
Batterer Intervention Programs: Stakeholder Observations

August 2011

alaska judicial council



Batterer Intervention Programs: Stakeholder Observations

**A report to the Department of Corrections by
The Alaska Judicial Council**

Susie Mason Dosik

August 2011

Contact:

Larry Cohn, Executive Director
Alaska Judicial Council
1029 West Third Avenue, Suite 201
Anchorage, AK 99501

(907) 279-2526

www.ajc.state.ak.us

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.	1
II.	Findings and Discussion.	2
	A. Overall Impressions.	2
	B. Lack of awareness of BIP purposes and goals.	2
	C. Disparity of beliefs of BIP effectiveness.	3
	D. Referrals.	4
	1. Types of Cases.	4
	2. BIP referred populations.	5
	E. Assessment Processes and Tools.	6
	F. Barriers to Referral, Enrollment, and Completion.	6
	G. Programs.	7
	H. Compliance.	8
	1. Inconsistent compliance enforcement.	8
	2. The lack of meaningful sanctions for non-compliance.	9
	3. Coordination and communication between agencies.	10
	J. Thoughts on how to improve the response to domestic violence.	10
	1. Revise statutory definition of “household member”.	10
	2. Find ways to reach rural communities.	10
	3. Find ways to reach youth.	10
	4. Continue and expand efforts at community outreach.	11
III.	Conclusions.	11
IV.	Appendices	
	Appendix 1: List of Interviewees.	13
	Appendix 2: Interview Questions.	15

I. Introduction

The Department of Corrections requested that the Alaska Judicial Council conduct a series of interviews of stakeholders involved with Batterer Intervention Programs (BIPs) in five DOC-approved sites: Fairbanks, Homer, Kenai, Ketchikan, and Palmer. The purpose of the interviews was to identify any systemic problems that might affect overall effectiveness of the BIP system, which in turn might affect a recidivism analysis which is currently being performed by the University of Alaska Anchorage Justice Center. The Judicial Council had no access to the data or outcomes of that study.

The criminal justice system response to misdemeanor Domestic Violence Assault may include an offender's arrest, prosecution, conviction, and sentencing. At sentencing, in lieu of some jail time, a misdemeanor offender is offered a year's probation, conditioned on the offender completing a many-months long BIP course. Probation officers also refer felony domestic violence offenders to the programs. Offenders must comply with program requirements, including weekly group meetings, or the offender is deemed to be non-compliant, his probation may be revoked and jail time may be imposed.

Child protective services employ the use of Batterer's' Intervention Programs in hopes of creating safer and healthier home environments for children. Office of Children's Services-involved parents often receive a referral to BIPs as part of their case plans, with which they must comply to remove their children from state custody. If parents fail to comply with their case plans, including BIPs, their parental rights may be terminated.

The five BIPs studied are community-based organizations that receive state grants through the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (an entity lodged within the Department of Public Safety) and that are regulated by the Department of Corrections. They also receive funding through other grants and from the costs of the courses. The BIPs are taught by facilitators, whose training and education varies widely. In addition to court-ordered and OCS-ordered clients, BIPs also accept clients who self-refer.

Susie Mason Dosik, Administrative Attorney for the Alaska Judicial Council, conducted twenty-seven interviews of judges, attorneys, Batterer Intervention Program staff, and victim services providers. Because the UAA Justice Center's study focuses on criminal recidivism, most of the interviews focused on the criminal justice process. Some query was also made into the process of child protective service referrals to BIPs.¹ Most interviewees were asked the same series of questions.² A few interviewees, due to their particular positions and knowledge, were asked more targeted questions. Responses to the informational interviews were compiled and analyzed. Findings are presented below.

¹ A list of interviewees is attached as Appendix 1.

² Interview questions are attached as Appendix 2.

II. Findings and Discussion

A. Overall Impressions

Overall, the interviews indicated that a viable system and healthy institutional structures are in place and functioning to respond to the serious problem of domestic violence. A wealth of well-trained, highly committed experts staffed both the BIPs and the legal positions in agencies and the courts. These resources were highly regarded by most interviewees. No interviewee stated that BIPs should be discontinued or that the systemic response was inappropriate. Most interviewees, in fact, stated that the state should offer more BIPs in more locations, especially rural ones. Most interviewees voiced that they wanted the system to work better, be more accessible, and be more consistent and more certain. That these systems are in place and already staffed by highly committed and experienced individuals presents an opportunity to refine and strengthen the systems to promote state goals for domestic violence intervention.

B. Lack of awareness of BIP purposes and goals

Many interviewees, across all categories, could not clearly articulate the goals of state intervention in domestic violence. Goals that were articulated included: victim safety, batterer accountability, reduced recidivism, heightened safety for everyone, promoting healthy relationships and healthy families, and changing community norms from accepting violence to respectful treatment of everyone. This inability to articulate state goals - or priorities within those goals - may have fed a disparity of understanding of the purposes and goals of BIPs. This disparity may also be fed by differing viewpoints of the BIPs and the legal stakeholders.

When asked specifically about goals of BIPs, BIP and victim services staffs voiced that the BIPs are one part of a coordinated community response to domestic violence that includes police contact; prosecutor, probation, and caseworker referrals; linkage of victims and batterers to community services; court monitoring; and corrections. In particular, BIPs noted that the primary goals of the BIPs were to increase victim safety and to promote batterer accountability. The programs promote victim safety in a variety of ways: by offering victims safety planning and performing victim safety checks if requested, by keeping children safe, and by performing informal monitoring of batterers while in the program (because most batterers, as misdemeanor offenders, were not monitored by probation officers). Promoting offender accountability includes attempting to change batterer behavior, but emphasizes providing the offender, the victim, and the community with messages that violent behavior towards intimate partners is unacceptable and will not be tolerated. These messages are transmitted through the criminal process, through victim safety measures, and community education efforts.

Interviewees within the criminal justice system were much less likely to view the BIPs as one element of a community response and were more likely to view BIPs as an element of the criminal justice system. They were much more likely identify the goal of the BIP process as attempting to change batterer behavior and not to include as goals any effects on the victim or community as a whole. A few very experienced interviewees within that system were aware that BIP's stated goals are to promote victim safety.

Suggestion: Promote a wider understanding of the role BIPs play in the state and community response to domestic violence through continuing education opportunities for legal stakeholders, as well as through invitations by the BIPs to learn more about local programs. Programs should focus on the role of the BIPs within the coordinated community response to domestic violence.

C. Disparity of beliefs of BIP effectiveness

Because the criminal justice system has focused on changing offender behavior as a goal, criminal justice researchers and professionals have looked largely to recidivism as a measure of whether BIP systems are effective. Meta-analyses of studies on BIP effectiveness suggest that BIPs have a “modest” effect, if any, on reducing recidivism.³ The findings, however, should be viewed with caution due to wide variations in study design, program implementation, and community response.⁴

Many legal interviewees expressed their uncertainty about whether BIPs were effective. Most did not remember ever receiving information about BIP effectiveness, despite many continuing education courses, out-of-state domestic violence trainings, and many years on the job working with domestic violence cases. Most hoped that they did work, given the amount of time and resources that went into them, and because there were no alternatives. Some legal stakeholder interviewees expressed a great deal of skepticism about the programs. Many legal stakeholders did note, however, that they “only see the failures” when defendants either didn’t comply or reoffended. A few legal stakeholders also expressed that BIP providers have “vested interests” (both financial and philosophical) in promoting their programs and stated that providers often looked only to evidence that supported the use of BIPs, and current BIP programming, rather than being open to evidence that may suggest changing course. This view tended to increase legal stakeholder skepticism of programs.

It is important to note that BIP providers are aware of the skepticism and are sensitive to it. They are eager to share any evidence of effectiveness with legal stakeholders. But in contrast to legal stakeholders, BIPs tend to view recidivism as one measure of victim safety, rather than as a definitive measure of overall program effectiveness. They tend to reject recidivism evidence, claiming the studies are flawed, or because other measures – such as victim and children safety

³ Andrew R. Klein, Practical Implications of Current Domestic Violence Research: For Law Enforcement, Prosecutors and Judges, National Institute of Justice (2009) available at: <http://www.nij.gov/nij/topics/crime/intimate-partner-violence/practical-implications-research/ch8/prevent-reabuse.htm>. See also, Steve Aos, et al., Return on Investment: Evidence-Based Options to Improve Statewide Outcomes, July 2011 Update available at: <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/pub.asp?docid=11-07-1201> (finding a negative cost-benefit of batterer’s intervention programs); Julia C. Babcock, et al., Does Batterers’ Treatment Work? A Meta-analytic Review of Domestic Violence Treatment, *Clinical Psychology Review* 23 (2004) 1023-1053 (finding small effect sizes from both cognitive-behavioral and Duluth-model programs).

⁴ See, e.g., Babcock, et al., Does Batterers’ Treatment Work? A Meta-analytic Review of Domestic Violence Treatment, *Clinical Psychology Review* 23 (2009) at 1046-47 (describing study limitations, program implementation differences, and variations in quality of treatment quality and community responses); Edward W. Gondolf, Evaluating Batterer Counseling Programs: A Difficult Task Showing Some Effects and Implications, *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 9 (2004) 605-631 (describing limitations of many BIP studies).

measures and offender accountability – are not studied by researchers. They expressed frustration with being judged on only one dimension of the BIP merely (1) because that dimension was easily quantified and (2) because of a lack of understanding by other stakeholders of BIPs’ primary goals of victim safety and offender accountability.

Despite the skepticism, most legal stakeholders expressed the opinion that even if they did not know if the BIPs were effective in reducing recidivism, “they are the only thing we have,” that the services BIPs provided were valuable, and if they reached even some individuals, they were worth pursuing. This view suggests that promoting a wider understanding of the multifaceted goals of BIPs could encourage more confidence in the programs.

Suggestion: Encourage trust between groups by exploring ways to measure BIP outcomes beyond reduced recidivism, while recognizing the value of that measure to legal stakeholders and policymakers. Encourage the dissemination of, and openness to, objective evidence of BIP effectiveness by legal stakeholders, BIPs and victim service agencies. Look at ways to promote the goal of reducing recidivism while retaining the goal of increasing victim safety.

D. Referrals

1. Types of Cases

Interviewees stated that in the criminal justice system, misdemeanor and felony domestic violence assault cases almost always include a BIP referral as a condition of probation unless the case did not involve intimate partners. Criminal mischief cases involving destruction of intimate partner property also sometimes received referrals. Any uncertainty or skepticism about effectiveness did not appear to be a force in whether a defendant was referred to a BIP for a domestic violence assault charge but may have had an effect when negotiating case outcomes.

Many interviewees reported that many cases charged as domestic violence assault are negotiated. In return for a guilty or no contest plea, defendants receive a Rule 11 plea agreement that may reclassify the charge to a non-DV charge, such as harassment, criminal mischief, or disorderly conduct and avoid a referral to BIP. Alternatively, defendants may be convicted of the DV offense, but may still avoid the BIP referral. Some offenders who avoided the DV offense conviction still received the BIP referral, if it was appropriate to the facts of the case. Interviewees stated that negotiated outcomes depended largely on the facts of the case and the strength of the evidence. The more that a case appeared to be an isolated instance, the more likely that the charge would be reduced or changed to a non-DV charge.

When negotiating a case, defense attorneys tended to focus on the case in front of them and not on the possible future effects of their clients receiving a subsequent DV offense conviction (a third DV assault conviction is felony). Defense attorneys were more cognizant of immediate collateral effects of any DV conviction, including custody decisions, low-income housing eligibility, child-in-need-of-aid status, bail decisions, firearms possession, and employment. Interviewees reported that some judges were hesitant to impose a BIP requirement on first-time offenders because of its cost and length.

Referrals were very rarely made in the context of domestic violence civil protective orders. Interviewees stated that judges sometimes made referrals when custody was at issue. This was largely due to the lack of any effective enforcement mechanism to ensure that the batterer complied. Judges also stated that if the situation warranted a BIP referral in a civil protective order case, the batterer was likely facing a criminal charge as well.

Referrals were often recommended by OCS as part of a case plan. A new process started this year includes only elements that parents agree to in case plans. Referrals to BIP are usually based on admitted conduct or on police reports, but interviewees agreed that allegations in petitions for *ex parte* protective orders could serve as the basis for a referral. Parents usually did not object to the referral.

Suggestion: The referral process seems to be effective in the criminal context. Although many cases are negotiated, this is true for most criminal cases. Researchers should closely examine cases initially charged as domestic violence assaults but that are otherwise disposed of to gain an understanding of the dynamics of case negotiation to avoid a DV conviction and/or BIP referral.

2. BIP referred populations

Interviewees from all categories reported that the population of domestic violence offenders appropriate for BIP referral were extremely likely to require additional referrals. Other referrals included substance abuse treatment, mental health treatment, education and employment training, housing, and food assistance. Many noted that these co-occurring disorders and social service needs may not cause domestic violence, but that resolving them were often necessary prerequisites to resolving the domestic violence patterns or enabling the victim and the batterer to extricate themselves from the relationship if that is what they desired. Interviewees reported that the BIPs did their best but were often ill-equipped to handle the increasing needs of the batterers for simultaneous referrals for treatment and social services.

Some interviewees noted that this population had shifted and that it was not the “classic” DV offender profile for which the “Duluth Model” and others had been intended, although they believed that the programs were still appropriate for most offenders. They remarked that domestic violence law enforcement and prosecution efforts were not capturing high-functioning DV offenders (“white doctors”) even though interviewees believed that those offenders still existed. They also remarked on the high incidence of cognitively-impaired individuals who were referred to BIPs but who were later deemed to be inappropriate due to their inability to process the BIP curriculum.

Some interviewees believed that the population of DV offenders was shifting because of mandatory arrest policies. They hypothesized that some victims may be savvy to the mandatory arrest policy and did not wish batterers to be arrested, and would not report, or that lack of officer discretion was resulting in more “situational violence” of one-time, non-pattern offenders being captured into the system. Another hypothesis was that “high-functioning” offenders were largely successful in eluding prosecution and conviction due to good legal representation.

Suggestion: A close examination of offender characteristics should be performed by researchers performing the recidivism study to guide policy and funding decisions for BIP providers and other agencies providing services to victims and offenders. To the extent that the need for other social services impedes the effectiveness of BIPs, seek increased resources and collaboration with other agencies to provide them.

E. Assessment Processes and Tools

Assessments are performed by BIPs at intake. The assessment process generally involves gathering information from offenders about their histories. The purpose of the assessment was generally not to determine suitability for the BIP but to gather information about the offender to assist the facilitator in guiding the program. Sometimes offenders were determined not to be appropriate for the BIP at assessment, especially if the offender was determined to be unable to participate effectively in a group setting due to mental health problems.

When asked what would help to identify and refer appropriate offenders to BIP, some interviewees noted that they would be more comfortable having an independent agency assess offenders. They noted that offenders were rarely assessed as “not appropriate” by the BIP and a few interviewees were suspicious that the BIP acted in its own self-interest rather than in the best interests of the offender and justice system when making assessment decisions. Some interviewees made the analogy to ASAP, where an independent agency performed an assessment and offenders were told to follow up on its recommendation with independent treatment providers. Many interviewees, however, were comfortable with the BIP assessment process and noted that if an offender was convicted of a domestic violence assault, a BIP was appropriate by definition. The situation was less clear, however, in the context of OCS referrals. Few interviewees outside of BIP staffs were aware of particular risk-assessment instruments.

Suggestion: Consider having ASAP or a similar entity perform assessments for DV offenders and for OCS-referred parents and make recommendations regarding BIP appropriateness. Continue to explore objective assessment instruments to determine offender risks.

F. Barriers to Referral, Enrollment, and Completion

Most interviewees cited the lack of programs that could accommodate offenders from rural locations as a barrier to offender referral. For example, interviewees in Ketchikan noted that no programs were available for offenders from Metlakatla or Prince of Wales Island. Interviewees also observed that no options were available for women in most locations. Across all categories of interviewees and all locations, the need for more programs and more accessible programs was noted. Emerging technology, such as Skype or other videoconferencing, was often cited as one possible way to fulfill this need.

Enrollment in programs was often perceived to be hindered by lack of transportation, lack of money to pay for programs, and defendant transiency. Defendants with domestic violence convictions often had no car or had no or suspended drivers' licenses. Public transportation was rarely available and cumbersome to use if available.

Lack of money to pay for the program was viewed by many as an excuse to avoid enrolling in or completing the BIP. All the BIPs stated that they employed sliding-scale fees and/or payment plans, and also offered community work service plans in lieu of cash payments. Public defense attorneys were much more likely to be sensitive to the financial straits of their clients who, by definition, were indigent. They stated that their clients were often not told of sliding-scale fees, could not add community service onto their already strapped schedules, and were often presented with a choice between “paying for groceries or paying for the program.” They stated that prosecutors, judges, and BIPs were not as sensitive to the actual dire needs of their clients because they simply did not have the same kind of experience with them on a daily basis.

Offender transiency was also cited by many as a barrier. Offenders often moved from place to place in the state in search of work. Most did not know what happened to these offenders and lost track of them. Interviewees did not know if an offender could transfer from one program to another, or how that could be accomplished. Cyclical work schedules (such as work on the North Slope) and seasonal employment (such as fishing) were not seen as barriers, however, as scheduling needs were well accommodated by the BIPs.

One other barrier that was often noted was the general low social functioning of individuals referred to BIPs. Whether from low “executive functioning” or inadequate socialization, interviewees noted that it was very difficult for many individuals to get to a program, participate cooperatively, and do the homework -- and then to do that for 36 or 48 weeks in a row. Some interviewees noted that probation officers worked with felons to accomplish acquiring general life skills but that misdemeanor offenders have no probation officer to assist them with that process. Offenders and OCS parents with cognitive disabilities were generally not deemed appropriate for the programs and received alternative referrals for individualized treatment.

Suggestions: Examine the need for more programs statewide. Look into ways to use technology to broaden programs to rural locations, to women, and to ease transportation difficulties; examine ways to lower program costs and to communicate payment options to offenders at the time of referral; develop state protocols for transferring offenders from BIP to another in a different location; consider ways to promote BIP completion by teaching offenders “life skills” as part of the BIP or as a course prior to entry.

G. Programs

Programs varied in content but all were based on some variant of the “Duluth” or “Emerge” models for batterer intervention and included educational components such as the “power and control wheel,” the cycle of domestic violence, models of healthy relationships, and challenges to a “male privileged” society. Some programs also included cognitive-behavior elements. Most interviewees had only very general ideas of what BIPs attempted to teach offenders. Most were aware that the education was attempted in facilitated peer groups. Most interviewees stated that they would welcome more information about BIP programming.

Although they did not know much about the BIP curricula, many interviewees were troubled by its “one-size-fits-all” nature both in program components and length of program. Some believed that the BIPs’ curricula were designed for the “classic batterer” but believed that many DV offenders did not fit that description. Some believed that many, if not most, first-time offenders would benefit from a scaled-back “informational” type program.

Four programs were 36 weeks long; one was 48 weeks. While some interviewees maintained that offenders would receive no benefit unless they received the entire 36 or 48-week course, many others made the analogy to ASAP programming, where defendants who abuse alcohol are assessed and referred to different-leveled programming depending on individual needs. They stated that not all domestic violence offenders were the same and that defendants presented different risks: some were likely one-time offenders who had gotten themselves in bad situations, while some presented with hard-core power and control patterns who could potentially be lethal to their victims. Many interviewees also pointed to Anchorage programs, which offered 12, 24, and 36 week programs, and to the former Fairbanks program, which used to be 26 weeks. Some observed that a 36-week (or 48-week) program set up failure for many otherwise amenable offenders.

Suggestion: Explore alternatives to a 36 or 48 week course and consider presenting varied levels of programming based on offender risk. Consider reviewing course curricula for ways to tailor programs to particular offenders or particular risks.

H. Compliance

1. Inconsistent compliance enforcement

When BIP was ordered as a condition of misdemeanor probation, compliance enforcement varied widely by location. In one location, the BIP, court, and prosecutor’s office worked very effectively to identify non-compliant offenders and bring them into compliance or revoke their probation. BIP staff reported that most offenders there completed the program. In another location, the BIP, court, and prosecutor’s office compliance efforts were ineffective and offenders often were able to wait out their probation period without having their probation revoked for non-compliance. Very few offenders in that location completed the BIP. In other locations, compliance efforts fell somewhere in between.

The most successful locations had early identification of non-compliance by the BIP, quick communication of non-compliance to the court and prosecutor’s office, quick initiation of a petition to revoke probation by the prosecutor’s office, and regular status/compliance hearings by the court. The less successful locations had slow identification or communication of non-compliance to the prosecutor’s office (sometimes at the prosecutor’s office request), slow or no initiation of petitions to revoke by prosecutors, no regular court status hearings, and oft-delayed petition to revoke hearings.

One of the biggest concerns voiced from the BIP and advocacy staffs was inadequate compliance enforcement efforts from prosecutor’s offices and courts. They stated that inadequate enforcement resulted in extreme danger to victims because the offenders knew that their offense

was not being taken seriously and that “nothing would be done,” in effect giving offenders license to reoffend. They stated that for the BIPs to work as intended, offenders had to be forced into going, at least initially. BIP staffs stated that once an offender became engaged in the program it was usually not a problem for them to complete, but that the initial few weeks were critical to compliance.

The most successful programs reported that offender compliance was heightened when participants heard that another offender’s probation had been revoked for non-compliance in BIP group and at court status/compliance hearings, where they could watch the outcomes of other offender’s non-compliance. Prosecutor’s offices agreed that compliance enforcement was extremely important but some offices stated that they were consistently understaffed and were unable to respond in a timely manner. In locations where the system worked well, all agencies communicated extremely well and had good relationships. In locations that worked well, the system’s response was quickened by the ability to communicate and respond immediately.

Suggestion: Develop statewide “best practice” protocols for BIPs, the Department of Law, and courts to follow to ensure swift enforcement of sanctions for non-compliance with BIP as a condition of probation. Request that the Department of Law review its staffing to ensure a quick response to non-compliance. Request that the courts schedule regular status/compliance hearings for DV offenders. Promote good communication and develop good relationships between agencies by having DV staffs meet regularly.

2. The lack of meaningful sanctions for non-compliance

In most locations, sanctions for non-compliance were rarely imposed. In one location, there were inconsistent and few sanctions for offender non-compliance with court-ordered BIP. In one location, status/compliance hearings were swift and certain, but there were still few sanctions for the offender being in non-compliance. In one location, the court allowed offenders to opt for 30 days of imposed jail time (20 days, with good time) instead of completing the BIP if they were in non-compliance, but their probation was not revoked. Across all locations, the remedy was usually to get the offender back into compliance. Sometimes several jail days were imposed. Probation revocation was seen as a last-ditch remedy to be avoided unless efforts at compliance were unsuccessful and had been tried numerous times. In the context of OCS referral, BIP non-compliance was usually not the only area in which the parent failed to comply and parental rights were usually terminated for other reasons, usually related to substance abuse.

The criminal justice response tends to focus on the goals of changing offender behavior through undergoing programming/education efforts and of increased victim safety through informal monitoring of offender behavior by the BIP. The lack of sanctions, however undermines the goal of accountability because the offender receives no response for his bad behavior - he receives only what he would have had if he’d complied in the beginning. If accountability is a state goal, sanctions for non-compliance should be examined.

Suggestion: If offender accountability is determined to be a primary goal of BIPs, reexamine sanctions for non-compliance.

3. Coordination and communication between agencies

For the compliance system to work, all of the involved agencies must work closely together and communicate well. This coordination was problematic in some locations. No one agency was charged with leadership for this coordination. In some locations, the court or prosecutor's office took the lead. In some, the BIP took the lead. In others, the system seemed to flounder because of lack of coordination and leadership. In one location the prosecution and public defense agencies were in a different location than the court and BIP and there the court and BIP worked well together but they often had trouble communicating consistently with the legal agencies.

Suggestion: In each site, determine an agency to lead compliance efforts.

J. Thoughts on how to improve the response to domestic violence

Although not directly related to BIPs, interviewees were asked about their thoughts on ways to improve the criminal justice and community responses to domestic violence. Several themes emerged. The most common responses follow.

1. Revise statutory definition of "household member"

Many legal stakeholders, especially judicial officers, believed that the statutory definition of "household member" in AS 18.66.990(5) was too broad and captured too many inappropriate cases into the domestic violence system. Examples were given of twenty-years-ago romantic partners, adult children and parents, and former college roommates being thrust into the domestic violence system which offered little to address their circumstances. Some interviewees believed that this broad definition in effect watered down the response so that "true" cases of domestic violence - involving power and control of the batterer over an intimate partner victim - were not being treated seriously enough. Interviewees also were reluctant to refer cases to BIPs in these instances because the programs were not designed to address those types of relationships.

2. Find ways to reach rural communities

Almost all interviewees described a desperate need for victim services and a criminal justice response to batterers in rural locations. Many interviewees had direct experience working in some aspect or at some time of their careers in rural Alaska villages and stated that in effect there was no response to domestic violence in many, many places in Alaska. Many also stated that domestic violence was largely fueled by alcohol in rural locations, and that needed to be addressed as well.

3. Find ways to reach youth

Almost all interviewees also hoped that the state could find ways to educate youth about healthy relationships and the consequences of relationship choices. Interviewees suggested going into all levels of public schools, starting at the elementary level and continuing through college. Many also believed that more children and youth who were exposed to domestic violence at

home needed to be provided with more (or any) intervention services in hopes of stopping the inter-generational cycle of domestic violence. One interviewee believed that committing domestic violence in front of a child witness should itself be a crime of domestic violence. The effect of domestic violence on children was a deep concern across all locations and across all types of stakeholders.

4. Continue and expand efforts at community outreach

Many interviewees cited the positive response to the Governor's outreach efforts and public service messages on radio and television. They stated that these were effective in getting the message out to communities that domestic violence would not be tolerated and that services were available to victims. Interviewees hoped that these efforts would continue and would expand.

III. Conclusion

Batterer intervention programs provide one way to address domestic violence. As part of a community response to domestic violence, they provide an existing mechanism through which both victim safety and batterer accountability may be heightened. Suggestions have been made throughout this report on how to improve the process to accomplish those goals. But more, and better, research needs to be performed to address how to improve the programs themselves to increase the likelihood that batterers' behavior can be changed to further victim safety, batterer accountability, and the overall health of our families and communities. It is hoped that the observations from these interviewees will better inform the ongoing research as well as the development and evolution of the BIPS in Alaska.

Appendix 1 List of Interviewees

Fairbanks	
Lisa Hay	LEAP (BIP)
Brenda Stanfill	Interior Alaska Center for Non-Violent Living
Judge Raymond Funk	Alaska Court System
Jennifer Hite	Public Defender Agency
Corinne Vorenkamp	Department of Law
J. Michael Gray	Department of Law
Homer	
Peg Coleman	Haven House (BIP)
Judge Margaret Murphy	Alaska Court System
Kenai/Homer	
Lance Joanis	Department of Law
Joe Montague	Public Defender Agency
Kenai	
Cheri Smith	Lee Shore Center (BIP)
Magistrate Matthew Christian	Alaska Court System
Ketchikan	
Judge Kevin Miller	Alaska Court System
Nick Polasky	Department of Law
Sam McQuerry	Public Defender Agency
Dianne Thoben	Public Defender Agency
Naomi Michaelson	Women in Safe Homes
Cynthia Carlson	Women in Safe Homes
Glen Fazakerley	Ketchikan Indian Community (BIP)
Sue Pickrell	Ketchikan Indian Community
Palmer	
Judy Gette	Alaska Family Services (BIP)
Windy Hannaman	Office of Public Advocacy
Rachel Levitt	Office of Public Advocacy
John Richard	Public Defender Agency
Trina Sears	Department of Law
Anchorage	
Jo-Ann Chung	Municipal Prosecutor's Office
Steven Bookman	Department of Law

Appendix 2 Interview Questions

I. DV Background and Awareness

1. What training or education have you had regarding domestic violence?
2. What work experience have you have regarding domestic violence?
3. How familiar are you with the local DVIP?

II. Case Identification and Referral Process

1. What cases do you believe are appropriate or required for referral to a DVIP?
 - Geographic suitability (w/in 50 miles of a DVIP)
 - Charge? CINA status? Protective Orders?
 - Case fact pattern?
 - Defendant history? Relationship to victim?
 - Clinical/behavioral assessment?
2. What is the process for recommendation/referral/opposition?
3. What cases usually do get referred by the court?
 - Case fact pattern? - Evidentiary strength of case?
 - Defendant history? - Other negotiated elements?
4. If a case is not referred to DVIP, does it receive a different referral (e.g. ASAP, anger management, other treatment)? Do some cases receive simultaneous referrals?
5. What tools or training would better enable you to identify and refer appropriate cases?

III. Enrollment and Program Completion

1. Once referred by the court, how does a defendant enroll in a program?
2. Do defendants encounter any barriers when attempting to enroll in DVIPs?
 - Cost
 - Scheduling, employment, child care, etc.
3. Do defendants encounter any barriers when attempting to complete DVIPs?
4. What information do you receive about whether and when a defendant doesn't enroll in or complete the program?

5. What happens then?
8. How could the case enrollment and program completion process be improved?

Program Information:

1. What do DVIPs try to teach DV offenders?
2. What challenges do you think DVIPs experience in program delivery?
3. What do you think works well?

Underlying Beliefs about DV and DVIPs:

1. How would you define a successful DV intervention? (What is the “goal” of state intervention? What are the “goals” of BIPs?)
2. Do you have an opinion about the effectiveness of the local DVIP program in reducing DV?
3. Do you have an opinion about the effectiveness of DVIP programs in general?
4. Do you believe the programs help to keep DV victims and children safe in other ways besides attempting to reduce recidivism?
5. Do you believe that the program fulfills any other role in the community?
6. What other programs or systems are used to address DV in your community?
7. What else could be done within the criminal justice system to better address DV?
8. What else outside the criminal justice system could be done to better address DV?
9. Is there anything else you’d like to share regarding successes, frustrations, or failures with the DVIPs?