

**Nampa Family Justice Center
2010 Outcome Evaluation**

Prepared by

Lisa Growette Bostaph, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Principal Investigator
Department of Criminal Justice
Boise State University
1910 University Drive
Boise, Idaho 83725-1955
208-426-3886
LisaBostaph@boisestate.edu

January 2010

The author wishes to acknowledge the invaluable research assistance of Boise State University graduate student Suzann Lathrop.

Introduction

In April of 2007, the Nampa Family Justice Center (NFJC) contracted with researchers at Boise State University to conduct a process and outcome evaluation which included a population study. During 2007, the research team collected data on clients using the services of the NFJC and conducted interviews with directors and line staff of partnering agencies. Results of those analyses were detailed in two reports produced for the Nampa Family Justice Center. In order to measure ongoing changes within the NFJC and the criminal justice system, NFJC and its stakeholders incorporated periodic outcome and process evaluations in their strategic planning.

In November of 2009, the NFJC contracted with Dr. Lisa Growette Bostaph at Boise State University to conduct an updated outcome evaluation. The overall purpose of an outcome evaluation is to determine if the NFJC and the criminal justice system is achieving its stated goal to expand current projects involving police, prosecutors, and non-profit victim advocacy groups regarding the investigation and prosecution of domestic violence and “centralize and coordinate” criminal justice system response to domestic violence (NFJC Grant Application 2006:1). This report is the second outcome evaluation of the evaluation of the Nampa Family Justice Center. It details the results of the outcome study undertaken from a systemic perspective. The next section provides a brief overview of the methodology used in this portion of the evaluation, followed by the findings and a discussion of the study’s results.

Methodology

The outcome portion of this evaluation required data to be collected from agencies across the criminal justice system. As with the previous evaluation, the study focused on the population of cases coming into the Nampa Family Justice Center during a two month period of time (April-May 2008). These cases (N=66) were then tracked through the criminal justice system (police, prosecution, and sentencing). We chose the time period of April-May 2008 to ensure that all cases that were prosecuted would be resolved, thus enabling the collection of sentencing data. Data were gathered from NFJC files, the ISTARS database in the Nampa Police Department and the City Prosecutor's Office, the Idaho Repository, and additional data were from Valley Crisis Center.

As with the initial outcome evaluation, some obstacles were still present that made data collection somewhat cumbersome. Offender names are an ongoing obstacle for this type of data collection. Victim services agencies focus on assisting victims, so case files are generally filed by the victim name and often do not include the offender's name. However, the criminal justice system is focused on the offender's suspected behavior and organizes all information using the offender's name; the victim's name may or may not appear in the file. Linking the two information bodies is essential for systemic evaluations, but is still problematic within the NFJC and its partnering agencies. Based on our previous experience, a graduate research assistant applied and was accepted as an intern for the police department. The research assistant had access to departmental files (via ISTARS) and remaining data were gathered at the City Prosecutor's Office, again using ISTARS and Spillman.

Data were collected using previously designed paper forms and later entered into an Access database. In order to perform the necessary statistical analyses, the data were transferred into SPSS. The data were collected, stored, and analyzed on a secure computer in a restricted access location. The next section reports the findings of these analyses. The reader may find it useful to view a visual representation of the findings outlined, Figure 1: NFJC Cases-A Systemic Perspective (Appendix A).

Findings

Spotlight: Decision to seek assistance from NFJC

During the study period¹:

- 66 clients completed intake at NFJC.
- 83% (n=55) were residents of Nampa and 40% (n=26) resided in the 83686 zip code.
- 92% (n=61) of these clients were female.
- The average age of clients seeking assistance was 35 years.
- 36% (n=24) of clients were currently divorced or separated from their offender, while 35% (n=23) were currently married to their offender.
- 92% (n=58) of those clients who disclosed their ethnicity reported themselves to be Latina or Latino.
- 93% (n=28) of identified offenders were male.
- 77% (n=26) of those clients who discussed their most recent assault disclosed that the most recent assault did not involve any physical injuries.
- 20% (n=13) of clients sought an order for protection at the time of intake, while 2.9% (n=1) sought shelter and 39% (n=26) requested counseling.

Summary of decision to seek assistance from NFJC²

Not surprisingly, due to the gendered nature of domestic violence, the overwhelming majority of clients seeking assistance from NFJC during the study period

¹ The researchers acknowledge that, due to the smaller sample size of the 2010 data collection period, small raw number changes may result in larger percentage changes.

² When discussing the comparison of data across the two evaluations, the researchers use 2008 & 2010 (the dates of the actual evaluations) as opposed to the dates of the cases analyzed for the evaluations (2006 & 2008).

were females. The current data collection allowed us to report on a few new variables: city of residence, zip code, age, marital status, and ethnicity/race. As expected a majority of the clients seeking assistance at NFJC reside within the city of Nampa with a clustering of clients residing within the 83686 zip code. However, clients residing in Caldwell (six percent), other cities within Canyon County (eight percent), and other cities outside of Canyon County (three percent) also accessed services at NFJC during the study period. This percentage has remained relatively unchanged from the 2008 evaluation. A snapshot of clients seeking services during the study period finds the average age of clients to be 35 years, even percentages of married and divorced/separated, and an overwhelming Latina client population.

During this evaluation cycle, we were able to identify 52%³ of the offenders through other data sources (police and prosecution records). Continuing the gendered nature of domestic violence and remaining the static from 2008, 93% of clients' offenders were male. There was minimal overlap in requested services. Clients appeared to come to NFJC for a specific form of assistance and did not often request additional services. However, the 2010 analysis shows a substantial increase in clients seeking protection orders (20% vs. less than one percent, respectively) and clients seeking counseling (39% vs. 22%, respectively). Requests for shelter decreased slightly during the study period from eight percent to three percent.

³ This is an increase from 32% in the 2008 evaluation. However, that increase is a function of the increased reporting numbers rather than increased data collection on offenders by NFJC or the researchers.

Spotlight: Decision to report to police

During the study period:

- 52% (n=34) of the clients entering NFJC during the study period reported their assault to the police, including 50% (n=17) who requested counseling, one client who sought an order for protection, one client who requested shelter, and 24% (n=8) who disclosed physical injuries resulting from the assault.
- 94% (n=32) of the victims were female and 93% (n=28) of offenders were male.
- 39% of clients reporting to the police were divorced/separated, while 32% were married and 29% were single/living together.
- 100% of the cases reported to the police involved Latina clients and the average age of those reporting to the police was 37 years old.
- 76% (n=25) were reported by the client themselves with 24% (n=8) reported by a third party.
- The two most frequently specified offenses were domestic violence (27%, n=9) and domestic battery (35%, n=12).
- 77% (n=26) of reported cases involved no physical injuries.
- Of the 24% (n=8) involving injuries, the most frequently reported injuries were body bruising (50%, n=4) and facial lacerations (38%, n=3).
- Once case involved multiple forms of injuries.
- No weapons were involved in any of the reported assaults.
- There were no additional witnesses beyond the victim in 77% (n=26) of the reported assaults.
- 68% (n=19) of the reported assaults occurred within the victim's residence.

- 74% (n=25) of the offenders were arrested with one dual arrest occurring.

Summary of decision to report assault to the police

Nationally, the reporting rate for intimate partner violence is roughly 50 percent (Rennison & Welchans, 2000). During the study period, 52% of clients at NFJC reported their assault to police, higher than the national average. But, with an overwhelming majority of the clients being Latinas, it would be of importance to examine the national reporting rate for Latinas in intimate partner violence cases, which is 65 percent (Rennison & Welchans, rev. 2002). Thus, while the reporting rate involving NFJC clients has increased significantly since our initial data collection (32%), for the clientele who are accessing NFJC, the rate is still below the national average.

Compared to those seeking assistance, the proportion of married clients who reported to the police decreased slightly (35% to 32%) with a subsequent increase (36% to 39%) in divorced/separated clients who reported to the police.

An overwhelming percentage of offenders (74%) were arrested with a majority of the assaults reported by the victims themselves (77%). Both of these statistics are relatively unchanged from 2008. Roughly one-quarter of the reported cases involved visible physical injuries to the victim (a decrease from 36% in 2008), but this represents all of the cases involving injury coming into the NFJC. Compared to 2008, the most frequently reported injuries changed with facial lacerations (38%) replacing facial bruising. There was a significant increase in the proportion of cases reported to the police that involved no additional witness beyond the victim (64% in 2008 vs. 77% in 2010).

Spotlight: Decision to refer for charging

During the study period:

- 85% (n=29) of reported cases were referred for prosecution, including 86% (n=25) of cases involving arrests and 80% (n=4) of cases where the offender was not arrested.
- Overall, 86% (n=25) of referred cases involved an arrested offender.
- 93% (n=27) of victims in referred cases were female and 93% (n=26) of offenders were male.
- Both divorced/separated and single/living together clients comprised 32% of the cases that were referred for charging.
- The average age of clients whose cases were referred for charging was 33 years old.
- One of the victim in referred cases had an order for protection, one was sheltered, and 59% (n=17) were in counseling.
- The two most frequent offenses comprising referred cases were domestic battery (41%, n=12) and domestic assault/violence (41%, n=9).
- 72% (n=21) of referred cases involved no visible physical injuries.
- 72% (n=21) of referred cases had no other witnesses to the assault other than the victim.
- 65% (n=17) of referred cases occurred inside the victim's residence.

Summary of the decision to refer for charging

As would be expected due to the existence of probable cause, the majority of cases where the offender was arrested were referred for prosecution. However, that proportion of referred cases decreased from 99% in 2008 to 86% in 2010. The more significant change in referred cases though occurred in those where the offender was not arrested at the scene. During the study period, 80% of non-arrest cases were referred for prosecution compared to 48% in 2008.

The percentage of cases with a female victim remained relatively unchanged from those who reported to the police and from 2008 with similar results for cases involving a male offender. A smaller proportion of cases involving divorced/separated clients comprised those referred for prosecution compared to those who reported to the police (32% vs. 39%, respectively), resulting in an increase in the proportion of single/living together cases referred for prosecution (29% to 32%). In addition, the average age of clients whose cases were referred for prosecution (33 years old) declined from those who reported to the police (37 years old). While the number of cases involving clients requesting a protection order or shelter was minimal (one case for each service type), 59% of referred cases involved a client who requested counseling compared to 50% of those seeking assistance.

Compared to 2008, increases were found in types of offenses, lack of physical injuries, lack of witnesses, and location of assault. While the most frequent offenses listed in referred cases remained the same, domestic battery increased from 23% in 2008 to 41% in 2010. In 2008, 57% of referred cases involved no visible physical injuries, but increased to 72% in 2010. The proportion of referred cases lacking additional witnesses

(outside of the victim) also increased from 2008 to 2010 (60% vs. 72%). And, the proportion of referred cases occurring inside the victim's residence continued to increase (57% in 2008 vs. 65% in 2010).

Spotlight: Decision to prosecute

During the study period:

- 93% (n=27) of cases referred for prosecution by the police were actually charged.
- 96% (n=26) of prosecuted cases had a female victim and 96% had a male offender.
- The average age of victims in prosecuted cases was 33 years and fairly similar proportions of divorced/separated, married, and single/living together victims in those cases that were prosecuted.
- Only one prosecuted case involved a protection order and one involved a request for shelter, while 63% of victims in prosecuted cases requested counseling.
- 74% (n=20) of prosecuted cases involved no visible physical injuries.
- 74% (n=15) of cases prosecuted had no other witnesses aside from the victim.
- The most frequently charged offenses were Battery-Domestic Violence (34%, n=10) and Enhancement-Domestic Battery in the Presence of a Child (24%, n=7).
- An even proportion of defendants were released on their recognizance and ordered to post bail (42%, n=10) with the most frequent bail amount ordered at \$5,000 (22%, n=6). Ninety percent of those ordered to post bail actually made bail.
- 88% (n=22) of the defendants were provided court appointed attorneys.

- 15% (n=4) of prosecuted cases were dismissed.
- 19% (n=5) of cases went to jury trial and one case went to a court trial.
- 19% (n=5) of prosecuted cases were resolved by a guilty plea.
- 44% (n=12) of cases were resolved through a guilty plea to lesser charges (plea bargain).

Summary of the decision to prosecute

A large majority of the cases referred by police for charging were prosecuted (93%) and the proportion has increased compared to 2008 (83%). The proportions of female victims and male offenders have also increased since 2008 (92% to 96%, 88% to 96%). The average age of clients whose cases were prosecuted remained unchanged from cases that were charged (33 years old); however marital status has continued to change across decision-making points in the criminal justice system. The proportion of divorced/separated victims in prosecuted cases continued to decline compared to earlier decision-making points in the system (31%). While the proportion of married victims has remained relatively stable across those same points, the proportion of single/living together victims has continued to increase (35% for prosecuted cases compared to 29% for charging cases). While no changes have occurred with clients who requested a protection order or shelter (remaining extremely low at one case each), the percentage of cases involving a victim who requested counseling continued to increase with 63% of victims in prosecuted cases having requested this service (an increase from 59% at charging).

Roughly three-quarters of prosecuted cases still involve no physical injury and that statistic has remained fairly stable as cases have progressed through the criminal justice system (varying 72%-77%). However, this proportion is a significant increase from 2008 when only 52% of prosecuted cases involved no visible physical injuries. This increase is similar to that reported for prosecuted cases with no other witnesses aside from the victim (74% up from 60% in 2008). While Domestic Violence and Criminal Trespass were the two most frequent charged offenses in 2008, for 2010, Battery-Domestic Violence and an enhancement for Domestic Battery in the Presence of a Child were the most frequent offenses charged by prosecutors. The higher proportion of cases involving no visible physical injury and no additional witnesses may account for the significant decrease in defendants ordered to pretrial detention (16% in 2010 vs. 76% in 2008). Defendants in 2010 were equally likely to be released on their own recognizance or ordered to post bail (42% each) with 90% of defendants ordered to post bail making bail and being released. The most frequent bail amount ordered by the court was \$5000. In 2008, all of the defendants qualified for court appointed attorneys, but that proportion decreased to 88% in 2010.

A dramatic decrease in dismissed cases occurred in 2010 compared to 2008 (15% vs. 32%). All of the defendants in these dismissed cases had been arrested (n=4). Twenty-five percent of these dismissed cases involved physical injuries to the victim and all had no additional witnesses beyond the victim. There was no concentration in any specific type of offense charged for these dismissed cases as they ranged from disturbing the peace to domestic battery in the presence of a child.

For this evaluation, the researchers were able to separate straight guilty pleas from guilty pleas originating from a plea bargain to a lesser offense. Thus, only 19% of prosecuted cases were resolved through a straight plea to original charges, while 44% were resolved through a guilty plea to a lesser charge. These appear to be decreases compared to 2008 where 64% were resolved through either straight pleas or a plea to a lesser charge. Comprising the difference was an increase in both jury and court trials (19%). In a change from 2008, only one of the plea bargained cases involved a lesser charge of disturbing the peace, compared to 90% in 2008.

Spotlight: Decision to sentence

During the study period:

- 81% of cases resolved by guilty plea, jury trial, court trial, or plea bargain were sentenced (n=22)
- 96% (n=21) of the cases sentenced involved a female victim and 95% (n=20) involved a male offender.
- The average age of the victim in sentenced cases was 33 years old.
- Only 24% of sentenced cases involved divorced/separated victims, while both married and single/living together victims reached 38% of the prosecuted cases.
- None of the sentenced cases included an initial request for a protection order or shelter. However, 68% of sentenced cases involved a victim who requested counseling.
- 77% (n=17) of sentenced cases involved no physical injuries to the victim.
- 68% (n=15) of sentenced cases had no additional witnesses beyond the victim.

- 71% (n=15) of sentenced cases occurred at the victim's residence.
- 86% (n=19) of the defendants sentenced received jail time and in all of the cases at least some, if not all, of the jail time was suspended by the court.
- One case resulted in a conviction to a felony charge and the defendant was ordered to serve 60 months in prison.
- 91% (n=20) of defendants sentenced were required to pay any fine to the court with 29% ordered to pay \$350 (most frequent amount).
- 46% (n=10) were ordered to complete some form of treatment with 30% ordered to complete domestic violence treatment (most frequent treatment type).
- 27% (n=6) of defendants were ordered to have no contact with the victim of the crime.
- 91% (n=20) of defendants were placed on probation for a specified amount of time with 60% ordered on probation for 2 years (most frequent length of time).

Summary of the decision to sentence

A majority of cases (81%) that were resolved through various means were sentenced. Of these sentenced cases, 96% involved a female victim (an increase from 88% in 2008) and 95% involved a male offender (also an increase from 82% in 2008). The average of the victim in sentenced cases remained unchanged from prosecuted cases at 33 years old. The proportion of cases involving separated/divorced victims continued to decline (24% down from 31% of prosecuted cases), while the proportion of married or single/living together cases continued to increase across decision making points in the system (both at 38% up from 32% and 35% respectively). While neither of the cases

involving a protection order or a request for shelter was sentenced, the proportion of cases involved victims who requested counseling reached its highest level at 68% of sentenced cases.

Some of the most dramatic increases occurred in the characteristics of cases reaching the sentencing phase. The percentage of cases being sentenced that included no physical injuries to the victim and no additional witnesses beyond the victim increased from 53% for both in 2008 to 77% and 68%, respectively. A smaller increase was noted in the percentage of sentenced cases that occurred at the victim's residence (71%, up from 65% in 2008).

In terms of actual sentences handed down to offenders, most measures saw steady increases. A higher percentage of defendants were required to pay a fine in 2010 (91%) than in 2008 (82%). The most significant increase in this category appeared in area of treatment. In 2008, only one defendant was ordered to complete some form of domestic violence treatment. In 2010, 46% of defendants were ordered to treatment and the researchers were able to document the type of treatment ordered by the Court. Thirty percent were ordered to complete domestic violence treatment which was the most frequent form of treatment ordered for defendants during the study period. Some measures did decrease compared to the 2008 data. In 2008, 94% of sentenced defendants received jail time, while in 2010, 86% received jail time and all defendants had partial or all of their time suspended by the Court. The percentage of defendants ordered to have no contact with the victim as a condition of their sentence also decreased in 2010 (27%, down from 35%). Finally, 91% of defendants were placed on probation for a period of

time in 2010, a decrease from 94% in 2008. And only 60% were given a probationary period of 2 years as opposed to 91% in 2008.

The next section of this report discusses the implications of these findings.

Conclusion

The purpose of this outcome evaluation was to provide comparison statistics for the Nampa Family Justice Center to evaluate how well it is meeting its stated goals, (i.e., increased victim safety and increased accountability for offenders). Using a systemic evaluation allows for all of the agencies involved in the NFJC to evaluate how well they, as a system, are functioning in terms of holding offenders accountable for the violence they commit and increasing public safety. Because the actions of each agency along the criminal justice continuum affect the ability of each successive agency to act, a systemic analysis, such as this one, is the only appropriate means of evaluating the broader picture of institutional response to domestic violence.

The initial results indicated that, for the most part, each agency in the system is addressing domestic violence to some extent. And, in comparison to the 2008 evaluation, significant increases across many of the measures indicate greater awareness and better response to cases of domestic violence. The high percentage of reported cases actually involving an arrest, those being referred for prosecution, the proportion being charged, the percentage of offenders being held in jail, the likelihood of a convicted offender being sentenced to jail time and probation are all good indicators of a functioning system in response to domestic violence. In addition, there were significant increases and decreases in case characteristics that imply a stronger prosecutorial presence in the criminal justice system's response to domestic violence compared to 2008. Some of these changes are discussed in the remainder of this section.

First, in the 2008 evaluation, we had limited information on the demographics of clients coming into the NFJC, thus comparisons could not be made across 2008 and 2010

for average age, marital status, race/ethnicity, or location of residence within the city of Nampa. In terms of demographics, the most informative finding was that 92% of clients who disclosed their ethnicity during the study period reported themselves to be Latina or Latino. While researchers expected some measureable proportion of clients would be Latina/o, the result that almost all of the clients during the two months of data collection were Latina/o was quite surprising. This result implies many positive outcomes, such as increased awareness in the Latina/o community of the NFJC's services and increased willingness to report domestic assault within the Latina/o community (as this high percentage remained throughout the systemic response). However, Latinas/os do not represent the majority of citizens residing in Nampa or Canyon County. While Canyon County does have a higher proportion of Hispanics residing in it compared to the rest of the state (21.5% vs. 10.2%) as does the city of Nampa (17.9%), 74% of Canyon County citizens and 83%⁴ of Nampa citizens report their race as White (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009). In addition, domestic violence in the state does not appear to be highly concentrated within the Hispanic population. According to the Idaho Crime Victimization Survey: Trends from 2000-2006 (Mereen, 2007), Hispanics comprised only 10.6% of respondents reporting domestic violence victimization in 2006 in Idaho. Even though Canyon County had the sixth highest reported rate of domestic violence victimization in the state in 2006 (5.23 per 1,000 people which was a 16% decrease from 2000), it is very doubtful that the proportion of domestic violence victims in Nampa would reach 90% Latina/o. So, the question becomes: Why are more Latina/os coming to the NFJC and

⁴ For the city of Nampa, the U.S. Census only reports the percentage of White citizens (from 2006) which does include Hispanics who report their race as White and ethnicity as Hispanic. The Canyon County and Idaho figures do **not** include Hispanics as these numbers are for citizens who report their race as White, but are **not** of Hispanic ethnicity.

where are Non-Hispanic White victims receiving services and why? The researchers did not have the requisite data to answer this question, but it should be the one of the foci of any future evaluations.

This leads to another finding which has both positive and negative connotations. In 2010, the percentage of cases coming into the Nampa Family Justice Center that were reported to the police was 52%, a significant increase from a reporting rate of 31% in 2008. This possibly reflects an increased awareness of the NFJC and its services as well as an increased willingness to report these incidents to law enforcement. The researchers did not have the requisite data to answer the question as to why reporting has increased. However, since the ethnicity of those reporting is overwhelmingly Latina, a comparison to national reporting rates for Latinas is instructive. The domestic violence reporting rate for Latinas in the United States is 65%, 13% above the reporting rate at the NFJC (Rennison & Welchans, 2000). The primary caveat to this finding is that the actual reporting rate to the local police department may be higher, in that victims may be reporting directly to local police and never receiving services from the NFJC. If victims did not seek out services from NFJC, they would not be reflected in this analysis. But, the only way to ascertain that would be to conduct a victimization study in the Nampa-area to determine prevalence and incidence rates and actual proportions which are being reported to area police. In terms of the NFJC evaluation, the increase in reporting from 2008 is significant, yet, given the demographics of clients, there is room for more improvement.

Second, in 2008, the researchers highlighted two areas of concern: the low percentages of non-arrest cases referred for prosecution and non-arrest cases actually charged. These were areas of concern due to the issue that victims may often wait to

report the assault, sometimes waiting to see what the response of the offender will be, while other times in order to make appropriate plans for themselves and/or their children. This potentially could mean that a large proportion of domestic violence cases coming to the attention of the police would never reach the rest of the criminal justice system, accountability for the offender would decrease, and, possibly, risk for the victim would increase. The results from the 2010 analysis have calmed those concerns. In 2010, 80% of cases where the offender was not arrested were referred for charging as opposed to 48% in 2008. In 2010, 50% of the cases referred where the offender was not arrested were actually charged as opposed to none in 2008.

Those changes may be related to changes that were observed in the characteristics of cases prosecuted in the 2010 study period compared to the 2008 study period. Strength of domestic violence cases is often determined by the presence of physical injuries, witnesses beyond the victim, and location of the assault (which is highly correlated to the presence of witnesses). The concern is that most cases of domestic violence fall into the misdemeanor category of offenses, often involve few, if any, physical injuries visible at the time of reporting, and few witnesses other than the victim primarily because most incidents occur inside of a private residence. Improvements have been made over the years in evidence collection and prosecution of cases with these characteristics in order to address the vast majority of domestic violence. In 2008, 57% of cases referred by the police had no visible physical injuries, 60% involved no other witnesses beyond the victim, and 57% occurred inside the victim's residence. While not bad findings, there was still the possibility that many domestic violence cases were being overlooked in the decision to refer to the prosecutor's office because of a perceived lack of strength in the

case. Also in 2008, 52% of prosecuted domestic violence cases coming from the NFJC involved no physical injuries and 60% had no other witnesses beyond the victim. Again, while these findings were not necessarily negative, if the vast majority of cases fall into these categories but only half of the prosecutions, there is some concern. In 2010, these concerns can be set aside to some extent. Seventy-two percent of cases referred by the police involved no physical injuries, 72% had no other witnesses, and 65% occurred inside the victim's residence. Of the cases charged by the prosecutor in 2010, 74% had no visible physical injuries and 74% had no other witnesses. In addition, the percentage of cases dismissed by the prosecutor decreased from 32% in 2008 to 15% in 2010. These are sizable increases (and decreases) within that time frame.

Finally, in 2008, we expressed concern that only one defendant during the study period was court-ordered into treatment. Defendants who pled guilty to original charges of domestic violence or domestic battery were not even ordered into treatment. In 2010, 46% of defendants were ordered to complete some form of treatment of which 30% were ordered to complete domestic violence treatment. This is an obvious improvement from 2008, however only 30% of defendants convicted of an incident arising out of act of domestic violence were ordered to complete a course of treatment designed specifically to address domestic violence. The other 70% were ordered to sex offender treatment, alcohol treatment, anger management, or marriage counseling (which of course would require the participation of a victim who is **not** under the purview of the Court and places that victim in a very precarious situation). The researchers do not argue that these other forms of treatment were inappropriate for each individual defendant, but they are not designed to address the issue of domestic violence and may further misconceptions about

causative factors (e.g., alcohol **causes** domestic violence rather than as a facilitator or aggravator of domestic violence).

The initial outcome study (also conducted from a systemic perspective) served as a baseline for this second evaluation. This outcome study (and any other subsequent ones) serves as an update to assist the NFJC and its partnering agencies in achieving their stated goals, especially in the areas of increasing accountability for offenders and increasing safety for victims. Towards this end, NFJC and its partnering agencies must continue to address data sharing issues that prevent effective analysis of the work all of the agencies are conducting. In the future, a larger data collection period (six months as opposed to two months) may be more instructive especially if the NFJC is interested in examining predictive characteristics among client demographics, case characteristics, and systemic response. In addition, comparing cases that originate at the NFJC to those that bypass the NFJC will be important in determining the full effect of the NFJC.

In conclusion, the work done by the NFJC and its partnering agencies has possibly lead to significant increases in reporting, referral, prosecution, and sentencing of domestic violence cases in the past two years. These increases, especially in the area of prosecution, should demonstrate that changing one or more parts of the system can have a dramatic effect on the system's response as a whole. Ongoing evaluations from a systemic perspective are important in order gain perspective on the effects of changes within the system and to ensure that the goals of the Nampa Family Justice Center continue to be met.

References

Mereen, R. (2007). *Intimate partner violence in Idaho: Trends from 2002 through 2006*.

Meridian, ID: Idaho State Police. Retrieved from

http://www.isp.state.id.us/pgr/Research/documents/IPVinIdaho2006_005.pdf.

Accessed on January 28, 2010.

Rennison, C.M. & S. Welchans (2000). *Bureau of Justice Statistics special report:*

Intimate partner violence. Washington, DC: Office of Justice Programs.

United States Census Bureau (2009). *State & county quick facts*. Washington, DC: U.S.

Census Bureau. Retrieved from <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/16000.html>

Accessed on January 28, 2010.

Appendix A