



NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

Data Resources Program

Evaluation of Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies for Domestic Violence Cases in the State College, Pennsylvania, Police Department, 1999–2000

ICPSR 3166

Jennifer Adams Mastrofski

User Guide



Inter university Consortium for Political and Social Research

EVALUATION OF GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE ARREST POLICIES FOR
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CASES IN THE STATE COLLEGE,
PENNSYLVANIA, POLICE DEPARTMENT, 1999-2000

(ICPSR 3166)

Principal Investigator

Jennifer Adams Mastrofski
Pennsylvania State University
Justice and Safety Institute

First ICPSR Version
November 2001

Inter-university Consortium for
Political and Social Research
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

BIBLIOGRAPHIC CITATION

Publications based on ICPSR data collections should acknowledge those sources by means of bibliographic citations. To ensure that such source attributions are captured for social science bibliographic utilities, citations must appear in footnotes or in the reference section of publications. The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

Mastrofski, Jennifer Adams. EVALUATION OF GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE ARREST POLICIES FOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CASES IN THE STATE COLLEGE, PENNSYLVANIA, POLICE DEPARTMENT, 1999-2000 [Computer file]. ICPSR version. State College, PA: Pennsylvania State University, Justice and Safety Institute [producer], 2001. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2001.

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON USE OF ICPSR RESOURCES

To provide funding agencies with essential information about use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about ICPSR participants' research activities, users of ICPSR data are requested to send to ICPSR bibliographic citations for each completed manuscript or thesis abstract. Please indicate in a cover letter which data were used.

DATA DISCLAIMER

The original collector of the data, ICPSR, and the relevant funding agency bear no responsibility for uses of this collection or for interpretations or inferences based upon such uses.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary	1
General Study Overview	3
Study Identification	3
Key Words	3
Purpose of the Study	3
Methods	4
Study Design	4
Sources of Information	5
Sample	5
Response Rates	5
Dates of Data Collection	5
Summary of Contents	5
Description of Variables	5
Presence of Common Scales	6
Unit of Observation	6
Extent of Processing	6
Extent of Collection	6
Data Collection Notes	6
File Specifications	7
Related Publications	8
Final Reports and Other Publications	8
Data Resources Program on the Internet	8
Data Completeness Report	
Part 1	11
Part 2	13
Part 3	15
Part 4	17

SUMMARY

This project was an 18-month long research-practitioner partnership to conduct a process evaluation of the State College Police Department's implementation of a grant to encourage arrest policies for domestic violence. The general goals of the process evaluation were to assess how and to what extent the State College Police Department's proposed activities were implemented as planned, based on the rationale that such activities would enhance the potential for increasing victim safety and perpetrator accountability systemically. As part of the grant, the police department sought to improve case tracking and services to victims by developing new specialized positions for domestic violence, including: (1) a domestic violence arrest coordinator from within the State College Police Department who was responsible for monitoring case outcomes through the courts and updating domestic violence policies and training (Part 1, Victim Tracking Data from Domestic Violence Coordinator), (2) a victims service attorney from Legal Services who was responsible for handling civil law issues for domestic violence victims, including support, child custody, employment, financial, consumer, public benefits, and housing issues (Part 2, Victim Tracking Data From Victim Services Attorney), and (3) an intensive domestic violence probation officer from the Centre County Probation and Parole Department who was responsible for providing close supervision and follow-up of batterers (Part 3, Offender Tracking Data). Researchers worked with practitioners to develop databases suitable for monitoring service provision by the three newly-created positions for domestic violence cases. Major categories of data collected on the victim tracking form (Parts 1 and 2) included location of initial contact, type of initial contact, referral source, reason for initial contact, service/consultation provided at initial contact, meetings, and referrals out. Types of services provided include reporting abuse, filing a Protection from Abuse order, legal representation, and assistance with court procedures. Major categories of data collected on the offender tracking form (Part 3) included location of initial contact, type of initial contact, referral source, reason for initial contact, service/consultation provided, charges, sentence received, relationship between the victim and perpetrator, marital status, children in the home, referrals out, presentencing investigation completed, prior criminal history, and reason for termination. Types of services provided include pre-sentence investigation, placement on supervision, and assessment and evaluation. In addition to developing these new positions, the police department also sought to improve how officers handled domestic violence cases through a two-day training program. The evaluation conducted pre- and post-training assessments of all personnel training in 1999 and conducted follow-up surveys to assess the long-term impact of training. For Part 4, Police Training

Survey Data, surveys were administered to law enforcement personnel participating in a two-day domestic violence training program. Surveys were administered both before and after the training program and focused on knowledge about domestic violence policies and protocols, attitudes and beliefs about domestic violence, and the background and experience of the officers. Within six months after the training, the same participants were contacted to complete a follow-up survey. Variables in Part 4 measure how well officers knew domestic violence arrest policies, their attitudes toward abused women and how to handle domestic violence cases, and their opinions about training. Demographic variables in Part 4 include age, sex, race, education, and years in law enforcement.

GENERAL STUDY OVERVIEW

STUDY IDENTIFICATION

EVALUATION OF GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE ARREST POLICIES FOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CASES IN THE STATE COLLEGE, PENNSYLVANIA, POLICE DEPARTMENT, 1999-2000

Jennifer Adams Mastrofski

Pennsylvania State University. Justice and Safety Institute

Award No. 98-WE-VX-K012

KEY WORDS

case processing, domestic violence, offenders, police, program evaluation, victims

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This project was an 18-month long research-practitioner partnership to conduct a process evaluation of the State College Police Department's implementation of a grant to encourage arrest policies for domestic violence. As part of this grant, the police department sought to improve case tracking and services to victims by developing new specialized positions for domestic violence, including: (1) a domestic violence arrest coordinator from within the State College Police Department who was responsible for monitoring case outcomes through the courts and updating domestic violence policies and training, (2) a victims service attorney from Legal Services who was responsible for handling civil law issues for domestic violence victims, including support, child custody, employment, financial, consumer, public benefits, and housing issues, and (3) an intensive domestic violence probation officer from the Centre County Probation and Parole Department who was responsible for providing close supervision and follow-up of batterers. Researchers worked with practitioners to assess the development of newly-created positions to better serve domestic violence victims, evaluate performance of personnel in these positions, and examine activities associated with the development of a systemwide, inter-agency database. In addition to the development of these new positions, the police department also

sought to improve how officers handled domestic violence cases through a two-day training program. The evaluation conducted pre- and post-training assessments of all personnel training in 1999 and conducted follow-up surveys to assess the long-term impact of training. The general goals of the process evaluation were to assess how and to what extent the State College Police Department's proposed activities were implemented as planned, based on the rationale that such activities would enhance the potential for increasing victim safety and perpetrator accountability systemically. However, this evaluation, as a process model, was not designed to test whether the proposed activities actually increased victim safety and perpetrator accountability (which would be appropriate goals in an impact evaluation).

METHODS

STUDY DESIGN

Researchers worked with practitioners to develop databases suitable for monitoring service provision by the three newly-created positions for domestic violence cases. Major categories of data collected on the victim tracking form (Parts 1 and 2) included location of initial contact, type of initial contact, referral source, reason for initial contact, service/consultation provided at initial contact, meetings, and referrals out. Major categories of data collected on the offender tracking form (Part 3) included location of initial contact, type of initial contact, referral source, reason for initial contact, service/consultation provided, charges, sentence received, relationship between the victim and perpetrator, marital status, children in the home, referrals out, presentencing investigation completed, prior criminal history, and reason for termination. For Part 4, surveys were administered to law enforcement personnel participating in a two-day domestic violence training program. Surveys were administered both before and after the training program and focused on knowledge about domestic violence policies and protocols, attitudes and beliefs about domestic violence, and the background and experience of the officers. Within six months after the training, the same participants were contacted to complete a follow-up survey. This survey included questions about domestic violence incidents the officers encountered at work, how they worked with non-law enforcement agencies, and input on future training.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Data for Parts 1-3 were compiled in case tracking databases by three newly hired personnel. Data for Part 4 were collected through self-enumerated questionnaires.

SAMPLE

Not applicable.

RESPONSE RATES

Parts 1-3: Not applicable. Part 4: The pre- and post-training surveys had response rates of 100 percent and the follow-up survey had a response rate of 56 percent.

DATE(S) OF DATA COLLECTION

Part 1: April 1999-June 2000, Part 2: Early 1999-July 2000, Part 3: May 1999-May 2000, Part 4: December 1999 and early 2000

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

DESCRIPTION OF VARIABLES

Variables in Parts 1-3 include location and type of initial and follow-up contacts, reasons for initial and follow-up contacts, referral sources, and types of services offered at initial and follow-up contacts. In Parts 1 and 2, types of services provided include reporting abuse, filing a Protection from Abuse order, legal representation, and assistance with court procedures. In Part 3, types of services provided include pre-sentence investigation, placement on supervision, and assessment and evaluation. Part 3 also includes variables on the family and living situation of offenders, as well as prior criminal history. Variables in Part 4 measured how well officers knew domestic violence arrest policies, their attitudes toward abused women and how to handle domestic violence cases, and their opinions about training. Demographic variables in Part 4 include age, sex, race, education, and years in law enforcement.

PRESENCE OF COMMON SCALES

Several Likert-type scales were used in Part 4.

UNIT OF OBSERVATION

Parts 1-3: Cases. Part 4: Individuals.

EXTENT OF PROCESSING

Missing data codes were standardized by the principal investigator and ICPSR. ICPSR checked for undocumented codes, produced a codebook, generated SAS and SPSS data definition statements, converted the hardcopy documentation to a PDF file, and reformatted the data and documentation.

EXTENT OF COLLECTION

This data collection consists of four data files, a PDF user guide, a codebook and data collection instruments in a separate PDF file, and SAS and SPSS data definition statements.

DATA COLLECTION NOTES

(1) The data available in this collection are part of a broader evaluation project. Other components of the evaluation that are not available through this data collection include the evaluation of a fourth newly-created position (safety auditor coordinator), tracking time spent on various activities by the newly-created positions, and a survey of non-law enforcement personnel who participated in the domestic violence training program. Users are strongly encouraged to obtain the Final Report for this project in order to understand the entire process evaluation. (2) The user guide, codebook, and data collection instruments are provided by ICPSR as Portable Document Format (PDF) files. The PDF file format was developed by Adobe Systems Incorporated and can be accessed using PDF reader software, such as the Adobe Acrobat Reader. Information on how to obtain a copy of the Acrobat Reader is provided on the ICPSR Web site.

FILE SPECIFICATIONS

PART NUMBER: 1
PART NAME: Victim Tracking Data From Domestic Violence Coordinator
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 50
VARIABLE COUNT: 250
RECORD LENGTH: 763
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 2
PART NAME: Victim Tracking Data From Victim Services Attorney
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 151
VARIABLE COUNT: 243
RECORD LENGTH: 914
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 3
PART NAME: Offender Tracking Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 49
VARIABLE COUNT: 130
RECORD LENGTH: 440
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 4
PART NAME: Police Training Survey Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 25
VARIABLE COUNT: 136
RECORD LENGTH: 1,018
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

RESTRICTIONS

The data are restricted from general dissemination. Users interested in obtaining these data must complete a Data Transfer Agreement Form and specify the reasons why they need the data. A copy of the Data Transfer Agreement Form can be requested by calling 800-999-0960 or 734-998-9825. The Data Transfer Agreement Form is also available as a Portable Document Format (PDF) file from the NACJD Web site at <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD/Private/private.pdf>. Completed forms should be returned to: Director, National Archive of Criminal Justice Data, Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, Institute for Social Research, P.O. Box 1248, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248, or by fax: 734-998-9905.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Mastrofski, Jennifer Adams, Debra Derman, Elizabeth Phillips, and Gary Woodling. "NIJ Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships: Evaluation of Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies for Domestic Violence" (Final Report). Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, 2001.

Mastrofski, Jennifer Adams, Debra Derman, Elizabeth Phillips, and Gary Woodling. "NIJ Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships: Evaluation of Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies for Domestic Violence" (Executive Summary). NCJ 187345. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, 2001.

FINAL REPORTS AND OTHER PUBLICATIONS

The National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) was established in 1972 by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), of the U.S. Department of Justice, to provide research findings to criminal justice professionals and researchers. NCJRS operates specialized clearinghouses that are staffed by information specialists who supply a range of reference, referral, and distribution services. Final reports and other publications describing research conducted on a variety of criminal justice topics are available. Publications can be obtained from NCJRS at NIJ/NCJRS, Box 6000, Rockville, MD, 20849-6000, 800-851-3420 or 301-519-5500. TTY Service for the Hearing Impaired is 877-712-9279 (toll-free) or 301-947-8374 (local). The URL for the NCJRS homepage is:

<http://www.ncjrs.org>

DATA RESOURCES PROGRAM ON THE INTERNET

The National Institute of Justice Data Resources Program (DRP) makes datasets from NIJ-funded research and evaluation projects available to the research community and sponsors research and training activities devoted to secondary data analysis. Datasets are archived by the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) at the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan.

The NACJD maintains a World Wide Web site with instructions for transferring files and sending messages. Criminal justice data funded by the Department of Justice are available via the Internet at this site at no charge to the user. NACJD may be contacted at NACJD/ICPSR, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI, 48106-1248, 800-999-0960 or 734-998-9825. The URL for the NACJD homepage is:

<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD>

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3166.P1

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                               Percent of Cases with
  (Total cases=50)                                   Missing Values
-----
91.6% (229 of 250 variables) have 0% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 250 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 250 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 250 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 250 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

0.4% (1 of 250 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

NUMDAYS  NUMBER OF DAYS ELAPSED (CLOSED-INITIAL)      14.0%

0.0% (0 of 250 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

8.0% (20 of 250 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

REPORT11 FILE REPORT ONLY                             44.0%
OTHERQS  REASON INIT CONTACT-OTHER QUESTIONS         74.0%
OTHREF4  FP REF OUT-OTHER                             80.0%
OTHERREF REFERRAL SOURCE - OTHER                     88.0%
OTHRPT1  OTHER REPORTING                             88.0%
OTHERLOC INITIAL CONTACT - OTHER LOCATION            90.0%
OTHERPD  REFERRAL OUT-OTHER PD                       92.0%
OTHINIT  FOLLOW-UP OTHER INITIATED                   92.0%
OTHREP3  FP OTHER REPORTING                          94.0%
OTHPD4   FP REF OUT-OTHER PD                         94.0%
OTHERFP  OTHER REASON FOR FOLLOW-UP                  96.0%
OTHPFA3  OTHER FP PFA SERVICES                       96.0%
OTHER3   FP OTHER COURT APPEARANCE                  96.0%
OTHSTAT  OUTCOME-OTHER STATUS                       96.0%
OTHREF2  REFERRAL OUT-OTHER                         98.0%
NA       FILE NUMBER NOT AVAILABLE                   100.0%
=====

```

Table 1 (continued)

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                                     Percent of Cases with
                                                           Missing Values
-----
OTHERQS2 RELATED ISSUES-OTHER QUESTIONS                 100.0%
NEWFILE FOLLOW-UP NEW FILE NUMBER                        100.0%
FUDATE FOLLOW-UP INITIAL CONTACT DATE                   100.0%
FUTIME FOLLOW-UP INITIAL CONTACT TIME                   100.0%
=====
    
```

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.
 Data does not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected
 in the data as coded.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3166.P2

Table 2: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

=====

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=151)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
--	---

88.9% (216 of 243 variables) have 0% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 243 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 243 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 243 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 243 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 243 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 243 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

11.1% (27 of 243 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

NUMDAYS	NUMBER OF DAYS ELAPSED (CLOSED-INITIAL)	62.9%
ADVICE1	ADVICE ONLY	62.9%
DATE	CURRENT DATE	81.5%
OTHSTAT	OUTCOME-OTHER STATUS	86.8%
OTHMEET	OTHER MEETINGS	90.1%
DOMREL	REFERRAL OUT-DOMESTIC RELATIONS	92.1%
OTHERFP	OTHER REASON FOR FOLLOW-UP 1	95.4%
OTHREF2	REFERRAL OUT-OTHER	96.0%
OTHERQS	REASON INIT CONTACT-OTHER QUESTIONS	96.7%
OTHERQS2	RELATED ISSUES-OTHER QUESTIONS	96.7%
OTHREF4	FP REF OUT-OTHER	96.7%
OTHERREF	REFERRAL SOURCE - OTHER	97.4%
FPSERV	FOLLOW-UP SERVICES	98.0%
OTHER3	FP OTHER COURT APPEARANCE	98.0%
OTHERLOC	INITIAL CONTACT - OTHER LOCATION	98.7%
REPORT	FILE REPORT ONLY	98.7%
OTHPFA3	OTHER FP PFA SERVICES	99.3%
OTHREP3	FP OTHER REPRESENTATION	99.3%

=====

Table 2 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
NA FILE NUMBER NOT AVAILABLE	100.0%
TIME TIME OF INITIAL CONTACT	100.0%
NEWFILE FOLLOW-UP NEW FILE NUMBER	100.0%
FUDATE FOLLOW-UP INITIAL CONTACT DATE	100.0%
FUTIME FOLLOW-UP INITIAL CONTACT TIME	100.0%
OTHREAS2 OTHER REASON FOR FOLLOW-UP 2	100.0%
INITDAT2 INITIAL DATE	100.0%
CLOSED DATE FILE CLOSED	100.0%
REPTABUS REASON INIT CONTACT-REPT ABUSE	100.0%

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.
 Data does not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected
 in the data as coded.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3166.P3

Table 3: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                               Percent of Cases with
  (Total cases=49)                                   Missing Values
-----
70.8% (92 of 130 variables) have 0% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 130 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

1.5% (2 of 130 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 130 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

0.8% (1 of 130 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

MARITAL  MARITAL STATUS                               6.1%

0.0% (0 of 130 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 130 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

26.9% (35 of 130 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

AGEH      HUSBAND'S AGE                               46.9%
NUMDAYS   NUMBER OF DAYS ELAPSED                     55.1%
AGEB      AGE BOYFRIEND                               81.6%
AGEW      WIFE'S AGE                                  85.7%
AGEG      AGE GIRLFRIEND                             87.8%
CCPRISON  INITIAL CONTACT - COUNTY PRISON            87.8%
AGEFB     AGE FORMER BOYFRIEND                       91.8%
ABSCTRAN  TRANSFERRED, DIED, ABSCONDED               91.8%
AGEFH     AGE FORMER HUSBAND                         95.9%
AGEONF1   AGE OF FIRST PARTY (NON FAMILY)            95.9%
AGEFG     AGE FORMER GIRLFRIEND                     98.0%
AGEC2     AGE OF CHILD (F/C)                         98.0%
AGEC3     AGE OF CHILD (SM/C)                       98.0%
AGEC4     AGE OF CHILD (SF/C)                       98.0%
AGEOF1    AGE OF FIRST PARTY (OTHER FAMILY)          98.0%
AGEOF2    AGE OF SECOND PARTY (OTHER FAMILY)        98.0%
=====

```

Table 3 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
SEXI1 SEX FIRST INTIMATE	98.0%
SEXC2 SEX OF CHILD (F/C)	98.0%
SEXC3 SEX OF CHILD (SM/C)	98.0%
SEXOF1 SEX OF FIRST PARTY (OTHER FAMILY)	98.0%
SEXOF2 SEX OF SECOND PARTY (OTHER FAMILY)	98.0%
SEXONF1 SEX OF FIRST PARTY (NON FAMILY)	98.0%
TIME TIME OF FIRST CONTACT	100.0%
AGEFW AGE FORMER WIFE	100.0%
AGEI1 AGE FIRST INTIMATE	100.0%
AGEI2 AGE SECOND INTIMATE	100.0%
SEXI2 SEX SECOND INTIMATE	100.0%
AGEC AGE OF CHILD (M/C)	100.0%
SEXC SEX OF CHILD (M/C)	100.0%
SEXC4 SEX OF CHILD (SF/C)	100.0%
AGEONF2 AGE OF SECOND PARTY (NON FAMILY)	100.0%
SEXONF2 SEX OF SECOND PARTY (NON FAMILY)	100.0%
CLOSED DATE CASE CLOSED	100.0%
INITIAL DATE OF INITIAL CONTACT	100.0%
CURRDATE CURRENT DATE	100.0%

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.
Data does not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected
in the data as coded.

**Variables CLOSED, INITIAL, AND CURRDATE were blanked by ICPSR for
confidentiality reasons.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3166.P4

Table 4: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                               Percent of Cases with
  (Total cases=25)                                   Missing Values
-----
77.9% (106 of 136 variables) have 0% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 136 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 136 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 136 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 136 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 136 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

0.7% (1 of 136 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

TOPIC2  WHICH TOPIC WAS MOST IMPORTANT-2              24.0%

21.3% (29 of 136 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

HELPFUL3 HOW HELPFUL WAS TRAINING-3                  48.0%
DEF3     DEFINITION/DYNAMICS DOMESTIC VIOLENCE-3    48.0%
PROT3    PROTECTION FROM ABUSE ORDERS-3             48.0%
CENTRE3  CENTRE COUNTY DOMESTIC VIOLENCE POLICY-   48.0%
LIABIL3  LIBAILITY ISSUES-3                         48.0%
LOCAL3   LOCAL VICTIM SERVICE AGENCIES-3           48.0%
STATE3   STATE COLLEGE DV SEXUAL ASSAULT UNIT-3    48.0%
AFTER3   TRAINING SHOULD BE MANDATORY-3            48.0%
TOPIC3   WHAT TOPIC NEED ADDITIONAL TRAINING-3     48.0%
AGENCA3  COMMUNICATE WITH OTHER AGENCY 1-3        52.0%
PRIMA3   PRIMARY CONTACT FOR AGENCY 1-3            60.0%
SINCEA3  CHANGE CONTACT W/AGENCY 1 SINCE TRAIN-3  60.0%
IMPROVE2 HOW TO IMPROVE-2                           64.0%
PRIMB3   PRIMARY CONTACT FOR AGENCY 2-3            76.0%
SINCEB3  CHANGE CONTACT W/AGENCY 2 SINCE TRAIN-3  76.0%
POINTS2  WHAT POINTS STILL NOT SURE ABOUT-2        76.0%
=====

```

Table 4 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
AGNECB3 COMMUNICATE WITH OTHER AGENCY 2-3	76.0%
NEED3 WHY NEED MORE TRAINING-3	84.0%
WAYS2 WAYS INSTRUCTORS COULD IMPROVE-2	88.0%
CURROTH1 DESCRIBE OTHER CURRENT RANK-1	92.0%
COMMENT2 COMMENTS-2	92.0%
PRIMC3 PRIMARY CONTACT FOR AGENCY 3-3	96.0%
COMMENT1 COMMENTS-1	96.0%
AGENCC3 COMMUNICATE WITH OTHER AGENCY 3-3	96.0%
RACEOTH1 DESCRIBE OTHER RACE-1	100.0%
OTHA3 OTHER CONTACT FOR AGENCY 1-3	100.0%
OTHB3 OTHER CONTACT FOR AGENCY 2-3	100.0%
OTHC3 OTHER CONTACT FOR AGENCY 3-3	100.0%
SINCEC3 CHANGE CONTACT W/AGENCY 3 SINCE TRAIN-3	100.0%

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.
Data does not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected
in the data as coded.