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“Coaching Boys Into Men” – Futures Without Violence (www.futureswithoutviolence.org) campaign

Eat your vegetables.

Don’t play with matches.

It’s cold out, wear a coat.

Don’t talk to strangers.

 Respect women.

Violence against women is a tragic reality. We must teach our sons early and often what it means to be a real man – that women deserve honor and respect, and that violence never equals strength. A safer world is in their hands. Help them grasp it.

www.endabuse.org

Eat your vegetables.

Don’t play with matches.

Finish your homework.

Respect women.

Violence against women is not part of our traditions. Harmony relies on our ability to respect, honor and nurture all our relatives. We must teach the boys in our life early and often that this is what it means to be a warrior and that violence never equals strength. A safer world is in their hands, help them grasp it.

www.endabuse.org
Huffington Post – “This is not a love story” Melissa Jeltsen

January 2016, 81 US women killed by a husband, BF partner or ex; 5 children killed when mother killed; 12 women killed husband, BF, partner or ex – 112 total killed – IP Homicide

5 children also killed – all by males – at least 7 children witnessed the homicide

57% killed with guns At least 4 of the 86 women were strangled to death

In January, 112 people were killed in suspected intimate partner homicides, including children and bystanders. Men committed 89 percent of the alleged fatal attacks, and 77 percent of the victims were women.

http://testkitchen.huffingtonpost.com/this-is-not-a-love-story/
Huffington Post – “This is not a love story”  
Melissa Jeltsen – 2/7/2016

89 percent of victims killed by alleged male perpetrator  
11 percent of victims killed by alleged female perpetrator

Joceline Romo, 19, 1/1/2016

Melissa McLain and her daughter Ashley Fite

Emily Young, pictured with her three children

Phillip Nguyen, 2 & his mom

Tiffany Nolan
• The Day Domestic Violence Came To Church
  • “A Saturday night in 2014, 18-year-old Danielle Shields sent a friend a series of panicked texts. Her boyfriend, Devin Patrick Kelley, was abusing her, she wrote. Her arms were red ... When the texts abruptly stopped, her friend called the cops. They went to Shields’ house, but closed the report a half hour later. The incident was simply a “misunderstanding and teenage drama,” they wrote ... Two months later, the couple married. Three years later ..on Nov 5, 2017, a sleepy Sunday morning, here’s how it ends.”
  • ....First Baptist Church, Sutherland Springs, TX – Danielle’s mother’s church – 26 died – Kelly, a known DV abuser - had strangled & beaten his first wife when in the military & fractured her (not his) son’s skull – he was convicted of DV assault - 364 days in jail – should have been entered into the gun prohibition data base was not
  • Everytown - 54% of mass shootings in US – 2009-16 connected to DV/FV

• [Huffington Post Link]
• [Everytown Research Link]
• [Splitsider Link]
HOMICIDE IN BATTERING RELATIONSHIPS

- 40 - 55% of US women killed - by husband, BF or ex (vs. 5-8% of men) (9 times rate killed by a stranger)
- Homicide - #2 cause of death - Af-Am; #3 AI/NA women 15-34 yo; #5 cause of death for young white women 30-34
- At least 2/3 of women killed – battered prior – if male killed – prior wife abuse -75% (Campbell, ‘92; Morocco ‘98)
- More at risk when leaving or left 1st 3 mos & 1st year (Wilson & Daly, ‘93; Campbell ’01; Websdale ‘99)
  - Eventually more safe
- Immigrant women at increased risk - NYC (Frye, Wilt ’10)
- Women far more likely victims of homicide-suicide (29% vs .1% male)
- Urban IP femicide decrease/rural increase (Gallup-Black ‘05)
- Homicide by personal relation #2 leading cause of female workplace homicide (after criminal intent) majority (78%) IP’s
- 40-47% femicides in health care year prior (Campbell ‘02)
Children involved

- Approximately 19% of IP homicides – children also killed (Websdale ‘99)
- For every one femicide, 8-9 attempted femicides
- Approximately 70% of cases where children – child either witnesses femicide or first to find the body
  - Less than 60% received any counseling & many only X1
  - Custody battles – 40% to mother’s kin; 12% to father’s (killer) kin; 5% split between mother’s & father’s; 14% to others –
  - “He killed my mommy” Lewandowski, Campbell et. al., *J of Family Violence ’04*; Hardesty, Campbell et al ’08. *J of Family Issues ’08*
- 8% of cases prior reported child abuse
- Plus women killed while pregnant – approximately 3% of femicide cases –
Maternal Mortality – Death During Pregnancy & First PP Year

  - Firearms most common (61.8%) method of death.
  - 71% African American women
  - Current or former intimate partner perpetrator in 54.5% (n= 60) of the homicide deaths – if IP nearly 2/3 of killed with guns.
- Also leading cause in NYC 87-91 (Dannenburg et al AJOG ’95) in VA tied with MVA for leading cause (Bronson 2013)
- USA 1991-99 homicide 2nd leading cause of MM (Chang et ’03)
- National study maternal mortality (NVDRS) – African American at increased risk in general & especially for homicide & suicide maternal mortality (Palladino, Singh, Campbell et al 2011)
- 15% of homicides of reproductive age women – women pregnant or ≤6 wks pp NVDRS 2003-14 MMWR – 2017 66(28);741–746
17 states (OR, AK, NV, NM, OK, MI, WI, OH, CA, KY, NC, SC, GA, MD, MA, UT, RI, VA, ) – 2903 IP Homicides – 77% female victim (n = 2235)

- 54% overall guns used; 10.9% of females strangled
- 849 male perpetrator killed self after (38%)
  - ('17 report – 41%)
- 460 incidents – Familicide
  - 91.4% Male perpetrator; 77% non hispanic white
  - 80% - (N = 380) male intimate partner killed wife, GF or ex & other family member, most often a child & often self - 88% gun used
  - N = 350 child (<17) killed (10% of femicides)
  - N = 133 child <11 yo killed
Top Ten States in Femicide 2015

www.vpc.org (US 1.08/100,000)

- #1 Alaska 11 women killed 3.15/100,000
- #2 Louisiana 51 women killed 2.15/100,000
- #3 Nevada 28 women killed 1.98/100,000
- #4 Oklahoma 38 women killed 1.94/100,000
- #5 South Carolina 43 women killed 1.73/100,000 vs. 1.08/100,000 national
- #6 New Mexico 18 women killed 1.71/100,000
- #7 South Dakota 7 women killed 1.65/100,000
- #8 Georgia 84 women killed 1.62/100,000
- #9 Tennessee 53 women killed 1.58/100,000
- #10 Texas 195 women killed 1.44/100,000
Femicide in California -
www.vpc.org; www.cpedv.org

- 2015 - CA #24 202 women killed 1.03/100,000 vs. 1.08 national but largest # of women killed (as in every yr but 1)
- 2014 – CA #27 - 196 women killed .97/100,000 vs. 1.09 national
- 2013 - CA #27 - 212 women killed 1.11/100,000 vs. 1.16 national
- 2011 - CA #29 - 193 women killed 1.02/100,000 vs. 1.17 national
- 2010 - CA #26 - 216 women killed 1.15/100,000 vs. 1.22 national
- 2009 – CA #31 – 193 women killed; 1.05/100,000 vs. 1.25 national
- 2008 – CA #29 – 206 women killed - 1.13/100,000 vs. 1.26 national
- 2006 - CA #25 - 210 women killed – 1.16/100,000 vs. 1.29 national
- 2003 – CA #22 - 232 women killed - 1.31/100,000 vs. 1.31 national
- 2002 – CA #20 - 239 women killed - 1.36/100,000 vs. 1.37 national
- 2001 – CA #22 - 238 women killed – 1.42/100,000 vs. 1.35 national

- 2009-11 other homicides decreased but DV homicides increased by 11.8%
- State data – approximately 60% of femicides – killed by IP – 16% stranger
- On average 2 children in each of the homes – therefore in CA

  - Approx 2000/yr children witness actual or attempted IP femicide
- Ratio of men to women in CA: 2014 - 46 women killed vs. 13 men – 3.5:1
INTIMATE PARTNER FEMICIDE BY PERPETRATOR IN TEN CITIES (N= 311)
U.S. INTIMATE PARTNER HOMICIDE RATE DECLINE 1976-07 FBI (SHR, 1976-02; BJS ‘05, ‘09)

1993 – first including ex-BF/ex-GF – Catalano, Snyder & Rand BJS ‘09 – adds approx 600 IP femicides per year; 250 IP males killed
Decline in Intimate Partner Homicide and Femicide

- Decline in male victimization in states where improved DV laws & services - resource availability (Browne & Williams '98, Dugan, Nagin, & Rosenfeld '99)

- Exposure reduction - increased female earnings, lower marriage rate, higher divorce rate (Dugan, Nagin & Rosenfeld '99; Smith & Brewer '00)

- Gun availability decline (Wilt '97; Block '95; Kellerman '93, '97 - gun increases risk X3)
  - Diez et al, 2017; Vigdor & Mercy ‘06 - States that prohibit possession & require relinquishing firearms with PO 9.7% lower total IPH rates; 14.0% lower firearm-related IPH rates than states without these laws – prohibiting purchase not enough
  - Implementation challenges – Frattaroli & Webster ‘06
  - US v Hayes ‘09 – Supreme Court upheld removal in DV cases – again in 2014; Brady bill bill upheld in 2016
U.S. INTIMATE PARTNER HOMICIDE RATES & DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SERVICES 1976-9
(Resources per 50 million - Dugan, Nagin & Rosenfeld ‘03)
INTIMATE PARTNER HOMICIDE: KILLED BY GUNS US ‘76–’05 (SHR) (>2/3 of intimates)
“Prediction is very hard to do - especially if it is about the future”

Yogi Berra
Overview of Issues

- High demand for both lethality & reoffending risk assessment by criminal justice, advocacy, victim service, & health systems
  - Petrone vs. Pike – Pike Co. Probation Department in PA – successfully sued (settled) under a Section 1983 ruling for failing to recognize potential lethality in a batterer – gave low level – phone only - supervision & failed to assure completion of an adequate batterer intervention program
  - Other risk assessment instruments used for general probation purposes not accurate for batterers
- Low base rates
- Relatively young science in intimate partner violence & risk assessment particularly
- 4 interacting parts to consider - instrument, risk assessor, perpetrator & one specific potential victim (vs. sexual assault or mental health – MacArthur study)
  - Actuarial versus structured clinical assessment
- Fears that risk assessment will be used to limit service to victims & fears of false negatives
Overlapping Concerns

Similar;
Not the same

Risk Assessment
Lethality Assessment
Safety Assessment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) TRUE POSITIVES</td>
<td>Predicted violence, Violent outcomes</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) FALSE POSITIVES</td>
<td>Predicted violence</td>
<td>No violent outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) FALSE NEGATIVES</td>
<td>No violence predicted, Violence occurs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) TRUE NEGATIVES</td>
<td>No violence predicted, No violence occurs</td>
<td>Specificity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Existing Evidence Based Risk Assessment Scales (with ROC evaluation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ROC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Navy (DoD) FAP</td>
<td>Victim &amp; Offender –risk of physical injury (FA, MP, health) in DV cases</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPPV-RAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV Mosaic (20) (deBecker)</td>
<td>Computerized/Victim (criminal justice) - lethality risk system</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVSI- R (Kirk Williams)</td>
<td>Offenders (criminal justice) short – reoffending</td>
<td>.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger Assessment (Campbell) - LAP</td>
<td>Victim- Lethality (Advocates, Health)</td>
<td>.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reattack; .90% att. hom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DANGER ASSESSMENT (Campbell ‘86)

www.dangerassessment.org

- Developed in 1985 to increase abused women’s ability to take care of themselves (Self Care Agency; Orem ‘81, 92) – original DA used with 10 samples of 2251 abused women to establish preliminary reliability & validity

- Interactive, uses calendar - aids recall plus women come to own conclusions - more persuasive & in adult learner/ strong woman/ survivor model –
  - “You actually see your own roller coaster ride; it was on the calendar.” (Woman in shelter in Alberta, CA)

  - Use in bail hearings, family court, screening by CJ for high risk, with expert in criminal hearings
  - Section on website on attorney use
ROC Curve Analysis – 92% under the curve for Attempted Femicides; 90% for actuals
Femicide Risk Study

**Purpose:** Identify and establish risk factors for IP femicide – (over and above domestic violence)

**Significance:** Determine strategies to prevent IP femicide – especially amongst battered women – Approximately half of victims (54% of actual femicides; 45% of attempteds) did not accurately perceive their risk – that perpetrator was capable of killing her &/or would kill her
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RISK FACTORS FOR INTIMATE PARTNER FEMICIDE: 11 CITIES
(Funded by: NIDA/NIAAA, NIMH, CDC, NIJ VAWA R01 DA/AA1156)
### Case Control Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASES</strong></td>
<td>women who are killed by their intimate partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROLS</strong></td>
<td>women who are physically abused by their intimate partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(second set of nonabused controls – for later analysis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Addition of Attempted Femicides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CASES</strong></th>
<th><strong>CONTROLS</strong></th>
<th><strong>Data Source</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - women who are killed by their intimate partners | - women who are physically abused by their intimate partners | - Police Homicide files  
Proxy informants |
| - women who are **ALMOST** killed by their intimate partners | | - Women themselves  
Women themselves – to address issue of validity of proxy information |
Definition: Attempted Femicide

- GSW or SW to the head, neck or torso.
- Strangulation or near drowning with loss of consciousness.
- Severe injuries inflicted that easily could have led to death.
- GSW or SW to other body part with unambiguous intent to kill.
- If none of above, unambiguous intent to kill.
Recruitment of Attempted Femicides

- From police assault files – difficult to impossible in many jurisdictions
- From shelters, trauma hospital data bases, DA offices – attempted to contact consecutive cases wherever located – many victims move
- Failure to locate rates high – but refusals low (less than 10%)
- Telephone interviews – subsample of 30 in depth
- Safety protocols carefully followed
Prior physical abuse & stalking experienced on year prior to femicide (N=311) & attempted femicide (N=182)

- Prior physical abuse
  - Increased in frequency
  - Increased in severity
  - Stalked
- No prior physical abuse
  - Stalked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Femicide</th>
<th>Attempted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior physical abuse</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased in frequency</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased in severity</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalked</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No prior physical abuse</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalked</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intimate Partner Abused Controls (N = 350)

- Random sample selected from same cities as femicide and attempted femicide cases
- Telephone survey conducted 11/98 - 9/99 using random digit dialing
- Women abused (including sexual assault & threats) by an intimate partner w/in 2 years prior – modified CTS
- Safety protocols followed
- Women in household 18-50 years old & most recently celebrated a birthday
### Sample – (only those cases with prior physical abuse or threats)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Femicide Cases</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Femicide Cases</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abused Controls</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sociodemographic comparisons

Mean Age
- Fem/Att Perp = 36
- Abuse Perp = 31
- Fem/Att Victim = 34
- Abuse Victim = 29
DANGER ASSESSMENT (Campbell ‘86)

www.dangerassessment.org

- Developed in 1985 to increase battered women’s ability to take care of themselves (Self Care Agency; Orem ‘81, 92) – original DA used with 10 samples of 2251 battered women to establish preliminary reliability & validity

- Interactive, uses calendar - aids recall plus women come to own conclusions - more persuasive & in adult learner/ strong woman/ survivor model – choking now added to calendar
  - “You actually see your own roller coaster ride; it was on the calendar.” (Woman in shelter in Alberta, CA)
Danger Assessment – Independent Predictive Validity Studies - Reassault

- (Goodman, Dutton & Bennett, 2001) N = 92; 53% returned; successful prediction of reabuse, DA stronger predictor than CTS2 (4.2 vs. 2.8 OR per 1 SD DA vs. CTS2)

- Women’s perception of danger stronger predictor than any of the 10 DA items available in criminal justice records – (Weisz, Tolman, & Saunders, 2000)

- Heckert & Gondolf (’02; ‘04) N = 499 – DA- 66% sensitivity but 33% false positives - Women’s perception of risk PLUS DA best model (over SARA & K-SID) but women’s perception of risk by itself not quite as good as DA
DANGER ASSESSMENT - Actual (N = 263) & Attempted (N=182) Femicides & Abuse Victims (N=342)*

Reliability (Coefficient Alpha)
- Attempted Femicide Victims  .75
- Abused Control Victims  .74
- Actual Femicides  .80

* Presence of DA items within one year prior to femicide and attempted femicide and within one year prior to worst incident of physical abuse experienced by abused controls
## DANGER ASSESSMENT SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abused Controls</td>
<td>2.9*</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Femicide</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Femicides</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femicide w/o suicide</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femicide/suicide</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attempted and Femicide scores significantly higher than abused controls (*p<.05)
DANGER ASSESSMENT ITEMS COMPARING ACTUAL & ATTEMPTED FEMICIDE SURVIVORS (N=493) & ABUSED (WITHIN PAST 24 MONTHS) CONTROLS (N=427) (*p < .05)

- Physical violence increased in frequency *
- Physical violence increased in severity *
- Partner tried to choke victim *
- A gun is present in the house *
- Partner forced victim to have sex *
- Partner used street drugs *
- Partner threatened to kill victim *
- Victim believes partner is capable of killing her *
- Perpetrator AD Military History (ns.)
- Stalking score *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Att/Actual</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence increase in frequency</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence increase in severity</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner tried to choke victim</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A gun is present in the house</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner forced victim to have sex</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner used street drugs</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner threatened to kill victim</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim believes partner is capable of killing her</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator AD Military History (ns.)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking score</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Choking”: A Potentially Lethal Act

- Non Fatal Strangulation – but often no visible injury
  - Hoarseness; incontinence
  - Internal swelling, petichiae, marks apparent under enhanced light
  - Increased risk of death in next 24-48 hours from stroke or aspiration

- Increases risk of CNS Sx – anoxia – memory loss, seizures – along with HI w/LOC - TBI (Campbell et al 2017; Valera 2015 – cognitive deficits)

- Increases risk of femicide (Glass et al ’08)
  - 6.70 AOR (95% confidence interval [CI] 3.91–11.49) of becoming an attempted homicide
  - 7.48 AOR (95% [CI] 4.53–12.35) of becoming an actual homicide
  - If to LOC or more than once, increases risk more
TBI in Abused Women – From Repeated Choking &/or Head Injury – ACAAWS study

HI = Head Injury
HI w/LOC = with Loss of Consciousness
Choking = Strangulation

ACAAWS Study – African American & African American women in the USVI & US – 832 women – case control design
VICTIM & PERPETRATOR OWNERSHIP OF WEAPON IN FEMICIDE (N = 311), ATTEMPTED FEMICIDE (N = 182), ABUSED CONTROL (N=427) & NON-ABUSED CONTROL (N=418) CASES

\[ \chi^2 = 125.6, \ P < .0001 \]
Arrest, Protective Orders & Weapon Use

- 48 (33.6% of 156) of attempteds were shot
  - 15 of the 45 (33.3%) with data - perpetrator either had prior DV arrest or PO at the time of the incident

- 91 of 159 (57.3%) femicides that had weapon information were shot
  - Of 74 with data, 27 (36.5%) had a prior DV arrest or had a restraining order at the time of the incident

- According to federal legislation – these men should NOT have had possession of a gun
### DANGER ASSESSMENT ITEMS COMPARING ACTUAL & ATTEMPTED FEMICIDE SURVIVORS (N=493) & ABUSED (WITHIN PAST 24 MONTHS) CONTROLS (N=427) (**p < .05**)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Att/Actual</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner is drunk every day</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner controls all victim’s activities</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner beat victim while pregnant</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner is violently jealous of victim (says things like “If I can’t have you, no one can”)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim threatened/tried to commit suicide</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner threatened/tried to commit suicide</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner is violent toward victim’s children</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner is violent outside house</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner arrested for DV* <em>(not criminality)</em></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner hurt a pet on purpose</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nonsignificant Variables of note

- Hurting a pet on purpose - 10% of attempteds/actual victims vs. 8.5% of controls
  - BUT – some clear cases of using cruelty to a pet as a threat to kill – if killed pet
  - WAS a risk for women to be abused (compared with nonabused controls) (AOR = 7.59 – Walton-Moss et al ’05)

- Perpetrator military history – 16% actual/attempts vs. 22% of controls
  - But PTSD in Vets associated with IPV (& child abuse)
  - & evidence that significant proportion of veteran suicides related to “marital distress” & some veteran suicides involve homicide of partner also
  - Strength at Home intervention for veterans who “use” violence (routine screening) – RCT evaluation – Casey Taft – significantly decreased use of violence among veterans AND reduced PTSD
Risk Models

- Femicides with abuse history only (violence & threats) compared to abused controls (*N=181 femicides; 319 abused controls – total = 500 (18-50 yo only)

- Missing variables
  - variables had to be excluded from femicide model due to missing responses – if don’t know – no – therefore underestimate risk

- Logistic Regression Plan – comparing cases & controls
  - Model variable in blocks – background characteristics – individual & couple, general violence related variables, violent relationship characteristics – then incident level
  - Interaction terms entered – theoretically derived
Significant (p<.05) Variables (Entered into Blocks) before Incident (overall fit = 85% correct classification)

- Perpetrator unemployed  OR = 4.4
- Perpetrator gun ownership  OR = 5.4
- Perpetrator Stepchild  OR = 2.4
- Couple Never Lived Together  OR = .34
- Highly controlling perpetrator  OR = 2.1
- Estranged X Low control (interaction)  OR = 3.6
- Estranged X Control (interaction)  OR = 5.5
- Threatened to kill her  OR = 3.2
- Threatened w/weapon prior  OR = 3.8
- Forced sex  OR = 1.9
- Prior Arrest for DV  OR = .34
Significant (p<.05) Variables at Incident Level

- Perpetrator unemployed  $\text{OR} = 4.4$
- Perpetrator Stepchild  $\text{OR} = 2.4$
- Couple Never Lived Together  $\text{OR} = .31$
- Threatened w/weapon prior  $\text{OR} = 4.1$
- Highly controlling perpetrator  $\text{OR} = 2.4$
- Estranged X Low control (interaction)  $\text{OR} = 3.1$
- Estranged X Control (interaction)  $\text{OR} = 3.4$
- Perpetrator Used Gun  $\text{OR} = 24.4$
- Prior Arrest for DV  $\text{OR} = .31$
- Trigger - Victim Leaving (33%)  $\text{OR} = 4.1$
- Trigger – Jealousy/new relationship  $\text{OR} = 4.9$
Femicide – Suicide Cases (32% of femicide cases - 12 city femicide study)

— Koziol-McLain, Campbell et al ‘06

- Significant explanatory power for same femicide – suicide risk factors – as intimate partner femicide without suicide – over & above prior IPV (72%)
  - Partner gun ownership – AOR = 13.0
  - Threats with a weapon – AOR = 9.3
  - Threats to kill – AOR = 5.4
  - Step child in the home – AOR = 3.1
  - Estrangement – AOR = 4.3 - stalking in 76% of cases
Femicide-Suicide Cases

- Unique to femicide – suicide:
  - Partner suicide threats (50%) – history of poor mental health (40%)
  - Married (AOR = 2.9)
  - Somewhat higher education levels (unemployment still a risk factor but not as strong), more likely to be white
CONCLUSIONS

- ALL DV IS DANGEROUS
- But 10 or more yeses on revised DA very dangerous
- Much more sensitive & specific if weighted items used – ROC curves – area under curve .91 (vs. .88 & .83 original version) with acceptable PPV at identifiable higher and lower danger ranges
ROC Curve Analysis – 92% under the curve for Attempted Femicides; 90% for actuals
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Instructions for Scoring Revised Danger Assessment

- Add total number of “yes” responses: 1 through 19. _____
- Add 4 points for a “yes” to question 2. _____
- Add 3 points for each “yes” to questions 3 & 4. _____
- Add 2 points for each “yes” to questions 5, 6, & 7. _____
- Add 1 point for each “yes” to questions 8 & 9. _____
- Subtract 3 points if 3a is checked. _____

Total _____

Note that a yes to question 20 does not count towards total in weighted scoring.
**Danger Assessment Certification**

has completed the
Danger Assessment Training Program
and is certified to use the
Danger Assessment and Levels of Danger Scoring System
to evaluate the level of danger in domestic violence cases.

| Jacquelyn C Campbell, PhD, RN, FAAN |
| Professor and Anna D Wolf Chair |
| The Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing |
| Date |
| NAME OF VICTIM: | Signature of certified assessor |

**Danger Assessment Scoring**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add total number of “Yes” responses, 1 through 19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add 4 points for a “Yes” to question 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add 3 points for each “Yes” to questions 3 and 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add 2 points for each “Yes” to questions 5, 6 and 7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add 1 point for each “Yes” to questions 8 &amp; 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtract 3 points if 3a is checked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of Danger</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 8</td>
<td>Variable Danger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – 13</td>
<td>Increased Danger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 -17</td>
<td>Severe Danger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 or more</td>
<td>Extreme Danger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of this Danger Assessment Scoring system is restricted to certified assessors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger Assessment Certified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on sum of weighted scoring place into 1 of the following categories:

- Less than 8 - “variable danger”
- 8 to 13 - “increased danger”
- 14 to 17 - “severe danger”
- 18 or more - “extreme danger”
Tentative suggestions for ranges

- **NEVER DENY SERVICES ON BASIS OF DA or ANY OTHER RISK ASSESSMENT AT CURRENT STATE OF KNOWLEDGE**

- **Variable danger range** – be sure to tell women level can change quickly – watch for other signs of danger, believe their gut

- **Increased and severe danger** – advise women of risk, assertive safety planning; consult with judges, high level of supervision recommendations

- **Highest level** – advise of serious danger – take assertive actions – call for criminal justice or other professional help -- recommend highest bail, highest probation supervision
myPlan – free in app stores – N. Glass
originally developed by OneLove

One Love My Plan

- Starts with secure access;
- Can be done by friend or family member;
- Relationship myths;
- Plan tailored to priorities & level of danger

myPlan App
Mongoose Projects

OneLove MyPlan

Menu
1. Myths
2. Healthy Relationships
3. Red Flags
4. My Safety
5. My Priorities
6. My Plan

MY PRIORITIES

Everyone juggles different factors when they make decisions about life, relationships, and safety. MyPlan helps you compare these factors to get a better idea of what is important to you. You might be juggling your:

- Commitment to relationship/love
- Your feelings for your partner, your investment in the relationship
- Retaliative violence
- Your want to lose your friends if you end the relationship
- Safety
- Your safety, the safety of your family and friends
- My child's well-being
- The health and safety of your children

About Violence Sources Of Help Safety Plan

Physical violence
Fear
Your partner avoiding arrest
Controlling behaviors
Guns
Leaving your partner
## Comparisons on Cutoffs – Sensitivity/Specificity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danger Level</th>
<th>Femicides</th>
<th>Attempteds</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable Danger &lt; 8</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Danger: 8 – 13</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Danger: 14 – 17</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Danger: 18 +</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revised DA Scores (ANOVA $p<.000$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not abused</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abused Controls</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Femicides</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Femicides</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

- Danger Assessment has support for validity/accuracy in a large national case control study
- DA can be an important basis for safety planning - cutoffs validated but use with great caution
- Was revised with femicide data – ranges were determined – & tested with attempted femicides
- Further evaluated (along with DVSI, K-SID & Mosaic in large prospective “Risk Assessment Validity Evaluation” supported by NIJ)
GENERAL PRINCIPLES FOR RISK ASSESSMENT IN DV

- More sources of information the better – “gold standard” for information is victim – without information from victim, cutoffs for lethality risk problematic – criminal record check important
- Perpetrators will minimize perpetration
- Use any cutoffs on any risk assessment with caution – DVSI-R best if criminal justice records
- Instrument improves “expert judgment” – but clinician wisdom important also
- Never underestimate victim’s perceptions (Weisz, 2000; Gondolf, 2002) but often minimize victimization – therefore victim assessment of risk not enough if low
Implications for Policy & Safety Planning

- Making sure he doesn’t have access to her as part of the court process
- If she says she’s going to leave, cannot leave face to face
- Importance of forced sex, stepchild & choking variables – not on most risk assessment instruments
  - Issues with marital rape prosecution
  - Strangulation issues
  - Blended families
- Make sure she knows entire range of shelter services
- Be alert for depressed/suicidal batterer
- Batterer intervention programs working with partners
Implications for Policy & Safety Planning

- Engage women’s mothering concerns & skills (Henderson & Erikson ’97 ‘93; Humphreys ‘93)
  - Majority of abused women good parents (Sullivan ‘00)
- Clinical assessment (psychiatry, psychology) needs specific DV training
- Batterer intervention - she needs to stay gone until he completes & his attendance monitored
- Employment issues – especially for African American men
- Protective order for stalking - or use stalking laws
- Issues with various “risk” lists included in safety planning
Gun Issues

- Get the gun(s) out!!! Implementation of Brady Bill – judges can order removal of all guns – specify in search warrants & PO’s – studies show implementation px-police did not feel empowered to check about guns
- Prohibition of possession with protective orders (& with TPO/Emergency PO – about ½ states)
- PO information entered into federal data base as are convictions for DV misdemeanors & felonies – prohibits purchase not possession ½ states (not at gun shows as well as licensed dealer)
- Laws vary – regarding prohibiting possession – disarming & removal only in about 10 states) but judges can still order removal
- Requiring background check’s non licensed dealers
- Need for coordinated strategies – storage etc.
Community Model

Women/Victims in Shelters
Health Care System-DA-5/FJC

MD Lethality Assessment LAP

Partners of Men in System

Lethality Assessment & Safety Assessment

Risk Assessment (Re-assault)

Offenders in CJ, BIP, MH SA Tx &/or VA/DoD/FJC

Criminal Justice-Judicial System – pretrial or High Risk Team (JGCC)

System Safety Audit – CCR, Including Fatality Reviews & Court Watch/Monitoring (www.watchmn.org)
The OK–LA Study

- Quasi-experimental field trial funded by the National Institute of Justice
  - Phase 1 – police respond to calls as usual & recruit
  - Phase 2 – police respond, arrest etc as usual, LAP

- 7 sites in Oklahoma, includes police departments + collaborating domestic violence service providers
*Includes all victims (males, females, and bystanders) killed in intimate partner homicide incidents from 1999-2007
## DOMESTIC VIOLENCE LETHALITY SCREEN FOR FIRST RESPONDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Case #:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim:</td>
<td>Offender:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Check here if victim did not answer any of the questions.**
- **A "Yes" response to any of Questions #1-3 automatically triggers the protocol referral.**
  1. Has he/she ever used a weapon against you or threatened you with a weapon? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Ans.
  2. Has he/she threatened to kill you or your children? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Ans.
  3. Do you think he/she might try to kill you? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Ans.

- **Negative responses to Questions #1-3, but positive responses to at least four of Questions #4-11, trigger the protocol referral.**
  4. Does he/she have a gun or can he/she get one easily? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Ans.
  5. Has he/she ever tried to choke you? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Ans.
  6. Is he/she violently or constantly jealous or does he/she control most of your daily activities? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Ans.
  7. Have you left him/her or separated after living together or being married? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Ans.
  8. Is he/she unemployed? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Ans.
  9. Has he/she ever tried to kill himself/herself? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Ans.
  10. Do you have a child that he/she knows is not his/hers? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Ans.
  11. Does he/she follow or spy on you or leave threatening messages? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Ans.

- **An officer may trigger the protocol referral, if not already triggered above, as a result of the victim’s response to the below question, or whenever the officer believes the victim is in a potentially lethal situation.**

Is there anything else that worries you about your safety? (If "yes") What worries you?

- Check one: [ ] Victim screened in according to the protocol
  - [ ] Victim screened in based on the belief of officer
  - [ ] Victim did not screen in

If victim screened in: After advising her/him of a high danger assessment, [ ] Yes [ ] No did the victim speak with the hotline counselor?

---

**Note:** The questions above and the criteria for determining the level of risk a person faces is based on the best available research on factors associated with lethal violence by a current or former intimate partner. However, each situation may present unique factors that influence risk.
## Study Sample: Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Comparison Group N (%)/Mean (SD) n =</th>
<th>Intervention Group N (%)/Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>32.78 (9.758)</td>
<td>32.26 (10.130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>141 (41.35%)</td>
<td>147 (44.28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>107 (24.83%)</td>
<td>91 (26.61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>36 (10.56%)</td>
<td>31 (9.34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>22 (6.45%)</td>
<td>31 (9.34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>29 (8.50%)</td>
<td>23 (6.93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6 (1.76%)</td>
<td>9 (2.71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born Outside the U.S.*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>333 (97.65%)</td>
<td>321 (94.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8 (2.35%)</td>
<td>19 (5.58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>No HS degree</td>
<td>73 (21.35%)</td>
<td>95 (27.38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS degree/higher</td>
<td>269 (78.65%)</td>
<td>252 (72.62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Full/Part Time</td>
<td>146 (42.69%)</td>
<td>133 (38.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>196 (57.31%)</td>
<td>214 (61.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26 (7.93%)</td>
<td>23 (7.06%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>302 (92.07%)</td>
<td>303 (92.94%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant differences between groups*
### Study Sample: Relationship Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Comparison Group N (%)/Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Intervention Group N (%)/Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently living with partner</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>284 (83.04%)</td>
<td>289 (83.29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58 (16.96%)</td>
<td>58 (16.71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status*</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>197 (58.28%)</td>
<td>221 (64.62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>77 (22.78%)</td>
<td>83 (24.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>17 (5.03%)</td>
<td>17 (4.97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>47 (13.91%)</td>
<td>21 (6.14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in household</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>110 (32.16%)</td>
<td>128 (36.89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>232 (67.84%)</td>
<td>219 (63.11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with partner</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>186 (54.39%)</td>
<td>188 (54.18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>156 (45.61%)</td>
<td>159 (45.82%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant differences between groups
Nearly 90% of the sample reported severe or near-lethal violence

- Used a knife or gun on you/threatened you with a weapon
- Punched you/hit you with something that could hurt
- Strangled/tries to strangle you
- Beat you up
- Burned or scalded you on purpose
- Kicked you
- Did anything that might have killed you/nearly killed you
- Tried to kill you
### Main Findings – Violence

**Dependent Variable:** Weighted Frequency by Severity CTS–2 Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coefficient (95% CI)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Group</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>−14.71 (−28.60 to −0.81)</td>
<td>p=.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger Assessment Category</td>
<td>Ordinal (0–3)</td>
<td>−23.10 (−29.78 to −16.43)</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>−13.43 (−29.56 to 2.69)</td>
<td>p=.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>23.98 (−13.22 to 61.17)</td>
<td>p=.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>16.36 (−6.49 to 39.22)</td>
<td>p=.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Status</td>
<td>Born outside the US</td>
<td>−16.48 (−51.24 to 18.28)</td>
<td>p=.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time between baseline and follow–up interviews</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>−1.66 (−3.91 to .60)</td>
<td>p=.149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fit Statistics:** $F(7,397)= 8.29$, $p<.001$, Pseudo $R^2= .1121$
## Main Findings – Immediate Protective Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protective Action / Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Comparison Group n(%)</th>
<th>Intervention Group n(%)</th>
<th>Conditional OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Removed or hid their partner’s weapons (n=689)</td>
<td>13 (3.8)</td>
<td>27 (7.8)</td>
<td>2.48 (1.14–5.37)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received services related to domestic violence (n=681)</td>
<td>75 (21.9)</td>
<td>106 (30.5)</td>
<td>1.79 (1.25–2.56)</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Main Findings – Protective Actions at Follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protective Action / Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Comparison Group n(%)</th>
<th>Intervention Group n(%)</th>
<th>Conditional OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established a code with family and friends at follow-up (n=409)</td>
<td>84 (39.6)</td>
<td>97 (48.0)</td>
<td>1.63 (1.07–2.49)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained something to protect yourself at follow-up (n=409)</td>
<td>50 (23.6)</td>
<td>75 (37.1)</td>
<td>2.17 (1.37–3.45)</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in other protective actions at follow-up (n=409)</td>
<td>80 (37.7)</td>
<td>90 (44.6)</td>
<td>1.54 (1.01–2.35)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied for a protective order at follow-up (n=409)</td>
<td>66 (31.1)</td>
<td>83 (41.1)</td>
<td>1.64 (1.07–2.53)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Main Findings – Protective Actions at Follow–up (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protective Action / Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Comparison Group n(%)</th>
<th>Intervention Group n(%)</th>
<th>Conditional OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>p–value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received an order of protection at follow–up (n=409)</td>
<td>50 (23.6)</td>
<td>69 (34.2)</td>
<td>1.59 (1.01–2.51)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received medical care due to violence at follow–up (n=409)</td>
<td>22 (10.4)</td>
<td>33 (16.3)</td>
<td>1.88 (1.02–3.45)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went somewhere partner could not find you at follow–up (n=409)</td>
<td>72 (34.0)</td>
<td>82 (40.6)</td>
<td>1.61 (1.04–2.48)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner went somewhere he could not see you at follow–up (n=409)</td>
<td>66 (31.1)</td>
<td>92 (45.5)</td>
<td>2.53 (1.62–3.95)</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

- The Lethality Assessment Program
  - Decreased women’s violent victimization
  - Increased immediate protective actions
  - Increased protective actions at 7 months follow-up
- There do not appear to be differences in effectiveness across ethnicity
- The intervention is “supported” on the effectiveness dimension and shows “promising direction” on the external validity dimension of the Continuum of Evidence Effectiveness (Puddy & Wilkins, 2011).
Visitation & Abuse during Follow-Up

- 75% children in common with abuser
- 52% - abuser having visits w/ children
- 51% of visits by court order

- Unsupervised – 73%
- Supervised – 27%
- 24%: Physical abuse, threats or intimidation during exchange for visits
As important as the “instrument or system” – the protocol – Elements Needed:

- Agreement on purpose of risk assessment in system
- Approach to victims if involved
  - What is said to encourage participation
  - What is said regarding use of results – confidentiality
  - If perpetrator – what are legalities of use of results
- Who conducts the risk assessment – first responders? In depth assessors?
  - Credentials – training necessary
Protocol - continued

- What happens to results
  - What is communicated to victim
  - What is communicated to system – what parts and for what use
  - Where is paperwork stored – who has access
  - How can victim access later?
NIJ “RAVE” study

- 1307 abused women randomly assigned to 2 of 4 risk assessment methods (recruited from courts, DV shelters, police calls)
  - Also CTS, WEB scale, HARASS
  - Also 40 other items hypothesized to increase risk
  - Also 2 items to assess victim’s perceived risk
- 782 recontacted 6 – 12 months later – interviewed by phone
  - Also a criminal justice record check for violent crime & DV offenses –
    - 31% of victims were re-assaulted according to victim reports & an additional 16% stalked – yet only 6% of men rearrested for DV & 11% for other crimes
- Women – especially those who saw themselves at high risk took many impressive protective actions – all kinds
- Their accuracy of perception of re-assault – significantly better than chance but
Areas ROC curve (excluding 27 victims w/no exposure to abuser) with potential confounders

- Chance - .50
- Any & severe re-assault – all significant at <.01
  - DA - .67; .697
  - DV-MOSAIC .62; .65
  - DVSI - .60; .616
  - K-SID - .60; .62
  - Victim perception .62; .62
- Instruments/method = to or improved on victim assessment
- But none of approaches without serious margin of error
- DV MOSAIC most accurate for threats & stalking
Effects of protective actions on severe re-assault during follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline report</th>
<th>$e^B$</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not cohabitating or intimate</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No voluntary contact with abuser (T2)</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went someplace he couldn’t find her</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got protective order</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filed criminal complaint</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuser arrested for T1 incident</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effects of protective actions on minor-moderate re-assault during follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>$e^B$</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not cohabitating or intimate</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No voluntary contact with abuser (T2)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went someplace he couldn’t find her</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got temp protective order</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filed criminal complaint</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuser arrested for T1 incident</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effects of protective actions on stalking during follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>$e^B$</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse sev./freq.</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not cohabitating or intimate</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No voluntary contact with abuser (T2)</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someplace he couldn’t find her</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got temp protective order</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filed criminal complaint</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuser arrested for T1 incident</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions re: protective actions’ effects on re-assault

- Going to shelter at T1 significantly reduced risk of severe and moderate assaults.
- No voluntary contact with abuser during follow-up reduced risk of moderately severe assaults.
- Arrest at T1 reduced severe assaults.
- OP/RO reduced moderate assaults.
- Some protective actions at T2 likely to be response to assaults during follow-up.
- Places she thinks he can’t find her – often after a while, someone tells
Women’s Statements After Risk Assessment Process (NIJ RAVE study)

- “I never knew – this makes me much more resolved to not go back”
- “I’m gonna’ go get that permanent thing (PO) – I wasn’t gonna’ go through the hassle before but now I surely will”
- “Damn…. He is really dangerous, isn’t he? I keep foolin’ myself about that – now I know I gotta do something”
- “I knew he was scary but no one believed me – I’m going to keep pushing now”
- Quote from a woman in Canada after doing the DA “It was like filling in a piece of a puzzle – I could finally see the whole picture"
Visitation & Abuse during Follow-Up

- 75% children in common with abuser
- 52% - abuser having visits w/ children
- 51% of visits by court order

- Unsupervised – 73%
  Supervised – 27%

- 24%: Physical abuse, threats or intimidation during exchange for visits
Alberta Council of Women’s Shelters DA Collaborative

- All women in shelter – 1st & 2nd Stage – in province of Alberta complete DA with advocate within first 48-72 hours of shelter admission

- All advocates certified in DA – Train the trainer (shelter directors or designated trainer) model so new advocates trained
  - Research funded by Community Incentive Fund, Gov of Alberta.

WE INVITE YOU...

To help us with an exciting, province-wide research project to learn more about how shelters can help abused women to stay safe. We are asking women to participate by completing the Danger Assessment and a follow-up survey. All the information you provide is anonymous. In thanks for your time, a gift certificate will be provided upon completion of the research project.

PLEASE TALK TO YOUR SHELTER WORKER FOR MORE INFORMATION
WE INVITE YOU...

To help us with an exciting, province-wide research project to learn more about how shelters can help abused women to stay safe. We are asking women to participate by completing the Danger Assessment and a follow-up survey. All the information you provide is anonymous. In thanks for your time, a gift certificate will be provided upon completion of the research project.

PLEASE TALK TO YOUR SHELTER WORKER FOR MORE INFORMATION
Alberta Council of Women’s Shelters
DA Collaborative: 9 shelters

- Emergency shelter – 6 (N = 459)
- Second stage shelters 3 (N = 50)
- Three on reserve (emergency) shelters
- 66% married or common-law; 15% separated or living apart (before coming to shelter)
- Average age = 31.06
- Self identified as: 31% English Canadian; 7% other visible minority; 46.6% Aboriginal (5% foreign born)
Alberta Council of Women’s Shelters DA Collaborative: 9 shelters

Project Data (‘07-’08):
- 235 participants
- 198 calendars completed - Spiritual, emotional, financial abuse as well as physical
- 180 qualitative responses
- 4 focus groups
- Shelter staff survey
Type of Abuse Experienced from DA Calendar and % Experiencing N = 198
### ACWS Danger Assessment Research
#### Outcomes Data Collection Document

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Please refer to the following scale when completing the questions below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Somewhat low</td>
<td>Neither low nor high</td>
<td>Somewhat high</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEFORE</th>
<th>NOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rate your awareness of the severity and frequency of abuse before completing the Danger Assessment.</td>
<td>Rate your awareness of the severity and frequency of abuse now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rate your understanding of the level of danger before completing the Danger Assessment.</td>
<td>Rate your understanding of the level of danger now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rate your knowledge of safety planning before completing the Danger Assessment.</td>
<td>Rate your knowledge of safety planning now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rate your readiness to take action to stay safe before completing the Danger Assessment.</td>
<td>Rate your readiness to take action to stay safe now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rate your confidence that Women’s Shelters can help before completing the Danger Assessment.</td>
<td>Rate your confidence that Women’s Shelters can help now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rate your level of hope before completing the Danger Assessment.</td>
<td>Rate your level of hope now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rate the likelihood you would seek help from police before completing the Danger Assessment.</td>
<td>Rate the likelihood you would seek help from police now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rate the likelihood you would seek help from Children’s Services before completing the Danger Assessment.</td>
<td>Rate the likelihood you would seek help from Children’s Services now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Rate the likelihood you would take action to keep your children safe before completing the Danger Assessment.</td>
<td>Rate the likelihood you would take action to keep your children safe now.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome results on 4 key questions (outcomes not significantly different for aboriginal women)
Alberta Council of Women’s Shelters DA project: Preliminary Analysis of Qualitative Data – Major themes:

- **Hard to do**
  - “It’s terrible to look back on!”
  - “-very stressed – all the emotional stuff came back – feeling low”
  - “Had to hold back tears.” “It hurts.”

- **Increased Awareness – decrease minimization**
  - “Confusing and clarifying because at first impression I minimize, then realize the truth!”
  - “It was eye opening. I have spent a lot of time trying to minimize my experiences so I could be normal.”
Alberta Council of Women’s Shelters DA project: Preliminary Analysis of Qualitative Data – Major themes:

- **Healing experience**
  - “It was painful when I was thinking [about] all the abuse but it helps me as well to loosen my breathing.”
  - “It felt good to get it off my shoulders.”

- **Realization of danger**
  - “It was shocking to realize that you are in a terrible situation and you don’t even realize it.”
  - “It helped me to know how much danger I was in. It scared me.”
Alberta Council of Women’s Shelters DA project: Qualitative Data – Major themes:

- **Strengthening Resolve**
  - “I should try more to seek outside help to prevent any abuse”
  - “made me stronger in supporting my decision to be free of stress and harm, especially for my baby….stay safe and secure always, not letting my guard down”
  - “Well, I want to be able to see my daughter grow. I want her to be able to be a little girl. I don’t want to keep the cycle going. I want her to see good things while she grows up and not abuse.”
From Alberta On Reserve Shelters and Shelter Advocates

- DA- Circle – DA culturally tailored for Indigenous Women – done with on reserve aboriginal shelter directors & workers
- Based on Medicine Wheel concepts
- Calendar with First Nations Symbols – more narrative – story telling traditions – start anywhere with her and go backwards and forwards – fill out with her or she fills out and tells stories of events – her choice
  - Months grouped to 4 seasons
  - Can be done in groups
DA-Circle developed with ACWS Indigenous Shelter Directors & Residents

Walking the Path Together Tools:
Danger Assessment Circle

Developed in consultation with
Jacquelyn C. Campbell, PhD, RN, FAAN

Several risk factors have been associated with increased risk of homicide (murder) of women and men in violent relationships.

We cannot predict what will happen in your case, but we would like you to be aware of the danger of homicide in situations of abuse and for you to see how many of the risk factors apply to your situation.

Instructions for completing the Walking the Path Together Danger Assessment Seasonal Calendar

Use the calendar to document incidents of physical abuse by your partner.

Identify the approximate dates using the numbers to indicate the severity of the incident:

1 = slapping, pushing, no injuries and/or teasing pain
2 = punching, kicking, bruises, cuts, and/or continuing pain
3 = "hitting up", severe contusions, burns, broken bones
4 = threat to use a weapon; head injury, internal injury, permanent injury, advantage
5 = use of a weapon; wounds from a weapon

Other types of abuse can be indicated by the following letters:

C = cultural/ethnic X = emotional, verbal and psychological
E = economic P = financial
F = familial S = sexual
H = physical OH = choking
I = Institutional SF = spiritual

Identify Person Implementing Abuse:

- Spouse
- Cousin
- In-Laws
- Family/Friend
- Son
- Daughter
- Niece/Nephew
- Brother
- Father
- Uncle
- Grandma/Grandpa
- Mother
- Aunt
- Grandma/Grandma

* If any descriptions for the higher number apply, use the higher number.
# Sample for DA-I – N = 148

**Born Outside USA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race / Ethnicity</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>22 (17.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina / Hispanic</td>
<td>82 (65.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European / White</td>
<td>8 (6.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7 (5.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7 (5.56)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country / Region of Origin</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>7 (5.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>37 (29.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>11 (8.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>21 (16.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>37 (29.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>6 (4.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia / Middle East</td>
<td>6 (4.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1 (0.79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>43 (34.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>19 (15.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>33 (26.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., Student, Homemaker)</td>
<td>31 (24.60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>35 (27.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>79 (62.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>5 (3.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>7 (5.56)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Danger Assessment for Immigrant Women (DA-I)

- 23 Items – best fit:
  - 14 from the original DA - significant
  - 9 additional risk items (22 initially tested)
  - Weighted from 1-4
  - Total Score: 0-52
  - Sample Score: M=25.18 (SD=9.0), Range: 4-47

- ROC analysis:
  - Severe IPV, AUC = 0.8229
  - Any IPV, AUC = 0.7942
ROC Curves: Severe/Near Fatal Abuse

DA Score ROC area: 0.638
victim perception abuse ROC area: 0.6333
victim perception hurt ROC area: 0.6259
DA-I ROC area: 0.8229
Reference
ROC Curves: Any Abuse

- DA score ROC area: 0.6698
- Victim perception abuse ROC area: 0.6361
- Victim perception hurt ROC area: 0.6407
- DA-I ROC area: 0.7942
- Reference
Several risk factors have been associated with increased risk of violence, particularly severe and/or life threatening violence, among immigrant women in violent relationships. We cannot predict what will happen in your case, but we would like you to be aware of the danger of repeat and severe violence in situations of abuse and for you to see how many of the risk factors apply to your situation.

Using the calendar, please mark the approximate dates during the past year when you were abused by your partner or ex partner. Write on that date how bad the incident was according to the following scale:
1. Slapping, pushing; no injuries and/or lasting pain
2. Punching, kicking; bruises, cuts, and/or continuing pain
3. "Beating up"; severe contusions, burns, broken bones
4. Threat to use weapon; head injury, internal injury, permanent injury
5. Use of weapon; wounds from weapon (If any of the descriptions for the higher number apply, use the higher number.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do you prefer to answer these questions in English?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Has the physical violence increased in severity or frequency over the past year?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Has he ever used a weapon against you or threatened you with a lethal weapon? (If yes, was the weapon a gun?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Does he threaten to kill you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Has he avoided being arrested for domestic violence?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Are you married to him?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>* Do you have any children living with you in your home?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>* Do you have any children with him?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Do you have a child that is not his?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Has he ever forced you to have sex when you did not wish to do so?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Does he ever try to choke you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Is he an alcoholic or problem drinker?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Is he violently and constantly jealous of you? (For instance, does he say &quot;If I can't have you, no one can.&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Have you ever been beaten by him while you were pregnant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Has he ever threatened or tried to commit suicide?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Does he threaten to harm your children?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Do you believe he is capable of killing you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Does he follow or spy on you, leave threatening notes or messages on voicemail, destroy your property, or call you when you don’t want him to?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Are you unemployed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Have you attended college, vocational school and/or graduate school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>* Do you have another / new partner?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Do you hide the truth from others because you are afraid of him?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Does he prevent you from going to school, or getting job training, or learning English?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Has he threatened to report you to child protective services, immigration, or other authorities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Do you feel ashamed of the things he does to you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Have you ever threatened or tried to commit suicide?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates that a “no” response increases risk.

Thank you. Please talk to your social worker, advocate, counselor or nurse about what the Danger Assessment means in terms of your situation.
Discussion

- Immigrant women have some different; some same risk factors for severe/any physical/sexual violence
- Lack of children in home, no children with partner increased risk
- Isolation is important: hide truth from others, threatened to report you, prevents you from getting job/school etc., ashamed of what he does
Future Directions

- Culturally appropriate practice: use of culturally tailored risk assessment and interventions for immigrant victims of violence
- Importance of translation – back translation processes – by bilingual women knowledgeable about DV & that culture – survivors &/or advocates from the culture
- Then working with groups of abused women for “content validity” – meanings to them
- Current study NIH funded validating DA-I with Asian and African immigrants as well Hispanic – (also DA-Circle) with online & app intervention based on myPlan app (weWomen; ourCircle) – we would love to partner with you!! Go to [www.dangerassessment.com](http://www.dangerassessment.com) and click on contact us for study information.
Never forget who it’s for -

“please don’t let her death be for nothing – please get her story told”

(one of the Moms)