



National Institute of

S o l i c i t a t i o n

Jeremy Travis, Director

February 1998

Solicitation for a National Evaluation of the Arrest Policies Program Under the Violence Against Women Act

APPLICATION DEADLINE:

April 3, 1998

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
810 Seventh Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20531

Janet Reno
Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice

Raymond C. Fisher
Associate Attorney General

Laurie Robinson
Assistant Attorney General

Noël Brennan
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

Jeremy Travis
Director, National Institute of Justice

Department of Justice Response Center:
800-421-6770

Office of Justice Programs
World Wide Web Site:
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov>

National Institute of Justice
World Wide Web Site:
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij>

Solicitation for a National Evaluation of the Arrest Policies Program Under the Violence Against Women Act

This request for proposals announces a national evaluation of the Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies program funded by the Office of Justice Programs, Violence Against Women Grants Office (VAWGO) in 1997 under the Violence Against Women Act, Title IV of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. The request responds to the need for research to assess the effectiveness of arrest to leverage the coercive power of the criminal justice system and community resources to manage an offender's behavior. One grant of up to \$625,000 will be awarded.

The Violence Against Women Act Arrest Policies Program

Title IV of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is the Violence Against Women Act. The Act reflects a firm commitment toward improving the criminal justice system's response to violence that occurs when any woman is threatened or assaulted by someone with whom she has or has had an intimate relationship, with whom she was previously acquainted, or who is a stranger.

By committing significant Federal resources and attention to restructuring and strengthening the criminal justice response to women who have been, or potentially could be, victimized by violence, the safety of all women can be more effectively ensured.

The Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies program is authorized for three years. For fiscal year (FY) 1996, Congress appropriated \$28 million to the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, which is being administered

by VAWGO for the program. Thirty-three million dollars was appropriated in FY 1997. For FY 1998, \$59 million has been authorized under Part U of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. The purpose of this program is to encourage States, Indian tribal governments, and units of local government to treat domestic violence as a serious violation of criminal law.

Section 2101 of the Act enumerates the following six purposes for which Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies may be used:

1. To implement mandatory arrest or proarrest programs and policies in police departments, including mandatory or proarrest programs and policies for protection order violations.
2. To develop policies and training programs in police departments and other criminal justice and tribal agencies to improve tracking of cases involving domestic violence.
3. To centralize and coordinate police enforcement, prosecution, probation, or judicial responsibility for domestic violence cases in groups or units of police officers, prosecutors, probation officers, or judges.
4. To coordinate computer tracking systems to ensure communication between police, prosecutors, and both criminal and family courts.
5. To strengthen legal advocacy service programs for victims of domestic violence.
6. To educate judges and/or others responsible for judicial handling of domestic violence cases in criminal, tribal, and other courts about domestic

violence and to improve judicial management of such cases.

Section 2101 of the Act requires jurisdictions to incorporate the experience of nonprofit, nongovernmental domestic violence service providers into the project planning and implementation process along with police, prosecutors, and the courts.

The Violence Against Women Grants Office has awarded 123 grants under the Arrest Policies Program. Examples of the types of programs jurisdictions intend to develop, implement and enhance include:

! Creating centralized units of police officers, prosecutors, judges, and probation and parole officers to investigate and handle domestic violence cases.

Seventy-eight jurisdictions, including eight Indian tribal communities, who received grants under the Program intend to create centralized units comprising criminal justice personnel, victim advocates, and service providers to handle domestic violence cases. Examples include multi-disciplinary domestic violence units, vertical prosecution units, domestic violence courts, fatality review teams, and tribal coordinated councils.

! Implementing and testing the effectiveness of domestic violence arrest policies for violations of protection orders in the context of a coordinated criminal justice and community response to domestic violence that assigns priority to the safety of the victim and holds the offender accountable.

Twenty-eight jurisdictions, including eight Indian tribal communities, who received grants under the Program, plan to establish and implement domestic violence arrest policies and policies regarding enforcement of protection

orders. Several jurisdictions plan to implement policies that address domestic violence committed by law enforcement officers.

! Delivering comprehensive training programs to the police, prosecutors, probation and parole officers, and the judiciary that address the technical issues associated with policies that encourage or mandate arrest for domestic violence, address the phenomenon of domestic violence, stress collaboration and shared responsibility for ensuring the safety of the victim, seek to change attitudes that have traditionally prevented professionals in the criminal justice system from responding to domestic violence as a serious violation of criminal law, and provide information on improved methods for tracking domestic violence cases.

Fifty-six jurisdictions, including six Indian tribal communities, who received grants under the Program, plan to provide training for criminal justice personnel and victim services providers on legal, social, and psychological aspects of domestic violence.

! Developing information systems, automated registries, education and training programs, and technical assistance efforts that facilitate enforcement of protection orders within a single jurisdiction, within a single State, and from State to State.

! Linking automated information and tracking systems to enhance communication among police, prosecutors, and criminal and family courts to ensure that all of the system's components have access to consistent and complete information about an individual's domestic violence history.

Seventy-one jurisdictions, including nine Indian tribal communities, receiving Program grants plan to develop and link automated tracking systems in order to monitor domestic violence cases and

provide a more coordinated response by the entire criminal justice system. Examples of systems that will be established include protection order registries, victim notification, electronic monitoring, and offender criminal histories.

! Establishing and expanding advocacy services for domestic violence victims from the time an abuse report is filed through the postsentencing of the offender, including any time during which the offender is subject to probation or parole supervision.

Forty-three jurisdictions, including four Indian tribal communities, receiving Program grants plan to establish or enhance advocacy services for victims of domestic violence by hiring victim advocates to work with prosecutors and the courts, or by coordinating services with non governmental victim advocates.

Abstracts of the projects funded, programs proposed under the various purpose areas, and guidelines for the program are available on the Violence Against Women Grants Office's home page. The Office's homepage address is: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/VAWGO>. The abstracts and guidelines are also available from the U.S. Department of Justice Response Center at 800-421-6770, in the Washington, D.C. area at 202-307-1480, and by fax at 202-616-9249.

Statement of the Problem

In the past, police departments and the criminal justice system as a whole, generally treated domestic violence as a private, family matter unlike any other violent crime. Many police departments maintained informal nonarrest policies for domestic violence, focusing instead on alternative responses such as family crisis intervention and counseling for domestic abusers (Liebman and Schwartz, 1973). In recent years

many departments have implemented new policies and practices that encourage or mandate arrest of a perpetrator of domestic violence for probable cause or for violating a protection order (Cohn and Sherman, 1987; Fagan, 1996). The Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment (Sherman and Berk, 1984), funded by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), was the first randomized study to assess the effects of different police responses, including arrest, on domestic assault. The findings of this study suggested that the prevalence of subsequent domestic violence was reduced by nearly 50 percent when the suspect was arrested, as opposed to ordering one of the parties out of the residence or providing some form of advice to the couple.

The Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment paved the way for six replications and extensions of the experiment. This research, collectively known as the Spouse Assault Replication Program, was undertaken in a variety of U.S. police departments [Atlanta, Georgia (Deutsch, 1986); Omaha, Nebraska (Dunford et al., 1989); Charlotte, North Carolina (Hirschel et al., 1990); Miami, Florida, Metro-Dade County (Pate and Hamilton, 1992); Colorado Springs, Colorado (Berk et al., 1992); and Milwaukee, Wisconsin (Sherman et al., 1992)]. The replications and extensions produced inconsistent results (i.e., no deterrent effect of arrest was found, only certain types of offenders were deterred, or, in the worst situations, arrest escalated violence) (Garner et al., 1995). These studies do suggest, however, the need for further research and evaluation in this area, especially as jurisdictions develop more integrated system approaches to violence against women as envisioned by the VAWA.

For example, in addition to implementing policies that mandate or encourage arrest of domestic violence perpetrators, some departments have created special domestic violence units that train personnel, developed guidelines and protocols for enforcing laws related to domestic violence,

created sophisticated tracking and communication systems, investigated both misdemeanor and felony domestic assaults, developed accountability measures that ensure enforcement of the law by all officers in the department, and developed effective strategies to coordinate with other criminal justice agencies and victim service providers.

Similarly, other criminal justice agencies have implemented practices and strategies complementary to the police that prioritize the safety of victims and hold the perpetrators of domestic violence accountable. In particular, several probation departments have instituted methods of supervision designed to enhance victim safety and vigorously enforce violations of protection orders, thereby promoting coordination with the courts. A number of prosecution agencies have established domestic violence teams that work closely with legal advocates and advocates affiliated with nonprofit, nongovernmental victim service organizations. Together, prosecutors and advocates alike keep victims informed about the progress of their cases as well as the status and known whereabouts of the perpetrators. They also provide assistance in preparing long- and short-term safety plans for victims and their children. Additionally, courts are beginning to recognize the need for continuing education for judges. They also are implementing improved case-processing procedures with designated dockets to better manage domestic violence cases and expedite scheduling of trials. To enhance these innovations and encourage the adaptation of successful strategies in additional communities across the country, agencies throughout the criminal justice system require more tools and resources. For arrest to be an effective domestic violence intervention, it must be part of a coordinated and integrated response to the problem on the part of the entire criminal justice system (Hart, 1995).

NIJ's Arrest Policies Program National Evaluation Solicitation

The VAWA Arrest Policies Program national evaluation will enhance the overall NIJ research and evaluation program in family and domestic violence and will build upon NIJ's previous Spouse Assault Replication Program. The intent of this solicitation is to examine the process associated with, and the impact resulting from, arrest policies that are implemented in the context of system-wide and coordinated approaches to domestic violence. A major objective is to assess the effectiveness of arrest to leverage the coercive power of the criminal justice system and community resources to manage an offender's behavior.

The national evaluation should provide both a broad overview of the entire program sponsored by the VAWGO, and an in-depth evaluation in a number of sites. For the in-depth component applicants should provide a comprehensive evaluation of the purpose areas of the VAWA Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies Program (i.e., policy development and implementation, training, education, centralized coordination, computer tracking, and victim advocacy) with a focus on system-level coordination. The rationale for the in-depth evaluation should be justified. Applicants should provide a detailed discussion of how sites will be selected, and the methods that will be used to assess impact. Applicants should also provide assurance of access to sites selected for the in-depth evaluation (i.e., letters of commitment). As part of the the overall national evaluation, the applicant should also identify substantively interesting and evaluable sites, not included in the in-depth component, for possible future research and evaluation.

Applicants are strongly encouraged to include a partnership working group comprised of relevant practitioners including non profit, non

governmental victim service providers from each site selected in the execution of the in-depth evaluation. This partnership is intended to provide research that is relevant to the practitioner community. As the partnership working group members collaborate they should consider the spirit and intent of the Arrest Policies Program under the Violence Against Women Act in executing the evaluation strategy.

Applicants should include plans to submit detailed annual reports on the status of the national evaluation. Applicants should provide an outline for the contents of the annual report.

Applicants must demonstrate organizational capacity to conduct a large scale national evaluation. This would be reflected in the staffing plan, effective and efficient use of consultants and subcontracts, and organizational history of prior large scale evaluation experience. Applicants should also have experience with successful retention of victim samples longitudinally. Specific retention rates for victim interviews from prior research should be noted in proposals.

A single national evaluation of up to \$625,000 will be supported. The award would cover a period of 24 months, but the project period may be extended to three years. A decision regarding project extension and supplemental funding will be made prior to the close of the 24 month project period. The first year of the project should focus on process, while subsequent years should focus on impact and on the development of measurable indicators of program and policy outcomes, especially ones practitioners can use over time.

Questions applicants should address under this solicitation include but are not limited to:

1. What impacts have the projects had by purpose areas (i.e., policy development and

implementation, training, education, centralized coordination, computer tracking, and victim advocacy) on the safety and protection of women and on improvements in responding to domestic violence by the criminal and civil justice systems? What impacts have the projects had on recidivism among offenders in jurisdictions where an integrated system is in place?

2. How were the programs implemented? What problems did jurisdictions encounter and how were they addressed? How did law enforcement agencies ensure that programs were implemented by line staff? Did federal technical assistance facilitate implementation?

3. What impacts have the projects had on law enforcement organizations? Have they led to more comprehensive training of officers at all levels of rank on the dynamics of domestic violence? Has training led to changed attitudes among law enforcement officers regarding the dynamics of domestic violence? Has evidence gathering and data collection been enhanced? Has there been an increase in reporting of domestic violence incidents? Has there been an increase in prosecution of domestic violence cases? Are greater number of offenders being convicted? Has sentencing of domestic violence offenders changed? In addition, information on the systemic readiness for the interventions proposed by jurisdictions receiving an arrest policy grant should be collected as part of the evaluation.

4. Did the arrest policies programs lead to better coordination between criminal justice agencies, and non-criminal justice organizations (e.g., victim services, social services, hospitals, shelters)?

5. What, if any, unintended consequences have resulted from the projects? For example, has there been an increase in dual arrests?

6. What impacts have the projects had on minority communities?

7. How will the research from your evaluation advance the knowledge base on the impact of arrest policies?

Measuring program effectiveness. The need for innovation in developing ways for practitioners and policymakers to know whether their programs and strategies are achieving the goals they have set is acknowledged. This will require a new emphasis on measurable indicators that can be tracked by practitioners over time, on qualitative measures, on culturally sensitive measures and on the development of indicators using different levels of data. Outcome measures that go beyond reoffending after arrest need to be considered and utilized. New outcome measures could address extent and effectiveness of a community- coordinated and integrated approach to reducing domestic violence, economic issues, impact on children, access to services, use of shelters and/or orders of protection, full faith and credit, safety plans, and other quality-of-life issues pertaining to the victim. Outcome measures relating to the offender could address the likelihood of threatening or battering a new partner, and the economic, social, and psychological impact of arrest on the offender. The use of data from a variety of systems (criminal justice, social service, public health) is encouraged, as is the development of indicators of outcome that can be built into on-going program record keeping and information systems. Projects may involve case studies, ethnography, victim and practitioner focus groups and surveys, data on secondary consequences, experimental and quasi-experimental designs such as comparison sites without mandatory or proarrest policies and coordinated systems, and other relevant approaches.

Dissemination. NIJ is also interested in expeditious and innovative methods to disseminate the results of the evaluation that would supplement the more traditional dissemination approaches. This would include methods to make the results available at the local level in policy discussions and program improvement. Results of the evaluation are expected to be reported to NIJ and the Office of Justice Programs as they become available. This will facilitate the dissemination of findings and innovations. Applicants should provide a discussion of the types of results or products that would become available over the course of the project and should describe how the evaluation would assist States in their efforts to combat violence against women.

Applicants should be familiar with the Violence Against Women Act, the Arrest Policies Program, the current NIJ program on violence against women, and related research and evaluation. The proposed budget for the project should include travel for the Principal Investigator to attend three coordination meetings in Washington, D.C. These meetings will provide for the coordination of Violence Against Women Act evaluation activities and field work and presentations and discussions of evaluation techniques and measures.

IV. How to Apply

Those interested in submitting proposals in response to this solicitation must complete the required application forms and submit related required documents. (See below for how to obtain application forms and guides for completing proposals.) Applicants must include the following information/forms to qualify for consideration:

- Standard Form (SF) 424—application for Federal assistance
- Assurances

- Certifications Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements (one form)
- Disclosure of Lobbying Activities
- Budget Detail Worksheet
- Budget Narrative
- Negotiated indirect rate agreement (if appropriate)
- Names and affiliations of all key persons from applicant and subcontractor(s), advisors, consultants, and advisory board members. Include name of principal investigator, title, organizational affiliation (if any), department (if institution of higher education), address, phone, and fax.
- Proposal abstract
- Table of contents
- Program narrative or technical proposal
- Privacy certificate, as appropriate
- References
- Letters of cooperation from organizations collaborating in the research project.
- Résumés
- Appendixes, if any (e.g., list of previous NIJ awards, their status, and products [in NIJ or other publications]).

Proposal abstract. The proposal abstract, when read separately from the rest of the application, is meant to serve as a succinct and accurate description of the proposed work. Applicants must concisely describe the research goals and objectives, research design, and methods for achieving the goals and objectives. Summaries of past accomplishments are to be avoided, and proprietary/confidential information is not to be included. Length is not to exceed 400 words. Use the following two headers:

Project Goals and Objectives:

Proposed Research Design and Methodology:

Page limit. The number of pages in the “Program Narrative” part of the proposal must not exceed 30 **double-spaced pages**.

Due date. Completed proposals **must be received** at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on **April 3, 1998**. Extensions of this deadline will not be permitted.

Award period. In general, NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months. However, longer budget periods may be considered.

Number of awards. NIJ anticipates supporting one grant under this solicitation.

Award amount. A single award of up to \$625,000 will be made available for this NIJ solicitation.

Applying. Two packets need to be obtained: (1) application forms (including a sample budget worksheet) and (2) guidelines for submitting proposals (including requirements for proposal writers and requirements for grant recipients). To receive them, applicants can:

- Access the Justice Information Center on the Web:
<http://www.ncjrs.org/fedgrant.htm#NIJ>.

or the NIJ web site:

<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/NIJ/funding.htm>

These web sites offer the NIJ application forms and guidelines as electronic files that may be downloaded to a personal computer.

- Request hard copies of the forms and guidelines by mail from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service at 800-851-3420 or from the Department of Justice Response Center at 800-421-6770 (in the Washington, D.C., area, at 202-307-1480).
- Request copies by fax. Call 800-851-3420 and select option 1, then option 1 again for NIJ. Code is 1023.

Guidance and information. Applicants who wish to receive additional guidance and information may contact the U.S. Department of Justice Response Center at 800-421-6770. Center staff can provide assistance or refer applicants to an appropriate NIJ professional. Applicants may, for example, wish to discuss their prospective research topics with the NIJ professional staff.

Send completed forms to:

Solicitation for a National Evaluation of the Arrest Policies Program Under the Violence Against Women Act
National Institute of Justice
810 7th Street
Washington, DC 20531

References/Bibliography

Berk, R. A., A. Campbell, R. Klap and B. Western. "Bayesian Analysis of the Colorado Springs Spouse Abuse Experiment." *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 83 (1992):170-200.
Cohn, E., and L.W. Sherman. *Police Policy on Domestic Violence, 1986: A National Survey* (Report 5), Crime Control Institute, Washington, D.C. (1987).

Deutsch, J. *The Atlanta Spouse Assault Experiment*, Grant 87-IJ-CX-K005, National Institute of Justice. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. (1987).

Dunford, F. W., D. Huizinga, and D. S. Elliott. *The Omaha Domestic Violence Police Experiment. Final Report*, Grant 85-IJ-CX-K435, National Institute of Justice. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. (1989). NCJ 119528.

Fagan, J. *The Criminalization of Domestic Violence: Promises and Limits*. Presentation at the Annual Conference on Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation, National Institute of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice (1996). NCJ 157641.

Garner, J., J. Fagan and C. Maxwell. "Published Findings from the Spouse Assault Replication Program: A Critical Review." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 11(1) (1995):3-28.

Hart, B.J. *Coordinated Community Approaches to Domestic Violence*. Paper Presented at the Strategic Planning Workshop on Violence Against Women, National Institute of Justice, Washington, D.C. (1995).

Hirschel, J. D., I. W. Hutchinson, C. W. Dean, J. J. Kelley, and C. E. Pesackis. *Charlotte Spouse Assault Replication Project: Final Report*. (1991). NCJ 130096.

Liebman, D.A., and J.A. Schwartz. "Police Programs in Crisis Intervention: A Review." In *The Urban Policeman in Transition: A Psychological and Sociological Review*, eds. J.R. Snibbe and H.M. Snibbe, Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1973.

Pate, A. M. and E. E. Hamilton. "Formal and Informal Deterrents to Domestic Violence: The Dade County Spouse Assault Experiment." *American Sociological Review* 57 (1992):691-697.

Sherman, L. W. *Policing Domestic Violence: Experiments and Dilemmas*. New York: The Free Press, 1992.

Sherman, L.W., and R. Berk. "The Specific Deterrent Effects of Arrest for Domestic Assault."

American Sociological Review 49
(1984):261–272.

Sherman, L. W., J. D. Schmidt, D. P. Rogan, D. A. Smith, P. R. Gartin, E. G. Cohn, D. J. Collins, and A. R. Bacich. (1992). “The Variable Effects of Arrest on Criminal Careers: The Milwaukee Domestic Violence Experiment.” *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 83(1) (1992):137-169.