

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

**Document Title: Jackson County, Oregon, Arrest Policies
Project: A Process Evaluation**

Author(s): Deborah L. Spence

Document No.: 201883

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

Jackson County, Oregon, Arrest Policies Project

A Process Evaluation

August 23, 2000

Prepared by
Deborah L. Spence

Prepared for
**Jackson County Community Corrections
National Institute of Justice
Violence Against Women Office**

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Project Environment.....	2
Jackson County Demographics	2
Criminal Justice System.....	3
Jackson County Community Corrections.....	3
Jackson County Circuit Court	4
Jackson County District Attorney’s Office	4
Jackson County Law Enforcement.....	4
The Non-Profit Community	4
The Domestic Violence Council	5
Oregon Domestic Violence Law	5
Development, Implementation, and Performance.....	6
Project Goals	6
Implementation	8
Project Performance	10
Agency Activity	10
Collaboration.....	12
Training	14
Recommendations and Conclusions.....	14
Recommendations	14
Develop an Evaluation Component.....	15
Expand Partnership to Law Enforcement.....	15
Focus on Training.....	16
Conclusions.....	16

Introduction

The Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies Program encourages jurisdictions to implement 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; and
- 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 twenty sites will examine the process and problems associated with implementation of the project. And third, an impact evaluation of five or 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 Policies project in Jackson County, Oregon. The overall goal of this project is the development of a program for intervening with and supervising batterers, modeled after the county's nationally recognized Sex Offender Treatment Team. The project, lead by Jackson County Community Corrections, initially received \$167,138 in FY 1997 for an 18-month period. A larger continuation grant was awarded in late 1998. Funds from the first grant were used to hire a Probation Officer and create a Domestic Violence Unit at the County Community Corrections Office, which would include a victim advocate from a local non-profit agency. The continuation funds covered another one-half time dedicated Probation Officer and a domestic violence advocate at the District Attorney's Office. Agency training has also been funded by the grants. The basis of the evaluation was a five-day site visit in June 1999 that concentrated on interviews and document review. Follow-up interviews and inquiries were conducted by telephone. This report is divided into three sections: 1) Project Environment, 2) Grant Development, Implementation, and Performance, and 3) Conclusions and Recommendations.

Project Environment

This section provides an overview of Jackson County, including demographics, the criminal justice system, the non-profit community, and Oregon laws concerning domestic violence.

Jackson County Demographics

Jackson County, Oregon is located in the southern part of the state, on the California border, equidistant from Portland and San Francisco. It is the sixth most populous county in Oregon, with a 1999 estimated population of 174,550. The county covers 2,801 square miles, approximately the same size as the state of Delaware. Two-thirds of the residents live in the 11 incorporated cities; Medford, the County Seat and largest city, has an estimated population of 60,000. The county was traditionally supported by the timber industry but has seen a shift to a service-oriented economy in recent years. There is also a substantial population of retirees. Estimates from 1995 put the median household income in the county at \$28,572, and per capita income at \$19,746.

Criminal Justice System

The lead partner in this project is Jackson County Community Corrections, which is in charge of probation and parole for the county. The original project team was made up of staff from Jackson County Community Corrections and Dunn House, a local, nonprofit service provider. It was later expanded to include the District Attorney's Office. The remainder of the criminal justice system only has contact with the project through the county's Domestic Violence Council. We will first look at Community Corrections, then the courts, the District Attorney's Office, and the law enforcement community.

Jackson County Community Corrections

Jackson County Community Corrections (JCCC) is responsible for all field probations, both misdemeanor and felony, as well as the county jail. The first grant created a Domestic Violence Unit (the Unit) in the JCCC, providing funding for the transfer of 1 full-time probation officer to supervise domestic violence offenders and 1 officer to act as Unit coordinator. When the project began, their non-domestic violence cases were reassigned to other officers. This transfer was completed by August 1997.

As the number of domestic violence offenders on probation increased, the department supplied funding for two additional probation officers. One of these officers maintains the limited supervision caseload—this officer is assigned all of the in-compliance and low risk cases from both the Domestic Violence Unit and the Sex Offender Unit.¹ The other officers supervise all the medium and high-risk offenders. When new cases go through intake procedures, they are assigned to one of three risk categories: low, medium and high. Over time a case can be re-assigned as “in-compliance”, which simply means that the probationer has been in compliance with all the conditions of his or her probation. Low risk and in-compliance probationers are only seen in the JCCC offices. Medium and high-risk offenders are supervised in the community. The officer will visit them at home, talk with other family members, and generally see them more often than the limited supervision officer sees his cases. For high-risk cases, surprise home visits are not uncommon.

¹ There is a general limited supervision officer for the whole department, but the domestic violence and sex offender officers historically never transferred cases to that person because of the special nature of their cases.

Jackson County Circuit Court

In Oregon, the Circuit Court is the trial court of general jurisdiction, which means that it hears cases regardless of the subject matter, amount of money involved, or the severity of the crime alleged. The Jackson County Circuit Court is made up of an appointed presiding judge, three elected civil judges, and three elected criminal judges. A domestic violence case may be heard by any of the judges on the criminal bench.

Jackson County also has a Community Family Court program. This ensures that a single judge will hear all the cases that involve members of the same family, thereby enabling the judge to make comprehensive decisions about the family by knowing more about their overall situation. The Family Community Court program is not exclusively for domestic violence cases, but domestic violence cases do enter the program if there are also pending cases involving related children. The court program can then consolidate and coordinate court orders and ensure consistency in sentencing and conditions.

Jackson County District Attorney's Office

A special Domestic Violence Response Team (DVRT) exists in the District Attorney's office. The DVRT, which consists of a prosecutor, an investigator, and an advocate, was originally entirely supported with Byrne Grant funds. In July 1999, funding for the investigator and the advocate was subsumed under the Arrest Policies grant, and the District Attorney's Office officially became a project partner.

Jackson County Law Enforcement

There are ten police agencies in Jackson County in addition to the County Sheriff's Office. The majority of the domestic violence cases that move through the court system originate with the Sheriff's Office or the Medford Police Department, the largest law enforcement agency in the county. Law enforcement is represented on the county's Domestic Violence Council, but none of the agencies are partners on the Arrest Policies project.

The Non-Profit Community

The non-profit partner for this project is the local battered women's shelter, Dunn House. The shelter was purchased outright in 1994 by an organization called Community Works,

ensuring its place as a permanent facility in the county. Dunn House serves approximately 700 women and children each year.

For this project, Dunn House was contracted to provide advocacy and support to victims throughout arrest, conviction, and supervision of their batterers. The original grant provided for one experienced Dunn House advocate to work for JCCC in the Criminal Justice Building in Medford. The continuation grant added two more Dunn House advocates to the project, one housed at the District Attorney's Office and the other at the courthouse.

The Domestic Violence Council

The Jackson County Domestic Violence Council was established in July 1995. The Council has approximately 90 members, with an average monthly attendance of 40 people. These members include representatives of Dunn House, the District Attorney's Office, JCCC, local law enforcement agencies, private attorneys, treatment providers, legal services, and the county Victim-Witness Office. The Council also has representatives from various social services providers, such as Medford Hospital and Adult and Family Services.

The Council has eight subcommittees, one of which is the Batterer Intervention Team (BIT) subcommittee. The BIT is the part of the Council that has the most regular contact with the Arrest Policies project team.

During the project period, the Council underwent a number of changes, as it re-evaluated membership and purpose. The end result was a larger council, representing a broader range of community interests. Part of the re-organization included the creation of a position for a part-time staff person for the Council, which was made a reality with funding from the project's continuation grant.

Oregon Domestic Violence Law

According to the Oregon Revised Statutes § 135.230, "abuse" includes:

- (a) Attempting to cause or intentionally, knowingly or recklessly causing physical injury;
- (b) Intentionally, knowingly or recklessly placing another in fear of imminent serious physical injury
- (c) Committing sexual abuse in any degree as defined in ORS § 163.415, 163.425 and 163.427

“Domestic Violence” means abuse between family or household members, defined by the following relationships

- (a) Spouses
- (b) Former Spouses
- (c) Adult persons related by blood or marriage
- (d) Persons cohabitating with each other
- (e) Persons who have cohabited with each other or who have been involved in a sexually intimate relationship
- (f) Unmarried parents of a minor child.

Under the Family Abuse Prevention Act § 107.705, “family or household members” is extended to include adult persons related by adoption and persons who have cohabited in the past as well as current cohabitees.

Development, Implementation, and Performance

The original proposal was prepared by Jackson County Community Corrections, with extensive consultation from one of the circuit court judges. The project was implemented by JCCC with the assistance of Dunn House and the Jackson County Domestic Violence Council. This section describes the proposal goals, implementation, and project performance.

Project Goals

The overarching goal of this project was to develop a new model for intervening with and supervising convicted batterers. The three stated project goals were to 1) develop specific standards and policies, as well as a specialized team approach to work with convicted domestic violence offenders, 2) improve communication and collaboration among the people, agencies and programs that deal with domestic violence in the county, and 3) increase understanding of the phenomenon of domestic violence and promote the concept of shared responsibility for victim safety among the people in the criminal justice system. The seven project objectives and related tasks are shown in Exhibit 1.

Exhibit 1: Project Objectives and Tasks

Objective	Tasks
Objective 1: Establish a Domestic Violence Unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• JCCC will assign an experienced probation officer to coordinate the DV unit• Contract with Dunn House and a private contractor for designated services• Review all cases to identify DV offenders• Reorganize caseloads and assign additional officers to the Unit based on current general caseload sizes
Objective 2: Establish a Batterer Intervention Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify and contact all team members• Convene to review goals and objectives and establish a monthly meeting schedule• Meet with Sex Offender Treatment Team• Establish guidelines for group interaction
Objective 3: Develop Batterer Intervention Program Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Decide on procedure and assign tasks to develop local standards for programs• Complete a draft of the standards• Draft reviewed by the DV Council Steering Committee• Complete appropriate revisions and resubmit• Court will designate programs for offender referral only if they meet standards
Objective 4: Develop Procedures to address victim safety and offender accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allocate subsidy funds for indigent offenders to participate in polygraph testing and electronic monitoring• BIT discussion of major issues such as lethality assessments, tracking, advocacy involvement, removal of “no contact” conditions• Prepare written reports on each issue
Objective 5: Develop protocols and procedures for probation and parole supervision	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• BIT to draft policy for supervision of DV offenders• Draft reviewed by JCCC administrators, advocates, the court and the DV Council• Revisions completed by Unit coordinator for approval by Director of JCCC
Objective 6: Develop and implement an education and training plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review existing work and completed survey• Conduct discussion on training needs and area of greatest need• Develop written plan• Work with DV Council to provide training and recruit trainers
Objective 7: Create a domestic violence training calendar	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The contractor will research, prepare and distribute a local calendar of training opportunities every quarter

Implementation

By the end of May 1997, two probation officers had been reassigned to form the Domestic Violence Unit. One served primarily as the project coordinator, the second was assigned to handle all new domestic violence intakes. Over the course of the summer, a preliminary identification of the existing domestic violence probation and parole cases was completed. Cases that were less than 6 months old, or older cases with recent violation behavior, were assigned to the Unit. It was decided that other older cases would only be moved in the event of problem behavior. Also at this time, all non-domestic cases were moved off the specialized probation officer's caseload. Finally in that first summer, a request for proposal process was completed and contracts signed to bring on board Dunn House and a private contractor. Dunn House, as the non-profit partner for the project, moved one of their victim advocates to the JCCC office. The contractor was hired to assist the project team with the development and implementation of a training plan, and to create and maintain the training calendar. A second probation officer was hired by JCCC in September 1997 to supervise domestic violence cases. A third officer was assigned in April 1998.

The first meeting of the Batterer Intervention Team (BIT) took place in May 1997, as the Domestic Violence Council requested that they meet even before the grant documents were signed. The BIT, a Council subcommittee, met with the Sex Offender Treatment Team – part of the nationally recognized program that this project hoped to emulate – in July, and from there drew up the guidelines for BIT. Monthly meetings of the BIT started right away.

The BIT divided into committees to review the State Domestic Council's proposal for Program Standards. Changes were recommended to meet the specific needs of the county, and a draft of the Standard was presented to the Domestic Violence Council Steering Committee in December 1997. After a defense attorney on the Steering Committee voiced some objections and concerns, a dialogue was opened between the BIT, the attorney in question, and the judge who chaired the Council. An example of standards in another Oregon county was presented that met the needs of the attorney and the judge, primarily in that it was shorter, less philosophical, and read more like a legal document.

Through the spring of 1998, the BIT re-drafted the Standards, with the end result being less wordy than the original, yet much more detailed. It was resubmitted to the Council. At this

time the Council was having its own problems and was unable to take the time to review the new standards. Review and approval was delayed approximately 6 months while the Council embarked upon a process of self-evaluation and re-organization. Also at this time the Unit coordinator moved to a neighboring county, and began commuting to Jackson County on a monthly basis to oversee completion of the project.

The full Domestic Violence Council finally approved the completed Standards document in September 1998. A copy of the Standards is attached as Appendix A. At this point the Standards were reviewed by the court, which made the request that JCCC handle the official designation of programs. This was a change from the original objective (see objective 3 above) which stated that the court would designate programs for offender referral. The Director of Community Corrections agreed to the change, and the Council approved this change in responsibility in December 1998. At that time, the BIT designed applications for providers, which were promptly distributed to the batterer treatment providers already working with JCCC.

A wide variety of topics relevant to victim safety and offender accountability have been discussed by the BIT at their monthly meetings. Advocacy involvement in the BIT was strong from the beginning, with as many as four or five advocates or survivors attending most meetings. Consequently, all meetings focused at least some of the time on issues of victim safety. Given that discussion of these topics was generated by the flow of the meeting more than by the agenda, the decision was made to complete one report on the issues, which would be included in the project's final report. This was a change from the number of smaller subject reports included in the original objectives and tasks.

A change in JCCC management late in the project's first year prompted some alterations to the original project goals, although the new management was very supportive of the project and responsive to the needs of the Unit. The Unit coordinator undertook research into policy and procedures for supervision, and many specific practices were implemented during the project's first year. At the request of the new director, the final document prepared by the team was changed to "A Supervision Manual," which would differ from other formal policy and procedure documents in that it would also include philosophical information, and only contain very limited "policy."

The private contractor hired to complete the tasks in Objectives 6 and 7 reviewed all the recent survey work done by the Council's Publicity/Education Committee. The contractor, with an introduction from the Judge who chairs the Council, also contacted all Council participants to establish communication regarding training needs and opportunities. New members were recruited to the Council's Publicity/Education Committee, which then began meeting regularly to plan a training process. The contractor also worked with other Council members to organize publicity for the project during Domestic Violence Awareness Month, and developed a written plan for the Council, the highlight of which was a conference held on August 28, 1998. The project objectives further called for the contractor to coordinate implementation of this plan during the grant period, but the contractor chose instead to leave the project in August to concentrate on his private practice. The Training Committee continues to meet and deal with on-going training needs in place of the contractor.

The contractor did not complete the formal training calendar for Objective 7. In the beginning, a list of scheduled upcoming events was gathered, but since there were only two items of general interest, they were announced at Council and Team meetings. Since then, training opportunities that arise are announced at Council and Team meetings and included in the minutes of both groups.

The project expanded its team in the summer of 1999, with the start of a continuation grant. The District Attorney's Office, which had previously funded its DVRT through a Bryne grant, needed a new funding source for their investigator and their advocate, who was contracted from Dunn House. By joining the Arrest Project team, these positions could continue.

Project Performance

This project does not have a formal evaluator. Consequently, documentation and collection of statistics to gauge project performance are limited. This section reviews project performance in four areas: (1) agency activity; (2) collaboration; (3) policies and procedures; and (4) training.

Agency Activity

For the first grant period, only one criminal justice agency was participating in the project, JCCC. After an initially slow start to the overall project, the Domestic Violence Unit

was up and operating within a couple of months. The transfer of non-domestic violence offenders off the caseloads of the Unit officers was completed with relative ease, and JCCC has been willing and able to provide additional officers to the Unit as the need has arisen.

Based on data provided by JCCC for November 1998 through May 1999, the Unit takes in an average of 15 new domestic violence cases each month. The average length of probation for a Class A misdemeanor is 1 year (6 months for a Class B misdemeanor). It has been challenging for the Unit to manage this caseload at the appropriate level of supervision, even with the officers provided by JCCC to work alongside the one grant-funded officer. The state does not provide funding for misdemeanor supervision, so additional resources for the Unit have been squeezed from the county budget to pay for the officers hired in September 1997 and April 1998.

As an additional measure to ease the caseload burden, an experienced officer has been assigned to a “limited supervision caseload” of both domestic violence cases and sex offender cases. By having one officer handle all the in-compliance and low risk cases from both units, the remaining officers have more time for the supervision of the medium and high-risk offenders. They can continue to perform home visits and meet the Unit’s contact standards. While JCCC has always had a limited supervision officer, the Sex Offender and Domestic Violence Units did not historically transfer cases to that officer because of the special nature of their offenders. Because this officer only serves these two units, the units now know and trust the officer to handle these cases appropriately.

Staffing changes have challenged JCCC, although in the long run, none of them have impeded the work of the Unit. At most, the changes have only led to temporary slow-downs of the overall project. First, the Coordinator, who headed the Unit, moved to another city. While she continued to work from her new home and traveled monthly to Medford to direct project activity, provisions had to be made for the daily supervision of project activities and her eventual replacement as Unit Coordinator. The replacement took over with the beginning of the continuation grant period. Also, the Director of JCCC, who had been very supportive of the project and active in the grant planning process, retired during the project period. Fortunately, the new director is also supportive of the project and the Unit remained stable through the

transition process. The new director kept the promises of his predecessor and has increased the number of officers serving in the Unit as it has become necessary.

The Dunn House advocate brought to work in JCCC is an entry-level position, but the position has maintained substantial continuity nevertheless. When the original advocate left the project due to a promotion, she was in a position to supervise her replacement, thus ensuring there was no major upheaval as a result of the staff change.

The Domestic Violence Council has undergone substantial change during the project period. This process at times hindered the progress of the project, but in the end they were able to fulfill their obligations to the project, perhaps even with greater effectiveness and efficiency than they might have otherwise. Project staff feel that Council meetings have been much more productive since the Council was re-organized, and that it better represents the interests of the community. Also improving the way the project works with the Council was the creation of a part-time coordinator/staff position for the Council funded by project funds from the continuation grant.

Collaboration

Both formal and informal collaboration between the various Jackson County agencies and with the community have improved as a result of the project, although the process has not been without challenges. At the beginning, the project team was very effective at educating themselves, but not at educating anyone else. They soon found that this led to a rejection of their ideas by the wider community. Since many of the project objectives were dependent on Council approval, changes had to be made in the way the project team dealt with people outside the team. The project team also quickly discovered that unrelated agency history and politics had an impact on their ability to accomplish the outlined tasks. Prior inter-agency experiences influenced current inter-agency relationships. Overall however, collaboration improved as a result of the project. The initial goal might have been to get good Batterer Intervention Programs for the offenders on probation, but one of the biggest actual outcomes has been the improvement in community collaboration. The Batterer Intervention Team opened communication between JCCC and area treatment providers above what had previously existed.

The fact that the project has expanded to also include the District Attorney's Office is another prime example of this improved community collaboration. The creation of the DV Unit in the JCCC improved communication between the District Attorney's Office and JCCC, particularly with respect to repeat offenders. Now, every Friday in court there are hearings on probation violations. Communication between the District Attorney's Office and Dunn House is still problematic. The District Attorney would find it helpful to know more about the victims when making decisions on approaching new cases. The non-profit is, understandably, very protective of clients' confidentiality rights, and therefore hesitant to provide this information.

Even with its protective stance regarding victim information, the collaboration with Dunn House has been beneficial to the project. The advocacy involvement on the project team is strong, and it keeps the project team focused on issues of victim safety. Prior to the first grant, the probation officers had no domestic violence training; even before the first draw-down of grant funds a lot of informal training had taken place, due to regular contact with the advocates.

There have even been some surprises in the realm of collaboration. For example, there was no expectation that the project would have any effect on the law enforcement community. However, the probation officers will stop into the various police departments to say "hi" and chat about their work, offering the police the opportunity to learn more about what the JCCC Unit and the project team are trying to do.

Policies and Procedures

Many of the project objectives concerned the creation of policies and procedures for the supervision of domestic violence offenders. Despite the lack of a dedicated person for standards and policy writing, much has been accomplished by the project team in this area.

As the project got underway, the team did find themselves expanding the scope of their plan in this area. For example, JCCC adopted a new risk assessment tool for domestic violence offenders. The Unit felt that the existing state tools did not address the issues important to domestic violence. The Unit found a new tool and had it entered into the statewide case management computer system.

The creation of the Batterer Intervention Program Standards was successfully completed, albeit almost a year later than the project had predicted. However, the majority of this delay was the result of the Council re-organization, rather than a shortcoming of the BIT.

A supervision manual for JCCC was prepared by the project team after extensive research; it was completed by the close of the first grant period. Even before the completion of the manual, many specific practices were implemented by the department to change the procedures for supervising domestic violence offenders. Out of the work of the first grant, new directions for policy and procedure development have taken shape. As the continuation grant began, the team's new priority was the development of standards for supervising female domestic violence offenders. At the time of this site visit, they were conducting research on the subject with assistance from the National Clearinghouse for the Defense of Battered Women.

Training

The original proposal called for the assignment of experienced officers to the Unit. While the officers working in the Unit are not senior, they have volunteered and have been well trained. All of the Unit officers have attended several statewide trainings for domestic violence, and at the time of this site visit, the Unit was planning to speak at the Oregon Community Corrections Managers Association Meeting. The intention is to ask the various county directors to support the formation of a statewide domestic violence supervision group, through which officers can share ideas and tools with their counterparts throughout the state.

Recommendations and Conclusions

The Jackson County Arrest project is a focused effort to improve supervision of domestic violence offenders in the community. While not as ambitious as some of the other Arrest Policies projects, this project team has remained focused on their goals and has met their objectives. The expansion of the project team to members of the DA's Office DVRT would seem to be a step towards the project having a real impact on offender accountability and victim safety.

Recommendations

The following recommendations, if implemented, would improve project performance.

1. Develop a comprehensive evaluation component
2. Expand partnership to include law enforcement
3. Increase focus on training of criminal justice system personnel

Develop an Evaluation Component

An assessment of project performance should be conducted. While there is substantial anecdotal information that this project is a success, these assertions have not been documented. Statistics should be collected to document probation, prosecution, and advocacy response. Surveys could be developed to evaluate team member and victim satisfaction with the Batterer Intervention Program.

Realistically, this recommendation might be difficult to meet because of the already heavy demands on project staff, but the individual agencies have already begun to take steps in the right direction. The District Attorney's Office is working to create a tracking system to share information with the other agencies. JCCC already has access to a statewide information management system that tracks offenders on probation. The Family Court program is already tracking offender and victim histories. All of these systems could be used to create a fairly detailed picture of the community response to domestic violence offenders and victims in the county.

Challenges to a truly comprehensive tracking system exist with the multitude of law enforcement agencies from which offenders and victims can enter the system in Jackson County, and from Dunn House. Understandably, the shelter prefers not to keep a tracking system as a matter of confidentiality.

Expand Partnership to Law Enforcement

So far, only minimal effort has been made to include any of the local law enforcement agencies in the project. While there is law enforcement representation on the Council and informal collaboration between probation officers and police officers has improved over the course of the project, this is the extent of cooperation between the two. Project participants reported that police trainings have not gone very well in terms of follow-up, primarily due to the cultures of the various departments. At the outset of the second grant period, the hope was to further improve law enforcement response through informal measures. An investigator was added to the District Attorney's Domestic Violence Response Team with the second grant, and

the expectation is that in addition to increasing convictions, this investigator will set an example for law enforcement personnel in the county.

Project staff expressed the opinion that including law enforcement in the formal partnership would be difficult because of the fact that there are 11 law enforcement agencies in the county. Perhaps the most effective way of expanding the partnership to law enforcement would be invite 1 or 2 agencies to join. The District Attorney's Office and JCCC already know that the majority of domestic violence cases enter the system from Jackson County Sheriff's Office or the Medford Police Department. Simply extending the partnership to include these two key agencies could dramatically improve the overall system response to domestic violence.

Focus on Training

Since the loss of the contractor partway through the original grant period, notification of training opportunities and organization of training presentations has become a very informal component of this project. With the major products planned for the project either completed or nearing completion, it would be a good time to re-dedicate efforts on training. In addition to expanding training within their own agencies, this would be another excellent way for the project team to reach out to the law enforcement community. While law enforcement training has had mixed results in the past, a more concentrated and focused effort might prove more effective in the future.

Conclusions

The Jackson County Arrest project is interesting in that it began with Community Corrections rather than as an initiative of law enforcement or prosecution. JCCC works to ensure that there is a consistent emphasis on offender accountability and the involvement of advocates from Dunn House keep the Unit focused on issues of victim safety. Collaboration with the county Domestic Violence Council is a real piece of the project, not a political nod.

The addition of the District Attorney's Office to the partnership with the continuation grant is an important step toward increasing the consistency of the community response to domestic violence. Informal collaboration with other county agencies and service providers has also improved as a serendipitous outcome of project activities. There is still room for further improvement in collaboration, however, and attention should be focused in this direction in the

future. If the project team is truly interested in improving offender accountability and victim safety, cooperation with the front end of the community response to crime (i.e. law enforcement) is crucial.

The JCCC DV Unit has, with its project partners Dunn House and the Domestic Violence Council, shifted the focus in Jackson County Community Corrections from simply containing offenders to serving the victims of domestic violence. It was not an overly ambitious project, but it has brought about noticeable policy and procedural changes within both JCCC and the Council. Perhaps what is most exciting about the project is that these changes are institutional, which makes it seem more than likely that the JCCC Domestic Violence Unit, as well as all other project staff, will remain in place and continue their work long past the end of Arrest Policies funding. The real question is whether they will take advantage of this job security to expand their goals and activities and really affect a change in Jackson County's response to domestic violence. The answer to that is yet to be seen.