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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

No matter what policing philosophy prevails, responding to violence is at the core of the police function. Violent crime is so central a task for law enforcement that its importance remains unchallenged even when police departments thoroughly redefine their function as they switch from "traditional" to "community policing" models. How then does the community policing philosophy alter the way police handle the violent crime problem in their communities? The Portland Police Bureau's Domestic Violence Reduction Unit (DVRU) provides us with one informative example. It illustrates how community policing strategies can be used in the fight against domestic violent crime. But does it work? Our report represents an attempt to show ways of assessing the effectiveness of community policing strategies when they are applied to a core law enforcement problem.

We used quantitative and qualitative methodologies which included the analysis of computer records, the use of surveys and structured interviews with victims and domestic violence response system representatives to answer the following key questions: "How well were community policing strategies implemented?" "What methods can be used to find out whether these strategies work?" and "How do these strategies impact the problem of family violence?"

"How well were community policing strategies implemented?"

The Portland Police Bureau community policing model has five core values to be used as guideposts for all policing strategies. Our findings indicate that each of the five core values--service orientation, partnership, empowerment, problem solving and accountability--find ample expression in the strategies the DVRU uses to address domestic violent crime in Portland. Appendix A presents a complete listing of these strategies.

"What methods can be used to find out whether these strategies work?"

We devised the Victim Call-Back Survey (VCBS) to measure the
effectiveness of the DVRU's service orientation strategies. The VCBS was used to ask victims of domestic violence to rate the quality of services they received from DVRU and uniform officers. While it makes sense to obtain this information directly from the service recipients, doing so potentially exposes domestic violence victims to harm. Appropriate interviewer training is therefore required. Apart from that, the VCBS is easily administered, and thus suitable as a routine performance measurement tool. Furthermore, we found that most victims were pleased to be contacted, and many were doubly pleased to be asked for their input.

Service Orientation Findings:

*It appears that performance ratings are positively related to the amount of police attention domestic violence victims receive. Victims who had police contact only at the time of the original incident gave consistently lower performance ratings than victims who had additional police services from the DVRU.

*DVRU officers received significantly higher ratings than uniform officers. For example, for overall service, 91% of victims gave positive ratings to DVRU officers and 73% gave positive ratings to uniform officers.

*The performance ratings for the five service orientation categories ranged between 91 and 96 percent positive for DVRU officers, as compared to between 71 and 79 percent positive for uniform officers.

To determine how well partnership strategies worked we conducted structured interviews with representatives of each of the domestic violence response system partners. Such interviews are suitable to determine whether "partnerships" between the police and related other organizations do indeed exist. Beyond that we do not suggest the use of such interviews as part of a routine assessment process. Other methods, both less and more formal, can be used equally effectively (see Section 8) to ascertain the quality of partner relationships.
Partnership Findings:

* We found that at the policy level, informal agreements were used, but no formal partnership agreements were in place.

* The informal agreements appeared to work most effectively with the prosecutor's office, the courts, and a batterer treatment program. They worked less well with a local shelter, and the community corrections unit that handles domestic violence cases. The shelter and domestic violence coalition representatives especially felt that they were not treated as equals by the DVRU. They cited as evidence a tendency on the part of the DVRU representatives to regard the criminal justice response as the only valid response to domestic violence.

* At the service level there was all around agreement that working as partners with the DVRU had succeeded in improving the overall community response to domestic violence. Still, DVRU officers, like members of some partner agencies, acknowledged that working in partnership was problematic at times. They identified the shelter's reluctance to divulge their location to them as the most bothersome symptom of what some officers described as "a different philosophy," "different rules," or "mistrust of the police." Despite these difficulties, one officer's words best reflect the overall assessment: [our relationship is] "...good and bad...some of their rules are tough to accept for some of our officers, for the most part though, we get along with them pretty well."

The DVRU uses empowerment strategies with victims of domestic violence, with the community at large, and with members of its own police department.¹

We measured the effectiveness of empowerment strategies for

¹While the DVRU engages in community and police bureau empowerment activities in the form of speeches, media interviews, and in-service training sessions (see Table 5), the effects of such activities are discernible in the long term rather than the short term.
victims using Part 2 of the VCBS. As noted above, the questionnaire is relatively easy to administer and also lends itself to be used for different purposes. Here we added victim empowerment questions to the service orientation questions in Part 1.

**Empowerment Findings:**

*Victims who receive DVRU services are more likely to engage in self-help behavior in the form of obtaining restraining orders, and they are more knowledgeable about getting legal help than victims who do not receive the services of the DVRU.

*Victims who received DVRU services were significantly more likely to have obtained temporary restraining orders than victims who did not receive DVRU services.

*We found that more victims who received DVRU services than victims who did not receive such services said they knew how to access the legal system to get the help they needed.

We gained insight into the DVRU's community empowerment strategies from structured interviews with domestic violence response system representatives.

*Non-police domestic violence agency representatives were very well informed about the DVRU, knew its purpose, and said that the unit staff had made special efforts to convey program information to them. The DVRU received uniformly high marks for informing those outside the PPB about its program.

"How do these strategies impact the problem of family violence?"

**Problem solving,** in the context of community policing, entails the use of traditional investigative policing methods in combination with strategies that clearly go beyond such methods. In the words of two DVRU officers this means: "To look at solutions even if they don't involve the criminal justice system," and to aim at getting "...the victim and children away from violence on a permanent basis." These statements reflect what community policing hopes to accomplish—an expansion in the scope
of possible activities to bring about more permanent and effective results.

We attempted to use available computer records to find out whether prosecutions and restraining order petitions had increased in response to DVRU activities, and whether revictimization and reoffending rates had decreased. The obstacles we encountered were formidable. They ranged from variations in "what" was counted as domestic violence within agencies as well as between agencies, to the equally crippling discovery that the mechanisms to trace cases from agency computer to agency computer did not exist. While it is our view that a computerized multi-agency recording system would not provide answers to all assessment questions, it is of pivotal importance to community policing performance measurement. If all agencies were to make a small sacrifice of convenience and either agree to use one case number, perhaps one assigned at the 9-1-1 center, or agree to track the previous agency's case number alongside their own, it would become possible to measure outcomes using computer database methods.

Problem Solving Findings, Preliminary Results:

*A significant increase in the number of Temporary Restraining Orders issued.

*An increase in the prosecution rate for misdemeanor domestic violence cases.

*A tentative finding of less recidivism for cases with DVRU intervention as compared to cases without DVRU intervention.

---

2See sections 6 and 8 for a discussion of the methodological limitations of these preliminary findings.
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1. INTRODUCTION

No matter what policing philosophy prevails, responding to violence is at the core of the police function. Violent crime is so central a task for law enforcement that its importance remains unchallenged even when police departments thoroughly redefine their function as they switch from 'traditional' to 'community policing' models. How then does the community policing philosophy alter the way police handle the violent crime problem in their communities? The Portland Police Bureau's Domestic Violence Reduction Unit (DVRU) provides us with one informative example. It illustrates how community policing strategies can be used in the fight against domestic violent crime. But does it work? Our report represents an attempt to show ways of assessing the effectiveness of community policing strategies when they are applied to a core law enforcement problem.

In addition to a description of the Portland context, the development, and the operation of the Domestic Violence Reduction Unit (DVRU) we assess the implementation of the unit's community policing strategies, and offer a partial assessment of anticipated community policing outcomes. Our document contains process evaluation components as well as outcome evaluation components with
the overall goal to answer these questions: "How well were community policing strategies implemented?" "What methods can be used to find out whether these strategies work?" and "How do these strategies impact the crime problem at issue?"

2. CONTEXT AND HISTORY OF THE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE REDUCTION UNIT

2.1 The Portland Police Bureau's Community Policing Model

In January of 1990, the Portland city council adopted a plan that provided for an organization wide transformation of its police department from what is commonly called a "traditional" model to a "community policing" model:

2.2 The Portland Police Bureau Mission Statement

The mission of the Portland Police Bureau is to maintain and improve community livability by working with all citizens to preserve life, maintain human rights, protect property, and promote individual responsibility and community commitment (Portland Police Bureau, 1994:2).

This mission is to be carried out in accordance with the following five core values: Service Orientation, Partnership, Empowerment, Problem Solving and Accountability.

Following a brief history and summary description of the DVRU, our report examines how each of these five values finds expression in DVRU strategies, to what extent these strategies are implemented, and if implemented, whether they have had the desired effects.
2.3 The Creation of a Community Policing Unit to Fight Domestic Violence

Year three of the Portland Police Bureau Community Policing Transition Plan called for the implementation of Bureau activities that "Target at-risk youth for special attention through a Juvenile Division/Program" (1990:60). In the fall of 1992 the Bureau assigned a captain to explore with the community what form such an effort should take. What followed were extensive discussions with a wide variety of community representatives who ultimately identified the "need to break the cycle of violence" as an immediate problem the Portland police should address (Brooks, 1992:1).

In these discussions it was noted that the police in Portland receive over 11,000 domestic violence emergency calls per year (Brooks, 1992), and that family violence has consistently been associated with generating future violence or tolerance for violence in affected children (Blackburn, 1993). These facts, combined with the questionable effectiveness of the standard criminal justice response to domestic violence, led to a consensus decision between community representatives and police officials. They all advocated for the creation of a special police unit to address family violence in Portland. In April 1993, the Portland
City Council authorized the necessary budget allocations, and the unit began operations in July of 1993. The process by which the unit was created exemplified how working in partnership with the community served as a method to identify crime problems and their solutions. And how a community may have insights into long-term solutions that clearly fall outside the realm of traditional policing methods.

2.4 The Domestic Violence Reduction Unit Mission Statement

The mission of the Portland Police Bureau's Domestic Violence Reduction Unit is to decrease the level of domestic violence in Portland by:

- Investigating selected domestic violence cases;
- Promoting deterrence for domestic violence;
- Assisting victims by removing the obstacles that prevent them from protecting themselves and their children;
- Interrupting the modeling of violence to children as a means of solving problems; and
- Assisting in local and regional training and coordination to improve system-wide response to domestic violence (Brooks, 1992).

In the following pages we shall examine the specific activities, the DVRU has adopted to carry out these charges in light of the five community policing values: service orientation, partnership, empowerment, problem solving and accountability. Each of the following sections contains 1) a definition of the community policing value, 2) a description of DVRU strategies that reflect this value, 3) an assessment of the implementation of these
strategies, and 4) an assessment of the effectiveness of the community policing strategies that are used to address domestic violence.

3. DVRU SERVICE ORIENTATION

Service Orientation means to: "provide supportive, professional service to the community and to employees by promoting human rights, mutual respect, and courtesy" (Portland Police Bureau, 1994:2)

3.1 Service Orientation Strategies

Service orientation, as it is defined above, suggests a mode of interaction that applies to all human encounters, and not only to specifically delineated tasks. Still, there are some deliberately chosen approaches DVRU officers use that reflect the service orientation principles of promoting human rights, mutual respect, and courtesy in ways that are noteworthy. For example, DVRU officers are careful to avoid telling victims of domestic violence what to do. They are sensitive to the role power and control can play in police/citizen interactions in general, and even more so in police/domestic violence victim interactions. They take conscious steps to avoid patronizing or prescriptive behavior with victims. As one DVRU officer stated: "I am careful to not tell them what to do, I explain options...I explain how the system works" (Officer 2, 1994:1). The goal of DVRU officer/victim
interactions is "...to help her make things safe" (Officer 6, 1994:1). The efforts to "make things safe" take a variety of forms, the majority of which, according to one officer's assessment (Officer 3, 1994:1) fall outside the realm of traditional law enforcement (Officer 3, 1994:1). Appendix A contains a list of DVRU activities for each of the five community policing values.

3.2 Measuring Service Orientation with the VICTIM CALL-BACK SURVEY

The DVRU dedicates considerable resources to services for victims of violent domestic crimes. We developed a brief questionnaire to ask the recipients to rate the delivery of these services. The Victim Call-Back Survey (VCBS) (see Appendix B for a copy of the questionnaire) was designed for use with any type of police service recipient. A detailed description of the questionnaire, its development and application, is available in a PSU research group working paper entitled *Victim Call Back Survey* (1993).

The questionnaire consists of two parts, Part 1--the service orientation section--contains questions that are designed to measure officer performance, and Part 2 is used to assess citizen empowerment. Where Part 1 consists of standard questions, Part 2 requires that it be adapted to each individual respondent group.
Part 1 questions ask respondents to rate officer service orientation which is defined as officers' helpfulness, their concern for citizens, the respect they accord them, and the degree of knowledge they exhibit in their professional encounters with citizens. As indicated above, these questions can be presented to any citizen or crime victim who has had contact with officers. Furthermore, if citizens, concerning the same incident, encounter more than one group of officers, e.g. uniform officers initially, and later non-uniform investigators, the VCBS can be used as performance measure for each group separately. We shall describe how we used the VCBS, and what we found when we asked domestic violence victims to rate Portland officers' service orientation.

3.2.1 The Procedures

While the questions in Part 1 of the VCBS remain the same regardless of the type of respondent group involved, the procedures used in administering the survey must be carefully developed for each group. Not to tailor survey procedures to the respondent group in question, might adversely affect either the participants themselves or the validity of the results.

Interviews with domestic violence victims require procedures that take the following circumstances into consideration:

1. The offender may be present when the interviewer calls;
2. Victims may have experienced multiple recent domestic violence victimizations that required police intervention;

3. Domestic violence victims, for a variety of reasons, are increasingly hard to reach as the time between the domestic incident and the interview lengthens.

3.2.1.1 Safety Risks To Survey Participants

Given the nature of the crime of domestic violence, it is possible that the offender is present when the interviewer tries to contact the victim. Thus, a simple telephone call may pose a threat to the respondent's safety as well as to the validity of the obtained information. A respondent in this situation may immediately discontinue the call, may give responses to conceal the nature of the call, or, in the worst case scenario, may find herself exposed to a violent reaction from her partner. To insure the safety of this respondent group, interviewers are instructed to adhere to the following precautions suggested by the methods of Harrell (1991) and Rumptz et al. (1991), and used in this study (see VCBS in Appendix B):

1. When calling, interviewers will ask for a fictitious name if a

---

3For purposes of this report we shall use the female personal pronoun whenever we refer to victims of domestic violence. It is the case in our study, as in others, that about 95 percent of the victims in reported domestic violence incidents are women.
man answers, and call back later.

2. If the woman answers, the interviewer will inquire as to whether it is a safe time for the woman to talk. If it is not safe, the interviewer will give the woman an excuse for the call if she wants one (for example: "The purpose of this call is to ask questions for a national survey on the different uses of soap products by women"), and ask to set another time, or hang up.

All our interviews were conducted at the Portland Police Bureau DVRU offices by telephone. Both, a research supervisor and a DVRU officer were present at all times. Interviewers were instructed to alert the DVRU officer on duty whenever s/he felt that a victim was in danger, or when a victim wanted information the interviewer was not trained to provide.

3.2.1.2 Multiple Police Contacts

The validity of officer performance ratings may also be adversely affected because domestic violence victims often experience multiple victimizations which may involve multiple police contacts. We learned of the necessity to carefully differentiate between officers and domestic incidents during a pilot study we conducted in the fall of 1993. Our pre-tests revealed that a number of victims could not remember which of the many recent police contacts we wanted to talk about. Our interviewers encountered this problem more frequently as the time between the incident and the interview date lengthened.
Respondents who had frequent contacts with police officers found it difficult to identify the specific incident, and therefore the officers whose performance we asked them to rate. To help victims identify the incident in question, interviewers were instructed to select specific facts from the police report that might enable the victim to differentiate between police contacts. In some cases this required little more than reminding the victim of the day and month, in other cases interviewers had to recite characteristics and context of the encounter.

In a related finding, the pre-test also revealed the importance of differentiating between groups of officers. We learned that asking respondents to give generalized ratings of officers' performance, in other words, to assess the aggregate performance of all PPB officers--uniform and DVRU officers--was not a good approach. The respondents nearly always insisted on differentiating between uniform officers and DVRU officers, and were either unable or unwilling to provide us with aggregate ratings. Since our instrument was not designed to record separate ratings, we failed to obtain valid performance ratings from our pre-test. We subsequently re-designed the VCBS to include two sets of officer performance questions (see Appendix B), with clear instructions to respondents about the officer group in question.
3.2.2 Survey Participants

Each business day approximately 15 domestic violence misdemeanor cases are delivered to the DVRU. Upon reviewing each of the 15 cases, the unit sergeant, or his stand-in, selects those cases which meet one or more of the unit's criteria for priority status. The criteria are as follows:

1. The case involves prior domestic violence with either the victim or the assailant;
2. The case involves the use of a weapon (statutorily defined);
3. The case involves children, i.e. children were present.

On average, roughly 10 of 15 cases receive priority status. Between July 19, 1993 and June 30, 1994, the unit sergeant had reviewed 5340 cases, 78%, or 4149, qualified for priority status (Appendix F contains a copy of the DVRU Statistics, 1994). Priority status means that a case is eligible for assignment to DVRU officers. However, given the present staff resources—six officers who work in teams of two—only 12% of the 4149 priority cases receive the services of DVRU officers. Whether priority cases are assigned for further DVRU intervention or not, is largely a function of the sergeant's professional judgement, i.e. the decision depends neither on a set of standard nor on randomized selection procedures. Any data about differences in outcomes
between intervention and non-intervention cases may therefore be a function of selection bias, and not of treatment effects.

3.2.2.1 A Subgroup Comparison of DVRU Intervention Cases and Non-Intervention Cases

We selected 241 priority cases, 122 DVRU intervention cases and 119 non-intervention cases. We discuss details of the selection procedure in the section entitled Completed Interview Rate. Table 1 depicts the distribution of case characteristics for the intervention and non-intervention subgroups. There were no significant differences in the percentage distributions of priority criteria—prior violence, children, weapons—however, there was a greater (96% v 89%) percentage of female victims, and male suspects (96% v 89%) among DVRU intervention cases than among non-intervention cases. Likewise, the percentage of cases involving assaults (76% v 58%) was greater among DVRU intervention cases than among non-intervention cases. The percentage of restraining order violations, on the other hand, was greater (24% v 11%) among non-intervention cases than among those with DVRU intervention. The statistical significance levels indicate that the percent differences we observed for these case characteristics are unlikely to be due to chance, however, these statistical significance levels
don't hold up when we use a logistic regression analysis to compare intervention and non-intervention cases, which suggests that some

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>DVRU INTERVENTION</th>
<th>DVRU NON-INTERVENTION</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=122*</td>
<td>n=119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEW COMPLETE</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM AGE</td>
<td>average: 34.8</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSPECT AGE</td>
<td>average: 35.1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM RACE</td>
<td>non white: 28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSPECT RACE</td>
<td>non white: 35%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM SEX</td>
<td>female: 96%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSPECT SEX</td>
<td>male: 95%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIOR VIOLENCE</td>
<td>yes: 81%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAPONS</td>
<td>yes: 21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDREN</td>
<td>yes: 38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSAULT</td>
<td>yes: 76%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENACING</td>
<td>yes: 17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEATH THREAT</td>
<td>yes: 13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STALKING</td>
<td>yes: 3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTRAINING ORDER VIOLATION</td>
<td>yes: 11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CRIME</td>
<td>yes: 27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRUGS/ALCOHOL</td>
<td>yes: 36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The maximum number of cases missing from any of the comparisons, because of missing data, was 4.
** The significance level (p-value) indicates the probability of getting a difference by chance between the two groups as large as the observed difference.

of these differences in percentages (Table 1) are due to other characteristics of the case. For example, Table 1 percentages and
significance levels suggest that more than chance is at work to produce DVRU intervention cases with 96% female victims and DVRU non-intervention cases with 89% female victims. On the surface such a finding might be interpreted to mean that female victims received preferential treatment by the police, but it could mean that cases with female victims tend to be different in other ways which make them more serious cases and, therefore, more likely to be targeted for intervention. The logistic regression analysis is a technique that allows us to separate out the effects of such case characteristics on the likelihood of selection for DVRU intervention. As noted above, what we found was that given the influence of the other case characteristics, the difference in the number of female victims was no longer statistically significant, suggesting that other case characteristics accounted for the apparent preferential treatment of women victims. The same holds true for the observed differences in percentages of cases involving restraining order violations.

3.2.2.2 Completed Interview Rate

In a Working Paper Example of Using Performance Measures for Program Evaluation: Evaluation of Domestic Violence Unit (1993) we suggested the use of the VCBS to obtain performance ratings as well as re-victimization information. To combine the two we
planned to contact victims six months following the domestic violence incident. We encountered much greater difficulties in obtaining completed interviews than we had anticipated. Of 51 attempted interviews, only 10 were successfully completed, for a completion rate of less than 20%.

We abandoned this effort, excluded the re-victimization questions, and attempted to contact victims within 1 to 3 months following the crime. Shortening the time span resulted in a completion rate of 31 percent (Morley, 1993). We learned that the low interview completion rate was largely a function of being unable to make contact with the victim. Once an interviewer had established contact, 90% of the victims were willing to participate in the survey (Morley, 1993).

For the present study, we aimed to further reduce the "time since incident," by calling the most recent cases first (usually within days of the incident) and then working backward in time until we had obtained the planned number of completed surveys. We varied the times when we called; for example, if an interviewer was unable to reach the victim during evening hours, she placed a second call the next morning, and, if still unsuccessful, the third and final call in the afternoon. This procedure resulted in a 42% completion rate. Of 241 attempted interviews, 101 were
successfully completed.

The reasons for the 140 unsuccessful contacts were as follows:

31% No Contact After Three Re-Calls;  
29% Disconnected Telephone Service;  
24% No Available Telephone Number/Wrong Number;  
9% Respondent Hung Up or Otherwise Indicated Unwillingness to Participate;  
8% Communication Problems (e.g. the respondent spoke no English, or was deaf).

3.2.2.3 A Subgroup Comparison of Case Characteristics for Cases WITH and WITHOUT Victim Interviews

Despite improvements in the interview completion rate, the fact remains that we were unable to establish contact with slightly more than half of the respondents in our sample. However, we had some information about these cases from the police reports which had been sent to the DVRU. We were able to conduct a limited number of comparisons of the 101 completed and the 141 non-completed cases. Table 2 presents the results of this comparison, which shows only one notable difference, namely that weapons were involved less often (15% v 26%) in those cases in which we were able to interview the victims.

| TABLE 2: A COMPARISON OF CASE CHARACTERISTICS for cases WITH and WITHOUT VICTIM INTERVIEWS. |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| VARIABLES                      | CASES WITH VICTIM INTERVIEW n=101* | CASES WITHOUT VICTIM INTERVIEW n=140* | SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS**  |
| VICTIM AGE                     | average: 34.5                      | 32.5                                      | .19                        |
| SUSPECT AGE                    | average: 34.5                      | 34.1                                      | .77                        |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>non-white:</th>
<th>38%</th>
<th>.07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM RACE</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSPECT RACE</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM SEX</td>
<td>female: 95%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSPECT SEX</td>
<td>male: 94%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIOR VIOLENCE</td>
<td>yes: 88%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAPON</td>
<td>yes: 15%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDREN</td>
<td>yes: 34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSAULT</td>
<td>yes: 68%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENACING</td>
<td>yes: 12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEATH THREAT</td>
<td>yes: 10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STALKING</td>
<td>yes: 3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTRAINING ORDER VIOLATION</td>
<td>yes: 18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CRIME</td>
<td>yes: 20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRUGS/ALCOHOL</td>
<td>yes: 33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The maximum number of cases missing from any of the comparisons, because of missing data, was 4.
** The significance level (p-value) indicates the probability of getting a difference by chance between two groups as large as the observed difference.

3.2.3 Results: Officer Performance Assessment

We asked respondents to tell us about both uniform officers and DVRU officers separately. In all we obtained performance ratings for uniform officers and DVRU officers from two respondent groups. One group (n=50) was made up of respondents who completed the interview in its entirety: victims of misdemeanor domestic

---

4 The performance ratings reported in this section must be considered in light of the fact that our interviewers identified themselves with these words: "My name is...I am calling ON BEHALF of the Portland Police Bureau..." This official association with the police bureau may have caused some respondents to be less critical in their ratings than they might have been with an interviewer perceived to be more independent.
violence incidents who had received police services from uniform officers, whose cases had been given priority status by the DVRU sergeant, and who also received the services of the DVRU. The other group (n=51) was made up of respondents who differed only in that they did not receive DVRU services. Table 3 presents the results for each of the four response categories--excellent, good, fair and poor--separately, and combined--positive: excellent/good and negative: fair/poor. Ratings for uniform officers are presented for each respondent group separately. Two general inferences can be drawn from the results shown in Table 3. First, it appears that performance ratings are positively related to the amount of police attention domestic violence victims receive. Victims who had police contact only at the time of the incident (Table 3, last column) gave consistently lower performance ratings than victims who had additional police services from the DVRU.

![Table 3: Performance Ratings for Uniform and DVRU Officers from Respondents with and without DVRU Services.](image-url)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELPFULNESS</th>
<th>77%</th>
<th>54%</th>
<th>41%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good.....positive</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor.....negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good.....positive</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor.....negative</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCERN</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good.....positive</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor.....negative</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPECT</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good.....positive</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor.....negative</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL SERVICE</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good.....positive</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor.....negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

Second, DVRU officers received the highest ratings in all performance categories. Over ninety percent of the respondents rated the overall service they received from DVRU officers as positive; 96% felt good about the concern DVRU officers showed them, 95% gave them good or excellent ratings for being knowledgeable, 94% rated them as helpful, and 91% gave the DVRU officers positive ratings for the respect they showed them. The same respondents who rated the DVRU officers also rated the performance of the uniform officers with whom they had been in contact. DVRU officers received higher ratings than uniform
officers in all categories (comparing columns 1 and 2), however, these differences in ratings reached statistical significance only in the performance categories knowledge, respect and overall service. A comparison of DVRU officer ratings (column 1) with ratings given to uniform officers by victims without DVRU service (column 3), show even greater differences in favor of the DVRU officers.

When uniform officer ratings were divided by respondent group, we found that those respondents who received DVRU services gave consistently higher performance ratings to uniform officers \(^5\) (column 2), than the respondents who did not receive DVRU services (column 3). It is possible, that this difference in ratings for uniform officers is the result of a "Halo effect," that what is at work here is not a difference in officer performance but difference in the perception of officer performance \(^6\).

\(^5\)Comparisons in ratings given to uniform officers by respondents who had, and those who had not, received the services of the DVRU revealed no statistically significant differences.

\(^6\) The term halo effect refers to observer bias, and suggests that, perhaps unwittingly, an observer's ratings can be influenced by an initial attitude or experience that colors all subsequent ratings.
The lowest ratings\(^7\), in nearly all categories, came from those survey participants whose only contact with the police was uniformed officers responding to the 911 domestic violence call. These ratings are listed in the far right column in Table 3. Thirty two percent of domestic violence victims considered the uniform officers' overall knowledge to be less than good, 29% thought they could have been more helpful, 22% gave below average ratings for the officers' concern, 22% thought respect was lacking, and 27% rated the overall service as fair or less. In other words, between 22% and 32% of these respondents judged the uniform officers' performance as less than positive.

4. DVRU PARTNERSHIPS

Perhaps more so than the other Portland core values--service orientation, empowerment, problem solving and accountability--partnership lies at the heart of community policing. Grine (1994:440), in a recent review of community involvement in community policing, notes that "although there is little agreement among theorists and practitioners on the precise definition of

\(^7\) To treat the response category 'fair' as an indication of a negative rating could be seen as inappropriately harsh. However, since we conducted our interviews "on behalf of the police" it could be argued that we already may have biased the responses in a positive direction, to do so twice did not seem advisable.
community policing, there is one central tenet that they share—that the police and community must work together..." This pivotal role becomes apparent when one examines its relationship to the other basic values. Service orientation, accountability, and empowerment are prerequisites for effective partnerships, and effective partnerships are prerequisite for workable solutions to crime and livability problems. It is not surprising then to find that, as a concept, partnership appears in the PPB's community policing mission statement:

"The mission of the Portland Police Bureau is to maintain and improve community livability by working with all citizens to preserve life, maintain human rights, protect property, and promote individual responsibility and community commitment" (emphasis mine).

Translated into concrete terms, it means to work "in partnership with the community, City Council, other bureaus, service agencies, and the criminal justice system" (Portland Police Bureau, 1994:2). The DVRU was conceptualized in partnership with community organizations (Heisler, 1994:1), and today, the DVRU functions as one part of an extensive domestic violence coalition that consists of social service, criminal justice, and treatment agencies.

4.1 DVRU Partnership Strategies at the Policy Level
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Partnership involves two broad levels of activities: 1. the agency-to-agency, policy level, and, 2. the staff-to-staff, direct service level. At the policy level, the DVRU captain represents the unit on the Family Violence Intervention Steering Committee, which consists of representatives from shelter and emergency services, the police, the district attorney's office, legal aid, the county Bar Association, corrections, treatment programs, the medical community, court personnel, United Way, and city government (Family Violence Intervention Steering Committee, 1994:2). This group meets once a month, for the general purpose of enhancing the response to domestic violence in Portland. The captain views her membership in the Steering Committee as a way to "create a close working relationship with other parts of the system" (Heisler, 1994:1).

To date, these relationships have not been formalized in written partnership agreements. However, the captain says: "the will to have them is there, but there has to be a demonstrated need for them." Presumably this need would arise, if, for example, informal agreements were violated, and attempts to settle disagreements informally failed. So far, she continues, "any difficulties that have emerged stem from differences in philosophy...that emerge along the social work-law enforcement
dimensions... when they crop up, I set up meetings with the agencies and DVRU officers, and try to resolve the problem without major conflicts" (1994:1).

4.1.1 Measuring Partnership Strategies at the Policy Level

To measure the extent and effectiveness of the DVRU's partnerships with other agencies we relied on information gained from interviews with DVRU personnel and representatives of partnership organizations (see Appendix D and E for interview schedules).

To gain further insight into the extent and quality of partnerships between the DVRU and other organizations, we interviewed representatives from seven agencies, both criminal justice and non-criminal justice. The agencies and their representatives were selected based upon their involvement with the domestic violence response system. We included one representative each from the district attorney's office, the civil division of the court, the group of judges who handle domestic violence cases, the community corrections deferred sentencing unit, the local women's shelter, the batterer treatment center, and the Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence. The interviews took place in July 1994 and were conducted by telephone. The interview schedule contains questions about other organizations' degree of knowledge
regarding the DVRU, about these agencies' interaction with the DVRU, the quality of the relationship between them, and the impact of this interaction. It asks about partnership agreements, and whether police conduct and training have changed since the DVRU started operations.

The agency representatives confirmed that there are no formal partnership agreements between any of the agencies and the DVRU. In the words of one respondent "...there is no need if they do their job, and we do ours" (3, 1994). However, complete agreement about what "their job" is, does not exist among all those involved in the domestic violence response system. The shelter, domestic violence coalition, and to some extent, the community corrections representatives all note points of disagreement with a strict law enforcement response to domestic violence. Because such differences can give rise to conflict, representatives from these agencies are less inclined to dismiss the need for formal partnership agreements. The shelter representative, for example, would welcome a formal partnership agreement because "...it might be useful to have an understanding of confidentiality, what can and what can not be done" (7, 1994). At the present time, these issues are handled in meetings at the policy level, and on a case by case basis at the service level.
Other policy-level issues in need of resolution appear to revolve around the issue of equality as it pertains to the relationship between the DVRU and other, non-criminal justice organizations. The shelter and coalition representatives especially feel that they are not treated as equals by the DVRU. They cite a tendency on the part of the DVRU representatives to regard the criminal justice response as the only valid response to domestic violence. "They see the law enforcement solution as the only solution, i.e. their way is the right way, if one does not agree with them one is viewed as obstructionist..." (7,1994). A different issue, troublesome to those whose work is directly affected by changes in DVRU policy, pertains to the fact that such policy changes are made unilaterally by the DVRU. "For example, when they made the decision to phone all victims [as opposed to phoning only those whose cases were selected for intervention], they had not informed us of that policy decision, something like this needs to be shared" (4,1994).

4.2 Partnership Strategies at the Service Level

At the service level, DVRU officers routinely interact with agency personnel from a wide spectrum of organizations. The six DVRU officers named a total of 18 different agencies, 8 in the
criminal justice system and 10 others. The officers reported having the most frequent contact with the district attorney's office, the Family Law office of the county court's civil division (regarding restraining orders), and with judges. Others they contact regularly are the sheriff's office, community corrections, shelters, and the Children's Services Division (CSD). Occasional contacts include private attorneys, Aging Services, schools, other police departments, the telephone company, medical doctors, the Sunshine Division (food and clothing donations), the Urban League, Touchstone, Family Nursery, and the juvenile corrections department. As one officer recalled: "In one case we had 7 or 8 agencies involved" (Officer 3).

4.2.1 Measuring Partnership Strategies at the Service Level

We asked officers to rate the quality of each relationship. There was little variation among the DVRU officers in rating the quality of the working relationships with these other organizations. All were good or excellent with only one exception: working with one of the local shelters was not always trouble free. Everyone of the DVRU officers (1,2,3,4,5,6) reported the relationship to have been problematic at times. They identified the shelter's reluctance to divulge their location to them as the most bothersome symptom of what some have described as "a different
philosophy" (Officer 6), "different rules" (Officer 1) or "mistrust of the police (2 and 4). Despite these difficulties, one officer's words best reflect the overall assessment: [our relationship is] "good and bad...some of their rules are tough to accept for some of our officers; for the most part though, we get along with them pretty well" (Officer 5).

Everyone of the seven agency representatives characterized the service level interactions between them and the DVRU officers as productive. The agencies view the work of the DVRU as aiding their own efforts, as benefiting their clients, and hence as providing an improved response to domestic violence in their community along with an anticipated positive effect in the long term. Most agencies also agreed that the quality of their relationship with the DVRU was not dependent on particular individuals within that unit, but was mostly a function of the unit structure and its administration. "The relationship," in the words of one respondent, "seems to revolve around a common goal, not individual people" (6, 1994). But some are uneasy about a change in unit leadership and personnel (7,5,2,1,4). "It could be a problem...a change in personnel, if it means a change in competency, would certainly be a problem" (2,1994).

5. **DVRU EMPOWERMENT**
Empowerment means to "Encourage decision making at the most effective level, and promote citizen responsibility and involvement" (Portland Police Bureau, 1994:2). Empowerment, as this definition suggests, must take place at two levels: the community level and the institutional level. The strategic plan for the 1994-1996 biennium proposes four major goals, two that involve empowerment: Goal 2 -- Empower the Community, and Goal 3 -- Develop and Empower Personnel.

Empower the Community. Create a more involved, responsible community by building stronger community partnerships, improving customer service, providing more open and responsive communications, and delivering programs that promote involvement in problem solving and crime prevention (Portland Police Bureau, 1994:3).

5.1 Victim Empowerment Strategies

The DVRU employs a number of strategies that serve to empower the community at large, and individuals or victims within it. We shall discuss victim empowerment first. Activities and strategies that are aimed at empowering domestic violence victims are embedded in an overall approach that was perhaps best expressed by two of the unit's officers: "We give people the tools to help themselves as well as to rely on us to help them" (6, 1994:2); "We are careful not to tell the victim what to do" (2, 1994:1).

Appendix A contains a list of DVRU strategies that aim to
empower victims of domestic violence. These activities fall into three broad groupings: 1. providing victims with information about available options; 2. explaining to victims how to pursue a chosen option; and 3. assisting victims with the pursuit of a chosen option. A victim who decides to obtain a restraining order is taking an important step toward preventing further violence in her life. The DVRU officers' role in this process illustrates the use of empowerment strategies. First DVRU officers explain what a restraining order is, and what it can and can not do; then they instruct victims in how to go about getting a restraining order, and last, should the victim decide to get a restraining order, DVRU officers are ready to assist them with transportation to and from the courthouse, child care arrangements, and of course, assistance with the required paper work. DVRU officers, in cooperation with the Family Law staff, have developed an easy-to-understand pamphlet that explains "all" there is to know about restraining orders (see Appendix C), eliminating the mystifying legal and administrative language of the previously available materials.

5.1.1 Measuring Victim Empowerment Strategies with the VCBS

We measured the extent to which DVRU strategies increased victims' knowledge about available options, and whether they increased the likelihood that victims took steps to stop the
violence. For example, they sought to prosecute the suspect or to get professional help. One way to assess whether or not the explicitly stated DVRU empowerment goals—to increase prosecutions and restraining orders—are reached is to compare their numbers before and after the DVRU started. The results of this comparison are presented in section 6.2.4 below. The other way we measured the success of victim empowerment strategies was to ask victims directly as part of the Victim Call-Back Survey. Part 2 of the VCBS, as we noted in the Service Orientation section above, aims to determine the extent to which domestic violence victims who receive DVRU program services know about ways to prevent future violence against them, and whether they engage in preventative behaviors. The VCBS (see Appendix B) contains 8 questions which seek to assess
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS WITH DVRU SERVICES n=50*</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS WITHOUT DVRU SERVICES n=51*</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM Filed restraining order</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims who had NOT filed a restraining order, were they planning to do so?</td>
<td>YES: 17%</td>
<td>YES: 15%</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: 67%</td>
<td>NO: 73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCERTAIN: 17%</td>
<td>UNCERTAIN: 12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM IS CURRENTLY PROSECUTING</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims who were NOT currently prosecuting, were they planning to do so?</td>
<td>YES: 9%</td>
<td>YES: 13%</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: 78%</td>
<td>NO: 75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCERTAIN: 13%</td>
<td>UNCERTAIN: 13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM KNOWS HOW TO GET SHELTER CARE</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM KNOWS HOW TO GET LEGAL HELP</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM KNOWS HOW TO GET COUNSELING</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM KNOWS HOW TO GET COUNSELING FOR PARTNER</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.
* The maximum number of cases missing from any of the comparisons, because of missing data, was 4.
** The significance level (p-value) indicates the probability of getting a difference by chance between the two groups as large as the observed difference.
victim empowerment in this way.\textsuperscript{8} We would expect that a comparison of empowerment indicators would show a greater degree of empowerment for victims with DVRU services than for those without those services. Table 4 shows the results of this comparison.

As Table 4 shows, victims who had received DVRU services were more likely to say that they had taken legal steps to prevent further violence in their lives than the victims who had not received the DVRU services. In the case of restraining orders, the observed difference in percentages (76\% v 49\%) between the two victim groups is large enough to be statistically significant. The observed difference in prosecutions (46\% v 37\%), while in the expected direction, is not statistically significant. Relatively few victims, in either group, if they had not already filed a restraining order by the time of the interview, indicated that they were planning to do so in the future, the same was true for planning prosecutions.

In two domains—shelter care and legal help—victims with DVRU services were more knowledgeable than victims who had not received DVRU services. Of the two observed differences in percentages, only victim's knowledge about how to obtain legal help showed

\textsuperscript{8}In section 3.2.1 we describe the procedures we used to obtain this information.
statistically significant differences. Our results indicated that, with or without DVRU services, two thirds of the victims knew how to get counseling for themselves and half knew where batterer counseling was available.

If the respondents in our sample are reasonably representative of domestic violence victims in Portland, then one can assert that victims who receive DVRU services are more likely to engage in self-help behavior in the form of obtaining restraining orders, and they are more knowledgeable about getting legal help than victims who do not receive the services of the DVRU.

5.2 Community Empowerment Strategies

Only an informed community can be an empowered community, so communication is essential to community policing. The Strategic Plan gives specific directives to "Develop and implement methods to communicate with the public about police services and how to access them" (Portland Police Bureau, 1994:22). The DVRU, in its first year of operation, has committed considerable resources to the implementation of this objective. Information about the extent and effectiveness of the DVRU's public education efforts comes from two sources: 1. DVRU records and, 2. interviews with representatives of criminal justice and community organizations.

5.2.1 Measuring Community Empowerment Strategies
Between July 19, 1993 and December 31, 1993, DVRU records show how many presentations unit staff gave, and who their audiences were. Beginning with January 1, 1994, and through July 28, 1994, DVRU records also tell when the presentation was given, who from the unit gave it, and how long it lasted. Table 5 contains information only about presentation quantity and type of audience, since these were the available data for both time periods. Table 5 shows that the DVRU staff gave a total of 148 presentations during their first year of operation. During the first 5 1/2 months, 71% (57) of these presentations were addressed to criminal justice system audiences; this includes 45 presentations at PPB precinct roll-calls. Twenty-three presentations (29%) were to groups in the community at large, such as the Urban League, the Mayor's Forum, and the S.E. Portland Impact Low-Income Housing Task Force. In the last six months of the first year, 85% of the DVRU's presentations addressed community groups and only 15% were for criminal justice audiences. This shift from criminal justice to audiences in the community at large shows an interesting, concentric pattern imitating the "community" the DVRU works in: PPB officers first, other criminal justice agencies next, and the community at large last. By the end of the year the vast majority of the unit's education efforts focus on the outer "rings" of the
PPB community.

The 1994 records show a nearly 3 to 1 ratio of administrators to officers as DVRU presenters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY GROUPS</td>
<td>23 (29%)</td>
<td>58 (85%)</td>
<td>81 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMINAL JUSTICE AGENCIES</td>
<td>57 (71%)</td>
<td>10 (15%)</td>
<td>67 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>80 (100%)</td>
<td>68 (100%)</td>
<td>148 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to gain some insight into the implementation and effectiveness of these community empowerment strategies, we interviewed representatives of a variety of community groups to whom DVRU presenters spoke. A set of four questions from the "Other Organization Questionnaire" (see Appendix E for a complete copy) asks how well-informed the interviewee is about the DVRU, whether s/he knows the purpose for the unit, whether DVRU staff have made special efforts to teach the interviewee about their

---

*A detailed description of the interview schedule, its development and application can be found in Section 4 of this document.
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program, and whether the interviewee would like to know more about the unit. We asked criminal justice agency representatives from the district attorney's office, the family court, the civil division of the court, and community corrections, as well as representatives from community agencies—a treatment program for batterers, a shelter for battered women, and the local domestic violence coalition—to answer these questions. Without exception, the representatives from these non-police audiences were very well informed about the DVRU, knew its purpose, and said that the unit staff had made special efforts to convey program information to them. The DVRU received uniformly high marks for informing those outside the police bureau about its program.

5.3 Internal Community Empowerment Strategies

Institutional community policing goals address the internal changes in personnel policies, training, planning, and management practices that are needed to support the community policing goals. To empower personnel means to strengthen skills and morale, and to create work environments that "are supportive of customer service, innovation, personal accountability, and team contribution" (Portland Police Bureau, 1994:3). One could reasonably expect officers thus 'empowered' to report satisfaction with their work, a sense of accomplishment, and generally high morale.
5.3.1 Measuring DVRU Officer Empowerment

We asked DVRU personnel what they liked best and what they liked least about their work. What, if any, changes would they like to see, and do they think the DVRU accomplishes what it sets out to do? These questions were part of a structured set of open-ended questions we used to conduct personal interviews with all DVRU staff and administrators during June and July, 1994 (see Appendix D for a copy).

Every one of the six DVRU officers named a sense of accomplishment as one of the aspects they liked best about their job. Some expressed it simply as "I feel like I am making a difference..." (Officers 5 and 6), while others gave reasons (Officers 1,2, 3,4). Officer 3, for example, expressed "I like...the freedom we have to investigate and decide the best way to handle the investigation. We develop contacts in the community, use our brain to solve the problem the best way we can." Officer 2: "I look at all possible solutions even if they don't involve the system...the unit structure allows for this option to be exercised by its officers...I feel like it's [my work] doing something, I feel self worth....I worked the street 11 years...[and] made over 1000 arrests for 'Assault fours', only 3 of the 1000 ever went to
trial; I felt it was a hopeless situation, nothing would ever happen..." Other officers (1, 3 and 4) got a sense of accomplishment from "seeing things all the way through, seeing some resolution" (Officer 1), a fact so highly valued by one officer that working in the DVRU "is like a reward" (Officer 4).

Further inference about a high level of morale can be drawn from the fact that after one year, none of the officers have left or plan to leave the unit, and that positive statements about the work environment far outweigh critical ones. Comments that can be labeled as critical in nature fell into two broad categories, those that related to accomplishing DVRU goals, and those that pertained to working conditions. Three of the six officers named as the only drawbacks the frustration they experience when some victims return to their assailants, or were unwilling to help themselves or be helped (Officers 3, 5 and 6). Two other officers mentioned that joining the unit has resulted in a cut in pay, largely because DVRU hours are 8 am to 4 pm, Mondays through Fridays, and thus, unlike shift work on the street, produce no overtime pay or compensatory leave for appearing in court (Officers 2 and 4). One officer listed as the only distraction from the job, the occasional assignment to perform computer entry tasks (Officer 1). The officers' assessment of the unit's accomplishments mirror their
expressions of individual satisfaction. Positive assessments are qualified only by the realization that resources, and patience, are needed when domestic violence is the issue.

Nearly all suggestions for changes relate to the unit's limited resources (Officers 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6) which result in the fact that only 12% of eligible cases receive DVRU services. Some officers advocate moving from a strict weekday work schedule to one that includes some weekend and shift-work as a way to stretch available resources (Officers 3, 4 and 5, 4). Another officer thinks that using volunteers would serve a similar purpose (Officer 2). One officer thinks that each investigator's decision-making power should include selecting a case for investigation. Case assignment decisions are currently made by one sergeant.  

5.3.2 Measuring Uniform Officer Empowerment

As we noted in an earlier section, a number of DVRU strategies (for example peer training, internal publications, and recruit rotations in the DVRU) are aimed at providing uniform officers with

---

10As this report neared completion, we were notified of a policy change regarding case assignment. The unit recently adopted "self-assignment," thereby eliminating a task that had been the sergeant's since the beginning. The new procedure also appears to eliminate the prioritizing of cases as discussed in sections 3.2.2 and 6.1. Officers now have full discretion to choose freely from among all cases that arrive at the unit for review.
more tools with which to handle domestic violence crisis calls.

Perhaps the most promising strategy, one week of recruit officer training in the DVRU, is also the most recent one (February 1994), and one that warrants being formally evaluated at a future date. We got a glimpse of how effective this method may be by chatting informally with two of the recruit trainees. This is what one trainee takes away from his week at the DVRU: "Before I came to the unit, I didn't have a good feel for the resources that were at my disposal, now I know what the resources are and where they are. I would...do some of what the DVRU does as district officer, for example, I would follow up on cases..." (Goldschmidt, 1994).

We recently learned that as of November 1994, nine months after the beginning of the recruit rotation, 50 officers have completed the DVRU training.

6. DVRU PROBLEM SOLVING

Problem Solving. Use problem solving methods to reduce the incidence and fear of crime and to improve management and operational approaches (Portland Police Bureau, 1994:2)

One method the bureau describes in this context is listed under Goal 1 together with associated objectives and strategies.

Goal 1: Reduce Crime and Fear of Crime

Objective 1.4: Increase Early Intervention

Develop and implement programs that reduce the likelihood of
criminal behavior by at-risk youth and violence in at-risk families.

**Strategy 1.4.1** Enhance ability to report and prosecute domestic violence cases (Portland Police Bureau, 1994:15).

### 6.1 Problem Solving Strategies

The 1994 Strategic Plan continues to emphasize what was begun as part of the 1990 Portland Police Bureau Community Policing Transition Plan which called for the implementation of Bureau activities that "Target at-risk youth for special attention through Juvenile Division/Program" (1990:60). As we noted earlier in this report, the Bureau assigned Captain Brooks to explore with the community what form such an effort should take. Extensive discussions between the police and a wide variety of community representatives ultimately identified the "need to break the cycle of violence" as an immediate problem the Portland police should address (Brooks, 1992:1). In the twelve months preceding the start up of the DVRU, the local district attorney's office undertook the prosecution of 207 cases in their Domestic Violence Unit. This is an average of about 17 cases per month. Around 230 Portland police reports were written per month in response to domestic violence 9-1-1 calls, not including those written for other crimes which later revealed themselves as stemming from family violence. The prosecution rate the community task force faced was at most 7%.
Therefore, DVRU planners chose as their primary crime reduction strategy activities that would result in an enhanced criminal justice response by way of increasing the rate of prosecutions. At the core of these activities are traditional follow-up investigations which consist of gathering evidence, preparing reports to facilitate the issuance of complaints and restraining orders, and the making of arrests (for a complete list of problem solving activities see Appendix A).

What differentiates the DVRU approach from traditional police work is that the investigative strategies these officers use go beyond merely responding to the incident that brought the case to their attention. In the words of the unit sergeant: "We look upon domestic violence as a process, and not as an event" (Day, 1994:3). Consequently DVRU problem solving strategies are guided by considerations like these: "To get the victim and children away from violence on a permanent basis" (Officer 3, 1994:2). "To look at solutions even if they don't involve the criminal justice system" (Officer 2, 1994:2). Thus DVRU activities may veer from the path of traditional investigations while the officers work with the victim in an attempt to solve the overall problem she faces. Hence, rather than detract from the DVRU's ultimate goal, which is to decrease domestic violence in Portland (Heisler, 1993:1), these
alternative activities are viewed as an integral and important part of the unit's approach to solving the problem of domestic violence.

Some of the DVRU problem solving activities are captured in DVRU Statistics FY 1993/1994 (see Appendix F for a detailed presentation of these data). They show, for example, that the DVRU receives many more domestic violence cases than it is equipped to handle. In its first year of operation the unit sergeant reviewed 5340 police reports, and determined that 78% or 4149 of them were eligible for DVRU intervention\(^{11}\). The unit's statistics indicate that during this first year, the DVRU had roughly seven times more cases eligible for investigation than it had resources to pursue. Of the 621 cases that were assigned to DVRU officers for investigation, 39% (242) resulted in prosecution, and 38% (235) resulted in restraining orders being filed against the offenders.

According to the program logic as shown in Figure 1, doing investigations and empowering domestic violence victims is expected

\(^{11}\) The eligibility decision rests on the seriousness of a case, whereby seriousness is defined as the presence of any one, or a combination, of the following three conditions: Prior Domestic Violence Victimization; Prior Domestic Violence Criminal History; Children were Present; and Weapons were involved. According to the DVRU statistics (Appendix F), 80% of these priority cases involved victims with a history of domestic abuse, 78% involved suspects with a criminal history for domestic abuse, 27% involved children, and 21% involved the use of weapons.
to result in two types of 12 short term effects: Those that aim at either specific or general deterrence, and those that aim at either specific or general prevention. Intermediate outcomes like increases in prosecutions, temporary restraining orders and warrants fall into the deterrence category, while intermediate outcomes like victim empowerment and community empowerment fall into the prevention category. As the arrows in Figure 1 suggest, deterrence and prevention effects are not mutually exclusive -- in fact they act to reinforce each other. Nonetheless, for purposes of conceptual clarity it is useful to differentiate between these two types of outcomes. The combined impact of these intermediate outcomes is expected to lead, in the long run, to a lower rate of

12 DVRU officers noted that not infrequently, misdemeanor cases would turn into felony cases following their investigations. For example, based upon the investigation at the scene, the uniform officer charges the suspect with Assault IV. The DVRU investigates further, and sends the case to the district attorney's office. Upon review of the entire evidence in the case, the original Assault IV (misdemeanor) charge becomes an Assault II (felony). And since the criminal justice system is designed to treat violent felonies much more seriously than violent misdemeanors, a domestic violence case, by virtue of being a felony, is accorded greater importance. In light of the fact that the unit is, at least in part, designed to enhance the criminal justice response to domestic violence, this result of the unit's activities should be considered as an additional intermediate outcome in future evaluations.
domestic violence in Portland—-the anticipated long term effect.

6.2 Measuring Problem Solving Strategies: Intermediate Outcomes

The overall difficulty of measuring criminal justice outcomes is well-illustrated by our attempts to identify and use outcome measures to assess whether DVRU strategies produced Figure 1's projected results. We tried to approach intermediate outcomes in several ways. One way was to analyze trends in the quantitative measures of "the domestic violence problem": the available monthly tallies of 9-1-1 incidents, police reports, DVRU investigations,
prosecution cases, and restraining orders. We also attempted to use existing computerized information to assess the impact of DVRU efforts upon a set of specific incidents and the people involved in them: whether a DVRU investigation led to prosecutions which led to consequences for the offender; or whether emergency calls which led to investigations subsequently led to restraining orders for the victims. We used quantitative and qualitative measurement instruments designed primarily for the assessment of intermediate outcomes in the area of prevention.

In the 'observe trends' approach the researcher is stymied by the varying definitions of "what" is counted as domestic violence. Variations exist both within and between agencies. For example, on March 6th, 1994 the 9-1-1 center began coding one set of calls as "famdis" (for 'family disturbance') which did not exactly correspond to the old set of "FA1" and "FA2" codes which comprised the 9-1-1 family disturbance codes before that date. These changes are often the byproduct of installing new information systems in the respective agencies. As a result there is now no smooth, reliable way to leap across the changeovers to capture accurate trends. There is little doubt that the old information system needed replacing, indeed, the accelerating pace of technological advance means that new information management systems will be
installed at closer intervals in the future in all public agencies. However, if criminal justice agencies are resolute about measuring progress on problems and outcomes, more energy must be committed to maintaining continuity and accessibility for data across information system changes.

For additional complexity, as programmers and information system managers adapt to the new systems, the knowledge and ability to manipulate the old systems are disappearing even when the same basic data sets are kept. For example, it is already difficult, little more than a year into the new district attorney case tracking (DACTS) system, to ask analysts to investigate one DVRU intermediate outcome--prosecutions in the district attorney's office--if the time frame involves cases that were computerized on the old 'PROMIS' system.

The main obstacle to measuring impacts upon a specific set of individuals or events served by the DVRU--DVRU outcomes--is that each justice agency has created a system which tracks its own workload or fulfills its own communication needs best. The computerized information at each agency has been designed as if the important "story" about a case begins and ends within that agency's oversight. For example, each agency typically creates a new, unique "case number" for what are really the same characteristics
of an event or person moving through the chain of agencies which form the criminal justice "system." If all agencies were to make a small sacrifice of convenience and either agree to use one case number, assigned at the 9-1-1 stage, or agree to track the previous agency's case number alongside their own, it would become possible to measure case outcomes using computerized searching and sorting methods.

6.2.1 DVRU Impact on Restraining Orders: Measurement Issues

Local court statistics kept since January 1, 1994 indicate that an average of 15% of the temporary restraining orders (TROs) issued by a judge are later vacated, and that between 65%-80% are ultimately served upon the defendant. For those TROs served but not vacated, computerized information is available in the statewide Law Enforcement Data System (LEDS). Because this database is designed to help the police officer in the field identify individuals, the possibility exists to locate key fields such as date of birth or case record number with which to match data fields kept by the DVRU. But since LEDS is a very large database for use by the entire state law enforcement community, it is filled with information identifying thousands of other criminals. It is inefficient to 'troll' in LEDS for information about the 300-400 TROs issued each month in the DVRU's local area. LEDS would have
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to be first sorted by county and type of crime and many other 'screens' before attempting to match numerical identifiers. That labor would be unnecessary if we examine all TROs in Multnomah County in the first place. The best potential for data to be closely coordinated with local agency information systems therefore lies within the Multnomah County court administration.

Unfortunately, computerized record-keeping in the Multnomah County court administration which is responsible for the issuance of temporary restraining orders (TROs) is limited to the plaintiff's last name and a unique case number used by the court only. We were therefore unable to connect either DVRU interventions or any PPB domestic violence reports to the issuance of a TRO using a "key" number such as victim's date of birth or police report number. As TROs are also filed by the date they are received, rather than victims' last names, tracing outcomes could only be accomplished by a one-by-one, name/case number-to-drawer search. Since January 1994 the court has been entering more fields of information such as whether children were involved or the date vacated, which will be useful for analysis when more months have passed.

6.2.2 DVRU Impact on Restraining Orders: Results

Our research was confined to an analysis of the trend in TROs over two years: for twelve months before and twelve months after
the month of the start up of the DVRU. **Figure 2**'s source is purely a hand count provided to us of all the TROs issued in the county in which Portland Police and the DVRU operate. It is not adjusted for TROs later vacated, nor does it reflect only "clients" of the PPB, since at least two other police jurisdictions are in the same county.

**Figure 2:** Restraining Orders Increase

As **Figure 2** illustrates, there has been an upward trend in the total number of Temporary Restraining Orders (TROs) issued by the county in which the DVRU operates. Indeed, the monthly average for
the twelve months after the DVRU opened exceeds the average for the 12 months preceding by over 47 TROs per month. The difference is statistically significant (1-tail p-value = .003). Considering that according to the DVRU's own computerized records their interventions led to the issuance of 235 restraining orders during the first 11.5 months of operation (an average of 20 TROs per month, see Appendix F), one could safely attribute some of the upward shift in TROs to the DVRU. However, population growth in the county or other, non-DVRU program initiatives aimed at helping domestic violence victims obtain restraining orders, might have increased the issuance of TROs also. Given the current restraining order record-keeping procedures, it was not possible to trace TROs to an agency of origin.

6.2.3 DVRU Impact on Prosecutions: Measurement Issues

A crucial component of the Domestic Violence Reduction Unit's long term goal—to reduce violence in the home—is to increase prosecutions, on the assumption that consequences that go beyond the arrest will decrease offenders' future violent behavior.

To ascertain the impact of the DVRU upon the number of prosecutions undertaken by the district attorney's office, a monthly count of complaints issued was obtained (by telephone) for July 1992 through June 1994, which equals one year before and one year after the
start of the DVRU. The district attorney's office made several changes during the course of 1993 and 1994 which make it difficult to examine trends in prosecution activity in more detail. In April/May 1993, in anticipation of the proposed new domestic violence unit within the Portland Police Bureau, the district attorney's office began issuing complaints in misdemeanor domestic violence cases regardless of the victim's co-operation. This was a major policy shift which allowed the prosecutor's office to gauge what resources it would need to handle the increase in such cases once the DVRU became operational.\textsuperscript{13}

Record-keeping systems at the prosecutor's office also underwent changes in the time period surrounding the creation of the DVRU. On July 1, 1993 the District Attorney's Case Tracking System (DACTS) was installed, removing from computer inquiry a previous system known as PROMIS. Then in January 1994, DACTS was reprogrammed to include misdemeanors in its counting of complaints issued. In any case, prosecution information stored about pre-DVRU cases is no longer available by computer searching, only in paper reports. The combination of changes in policy and computerized

\textsuperscript{13}The Multnomah County District Attorney was part of the community wide planning team which urged city council to approve the necessary resources to create the DVRU within the Portland Police Bureau.
record-keeping complicates establishing a simple measure for "number of domestic violence prosecutions undertaken."

With DACTS we can search the 1993-94 records electronically for matching PPB report numbers, making it possible to examine the prosecution outcomes for PPB cases with DVRU interventions. What makes this possible is that both databases have one numerical field in common, a good example of how to overcome the obstacles to outcome evaluation when one agency 's work culminates in another agency. However, we learned that the District Attorney's office does not always enter the police report number in a consistent pattern: 93-012345, 930012345, and 9312345 could all be found as entries for what is really the same report number: entered by PPB consistently as 93-012345. While understandable, such variations in data entry of zeroes and dashes nearly made the key field useless.

6.2.4 DVRU Impact on Prosecution Activity: Results

As Figure 3 shows, there was an upward trend in cases issued after the DVRU opened in July 1993, particularly in September, October, and November of that year. Considering a start up phase for the new police unit, a variation in delays between actual incidents and prosecution complaint issuance, and also given time needed for knowledge of the enhanced police services to spread,
(see Table 5 of community presentations), the upward trend in prosecutions is most likely one outcome of the DVRU's work. This finding is underscored by the fact that family disturbance police calls show a seasonal decrease during these same months.

The nearly fourfold increase in "domestic violence cases issued" when comparing January through June of 1993 with the same time period in 1994, however, cannot be attributed solely to the activities of the DVRU. In January 1994, as the flag on the graph

**Figure 3:** Domestic Violence Prosecutions Increase

Contains Data for Postscript Only.
indicates, the district attorney's domestic violence unit began to commingle misdemeanor issuances with felonies when reporting their monthly output. Thus at least some of the large observed difference in prosecutions between spring 1993 and 1994 is most likely caused by a change in recordkeeping, not an increase in prosecutions.

6.2.5 DVRU Impact on Prosecution Outcomes: Results

We obtained data about "domestic violence cases reviewed" from the District Attorney Case Tracking System (DACTS) for the period from July 1, 1993 through June 30, 1994. Similar electronic records were not available from before the DVRU opened because the previous computerized case record system -PROMIS- is no longer easily accessible after being replaced June 28, 1993. We compared the prosecutions which were a result of a DVRU intervention, (DVRU-Investigated) and all others (Not DVRU-Investigated).\footnote{We conformed the report numbers to a uniform pattern and separated the data records into discrete "prosecutions". We electronically searched the file for matches with 625 Investigated PPB report numbers which DVRU had provided in an electronic file. We found 190 "hits" and used these matches to create two groups: cases "investigated" and "not investigated" by the DVRU.} We manually counted over 2500 records printed out this way. The results in Table 6 show that DVRU investigations show equal or better prosecution outcomes as a group.
TABLE 6. Prosecution Outcomes for DVRU-Investigated Cases and for All Others Prosecuted by the District Attorney in FY 1993-94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROSECUTION TYPE</th>
<th>SENTENCE</th>
<th>DIVERTED</th>
<th>DISMISSED</th>
<th>OPEN / WARRANT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DVRU Investigated</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Investigated</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that those not investigated by the DVRU are a mixture of the most serious--felony prosecutions—and of misdemeanors similar to those the DVRU works.

Sentence = Sentence obtained, ranging from 5 days in jail to 10 years of probation.

Diversion = Offenders are somewhat under the court's supervision: they have the opportunity to avoid prosecution if a treatment contract is completed, known as a diversion program.

Dismissed = All criminal charges stemming from the incident were either rejected for prosecution, dismissed by the court, or the defendant was judged Not Guilty. (Most rejections occur earlier in the process and are not considered "prosecutions" by our analysis.)

Open = Prosecution was still pending disposition at the time of data capture: 8/1/94. Sometimes this is due to a warrant being out for defendant who failed to appear.

Of the cases prosecuted, a higher proportion of DVRU-investigated cases led to some type of sentence for the offenders. A lower proportion were dismissed or found not guilty. More of those cases not investigated by the DVRU were diverted into treatment, which probably reflects the fact that the less serious cases are not selected for DVRU investigation, but are appropriate for diversion. While these percentages are in the right direction, the "pollution" of the Not-Investigated group by a few felony prosecutions makes them unusable for rigorous comparison.

6.2.6 DVRU Impact on Warrants
After a police officer files a report or a citizen signs a complaint, if the district attorney decides to prosecute and no arrest was made, a warrant can be issued. As explained in the section on measurement issues for prosecutions, computerized data from the district attorney system are not readily available from before the DVRU opened in July 1993. In addition, although we obtained a detailed DACTS database for the first year of DVRU operations, it became apparent that it suffered from several data consistency problems. Text rather than numerical codes were used in a case status field, which included information about "warrant" outcomes. Because many different people enter these codes, there are many variations in the format. Thus only visual counting and searching can be done, which is inappropriate for routine performance measurement.

A mitigating factor, however, is the fact that since 1978 Oregon has had a mandatory arrest law covering misdemeanor domestic violence cases and restraining order violations. Warrants, in this context, are of somewhat lesser importance than they are in jurisdictions without mandatory arrest policies.
6.3 Measuring Problem Solving Strategies: Long-Term Outcome Measures

As Figure 4 illustrates, "domestic violence in Portland," if roughly conceived of as all family disturbances dispatched by 9-1-1, is around 1000 incidents per month, or 12,000 per year. About half that many written reports are reviewed by the DVRU every month. The graph highlights that about one fourth of the 9-1-1
calls result in reports that are forwarded to the DVRU, and that the DVRU has the resources to intervene with only a small fraction of the cases it receives. So we must expect that the long-term goal of the DVRU—to reduce domestic violence in Portland—may not be observable "in the numbers" after just one year of operation.

6.3.1 DVRU Impact on Chronic Locations: Measurement Issues

One frequently cited fact is that family violence calls account for a large percentage of all repeat calls to the same address. Thus reducing calls to chronic locations is included as one of three long term goals in the DVRU's program description (Brooks, 1993). It is expected that the DVRU is not only solving problems for victims and families, but by addressing the causes of "chronic locations", the unit is reducing street officers' call-driven workload. Reducing calls frees time for even more problem-solving patrol work, creating a positive cycle. Three questions

15When it became clear that a 12 percent intervention rate was a stable pattern after nearly 10 months of operation, the unit captain instituted a "100% call-back" policy. In other words, the decision was made to provide a minimum level of service to all victims. An attempt is made by unit officers to provide every victim with information about her legal options and the steps required to pursue them. Although it is not expected that all of the officers' time will be taken up with phone calls to victims, it is reasonable to expect that this resource re-allocation within the unit will reduce the number of full interventions the DVRU conducts.
can be posed to measure the DVRU's impact on chronic locations:

1. How many addresses with, say, more than 3 emergency calls in a month, involve domestic violence?
2. Are there fewer such addresses now, as compared to the time when the DVRU did not exist?
3. What are the trends when we follow these addresses over time?

In searching for answers to these questions we discovered that the Portland Police Bureau, at least at this time, has no means to routinely generate a report or a count of addresses with more than "X" 9-1-1 calls. Thus, currently, there are no answers to the questions we posed. However, the capability to generate the desired information is apparently lurking in the Management Information System under development for the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system which was installed on March 6, 1994. Our follow-up inquiry at the Bureau of Emergency Communications indicates this potential will not be accessible until at least March of 1995 and probably closer to March 1996. And the answer to question 2 will never be captured, since the new MIS will not enfold CAD data before March 6, 1994. We hope this report will underscore the need to analyze chronic 9-1-1 locations in order to illuminate problems and whether they get solved, including domestic violence problems.

6.3.2 DVRU Impact on Repeat Domestic Violence: Measurement Issues

We must preface our discussion of the domestic violence
recidivism data with the following words of caution. Even under the best of circumstances is it difficult to document satisfactorily that a program "causes" changes in the behavior of program participants. This becomes an even greater challenge when a program is expected to produce changes in two people whose behaviors are enmeshed with each other. Ideally, researchers would approach such a complex question of causation by following, over time, those persons who were randomly assigned to partake in the program and those who were not (Weisburd et al., 1993). For a variety of reasons, it was not possible to assess the program's impact on domestic violence with the use of such an experimental design. Our recidivism data have one further limitation, they are derived solely from computerized police records, and it is well-known that crimes reported to the police are only a fraction of the offenses that occur (Gibbons, 1987). In other words, our data exclude those victims who choose not to re-involve the police, and on whose behalf no third party police calls are made. Hence the data we present in this section are not representative of DVRU cases in general, nor are they representative of domestic violence cases in Portland. This being said, we have attempted to provide at least partial answers to questions about the DVRU's ability to affect recidivism.
Official police records potentially provide three levels of recidivism data:

1. Repeat 9-1-1 calls for domestic violence
2. Repeat police reports for domestic violence;
3. Repeat arrests for domestic violence.

6.3.2.1 Repeat 9-1-1 calls: Results

We provided an electronic file of the 625 addresses the DVRU investigated during their first year, along with the date of the investigation to the Bureau's Records Division for analysis. They eventually determined that it was too laborious to generate a list of 9-1-1 calls to each address spanning three months before and three after the intervening DVRU investigation. This is because the CAD data were stored on monthly tapes until March 1994 and because until then address fields were a messy combination of text and numbers which required an exact character match to find. Searching separate months on either side of the DVRU date seemed pointless with so many calls with slightly different address entries sure to be missed. With data from March of 1994 forward, eventually one will be able to sit down at a satellite CAD terminal, enter any address or an electronic file of addresses, and receive a display of the 9-1-1 call history at each address. Such query capability is likely to be available sooner than the reverse
query for "addresses with more than 3 calls," since it is part of the CAD "product" purchased and installed March 6, 1994.

6.3.2.2 Re-Reports and Re-Arrests: Results

Keeping in mind the 6.3.2 discussion of limitations of our recidivism data, we can see in Table 7 that within five months of the original incident, re-reports of domestic violence involving either the victim or the perpetrator are 14 percent lower for cases with DVRU intervention than they are for cases without DVRU intervention. This difference is almost statistically significant (.07, one-tailed test) and is therefore "in the right direction". For re-arrests there appears to be no significant difference between the groups. There are virtually no differences between the two groups in the average number of days to re-report or re-arrest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 7. RECIDIVISM AND SURVIVAL TIME by DVRU CASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-REPORTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-ARRESTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAYS TO RE-REPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAYS TO RE-ARREST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. DVRU ACCOUNTABILITY

The Portland Police Bureau Community Policing Strategic Plan
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(1994:2) defines Accountability:

Promote responsibility among Bureau management, employees, the community, the City council, and other agencies for public safety resources, strategies, and outcomes.

7.1 Accountability Strategies and Measurement

The PPB (1994:39) notes in its plan for 1994-1996 that the nature of assessing police performance is changing as a result of changes in policing methods. Measuring community policing is a complex undertaking. It is easy to illustrate this point using the present report. If we assume for a moment that the DVRU was created in a traditional policing environment, then Section 6 of this report would be all that was required to measure the unit’s performance. We would attempt to find answers to questions about prosecutions, restraining orders, 9-1-1 calls, and repeated violent incidents. Questions about victim or community empowerment, officers’ service orientation, partnership arrangements, or the PPB’s accountability regarding these values would not arise for they would not be part of the policing methods the unit employed to address domestic violence in its jurisdiction. However, the DVRU was not created that way and does employ new methods.

Guided by the accountability value, the DVRU has opened its doors to outside evaluators from the very beginning. Evaluators were part of the two-week DVRU officer training program, and
evaluators have been involved in an ongoing process evaluation since then, and have conducted pre-tests for a full-scale outcome evaluation. In fact, this report was funded and undertaken to promote DVRU accountability.

Formal evaluation procedures are only one way the unit measures its performance. For example, staff attendance at the monthly Family Violence Intervention Steering Committee meetings provides an ongoing and immediate feedback mechanism for the unit's partnership performance. But, as DVRU staff point out, accountability is not a one-way street. For example, it is equally important for partnership agencies and members of the community to demonstrate their commitment to common goals. One of the DVRU officers expressed it this way: "We all play a role in solving the [domestic violence] problem. If we are not part of the solution, we will be part of the problem" (Officer 6, 1994).

8. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ONGOING PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

The NIJ grant which funded this project called for the development of performance measures that could be used to evaluate community policing. Our report goes beyond the NIJ charge and looks at the results we get when we use the measures we developed.

The overriding question for a problem solving unit like the
DVRU is "Do the unit's community policing strategies solve problems?" or at least "Do they reduce the magnitude of the problem?"

Three broad categories of activities must therefore be assessed:

1. Does the DVRU apply strategies that reflect the five core community policing values?
2. Does the criminal justice system process more domestic violence cases as a result of DVRU activities?
3. Is there a reduction in domestic violence in Portland?

We developed and applied a variety of measures in an attempt to assess both the processes that were employed to produce the outcomes and the outcomes themselves. It is the purpose of this section of our report to provide brief descriptions of each measurement instrument, and when and how it might best be used.

COMPUTERIZED RECORDS

Intended Use: Computerized records are used to determine whether or not DVRU activities produce:

1. The intermediate results they are expected to produce: increases in prosecutions, increases in restraining orders filed, and increases in warrants issued.
2. The anticipated long term outcome, a reduction in recidivism and in the rate of family violence in the city.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{16}The main purpose of this project is to develop ways to measure community policing as opposed to determining the effectiveness of any given community policing project such as the DVRU. This being the case, we did not have the resources to use our instruments in conjunction with an experimental design. We
**Possible Products:** The use of computerized records permits at least two ways of assessing short term and long term outcomes. One way is to analyze trends in the quantitative measures of "the domestic violence problem." This, for example would result in a monthly record of domestic violence 9-1-1 calls, police reports, arrests, prosecutions, and restraining orders. Another way is to assess the impact of DVRU efforts upon a set of specific cases and the people involved in them. This approach would tell us, for example, whether cases that received DVRU services were more likely to result in prosecutions, other associated consequences for the offenders, and eventually fewer incidents of domestic violence.

**Obstacles Encountered:** We encountered numerous obstacles trying to use computerized records from different agencies to assess the DVRU (Sections 6.2 through 6.3.1 contain detailed accounts of the various problems we encountered). They ranged from variations in "what" was counted as domestic violence within agencies as well as between agencies, to the equally crippling discovery that the data fields to link cases from agency computer to agency computer did not exist.

discuss this issue in greater depth in section 6.3.2 of this report.
Recommendations:

1. The same people, community activists and criminal justice system workers, who created the DVRU need to undertake a process to choose a small number of carefully defined outcome indicators to be reported and recorded month after month, year after year so real, long-term trends will become visible.

2. The data managers at each agency must be authorized to collectively decide how they are going to link up the agencies of the criminal justice system so that one computer and one researcher can match a DVRU investigation with a temporary restraining order or a prosecution with a 9-1-1 call. Until this mental shift to "the big picture," occurs the answer to the question "Does what we do get results?" will remain a puzzle. Technically, the transformation from the current agency-centered approach to a system-wide approach could be a simple as this: each agency would either agree to use one case number, assigned at the 9-1-1 stage, or agree to track the previous agency's case number alongside their own.

3. To create and use a computerized multi-agency system as we suggest will require resources mostly at the outset, especially the time of current technical staff. Thereafter, costs will be largely a function of what officials wish to extract from the data base.
For example, do they want quarterly reports that reflect monthly trends of prosecutions, sentences and re-arrests for DVRU cases (almost no cost via automatic report generating), or do they want comparative analyses for DVRU and non-DVRU cases once a year (some time cost)?

It is our view, that while it does not provide answers to all assessment questions, a computerized multi-agency record system is of pivotal importance to community policing performance measurement.

THE VICTIM CALL-BACK SURVEY (VCBS)

Intended Use: The VCBS can be used to assess the service orientation strategies of uniform officers and DVRU officers, and to measure victim empowerment.

Possible Products: Part 1 of the VCBS--the service orientation section--provides information about officers' helpfulness, their concern for citizens, the respect they accord them, and the degree of knowledge they exhibit in their professional encounters with citizens. In other words, the questions describe particulars of the community policing service orientation value which means to: "provide supportive, professional service to the community...by
promoting human rights, mutual respect, and courtesy" (Portland Police Bureau, 1994:2). (Appendix B contains a copy of the VCBS). The persons who supplied this information, were victims of domestic violence who had recent contact with DVRU officers and/or uniform officers in conjunction with the domestic violence incident. Sections 3.2 through 3.2.3 contain a thorough discussion of VCBS procedures and service orientation results.

Part 2 of the VCBS—the victim empowerment section—attempts to assess the success of DVRU strategies that were aimed at providing victims with the tools or options to help themselves. Empowerment means to: "encourage decision making at the most effective level, and promote citizen responsibility and involvement" (Portland Police Bureau, 1994:2). For a copy of the actual questions, consult the VCBS in Appendix B. Section 5.1 contains a detailed discussion of the victim empowerment results from our study.

The empowerment segment can also be adapted to a wide variety of uses. If the police bureau, together with neighborhood organizations and other partners, undertakes extensive community education efforts to prevent burglaries, for example Part 2 of the
VCBS should be re-written to permit the assessment of the results.

In addition to these various uses, with the addition of a few questions, the VCBS can also serve as victimization survey for selected victim groups. Re-victimization information that is obtained from the victims themselves is vital whenever impact on criminal behavior is of interest. We discuss the use of the VCBS for this purpose briefly in Section 3.2.2.2 of this report.

Obstacles Encountered: On the whole the VCBS is quite easy to use, once interviewers are trained, an average interview takes little more than 5 minutes, and the vast majority of interviewees who are successfully contacted are very willing to participate in the survey. The main difficulties with the use of the VCBS concern time span and procedural issues which stem from the fact that these victims are domestic violence victims. Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.1.1 describe procedures and protocol for this respondent group.

Recommendations:

If one wants to find out whether officers use service orientation strategies, there are few measurement alternatives to asking the recipients of these services directly. Based on our experience with using the VCBS in pretests and for this report, we
found it well-suited to the task.

What further recommends this survey is that it is a multi-purpose instrument. 1. It can be used with any victim or citizen group who received police services. 2. It can be used to elicit information from victims or citizens about any category of police service, which is particularly advantageous in police agencies where community policing has been implemented organization-wide. 3. It can be used to measure the impact of victim or citizen empowerment efforts. 4. It can be used to elicit re-victimization information from victims.

We would recommend the VCBS be used periodically, especially following policy changes that affect service orientation, victim/citizen empowerment, or victimization rates. Whenever possible survey participants should be chosen with the use of a random selection process.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR DVRU PERSONNEL

Intended Use: This instrument (see Appendix D) was developed to be used for structured personal interviews with the people in the DVRU, for the purpose of eliciting information about the use of community policing strategies, partnership, and employee empowerment.
Possible Products: We wanted to determine the following:

1. Do officers use strategies that reflect community policing values?
2. Specifically, do DVRU officers work as partners with other agencies in responding to domestic violence?
3. How well are these partnerships working?
4. Do DVRU officers themselves feel empowered?
5. How satisfied are DVRU personnel with their jobs?

Appendix A which lists DVRU community policing strategies is one product of our interviews. In addition to providing first-hand information about DVRU activities, it permitted us to compare officially declared strategies to those actually used.

The assessment of partnership requires asking each partner about the other. The questions we asked allowed us to determine the extent and quality of partnership arrangements between the DVRU and other domestic violence response agencies. When we posed similar questions to representatives of these other organizations, we were able to use the combined information to assess strengths and weaknesses in the partnership arrangements. Section 4 contains a detailed analysis of partnership in the context of the DVRU. We also attempted to find out to what extent DVRU personnel felt empowered as employees. Section 5.3.1 in our report relates to
this topic.

**Obstacles Encountered:** There were no obstacles. Once DVRU personnel were assured of their confidentiality, they were delighted to take part in this assessment process.

**Recommendations:** We suggest the use of this instrument only in the context of a formal evaluation. On an ongoing basis, less formal ways to assess partnership, employee empowerment, and the use of community policing strategies can be developed. One informal avenue for the assessment of partnership quality exists in Portland already in the form of the Family Violence Intervention Steering Committee monthly meetings as noted in Section 4.1 of this report.

**INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER ORGANIZATIONS**

The set of questions in this interview schedule was adopted from the "Focus Group Questions for Related Organizations" originally developed by John Clark (1994). The two main purposes for the interviews with representatives of organizations in the domestic violence response system were to assess partnership relationships and community empowerment. Appendix E contains the interview schedule, Sections 4.1.1, 4.2, and 4.2.1 discuss the partnership findings, and Sections 5.2 and 5.2.1 detail community empowerment issues and results.
Recommendations: We suggest the use of this instrument only in the context of a formal evaluation. On an ongoing basis, less formal ways to assess partnership relationships and community empowerment can be developed.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


PERSONS INTERVIEWED

101 Domestic Violence Victims

DVRU Personnel

Captain Robert Brooks
Captain Marianne Heisler
Sergeant Randy Day
Officer Linda Johnson
Officer John Laws
Officer Rick Miller
Officer Pam Moen
Officer Steve Morrow
Officer Anne Sundstrom
Officer Trainee William Cotter
Representatives of Partnership Organizations

Judith Armatta, Oregon Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence
Mark Hess, Multnomah County Community Corrections
Joe Olexa, Chief Civil Division of the Court
Chiquita Rollins, Bradley Angle House
Helen Smith, Deputy District Attorney
Robert Weinreich, Men's Resource Center
Elizabeth Welch, Chief Family Court Judge
APPENDIX  A

DVRU COMMUNITY POLICING STRATEGIES

SERVICE ORIENTATION STRATEGIES

Several DVRU activities and strategies exemplify more than one community policing value. For example, when DVRU officers arrange for the victim to get in touch with the district attorney’s office for purposes of prosecuting the suspect, one can classify this activity as rightfully belonging to any or all of the community policing values "problem solving," "service orientation," and "victim empowerment." Multiple listings of strategies are included here, because the purpose is to illustrate how DVRU strategies and activities reflect certain community policing values, and not to present the reader with an assessment of DVRU work load.

1. Call backs:
   the DVRU staffing limitations permit that only a small percentage of cases that warrant further investigation receive full DVRU services. Since the spring 1994, DVRU officers call all victims of priority cases to provide them with information about restraining orders, prosecution etc..

2. Victim assistance with:
   Transportation to and from the court house, hospital, shelter etc.;
   Accompanying victim to district attorney’s office and court house;
   Get victim relocated, and arrange for emergency food and clothing.

3. Victim counseling:
   Discuss with victim, as needed and desired, issues pertaining to victimization;
   Discuss with victim, as needed and desired, the pros and cons of prosecutions, treatment, separation etc.;
   Discuss with victim, as needed or desired, taking control of ones life and how to go about it.

PARTNERSHIP

The DVRU officers and supervisory staff routinely interact with a variety of agencies, both inside and outside the criminal justice system. These agencies are:

1 The information presented below was obtained by conducting personal, structured interviews with all DVRU officers, supervisors and staff during June and July, 1994.
District attorney’s office, family law restraining order department, family court judges, probation/parole office, children services, other police agencies, shelters, hospitals, private physicians, legal services—public and private, aging services, telephone company *57 traces program, private non-profit social service agencies e.g. Urban League, batterer counseling services, victim counseling services, emergency food and clothing suppliers.

"In one case we had 7 or 8 agencies involved, this would not have happened under traditional policing" (3,1994:1).

EMPOWERMENT STRATEGIES

Victim Empowerment

The specific DVRU strategies listed below are embedded in an approach that DVRU officers have articulated in these words:

"We give people the tools to help themselves as well as rely on us to help them" (6,1994:2). "We are careful not to tell the victim what to do" (2, 1994:1).

1. Providing victim information about her options:
   How the criminal justice system works;
   What it means to prosecute;
   What a restraining order means;
   What a warrant means.

2. Explain how to pursue a chosen option:
   How to go about prosecuting the suspect;
   How to go about getting a restraining order;
   How to get safe housing;
   How to get counseling;

3. Assist victim with pursuit of chosen option:
   Help victim set up appointment with district attorney;
   Help victim get restraining order;
   Help victim get safe housing;
   Inform victim of upcoming court dates;
   Help victim with transportation to/from court.

Community Empowerment: External Community and Police Community

1. Presentations at:
   Community centers and community forums;
   Conferences and workshops;
   Schools, universities and colleges;
   Participation in television broadcasts.


3. Conducting training for police officers, via in-service
training sessions, via attendance at roll calls, and by hosting rookie officers for one-week rotations at the DVRU.

PROBLEM SOLVING STRATEGIES

1. Get background information re prior victimization/offending
2. Conduct computer check re 'prior location'
3. Conduct computer check for outstanding warrants
4. Check if suspect is in custody or not
5. Get in touch with victim by phone, note the following victim safety procedures:
   If "he" answers the male investigating officer says "Is Joe (fictitious name) there? ... "Must have the wrong number."
   Or, when "he" the female investigating officer says "I am calling for Avon, is ... there?" When the victim gets on the phone the officer reveals her identity and asks the victim whether this is a safe time to talk.

6. Establish in person contact with victim:
   Go to victim's house, or wherever the victim is located at the time, or ask victim to come to the office.

7. Collect Evidence
   Take photos of injuries
   Take photos of property damage
   Interview witnesses
   Contact the offender to get his side of the story
   Contact other agencies for information, e.g. the probation department if the suspect is on probation
   Prepare documentation

8. Get complaints issued
   Make arrests following a non-custodial report
   Get warrants issued
   Obtain restraining orders with/for victim

These problem solving activities are generally guided by the following considerations:

To get the victim and children away from violence on permanent basis;

To look at solutions even if they don’t involve the criminal justice system.
In one officer's words this involves to: "try to determine what keeps the victim in the relationship, and then approach the discussions with her from that angle, even when the person says I don't want to prosecute..." (2, 1994:2). But even then another officers says "...I don't give up on her, I call her
again, I keep those cases on my desk with a note to recontact her in a few days" (1, 1994:2)

ACCOUNTABILITY

The DVRU produces quarterly and annual reports that document the major unit activities (see Appendix F for a copy of the 1993/94 report).

The DVRU has opened its doors to outside evaluators from the time it began operations, i.e. evaluators were part of the two week DVRU officer training program, and evaluators have been involved in an ongoing process evaluation since then, and have conducted pre-tests for an upcoming outcome evaluation.

The DVRU supervisory staff solicits feedback from the community on an ongoing basis, by attending the local Family Violence Intervention Steering Committee monthly meetings. These meetings are attended by representatives from shelter and emergency services, the district attorney’s office, legal aid, the private bar, corrections, treatment programs, the medical community, court personnel, United Way personnel, and city government (The Family Violence Intervention Steering Committee, 1994:2).
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM CALL BACK SURVEY
INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS

BEFORE THE INTERVIEW BEGINS:

1. Write the police report number on each page where it calls for the Case ID number

2. Fill in the case characteristics information before you call the victim, you will find the necessary information on the police report

3. Make sure to note date and time of each attempted call. If you are unable to reach the victim, give the case to the supervisor on duty (Annette most likely). You may encounter different types of unable to reach situations, note what they are:
   a. no answer
   b. answering machine HANG UP DO NOT LEAVE MESSAGE!
   c. the phone number you have is a message number only or has been disconnected
   d. the victim answers the phone but does not speak enough English to be able to conduct interview

4. Make no more than THREE call backs in the event that you are unable to reach the victim. Vary calling times, e.g. if you called in the evening and victim was not home,

5. If a child or person other than the victim answers the phone, ask for the victim by name. DO NOT give the reason for the call. Do not argue with the person.

6. If you get a hostile victim, be courteous, restate that this is voluntary, and that you are sorry to upset her and terminate the call.

7. If your call initiates violence, notify the police officer working with you immediately.

8. If the victim is not clear as to which domestic incident you want to talk about (she may have been assaulted several times in the mean time) refer to the date and time of the incident, and if necessary remind her of significant details you have knowledge of from reading the police report.
9. Should a victim tell you about other victimizations, and you get the impression she has not reported them to the police, you might consider advising her to do so. If she tells you about a child abuse case you must report it to the Child Abuse Hotline. Oregon has a mandatory child abuse reporting law.

10. When a victim asks for specific information about other agencies that might be able to help, refer to your resource sheet.

11. If a victim asks specific questions about her case, take a name and phone number and tell them an officer will call them back. Give this message to the officer on duty when you make the call. Your next try should be in the morning.

12. If the victim wants to know how we keep the information confidential, tell her that her answers to the questions are not linked to her name, that we want to know how victims as a group, not individual victims, who had police contact view the police response they got.

13. If after you have completed the interview with the victim, you feel uncertain about the victim’s safety, immediately consult the DVRU officer in attendance and relate your concern to him/her.

14. Record Answers by circling the brackets [ ] with the appropriate response codes.
# DVRU CASE WORK SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DVRU Priority</th>
<th>Entered DVRU</th>
<th>Entered PPDS</th>
<th>Called By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault / DA</td>
<td>Menacing / DM</td>
<td>Death Threats / DT</td>
<td>Stalking / DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.O. Violation / DR</td>
<td>Elder Abuse / DJ</td>
<td>R.O. Service / RS</td>
<td>Other / DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Present</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons Involved</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VICTIM

- Prior DV Cases: Y, N, U
- Drug/Alcohol: Y, N, U

### SUSPECT

- Prior DV Cases: Y, N, U
- Drugs/Alcohol: Y, N, U
- In Custody: Y, N, U
- Arrested By DVRU: Y, N, U

### CASE ASSIGNMENT

- Date Assigned:
- Assigned Officers:
- Follow Up Assigned By DVRU:
- DVRU Intake
- D/A Request/List:
- Other/List:

### CLOSED CASE

- Participating Victim?: Y, N
- DVRU Dispo: OUCR Dispo:
- Complaint Issued?: Y, N
- Charge:
- Restraining Order Obtained?: Y, N
- R.O. Number

### NOTES/COMMENTS:

March 30, 1994
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM CALL BACK SURVEY

Case ID (police report number)______________________________
Interviewer name______________________________
Date 1st attempt_________________________Time ____________
Date 2nd attempt_________________________Time ____________
Date 3rd attempt_________________________Time ____________

Please take care to complete each item on this form. Take as much information as possible from the police report.

1. DVRU Intervention Case? Yes [1] No [0]

2. Age of victim in years _____

3. Age of suspect in years _____

4. Race of Victim, circle the appropriate bracket
   Asian [1]
   Black [2]
   Hispanic [3]
   Indian (US) [4]
   White [5]
   Other [6]

5. Race of Suspect, circle as above
   Asian [1]
   Black [2]
   Hispanic [3]
   Indian (US) [4]
   White [5]
   Other [6]


8. Case involved Repeat Violence......Yes [1] No [0]
9. Case involved Weapon.................Yes [1] No [0]
10. Case involved Children.............Yes [1] No [0]
11. Case involved Assault...............Yes [1] No [0]
12. Case involved Menacing............Yes [1] No [0]
13. Case involved Death Threat........Yes [1] No [0]
14. Case involved Stalking..............Yes [1] No [0]
15. Case involve R.O.Violation........Yes [1] No [0]
16. Case involved other crime........Yes [1] No [0]

17. Case involved Drug/Alcohol........Yes [1] No [0]
PORTLAND POLICE BUREAU DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM CALL BACK SURVEY

Can I please speak with [victim first name]. My name is [interviewer first name]. I am calling ON BEHALF of the Portland Police Bureau to ask your opinion on how domestic violence is being handled by the police. This will help us improve the quality of police services to victims of domestic violence.

ASK: "Is this a safe time to talk?" YES=[1] NO=[0]

IF NO, ask "When would be a good time to talk?___

ASK: "Do you need an excuse for this call?" YES=[1] NO=[0]

IF YES, say you were doing a survey on women's cosmetics.

Our records show that you were the victim in a recent domestic conflict. (If victim seems unsure which domestic conflict you mean, clarify by referring to the date of the incident as noted on the police report). We would like to ask you a few questions about how the uniformed officers who came to your house handled your case. To answer these questions will take about 5 minutes of your time. Your answers will remain strictly confidential. A goal of our study is to find out if you thought that the actions the police took with you and your partner were in any way helpful to you. In order for us to know whether the officers helped you, we hope that you will be willing to tell us what you thought of the uniformed officers who handled the recent conflict in your home?

ASK: "Are you willing to participate in our survey?" YES=[1] NO=[0]

IF NO, thank them for their time and say good bye.

IF YES, proceed with the questions. If necessary, remind victim occasionally that her answers pertain to the uniformed officers who responded to the incidence in question.
1. "Overall, how would you rate the helpfulness of the police?"
   
   EXCELLENT  GOOD  FAIR  POOR
   [4]  [3]  [2]  [1]

   COMMENTS:

2. "Overall, how would you rate the knowledge of the police?"

   EXCELLENT  GOOD  FAIR  POOR
   [4]  [3]  [2]  [1]

   COMMENTS:

3. "Overall, how would you rate their concern for you?"

   EXCELLENT  GOOD  FAIR  POOR
   [4]  [3]  [2]  [1]

   COMMENTS:

4. "Overall, how would you rate the respect the police showed for you?"

   EXCELLENT  GOOD  FAIR  POOR
   [4]  [3]  [2]  [1]

   COMMENTS:

5. "How would you rate the overall quality of the police service?"

   EXCELLENT  GOOD  FAIR  POOR
   [4]  [3]  [2]  [1]

   COMMENTS:

6. "As a result of your contact with the police, have you filed a restraining order?"
   YES= [1] NO= [0]

7. IF NO: "Do you plan to file a restraining order?"
   YES= [1] NO= [0] UNSURE= [3]
   N/A= [4]

8. "Have you taken steps to prosecute?"
   YES= [1] NO= [0]

9. IF NO: "Do you plan to prosecute?"
   YES= [1] NO= [0] UNSURE= [3]
   N/A= [4]
NOTE: IF THE VICTIM IS A MAN SKIP THE NEXT QUESTION

10."Do you know how to contact a shelter
   for battered women?" YES= [1] NO= [0]

11."Do you know how to get legal assistance?" YES= [1] NO= [0]

12."Do you know where you can get counseling,
    if you want it?" YES= [1] NO= [0]

13."Do you know where your partner can get
    counseling?" YES= [1] NO= [0]

14."Where children present during the
    recent conflict?" YES= [1] NO= [0]

15."Did the recent conflict involve a weapon?" YES= [1] NO= [0]

16."Have you felt threatened by this person in
    the past?" YES= [1] NO= [0]

17. IF YES: HOW MANY TIMES? LESS THAN TWO TIMES= [1]
    2 TO 5 TIMES= [2]
    5 TIMES AND MORE= [3]

18. How long have you known this person?"

19."Did anyone use drugs of alcohol during the
    incident?" YES= [1] NO= [0]

20."Who called the police? DID YOU?= [1]
    THE CHILDREN?= [2]
    A NEIGHBOR?= [3]
    A FRIEND?= [5]
    ANOTHER PERSON?= [6]
21. "Other than the uniformed officers, did anyone else from the Portland Police Bureau contact you about this incident?"

UNIFORMED OFFICERS ONLY: [1]  
OFFICERS FROM THE DVRU BY PHONE ONLY: [2]  
OFFICERS FROM THE DVRU IN PERSON: [3]  
OTHERS: [4]  

IF THE VICTIM HAD NO PERSONAL CONTACT FROM THE DVRU OFFICERS, THANK THE VICTIM FOR HER TIME, AND SAY GOOD BYE!!!!!!

IF VICTIM WAS CONTACTED BY THE DVRU IN PERSON, continue as follows:

I would like to ask you a few questions about the officers from the domestic violence unit who contacted you about your case. These questions are very similar to the ones you already answered, EXCEPT THAT NOW, I ASK YOU TO PLEASE think of the Domestic Violence Unit officers, when you answer the next questions:

QUESTION:  
22. "Overall, how would you rate the helpfulness of the Domestic Violence Unit officers?" [4] [3] [2] [1]  

COMMENTS:

23. "Overall, how would you rate the knowledge of these officers?" [4] [3] [2] [1]  

COMMENTS:

24. "Overall, how would you rate their concern for you?" [4] [3] [2] [1]  

COMMENTS:
25. "Overall, how would you rate the respect the Domestic Violence Unit officers showed for you?"

COMMENTS:

26. "How would you rate the overall quality of the services they provided for you?"

COMMENTS:

THESE ARE ALL THE QUESTIONS I HAVE. DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS? THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP.

INTERVIEWER please note whether you encountered any problems or circumstances that might have affected the interview:

[1] Difficulty with the English language
[2] Overall difficulty understanding the questions
[3] Many interruptions or temporary breakoff
[4] Could not finish the interview
[5] Other (explain, if necessary)
APPENDIX C

RESTRAINING ORDER INFORMATION
(Provided by: Family Law, 248-3943 & PPB-Domestic Violence Reduction Unit, 823-0961)

IF YOU ARE THE PETITIONER . . . (you obtained the order)

- understand that the order must be served on the respondent, presented to the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office (12240 NE Glisan) and entered into the state wide computer system before it becomes enforceable.

- call 9-1-1 when the respondent is violating the order. Make a police report. If the respondent has left the scene, call 230-2121 and make a police report.

- after making a police report (whether or not an arrest was made), contact the District Attorney's Domestic Violence Unit at 248-3873 for case review.

- understand that your restraining order can only be modified, amended or dismissed (vacated) by a judge. Your actions of calling, meeting or living with the respondent does not make your order invalid. They are still subject to arrest!

- if the respondent requests a "21 day" hearing, you must attend, otherwise the order will be dismissed. If you need legal advice, contact the Multnomah County Bar Association's Volunteer Lawyers Project at 224-1512.

- the order will last for one year from the date signed by the judge. If you still need it renew it before it expires.

- understand that to "vacate" (dismiss/remove/cancel) the order, you must go to Family Law at the courthouse, Room 211, complete the paperwork and see a judge.

IF YOU ARE THE RESPONDENT . . . (you were/are served with a restraining order)

- obey all of the restrictions placed on you by this order (even if you disagree) or be subject to arrest.

- understand that this order does not stop the petitioner from calling, meeting or living with you. YOUR behavior and actions are restrained, not theirs. If the petitioner has given you "permission" to call, visit or live with them, you are still subject to arrest!

- understand that this order can only be modified, amended or dismissed (vacated) by a judge. (Example: The petitioner invites you into the house. They have not made the order invalid. You are still subject to mandatory arrest.)

- within 30 days of being served, you have the right to request a hearing to contest the order (i.e. visitation, locations, etc.) SEE ATTACHED FORM, "NOTICE TO RESPONDENT", WHICH DISCUSS HOW TO REQUEST A 21 DAY HEARING.

- understand that if you violate the order, the law mandates a custody arrest, not the petitioner.

- your order may allow you one-20 minute move-out with police presence.

June 2, 1994
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APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR DVRU PERSONNEL

1. Please describe what you do in conjunction with the investigation of a case assigned to you.

2. What are the routine tasks you perform in an investigation?

3. What are unusual tasks you perform in an investigation?

4. How much time, on average, do you spent investigating a case?

5. Do you contact outside agencies in the course of investigating a case?

6. What agencies do you contact most often?

7. Do you have contact persons at these agencies with whom you deal on a regular basis?

8. How would you describe your relationship with non-police agencies?
   With the DA’s office?
   With shelter staff?
   With community corrections staff?
   With ...................?

9. How often do you contact other officers in your department in conjunction with an investigation?

10. What tasks do you perform outside of investigating DV cases?

11. What do you like best about your work with the DVRU?

12. What do you like least about your work with the DVRU?

13. In your view, do you think, the DVRU accomplishes what it set out to do?

14. If given the opportunity, what, if anything, would you change about the way in which you do your work?

15. Has your work in the DVRU changed your view of domestic violence?
    If so, describe how it has changed.

The interviews were conducted in person, by the author of this report who recorded the interviewees’ responses with a lap top computer the time of the interview. The interviews were held at
the DVRU offices in the "soft room;" they lasted anywhere between 45 and 85 minutes, and were completed between June and July of 1994.
APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

1. How well informed is your agency/organization about the DVRU?
2. Do you know what the purpose of the DVRU is?
3. Have members of the DVRU made special efforts to inform you about their operations?
4. Are there aspects of the DVRU you would like to know more about?
5. On what occasions do you, or the people you work with, meet with DVRU staff to discuss domestic violence issues?
6. Are these meetings productive?
7. Do you feel like you are dealing with each other on an equal basis?
8. Does your relationship with the DVRU depend on specific person-to-person contacts?
9. How would personnel turnover affect your relationship with the DVRU?
10. Considering the goal of improving the response to domestic violence in our community, how important is give and take between agencies?
11. Is your agency's work made easier through co-operation with the DVRU?
   In terms of delivery of services to your clients?
   In terms of referrals to or from your agency?
12. Do you see positive long term developments as a result of this co-operation?
13. Is the DVRU's job made easier through the co-operation with your agency?
14. Does your agency have any written co-operative agreements with the DVRU?
15. Does your agency have any informal (unwritten) co-operative agreements with the DVRU?
   What do they address?
   Who initiated them?
How well are they adhered to?
How well are they working?

16. Police training is an important aspect of effective domestic violence intervention. Are you aware of any changes in officer conduct in the last year?

17. What would you suggest should be included in officer training that would improve the interaction between the PPB and your agency?

These questions are adopted from the "Focus Group Questions for Related Organizations" which were originally compiled by John Clark of the University of Oregon.
## NOTES

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>This reflects the number of cases that were reviewed during the listed quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>This is the number of <em>Reviewed Cases</em> where the suspect was arrested at the scene or a short time later by uniformed officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>This is the percentage of the <em>Cases Reviewed</em> for the quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Except for the <em>Total Assigned Cases</em> this is the percentage of the <em>Total Assigned Cases</em> for the quarter. <em>Total Assigned Cases</em> is the percentage of the <em>Cases Reviewed</em> for the quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>This shows the number of cases assigned during the listed quarter. These cases may have occurred during a prior quarter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All percentages are rounded. As a result totals may not equal 100%.
Figure 4

Education Evaluation Score by Week

Week Number

Mean Education Score
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ARREST INFORMATION

(Provided by: Family Law, 248-3943 & PPB-Domestic Violence Reduction Unit, 823-0961)

IF YOU WERE ARRESTED FOR DOMESTIC ASSAULT OR MENACING . . . . .

- understand that ORS 133.055 mandated (required) that the police officers take you into custody and lodge you in jail. The victim/complainant/witness did not arrest you. Family and household abuse will not be tolerated in this community!

- you may be offered the "deferred sentencing program." If you qualify and enter a guilty plea, you will enter a 6 to 12 month program of domestic violence counseling and, if determined through an evaluation, a drug and alcohol treatment program. If you successfully complete the program, the guilty plea will be dropped from your record.

IF YOU WERE ARRESTED FOR VIOLATING A RESTRAINING ORDER . . . .

- ORS 133.310(3) mandated (required) that you be arrested and taken into custody.

- only judges have the authority to modify or dismiss (vacate) the order that required your arrest.

- to avoid future arrests, review and follow the rules of the restraining order.

- understand that a restraining order does not stop the petitioner from calling, meeting or living with you. YOUR behavior and actions are restrained, not theirs. If the petitioner has given you "permission" to call, visit or live with them, you are still subject to arrest!

IF YOU BAIL OUT OF JAIL . . . . .

- you will sign a release order and agreement stating you, the defendant, shall not contact the victim unless specifically authorized by the court. If you violate the order, you are subject to arrest under ORS 133.310(6).

COUNSELING AND TREATMENT RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO YOU . . . . .

(Drug & alcohol evaluation and treatment - domestic violence counseling)

Mens Resource Center/Women's Agenda ................. 2325 E. Burnside, 235-3433
Portland Women's Crisis Line ..................................... 235-5333
ASAP (Drug, alcohol & anger management assistance) .... 2130 SW 5th, 224-0075
Transitions Projects (Hispanic Services) ...................... 222-9361
Portland Police Bureau, Domestic Violence Reduction Unit ........... 823-0961
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