



NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

Data Resources Program

Impact Evaluation of “STOP Violence Against Women” Grants in Dane County, Wisconsin, Hillsborough County, New Hampshire, Jackson County, Missouri, and Stark County, Ohio, 1996–2000

Brenda K. Uekert, Neal Miller, and Cheron Dupree

ICPSR 3252

User Guide



Inter university Consortium for Political and Social Research

IMPACT EVALUATION OF "STOP VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN" GRANTS IN
DANE COUNTY, WISCONSIN, HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, NEW HAMPSHIRE,
JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI, AND STARK COUNTY, OHIO, 1996-2000

(ICPSR 3252)

Principal Investigators

Brenda K. Uekert, Neal Miller, and Cheron Dupree
Institute for Law and Justice

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:

Uekert, Brenda K., Neal Miller, and Cheron Dupree. IMPACT EVALUATION OF "STOP VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN" GRANTS IN DANE COUNTY, WISCONSIN, HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, NEW HAMPSHIRE, JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI, AND STARK COUNTY, OHIO, 1996-2000 [Computer file]. ICPSR version. Alexandria, VA: Institute for Law and Justice [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	6
Summary of Contents	6
Description of Variables	6
Presence of Common Scales	7
Unit of Observation	7
Extent of Processing	7
Extent of Collection	7
Data Collection Notes	7
File Specifications	7
Related Publications	9
Final Reports and Other Publications	10
Data Resources Program on the Internet	10
Data Completeness Report	
Part 1	11
Part 2	13
Part 3	15
Part 4	17
Part 5	19
Part 6	21
Part 7	23
Part 8	25
Part 9	27

SUMMARY

In 1996 the Institute for Law and Justice (ILJ) began an evaluation of the law enforcement and prosecution components of the "STOP Violence Against Women" grant program authorized by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. This data collection constitutes one component of the evaluation. The researchers chose to evaluate two specialized units and two multi-agency team projects in order to study the local impact of STOP on victim safety and offender accountability. The two specialized units reflected typical STOP funding, with money being used for the addition of one or two dedicated professionals in each community. The Dane County, Wisconsin, Sheriff's Office used STOP funds to support the salaries of two domestic violence detectives. This project was evaluated through surveys of domestic violence victims served by the Dane County Sheriff's Office (Part 1). In Stark County, Ohio, the Office of the Prosecutor used STOP funds to support the salary of a designated felony domestic violence prosecutor. The Stark County project was evaluated by tracking domestic violence cases filed with the prosecutor's office. The case tracking system included only cases involving intimate partner violence, with a male offender and female victim. All domestic violence felons from 1996 were tracked from arrest to disposition and sentence (Part 2). This pre-grant group of felons was compared with a sample of cases from 1999 (Part 3). In Hillsborough County, New Hampshire, a comprehensive evaluation strategy was used to assess the impact of the use of STOP funds on domestic violence cases. First, a sample of 1996 pre-grant and 1999 post-grant domestic violence cases was tracked from arrest to disposition for both regular domestic violence cases (Part 4) and also for dual arrest cases (Part 5). Second, a content analysis of police incident reports from pre- and post-grant periods was carried out to gauge any changes in report writing (Part 6). Finally, interviews were conducted with victims to document their experiences with the criminal justice system, and to better understand the factors that contribute to victim safety and well-being (Part 7). In Jackson County, Missouri, evaluation methods included reviews of prosecutor case files and tracking all sex crimes referred to the Jackson County Prosecutor's Office over both pre-grant and post-grant periods (Part 8). The evaluation also included personal interviews with female victims (Part 9). Variables in Part 1 (Dane County Victim Survey Data) describe the relationship of the victim and offender, injuries sustained, who called the police and when, how the police responded to the victim and the situation, how the detective contacted the victim, and services provided by the detective. Part 2 (1996 Stark County Case Tracking Data), Part 3 (1999 Stark County Case Tracking Data), Part 4 (Hillsborough County Regular Case Tracking Data), Part 5 (Hillsborough County Dual Arrest Case Tracking Data), and Part 8 (Jackson County Case Tracking Data) include variables on substance abuse by victim and

offender, use of weapons, law enforcement response, primary arrest offense, whether children were present, injuries sustained, indictment charge, pre-sentence investigation, victim impact statement, arrest and trial dates, disposition, sentence, and court costs. Demographic variables include the age, sex, and ethnicity of the victim and the offender. Variables in Part 6 (Hillsborough County Police Report Data) provide information on whether there was an existing protective order, whether the victim was interviewed separately, severity of injuries, seizure of weapons, witnesses present, involvement of children, and demeanor of suspect and victim. In Part 7 (Hillsborough County Victim Interview Data) variables focus on whether victims had prior experience with the court, type of physical abuse experienced, injuries from abuse, support from relatives, friends, neighbors, doctor, religious community, or police, assistance from police, satisfaction with police response, expectations about case outcome, why the victim dropped the charges, contact with the prosecutor, criminal justice advocate, and judge, and the outcome of the case. Demographic variables include age, race, number of children, and occupation. Variables in Part 9 (Jackson County Victim Interview Data) relate to when victims were sexually assaulted, if they knew the perpetrator, who was contacted to help, victims' opinions about police and detectives who responded to the case, contact with the prosecutor and victim's advocate, and aspects of the medical examination. Demographic variables include age, race, and marital status.

GENERAL STUDY OVERVIEW

STUDY IDENTIFICATION

IMPACT EVALUATION OF "STOP VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN" GRANTS IN DANE COUNTY, WISCONSIN, HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, NEW HAMPSHIRE, JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI, AND STARK COUNTY, OHIO, 1996-2000

Brenda K. Uekert, Neal Miller, and Cheron Dupree

Institute for Law and Justice

Award No. 96-WT-NX-0007

KEY WORDS

case processing, domestic violence, offenders, police, victims

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

In 1996 the Institute for Law and Justice (ILJ) began an evaluation of the law enforcement and prosecution components of the "STOP Violence Against Women" grant program authorized by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. This data collection constitutes one component of the evaluation. The researchers chose to evaluate two specialized units and two multi-agency team projects in order to study the local impact of STOP on victim safety and offender accountability. The two specialized units reflected typical STOP funding, with money being used for the addition of one or two dedicated professionals in each community. One specialized unit in Dane County, Wisconsin (Part 1), used STOP funds to support the salaries of two domestic violence detectives to improve the quality of the response provided to victims. The second specialized unit in Stark County, Ohio (Parts 2 and 3), used STOP funds to support the salary of a designated felony domestic violence prosecutor to assure that these cases were given the fullest attention. The multi-agency project in Hillsborough County, New Hampshire (Parts 4-7), used STOP funds to create a domestic violence team involving three different agencies. The team included police officers, a domestic violence misdemeanor prosecutor, victim advocates, and probation officers. The overarching goal was to reduce the incidence of domestic violence in the area through aggressive enforcement, community education, and agency cooperation. The other multi-agency project in Jackson County, Missouri, used funds to

improve the community's response to sexual assault (Parts 8 and 9). STOP funds supported the crime lab, the county prosecutor's office, the Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner's (SANE) program, and the local victim services provider. The primary goal of this project was improvement in evidence collection and documentation, which would lead to higher prosecution and conviction rates.

METHODS

STUDY DESIGN

The Dane County, Wisconsin, Sheriff's Office used STOP funds to support the salaries of two domestic violence detectives. This project was evaluated through surveys of domestic violence victims served by the Dane County Sheriff's Office (Part 1). Surveys were also sent to domestic violence victims served by a comparably-sized police department in the state that did not have a domestic violence unit. The survey instrument consisted of both open-ended and closed-ended questions, and captured information on the incident, contact with responding patrol officers, experiences with domestic violence detectives, and overall thoughts on police response. In Stark County, Ohio, the Office of the Prosecutor used STOP funds to support the salary of a designated felony domestic violence prosecutor. The Stark County project was evaluated by tracking domestic violence cases filed with the prosecutor's office. The case tracking system included only cases involving intimate partner violence, with a male offender and female victim. All domestic violence felons from 1996 were tracked from arrest to disposition and sentence (Part 2). This pre-grant group of felons was compared with a sample of cases from 1999 (Part 3). In Hillsborough County, New Hampshire, a comprehensive evaluation strategy was used to assess the impact of the use of STOP funds on domestic violence cases. First, a sample of 1996 pre-grant and 1999 post-grant domestic violence cases was tracked from arrest to disposition for both regular domestic violence cases (Part 4) and also for dual arrest cases (Part 5). Second, a content analysis of police incident reports from pre- and post-grant periods was carried out to gauge any changes in report writing (Part 6). Finally, interviews were conducted with victims to document their experiences with the criminal justice system, and to better understand the factors that contribute to victim safety and well-being (Part 7). To recruit study participants the researchers mailed over 200 flyers to victims and posted flyers in public places. In addition, some women were contacted by phone. Despite these efforts, the response rate was very low. These interviews, lasting approximately 90 minutes, consisted of 86 questions covering a wide range of topics, including severity of violence experienced, social support networks, police response,

satisfaction with process and sentence, and experiences in court. In Jackson County, Missouri, evaluation methods included reviews of prosecutor case files and tracking all sex crimes referred to the Jackson County Prosecutor's Office over both pre-grant and post-grant periods (Part 8). The evaluation also included personal interviews with female victims (Part 9). These face-to-face interviews lasted an average of 20 minutes.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Data for Part 1 were obtained through mailback questionnaires. Data for Parts 2-6 and 8 were gathered from administrative records. Data for Parts 7 and 9 were collected with personal interviews.

SAMPLE

Part 1: Surveys were sent to all victims served by the Dane County Sheriff's Office Domestic Violence Unit between January 1 and June 30, 2000. Due to the large number of incidents in the comparison city, a sample was drawn, with 202 surveys sent to victims of domestic violence incidents in which the offender was arrested at the scene. Parts 2 and 3: Only cases involving intimate partner violence with a male offender and female victim were included in the sample. All cases from 1996 meeting this criterion and a sample of 50 cases from 1990 were tracked. Parts 4 and 5: Researchers selected a random sample of 100 men arrested on domestic violence charges during the first half of 1996 and a sample of 100 men arrested in the post-grant period, the first half of 1999. Part 6: Unknown. Part 7: Victim interviews were restricted to women whose domestic violence cases had been processed through the criminal justice system. Respondents were recruited through mail flyers that were sent to victims and posted in public places. Some victims were also contacted by phone. Part 8: All adult domestic violence cases with female victims referred to the prosecutor's office in 1996 and 1998. Part 9: The sample included female victims of sexual assault cases in which a male offender was arrested. Subjects were recruited with the help of the Kansas City Police Department and the Metropolitan Organization to Counter Sexual Assault (MOCSA).

RESPONSE RATES

Part 1: The response rate was 20 percent for the Dane County Sheriff's sample and 8 percent for the comparison sample. Parts 2-6 and 8: Not applicable. Part 7: Unknown. Part 9: The response rate was about 10 percent.

DATE(S) OF DATA COLLECTION

Part 1: August 2000, Parts 2-6: 2000, Part 7: May-September 2000,
Part 8: May-October 2000, Part 9: June-September 2000

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

DESCRIPTION OF VARIABLES

Variables in Part 1 (Dane County Victim Survey Data) describe the relationship of the victim and offender, injuries sustained, who called the police and when, how the police responded to the victim and the situation, how the detective contacted the victim, and services provided by the detective. Part 2 (1996 Stark County Case Tracking Data), Part 3 (1999 Stark County Case Tracking Data), Part 4 (Hillsborough County Regular Case Tracking Data), Part 5 (Hillsborough County Dual Arrest Case Tracking Data), and Part 8 (Jackson County Case Tracking Data) include variables on substance abuse by victim and offender, use of weapons, law enforcement response, primary arrest offense, whether children were present, injuries sustained, indictment charge, pre-sentence investigation, victim impact statement, arrest and trial dates, disposition, sentence, and court costs. Demographic variables include the age, sex, and ethnicity of the victim and the offender. Variables in Part 6 (Hillsborough County Police Report Data) provide information on whether there was an existing protective order, whether the victim was interviewed separately, severity of injuries, seizure of weapons, witnesses present, involvement of children, and demeanor of suspect and victim. In Part 7 (Hillsborough County Victim Interview Data), variables focus on whether victims had prior experience with the court, type of physical abuse experienced, injuries from abuse, support from relatives, friends, neighbors, doctor, religious community, or police, assistance from police, satisfaction with police response, expectations about case outcome, why the victim dropped the charges, contact with the prosecutor, criminal justice advocate, and judge, and the outcome of the case. Demographic variables include age, race, number of children, and occupation. Variables in Part 9 (Jackson County Victim Interview Data) relate to when victims were sexually assaulted, if they knew the perpetrator, who was contacted to help, victims' opinions about police and detectives who responded to the case, contact with the prosecutor and victim's advocate, and aspects of the medical examination. Demographic variables include age, race, and marital status.

PRESENCE OF COMMON SCALES

Several Likert-type scales were used.

UNIT OF OBSERVATION

Parts 1, 7, and 9: Individuals, Parts 2-6, and 8: Incidents

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 nine 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

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: Dane County Victim Survey Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 49
VARIABLE COUNT: 90
RECORD LENGTH: 296

RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 2
PART NAME: 1996 Stark County Case Tracking Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 62
VARIABLE COUNT: 75
RECORD LENGTH: 227
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 3
PART NAME: 1999 Stark County Case Tracking Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 50
VARIABLE COUNT: 72
RECORD LENGTH: 215
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 4
PART NAME: Hillsborough County Regular Case Tracking Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 204
VARIABLE COUNT: 102
RECORD LENGTH: 250
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 5
PART NAME: Hillsborough County Dual Arrest Case Tracking Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 50
VARIABLE COUNT: 97
RECORD LENGTH: 181
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 6
PART NAME: Hillsborough County Police Report Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 100
VARIABLE COUNT: 38
RECORD LENGTH: 43
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 7
PART NAME: Hillsborough County Victim Interview Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 11
VARIABLE COUNT: 410
RECORD LENGTH: 495

RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 8
PART NAME: Jackson County Case Tracking Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 195
VARIABLE COUNT: 88
RECORD LENGTH: 836
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 9
PART NAME: Jackson County Victim Interview Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 26
VARIABLE COUNT: 67
RECORD LENGTH: 127
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 PUBLICATION

Uekert, Brenda K., Neal Miller, Cheron DuPree, Deborah Spence, and Cassandra Archer. "The Evaluation of the STOP Violence Against Women Grant Program" (Final Report). NCJ 189163. 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: DA3252.P1

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

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                               Percent of Cases with
  (Total cases=49)                                   Missing Values
-----
4.4%  (4 of 90 variables) have 0% Missing Values

0.0%  (0 of 90 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

18.9% (17 of 90 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

25.6% (23 of 90 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

12.2% (11 of 90 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

ADDOFFIC ADDITITONAL OFFICERS INVOLVED              6.1%
ARREST POLICE MAKE AN UNWANTED ARREST                6.1%
THREATEN POLICE THREATEN VICTIM                     6.1%
CONTACT1 DETECTIVE CONTACT THE VICTIM BY PHONE      6.1%
CONTACT2 DETECTIVE LEFT MESSAGE ON ANSWER MACHIN    6.1%
CONTACT3 DETECTIVE VISITED PERSONALLY               6.1%
CONTACT4 DETECTIVE CONTACT VIA LETTER               6.1%
CONTACT5 DETECTIVE NO CONTACT                       6.1%
TREATMNT MEDICAL TREATMENT FOR INJURIES             8.2%
LEGLINO POLICE GIVE WRITTEN INFO ABOUT LEGAL SY     8.2%
IGNORE POL IGNORE PROTECTION/NO CONTACT ORDER      8.2%

0.0%  (0 of 90 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

2.2%  (2 of 90 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

ANYTHING POLICE DO ANYTHING ELSE (SPECIFY)         22.4%
DETECTIV DETECTIVE WHO RESPONDED                    32.7%

36.7% (33 of 90 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

DRESPONS VICTIM SATISFIED W/DETECTIVE'S RESPONSE   42.9%
FREQUENT TIMES DETECTIVE CONTACTED VICTIM          44.9%
DLISTEN DETECTIVE LISTEN TO V'S SIDE OF STORY      44.9%
=====

```

Table 1 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
DBELIEVE DETECTIVE SEEM TO BELIEVE VICTIM	44.9%
DKIDTALK DETECTIVE INTERVIEW THE CHILDREN	44.9%
DSUPPORT DETECTIVE SUPPORT VICTIM'S DECISIONS	44.9%
DBLAME DETECTIVE BLAME VICTIM FOR VIOLENCE	44.9%
DDISCRGE DETECTIVE DISCOURAGE V FROM CONTINUING	44.9%
DOWNCARE DETECTIVE TELL V TO TAKE CARE ON OWN	44.9%
DSAFER DETECTIVE MAKE VICTIM FEEL SAFER	44.9%
DDANGER DETECTIVE MADE V FEEL MORE IN DANGER	44.9%
DCHARGES DETECTIVE PRESSURE V PRESSING CHARGES	44.9%
DPRIOR DETECTIVE BLAME V NOT FOLLOW W/PRIORS	44.9%
HOWSOON HOW SOON DETECTIVE CONTACT VICTIM	46.9%
DLGLINFO DETECTIVE GIVE WRITTEN INFO LEGAL SYSTE	46.9%
DRESRCES DETECTIVE WRITTEN INFO OTHER RESOURCES	46.9%
DPHOTO DETECTIVE PHOTOGRAPH INJURIES	46.9%
DEQUIP DETECTIVE OFFER SAFETY EQUIPMENT	46.9%
SAFETY DETECTIVE FILL OUT A SAFETY PLAN	46.9%
INJUNCTN DETECTIVE FILL DOMESTIC ABUSE INJUNCTIO	46.9%
TRANSTCT DETECTIVE OFFER TRANSPORTATION TO COURT	46.9%
DARREST DETECTIVE MAKE AN UNWANTED ARREST	46.9%
DNOTHING DETECTIVE SAY NOTHING POLICE COULD DO	46.9%
DIGNORE DETECTIVE IGNORE PROTECT/NO CONTACT ORD	46.9%
DNEXT DETECTIVE TELL V WHAT WOULD HAPPEN NEXT	46.9%
DTHREAT DETECTIVE THREATEN VICTIM	49.0%
DWITNESS DETECTIVE INTERVIEW OTHER WITNESSES	53.1%
DANYTHNG DETECTIVE DO ANYTHING ELSE	61.2%
OSPECIFY SPECIFY WHAT ELSE POLICE DID	75.5%
DOTHER OTHER CONTACT W/DETECTIVE	77.6%
OTHRSPEC SPECIFY OTHER CONTACT W/DETECTIVE	91.8%
DSPECIFY SPECIFY WHAT ELSE DETECTIVE DID	98.0%
NORESP NO RESPONSE	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: DA3252.P2

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

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                                Percent of Cases with
  (Total cases=62)                                    Missing Values
-----
66.7% (50 of 75 variables) have 0% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 75 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

6.7% (5 of 75 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

5.3% (4 of 75 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

1.3% (1 of 75 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

V27      VICTIM DOB                                    6.5%

2.7% (2 of 75 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

V35      DATE OF GRAND JURY                            11.3%
CUSTODY  CUSTODY STATUS                                14.5%

5.3% (4 of 75 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

V25      OFFENDER INJURED                              21.0%
V32      VICTIM MEDICAL TREATMENT                      27.4%
V13      IF YES, WHAT WEAPON                           29.0%
V24      SAME VICTIM                                    33.9%

12.0% (9 of 75 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

V65      PRISON/JAIL TERM                              71.0%
V51      OTHER NOTES                                   72.6%
V39      PRE-SENTENCE INVESTIGATION                   74.2%
V9       ALCOHOL USED BY WHOM                         80.6%
V62      TYPE OF CASE                                  82.3%
V11      DRUGS USED BY WHOM                           95.2%
V26      OFFENDER MEDICAL TREATMENT                  95.2%
V54      TRIAL DATE                                    95.2%
V52      DATE CASE WAS FILED                          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: DA3252.P3

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

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=50)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values

69.4% (50 of 72 variables) have 0% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 72 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values	
9.7% (7 of 72 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values	
4.2% (3 of 72 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values	
1.4% (1 of 72 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values	
V35 DATE OF GRAND JURY	8.0%
5.6% (4 of 72 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values	
V13 IF YES, WHAT WEAPON	12.0%
V24 SAME VICTIM	16.0%
V32 VICTIM MEDICAL TREATMENT	16.0%
V25 OFFENDER INJURED	18.0%
1.4% (1 of 72 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values	
V39 PRE-SENTENCE INVESTIGATION	22.0%
8.3% (6 of 72 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values	
V51 OTHER NOTES	44.0%
V9 ALCOHOL USED BY WHOM	48.0%
V26 OFFENDER MEDICAL TREATMENT	76.0%
V54 TRIAL DATE	90.0%
V11 DRUGS USED BY WHOM	92.0%
V52 DATE CASE WAS FILED	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: DA3252.P4

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

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                                Percent of Cases with
  (Total cases=204)                                    Missing Values
-----
61.8% (63 of 102 variables) have 0% Missing Values

5.9% (6 of 102 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

3.9% (4 of 102 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

1.0% (1 of 102 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 102 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

1.0% (1 of 102 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

VAR013  IF YES, WHAT WEAPON                            16.2%

1.0% (1 of 102 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

VAR030  CHILDREN IN COMMON                             27.0%

25.5% (26 of 102 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

VAR098  OFFENSE YEAR                                    49.0%
VAR045  REASON FOR NOL PROSSING                        69.6%
VAR108  PROBATION STATUS                               75.5%
VAR102  DRUGS/ALC COUNSELING                          84.8%
VAR103  DV COUNSELING                                  84.8%
VAR113  VIOLATION(S)                                  84.8%
VAR109  REOFFENSE/ARREST                              92.2%
VAR112  TYPE_DRUGS/ALC                                94.1%
VAR073  HO2:LAST PRIOR ARREST CHARGE                  95.1%
VAR075  HO2:LAST PRIOR ARREST DISPOSITION             95.1%
VAR101  CHARGE(S)                                     95.1%
VAR111  TYPE_COUNSELING                               96.1%
VAR110  TYPE_CONTACT                                  97.1%
VAR114  TYPE_VIOLATION                                97.5%
=====

```

Table 4 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
VAR104 DRUG/ALCOHOL COUNSEL PARTICIPATION INDE	98.5%
VAR099 # DRUG/ALCOHOL COUNSELING ABSENCES	99.0%
VAR100 # DV/ABUSE COUNSELING ABSENCES	99.0%
VAR074 HO1:2ND TO LAST PRIOR ARREST CHARGE	99.5%
VAR076 HO1:2ND TO LAST PRIOR ARREST DISPOSITIO	99.5%
VAR023 SAME VICTIM	100.0%
VAR034 DECEASED	100.0%
VAR040 DATE PRESENTED TO DA	100.0%
VAR071 HO2: LAST PRIOR ARREST INCIDENT DATE	100.0%
VAR072 HO1:2ND TO LAST PRIOR ARREST INCID DATE	100.0%
VAR105 DV/ABUSE TREATMENT PARTICIPATION INDEX	100.0%
VAR106 PPO CONTACTS	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: DA3252.P5

Table 5: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                                Percent of Cases with
(Total cases=50)                                     Missing Values
-----
60.8% (59 of 97 variables) have 0% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 97 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

1.0% (1 of 97 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

3.1% (3 of 97 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

5.2% (5 of 97 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

VAR058  CHARGE ISSUED                                6.0%
VAR060  CUSTODY STATUS                                6.0%
VAR071  TYPE OF CASE                                  6.0%
VAR052  DISPOSITION CODE                             10.0%
VAR067  BAIL CONDITIONS                               10.0%

1.0% (1 of 97 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

VAR070  DISPOSITION DATE                             14.0%

2.1% (2 of 97 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

VAR030  IF YES, WHAT WEAPON                           30.0%
VAR016  CHILDREN IN COMMON                           36.0%

26.8% (26 of 97 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

VAR061  REASON FOR NOL PROSSING                       82.0%
VAR053  DOMESTIC ABUSE ASSESSMENT                    94.0%
VAR001  TYPE_DRUGS/ALC                               100.0%
VAR002  # DRUG/ALCOHOL COUNSELING ABSENCES          100.0%
VAR003  VIOLATION(S)                                 100.0%
VAR004  TYPE_COUNSELING                              100.0%
VAR005  TYPE_CONTACT                                 100.0%
=====
    
```

Table 5 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values	
VAR006	REOFFENSE/ARREST	100.0%
VAR007	PROBATION STATUS	100.0%
VAR009	DV/ABUSE TREATMENT PARTICIPATION INDEX	100.0%
VAR010	DRUG/ALCOHOL COUNSEL PARTICIPATION INDEX	100.0%
VAR011	DV COUNSELING	100.0%
VAR012	DRUGS/ALC COUNSELING	100.0%
VAR013	CHARGE(S)	100.0%
VAR014	# DV/ABUSE COUNSELING ABSENCES	100.0%
VAR015	PPO CONTACTS	100.0%
VAR017	MULTIPLE VICTIM	100.0%
VAR040	SAME VICTIM	100.0%
VAR050	DECEASED	100.0%
VAR056	DATE PRESENTED TO DA	100.0%
VAR087	HO2:LAST PRIOR ARREST INCIDENT DATE	100.0%
VAR088	HO1:2ND TO LAST PRIOR ARREST INCID DATE	100.0%
VAR089	HO2:LAST PRIOR ARREST CHARGE	100.0%
VAR090	HO1:2ND TO LAST PRIOR ARREST CHARGE	100.0%
VAR091	HO2:LAST PRIOR ARREST DISPOSITION	100.0%
VAR092	HO1:2ND TO LAST PRIOR ARREST DISPOSITION	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: DA3252.P6

Table 6: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                                Percent of Cases with
  (Total cases=100)                                    Missing Values
-----
78.9% (30 of 38 variables) have 0% Missing Values

7.9% (3 of 38 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

2.6% (1 of 38 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

2.6% (1 of 38 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 38 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 38 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 38 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

7.9% (3 of 38 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

V024      V'S WISHES RE A'S ARREST                      100.0%
V026      TEMPORARY PROTECT ORDER OFFER BY POLICE      100.0%
V030      ARRIVAL CLEARANCE TOTAL                      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: DA3252.P7

Table 7: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                                Percent of Cases with
  (Total cases=11)                                    Missing Values
-----
89.8% (368 of 410 variables) have 0% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 410 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 410 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 410 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

4.9% (20 of 410 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

SUP12M  CHILD PROTECTION SERVICES SUPPORTS          9.1%
POL18A2  POLICE GAVE INFO ON RESOURCES              9.1%
POL18B5  SAID THEY COULD DO NOTHING                 9.1%
POL18B10 BLAMED YOU                                9.1%
POL18B12 DISCOURAGED CONTINUING                    9.1%
POL18B16 PRESSURE YOU TO PRESS CHARGE              9.1%
EXP22A   WOULD BE RELEASED                         9.1%
INVEST   CONTACTED BY INVESTIGATOR                9.1%
BYMAIL   TIMES BY MAIL                             9.1%
BYPHONE  TIMES BY PHONE                            9.1%
INPERSON TIMES IN PERSON                           9.1%
HOWCON1  IN PERSON                                 9.1%
HOWCON2  BY PHONE                                  9.1%
HOWCON3  THROUGH AN ADVOCATE                       9.1%
HOWCON4  BY MAIL                                   9.1%
HOWCON5  OTHER WAY                                 9.1%
JUDGE54B SEEMED TO BELIEVE YOU                     9.1%
KNOWSENT KNOW WHAT SENTENCE                         9.1%
DAYS2DIS DAYS TO DISPOSITION                       9.1%
INCIDENT INCIDENT DATE                             9.1%

2.7% (11 of 410 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

PRIDATE  PRIOR EXPERIENCE YEAR                      18.2%
=====
    
```

Table 7 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
POL18B7 INTERVIEWED OTHER WITNESSES	18.2%
ADV44A1 CJA REFER TO SHELTER	18.2%
ADV44B1 CJA PROVIDE COUNSELING	18.2%
ADV44C1 CJA COMPENSATION	18.2%
ADV44D1 CJA WENT TO COURT	18.2%
ADV44E1 CJA DISCUSS PPOS	18.2%
ADV44F1 CJA SAFETY PLANNING	18.2%
ADV44G1 CJA REFER TO WELFARE	18.2%
ADV44H1 CJA PROVIDE CELL PHONE	18.2%
ADV44I1 CJA OTHER	18.2%
0.2% (1 of 410 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values	
POLORPRO MOST CONTACT WITH	36.4%
2.4% (10 of 410 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values	
ADV44A2 COMAD REFER TO SHELTER	45.5%
ADV44B2 COMAD PROVIDE COUNSELING	45.5%
ADV44C2 COMAD COMPENSATION	45.5%
ADV44D2 COMAD WENT TO COURT	45.5%
ADV44E2 COMAD DISCUSS PPOS	45.5%
ADV44F2 COMAD SAFETY PLANNING	45.5%
ADV44G2 COMAD REFER TO WELFARE	45.5%
ADV44H2 COMAD PROVIDE CELL PHONE	45.5%
ADV44I2 COMAD OTHER	45.5%
NO12P TOLD NO ONE	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: DA3252.P8

Table 8: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                                Percent of Cases with
      (Total cases=195)                                Missing Values
-----
48.9% (43 of 88 variables) have 0% Missing Values

4.5%  (4 of 88 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

6.8%  (6 of 88 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

0.0%  (0 of 88 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

2.3%  (2 of 88 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

OTHERDIS OTHER INTAKE ACTION                          9.2%
INTAKE    OTHER INTAKE ACTION                          9.2%

0.0%  (0 of 88 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

2.3%  (2 of 88 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

REQUESTE REQUESTED CHARGE                             26.7%
DEC_DAT   DATE OF DECLINE                             29.7%

35.2% (31 of 88 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

REA_REJ   REASON FOR REJECTION                        49.7%
WEAWHAT   IF YES, WHAT WEAPON                         53.8%
PRIM_CHG  PRIMARY CHARGE                              69.2%
DISPDATE  DISPOSITION DATE                           69.2%
CHARGE    CHARGE STATUS                              69.7%
CHG_ISSD  CHARGE ISSUED                              69.7%
BONDREC   BOND RECOMMENDATIONS                       69.7%
DAT_ASSG  DATE ASSIGNED TO SEX CRIMES DA            69.7%
PRES_DA   DATE PRESENTED TO DA                       71.3%
ARR_DATE  ARREST DATE                                71.3%
INSUFFIC  INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE REASONS             74.4%
CUSTODY   CUSTODY STATUS                             76.9%
=====

```

Table 8 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
DA_REQ DA REQUEST	79.0%
PRIS_SEN LENGTH OF PRISON SENTENCE	79.5%
TREATMEN TREATMENT FACILITY (HOSPITAL)	80.0%
EXAM_DAT DATE EXAMINATION COMPLETED	80.0%
SENT_INF OTHER SENTENCE INFORMATION	81.5%
LAB_RECV DATE LAB RECEIVED EVIDENCE	85.1%
LAB_EXAM DATE LAB EXAMINED EVIDENCE	85.1%
EVIDENCE SPECIFY OTHER EVIDENCE	85.1%
PROB_LGT LENGTH OF PROBATION	92.8%
PR_TERMS TERMS OF PROBATION	93.3%
PROB_DAT DATE PROBATION GIVEN	93.3%
SA_ADVTE SA ADVOCATE	93.8%
OTHER OTHER NOTES	95.9%
V_REQUT VICTIM REQUESTS	99.5%
LERESP LAW ENFORCEMENT RESPONSE	100.0%
DECEASED IDENTITY OF DECEASED	100.0%
DV_REC DV UNIT RECOMMENDATION	100.0%
RESUBMIT RESUBMIT DATE	100.0%
SENT_IMP DATE SENTENCE IMPOSED	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: DA3252.P9

Table 9: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

```
=====
Variable Name and Label                               Percent of Cases with
(Total cases=26)                                     Missing Values
-----
```

98.5% (66 of 67 variables) have 0% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 67 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 67 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 67 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

1.5% (1 of 67 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

B13 WHO NOTIFIED YOU OF DISMISSAL 7.7%

```
=====
*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.
```