

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

Document Title: Marin County Arrest Policy Enhancement and Legal Support Collaborative Project: A Process Evaluation

Author(s): Brenda K. Uekert Ph.D.

Document No.: 201882

Date Received: September 2003

Award Number: 98-WE-VX-0012

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

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



Institute for Law and Justice

1018 Duke Street
Alexandria, Virginia
Phone: 703-684-5300
Fax: 703-739-5533
E-Mail: ilj@ilj.org

**Marin County Arrest Policy Enhancement and
Legal Support Collaborative Project**

A Process Evaluation

December 22, 2000

Prepared by
Brenda K. Uekert, Ph.D.

Prepared for
**Marin County District Attorney's Office
Legal Aid of Marin
Marin Abused Womens Services
County of Marin, California
National Institute of Justice
Violence Against Women Office**

Introduction

The Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies Program promotes the implementation of mandatory or pro-arrest policies as an effective domestic violence intervention that is part of a coordinated community response. Congress appropriated funds for the Arrest Program under the Violence Against Women Act (1994). The Program assumes that the arrest of a batterer will leverage the coercive and persuasive power of the criminal justice system to ensure victim safety and manage the behavior of abusive, violent offenders. Ensuring victim safety and offender accountability are the guiding principles underlying the Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies. The Violence Against Women Act directs that the Arrest Program funds be used to

- Implement mandatory arrest or pro-arrest programs and policies in police departments, including mandatory arrest programs or pro-arrest program and policies for protection order violations
- Develop policies and training programs in police departments and other criminal justice and tribal agencies to improve tracking of cases involving domestic violence
- Centralize and coordinate police enforcement, prosecution, probation, parole or judicial responsibility for domestic violence cases in groups or units of police officers, prosecutors, probation and parole officers or judges
- Coordinate computer tracking systems to ensure communication between police, prosecutors, and both criminal and family courts
- Strengthen legal advocacy service programs for victims of domestic violence by providing complete information and support for a victim of domestic violence as the case against her abuser moves through the criminal justice system
- Educate judges, and others responsible for judicial handling of domestic violence cases, in criminal, tribal, and other courts about domestic violence to improve judicial handling of such cases.

The Institute for Law and Justice, Inc. (ILJ) is conducting a national assessment of the Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies Program, which is funded by The National Institute of Justice. ILJ is using a three-stage methodology for this evaluation. First is an annual national assessment of all sites that will document the type and scope of projects funded. Second, a process evaluation of 20 sites will examine the process and problems associated with implementation of the project. And third, an impact evaluation of six sites will assess the impact

of the project on the agencies involved, victim well-being, offender accountability, and community coordination.

This report is a process evaluation of the Arrest Program in Marin County, California. The project received \$305,889 for an 18-month period beginning March 1, 1997. The continuation grant was for the amount of \$360,000 and covered another 18 months of operations. Information for this report derives from staff interviews, courtroom observation, program documentation, and a review of local statistics.¹

Project Environment

This section of the report provides an overview of Marin County demographics, and Arrest Policies organizational partners.

Demographics

Marin County is located in the San Francisco Bay area (see Exhibit 1). Its largest city is San Rafael, with a 1998 estimated population of 54,010. The second largest city is Novato (pop. 47,085). There are nine other incorporated cities in the area, all with populations under 15,000. Most of the county's residents who live in unincorporated areas (pop. 69,449) live in the primarily rural western part of the county.

Exhibit 1: Map of Marin County, California



¹ A site visit was conducted June 21-25, 1999.

Marin County's population is predominantly white (89% in 1990). There is a small percentage of Asian/Pacific Islanders (4%) and persons of Hispanic origin represented (8%). The county leads California in per capita income, reported as \$40,474 in 1994.² The county has a very low crime rate, estimated at just 3.4 violent crimes per 1,000 residents in 1995.

Arrest Policies Organizational Partners

The Marin County project involves four organizations: Legal Aid of Marin, Marin Abused Women's Services (MAWS), the Family Law Center (FLC), and the Marin County District Attorney's Office.³ Legal Aid of Marin functions is the lead agency on this project, despite a formal partnership with MAWS. The District Attorney's Office is a late entry to this project.

Legal Aid of Marin

Legal Aid of Marin is part of Legal Aid of the North Bay, which includes an office in neighboring Napa County. North Bay Legal Aid is a community-based nonprofit civil legal services program serving low-income residents. Legal Aid provides legal services in the areas of poverty law, public benefits, labor and employment rights, and rights of children and families.

Marin Abused Women's Services (MAWS)

Marin Abused Women's Services (MAWS) is a countywide non-profit organization that offers a variety of comprehensive services for abused women and their children. MAWS provides direct services that include hotlines, emergency shelter, short-and long-term transitional housing, advocacy, support groups, and referrals. This organization has an innovative men's program especially designed for male batterers and also operates numerous community prevention projects. MAWS has participated in training law enforcement officers on the dynamics of domestic violence.

² Per capita income was \$28,472 in the San Francisco Bay area and \$22,345 in California.

³ The County of Marin was also listed as a partner in the proposals but serves no functional role in this project.

Family Law Center (FLC)

The Family Law Center (FLC) provides civil legal services to low and moderate income clients in the areas of family law, domestic violence, and family mediation. The Center offers a Domestic Violence Temporary Restraining Order Clinic.

Marin County District Attorney's Office and California Law

The District Attorney's Office prosecutes misdemeanors and felonies reported by all police departments in the county. Domestic Violence Crimes are prosecuted by the Office's Criminal Division. The Division has a Domestic Violence Unit. Additionally, advocates from the Victim/Witness Unit work in the Criminal Division to provide the following services: crisis intervention, resource and referral counseling, restitution, court support, and assistance in applying for compensation from the California Crime Victims Compensation Program.

The District Attorney's Office operates under California law to prosecute domestic violence crimes, as defined by California Revised Statutes as "abuse committed against an adult or a fully emancipated minor who is a spouse, former spouse, cohabitant, former cohabitant, or person with whom the suspect has had a child or is having or has had a dating or engagement relationship" (C.R.S §13700 (b)). "Abuse" is further defined as "intentionally or recklessly causing or attempting to cause bodily injury, or placing another person in reasonable apprehension of imminent serious bodily injury to himself or herself, or another" (C.R.S §13700 (a)).

Planning and Implementation

The original proposal, written by the Director of Legal Aid, with some input from the Executive Director of MAWS, was submitted in September 1996. Despite the fact that this project focused on prosecution, the District Attorney's Office was not approached by either agency until shortly before the proposal was due.⁴ The project was implemented in 1997. A year later, the District Attorney's Office formally entered into an agreement to participate in the project.

⁴ Even then, the former District Attorney was not provided with a copy of the grant application. The original application did not receive support from the District Attorney's Office, although they did assist with the project once the grant was received.

Proposal

The proposal submitted for the Grants to Encourage Arrest Project focused on the difficulty of prosecuting domestic violence cases. There are inconsistencies between the figures noted in the proposal and those obtained directly from the District Attorney's Office. While the report indicated a disposition rate of only 25 percent in domestic violence cases, the District Attorney's Office estimated a disposition rate of 72 percent, including those cases diverted to a county probation department.⁵ Nevertheless, the basic problem presented in the proposal is that victim cooperation, a necessity for prosecution, is missing in most domestic violence cases. Therefore, this project focused on the two problems that undermine mandatory arrest policies: (1) victim retractions and refusals to cooperate in prosecution efforts; and (2) the lack of coordination between the criminal and civil legal systems and social services.

The proposal states that "the ultimate rationale for this project is the belief that the provision of civil legal services to battered women will increase victim cooperation in criminal prosecution of the batterer." Thus stated, the provision of civil legal services became the cornerstone of this project, with a social services component added through the work of MAWS. The proposal, which was not supported by the District Attorney's Office, received approval from the county's Board of Supervisors and became Marin County's proposal for a Grant to Encourage Arrest Policies.

The proposal's overall objective was to design, implement, and test a protocol for providing comprehensive pretrial services for victims of domestic violence. There is a significant research component to test the theory that comprehensive pretrial civil legal assistance and social services will reduce the number of victim retractions, ultimately improving prosecution outcomes. Seven objectives were identified in the proposals:

1. To enhance victims' actual and perceived safety by providing immediate post-arrest and pretrial civil legal assistance, safety planning, and emotional support for up to 100 victims.
2. To enhance offender accountability by decreasing victim refusals to cooperate by 50 percent (this was amended to 25 percent in the continuation proposal).
3. To conduct a system requirements analysis for creating an integrated tracking system to include cases from law enforcement, the criminal and civil courts, and non-profit advocacy organizations.
4. To develop an improved system of coordination among the project partners.

⁵ Excluding cases diverted out of the system, the disposition rate would be 42 percent.

5. To strengthen and expand legal advocacy service programs for victims of domestic violence by supporting pretrial civil legal assistance, establishing a domestic violence civil pro bono panel of ten private attorneys, and training 10 volunteers to conduct intake and prepare and file temporary restraining orders (TROs).
6. To train all collaborative participants in the purpose and use of an integrated data system, in victim response as affected by life experiences, psychological complexity, and cultural diversity.
7. To make Marin County protocols available to all County municipalities and to other Bay Area jurisdictions.

The continuation proposal also indicated that it would offer parenting skills to mothers of children exposed to violence in the home, and would expand the program to neighboring Napa County.

The collaborative partners would share responsibility for all facets of this project, with the executive directors of Legal Aid and MAWS to serve as co-supervisors and share responsibility for the overall project. In the proposals, the County of Marin also played a role, especially in the area of coordination and the integration of computer systems. In addition, the County, working with Legal Aid, would be responsible for fiscal management of the project.

The role of Legal Aid was to provide legal needs assessment and civil legal services to project clients. This includes the provision of direct services such as full legal representation to obtain temporary and permanent restraining, custody, support, and visitation orders. The proposal also called for Legal Aid to coordinate the activities of all project participants and to take on the responsibility of general administration. Legal Aid was to provide training to project participants on the preparation of temporary restraining orders and other legal resources. MAWS was to provide pre- and post-training needs assessments, training for volunteers and collaborative participants, and to coordinate social services and safety planning for project clients. The Family Law Clinic, along with Legal Aid and MAWS, was charged with the recruitment and training of volunteers to conduct initial intakes and prepare and file temporary restraining orders for project clients.

The role of the Marin County District Attorney's Office was noted in the continuation proposal. This role was limited to the provision of information. According to the proposal, the District Attorney's Office would be "responsible for making available information regarding domestic violence victims (provided the victim consents to release the information) that will assist in the provision of services to her and in conducting the project."

Project Implementation

The Marin County Arrest Policies project, implemented in 1997, is referred to as the Marin Arrest Policy Enhancement and Legal Support Collaborative (MAPELS). For the purposes of this discussion, project implementation is divided into two specific stages: development and training (March 1, 1997 to June 14, 1998) and provision of services (June 15, 1998 to July 1999).⁶

Development and Training

The development and training stage started with the acquisition of grant funds in 1997 and continued through mid-June, 1998. This stage included hiring, creation of administrative practices, and training. Two major obstacles to full implementation at this time included the lack of interagency cooperation, and the lack of consensus on the methodology (including which victims would be officially considered “participants”).

The budget from the continuation proposal, in addition to contributing a small amount of funds for various salaries, included at least half-time funding for the following positions:

- Attorney/Project Coordination Supervisor – Legal Aid (full-time)
- Grant Administrator – Legal Aid (50 percent time)
- Advocate – MAWS (full-time)
- Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) Volunteer Coordinator – FLC (full-time)
- Deputy District Attorney (80 percent time)

In the latter half of 1997, all positions were hired (except for the Deputy District Attorney who was not written into the original proposal).

Administratively, Legal Aid designated a Project Coordination Supervisor to oversee the MAPELS project. This individual was primarily responsible for all administrative functions, including the dispersal of grant funds and coordination of agencies and staff. While the proposal called for direct involvement from the County of Marin in fiscal matters, in reality, Legal Aid performed this function in its entirety.

A number of activities were undertaken during this period, including the recruitment of volunteers and internal trainings. In the first half of 1998, six inter-agency training sessions were

⁶ Since this report is based on a site visit in July 1999, this date is used to mark the end of this period, even though the provision of services continued past this date.

held. There were four main sessions, averaging 22 attendees each. The training sessions covered the following topics:

- Introduction to MAPELS project and overview of domestic violence
- Support Services
- Preparing temporary restraining orders
- Crisis intervention, peer support, counseling, and interviewing techniques
- Criminal justice response
- The impact of domestic violence on children, batterers, and batterer intervention.

MAPELS did not provide services until the project was well underway. Early on, a significant barrier was the lack of access to victims. The proposal called for Legal Aid to provide services to victims of domestic violence incidents reported by the police. But Legal Aid was dependent on the District Attorney's Office for copies of police reports. There was no protocol in place for the District Attorney to turn over copies of reports, and the Office's interpretation of the California Public Records Act⁷ resulted in a major setback for the project. In brief, the District Attorney's Office required that a form be given to victims at the scene of the incident in which they could essentially waive their rights of confidentiality. All law enforcement agencies in the county would be required to use this form in order for the MAPELS project to be effective in contacting victims for participation in this project. In 1998, a form was developed—and used inconsistently for this purpose.⁸ Even after the project was well underway, Legal Aid was receiving just a fraction of the incident reports.

The lack of interagency cooperation impacted all partnering agencies. There was no structure in place by which project decisions could be made. Consequently, there were significant differences between project supervisors in how decisions should be made and how the project should be implemented. This was particularly apparent in the role of the MAWS victim advocate. MAWS and Legal Aid had different views on the role of the victim advocate, who would be funded through the grant but report directly to MAWS. Legal Aid placed demands on the advocate that were not always consistent with the organizational goals of MAWS. In particular, while MAWS serves all victims of domestic violence, the victim advocate hired for

⁷ According to California Public Records Act, Section 6254 (f): "Other provisions of this subdivision notwithstanding, state and local law enforcement agencies shall make public the following information, except to the extent that disclosure of a particular item of information would endanger the safety of a person involved in an investigation or would endanger the successful completion of the investigation or a related investigation."

⁸ The form contains a checkbox stating, "Except that I do want to be eligible for free, private legal and support services, and I agree you give my name, address, and telephone number to Marin Legal and Support Services."

this grant project was to serve only MAPELS clients. Over time, Legal Aid also requested that the advocate restrict services to only those victims that had already agreed to receive civil legal assistance through Legal Aid.

Additionally, project staff were not hired at the same time, leaving a three to four month gap before project work could begin. Much of the early phases of the project were used to develop the research component of the project, which took considerably longer than expected. Ultimately, there was a failure to clearly identify roles. Some of the major issues that transpired early on included a debate as to who would make the first contact with the victim; the role of the Family Law Clinic's legal work; the degree of involvement of the District Attorney's Office; and the relationship between the MAWS advocate and the District Attorney's Victim-Witness staff. Many of these issues were not adequately resolved and had a detrimental effect on project implementation.

Provision of Services

On June 15, 1998, MAPELS began to accept clients. By this time, Legal Aid had established a protocol whereby the District Attorney's Office would forward copies of police reports, although this practice was never conducted on a systematic basis. The provision of services is discussed in terms of two time periods, based on the revision of research methodology. In the first period, June 15 to December 31, 1998, MAWS was responsible for making the first contact to victims. Services were halted in the first part of 1999 to revamp the methodology. In the second period, approximately June 15, 1999 to January 31, 2000, Legal Aid and their volunteer interviewers provided the point of first contact.

The following procedure was established to conduct this project. Legal Aid would receive police reports daily and randomly select victims to offer them project services. Legal Aid staff and volunteers first conducted an initial intake, including conflict checks, and an assessment of the client's needs. If the client requested assistance with restraining orders, the Family Law Center helped with applications and filing, while a Legal Aid attorney was assigned to represent the client at the restraining order hearing. Legal Aid attorneys and pro bono attorneys would also be available to assist the client with other legal matters, such as housing, family law, immigration, juvenile dependency proceedings, public benefits, medical, employment, bankruptcy, and general civil law. Legal Aid would also forward contact

information regarding prospective clients to the MAWS advocate, who would make arrangements to meet with clients in regard to their needs for social services. MAWS would offer clients the following services: personal advocacy, group support sessions, court accompaniment, assistance in seeking medical, housing, employment, childcare, or public benefits, and assistance securing counseling.

In October 1998, project staff began meeting bi-weekly to discuss the status of each client in terms of services provided and any ongoing criminal cases. The Steering Committee, which included the directors of each agency, began to meet every six weeks. In November, the District Attorney was invited to attend the Steering Committee meeting for the first time. Throughout this period, there was conflict over the roles of each agency and how the criminal component would “fit in” with court advocacy and civil litigation efforts.

In the last half of 1998, the MAWS advocate was able to expand and develop resources for project clients, including Spanish-language materials, new safety plan, and information packets. The advocate recruited a volunteer counselor to offer free child counseling services, and engaged in recruiting efforts for volunteers who would provide support services. During this first phase, 59 individuals received services from MAWS advocates, ranging from a brief telephone conversation to extensive ongoing services.⁹ The Family Law Clinic was also working on volunteer recruitment to provide assistance with the temporary restraining order applications. During this same period, Legal Aid staff and volunteers provided legal services to 25 of 56 project clients. The primary legal need was representation at civil restraining order hearings. Legal Aid also provided 8 clients with assistance in family law matters through its pro bono program, and represented 5 clients in non-family law cases. However, Legal Aid was never able to develop a consistent pool of pro bono attorneys to handle the family law cases—this became a source of contention within the office and impacted the timeframe in which victims received legal counseling.

In December 1998, Legal Aid called a hiatus for the project. Agency partners cited the struggle to provide legal services (especially the inability to acquire a panel of pro bono attorneys) as a significant reason for the hiatus. Another problem was continuing difficulties with

⁹ Eighty (80) police reports were referred to MAWS; 59 women received services and 21 women were unable to be contacted or the contact was not substantial (these women were sent information/services packages).

obtaining copies of the police reports, with Legal Aid receiving less than half of the reports for all domestic violence incidents. MAWS also reported problems with the recruitment of volunteer service providers. Consequently, MAPELS staff halted the acceptance of new project clients. This hiatus would last for the first half of 1999.

The police incident reports were the only means by which the MAPELS staff could identify prospective clients. Legal Aid found great inconsistency in the use of the waiver forms the District Attorney's Office required to turn over the reports.¹⁰ Some police departments did not use the form; others used a different version that did not clearly identify the meaning of the project waiver, and some officers were filling out the form themselves without the victim's consent. The District Attorney's Office took the initiative to resolve these issues by meeting with the various police chiefs and circulating memos to all police departments. Eventually, the District Attorney's Office concluded that a waiver form was not required for misdemeanor cases. Legal Aid also discovered a delay in the transfer of police reports. It was learned that there was a delay from some police departments in forwarding their reports to the District Attorney's Office, and a further delay caused by the extra administrative tasks required for the District Attorney's Office to send the reports to Legal Aid. This delay created skepticism regarding the primary theory this project set out to test: that the provision of civil legal assistance and social services would increase the victim's willingness to participate in the criminal prosecution of her batterer. Essentially, the criminal disposition is decided before the victim receives any contact from MAPELS.

MAWS encountered difficulties in maintaining an adequate number of volunteers to meet the demand for support services to project clients. As a result, the victim advocate spent a significant amount of time providing direct services, limiting the range of support services that MAWS could continue to offer as more clients were accepted into the project. This problem also impacted the ability of MAWS staff to make first contact with clients as soon as possible after the incident. The inability to attract volunteers to the program was due to a number of factors. The role of the volunteer was not clearly defined, so that women who were recruited were unsure of the number of hours they needed to work or the exact nature of their work, and when the project was put on hold, there was not enough work for volunteers. MAWS also required

¹⁰ The waiver forms were required of felony reports.

recruits to complete a 52-hour training program before they could work on behalf of the organization. In June 1999, the volunteer training session was cancelled.

Several other issues became problematic. There was considerable discussion within Legal Aid concerning the provision of direct legal assistance in family law matters. Throughout this project, Legal Aid worked to create a reliable pool of pro bono family law attorneys to represent clients. This created considerable delays in assistance as Legal Aid had to expend considerable time securing such services. Furthermore, since there were no income levels placed on the MAPELS clients, the use of pro bono attorneys for those who could afford some legal fees was not conducive to the pro bono program as a whole. Another issue that was unresolved involved the actual duties of the MAWS advocate. While MAWS had a clear definition of the advocate's duties and responsibilities, this was sometimes in conflict with what others thought the advocate should be doing. In particular, the advocate acted on behalf of the client as a legal/court advocate. This sometimes placed the advocate in direct conflict with Victim-Witness staff and prosecutors from the District Attorney's Office. Legal Aid also installed a new accounting scheme requiring staff to further document time spent on the MAPELS project. This created some resentment, especially since there were indications of fiscal mismanagement, with Legal Aid delaying and withholding payment to MAWS.

In June 1999, the methodology was revised so that the first point of contact with the victim would be from volunteers working with Legal Aid, who administered a lengthy telephone interview. Under this methodology, Legal Aid received 130 police reports, but identified only 25 project participants. MAWS contacted all participants and provided some form of service. The MAPELS project terminated its services to clients in February 2000.

Project Performance

Based on proposal objectives, project performance is discussed here in terms of five aspects: (1) assessment of outcomes; (2) interagency collaboration; (3) information systems; (4) training; and (5) support services.

Assessment of Outcomes

This project contains an extensive evaluation component that is reliant on the adherence to a detailed methodology that includes victim interviews and documentation of outcomes. To

design the methodology, MAPELS staff brought in a consultant with considerable experience in domestic violence research. In late 1997, four hypotheses were put forward:

1. Battered women who received the intervention will cooperate with domestic violence criminal prosecution at higher rates than battered women who did not receive the services.
2. More cases in which the battered victim received the intervention will result in successful case dispositions than cases in which the battered victim did not receive the services.
3. Compared to battered women who did not receive the intervention, battered women who did will report a greater perception that the legal system acted to protect them and to hold their battering partner accountable for his actions.
4. Compared to battered women who did not receive the intervention, battered women who did will experience re-abuse at lower rates.

The consultant provided considerable advice on the selection of comparable groups and the types of data to be collected. MAPELS staff designed a questionnaire to be administered to clients by volunteers over the telephone. The questionnaire was unreasonably lengthy, consisting of 132 separate items and including items of questionable importance.¹¹ It was not clear how such information would be used in the final analysis.

While a considerable time was spent on victim interviewing protocols and strategies, there were increasing concerns over the basic premise of the theory that the provision of civil legal assistance and social services could impact the victim's participation in the criminal justice system. Timing was a key issue. Typically, District Attorney's Offices make filing decisions within a day of receiving the report. Consequently, we would expect that about half of the victims referred to the MAPELS project would have already had their cases "no actioned." When a conviction does result, nearly all of the convictions are a result of plea bargains. By the time a MAPELS client receives legal assistance and social services, in all likelihood, the disposition on her criminal case has already been reached. Therefore, it may have been more fruitful if this project refocused its energy on the impact of services on victims' cooperation in *future* proceedings.

Interagency Collaboration

As part of this evaluation, the primary partners involved in the collaboration representing MAWS, Legal Aid, and the District Attorney's Office, responded to a 35-item questionnaire

¹¹ For instance, item 18c asks "have you ever provided false information in the course of receiving benefits?"

designed to assess collaboration, support for the project, and individual participation. Although one of the goals of this project was “to develop an improved system of coordination among the project partners,” this collaboration was clearly not working. Results from the questionnaire given to project partners showed that there was virtually no consensus among partners on the goals of this project and how the project was to be administered. Despite numerous attempts to address collaborative issues by partners to clarify accountability issues, this project was dominated by the lead agency, and partnering organizations expressed dissatisfaction with their own agency’s level of input into the MAPELS project.

The partnership, as proposed, had also been altered through the course of this project. The Family Law Clinic had an insubstantial role in the project, and staff seemed unaware of the overall MAPELS project. The County of Marin, which was to act in the fiscal management and development of information systems, was never involved in any of the decision-making. On the positive side, the introduction of a newly elected District Attorney improved relations with the District Attorney’s Office.

Information Systems

A goal of this project was to conduct a system requirements analysis for creating an integrated tracking system. This system would include information from law enforcement, the criminal and civil courts, and non-profit service providers. This goal was not accomplished and it is unlikely that a case tracking system would be developed as a product of the MAPELS project. In 1998, the District Attorney’s Office modified their database and created a new program to capture domestic violence prosecution data. Yet the attainment of an integrated system was well beyond the scope of the organizations involved in this project. While the County of Marin responded to some requests from Legal Aid, its priorities were the upkeep and programming demands of the various county systems.

Training

Another goal of this project was to train all collaborative partners on domestic violence. Although the actual evaluations of the training sessions are not available, it appears that the training component of this project was successful. According to the progress reports submitted

as part of the Arrest Policies grant, the cross-training sessions held in the first part of 1998 received a favorable response from attendees.

Support Services

This project was to serve approximately 100 domestic violence victims with civil legal aid and social support services. MAWS reported serving a total of 84 victims, and noted that the number of clients was less than anticipated. Even before the project was temporarily halted, there were relatively few police reports (and the near absence of felonies), and there was also a lack of “qualifying” victims (due to Legal Aid’s requirement that victims must receive both legal and social services). Another reason for the inability to meet the goal of 100 clients was the delay caused by the introduction of a new methodology in 1999.

Summary

This project has provided some important resources to domestic violence victims that were previously not available. It has led to an expansion of MAWS into the field of court advocacy and has encouraged the civil legal community to consider the special needs of domestic violence victims. Regardless of difficulties reaching the stated objectives, there were women who received services and benefited from the services provided. The research may also provide an invaluable insight into the relationship between criminal prosecution and civil litigation efforts. Yet the MAPELS project, as a collaborative project, failed to meet its goals. While this project had some merit, the steering committee could not overcome problems with implementation, and deteriorating interagency relations seriously dampened hopes that the project could be successful.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Project Environment	2
Demographics	2
Arrest Policies Organizational Partners	3
Legal Aid of Marin	3
Marin Abused Women’s Services (MAWS).....	3
Family Law Center (FLC)	4
Marin County District Attorney’s Office and California Law	4
Planning and Implementation.....	4
Proposal.....	5
Project Implementation.....	7
Development and Training	7
Provision of Services.....	9
Project Performance	12
Assessment of Outcomes	12
Interagency Collaboration.....	13
Information Systems	14
Training.....	14
Support Services	15
Summary	15