

PROGRAM COMPLETION, BEHAVIORAL CHANGE, AND RE-ARREST
FOR THE BATTERER INTERVENTION SYSTEM OF COOK COUNTY ILLINOIS
FINAL REPORT TO THE ILLINOIS CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION AUTHORITY

February 14, 2005

Larry Bennett
University of Illinois at Chicago

Christine Call
University of Arkansas at Little Rock

Heather Flett
Social Service Department of the Circuit Court of Cook County

Charles Stoops
Dominican University

This report was supported by a contract between the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority and the University of Illinois at Chicago, Larry W. Bennett, Ph.D., Principal Investigator, 1040 West Harrison [m/c 309], Chicago, IL 60607-7134. The researchers are indebted to the following individuals who contributed to the completion of this project: Tracy Hahn and Ernst Melchior (ICJIA); Barbara Engel; Dr. James Swartz (UIC); Linda Hart and Sharon Hoffman, Social Service Department of the Circuit Court of Cook County; Jennifer Jenks; and Dr. Gerard Ramker, U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The effectiveness of intervention programs for men who batter is an important issue for practice, policy and research. This report summarizes a preliminary examination of outcomes of Cook County batterer intervention programs (BIP). In Cook County, 30 community programs and one court-housed program provide a state standard minimum of 24 weeks of intervention programming for men arrested for domestic violence. This is properly labeled a batterer intervention system because the interventions are delivered under the same state standards with unified completion criteria linked to a single county court system.

The specific questions this evaluation addresses are: (1) What is the completion rate of men referred to batterer programs in Cook County? (2) What is the rate of re-arrest of men completing the batterer program compared with men not completing the program? (3) Do participants change their behavior during the program? (4) Are there identifiable factors associated with program completion, re-arrest, and behavioral change?

Subjects for this program evaluation are males age 17 or older who pled guilty or were found guilty of a domestic violence crime, and ordered by the court to attend a batterer intervention program. Men either attend the in-house program at the court or they are referred to one of 30 community-based batterer programs. Data for this evaluation were available from four sources: (1) the Cook County Prosecutors Management Information System (PROMIS); (2) Research assessment data completed during an interview of the batterer by probation staff; (3) Staff ratings of behavior in individual case records of men attending batterers programs in Cook County; and, (4) Arrest records for men in the research sample (LEADS).

Key Findings

Nearly three out of every four men (73.4%) referred to batterer intervention programs within the batterer intervention system for Cook County (Chicago) Illinois complete the program, a substantially higher completion rate than those rates reported in the literature. A number of variables are statistically associated with program completion: income, self-reported drug abuse, frequency

of alcohol use, primitive psychological defenses, prior arrests, ethnicity, and employment. Full time employment more than triples the odds a man will complete a batterer program, while being Latino nearly doubles the chances of program completion. Prior violation of an order of protection reduces the odds of program completion by 61%.

The behavioral competency of men who complete batterer intervention programs in the Cook County Court system improves during the batterer program according to staff ratings, but small sample size make it difficult to analyze these results sufficiently.

The recidivism rate for men who drop out of the batterer programs is 37%, twice as high as the 15% recidivism rate for completers, suggesting a significant association between program drop-out and re-arrest for domestic violence. The odds of re-arrest for domestic violence are significantly reduced by age, but are increased both by the frequency of alcohol use and by the level of alcohol abuse, after controlling for the effects of employment and prior arrests. Completing a batterer intervention program in the Cook County system reduces the odds of being re-arrested for domestic violence by 63 percent, after controlling for age, employment, prior arrests, and alcohol abuse. This represents a moderate effect size for program completion.

Conclusion

This quasi-experimental study suggests that men in the Cook County batterer intervention system are completing the program at a better-than-expected rate. Data also suggest that the system may have a role in reducing re-arrest for crimes related to domestic violence. However, caution is warranted because the study lacked a true control group, so we do not know what accounts for the outcomes observed. Furthermore, one in four men dropped out of the program and one in seven men who completed the program re-offended. These facts point to the need for further research and program development.

In addition to the batterer intervention programs which are the focus of this report, there are other elements of the Cook County system which should be identified, even though the current study is unable to estimate the effect of their role. These other system elements include law enforcement,

other elements of the court, and victim service agencies. The latter of these elements—shelters, walk-in centers, and advocacy organizations—require special attention, although their role in batterer intervention systems are often unstudied and undervalued; if services to the victims of violence were unavailable, the effectiveness of batterer intervention programs would probably be less. Criminal justice policy would be better served if it promoted research which could account for the multiple components of coordinated community intervention systems. This is a much more complicated research project than the one reported in this paper. Use of clustered and community-level variables at different ecological levels requires better preparation, better measurement, better analysis, and ultimately, much more money. We believe the benefits would far outweigh these costs. Refined interventions and a coordinated court and community response to non-compliance and re-offense are likely to increase the safety of battered women.

One in five men who might batter again *may be* prevented from doing so by the batterer intervention system in Cook County. The fact that both the effects and the effect sizes for our findings are on the same order as those of other studies is intriguing. Other studies often use one or two well established intervention programs; this is not the case in our study. Other studies may use a much more accurate, difficult—and some would say dangerous—method of collecting recidivism data: victim report; our study used only arrest. The convergence of outcomes for our study with other studies suggest not only that batterer intervention systems have a moderate effect, but also that the effects may not be a function of individual programs which comprise the system as much as the system itself.

CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. BACKGROUND	7
II. SOCIAL SERVICE DEPARTMENT OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INTERVENTION PROGRAM	8
III. THE WEST SIDE DOMESTIC ABUSE PROJECT	10
IV. METHODOLOGY	11
V. OUTCOMES: PROGRAM COMPLETION	16
VI. OUTCOMES: BEHAVIORAL CHANGE	18
VII. OUTCOMES: RE-ARREST	24
VIII. FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH PROGRAM COMPLETION, BEHAVIORAL CHANGE, AND RE-ARREST	25
IX. CONCLUSIONS	41
X. REFERENCES	43
APPENDIX 1 CHARGE CATEGORIES	46
APPENDIX 2 OFFENDER ASSESSMENT TOOL	53
APPENDIX 3 COMPLETION CRITERIA	76

TABLES

		<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE 1	REASONS OF RECORD FOR NON-REFERRAL TO AND NON-COMPLETION OF BATTERER INTERVENTION PROGRAM	16
TABLE 2	PROGRAM COMPLETION IN RESEARCH SAMPLE OF 899 BATTERERS	18
TABLE 3	BATTERER PROGRAM AGENCY	19
TABLE 4	COMPETENCY ITEMS AT FIRST (T1) AND LAST (T2) STAFF EVALUATION AND MEAN CHANGE (T1-T2)	21
TABLE 5	KEY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEN WITH COMPETENCY DATA AND MEN WITHOUT COMPETENCY DATA	22
TABLE 6	MEAN ARRESTS AND RECIDIVISM BY CHARGE CATEGORY	24
TABLE 7	MEAN (STANDARD DEVIATION) OR PROPORTION OF BIP COMPLETERS AND NON-COMPLETERS ON KEY VARIABLES	26
TABLE 8	LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODEL OF PROGRAM COMPLETION	30
TABLE 9	DV RECIDIVISM RATES BY CASE STATUS	32
TABLE 10	MEAN (STANDARD DEVIATION) OR PROPORTION OF KEY VARIABLES FOR NO ARREST V. ARREST	34
TABLE 11	LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODELS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RE-ARREST	39

PROGRAM COMPLETION, BEHAVIORAL CHANGE, AND RE-ARREST
FOR THE BATTERER INTERVENTION SYSTEM OF COOK COUNTY ILLINOIS

This report summarizes a preliminary examination of outcomes of Cook County batterer intervention programs (BIP). In Cook County, 30 community programs provide a state-mandated minimum of 24 weeks of intervention programming for men who plead guilty or are found guilty of a domestic violence charge. The Social Service Department (SSD) of the Circuit Court of Cook County, a misdemeanor probation department of the Court, has an in-house batterer intervention program (SSDBIP) which provides the initial assessment and referral of men to the community programs. SSDBIP also provides a 24-week program to men who are more difficult to place in community programs due to their record. Social Service Department staff supervise the cases while in the community program through a mechanism of monthly reports, regular office visits every two to six weeks, and victim contact. The monthly reports require community staff to rate men in their programs on each of nine *Cook County Program Completion Criteria*, such as use of respectful language and taking responsibility for their violent behavior. The *Cook County Program Completion Criteria* are in Appendix 3.

I. BACKGROUND

Research on the effectiveness of batterer intervention programs (BIPs) is still in its infancy, with only four controlled experimental studies completed to date (Dunford, 2000; Feder & Forde, 2000; Palmer, Brown, & Barrera, 1992; Taylor, Davis, & Maxwell, 2001). The controlled studies, supported by approximately 50 published quasi-experimental and non-experimental outcome studies, suggest BIPs have modest effects on recidivism.

A serious weakness of research on BIPs is that, on average, 50% of the participants never complete the program, regardless of whether or not they are court ordered (Daley, Power & Gondolf,

2001). Recidivism rates for men who drop out of BIPs are greater than for men who complete the program (Cadsy, Hanson, Crawford, & Lalonde, 1996), so the “dosing” effect of keeping men in programs longer appears to have a direct effect on outcome. Factors which have been associated by research with BIP attrition are: younger age, less education, under-employment, history of police contact, violence in the family of origin, substance abuse, lower motivation to control others, less motivation to change, higher levels of personality or psychotic disorders, change in partner residence, fewer children, and lack of court sanction (Bersani & Chen, 1988; DeHart, et al., 1999; Demaris, 1989; Gondolf, 1999; Grusznski & Carillo, 1988; Hamberger & Hastings, 1989; Pirog-Good & Stets-Kelly, 1985; Saunders & Parker, 1989).

In general, research on both BIP attrition and BIP effectiveness supports the “stake in conformity” hypothesis (Fagan, 1995; Feder & Forde, 2000; Toby, 1957): the men most likely to complete the program and the men least likely to re-offend are those who have the most to lose, as measured by education, marital status, home ownership, employment, income, and length of residency. Some of these factors are not as straight forward as staff would expect, however, and there are interactions between these predictors. For example, older, better educated men are more likely to drop out of treatment when court ordered than younger, less-educated men who are court-ordered (Saunders & Parker, 1989). For the most part, however, treatment programs cannot directly impact stake in conformity, so attrition remains a critical topic for intervention research.

II. SOCIAL SERVICE DEPARTMENT OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INTERVENTION PROGRAM

The Social Service Department of the Circuit Court of Cook County batterer intervention program (SSDBIP) has been in continuous operation since 1979, and is one of the pioneer programs for intervention with batterers in the United States. Supervising several thousand men a year, the SSDBIP is also one of the largest BIPs in the U.S. During the early days of the SSDBIP, it was one

of the only batterer programs in Cook County, so almost all offenders attended the in-house program. With the implementation of Illinois state standards for batterer programs in 1994 (IDHS, 2002), the number of community-based programs in Cook County grew, and as they did, SSDBIP began referring less severe batterers to these outside programs, while maintaining ultimate responsibility for each case. One mechanism for this supervision is the *Program Completion Criteria* developed by the Abuser Services Committee of the Cook County Family Violence Coordinating Council. These are monthly reports on the progress of each batterer in a Cook County batterer program. We consider the Cook County network of batterer programs a batterer intervention system because (1) men in community programs are supervised in a single county court system; (2) each batterer program operates under the purview of Illinois state standards for batterer programs—the *Illinois Protocol for Partner Abuse Intervention Programs*—and must be approved by the Illinois Department of Human Services, and (3) men in all programs are evaluated monthly on a common set of *Program Completion Criteria* approved by a committee of the local coordinating council. To our knowledge, this system has never been empirically studied.

Recent interest in batterer and batterer intervention science has shifted from looking at individual BIPs to looking at larger, community-level *batterer intervention systems* (Gondolf, 2002). In batterer intervention systems, individual batterer programs are local nodes in a larger community-wide effort to prevent violence. Batterer intervention systems include, minimally, individual BIPs, victim services agencies like shelters and counseling programs, law enforcement and the criminal justice system. For purposes of this evaluation, we are limiting observations to BIPs operating within the context of the Cook County Court system. Future evaluation efforts should examine the effects of other system elements on violence prevention.

III. THE WEST SIDE DOMESTIC ABUSE PROJECT¹

In 1997 the UIC Jane Addams College of Social Work, the UIC Department of Psychiatry, Haymarket Center, the Chicago Abused Women's Coalition, the Social Service Department of the Circuit Court of Cook County, and other community agencies developed a town-gown research and practice collaboration called the West Side Domestic Abuse Project. WSDAP was an array of community agencies and UIC departments providing services and research on men who batter. The first funding for WSDAP was the UIC Great Cities Program. In 1999, Cook County funded the WSDAP to develop and implement a valid and reliable assessment tool for batterers at the Social Service Department. The overall goal of this project is to increase the safety of the victims by improving the ability of Social Service Department staff to identify men who are high risk and intervene to reduce their risk by assertive case management. As part of this project, WSDAP developed the Offender Assessment Tool (see Appendix 2). Computerization of the OAT allow staff to get computer generated reports on the men in the program in order to facilitate their intervention and case management. WSDAP systematically reduced the length and modified some of the content of the OAT in an effort to improve the utility of the assessment. As an adjunct project, WSDAP received funding from the UIC Campus Research Board to analyze the reliability (test-retest, concurrent measures) of key OAT indicators.

The current evaluation project was initiated when Social Service Department indicated their willingness to permit WSDAP to use data from the PROMIS dataset which indicates (1) where a DV referral for services has been made, (2) the outcome of the referral, (3) whether the offender

¹ The West Side Domestic Abuse Project was a town-gown research and practice collaboration centered at the University of Illinois at Chicago. The service delivery arm of the WSDAP was the West Side Domestic Abuse Program, which was staffed by the UIC Department of Psychiatry. In 2003, the West Side Domestic Abuse Program left UIC and was incorporated as a private non-profit agency. WSDAP is the only approved batterer intervention program in Illinois which works exclusively with men who batter. WSDAP maintains a research agenda and collaborates with founding members now at the University of Illinois at Chicago, Dominican University, and University of Arkansas at Little Rock.

completed or dropped the program, and (4) reasons for dropping the offender from the program (e.g. lack of attendance, inappropriate behavior, failure to participate, death, incarceration/deportation, termination prior to completion, and other). All cases after 12/1/2000 contain data on program completion. In addition, the Social Service Department agreed to make staff ratings of specific completion criteria available. Unfortunately, these data were not computerized and had to be drawn directly from case records.

IV. METHODOLOGY

Evaluation Questions

The specific questions this evaluation addresses are:

1. What is the completion rate of men referred to batterer programs in Cook County?
2. What is the rate of re-arrest of men completing the batterer program compared with men not completing the program?
3. Do participants change their staff-rated behavior during the program?
4. Are there factors associated with program completion, re-arrest, and behavioral change?

Subjects

Subjects for this program evaluation are males age 17 or older who are ordered to a batterer intervention program subsequent to receiving either supervision or a conditional discharge for a domestic violence crime. After an initial assessment completed by the supervising probation officer, these men attend either the in-house SSDBIP, or are referred by the probation officer to one of 30 community-based batterer programs.

Data

This is a summative evaluation using existing data available from three sources:

1. Prosecutors Management Information System (PROMIS), accessed through Cook County's computer database. Data were downloaded from the County system by a county staff

- member, de-identified by court employees, and provided to the investigators on a disk.
2. Offender Assessment Tool is completed by court staff as an “intake” into the program. The data from these forms are entered into Department of Social Service computers. The OAT and the computer report of the data were developed under a previous contract between Cook County and the West Side Domestic Abuse Project. The current evaluation report is based, in part, on OAT records from 899 men who gave permission for their records to be included in the original research project. These 899 records were stripped of identifiers and provided to the researchers electronically.
 3. Individual case records of 899 consenting men attending batterers programs in Cook County were searched for *Program Completion Criteria* and attendance information from the 30 community agencies and one court SSDBIP who provide batterer intervention programs.
 4. Arrest Records of the 899 consenting men were provided to the researchers by the Illinois Criminal Information Authority in electronic form from the Illinois State Police (LEADS) database.

Protection From Research Risk

This evaluation was approved by the University of Illinois Institutional Review Board, IRB No. 2000-00085. This protocol was amended in August 2002 to include the collection of arrest data for men consenting to the original research project.

Measures

A variety of measures were employed in this study. As an evaluation using existing data, the evaluators had no immediate control over the data collected.²

² The evaluators collaborated in the development of the Offender Assessment Tool adopted as an intake instrument by the Social Service Department of the Circuit Court of Cook County Domestic Violence Intervention Program, so they had a more distal impact of some of variables collected in this evaluation.

Program Completion is determined by program staff at the 31 batterer intervention programs. Program completion is based on *Program Completion Criteria* developed by the Abuser Services Committee of the Cook County Family Violence Coordinating Council, which consists of: participation, egalitarian attitude, accepting responsibility for the violence, knowledge about intimate partner abuse, skills, meeting additional program requirements, use of appropriate language, remaining nonviolent, and complying with referrals. Program completion is drawn from the PROMIS data, and is a dichotomous variable (1=Completed, 0=Not Completed). PROMIS data are matched to the research data set through the Social Service Department (SSD) identifier.

Competency is a measure of behavioral change while in the program, and is based on *Program Completion Criteria* developed by the Abuser Services Committee of the Cook County Family Violence Coordinating Council. The committee used the Discharge Criteria developed by Gondolf (1995) as a guide in the development of these criteria that were subsequently adopted by policy makers at the Social Service Department of the Circuit Court of Cook County as a standard tool required of all batterer programs in the county. We take this tool to be an empirical indicator of a man's competency during the program. Staff rate program participants monthly on Participation, Egalitarian Attitudes, Accepting Responsibility, Knowledge, Skills, Meeting Program Requirements, and Respectful language. *Competency* is a summary variable with a possible score between 7 and 28. Internal consistency of this Competency index is strong (Cronbach's $\alpha = .94$). While these items are rated monthly by staff in community agencies, only the initial and final ratings are used in this report.

Re-Arrest is determined by charges on the Illinois State Police electronic database (LEADS) provided to the Social Service Department by the Criminal Justice Information Authority. Identifiers are stripped from the data. LEADS data are matched to the research data through a series of links between the SSD and the State Identification (SID) number. The LEADS data included charges by the arresting officer, charges by the states attorney, and the final charges at the time of court review. For the purposes of this analysis, charges were limited to the initial charge at the time of arrest.

Charges were then assigned to one of four categories: (1) Domestic Violence [6 different charges], (2) Other Interpersonal Violence [64 charges], (3) Drug-Related [57 charges], and (4) Other Crime [219 charges]. Many of these charges were actual variant spellings of a single charge. The specific charges which were combined to form the Domestic Violence category are: Aggravated Domestic Battery, Domestic Battery, Domestic Violence Act, Interfere with Reporting Domestic Violence, Stalking, and Violating an Order of Protection. The man is considered to have re-offended if he was arrested for one of the domestic violence charges after the date his case was opened by the Social Service Department. Arrest data were re-coded as the number of charges in each category before intake and after intake. DV Recidivism is defined as any (≥ 1) DV charges after the Social Service Department intake date.

Independent Variables are drawn primarily from the data on the Offender Assessment Tool (Appendix 2) completed at admission to the program. Key variables for analysis are:

Age, in years

Ethnicity: Asian, Black, Latino, White, Other

Employment: retired, student, unemployed, part time, full time

Income: Dollars per month

Education: In both Years and Highest level Completed

Drinking frequency: Days per month, average

Drinking quantity: Drinks per drinking day

Dry drug use: Days per year of marijuana, crack/cocaine

Co-occurrence of drinking and violence: (1=Never 5=Always)

Alcoholism (CAGE: Mayfield, et al., 1974; 0 to 4; CAGE >1 suggests alcohol problem)

Motivation to change (1=pre-contemplative, 2=preparatory, 3=active, 4=maintenance; assessed by probation officer)

Accepting responsibility for violence (1=denies violence 4=accepts responsibility;

assessed by probation officer)

Frequency of physical domestic violence past year (CTS2: Straus, et al., 1996;

recoded as a continuous variable, number of acts of physical abuse)

Injury due to domestic violence (Injury scale, CTS2, Straus et al., 1996)

Prior DV Violations (Number of DV arrests before intake, LEADS)

Trauma Severity Index including subscales for depression, anxiety, sex trauma, dissociation, and sleep disorder (TSC-33: Briere & Runtz, 1989)

Psychological Maltreatment (PMWI: Tolman, 1989)

Conduct Disorder Traits (Index constructed from *DSM-IV* diagnostic items for Conduct Disorder)

Trait Anger (sub-scale of State-Trait Anger Scale: Spielberger, et al, 1983)

Primitive Defenses (Sub-scale of BPO: Oldham, et al. 1985)

Number of groups attended: Drawn from case records

Total Time in Program is measured in days, the elapsed time between the date of intake into the SSD and the date the case is closed.

V. OUTCOMES: PROGRAM COMPLETION

Cook County Court referred 10,928 male domestic violence clients to the Social Service Department between December 1, 2000 and January 24, 2004. Of those 10,928 referrals, 5,212 cases have been terminated from conditional discharge or supervision. Of these 5,212 cases, 2,663 (51.1%) have completed a batterer intervention program, 1,048 (20.1%) did not complete their BIP, and 1,501 (28.8%) were never referred to a BIP. The reasons identified for BIP non-referral and BIP non-completion are listed in Table 1. A substantial proportion of reasons for non-referral and non-completion were assigned codes by workers which were not appropriate for that category; inappropriate categories are indicated by a dash in Table 1.

TABLE 1
REASONS OF RECORD FOR NON-REFERRAL TO AND NON-COMPLETION OF BATTERER INTERVENTION PROGRAM

Reason	Never Referred	Did Not Complete
Community Service or Sheriff Work Alternative Programs in Lieu of BIP	–	1.9 %
Defendant Never Reported to SSD	13.1 %	–
Defendant Died	–	1.0 %
BIP not Ordered	36.8 %	–
BIP Not Available	0.9 %	–
Inappropriate for BIP	7.2 %	–
Incarcerated / Deported	–	26.1 %
Mental Health Issues	2.4 %	–

Other Treatment in Lieu of BIP	–	5.1 %
Substance Abuse Issues	13.4 %	–
Terminated Prior to Completion	–	51.9 %
Terminated Prior to Referral to BIP	6.1 %	–
Mis-coded Category	20.1 %	12.8 %

If we remove the 1,501 “never-referred” cases from consideration, we may conclude that the rate of program completion is 2,663 of a possible 3,711 cases during this period, or 71.8%. This figure is much higher than the often-quoted figure of 50% from the domestic violence literature (Daley, Power & Gondolf, 2001). Actually, the operational definition of program completion may vary from one study to the next, which makes completion rates difficult to compare. For example, a study may report the denominator of the completion ratio as all men referred, all men who complete an assessment, or all men who attend at least one group. We will also calculate our completion rate in several ways. The 71.8% completion rate above is calculated by using as a denominator all men referred and found appropriate for the program. This is the most common method of calculating program completion.

If we now match our research database of 899 men with the PROMIS database of 5,212 closed cases, we have program completion information on 632 of the 899 men (the remaining 267 men were still in a BIP or still in some other non-terminated state at the time we retrieved the PROMIS data). The completion data in our research sample of 899 men is listed in Table 2:

TABLE 2
PROGRAM COMPLETION IN RESEARCH SAMPLE OF 899 BATTERERS

Status	N	Percent	Closed
			Percent
BIP Completed	413	45.9 %	65.3 %
BIP Not Completed	127	14.1	20.1
BIP Never Ordered	72	8.0	11.4
BIP Not Appropriate	20	2.2	3.2
Currently In BIP/Process	267	29.7	—
TOTALS	899	100 %	100 %

If we use the same liberal calculation method for the data in Table 2 as we used in the larger dataset, we can say that 413 of 540 men (76.5%) of those men in our research dataset who were both ordered to the program and appropriate for the program completed the program. A more conservative figure includes the 20 men deemed inappropriate, and results in a completion rate of 413 out of 560, or 73.4%.

In summary, the completion rate for the 560 men in our research sample for whom we have completion data is 73.4%, while the completion rate is 71.8% for the 3,711 men in the larger sample of all men terminated from supervision or conditional discharge. It is not surprising that there is a slightly higher rate of completion among men who volunteer for a research study.

VI. OUTCOMES: BEHAVIORAL CHANGE

After men are evaluated and deemed suitable, they are referred either to community-based BIPs or to the in-house BIP at the Social Service Department. BIP staff in community based programs in Cook County providing service to men referred by the Court submit monthly reports on the *Program Completion Criteria* guidelines. The behavioral criteria rated are (1) actively

participates in group (2) Demonstrates an understanding of the benefits of an *egalitarian* relationship; (3) Accepts *responsibility* for his abusive behavior and its consequences; (4) Demonstrates *knowledge* about and understanding of abuse; (5) Uses *skills* and techniques learned in group, both within group and by self report about conduct outside the group; (6) Completes all program *requirements*; (7) Demonstrates use of respectful *language* regarding his partner and women; (8) no non-confidential reports of any recent violent or *abusive behaviors* are noted, and (9) the participant followed through on necessary *referrals* for mental health and substance abuse assessments and treatment. The first seven items are rated on the same metric (1= Poor: Rarely or never meets criteria; 2= Needs: Improvement: Meets criteria less than half the time; 3=Acceptable: Meets criteria the majority of the time; 4= Good: Meets criteria almost all of the time). The last two items are rated dichotomously: acceptable/not acceptable).

We have extracted 8,858 staff-rated outcome records from the closed case files at the Social Service Department. Of the 8,858 cases, 2,852 (32.2%) contain no agency indicator, so we do not know where the intervention program was provided. Table 3 lists batterer intervention programs by (1) the number of cases identified with that agency from the 8,858 in the PROMIS dataset, and (2) the number of cases agreeing to participate in the research. Table 3 also contains four agencies from Lake, Kane, and DuPage Counties which provided services for Cook County referrals. It should be also be pointed out that Wellpath, one of the 30 community programs is not an Illinois-Protocol approved program because it provides individual counseling for gay men. However, there are no men in the research data from Wellpath.

TABLE 3
BATTERER PROGRAM AGENCY

	Initial Dispositions	Research Cases
Agency Not Identified	2,852	568
Social Service Department	971	47
A Safe Place (Lake County)	5	0
Alexian Brothers	16	0
Associates in Human Development	249	49

	Initial Dispositions	Research Cases
AVANCE	292	5
Christine Call & Associates	670	23
Community Crisis Center (Kane County)	72	6
Cook County Intervention	66	8
Crisis Center for South Suburbia	54	4
David L Gates & Associates (Lake County)	4	0
Diversified Behavioral	1	0
Domestic Violence Intervention Program	140	0
Dr. Dugo and Associates	284	26
Psychological Services (Dupage County)	2	1
Family Service of Glencoe	5	0
Hamdard Center for Health	2	0
Healthcare Alternative Systems	130	19
La Familia Unida	212	6
Lifelink/Bensenville Home	1,170	45
Partners for Non-violence	63	9
Pillars Community Service	232	21
Polish American Association	55	1
Polish American Family Intervention	25	3
Polish American Family Services	17	3
Pro-health Advocates	124	5
Pro Solutions	1	0
Procure Center	114	10
Professional Consultation	65	1
Salvation Army	17	0
Sarah's Inn	284	8
Universal Family Connection	192	14
Well Path Center	7	0
West Side Domestic Abuse Program	409	15
YWCA Korean Center	4	1
Zabin and Associates	52	1
TOTALS	8,858	899

Missing data are a problem in this evaluation. The reason for much of the missing data is that the *Program Completion Criteria* were implemented in Cook County after some of the men in the research sample were admitted into the community programs. As with any new policy, implementation is not always uniform at the beginning. At this point in time (February, 2005), most closed cases have completion criteria evaluations, but these are not, for the most part, the cases we had in this evaluation.

In this evaluation, we are only using the first and last staff ratings. Of the 899 cases in the final SPSS research data set, 321 cases (36%) listed the total number of groups attended, 99 cases (11%) had Time 1 *Program Completion Criteria* data, 132 cases (15%) had Time 2 *Program Completion Criteria* data, and 64 cases (7%) had both Time1 and Time 2 *Program Completion Criteria* data. Table 4 lists the *Program Completion Criteria* ratings for Time 1 and Time 2. Time 1 is one month after starting the community program, and time 2 is the closing staff-assessed score. Both Time 1 and Time 2 scores are assigned by community agency staff. These seven items are also combined into a single *Competency* scale³. The numbers for the last two outcome items are much smaller since men who were violent and men who did not follow through with referrals are not likely to be completing the program at Time 2. The column in Table 4 marked $N_{T1}/N_{T2}/N_{T1T2}$ refers to the number of cases for which data are available for that item at time 1 (N_{T1}), at time 2 (N_{T2}), and for both time 1 and time 2 (N_{T1T2}).

TABLE 4
 COMPETENCY ITEMS AT FIRST (T1) AND LAST (T2) STAFF EVALUATION AND MEAN CHANGE (T1-T2)

	$N_{T1}/N_{T2}/N_{T1T2}$	M (SD) @ t1	M (SD) @ t2	Mean Change t1-t2
a. Participates	106/140/75	2.27 (.82)	3.39 (.67)	1.12 (.87) *
b. Egalitarian	104/140/73	1.81 (.76)	3.25 (.70)	1.37 (.92) *
c. Responsibility	102/139/73	1.83 (.75)	3.32 (.70)	1.42 (.94) *
d. Knowledge	102/140/73	1.75 (.75)	3.32 (.71)	1.51 (1.02) *
e. Skills	100/137/69	1.72 (.65)	3.34 (.69)	1.52 (.89) *

³ Although we have time 2 data on all 7 competency variables for 132 cases, only 119 (90%) of these cases had been closed. The remaining cases were either active (n=9) or warranted (n=4).

f. Requirements	103/140/74	2.18 (.84)	3.44 (.74)	1.18 (.97) *
g. Language	100/139/70	2.13 (.84)	3.38 (.72)	1.19 (1.04) *
<i>Competency</i> (Items a-g)	95/132/67	13.51 (4.55)	23.47 (4.22)	9.55 (5.53) *
		<u>Percent@t1</u>	<u>Percent@t2</u>	
h. Nonviolent	59/137	95 %	97 %	
I. Referrals	24/40	87 %	95 %	

* paired sample t-test $p < .001$

As we see in Table 4, there is a general improvement in the predicted direction on all measures of competency. Time1 to time 2 changes for items [a] through [g] and for the competency index are statistically significant using paired sample t-tests ($p < .001$). Barring any consideration of sample size and uncontrolled findings, we conclude that the competency of men who complete batterer intervention programs in the Cook County Court system improves during the batterer program according to staff ratings.

Unfortunately, sample size and the missing control group cannot be barred from any reasonable conclusion we might want to make about behavioral changes of court-involved Cook County batterers. Lacking a control group, we cannot attribute the ratings change to the batterer intervention system. Lacking an adequately large sample, we are hampered in our ability to correlate change with other factors. A small sub-sample of men with competency ratings may be very unrepresentative of the larger sample of 899 men. Fortunately, this concern raises an empirical question: Are men for whom we have competency ratings different than men in the larger sample along some key indicators such as stake in conformity variables, arrest history, domestic violence, and substance abuse? Table 5 summarizes this comparison.

TABLE 5
KEY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEN WITH COMPETENCY DATA AND MEN WITHOUT
TIME 2 COMPETENCY DATA

	Without Data	With Data
N	767	132
Age	35.2	33.8
African American (%)	32	37
Latino (%)	30	22
Employed Full Time (%)	55	60
Married (%)	35	33
Monthly Income (\$)	2,041	1,587
Education (yr)	10.6	10.1
Frequency of DV (CTS)	5.0	4.8
Number of DV Arrests	1.9	1.8
Total Arrests	6.6	7.1
Trait Anger (LN STAS)	2.7	2.7
CAGE	1.0	1.2
QxF Alcohol (drinks/mo)	20.1	18.6
Marijuana Use Days/Yr	10.3	10.7

None of the differences between groups in Table 5 are statistically significant, suggesting few differences on key variables between men for whom we have behavioral competency data and men for whom we do not. This makes us cautiously optimistic that the small sample of men for whom we have competency data may represent the larger sample.

In summary, the limited information we have on staff-rated behavioral change is positive. Only additional research and evaluation with better designs will be able to tell us whether the intervention is making the impact we believe it is making.

VII. OUTCOMES: RE-ARREST

Identifying information on 899 consenting subjects was transmitted to the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. ICJIA returned a file with a list of 21,862 charges for 847 of the 899 men (94.2%). Since the 21,862 entries included arresting charges, states attorney filings, and the final charge, we decided to use only the arresting charge (n=7,726). Docket numbers and charge dates were used to further cull duplicate entries. Using the date of intake into the Social Service Department as the point of recidivism, the mean number of arrests are listed in Table 6 according to the four charge categories: Domestic Violence, Other Interpersonal Violence, Substance Use, and Other. The mean elapsed time between program intake and the recidivism check date for Table 6 is 3.4 years. A final category added to Table 6 is the recidivism rate for each charge category, defined as 1 or more arrests in that category after the Intake date.

TABLE 6
MEAN ARRESTS AND RECIDIVISM BY CHARGE CATEGORY

	Mean Number <u>Before Intake</u>	Mean Number <u>After Intake</u>	Rate of <u>Recidivism</u>
Domestic Violence	1.31	.28	22 %
Other Interpersonal Violence	.99	.13	11
Drug/Alcohol	.70	.19	15
Other	2.13	.52	26
Any Arrest	4.61	.98	43

The domestic violence recidivism rate of 22% is generally higher than re-arrest rates reported in the research literature. The re-arrest rate at 48 months in Gondolf's (2002) study of 840 batterers in four programs (Denver, Houston, Pittsburgh, and Dallas) was 11%. The re-arrest rates for experimental

v. controls in three comparable⁴ experimental studies of batterer programs are 10% v. 31% for Ontario (Palmer, Brown, & Barrera, 1992), 4% v. 5% for Broward County (Feder & Forde, 2000), and 16% v. 26% in Brooklyn (Taylor, Davis, & Maxwell, 2001). Our 22% re-arrest figure includes both program completers and program dropouts. Re-arrest data are available for 512 men. The recidivism rate for the 128 men who dropped out of the batterer programs is 37.6%, over twice as high as the 15.4% recidivism rate for the 384 program completers, suggesting a significant association between program drop-out and re-arrest for domestic violence ($\chi^2=26.5$, $df=1$, $p<.001$).

VIII. FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH PROGRAM COMPLETION, BEHAVIORAL CHANGE, AND RE-ARREST

1. Program Completion

Of the 899 men for whom we have data in this evaluation, 540 (61%) have program completion data, were unambiguously ordered to the program and were deemed appropriate to the program. Of these 540 men, 413 (76.5%) completed the program. It is useful to ask whether there are variables associated with program completion. Among the personal characteristics in the literature associated with dropping out from batterer programs, and for which we have at least some form of data in this evaluation are: younger age, less education, unemployment, a greater history of arrest, growing up in a violent family, substance abuse, and emotional/personality problems. In addition to these variables, we want to examine race and income as predictors of completion. We also want to explore the relationship between program completion and intake staff ratings of response reliability, accountability, motivation, and time 1 competency. The values of an expanded list of these descriptors for completers and non-completers are listed in Table 7.

⁴ The fourth experimental batterer program study was the SanDiego Navy experiment (Dunford, 2000) but this study is not comparable because it has a very aberrant population: all the men were employed, married, and free of any alcohol or drug problems.

TABLE 7
 MEAN (STANDARD DEVIATION) OR PROPORTION OF BIP COMPLETERS AND NON-COMPLETERS ON KEY VARIABLES

	<u>Did Not Complete Program</u>	<u>Completed Program</u>	<u>Test of Difference</u> ⁵
N	137	413	
<u>Demographics</u>			
Age (yrs)	34.9 (10.3)	35.4 (9.7)	ns
Highest Education			ns
Less than High School (%)	29 %	25%	
High School (%)	59	58	
Technical School (%)	5	4	
College (%)	7	10	
> College (%)	1	3	
Education Years	10.0 (4.2)	10.6 (4.1)	ns
Employment			35.6 ***
Retired	1 %	5 %	
Student	1	2	
Unemployed	44	20	
Part Time	11	7	
Full Time	44	71	
Income (month)	\$1,308 (1,802)	\$1,963 (2,502)	3.2 **
Ethnicity			20.4 ***
Asian	0 %	2 %	

⁵ For percentages, difference test is Chi-square. For continuous numbers, differences are evaluated by independent groups t-test

NOTE: * p<.05
 ** p<.01
 *** p<.001

Black	42	26	
Latino	20	34	
White	34	35	
Other	4	2	
<u>Domestic Violence</u>			
Father Hit Mother	24 %	19 %	ns
Mother Hit Father	12 %	9 %	ns
Victim of Parental Violence	15 %	14 %	ns
Psychological abuse (PMWI)	22.5 (6.1)	22.3 (6.5)	ns
Physical abuse (CTS)	6.1 (12.3)	5.1 (8.2)	ns
Severe physical abuse (CTS-S)	1.8 (7.5)	.8 (1.7)	ns
Injury index (CTS-I)	.7 (1.1)	.6 (1.0)	ns
Times police called (DV)	2.6 (3.7)	1.9 (2.8)	ns
Battery charges (DV)	1.3 (2.0)	1.2 (1.1)	ns
Threats or verbal assault charges (DV)	.4 (2.6)	.3 (1.7)	ns
Complainant has OOP (%)	71 %	70 %	ns
Violation of OOP (%)	17	10	6.0 *
Total DV charges (LEADS)	1.6 (1.6)	1.2 (1.3)	ns
<u>Other Criminal Information</u>			
Total Interpersonal Violence Charges (LEADS)	1.6 (2.2)	.7 (1.4)	3.18 **
Total Other Charges (LEADS)	3.1 (4.3)	1.3 (2.5)	4.25 ***
Total Alcohol/Drug Charges (LEADS)	1.0 (1.6)	.5 (1.0)	4.44 ***
Total Arrests (LEADS)	6.6 (6.8)	3.2 (4.1)	5.24 ***
<u>Staff Ratings</u>			
Motivation to change			ns
Pre-contemplative	24 %	28 %	
Preparatory	28	30	
Active	47	41	
Maintenance	1	1	

Accepts responsibility for violence			ns
Denies violence occurred	10 %	14 %	
Not responsible for violence	27	28	
Partially responsible	35	34	
Accepts responsibility	27	25	
Reliability of man's answers			ns
None	1	3	
Low	27	28	
Moderate	61	60	
High	11	10	
Competency 1 st Month	13.1 (4.1)	13.6 (4.3)	ns
<u>Mental Health</u>			
Prior MH/AOD Inpatient (%)	9 %	9 %	ns
Current Feeling (1-10)	7.5 (2.0)	7.6 (2.1)	ns
Childhood Conduct Disorder Indicator (%)	65 %	56 %	ns
Primitive Psychological Defenses (BPO-P)	19.5 (7.5)	18.1 (6.9)	2.04 *
Trauma (TSC-33)	8.4 (9.3)	9.6 (9.8)	ns
Dissociation	.9 (1.7)	1.3 (1.9)	ns
Anxiety	1.6 (2.1)	1.9 (2.4)	ns
Sex Trauma	1.1 (1.9)	1.2 (1.8)	ns
Depression	3.0 (3.6)	3.3 (3.5)	ns
Sleep	2.1 (2.5)	2.0 (2.2)	ns
Trait Anger (TAS)	14.5 (.3)	15.1 (.3)	ns
<u>Alcohol/Drugs</u>			
30-day frequency alcohol used	4.6 (6.9)	3.3 (4.9)	2.08 *
Daily quantity alcohol	4.1 (4.7)	3.3 (4.3)	ns
30-day quantity frequency index	31.0 (106.2)	16.2 (31.8)	ns
Days marijuana/hashish last year	16.4 (66.8)	7.6 (40.8)	ns
Days cocaine crack last year	.4 (2.5)	1.2 (12.6)	ns
Drug Days past year	16.8 (66.9)	11.2 (66.4)	ns
Have drug problem (Self report %)	8 %	3 %	3.9 *

Drinking & DV Co-Occur			ns
Denies Violence	6 %	8 %	
Never	35	42	
Not often	39	31	
Half the time	10	8	
Often	4	3	
Always	7	8	
Alcoholism (CAGE)	1.1 (1.3)	1.0 (1.2)	n.s.
Alcohol/Drug Abuse Probable (%)	42 %	39 %	n.s.

As we see in Table 7, not completing a batterer program in this sample is associated with income, self-reported drug abuse, frequency of alcohol use, primitive psychological defenses, prior arrests, ethnicity, and employment. These findings are, for the most part, consistent with previous findings on completion of batterers program. In order to understand the most important independent correlates, we used logistic regression techniques to model program completion, with the significantly associated variables above as predictors. For this model, we omit income due to multicollinearity problems with the employment dummy variables. This logistic model is in Table 8.

TABLE 8
LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODEL OF PROGRAM COMPLETION

	B	SE	Wald	Odds Ratio
Part Time	.17	.45	.15	1.19
Full Time	1.25	.28	18.71	3.49 ***
Other Employment	1.32	1.12	1.38	3.75
Black	.23	.31	.58	1.26
Latino	.65	.34	4.68	1.92 §
Violation of OOP	- .94	.37	6.46	.39 *
Interpersonal Violence Charges	- .05	.13	.17	.94
Total Alcohol/Drug Charges	- .02	.14	.03	.97
Total Other Charges	- .00	.11	.00	.99
Total Arrests	- .00	.10	.59	.92
Primitive Defenses	- .00	.01	.10	1.00
Alcohol Frequency	- .04	.02	3.84	.96 §
Self Reported Drug Problem	.25	.59	.18	1.29

Note: Referent for ethnicity categories is CAUCASIAN; Referent for employment categories is UNEMPLOYED

Note: Asian and Other Ethnic groups both removed from table display due to small sample size

Note: §p=.05 * p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

The logistic regression model suggests that a self-reported previous violation of an order of protection reduces the odds of completing a batterers program by 61%, while full time employment, compared to unemployment, more than triples the odds of completing a batterer program. Two variables are marginal predictors of program completion: being Latino nearly doubles the chances a man will complete a program, while the frequency of alcohol use reduces completion odds by 4%.

These results are consistent with previous studies of program drop-outs which also found under-employment and personality disorders associated with dropping out. The “stake in

conformity” hypothesis (Feder & Forde, 2000; Toby, 1957) is partially supported in this study. Latinos have been found to be more compliant in a variety of domains, and this study is no exception. Likewise, a full time job is the best independent predictor of program completion. If free time were the operative factor in program compliance—batterers often state that they don’t have time to attend the programs—we would expect unemployed men to be more compliant, but this has rarely been the case and it is not the case here.

The frequency of prior arrests have an association with non-completion, but it is a violation of an order of protection which reduces the odds of program completion. This finding adds additional support to the emergent suggestion that prior offenders, serious offenders, or injurious offenders may do better with an intensive level of supervision and intervention early in batterer programs (Gondolf, 2002).

2. Behavioral Changes

As we suggested earlier, analyzing behavioral change data in this evaluation is a “bad news-good news” situation. The bad news is that we have only 136 cases of followup data, and 67 cases for which we have both baseline and followup data. The good news is that available data suggest no significant difference in key measures between these men and the other men in our sample. Analysis of 136 or 67 cases provides little more than thumbnail sketches of factors associated with staff-rated behavioral change, but such analysis may provoke discussion which will result in changes to data collection procedures.

Analysis of competency turns out to be simpler than we expected. Only two variables correlate weakly with competency at time 2: the number of LEADS arrests for interpersonal violence ($r = -.21, n=118, p<.05$) and LEADS total arrests ($r = -.18, n=118, p<.05$). Change in competency had one weak correlate, the sleep disorder index from the Trauma Severity Checklist ($r = .27, n=64, p<.05$). However, with such small correlations following numerous statistical tests, we must be cautious about concluding that competency is actually correlated with arrests or sleep problems. It

is not unlikely that these correlations have occurred by chance. Additional analyses will not be conducted without additional data.

3. Re-Arrest for Domestic Violence

Of the 847 men in our research sample for whom we have arrest data, 183 (21.6%) have been arrested for domestic violence since their intake into the Social Service Department of the Circuit Court of Cook County an average of 3.4 years earlier. The 21.6% DV recidivism figure includes 589 men whose cases are closed and 258 men whose cases were open at the time we accessed the PROMIS data. Table 9 breaks these differing recidivism rates down according to case status.

TABLE 9
DV RECIDIVISM RATES BY CASE STATUS

<u>Case Status</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Re-Arrested</u>	<u>DV Recidivism</u>
Closed, BIP Completed	384	59	15.4 %
Closed, BIP Not Completed	119	43	36.1 %
Closed, BIP Never Ordered	66	10	15.2 %
Closed, BIP Inappropriate	20	4	20.0 %
Open	258	67	26.0 %

Two case status lines in Table 9 require clarification: *Closed, BIP Never Ordered* and *Open*. The questions that are raised by a cursory inspection of these categories are (1) Is *Closed, BIP Never Ordered* a natural control group for *Closed, BIP Completed*? and (2) How can *Open* cases be so high in recidivism? The answer to question 1 is no, *Closed, BIP Never Ordered* cannot be compared to *Closed, BIP Completed*. We do not know anything about the conditions under which these cases were never ordered. We briefly explored the differences between Not Ordered and Ordered men,

and found the Not Ordered group to be, on average: higher in monthly income, lower in marijuana but higher in cocaine use, lower in psychological trauma, older, less violent, and less likely to be married. The biggest difference, however, was ethnicity: men not ordered to batterer programs were almost twice as likely to be white (60% v. 34%). For these reasons, we will not be analyzing this group further, although this group would make a very interesting sub-group for future study.

But why are cases still under supervision so highly recidivate? There are two reasons. First, this number includes both future completers and future dropouts. Second, it has been well over a year, on average, since these cases were opened. This is the recidivism we would expect for aggregated open and closed cases after a year.

The recidivism analysis most likely to result in a useable result is a comparison of men who have been re-arrested v. men who have not been re-arrested as a function of whether or not they have completed a batterer program. This analysis will represent the classic quasi-experimental design comparing treatment completers with non-completers while controlling for pre-treatment differences. Before we reach this step, however, we need to identify those variables which may differentiate arrested and non-arrested men. Following that analysis, we will regress recidivism on those differences in two steps: first entering the control variables, and second, entering the completion variable. In Table 10, we begin to cull control variables by listing the values of our key variables for men who have been re-arrested for domestic violence and men who have not been re-arrested. We will use as many cases as we have available to identify these control variables.

TABLE 10

MEAN (STANDARD DEVIATION) OR PROPORTION OF KEY VARIABLES FOR NO ARREST V. ARREST

	No Re-Arrest For DV	DV Re-Arrest	Test of Difference ⁶
N	664	183	
<u>Demographics</u>			
Age (yrs)	35.7 (10.1)	32.9 (8.6)	3.5 ***
Highest Education			ns
Less than High School (%)	26 %	33 %	
High School (%)	58	57	
Technical School (%)	5	5	
College (%)	10	4	
> College (%)	2	1	
Education Years	10.1 (4.3)	10.2 (3.9)	ns

⁶ For percentages, difference test is Chi-square. For continuous numbers, differences are evaluated by independent groups t-test

NOTE: * p<.05
 ** p<.01
 *** p<.001

Employment			10.6 *
Retired	2 %	1 %	
Student	1	2	
Unemployed	29	41	
Part Time	9	8	
Full Time	59	48	
Income	\$1,732 (2,348)	\$1,360 (1,905)	ns
Ethnicity			ns
Asian	2 %	1 %	
Black	33	37	
Latino	29	27	
White	33	32	
Other	4	3	
<u>Domestic Violence</u>			
Father Hit Mother	22 %	24 %	ns
Mother Hit Father	11 %	12 %	ns
Victim of Parental Violence	15 %	12 %	ns
Psychological abuse (PMWI)	22.2 (6.6)	22.4 (6.1)	ns
Physical abuse (CTS)	5.2 (8.4)	6.6 (12.9)	ns
Severe physical abuse (CTS-S)	1.1 (3.8)	1.8 (6.7)	ns
Injury index (CTS-I)	.7 (1.1)	.7 (1.1)	ns
Times police called (DV)	2.1 (2.9)	2.1 (2.6)	ns
Battery charges (DV)	1.3 (1.3)	1.2 (1.0)	ns
Threats or verbal assault charges (DV)	.3 (1.8)	.2 (.5)	ns
Complainant has OOP (%)	28 %	30 %	ns

Violation of OOP (%)	10 %	13 %	ns
Total DV charges (LEADS)	1.2 (1.2)	1.8 (1.8)	3.8 ***
<u>Other Criminal Information</u>			
Total Interpersonal Violence Charges	.8 (1.6)	1.5 (2.2)	4.1 ***
Total Other Charges (LEADS)	1.8 (4.0)	3.3 (4.7)	3.9 ***
Total Alcohol/Drug Charges (LEADS)	.6 (1.2)	1.1 (1.9)	3.7 ***
Total Arrests (LEADS)	4.0 (5.6)	6.9 (7.5)	4.9 ***
<u>Staff Ratings</u>			
Motivation to change			ns
Pre-contemplative	29 %	23 %	
Preparatory	29	33	
Active	41	44	
Maintenance	1	1	
Accepts responsibility for violence			ns
Denies violence occurred	14 %	11 %	
Not responsible for violence	28	32	
Partially responsible	35	35	
Accepts responsibility	23	22	
Reliability of man's answers			ns
None	2 %	3 %	
Low	30	32	
Moderate	60	56	
High	8	9	
Competency at Month 1	13.2 (4.2)	14.1 (4.7)	ns

Mental Health

Prior MH/AOD Inpatient (%)	10 %	11 %	ns
Current Feeling (1-10)	7.6 (2.1)	7.8 (2.0)	ns
Childhood Conduct Disorder Indicator	59 %	62 %	ns
Primitive Psychological Defenses (BPO-P)	18.7 (7.2)	18.9 (7.5)	ns
Trauma (TSC-33)	9.1 (9.6)	8.7 (9.7)	ns
Dissociation	1.2 (1.9)	1.2 (1.9)	ns
Anxiety	1.7 (2.3)	1.7 (2.6)	ns
Sex Trauma	1.1 (1.8)	1.1 (1.7)	ns
Depression	3.2(3.5)	2.9 (3.4)	ns
Sleep	2.0 (2.3)	2.0 (2.3)	ns
Trait Anger (LN)	2.7 (.3)	2.7 (.3)	ns

Alcohol/Drugs

30-day frequency alcohol used	3.5 (5.4)	4.7 (6.7)	2.2 *
Daily quantity alcohol	3.2 (4.1)	3.9(3.8)	ns
30-day quantity x frequency index	18.3 (48.9)	28.7 (80.9)	ns
Days marijuana/hashish last year	9.7 (45.5)	15.5 (54.4)	ns
Days cocaine crack last year	1.7 (15.9)	4.3 (31.8)	ns
Have drug problem (Self report %)	5 %	8 %	ns

Drinking & DV Co-Occur			ns
Denies Violence	9 %	6%	
Never	42	32	
Not often	30	35	
Half the time	9	11	
Often	3	4	
Always	7	12	
Alcoholism (CAGE)	1.0 (1.3)	1.2 (1.3)	2.2 *
Alcohol/Drug Abuse Probable (%)	40 %	48%	ns

Note:

BPO-P = Borderline Personality Orientation–Primitive Defenses Subscale
CAGE = Cut Down, Anger, Guilt, Eyeopener
CTS = Conflict Tactic Scale–Revised
CTS-S = Conflict Tactic Scale–Revised–Severe Abuse Subscale
CTS-I = Conflict Tactic Scale–Revised–Injury Subscale
DV = Domestic Violence
LEADS = Law Enforcement Agencies Data System
MH/AOD = Mental Health/Alcohol and Other Drugs
OOP = Order Of Protection
PMWI = Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory
TAS = Trait Anger Sub-Scale of the State-Trait Anger Scale
TSC-33 = Trauma Severity Index – 33-item Version

As we see in Table 10, re-arrest for domestic violence is predicted by being younger, employment, number of prior arrests, frequency of alcohol use, and CAGE alcoholism score.

We now create two logistic regression models of re-arrest. In the first model, we enter age, employment (referent variable unemployed), total prior arrests, frequency of alcohol use, and CAGE score. Pre-intake interpersonal violence, substance use and other arrests were excluded from the analysis to reduce the risk of multicollinearity. In the second model we added program completion to see whether it could capture any unique variance. If the batterer intervention system in Cook County is effective, the relationship between program completion and re-arrest should remain significant when other variables found to correlate with re-arrest are statistically controlled. Our method is compromised, however, by missing data. The two models are, of necessity, based on different numbers of cases, so comparisons should be made cautiously. These logistic models are displayed in Table 11.

TABLE 11
 LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODELS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RE-ARREST

	Model 1 N=591				Model 2 N=354			
	B	SE	Wald	Odds Ratio	B	SE	Wald	Odds Ratio
Age	-.03	.01	12.87	.96 ***	-.04	.01	9.77	.95 ***
Other Employment (0/1)	-.07	.73	.01	.92	-.29	1.17	.06	.74
Employed Part Time (0/1)	-.31	.37	.70	.73	-.75	.59	1.62	.47
Employed Full Time (0/1)	-.35	.21	2.68	.70	-.25	.31	.63	.77
Total DV Charges	.05	.07	.58	1.05	-.03	.12	.09	.75
Total Arrests	.02	.01	2.18	1.02	.03	.03	1.23	.26
Frequency alcohol used	.04	.01	7.05	1.04 **	.04	.02	3.55	1.04
CAGE	.18	.07	5.83	1.20 *	.20	.10	3.43	1.22
Program completion (0/1)	—	—	—	—	-.99	.29	11.69	.37 ***

Note: Referent for employment categories is UNEMPLOYED
 Note: * p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

As we see from Table 11, program completion reduced the likelihood of re-arrest by 63 percent. This is consistent with the CDC-funded Multi-site study of 840 batterers in four established programs which found that program completion reduced the likelihood of partner-reported re-assault by 44 to 64 percent (Gondolf, 2002). In that same study, using a combined recidivism indicator of either partner report or re-arrest, the re-offense rate for men completing at least 2 months of a BIP was 36%, compared to a recidivism rate of 55% for program dropouts. The estimated effect of the batterer program in that Multi-site study was, therefore, 19%. In our study, the effect of completing a batterer program in Cook County is 36.1% minus 15.4%, or 20.5% . Also comparable are our risk reduction rate of 63% compared to the Multi-site study range of 44% to 64%.

The net effect of the batterer intervention system is 20.5%, but is that a large effect? In order to estimate the relative effect size so it is comparable with other interventions, we use the mean number of DV re-arrests for completers ($M=.18$, $SD=.45$) and non-completers ($M=.53$, $SD=.87$) and the formula for Cohen's d [$(M_{NC} - M_C) / SD_{NC}$], which in this case is 0.40. According to Cohen (1988), this corresponds to a medium effect size. As a second estimate of effect size for program completion on arrest, we use the dichotomous recidivism rates of 36.1% for non-completers and 15.4% for completers. Dichotomous effect sizes are estimated by $H = [\cos^{-1}(1 - p_1) - \cos^{-1}(1 - p_2)]$ where p_1 and p_2 are proportions (.361 and .154). This results in an estimated effect size $H=.31$, predictably smaller than the .40 effect size for a continuous number like arrests, but still in the .30-.49 range Cohen (1988) describes as moderate or medium in size.

In summary, completing a batterer program in the Cook County system reduces the chance of re-arrest for domestic violence by 63%, controlling for age, employment, prior arrest, and alcohol abuse. This is a statistically significant and moderately large effect for program completion on re-arrest.

IX. CONCLUSIONS

In this report we have estimated the effects of the batterer intervention system in Cook County, Illinois. Immediate elements of this system include the Social Service Department of the Circuit Court of Cook County and 30 community-based batterer intervention programs. In addition to the batterer intervention programs, there are other elements of the Cook County system which should be identified, even though the current study is unable to estimate the effect of their role. These other system elements include the law enforcement system, other elements of the court, and the victim service agencies. The latter of these elements—shelters, walk-in centers, and advocacy organizations—require special attention, although their role in batterer intervention systems are often undervalued. If these services to the victims of violence were unavailable (as they have been in the past) and if the criminal justice system made violence against partners a marginally-criminal family matter (as it has in the past), then the effectiveness of batterer intervention programs would probably be minimal (if they existed at all, which they did not). Criminal justice policy would be well served if it promoted research which could account for the multiple components of coordinated community intervention systems. This is a much more complicated research project than the one reported in this paper. Use of clustered and community-level variables at different ecological levels requires better preparation, better measurement, better analysis, and ultimately, much more money. We believe the benefits would far outweigh these costs.

We are intrigued that one in five men who might batter again *may be* prevented from doing so by the batterer intervention system in Cook County. The fact that both the effects and the effect sizes for our findings are on the same order as those of the Multi-site study is interesting for several reasons. The Multi-site study use four well established batterer intervention programs, all of which had been in existence for at least 20 years; this is not the case in our study. The Multi-site study used a much more accurate, difficult—and some would say dangerous—method of collecting recidivism data: victim report; our study used only arrest. The convergence of outcomes for these two studies suggest not only that batterer intervention systems have a moderate effect, but also suggests that the

effects may not be a function of individual programs which comprise the system as much as the system itself.

X. REFERENCES

- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders IV (DSM-IV)*, Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association Press.
- Bersani, C.A., & Chen, H. (1988). Sociological perspectives in family violence. In V. Van Hasselt & R. Morrison (Ed), et al. *Handbook of family violence*. (pp. 57-86). New York: Plenum Press.
- Briere, J., & Runtz, M. (1989). The Trauma Symptom Checklist (TSC-33): Early data on a new scale. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 4, 151-163.
- Cadsky, O., Hanson, R.K., Crawford, M., & Lalonde, C. (1996). Attrition from a male batterer treatment program: Client-treatment congruence and lifestyle instability. *Violence and Victims*, 11, 51-64.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Daley, J.E., Power, T.G., & Gondolf, E.W. (2001). Predictors of batterer program attendance. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16, 971-991.
- DeHart, D.D., Kennerly, R.J., Burke, L.K., Follingstad, D.R. (1999). Predictors of attrition in a treatment program for battering men. *Journal of Family Violence*, 14, 19-34.
- DeMaris, Alfred. (1989). Attrition in batterers' counseling: The role of social and demographic factors. *Social Service Review* pp. 142-154.
- Dunford, F.W. (2000). The San Diego Navy Experiment: An assessment of interventions for men who assault their wives. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 68, 468-476.
- Hamberger, L. Kevin & Hastings, James. (1989). Counseling male spouse abusers: Characteristics of treatment completers and dropouts. *Violence and Victims*, 4, 275-286.
- Fagan, J (1995). *The criminalization of domestic violence: Promises and limits*. Paper presented at the 1995 Conference on Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation, National Institute of Justice. Available at <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/crimdom.pdf>

- Feder, L., & Forde, D.R. (2000). *A test of the efficacy of court-mandated counseling for domestic violence offenders: The Broward experiment*. National Institute of Justice.
- Gondolf, E.W. (1995). Discharge criteria for batterer programs. Unpublished paper, available at <http://www.mincava.umn.edu/papers/gondolf/discharg.htm>
- Gondolf, E.W. (1999). MCMI Results for Batterer Program Participants in Four Cities: Less 'Pathological' Than Expected. *Journal of Family Violence*, 14, 1-17
- Gondolf, E.W. (2002). *Batterer intervention systems*. Thousand oaks, CA: Sage Press
- Grusznski, Roger & Carrillo, Thomas. (1988). Who completes batterer's treatment groups? An empirical investigation. *Journal of Family Violence*, 3, 141-150.
- Illinois Department of Human Services (2002). *Illinois protocol for partner abuse intervention programs*. Springfield, IL.
- Mayfield D, McLeod G, Hall P (1974). The CAGE questionnaire: Validation of a new alcoholism screening instrument. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 131, 1121-1123.
- Oldham, J., Clarkin, J., Appelbaum, A., Carr, A., Kernberg, P., Lotterman, A., & Haas, G. (1985). A self-report instrument for Borderline Personality Organization. In T. H. McGlashan (Ed.), *The Borderline: Current empirical research* (pp. 1-18). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
- Palmer, S.E., Brown, R.A., & Barrera, M.E. (1992). Group treatment program for abusive husbands: Long term evaluation. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 62, 276-283.
- Pirog-Good, M., & Stets, J. (1986). Programs for abusers: Who drops out and what can be done? *Response*, 9, 17-19.
- Saunders, D. & Parker, J. (1989). Legal sanctions and treatment follow-through among men who batter: A multivariate analysis. *Social Work Research and Abstracts*, 25, 21-29.
- Spielberger, C.D., Jacobs, G., Russell, S., & Crane, R. (1983). Assessment of anger: The State-Trait Anger Scale. In J.N. Butcher & C.D. Spielberger (Eds.) *Advances in personality assessment*, Vol. 2, [pp. 159-187] Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The revised Conflict Tactics Scales(CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues, 17*, 283–316.
- Taylor, B.G., Davis, R.C., & Maxwell, C.D. (2001). The effects of a group batterer treatment program, Brooklyn. *Justice Quarterly, 18*, 170-201
- Toby, J. (1957). Social disorganization and stakes in conformity: Complimentary factors in the predatory behavior of hoodlums. *Journal of Criminal Law Criminology, and Political Science, 48*, 12-17.
- Tolman, R.M. (1989). The development of a measure of psychological maltreatment of women by their male partners. *Violence and Victims, 4*, 159-177.

APPENDIX 1

CHARGE CATEGORIES

Domestic Violence Charges (4)

AGGRAVATED DOMESTIC BATTERY
DOMESTIC BATTERY
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ACT
INTERFERE REPORT DOMESTIC VIOL
STALKING
VIOLATE ORDER PROTECTION

Other Interpersonal Violence Charges (64)

AGG BATTERY W/ FIREARM
AGG BATTERY/POLICE OFF/FIREMAN
AGG CRIM SEX ABUSE/ VIC 13-16
AGG CRIM SEX ASSAULT/FELONY
AGG CRIM SEX ASSLT/BODILY HARM
AGG CRIM SEX ASSLT/VICTIM <13
AGG CRIM SEXUAL ASSAULT/WEAPON
AGG CRIMINAL SEXUAL ABUSE
AGG CRIMINAL SEXUAL ASSAULT
AGGR BATTERY/GREAT BODILY HARM
AGGR BATTERY/PUBLIC PLACE'
AGGRAVATED ARSON
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT
AGGRAVATED BATTERY
AGGRAVATED BATTERY OF CHILD
AGGRAVATED BATTERY/VICTIM>60
AGGRAVATED BATTERY/WEAPON

AGGRAVATED KIDNAPING
AGGRAVATED ROBBERY
AGGRAVATED STALKING
AGGRAVATED UNLAWFUL RESTRAINT
AGGRAVATED UUW/ON PERSON
AGGRAVATED VEHICLE HIGHJACKING
AGGRVTD ASSLT DISCHARGE F/ARM
ARMED ROBBERY
ARMED ROBBERY/ARMED W/FIREARM
ARMED ROBBERY/DISCH F/ARM/HARM
ARMED VIOLENCE
AGGRAVATED DISCHARGE FIREARM
ARSON
ASSAULT
ATTEMPT
BATTERY
BATTERY UNBORN CHILD
BATTERY/BODILY HARM
CRIM SEX ASLT/VICTIM 13-17
CRIM SEXUAL ABUSE/CANT CONSENT
CRIMINAL SEX ABUSE/VICTIM 9-16
CRIMINAL SEXUAL ABUSE
CRIMINAL SEXUAL ASSAULT
CRIMINAL SEXUAL ASSAULT/FAMILY
CRIML SEXUAL ABUSE/FORCE
DEVIATE SEXUAL ASSAULT

DISARMING A PEACE OFFICER
DISCLOSE CHILD ABUSE REPORT
HATE CRIME
HOME INVASION/ARMED/FORCE
HOME INVASION/DIS FIREARM/HARM
INTIMIDATION
INV MANSLGHTR/RECKLSS HOMICIDE
KIDNAPING
MOB ACTION
MURDER
RAPE
AGG CRUELTY TO ANIMALS
AGG DISCHARGE OF FIREARM
AGG FLEEING OR ELUDING OFFICER
AGG UNLAW USE WEAPON/VEHICLE
AGG VEH HIJACK/DISC F/ARM/HARM
AGGR FALSE PERSONATION/POLICE
AGGRAVATED FLEEING POLICE
AGGRAVATED IVC FELONIES
CRUELTY TO ANIMALS
ENDANGER CHILD/CAUSE DEATH
ENDANGER LIFE OF CHILD
ENDANGER LIFE/HEALTH CHILD
HOME INVASION
INDECENT LIBERTY-CHILD
AGGRAVATED BATTERY/PREG PERS
CHILD ABDUCTION
CONT SEX DELINQUENCY OF CHILD
CRIM NEGLECT OF ELDERLY
RITUAL MUTILATION
CHILD ABANDONMENT

Other Crime Charges (219)

ARREST BY PEACE OFFICER
ARREST NOT REPORTED
AVOID TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE
BRIBERY
BURGLARY
BUYER NO FOID CARD
C/R/S REGISTRATION
CARRY/POSS CONCEALED WEAPON
CARRY/POSS FIREARM IN PUBLIC
CARRY/POSSESS FIREARM
CHARGE NOT REPORTED
CHARGE UNSPECIFIED
CHILD LABOR LAW VIOLATION
COND DISCH VIOLATION
CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT FRAUD
CONTEMPT OF COURT
CONTRIBUTING DELINQUENCY MINOR
CRIM DAMAGE TO FIRE EQUIPMENT
CRIM TRESP STATE LAND
CRIMINAL DAMAGE PROPERTY/FIRE
CRIMINAL DAMAGE STATE PROPERTY
CRIMINAL DAMAGE TO PROPERTY
CRIMINAL DEFACEMENT
CRIMINAL DEFACEMENT/PROPERTY
CRIMINAL TRESPASS BUILDING
CRIMINAL TRESPASS TO LAND
CRIMINAL TRESPASS TO RESIDENCE
CRIMINAL TRESPASS VEHICLE
CRIMINAL TRESPASS TO STATE LAND
CRIMINAL TRESPASS/REMAIN ON LAND

CURFEW VIOLATION	FAIL PAY FINE/DEFAULT
DECEPTIVE ADVERTISING	FAIL REPORT CHANGE OF ADDRESS
DECEPTIVE PRACTICE	FAIL SECURE NEW REGISTRATION
DECEPTIVE PRACTICES	FAIL TO GIVE AID OR INFORM
DEFACE FIREARM ID MARKINGS	FAIL TO GIVE SIGNAL
DEFACING ID MARKS FIREARMS	FAIL TO REPORT ACC TO POLICE
DEFECTIVE SIDE/REAR/WINDSHIELD	FAILURE TO CARRY PROOF/INSUR
DEFRAUD TELECOMM SERVICE	FALSE AFFIDAVIT
DISOBEY TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE	FALSE AFFIDAVT/DRIVERS LICENSE
DISOBEY TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNAL	FALSE ALARM/AMBULANCE
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	FALSE PERSONATION
DISREGARD STOP SIGN	FALSE PERSONATION OF POLICE
DRAG RACING	FALSE REPORT OF OFFENSE
DRIV LIC REVOKED OR SUSPENDED	FALSE REPORTING
DRIVE MOTORCYCLE W/O HEADLAMPS	FALSE STATE ID
DRIVERS LICENSE NOT ON PERSON	FINANCIAL ID THEFT
DRIVING IN WRONG LANE	FLEEING POLICE
DRIVING ON SUSP/REVOKD LICENSE	FOID I D CARDS
DRIVING ONLY ONE HEADLAMP	FOLLOWING TOO CLOSELY
DRIVING REVOKED/SUSPENDED 2ND+	FORGED ILL IDENTIFICATION CARD
DRIVING W/SUSP LIC	FORGERY
ELUDE POLICE OFFICER	GAMBLING
EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENT VIOL	HARBORING RUNAWAY
ESCAPE FROM DEPT OF CORRECTION	ILLEGAL LANE USAGE
ESCAPE/FELON	ILLEGAL PASSING ON RIGHT
ESCAPE/NO RETURN FROM FURLOUGH	ILLEGAL POSS AMMUNITION/FOID
ESCAPE/PEACE OFFICER	ILLEGAL POSS TRNSP LIQUOR
FAIL KEEP RECORD OF TRANSFER	ILLEGAL POSS WEAPON BY FELON
FAIL NOTFY ADDRESS/NAME CHNGE	ILLEGAL POSS/TRNSP LIQ--DRIVER
FAIL NOTIFY DAMAGE/UNATTND VEH	ILLEGAL POSS/TRNSP LIQ--PASSGR
FAIL NOTIFY SOS ADDRESS CHANGE	ILLEGAL POSSESS/USE OF AIR RIF

ILLEGAL TURN	NO DRIVERS LICENSE/PERMIT
ILLEGAL USE FIREWORKS	NO INSURANCE--OPER UNDER SUSPN
IMP OVERT RIGHT/DROVE OFF ROAD	NO RESTRAINT/CHILD 4 BUT NOT 1
IMPERSONATING MEMBER	NO SAFTY GLASS
IMPROPER DISPLAY LICENSE PLATE	NO SEAT BELTS
IMPROPER EQUIPMENT	NO VALID REGISTRATION
IMPROPER LANE USAGE,LANED RDW	NOT WEARING SEAT BELT
IMPROPER PARKING ON ROADWAY	OBST WNDSHLD OR FR/SIDE WINDOW
IMPROPER SIGNAL	OBSTRUCTING JUSTICE
IMPROPER TURN AT INTERSECTION	OBSTRUCTING SERVICE OF PROCESS
IMPROPER U-TURN/ROADWAY	OFFICIAL MISCONDUCT
IMPROPER USE REGISTR OR TITLE	OPER VE WHEN REGIST REVOK SUSP
IMPROPR OVERTAKING 2-WHEEL VEH	ORDINANCE
INDUCEMENT TO SUICIDE	PAROLE VIOLATION
INSTITUTION VANDALISM	PATRONIZING PROSTITUTE
INSURANCE--FALSE INSURNCE CARD	PEDESTRIAN UNDER INFLUENCE
INSURANCE--OPERATE UNINSURED	PERJURY
INSURANCE FRAUD	PIMPING
ITERFERE W/EMERGENCY COMM	PLATE/PERMIT DISPLAY VIOLATION
INTERFERE W/TELECOMMUNICATIONS	POSS CANC/SUSP/REV LICNS/PERMT
ISSUANCE OF WARRANT	POSSESS EXPL/INCENDIARY DEVICE
IVC FELONIES	POSSESS FIREARM/INVALID FOID
IVC MISDEMEANORS	POSSESS FRAUDULENT ID CARD
KEEP GAMBLING PLACE	POSSESSION OF BURGLARY TOOLS
KNOWINGLY DAMAGE PROPERTY	RECKLESS CONDUCT
LEAVE SCENE ACC DEATH INJURY	RECKLESS DAMAGE TO PROPERTY
LEAVE SCENE ACC VEHICLE DAMAGE	RECKLESS DRIVING
LITTERING	REFUSE TO PROVIDE SUPPORT
MISREPRESENTATION AGE BY MINOR	REGISTRATION EXPIRATION
MISUSE CREDIT CARD	RESIDENTIAL BURGLARY
MUFFLER DEFECTS NO MUFFLER	RESIST PEACE OFFICER

RESIST/OBSTRUCT OFFICER	TOO FAST FOR CONDITIONS SPEED
RESISTING/OBSTRUCTING OFFICER	TRAFFIC--ILLINOIS VEHICLE CODE
RETAIL THEFT	TRAFFIC CONTROL VIOL
ROBBERY	TRANSMISSION OBSCENE MESSAGE
SELL AIR RIFLE TO CHLD	TRESPASS TO RESIDENCE
SELL CONSP UNDER 18	UNAUTHORIZED VIDEOTAPING
SEX OFFENDER REGISTRANT	UNIFORM NARCOTIC DRUG ACT
SIGNAL LIGHT EQUIP	UNL SALE FIREARM BEFORE 72 HRS
SOLICITATION	UNLAU USE HEAD/AUXILIARY LAMPS
SOLICITATION OF A SEXUAL ACT	UNLAW POSS FIREARM/HANDGUN<18
SOLICITING FOR A PROSTITUTE	UNLAW POSSESS WEAPON BY FELON
SOLICITING FOR BUSINESS ON HWY	UNLAW USE INTOX COMP
SOLICITING FOR PROSTITUTE	UNLAW USE OF WEAPON/TEAR GAS
SOLICITATION OF SEXUAL ACT	UNLAWFUL POSS FIREARMS
SPEEDING	UNLAWFUL RESTRAINT
SPEEDING 40+ MILES OVER LIMIT	UNLAWFUL USE OF LICENSE PERMI
SPEEDING OVER STATUTORY LIMIT	UNLAWFUL USE OF WEAPON
STATE BENEFITS FRAUD	UNLAWFUL USE OF WEAPONS
STOP/YIELD SIGN VIOLATION	UNLAWFUL WINDOW PEEPING
SYNDICATED GAMBLING	UNSAFE OPENING OF VEH DOORS
TELEPHONE HARASSMENT	UNSPECIFIED STATUTE
THEFT	USE CREDIT CARD OF ANOTHER
THEFT BY DECEPTION	VEHICLE BUMPER - P.A. 78-436
THEFT LABOR/SERVICES	VEHICULAR INVASION
THEFT LOST/MISLAY PROPERTY	VIOL BAIL BOND/FAMILY MEMBER
THEFT/ COIN MACHINE	VIOL PROB/COND DIS/SUPERVISION
THEFT/COIN MACHINE	VIOL SEX OFFENDER REGISTRATION
THEFT/DECEPTION	VIOL/ORDER
THEFT/STOLEN	VIOLATE LIGHTS & LAMPS ACT
TITLE/REG-FELONIES	VIOLATE OWNER DUTY TO ANIMALS
TITLE/REG POSSESSION OFFENSES	VIOLATION BAIL BOND

VIOLATION ILLINOIS ID CARD ACT
VIOLATION OF CLASS 1ST DIV
WRONG SIDE OF WAY-DIVIDED ROAD

Drug-Related Charge (57)

VIOLATION LIQUOR CONTROL ACT
AGGRAVATED DUI
CANNABIS TRAFFICKING
CONTRBAND IN PENAL INSTITUTION
CONTRLLD SUBSTANCE TRAFFICKING
DRUG PARAPHERNALIA
DRUG PARAPHERNALIA SALE
DUI ALCOHOL/DRUGS
DUI/ALCOHOL
DUI/DRUGS
DUI/LICENSE SUSPENDED/REVOKED
ILLEG POSS PRESCRIPTION FORMS
LIQUOR SALES OR POSSESSION
MAN/DEL 100<400 GR COCAIN/ANLG
MAN/DEL 15/+ GM HEROIN/ANALOG
MAN/DEL 15<100 GR COCAINE/ANAL
MAN/DEL CANN 10<30 GRAM/SCHOOL
MAN/DEL CANN 2.5<10 GR/SCHOOL
MAN/DEL CANN MORE 500 GM
MAN/DEL CANNABIS
MAN/DEL CONTROL SUBSTANCES
MAN/DEL OTHER AMOUNT SCHED II
MAN/DEV 01-15 GM COCAIN/ANALOG
MANF AND DELIV CANNABIS
MANF/DEL CANNABIS < 2.5 GRAMS
MANF/DEL CANNABIS/10-30 GRAMS

MANF/DEL CANNABIS/2.5-10 GRAMS
MANF/DEL CANNABIS/30-500 GRAMS
MANU/DEL SCHOOL PROPERTY
MFG/DEL CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES
MISC CONTROL SUBS VIOL
POSS. DRUG PARAPHERNALIA
POSSESS 10+ GRAMS LSD/ANALOG
POSSESS 100<400 GRAM COCAINE
POSSESS 15 + GRAMS COCAINE
POSSESS 15 OR + GRAMS HEROIN
POSSESS 15<100 GRAMS COCAINE
POSSESS 15<100 GRAMS HEROIN
POSSESS ANABOLIC STEROID
POSSESS CANNABIS
POSSESS DRUG PARAPHERNALIA
POSSESSION CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE
POSSESSION CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE
POSSESSION CONTROLLED SUB
POSSESSION LIQUOR BY MINOR
POSSESSION NARCOTIC INSTRUMENT
POSSESSION OF CANNABIS
POSSESSION/STORAGE WEAPONS
PROSTITUTION
PUBLIC INDECENCY
PUBLIC INDECENCY/LEWD EXPOSURE
PUBLIC INDECENCY/SEX
PURCHASE FIREARM/FALSE INFO
SALE CANNABIS-CONSP
SALE OF CANN UNDER 18
SALE/EXCHANGE SYRINGE

APPENDIX 2

OFFENDER ASSESSMENT TOOL

APPENDIX 3

PROGRAM COMPLETION CRITERIA

Abuser Services Committee
Cook County Family Violence Coordinating Council

Name _____

Completion Criteria

Date: _____

For each item, put an "X" in the box which corresponds to the rating you are giving. Note that criteria #8 and 9 have a different scale. Add comments to justify your ratings.

Criteria 1-7

- 1- Poor: Rarely or never meets criteria
- 2- Needs: Improvement: Meets criteria less than half the time
- 3- Acceptable: Meets criteria the majority of the time
- 4- Good: Meets criteria almost all of the time

Criteria 8 & 9

- 1- Does not meet criteria
- 2- Meets criteria
- N/A- Not applicable

	1	2	3	4	Comments
1. Participant actively participates in group. Indicators: attends group on time, sober, attentive; makes appropriate eye contact; exhibits respectful manner					
2. Demonstrates an understanding of the benefits of an egalitarian relationship. Indicators: homework assignments; client self-reports; victim contacts					
3. Takes responsibility for his abusive behavior and its consequences. Indicators: no minimizing, blaming, or excusing; identifies how he contributes to problem					
4. Demonstrates knowledge about and understanding of abuse. Indicators: homework, discussion of concepts; using learned vocabulary; identifying forms of abuse and control he has used.					
5. Uses skills and techniques learned in group, both within group and by self report about conduct outside the group. Indicators: reveals feelings, fears, struggles, self doubts; no evasions, sarcasm, defensiveness; takes conscious steps to avoid violence; uses time outs, self talk, conflict resolution; aware of beliefs, emotions, behaviors that lead to violence; acknowledges his own power and control needs					
6. Completes all program requirements. Indicators: homework assignments, required number of weeks, pays all fees					
7. Demonstrates use of respectful language regarding his partner and women. Indicators: use of partner's first name; no sexist language, name calling, stereotypes					
8. No non-confidential reports of any recent violent or abusive behaviors. Indicators: self-explanatory					
9. Has followed through on necessary mental health and substance abuse assessments and treatment. Indicators: reports from service providers					

Participant's Signature: _____

Facilitators Signature: _____

Please Note: Successful completion of a Partner Abuse Intervention Project does not guarantee that this client will remain non-violent