting.</p> <p>Developed script to be used by judges and magistrates for arraignment on domestic violence charges.</p>

Enhanced Prosecution

All three sites have made changes to their prosecution of intimate partner cases as part of JOD. Changes shown in exhibit 2.3 include:

More staff assigned to domestic violence prosecution. The number of prosecutors assigned to domestic violence cases was increased in every JOD site. Dorchester doubled the number from two to four and added a supervisor, a victim witness advocate, and an investigator to their domestic violence prosecution unit. Milwaukee created four new Assistant District Attorney (ADA) positions with JOD funds—two assigned to felony cases, one assigned to prosecute misdemeanor cases vertically, and one assigned to a new Court Commissioner’s docket to handle pretrial proceedings. Washtenaw County created a new Domestic Violence Prosecution Unit staffed by five attorneys, two victim/witness advocates, and an investigator. (The grant coordinator, administrative coordinator, and site evaluation coordinator are also affiliated with the unit.)

Vertical prosecution. In Washtenaw, prosecutors are assigned to specific courtrooms and handle cases from pretrial through sentencing. In Milwaukee, vertical prosecution is used in felony and serious misdemeanor cases. Because vertical prosecution in these cases presents scheduling problems, the two full-time ADA positions are shared by three ADAs. In Dorchester, the ADAs began vertically prosecuting cases with the advent of JOD and the additional resources it brought.

Evidence-based prosecution. Sites have struggled to improve their ability to prosecute cases without requiring victim testimony. This is difficult and is used most widely in felony cases, although Washtenaw is trying this approach with some serious misdemeanors. The Milwaukee Domestic Violence Prosecution Unit has begun using tapes of offenders’ phone calls to the victims (or other witnesses) to influence their testimony, to support additional charges of bail jumping and/or intimidation of a witness. They have also started work on a manual on domestic violence prosecution under a STOP grant. The Boston Police Department now uses a revised version of its reporting form to enhance evidence collection, and Washtenaw has focused law enforcement training on improving evidence collection. In addition, in Dorchester and Washtenaw, the District Attorney’s Office has a Domestic Violence Investigator whose function is to provide better evidence collection for evidence-based prosecution.

Diversion. In Milwaukee, JOD has also revised its deferred prosecution agreements to limit eligibility for a seven-month deferral with strict requirements including Batterer Intervention Program graduation. Rights waived at acceptance of the agreement mean that defendants who fail to comply face immediate prospects of jail sentences. In Washtenaw and Dorchester, deferrals are quite rare which means that the Prosecution often has no option but to dismiss weak cases. If a deferral policy was in place, such defendants could receive batterer intervention and probation supervision and upon completion, their cases would be dismissed. However, such policies are risky without ability to ensure penalties for failure without close supervision.

Exhibit 2.3. Prosecution in Dorchester, Milwaukee, and Washtenaw County

	Dorchester Services/ JOD Innovations	Milwaukee Services/ JOD Innovations	Washtenaw County Services/ JOD Innovations
Prosecution	<p>Dorchester Domestic Violence Unit in the Suffolk County District Attorney’s Office doubled to four ADAs (plus a supervisor, a victim witness advocate, and an investigator), with JOD funds. New ADAs have received training, which has much enhanced the quality of their casework. They prosecute cases vertically and use an evidence-based prosecution policy.</p> <p>Domestic Violence unit established a protocol to help probation officers conduct probation violation hearings, and a mechanism to refer cases to the U.S. Attorney’s Office for federal prosecution, when appropriate.</p>	<p>Domestic Violence Prosecution Unit created. Four new Assistant District Attorneys (ADAs) hired in fall 2000.</p> <p>Vertical prosecution of felony cases. Two full-time ADA assignments shared by three ADAs due to scheduling issues.</p> <p>Revised procedures for Deferred Prosecution Agreements. Eligibility clarified, now based on the number and substance of prior criminal offenses. During seven-month deferral, the defendant must refrain from further violence, comply with bail conditions, pay domestic abuse assessment fee, and complete a Batterer Intervention Program.</p> <p>Increased focus on evidence-based prosecution. Charging rates are down but number of convictions up. Charging now linked to strength of evidence. Prosecution using excited utterances made to the police officer at scene and tapes of phone calls from jail used to intimidate witnesses or victims.</p> <p>Began issuing bail-jumping charges for Failure to Appear at court hearings.</p>	<p>Creation of a Domestic Violence Prosecution Unit. Unit has five attorneys, two victim witness advocates, one investigator, an administrative coordinator, a grant coordinator, and the local evaluator.</p> <p>Vertical prosecution with assistant prosecutors assigned to designated courts handling particular cases from the pretrial through sentencing and review hearings.</p> <p>Training for evidence-based prosecution.</p>

Probation Supervision

Probation supervision and required participation in Batterer Intervention Programs are critical JOD strategies for enhancing offender accountability. Site activities are shown in exhibit 2.4.

Dorchester doubled the number of officers assigned to its existing domestic violence unit to eight with JOD funds. This led to smaller caseloads and more time for home visits, contacts with victims, and with the Batterer Intervention Programs and other collateral sources. The police department is collaborating by providing escorts for officers on home visits in high-risk cases (identified by probation officers' assessments of potential dangerousness and the police department's database). In addition, two assistant probation officers have been assigned to the courtroom to provide criminal records, record case dispositions, and perform intake and other probation paperwork.

In Milwaukee, where the number of eligible offenders exceeds the caseload capacity of the specialized domestic violence agents, the specialized agents are responsible for helping other agents monitor JOD clients and monitor victim safety. To improve domestic violence case management the project is developing a protocol for victim contact and a protocol to govern information sharing with the District Attorney's Office. Although many probation officers initially feared the heavier workload and reporting requirement, acceptance is growing as officers receive reinforcement and support for the efforts to require probationers to comply with the conditions of supervision.

Washtenaw County created a specialized Domestic Violence Probation Unit to provide intensive supervision and collect victim input for presentence investigation reports. For the pretrial period, Washtenaw introduced bond condition review meetings, managed by the Domestic Violence Probation Unit and scheduled within 24 hours of arraignment, at which defendants are required to sign a form acknowledging their understanding of bond conditions and willingness to abide by them. Warrants are issued for failure to schedule or to appear at the bond condition review meeting. The Probation Unit also has developed protocols for home visits; protocols for presentence interviews and case supervision are in development. One innovative strategy has been to require domestic violence probationers to report to a group meeting at the probation office as part of their supervision requirement. (This procedure was initiated by a probation official from one court and is being utilized by other courts in the county.) Another innovation is surprise visits by probation agents at Batterer Intervention Program groups to test probationers for alcohol consumption.

Exhibit 2.4. Probation Supervision in Dorchester, Milwaukee, and Washtenaw County

	Dorchester Services/ JOD Innovations	Milwaukee Services/ JOD Innovations	Washtenaw County Services/ JOD Innovations
Probation Supervision	<p>Domestic Violence Probation Unit doubled to eight officers, cutting caseloads in half. Consequently, probation officers have been able to make more contact with victims, more home visits to probationers, and more collateral contacts with Batterer Intervention Programs and others who work with probationers through field visits.</p> <p>Two Assistant Probation Officer positions assigned to the Domestic Violence courtroom. Their function is to record case dispositions and new cases assigned to probation, to strengthen the link with the court.</p> <p>Fatherhood Program is often used as a condition of probation.</p>	<p>Domestic Violence Specialist Agents located in each Probation Unit.</p> <p>Enhanced communication with victims.</p> <p>Protocol developed for the District Attorney’s Office to share victim information with Probation.</p> <p>Probation sends victims letter providing their name and number. The agency is also in the process of developing a protocol for victim contact to be used by all agents including the non-domestic violence specialist.</p> <p>Probation sentence information and probation contact information routinely sent to victim by the Victim Witness Specialist.</p> <p>Increased communication with the courts. Regular court reports on offender status are e-mailed to the Domestic Violence Judge each Wednesday (now Monday).</p>	<p>Creation of a specialized Domestic Violence Probation Unit to provide intensive monitoring of domestic violence offenders. Prior to this unit, there was intensive supervision of domestic violence offenders in only one of the four courts.</p> <p>Developed protocols for home visits, presentence interviews, and case supervision.</p> <p>Monthly surprise breath tests at Batterer Intervention Program meetings.</p> <p>Probation agents are contacting more victims prior to sentencing for input into their pretrial sentencing reports.</p> <p>Web-based communication among the courts, probation, and Batterer Intervention Program.</p> <p>Group reporting for probationers from the 15th District Court.</p>

Batterer Intervention

JOD planners in each community have had to address the need for (1) supporting Batterer Intervention Programs for large numbers of indigent clients, (2) delivering culturally specific services for local immigrant communities, heterosexual female offenders, and other groups, and (3) deciding how to use Batterer Intervention Program with clients in need of treatment for other problems including substance abuse and mental health disorders.

The Batterer Intervention Program enhancements varied by site (see exhibit 2.5). In Dorchester, Batterer Intervention Programs, including specialized services for offenders who speak Haitian Creole, Cape Verdean Creole, Vietnamese, and Spanish, are generally available, as well as services for gay men and lesbian women. Batterer Intervention Programs also address offenders' financial constraints. Community service in lieu of payment is available for the indigent. One gap is that programs are not available for heterosexual women, who are a significant minority of those on probation for intimate partner violence. In Milwaukee, the four Batterer Intervention Program providers received JOD funding to offset the costs of serving new clients, many of whom pay on a sliding scale that does not cover costs. As a result, the number of groups has expanded and increased the availability of services shaped to the needs of minority and immigrant populations. Washtenaw County added a Batterer Intervention Program to the jail for incarcerated offenders with funding from JOD. The demand for services created by JOD has also doubled the number of groups conducted per week. Payment options, including community service and a sliding fee scale, were in place prior to JOD. Serving probationers with multiple problems (mental illness, heavy drug use) remains a challenge in Washtenaw, and it is beginning to be addressed by a collaboration of Dawn Farm (a substance abuse treatment provider) and one of the Batterer Intervention Programs.

Exhibit 2.5. Batterer Treatment in Dorchester, Milwaukee, and Washtenaw County

	Dorchester Services/ JOD Innovations	Milwaukee Services/ JOD Innovations	Washtenaw County Services/ JOD Innovations
Batterer Intervention Program	<p>Two Batterer Intervention Program providers take most referrals, but three to four other programs have also accepted Dorchester clients. No waiting lists. Specialized services are available for clients who speak Haitian Creole, Cape Verdean Creole, Vietnamese, and Spanish, and for gay men and lesbian women. Charge on a sliding scale, with community service as a payment option for very indigent clients.</p> <p>Batterer Intervention Programs are strongly regulated in Massachusetts and have strict practice and reporting requirements.</p> <p>The Dorchester Batterer Intervention Programs provide Probation with regular monthly reports and next-day notifications of problems or terminations. They coordinate with probation officers about Batterer Intervention Program session attendance, so that probation officers can contact victims during a time the officer knows the batterer will not be with the victim.</p>	<p>New Deferred Prosecution Agreement criteria are providing clients an opportunity to complete Batterer Intervention Program pre-adjudication.</p> <p>JOD funding to offset indigent clients. Batterer Intervention Program maintains that without JOD funding for Batterer Intervention Program they would not be able to serve the number of clients they have been serving on a sliding scale.</p> <p>Expanded capacity for Batterer Intervention Program. All four batterer treatment programs in Milwaukee expanded by offering more groups and adding specialized groups. Specialized groups for women, African Americans, and Spanish speakers, and those who wish to continue after completing Batterer Intervention Program requirements.</p>	<p>Added Batterer Intervention Program in the county jail for incarcerated offenders (both those held pending trial and those serving sentences).</p> <p>Expanded capacity. At the largest service provider of Batterer Intervention Program in Washtenaw, groups in the community have more than doubled from 5–6 per week to 13 per week.</p> <p>Initiated regular, formal communication on offender progress and attitude between Batterer Intervention Program and Probation.</p> <p>Increased interaction with other JOD partners. JOD has led to regular discussions between Batterer Intervention Program and other JOD partners, which facilitates problem solving.</p>

Law Enforcement

JOD has worked with law enforcement agencies on strategies for report writing and evidence collection to support evidence-based prosecution (see exhibit 2.6).

In Dorchester, law enforcement enhancements have taken place at the precinct level and citywide. In the three police precincts serving the JOD court in Dorchester, the number of domestic violence detectives was increased to three per precinct, although this enhancement has not used JOD funds. Each precinct also has a domestic violence victim advocate, who is supported with JOD funds. Under JOD, police reporting forms have been improved to enhance evidence collection. Officers in these precincts are also accompanying probation officers on home visits in high-risk cases. In addition, the police department is placing priority on serving warrants for probation violations committed by JOD clients. The Boston Police Department's centralized Domestic Violence Unit shares its high-risk/repeat offender database with prosecutors, probation officers, and JOD staff on a daily basis. The unit also provides support to precincts throughout the city, providing statistical reports, training, and policy development, and is currently planning training sessions on report-writing policies and on vicarious traumatization.

For the first two years, Milwaukee JOD tried to implement early crisis response by having advocates called to the scene of domestic violence incidents while police were on site. The plan was dropped because it was not feasible to provide police staff to remain at the scene to guarantee advocate safety. However, two recent initiatives announced by the Milwaukee Police Chief are expected to significantly benefit JOD. One initiative is a January 2002 directive, requiring photographs at the scene of all domestic violence arrests. Policies on the transmission and use of these photographs are still being worked out between the District Attorney's Office and the Milwaukee Police Department. Although the judges reported that photographs were not being used frequently, they could increase the likelihood that defendants would accept plea offers when faced with photographic evidence. The second initiative is a specialized Family Violence Unit in the Police Department, expected to begin in 2003, which will include a JOD-funded victim specialist to work on intimate partner violence cases. Major goals of the unit will be homicide prevention and improved investigation of domestic violence cases. One issue that has caused discussion between the court and the police department has been the cost of police officers (often at overtime rates) to attend jury trials, many of which result in dismissal when the victim does not appear. JOD is attempting to address the problem through improved evidence collection to support prosecution without witnesses.

Washtenaw County is served by 11 police/sheriff departments, some of which are quite small. JOD has worked to make the incident reports received by the courts more detailed so that prosecution can proceed without requiring victims to testify. Extensive training has been provided for officers in the dynamics of domestic violence, identification of primary perpetrator, and evidence collection. However, it has been difficult to get participation in the training from all 11 agencies. The four largest law enforcement agencies have designated staff to work to enhance the consistency of domestic violence practices in their departments. Ypsilanti hired a civilian coordinator to review reports, check on subpoena delivery, assist in data collection and victim referrals, and update the procedures manual. Ann Arbor hired an assistant to help the domestic violence detective in investigations. In October 2002, all law enforcement agencies in the State of Michigan were required under a new state

law to use a common incident reporting form or one substantially similar to it. To support enforcement, all district courts have begun entering misdemeanor domestic warrants into the Law Enforcement Information Network (LEIN), a statewide electronic database operated by the Michigan State Police, which is accessible to all Michigan law enforcement officers.

Additional law enforcement initiatives are being planned at each site. The Boston Police Department does not currently have a progressive policy for responding to situations in which a police officer is the subject of a restraining order. They are now focusing attention on this problem. In Milwaukee, pretrial services has a warrant unit (Failure to Appear Program), which acts on orders from the court to locate defendants and get them to court within seven days of a warrant. The program has been successful in getting 45 percent of the referred misdemeanor defendants with warrants to report to court. JOD staff hope that this will help reduce the large number of outstanding warrants for domestic violence offenders. Washtenaw County is challenged by the differences in policies and practices of 11 different law enforcement agencies operating in the county, but was expecting help from the implementation of a similar incident reporting form in the fall of 2002.

Exhibit 2.6. Law Enforcement in Dorchester, Milwaukee, and Washtenaw County

	Dorchester Services/ JOD Innovations	Milwaukee Services/ JOD Innovations	Washtenaw County Services/ JOD Innovations
Law Enforcement	<p>The Boston Police Department's (BPD) Domestic Violence Unit provides statistical reports, policy development, and training citywide.</p> <p>BPD has provided training on identifying dominant aggressors and mutual arrest, enforcement of report-writing policies by supervisory staff, and vicarious traumatization training is pending.</p> <p>Police developed and share a high-risk/repeat offender database with prosecutors, probation, and JOD staff.</p> <p>The three police precincts serving Dorchester District Court added Domestic Violence Detectives to their Domestic Violence Units to ensure day and night shift coverage, but this did not use JOD funds. The precincts also added Peace Liaisons (victim advocates) who specialize in domestic violence cases, using JOD funds. One of the precincts is piloting an on-call program to provide on-scene advocate response, but this is not supported with JOD funds.</p> <p>Police officers partner with probation officers to do evening home visits to high-risk cases, and to enhance the service of warrants for probation violations.</p>	<p>Family Violence Police Unit in the Sensitive Crimes Division (due in 2003). Model will loosely mirror the Colorado Springs Domestic Violence Enhanced Response Team. JOD to provide a victim liaison position for this unit to respond exclusively to intimate partner violence cases. Unit will work on investigation to support evidence-based prosecution. Intensive teams will be assigned to go back to problem locations when they get repeat calls from an address and the team will build evidence in this case and provide support to victims.</p> <p>Milwaukee Police Department (MPD) began taking photographs at the scenes of domestic violence incidents. As of February 2002, Milwaukee has reported that more than 40% of MPD cases included photos, which represents a dramatic increase in use of this type of evidence.</p>	<p>Training of law enforcement on investigation techniques.</p> <p>Designated Domestic Violence Officer in four largest police departments. Working on consistent domestic violence practices in their department.</p> <p>Ypsilanti PD hired a civilian Domestic Violence Coordinator to review domestic violence reports, assist in data collection, assist victims with referrals, assist with subpoena delivery, and update the department's domestic violence procedural manual.</p> <p>Pittsfield Township PD hired a Public Safety Domestic Violence Officer.</p> <p>Ann Arbor PD hired a Community Services Assistant to assist the Domestic Violence Investigator.</p> <p>Misdemeanor domestic violence warrants on non-in-custody defendants for domestic violence defendants in all district courts now entered into Law Enforcement Information Network. If a defendant is rearrested, the police will know immediately that he/she has an outstanding domestic violence charge.</p> <p>New state-required standardized domestic violence reports to be used by all law enforcement agencies (October 2002).</p>

LESSONS ON OFFENDER ACCOUNTABILITY

LESSON: JOD is helping justice agencies develop consistent policies for handling of intimate partner violence cases.

In Dorchester and Washtenaw County, judicial meetings and discussions of policies on pleas, sentencing, probation conditions, and their enforcement are occurring regularly. In all sites, prosecutors and probation departments are developing written policies and procedures for domestic violence cases to be applied by staff, and Batterer Intervention Programs have improved case tracking and reporting procedures. One effect of these changes is likely to be increased consistency in the response to these offenders, reducing the potential for bias and increasing the predictability of outcomes. This, in turn, is expected to reduce use of continuances and may increase the speed and perceived fairness of case disposition. However, one of the drawbacks of highly structured responses is a lack of flexibility in taking into account the specific circumstances facing defendants and their victims. Informal interviews with victims in two of the sites suggest that some victims would have preferred different case outcomes than those that occurred.

LESSON: JOD is shifting views of the role of the courts and judges, but not without controversy.

JOD judges are committed to the independence of the judiciary and their role as interpreter of the law. They avoid involvement in policy decisions on substantive matters that might come before them. At the same time, they are committed to systemic changes in the courts designed to improve the administration of justice, which entails holding offenders accountable under the law. They realize the importance of being seen as “fair” and not biased toward either the victim or the defendant, and the difficult balancing act between the presumption of innocence versus willingness to hear the kinds of evidence relevant to domestic violence. The JOD sites have involved defense bar representatives as full network partners in planning in an effort to retain a balance between advocacy on behalf of victims and defendants in court cases. As evidence of the balancing act the JOD judges are engaged in, all of the sites have struggled with prosecution when the victim is unwilling to testify. Some judges are reluctant to admit evidence without the victim’s corroboration (although Milwaukee has had success with both felony and misdemeanor cases). In Dorchester, the implementation of the education program for restraining order respondents is not only useful to participants, but has also been reported to promote an image of the court as fair and even-handed.

LESSON: Specialization is extremely helpful in achieving JOD goals.

Intimate partner violence cases require close monitoring, an understanding of domestic violence, and collaboration and data sharing across agencies. Dedicated prosecutors in the JOD sites allow staff to become experts in their field and develop techniques for evidence-based prosecution. Dedicated probation officers, also used in all sites, can provide more intensive supervision and allow agents to become experts in the complex interpersonal dynamics involved in intimate partner violence cases. In Milwaukee, which has a large probation staff and multiple offices, agents with specialized domestic violence caseloads are located in each office to serve as a resource to those officers who have intimate partner violence offenders within a general caseload.

In Washtenaw, the co-location of specialized units for prosecution and probation in one building provides opportunities for discussions among partner agencies on complex or

difficult cases, when appropriate. This office provides a natural hub for cross-agency exchange of police, prosecutor, probation and victim advocate information.

LESSON: JOD courts must proactively manage increased workloads.

To sustain JOD, courts will need to find ways to manage the court workload, particularly in the face of shrinking state budget support for court functions.

In Dorchester, JOD workloads are challenging court staff with sessions running into overtime hours regularly. This has an adverse effect on morale and may produce staff turnover. Scheduling in a single courtroom with a huge backlog of cases is difficult. Emergencies must be given priority; defendants picked up on outstanding warrants must be seen; and restraining order requests must be heard. Only extremely dedicated JOD judges and staff have allowed the project to sustain a high level of judicial monitoring.

Milwaukee's court reorganization has minimized, but not eliminated, the stress of intensive judicial monitoring. Locating the three courts next to each other has helped the attorneys and victim/witness unit organize their schedules and the courtrooms to share work. The use of JOD funds to support a domestic violence commissioner freed the judges for trial and review hearings and has reduced early continuances and delays. Review hearings are scheduled for Friday afternoons, which was the only time when a sufficient number of deputy sheriffs could be assigned to the courtroom to take noncomplying probationers into custody. Despite the additional resources, the extra hearings at pretrial and probation review place additional demands on court staff, the Public Defender's Office (which must provide defense attorneys for the hearings), and probation officers who are expected to attend reviews in person with their clients even when they are not on duty that day.

In Washtenaw County, the reorganization of the court workload into a dedicated docket has not required additional funds and may actually have reduced the time spent in court by court personnel and others who attend domestic violence hearings. However, the dedication of a domestic violence probation officer to each court is an added cost, as well as the two domestic violence victim specialists in the District Attorney's Office who were funded under JOD. The Public Defender's Office has experienced a considerable increase in workload and the County has responded by funding a new permanent position to handle domestic violence cases.

LESSON: Batterer Intervention Program capacity must be expanded as part of JOD.

Expanding Batterer Intervention Program referrals as part of JOD requires attention to staff training, staff qualifications, and procedures for ensuring that offender attendance is monitored and reported to ensure offender accountability.

One challenge has been how to maintain the quality of the batterer intervention programs while encouraging expansion. In Dorchester, state-required standards for batterer intervention practice, training, and reporting are in place, so problems have not arisen in these areas. In Milwaukee the four Batterer Intervention Programs have finalized an agreement on Batterers Intervention Treatment Standards; at this time, the standards are advisory only. This followed early training, provided through the technical assistance contract on standards for training and accreditation. A second challenge has been finding trained staff to run new groups or enhancing their staff in specific areas (i.e., diversity, foreign languages). Some providers use part-time consultants; others try to use agency employees. The Vera Institute provided training in batterer intervention to expand the pool of trained staff available to the Batterer Intervention Programs in Milwaukee. Yet another

challenge has been tracking and reporting enrollment, attendance, and graduation to the justice agencies. Although many providers had policies regarding reporting, actual practices had lagged behind and many of the policies had to be updated. Most of the JOD Batterer Intervention Programs now use a system to track individual clients and notify probation officers of failure to attend sessions. Sites report greatly enhanced communications with probation, the court, and victim service providers since the implementation of JOD.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS: JOD STAFF VIEWS

As part of the evaluation, we visit sites quarterly and interview the key staff of participating agencies. The following preliminary findings are based on qualitative analysis of these interviews.

JOD appears to be improving consistency in the court response to intimate partner violence cases. A major contribution of JOD has been the involvement of judges and the commitment of judges to the issue of domestic violence. This has dramatically changed the culture of the court system. In Milwaukee, the Chief Judge believes that the project has affected the legal community, District Attorney, Department of Corrections, and Public Defender's Office, and also has greatly increased linkages with social services. In all sites, the collective planning and ongoing meetings have increased understanding among the agencies and confidence on the part of social service providers and probation that their efforts to change offender behavior will be supported. Case-level collaboration has also increased. In Dorchester, police and probation officers are making joint home visits and prosecutors are assisting probation officers with violation hearings. In Washtenaw, the co-location of the domestic violence prosecutors, probation unit, victim specialists, and investigator encourages consultation, when appropriate. For example, the probation unit now works directly with the domestic violence prosecutors in requesting warrants for failure to appear for the bond review hearing or for probation violations. The victim specialists in the District Attorney's Office share information with probation officials who may be trying to locate a victim to get her input for a presentence report.

Although the review hearings add to the time judges spend on the bench, most believe that it is worth the effort. They can see for themselves whether offenders are making progress and they appreciate the chance to get feedback from victims and the probation staff. Most probation officers we talked with appreciate the court's support of their supervision and report that offenders faced with a review hearing are more willing to comply with referrals to batterer intervention programs and other probation requirements. Because review hearings have led to swift sanctions and swift termination of probation absconders, they believe this reduces the time they spend on "problem" cases and allows them to focus on the people who are trying to succeed.

However, enthusiasm is not universal. JOD also faces resistance by some probation agents to an orientation toward rehabilitation rather than enforcement. Some Milwaukee probation officers who supervise intimate partner violence offenders as part of a general caseload are not happy with the additional monitoring and court appearances for which they receive no credit under the work allocation rules of the state Department of Corrections. In Washtenaw County, officers in the special Domestic Violence Probation Unit must handle pretrial bond condition reviews, prepare presentence investigations, and provide intensive probation supervision. For these officers, an adequate support

staff for the team is important. In Dorchester, probation officers generally support the review concept but have sometimes had logistical difficulties structuring their schedules to get their work done given that they spend a lot of time in the courtroom.

Victim intimidation is of concern in all sites since it is widely believed that a case will be dismissed if the victim fails to appear. Many victims still do not ever appear in court, but the extent to which this results from lack of information, a wish to have the case dropped, or intimidation is not clear. Victims may not know whom to trust when faced with conflicting information from nonprofit organizations, government officials, and family or friends. However, anecdotal reports from victims and agency officials indicate that some victims are called by the defendant from the jail (despite a no-contact order), by the defendant's family or friends, or even by the defense attorney, and pressured not to testify or to change her story. Indeed, Milwaukee prosecutors have used tapes of calls from the jail to file victim intimidation charges.

JOD has supported enhanced evidence collection in a number of ways. Washtenaw County has been training police in the 11 different county law enforcement agencies, and Ypsilanti has hired a coordinator to review reports. In Milwaukee, the police are systematically taking pictures at the scene of an arrest and making these available to the prosecution unit when requested. In addition, Milwaukee is charging defendants who fail to appear at court hearings with bail jumping, for which evidence is easy to produce, and is using recorded jail telephone calls made to intimidate victims in court. Dorchester JOD has provided funds to support an investigator in the District Attorney's Office. In addition, police reporting forms were revised and a training session was conducted to enhance enforcement of report writing.

The sites note that it is important to consider who trains law enforcement. Officers tend not to respond positively to advocates and "feminists." A more balanced approach of another officer and an advocate, or a prosecutor and an advocate is better received. Getting some police chiefs to send their officers to training has been a major effort. Police chief buy-in, from the beginning, is crucial. Anecdotal reports from victims in two of the sites suggest that the law enforcement response to intimate partner violence remains irregular. Periodic refresher training for police officers is likely to be necessary to sustain improvements.

Enhancing Victim Services

JOD PLANS

To enhance services for victims of intimate partner violence, Dorchester began with plans to

- improve coordination among public-based and nonprofit victim service providers;
- establish a triage position for victim intake needs assessments and service referrals;
- provide more services to restraining order plaintiffs from a number of nonprofit organizations; and
- increase the availability of services in languages other than English to meet the needs of Dorchester's diverse population.

Milwaukee plans for improved victims services included

- implementation of a Domestic Violence Crisis Response Unit to provide immediate response to domestic violence victims and ongoing case management for cases originating in two of seven police districts;
- extending access to restraining orders by arranging for filing petitions during evening and Saturday hours at offices outside the courthouse; and
- expanding the capacity for community service providers to assist domestic violence victims through subcontracts to four existing service agencies to support new services of their choice.

Washtenaw County proposed using JOD funds to

- provide more services from district attorney–based victim/witness advocates to victims in criminal cases;
- expand contact with victims of domestic violence so that victim input into the criminal justice system can be increased;
- establish specialized autonomy services for victims, designed to increase the independence of victims of domestic violence;
- develop and implement a comprehensive training program for all JOD partner agency staff; and
- initiate and carry out a comprehensive community education plan to motivate the community to make the safety of victims and their children the first priority in related decisionmaking.

STRATEGIES IMPLEMENTED

Exhibit 3.1 illustrates the victim service networks in place for JOD.

Dorchester, MA

In Dorchester, JOD has built on a strong network of services at the court for victims involved in criminal cases, restraining orders, and family matters. Prior to JOD, there were two dedicated domestic violence advocates in the Suffolk County District Attorney's Office Victim/Witness Unit to provide victims with information about the justice system and criminal case processing, notify them of court events in their case, and help them to participate in the process through such means as victim impact statements. Help with restraining orders was available from Northeastern University Law Clinic interns and advocates from Casa Myrna Vasquez.

JOD enhanced the court-related services available to victims in several ways. An additional resource available to victims with criminal and/or restraining order cases is the Triager. This person has always been physically located in the courthouse near the restraining order clerk's office. The position was originally administratively located in the Dorchester Community Roundtable but was recently moved to the Clerk's Office. The person in this position, funded by JOD and staffed in November 2000, makes the initial contact with victims who enter the courthouse. During this contact the Triager identifies victims' court-related needs and refers them to the appropriate advocate, and makes additional needs assessments and referrals. In addition, JOD has supported four full-time advocates to assist victims seeking protection orders by adding funds to the existing programs operated by Northeastern's Law Clinic program and Casa Myrna Vasquez, and by funding new advocates from the Asian Task Force Against Domestic Violence and the Association of Haitian Women to meet the needs of victims from these communities. JOD has funded one full-time advocate for each of these agencies.

Outside of the courthouse, victims specialists, known as peace liaisons, funded through JOD, are assigned to the existing domestic violence units in the three Dorchester-area precincts of the Boston Police Department. The liaisons provide immediate assistance to victims and help them during the course of an investigation. In the community, advocacy services for Latina and other victims are provided by Casa Myrna Vasquez, which offers a hotline, crisis intervention, counseling, shelter, and many other types of services. Asian victims can receive shelter, safe home, a hotline, and needs assessment/referral services from the Asian Task Force Against Domestic Violence. Haitian victims have access to cultural and language programs, programs for children, support groups, adult literacy, computer classes, classes in handling finances, and crisis housing units provided by the Association of Haitian Women in Boston.

Milwaukee, WI

Milwaukee has provided victim services for many years. The first contact with victim services is made by the police, who call the hotline operated by Sojourner Truth when reporting the incident. The hotline then provides the victim with information on available resources. A Sojourner Truth advocate attempts to reach victims the next day by telephone to offer services and referrals. At the charging conference the next day, Sojourner Truth advocates are available to help victims with safety planning

and to provide information on the court process. Victim/witness specialists in the District Attorney's Office later mail victims letters advising them of the charges that have been filed and of their rights as victims. Before scheduled hearings, they attempt to reach victims by telephone to invite them to appear. They assist the Assistant District Attorneys by collecting information from the victim. Attorneys with the Legal Emergency Assistance Project (LEAP) of the Task Force Against Family Violence Victims provide legal aid for emergency legal proceedings. LEAP community resource advocates help with safety and resource planning, with the goal of ensuring that social service needs do not interfere with the success of a victim's legal proceedings. At the Restraining Order Clinic, advocates answer questions about civil protection orders, help fill out the proper paperwork, explain the process of filing and enforcing protection orders, and attend hearings with petitioners if requested.

JOD expanded victim services at the Milwaukee court by providing a secure victim waiting room for victims and their children to increase victim safety, comfort, and willingness to appear for hearings; adding victim witness specialists in the District Attorney's Office; providing courthouse child care services; and improving access to protection orders. Hours for filing were also expanded to include evening and weekend times; however, the extended hours have not been widely used. Plans for filing by e-mail were abandoned in the face of technology problems.

The Milwaukee Women's Center used JOD funds to add a case manager and an evening support group for older abused women. Services include housing coordination, consultation with physical and mental health providers, coordination with elderly benefit specialists (social security) to meet immediate needs, support group and individual counseling, peer support, legal assistance in eviction proceedings, divorce, nursing home legalities and policy change, and cooperation with the local aging department and volunteer organizations.

Sojourner Truth House used JOD funds to add a victim contact component to their Batterer Intervention Program. Partners of those enrolled in Batterer Intervention Program are updated on attendance and four information sessions are offered to explain the process of change in batterer treatment.

Washtenaw County, MI

In Washtenaw County, JOD was built on a strong existing set of services to victims provided primarily through the long-standing nonprofit organization established in the 1970s, the Domestic Violence Project, Inc./SAFE House (SAFE House). Resources and services available to victims from SAFE House included a 24-hour crisis line; 50-bed shelter (with counseling, advocacy, transportation, and on-site health care), nonresidential counseling, legal advocacy (including assistance with civil protection orders), 24-hour on-call response for police, and support groups for victims and their children. Civil legal services are provided by the Legal Services of Southeastern Michigan/Family Law Project. In addition, SAFE House has housing and supportive services partnerships with the Family Support Network and the Washtenaw Housing Alliance.

The primary goal for JOD is to increase victim input into the criminal justice system process and to make every effort to include the victim at each stage of the proceedings. JOD enhanced services to victims of domestic violence by strengthening both the governmental victim/witness advocate function, which operates out of the District Attorney's Office, and the nonprofit community response. JOD also

established an integrated domestic violence prosecution unit. Staff include two dedicated domestic violence victim/witness advocates funded by JOD. These advocates are housed with the domestic violence prosecutors, the grant coordinator, and the site evaluation coordinator, and often consult with the domestic violence probation unit. They assist the prosecutor in gathering information needed from the victim to advance the case and attend court on domestic violence docket days in all county courts. They also help victims apply for reimbursement under Michigan's Victims of Crime Act and make frequent referrals to SAFE House if needed and requested.

SAFE House receives JOD support for two autonomy advocates who work with the victim to identify losses due to domestic violence, such as loss of custody of the children, damaged credit history, and broken eyeglasses. The advocates also help identify barriers to autonomy (e.g., no car or no child care). Through SAFE House, JOD provides up to \$500 per victim for emergency food and shelter. It also provides funds to compensate for staff time in grant-related activities, including training, consultation, meetings, and supervision of the advocates. SAFE House advocates are present on domestic violence docket days in all county courts to support victims with whom they have been in contact, and to make contact with additional victims. During court proceedings, judges frequently tell victims that a SAFE House advocate is in the courtroom and available for consultation.

SAFE House has taken the lead role in coordinating and conducting domestic violence training for staff in all JOD partner agencies. Mandatory training (36 hours) for personnel hired under the grant was conducted in 1999–2000. Ongoing training and training for new employees has also been conducted. Workshops on five different topics (with multiple sessions) have been held to date. Training is open to all staff from any agency that participates in the grant.

LESSONS LEARNED ON VICTIM SERVICES

LESSON: Building on existing victim services requires extensive strategic planning to avoid overlap in service options among multiple service providers.

Two of the three JOD sites had many active community-based victim service providers with in-place services and programs. Dorchester focused on extending court-related services to victims in immigrant communities that did not overlap with existing services. In an effort to reduce confusion over multiple service providers at the courthouse, Dorchester created the new position (Triager) to provide victims with a “starting point,” a person to intercept victims entering the court to orient them to the court, assess their needs, and refer them to the advocates they need to see. In Milwaukee, the Domestic Violence Crisis Response Unit planned new, on-site advocacy at the scene of an incident to address the continuing problem of victims never making contact with a victim service provider. However, two agencies (both government and community-based) had existing programs for calling or writing victims shortly after an incident, although none had programs that involved visits to victims at home. However, the Domestic Violence Crisis Response Unit, the on-scene response plan, did not work. The failure was attributed partly to lack of clear definitions of the roles and responsibilities of the advocates and partly to concerns for safety at the scene for advocates when police officers left for other calls. Police now notify Sojourner Truth of domestic violence–related arrests so that advocates can contact victims early on by phone to offer follow-up referral/advocacy services. Three other

nongovernmental victim services agencies also offer victim services, and their victim specialists begin the contacting efforts immediately following arraignment.

LESSON: More time and effort needs to go into strategies for bridging the differences in goals, roles, and expectations of community-based advocates and victim specialists affiliated with justice agencies.

Dorchester's experience has shown that it is critical to address issues around each agency's goals, roles, and expectations in the planning stages. Justice-based and nonprofit advocates often have distinct views on these topics. Differences among the groups' goals, roles, and expectations for work conditions and operational procedures may produce conflicts. Bridging the differences is further complicated by differences in power, social class and status of advocates, justice officials (police officers, prosecutors), and staff (victim specialists, clerks, and other court employees). Meetings to address these issues have become very emotional, have been cancelled due to disagreements over agendas, and have been of limited effectiveness because of miscommunications over logistics. The effects play out in problems over confidentiality protections for client communications, reluctance to share information, and, in the end, conflicting messages to victims. Advocates on both sides suspect the others of refusal to refer victims. The Victim Services Subcommittee is arranging technical assistance from the Battered Women's Justice Project to identify ways to improve coordination across agencies and services offered to victims.

The problem is further exacerbated by the existence of multiple victim service providers in both Dorchester and Milwaukee and the need for coordination among them to eliminate possible gaps or duplications in services. Even in Washtenaw County where there is only one victim advocacy agency, developing a collaborative relationship between the governmental advocates and the nongovernmental advocates was difficult. Initially there were "turf issues" but numerous meetings helped each side understand the other's roles and the differences between them. The experience in all three sites has shown that investments in cross-training and strategic planning are very important in building a network of victim services.

LESSON: Expanded contact and collaboration between advocates and justice agencies is important to the goals of JOD, but difficult to achieve.

In Dorchester, victim service agencies participated actively during planning and were directly engaged in deciding how their activities could contribute to JOD goals. Most of the expanded services they provide under JOD are focused on victims' interactions with the courts. However, interactions between advocates and justice agency staff are not always smooth due to differences in organizational values, mission, and mandates. In Milwaukee, victim service agencies have received funds to expand their victim services in ways they chose, but have been less engaged in planning new ways to interact with the courts, probation or the police. As a result, JOD funds have helped support the existing coordinated community response, but have not been fully integrated into court planning.

Exhibit 3.1. JOD Strategies for Assisting Victims by Site

	Dorchester	Milwaukee	Washtenaw County
Court-related	<p><i>Suffolk County District Attorney's Office</i> Victim/Witness Unit educates victims about the justice system and criminal case processing, informs them about court events in their case, and helps victims to participate in the process through such means as victim impact statements. They also do safety planning and refer victims to domestic violence support services and human services in the community.</p> <p>A Triager located in the restraining order clerk's office serves as first contact for victims at courthouse, referring them to appropriate court-based advocates and offices, and making referrals to other service providers.</p>	<p>Legal Emergency Assistance Project (LEAP) of the <i>Task Force Against Family Violence</i> provides attorneys to represent victims in emergency legal proceedings related to family violence. Community resource advocates from the task force help with in-depth safety and resource planning.</p> <p>Victim/witness specialists at the District Attorney's Office send letters notifying victims of charges and their rights as victims. They attempt to telephone victims prior to hearings to encourage them to attend and to gather information for the prosecutors, and appear in court.</p> <p>JOD increased funding for advocates from Sojourner Truth House located in the District Attorney's Office to assist victims with safety planning and services.</p> <p>JOD established a secure victim waiting room in the courthouse for domestic violence victims.</p> <p>JOD worked with community partners to secure funding to provide courthouse child care.</p> <p>JOD funded a bail monitor who attempts to contact all victims after the defendants appear in intake and sends letters with information about the pretrial monitoring program and a number to call for assistance during the pretrial process.</p>	<p>JOD funded two government domestic violence victim/witness advocates to increase contact with victims to supplement the notification services available prior to JOD. These advocates provide court accompaniment, help prepare victim impact statements, and provide victims with notification of bond conditions following filing, information on court processes and victim rights, and referrals to services.</p> <p>SAFE House advocates are in court on domestic violence docket days to contact victims, to help victims at felony preliminary exams, and to attend subsequent hearings in felony cases if victims request it. Prior to JOD and the dedicated docket days, it was difficult to have advocates present in court for all domestic violence proceedings.</p> <p>SAFE House hired two legal advocates to help victims with court-related processes, including answers to legal questions or concerns, personal protection orders, expert witness testimony, and legal accompaniment.</p>

	Dorchester	Milwaukee	Washtenaw County
Protection Orders	<p>JOD funded a full-time advocate with the <i>Northeastern University Law Clinic</i> intern program to assist victims petitioning for restraining orders.</p> <p>JOD funded a full-time advocate for <i>Casa Myrna Vazquez's (CMV)</i> program assisting Latina and other victims seeking protection orders.</p> <p><i>Asian Task Force Against Domestic Violence (ATF)</i> and the <i>Association of Haitian Women in Boston (AFAB)</i> received JOD funding for one full-time advocate each, to serve Asian and Haitian women at the restraining order court, starting in the summer of 2001.</p>	<p><i>The Task Force Against Family Violence</i> advocates help petitioners in answering questions about civil protection orders, filling out the proper paperwork, explaining the process of filing and enforcing protection orders, and attending hearings with petitioners if so desired. JOD helped expand hours for protective orders and attempted to provide the technology for e-filing for protective orders.</p>	<p>Expanded services. JOD funding helped SAFE House reach more victims who are in need of assistance to obtain civil protection orders. SAFE House placed a dedicated domestic violence Personal Protection Order (PPO) liaison in the court to facilitate and expedite PPO applications.</p> <p>Negotiated protocol for personal protection orders. A local protocol was created through the collaborative efforts of the courts, law enforcement, the district attorney, private attorneys, the defense bar, and SAFE House. One judge in the 15th District Court handles the issuance and modification of PPOs for the county, and all violations of PPOs.</p>
Crisis Intervention	<p>CMV, ATF, and Boston Police Department (BPD) peace liaisons offer crisis intervention services, such as hotlines and shelters, and the non-JOD-funded BPD pilot program providing on-scene response to victims by peace liaisons.</p>	<p>JOD created a Domestic Violence Crisis Response Unit in September 2000 to provide immediate crisis intervention and ongoing case management to victims. The DVCRU was dissolved in April 2002.</p> <p><i>The Task Force on Family Violence</i> implemented Project Debbie through which victims and their children are given temporary housing in local hotels when shelters are full or a victim does not qualify for a shelter.</p> <p><i>Sojourner Truth House</i> crisis response services include a 38-bed shelter, open 24 hours/day, and a 24-hour domestic violence hotline.</p> <p><i>The Milwaukee Women's Center</i> provides 24-hour emergency shelter for up to 20 battered women; a 24-hour crisis line; crisis counseling; and referral.</p>	<p>SAFE House is paged by most police agencies who respond to a domestic violence case in Washtenaw County. They offer immediate outreach to victims, and operate a 50-bed shelter that offers counseling, advocacy, information, transportation, and on-site health care.</p>

	Dorchester	Milwaukee	Washtenaw County
Other Services	<p><i>Boston Police Department used JOD funds for peace liaisons in the domestic violence units in each of the three Dorchester-area precincts.</i> The liaisons provide information to victims about police services and help victims during investigation. They serve as a liaison between the department and victims. They also do safety planning and refer victims to community support services.</p> <p><i>Casa Myrna Vazquez (CMV)</i> offers a hotline, crisis intervention, counseling, shelter, and other types of services for Hispanic victims.</p> <p><i>The Asian Task Force Against Domestic Violence (ATF)</i> offers shelter, safe home, a hotline, and needs assessment/referral services to Asian women.</p> <p><i>The Association of Haitian Women in Boston (AFAB)</i> assists Haitian women through cultural and language programs, programs for children, support groups, adult literacy and computer classes, classes in handling finances, and crisis housing units.</p>	<p><i>The Milwaukee Women’s Center used JOD funds to add a case manager and an evening support group for older abused women.</i> Services include housing coordination, consultation with physical and mental health providers, coordination with elderly benefit specialists (social security) to meet immediate needs, support group and individual counseling, peer support, legal assistance in eviction proceedings, divorce, nursing home legalities and policy change, and cooperation with the local aging department and volunteer organizations.</p> <p><i>Asha</i> offers Women of Color “Sister Circles” group meetings.</p> <p>JOD funding added a victim services manager at Asha to provide accountability to the victim services program; coordinate the advocate staff so that they can provide Saturday and Sunday service; organize the training of staff; and oversee the accuracy of data reporting by generating statistics in monthly reports.</p> <p>JOD supported a Sojourner Truth House advocate to conduct follow-up services with domestic violence hotline calls (Domestic Violence Hotline Liaison).</p> <p>Advocates at the Sojourner Truth House now contact victims of offenders entering their Batterer Intervention Program (Batterers Anonymous) at intake to provide information about the Batterer Intervention Program, and a number to call.</p>	<p>Autonomy Services. SAFE House can provide emergency money to have locks changed, heat turned back on, telephone service restored, and other immediate needs. Two autonomy advocates assist victims to achieve independence by helping with security issues, housing relocation, employment, education, child care, and transportation.</p> <p>Safety planning through the Domestic Violence Probation Unit. As part of its comprehensive presentencing investigation and probation supervision as part of JOD, probation agents meet with victims of probationers and discuss safety issues and plans for reducing risk.</p> <p>Comprehensive training for JOD agencies and staff. SAFE House, in conjunction with the District Attorney’s Office and law enforcement, has developed and conducted a program of training on domestic violence, including Domestic Violence 101, PPOs and violation of PPOs, on-scene investigation of domestic violence cases, interviewing techniques with victims (for probation officers), recognizing self-defense injuries (July 2001), and most recently, on the new domestic violence laws involving dating relationships (March 2002). Training is provided at no cost to the participants.</p> <p>SAFE House also staffs a 24-hour crisis line, provides support groups for victims and children, provides postresidential services through the Families First program, and nonresidential counseling.</p> <p>Legal Services of Southeastern Michigan/Family Law Project. Provides civil legal services to victims of domestic violence.</p>

Appendix A: Multi-Site Technical Assistance, February 2000–August 2002

	All Sites
Technical Assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • February 2000. JOD Kick-Off Meeting. Multi-site engagement. • April 2000. First Associates' Meeting. Multi-site engagement. Overview of JOD initiatives and of roles of associates. Project directors from each site were present. • May 2000 and August 2000. Infrastructure and Capacity Building in Batterer Intervention Programs (two-part meeting). Multi-site engagement in partnership with the Vera Institute's Peer Exchange Program. • July 2000. Evaluation Meeting #1. Site Evaluation Coordinators (SECs), Police Departments (PDs), Urban Institute, National Institute of Justice (NIJ), Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), and Vera staff met to begin implementing evaluation activities. • July 27, 2000. Evaluation Program Board Meeting. • October 2000. Project Directors' Meeting #1. Multi-site meeting. JOD project directors met with OVW and other national partners to provide updates and set goals. • January 2001. Project Directors' Meeting #2. Multi-site meeting. JOD project directors and invited guests from each site discussed coordinated community responses to domestic violence and sustainability. • January 2001. Evaluation Meeting #2. SECs, PDs, Urban Institute, NIJ, OVW, and Vera staff met to discuss monthly quantitative implementation data and other evaluation issues. • March 2001. Enhancing Judicial Skills in Domestic Violence Cases. Multi-site engagement. Judges from all 3 sites attended judicial institute presented by the Family Violence Prevention Fund, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, Vera, and OVW. • May 2001. Promising Practice Site Visit to Westchester County Probation Department. Multi-site engagement. Washtenaw and Dorchester probation officers visited Westchester County to learn more about "victim-focused supervision." • August 2001. Project Directors' Meeting #3 and Milwaukee site visit by National Partners and Project Directors. Reviewed updates, challenges, successes, and TA needs. • October 2001. Project Directors' Meeting #4. Multi-site meeting. Project directors, law enforcement officers from each site, and members of the national partner agencies met to provide updates and plan future activities. • October 2001. Evaluation Meeting #3. SECs, PDs, Urban Institute, NIJ, OVW, and Vera staff met to discuss impact evaluation planning and other evaluation issues. • November 2001. Justice and Safety in Domestic Violence Cases: A Conversation Between Public Defenders and Victim Advocates. Multi-site engagement in partnership with the Vera Institute's Peer Exchange Program. • November 2001. Advancing Probation Practices in Domestic Violence Cases. Multi-site engagement. • January 2002. Project Directors' Meeting #5—Briefing for New Federal Administration Officials. Multi-site meeting. • January 2002. Brooklyn Felony Domestic Violence Project. Promising Practice Site Visit. Multi-site engagement. Washtenaw and Dorchester project directors and staff visited the Brooklyn Court. • May 2002. Project Directors' Meeting #6. Part I. Multi-site meeting. Reviewed budget and programmatic issues, and included cross-site sharing of progress and challenges. • May 2002. Project Directors' Meeting #6. Part II. Dorchester Site Visit. Multi-site engagement. Site personnel from Washtenaw and Milwaukee met with and observed key components of the Dorchester JOD Initiative. • August 7–8, 2002. Washtenaw County Site Visit. Multi-site engagement. Site personnel from Dorchester and Milwaukee met with and observed key components of the Washtenaw JOD Initiative. • August 9, 2002. Project Directors' Meeting #7—in Washtenaw. Multi-site. Reviewed budget and programmatic issues, and included cross-site sharing of progress and challenges. Discussed role of JOD Cabinet Group and met with NCJFCJ staff.