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The Driving Idea

When somebody whose name we know is repeatedly brutalizing someone else whose name we know, we should make him stop. **We have been utterly failing to do that.**
The Domestic Violence Problem

Drives a range of impacts:

• Deep harm to victims, their children, and their extended families
• Cycles of control and psychological abuse
• Victims experience repeat victimization by individual and multiple offenders
• Intergenerational cycles of violence
• Drained resources of community, health care providers, and the criminal justice system
Patterns of IPV Offending

- Repeat with same victim
- Repeat across victims
- Common pattern before lethal violence
- Offenders known to CJ system
- CJ response clearly ineffective
- "Experiential effect" – CJ system teaching offenders that they’ll get away with it
Domestic Violence Prevalence

35.6% of women in the US have experienced IPV in their lifetime

40-50% of all murders of women are IPV homicides

15% of all violent crime is IPV
Most Vulnerable Victims

Research consistently shows IPV homicide is greatly disproportionately concentrated amongst poor women of color, particularly African-American women, in poor minority neighborhoods.
Victim-Focused Advocacy and Formal Response

Our IPV strategies over the past decades have been primarily focused on victims. This is very important:

• Highlights fact and significance of victimization
• Provides support, services, and treatment to victims
• Is essential to providing safety and healing trauma
Existing Attitudes and Practices Place Profound Burdens on Victims

• Makes her responsible for her own victimization

• Focus is on **victim safety** in context of an essentially unaddressed offender

• Onus on the victim to upend her life—shelters, safety planning, counseling, etc.

• Traditional approaches ask that they:
  • Leave the relationship
  • Relocate their children
  • Resituate their lives and financial support
Dominant Interventions Don’t Work, Particularly for Most Dangerous Offenders

- Batterer intervention programs
- Safety planning & risk assessment
- Cognitive behavioral therapy
- Coordinated community response

These approaches have been unable to protect victims or break the cycle
Criminal Justice Response

• Restraining orders and the like fail to prevent a great deal of death and injury

• Mandatory arrest—the major CJ innovation on IPV—is known to put, especially, poor women of color at further risk

• Mandated batterer treatment probably completely ineffective and certainly for the most dangerous men
Criminal Justice Response Places Profound Burden on Victims

- Victim generally put in position of determining whether there is any CJ action
- Victims face high risk when they take CJ steps:
  - Call police
  - Give testimony
  - Take out orders of protection
  - Cooperate with prosecutors
  - Give trial testimony
- Exposure is routinely associated with unacceptable and undesirable results
Ineffective and Damaging Criminal Justice Response

Only about 50% of IPV victims report to police at all.

80% of IPV victims who had not contacted police are afraid to call in the future.

2 out of 3 IPV victims who contacted the police are afraid to call again.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Fear Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td>felt the police discriminated against them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>believed calling police would make things worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>were arrested or threatened with arrest while reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>felt less safe after calling the police</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
…several convictions about abuse have been brought in the past, nothing new is going to happen now except more anger towards me.

Anonymous respondent

Who Will Help Me? Domestic Violence Survivors Speak Out About Law Enforcement Responses
National Domestic Violence Hotline
…one of them was blaming me because I went back to my abuser. I had no money, no place to go, and no transportation.

Anonymous respondent

Who Will Help Me? Domestic Violence Survivors Speak Out About Law Enforcement Responses
National Domestic Violence Hotline
National Law Enforcement Experience

22% line-of-duty deaths resulting from call for service for **domestic dispute**

65% of those cases include at least 2 officers on the scene

“Every time you get a domestic, you know you’re going into something with so many moving parts.”

Officer Michael LaRiviere, Salem, MA, 27 year veteran
High Point's 24 Year Index Violent Crime Trend

- murder
- rape
- robbery
- assault
- Total Violent
- population

VCTF: + 42%
DMI: - 64%
GANG: - 64%
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Impact on High Point

By 2009, gun, gang, and drug related violence decreased.

However…
Impact on High Point, cont’d

1 out of 3 remaining homicides were DV related including two murder/suicides

HPPD Officers responded to more than 5,000 DV calls per year, including 5,352 in 2010

Average on scene time is 26 minutes x 2 officers = 6,472 hours on DV calls that year
Partners in Developing IPVI

- High Point Police Department
- Guilford County District Attorney’s Office
- High Point Community Against Violence
- Family Services of the Piedmont
- University of North Carolina, Greensboro
- National Network for Safe Communities
- Susan Herman, Deputy Commissioner of Collaborative Police, NYPD
Statement of Purpose

The High Point Police Department, in partnership with researchers, practitioners, and community, will develop, implement, and evaluate a focused deterrence initiative targeted at the chronic domestic violence offender to reduce repeat domestic violence calls, reported assaults, injuries, and deaths.
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Are IPV Offenders Different from Other Violent Offenders?

National and High Point analysis says no, not as much as we thought.
Literature Review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of All Perpetrators</th>
<th>% of Perpetrators with Any Criminal History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any Prior Criminal History</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Prior Violent Crime</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Nonviolent History</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Langford, et al, “Criminal and restraining order histories of intimate partner-related homicide offenders in Massachusetts.”
### Criminal History of Massachusetts Intimate Partner Homicide Offenders

#### Percentage with offense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Among All Perpetrators n=171</th>
<th>Among Violent Perpetrators n=90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any violent crime with a weapon</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32.7, 62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault without a weapon</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39.2, 74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault with a weapon</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32.2, 61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.9, 24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex offense</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.9, 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidnapping</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5, 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child abuse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5, 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child neglect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8, 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder/manslaughter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8, 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6, 1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Langford, et al, “Criminal and restraining order histories of intimate partner-related homicide offenders in Massachusetts.”
## Proportion of Male Batterers with Histories of Other Antisocial Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Antisocial Behavior</th>
<th>Proportion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faulk 1974</td>
<td>Previous criminal assault</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flynn 1977</td>
<td>Nonfamily criminal assault</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayford 1975</td>
<td>Previously incarcerated</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(one-third of above for violent offenses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey and Shupe 1983</td>
<td>Arrest record</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(one-third of above for violent offenses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker 1979</td>
<td>Previous arrest</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundsaville 1978</td>
<td>• Arrest record</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Previous incarceration</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nonfamily violence</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fagan, Stewart, and Hansen 1983</td>
<td>Previous arrests for other violence</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne 1984</td>
<td>Previous arrest</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(batterers who were killed by their wives)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Langford, et al, “Criminal and restraining order histories of intimate partner-related homicide offenders in Massachusetts.”
Criminal History
Offender Profile
UNC Greensboro Analysis

1,033  # of people charged w/ a DV-related offense between 2000 and 2010

The average DV offender had 10 other charges

10,328  # of charges amongst the 1,033 charged w/ a DV-related offense
Top 20 Most Common Arrest Charges Among Those With at Least One DV Offense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charge Type</th>
<th>Text Description (Statute Code)</th>
<th>Total Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>Assault on Female by Male Over 18 (14-33(C)(2))</td>
<td>1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Second Degree Trespass (14-159.13)</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/Alc</td>
<td>Driving While License Revoked ((20-28(A))</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>Communicating Threats (14-277.1)</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>Resisting Public Officer (14-223)</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/Alc</td>
<td>Felony Possession (90-95(A3)6)</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>Simple Assault (14-33)</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>Possession of Drug Paraphernalia (90-113.22)</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>Assault on a Female (14-33(B)(2))</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>Assault Attempt Serious Injury (M) (14-33(C)(1))</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Order Show Cause (5A-15)</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Larceny (14-72)(A)</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Larceny (M) (14-72(A)M</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Injury to Personal Property (14-160)</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/Alc</td>
<td>DWI (20-138.1(A))</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>DV Protective Order Violation (50B)</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Injury to Real Property (14-127)</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Larceny (F) (14-72(A)F)</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/Alc</td>
<td>Possession of Controlled Substance (90-95(A3)2)</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Turned Over to Other Agency</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td>3626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Only includes through June 14, 2010. In 2010, the total number of offenders arrested was 5,753 individuals.
High Point DV offenders are likely to have committed other offenses:

Of the top 10 most common additional offenses:

- 6 are violent
- 3 are drug or alcohol-related
- 1 is property-related
### High Point Homicide Offender Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86%</td>
<td>minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>unemployed, living in poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>average arrests each, w/ assaults as most prominent offense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most had lengthy histories with frequent contact in the justice system.
High Point IPV Offender Profile

- Already violated protection orders
- Most had offense history beyond DV
- There was only one exception to this profile in five years
- When we re-interviewed neighbors, officers, friends, and family the common statement was: “I knew that was going to happen”
High Point Homicide Offender Profile
Offender #1

- Stabbed mother-in-law and sister-in-law trying to find wife with another man
- Drug history, DDR charges
- 14 HPPD Arrests
- ADW history
- Combat vet with mental illness
- Under active 50B protection order
High Point Chronic Offender Profile
Offender #2

- 8 DV arrests
- 7 other assaults, robbery
- VCTF list
- Driving, threats, disorderly
- 6 violations of DV Act
- Multi-county and multiple victims
Victim Interviews
What Did the Victims Tell Us?

In developing the IPV strategy we took seriously what the victim wanted.

- Survey of victims in shelters by family services
- Workshop discussions with victims
- Interviews of victims for insight
  - Victim long ago
  - Victim less than 3 years ago
  - Victim currently
- Remove obstacles from system
- Common answer: “I just want him to stop”
Obvious System Flaws

• No differentiation between DV and IPV

• Inconsistent police response: different depending on officers present, whether offender and victim were still at scene, and victim’s willingness to press charges

• Poor coordination between CJ actors: police, prosecution, probation, parole
  • Little CJ coordination with advocates and service providers
  • Dropping “high intensity supervision” IPV probationers
  • Order of protection service brought offenders into contact with victims
“Are they resisting our best efforts?”

No.
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Offender-Focused Intervention Goals

- Do no harm
- Protect the most vulnerable victims from the most dangerous abusers
- Deter or control abusers
- Take the burden off victims
- Address as close to all abusers as possible: counter “experiential effect,” establish new norms
- Establish state, not victim, as addressing violence
- Match with best possible victim support and protection
Range of IPV

- Fatality and Serious Physical Harm
- Physical Abuse
- Control and Psychological Abuse
• Intimate partner violence
  • Unknown to law enforcement

• Known to law enforcement
  • Non-chronic offender
  • Ordinary deterrence regime

• Chronic offender
  • Special deterrence regime
In theory

A

Special law enforcement, outreach and support, and community moral voice focus

B

“A” strategy directly marketed to “B” offenders
In Practice

A-level
Dangerous enough to incapacitate
A

B-level
Demonstrated repeat offending
B

C-level
First known offense
C

D-level
Indication of IPV
D
Offending Criteria

A-level
Most dangerous

B-level
Repeat offender

C-level
First charge

D-level
First contact
Offending Criteria

A-level
Most dangerous

B-level
Repeat offender

C-level
First charge

D-level
First contact

- 3 or more previous IPV-related charges
- Offender has violent criminal record including IPV
- Violated a protective order
- Used weapon in the past when committing IPV
- Convicted felon
Offending Criteria

- **A-level**
  Most dangerous

- **B-level**
  Repeat offender

- **C-level**
  First charge

- **D-level**
  First contact

• 2nd charge of IPV

OR

• Violation of prohibited behavior for which offender received notice as a C-level offender (e.g., violating pretrial release condition, no contact order, etc.)
Offending Criteria

A-level
Most dangerous

B-level
Repeat offender

C-level
First charge

D-level
First contact

- 1st charge for an IPV offense
- No previous offenses in any jurisdiction
Offending Criteria

A-level
Most dangerous

B-level
Repeat offender

C-level
First charge

D-level
First contact

- Identified when police are called to a domestic disturbance call
- An intimate partner relationship exists
- Aggressor has no previous charges for IPV
- No violence occurred on this incident requiring charges
Offending Notification & Response

A-level
Most dangerous

B-level
Repeat offender

C-level
First charge

D-level
First contact
Offending Notification & Response

**A-level**
Most dangerous

- No notice given—most violent
- Selected for immediate prosecution as example to lower levels of offenders
- Addressed by any legal means available

**B-level**
Repeat offender

**C-level**
First charge

**D-level**
First contact
Offending Notification & Response

A-level
Most dangerous

B-level
Repeat offender

C-level
First charge

D-level
First contact

- Face-to-face law enforcement and community message
- Framing of intervention as from state and community
- Offenders required to attend a notification as a group
- Receive custom legal notification letter detailing presumptive sentences for future acts of violence
Offending Notification & Response

A-level
Most dangerous

B-level
Repeat offender

C-level
First charge

D-level
First contact

- Face-to-face individual deterrent message delivered by detective
- At the time of arrest or before pretrial release
Offending Notification & Response

A-level
Most dangerous

B-level
Repeat offender

C-level
First charge

D-level
First contact

- Receives letter from police putting them on official notice they are now on a “watch list”
- Delivered by a uniform patrol officer the next day or within 48 hours on a follow up visit
Support for Victims

**A-level**
Most dangerous

**B-level**
Repeat offender

**C-level**
First charge

**D-level**
First contact
Support for Victims

A-level
Most dangerous

B-level
Repeat offender

C-level
First charge

D-level
First contact

- All services offered
- Referral to the VJC where all “B-level” services are in one building
- Services offered for children who witnessed violence or experienced trauma, also located in VJC
Support for Victims

A-level
Most dangerous

B-level
Repeat offender

C-level
First charge

D-level
First contact

- Victim receives prior notice the offender is being called in
- Message reviewed with her first
- Offer of “cocooning” or “proximity informant”
- Direct contact post call-in for victims still in relationship with offender
- Dedicated prosecutor, civil attorney services, and victim advocate
Support for Victims

A-level
Most dangerous

B-level
Repeat offender

C-level
First charge

D-level
First contact

- Victim receives letter of services at VJC
- Direct contact with safety planner
- Follow up with detective
Support for Victims

A-level
Most dangerous

B-level
Repeat offender

C-level
First charge

D-level
First contact

- Victim receives letter of services offered at Victim’s Justice Center
- Explanation of the incremental approach to prohibited acts for holding the offender accountable
Logic Model

- Offenders identified and evaluated
  - D-level
  - C-level
  - B-level
  - A-level
Community Notification Message

• Domestic violence is wrong
• This community is saying no
• There is no excuse for domestic violence
• If you think nobody knows and nobody cares, that is not true. We know.
• No more secrecy
Community Notification Message, cont’d

- There is a serious cost to the community, family, and children
- We care about you
- We support LEO in prosecuting you if you do not stop
- We are sharing information and working with the community to increase reporting
Law Enforcement Message

To be delivered with respect and spoken as to a rational adult.

• It is not just domestic violence; it is violence.
• It will no longer be tolerated by the community or law enforcement.
• Clearly define what domestic violence is.
• Clearly state the prohibited behaviors.
• From now on action will be driven by LEO, not the victim.
To be delivered with respect and spoken as to a rational adult.

• Cases will be handled differently.

• Explain exactly how the rules have been changed.

• All sources of information will be considered and sought after.

• Each person receives a custom legal notification letter.
Services Offered to Offenders

- Education
- Job training
- Help with housing
- Mental health counseling
- Substance abuse counseling
Sample D-level letters

OFFENDER FOCUSED DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INITIATIVE

Dear [Name],

I am writing to inform you that the High Point Police Department is taking a new approach in preventing future acts of domestic violence. We have added a watch list for all cases involving domestic abuse. This list will be reviewed daily by detectives assigned to the Domestic Violence Task Force, who will be looking for any complaints about domestic violence related activity involving you.

Domestic violence-related crimes include: threats, trespassing, damage to property, assault, harassment, stalking, sexual assault, and assault leading to injury or homicide. If you would like to speak with someone at the police department about your incident or about further action you can contact Detective Thompson at 336-889-7964. Your call will be treated as confidential.

There are many organizations which provide help to victims of domestic violence in the form of advice, counseling, and risk assessments. If you would like to talk with a victim service provider, the police department has partnered with Family Service of the Piedmont, you may contact them at 336-889-6161, ext. 3311. The victim services are free to you.

If you believe domestic violence offenders are a threat to you or someone you know, please contact us.

Sincerely,

Lt. Kevin Ray
Violent Crime Unit

NOTICE TO VICTIM

Dear [Name],

I am writing to inform you that the High Point Police Department is taking a new approach in preventing future acts of domestic violence. We have added a watch list for all cases involving domestic abuse. This list will be reviewed daily by detectives assigned to the Domestic Violence Task Force, who will be looking for any complaints about domestic violence related activity involving you.

Domestic violence-related crimes include: threats, trespassing, damage to property, assault, harassment, stalking, sexual assault, and assault leading to injury or homicide. If you would like to speak with someone at the police department about your incident or about further action you can contact Detective Thompson at 336-889-7964. Your call will be treated as confidential.

There are many organizations which provide help to victims of domestic violence in the form of advice, counseling, and risk assessments. If you would like to talk with a victim service provider, the police department has partnered with Family Service of the Piedmont, you may contact them at 336-889-6161, ext. 3311. The victim services are free to you.

If you believe domestic violence offenders are a threat to you or someone you know, please contact us.

Sincerely,

Lt. Kevin Ray, Supervisor
Violent Crime Unit

Family Service of the Piedmont * 24 hr Domestic Violence Crisis Line * 336-889-7273
High Point Police Department * Nonemergency Number * 336-883-3224
High Point Police Department
June 1, 2016

Dear Mr. Bennett,

Your continual behavior in the domestic violence arena has recently come under the scrutiny of the High Point Domestic Violence Task Force. Our Task Force is taking a strong stance against those individuals who continue to abuse their respective partners and do not comply with Domestic Violence Protective Orders. The High Point Police Department and the High Point Community Against Violence and other partners are working closely to stop domestic violence in any form.

We have reviewed your individual record, Mr. Bennett, and we have determined that if you continue to Assault a Female you will be charged minimum sentence could start anywhere between 6-8 months. Your case will be handled in Superior Court, and we have a commitment from the Guilford County District Attorney’s Office that they will prosecute you for that Assault to the fullest. If convicted, you would fall into a presumptive range where your minimum sentence could start anywhere between 6-10 months. With your record, it is possible that you could receive an active sentence. Also, as a convicted felon, if you possess a firearm, you will be charged with (F) Possession of a Firearm by a Felon. If convicted, you would fall into a presumptive range where your minimum sentence could start anywhere between 13-17 months. With your record it is possible that you could receive an active sentence.

Because of your assaultive criminal history, if you commit another assault, you can be charged with (F) Habitual Misdemeanor Assault. If convicted, you would fall into a presumptive range where your minimum sentence could start anywhere between 6-10 months. You would risk an active sentence.

The same applies if you were to be convicted of (F) Assault by Strangulation or (F) Breakage and Entering. Additionally, if you commit another assault, you then have probationary sentences of 10-21 months, 6-17 months, and 6 months may be revoked.

Of course, we hope that you will follow all of the laws of North Carolina, and it is our hope that we will not have to charge you with any crimes. Please be forewarned, Mr. Bennett, that you have come onto our radar, and we are watching for any crimes you may commit in the future with a new, particular interest. Domestic violence will not be tolerated.

Sincerely,

Chief Kenneth J. Shultz
Steps for Implementation

1. Identify key partners for implementing
2. Begin tracking intimate partner violence calls separately from other domestic disturbances
3. Recognize there are four levels of offenders/aggressors
4. Establish implementation team
5. Review arrest and court records to create master list of IPV offenders (previous 12 months)
6. Review individual criminal histories and classify each as A, B, or C
Steps for Implementation, cont’d

7. Train officers and issue new General Order
8. Coordinate victim services and enhance
9. Begin “A-level” prosecutions for offenders identified as most dangerous
10. Hold “B-level” face-to-face notifications
11. Begin “C-level” notifications upon first arrest
12. Begin “D-level” notifications by identifying and documenting aggressors on IP calls
13. Utilize enhanced tracking of offenders and immediate response to those who reoffend
Interagency Working Group

HIGH POINT POLICE
- Lt. Al Ferguson – HPPD Administrative Assistant to the Court
- Jerry Thompson – HPPD Domestic Violence Detective
- Ken Leonard - HPPD Domestic Violence Detective
- Kevin Ray – Supervisor of Violent Crime Unit
- Capt. Tim Ellenberger – Major Crime Commander
- Major Ken Shultz – Assistant Chief of Major Crime Deterrence & Prevention
- Vee Nance – Police Finance Specialist

DISTRICT ATTORNEY’S OFFICE
- Walt Jones – Chief DA
- Christon Halkiotis – ADA
- Leah Howell – ADA
- Monica Burnette – DA’s office
- Sharron Kurtz – DA’s office
- Dawn Watlington – Victim/Witness Coordinator, DA’s office
- Mike Kimel – Magistrate

VICTIM SERVICES
- Amanda Carrick – UNCG/Victim’s Justice Center/High Point Center for Children & Families
Interagency Working Group, cont’d

• Includes 15-20 participants

• Meets at the same time, same place biweekly

• Includes police, prosecutors, probation, parole, victim advocates, family services, service providers, and community members
Interagency Working Group, cont’d

Central to keeping the strategy on track

• Ensures implementation fidelity
• Manages system change
• Gives high-level attention to standout cases and situations
• Coordinates agency action on enforcement
• Communicates victim safety information confidentially
• Maintains momentum and buy-in from partners
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Focus on Most Dangerous Offenders

- Summer 2009: Begin focus on A-level offenders
- 2009
- 2010
- Jan. 20, 2011: Research complete
- Feb. 21, 2012: First B-level call-in
- Apr. 1, 2012: Implement C-level and D-level responses
- 2012
- 2013
Call-ins

- February 21, 2012
- July 31, 2012
- April 9, 2013
- January 14, 2014
- September 16, 2014
- June 7, 2016
# Proportion of Male Batterers with Histories of Other Antisocial Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>IPV Homicides</th>
<th>Total Homicides</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

IPV Homicides in High Point

- IPV Homicides
- Total Homicides

Intimate Partner Violence Intervention
Problem-Oriented Policing Conference - October 25, 2016
Circumstances of Two IPV Homicides

Dec. 25, 2015 – Chiquita Adams, 35, was killed by her “on again, off again” boyfriend, Shanion Watson, 35, in a hotel room. Adams was a Greensboro resident who had been a victim of IPV in Greensboro, though not by Watson. Watson was a High Point resident and has previous convictions for drug possession, cruelty to animals, and obtaining property by false pretenses, but no arrest history for assault. Neither had been contacted for IPV in High Point or notified through IPVI.

August 27, 2016 – Michelle Morgan, 47, was shot and killed by her ex-boyfriend Carnell Atkins, 46, who lived with her. Morgan had moved to High Point within the past six months from Martinsville, VA, and Atkins had followed. Atkins has a criminal history in Virginia, where he had served 14 years in prison for robbery with a firearm and in 2010 had been charged with abduction with a firearm and possession of a firearm by a felon. The parties had lived in High Point for a short time and had not been notified through IPVI or had previous IPV contact with HPPD.
Results, cont’d

IPV Incidents with Injuries to Victims

- 2012-13: 468
- 2013-14: 399
- 2014-15: 391
Results, cont’d

Recidivism rate in High Point vs. recidivism rate in traditional DV interventions

- High Point IPVI: 17.70%
- Olympia, WA (George 2012): 45%
- Rhode Island (Klein, et al 2005): 64.2%
Results, cont’d

IPV Homicides in High Point vs. Guilford County, 2013

- **DV Homicides**
- **Total Homicides**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guilford County</th>
<th>High Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results, cont’d

Recidivism Rate of Notified Offenders
April 1, 2012 – April 1, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Notified</th>
<th>Reoffended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-Level</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Level</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Level</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Level</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intimate partner disturbance calls

- **Domestic Disturbance - non-IP**
  - 2012-13: 1921
  - 2013-14: 1962
  - 2014-15: 1956

- **Domestic Disturbance - IP**
  - 2012-13: 2354
  - 2013-14: 2184
  - 2014-15: 2090

Results, cont’d
Results, cont’d

Race Relationship of Victim and Offender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VICTIM RACE INVOLVEMENT WITH KNOWN OFFENDER RACE INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>WITH INCIDENTS FLAGGED DOMESTIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VICTIM RACE INVOLVEMENT WITH KNOWN OFFENDER RACE INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>WITH INCIDENTS FLAGGED DOMESTIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013–2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

179 fewer incidents over 2 years
What Has This Meant for the Partnership?

- Improved collaboration between LE agencies and victim advocates to take the burden off the victim and keep her safe
- Closer collaboration among LE agencies on IPV documentation, tracking, investigation, and prosecution
- Greater offender accountability and more prosecution success for the most serious IPV offenders without increasing the risk to victims
- Tracking and understanding IPV separately from DV
- Incremental approach supported by victims
- Increase in victim services
What Has This Meant for Victims and Providers?

• Predictable and consistent victim response
• Takes the onus off the victim
• Victim understands there’s a method to the response
• Providers can address systems issues and work closely with LE
• 502 victim referrals from HPPD to services in FY 2015-2016
"Until Lt. Carter reached out to me I felt like I was screaming and no one could hear me. I now know that I do have a voice."

Woman whose partner was addressed in an OFDVI replication in Lexington, NC
Replication

- Lexington, NC
  - Arrests with victim injury below the national average every month since implementation
  - Recidivism rates of D- and C-level offenders 10-15%
- DOJ’s Office on Violence Against Women is supporting three replication sites
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