A Conceptual Framework for Measuring Criminal Justice Success in Responding to Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) Crimes:

Dataset Inventory

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT | MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS INITIATIVE

JRSA
Justice Research and Statistics Association

Table of Contents

Purpose

The *Measuring Success in the Criminal Justice System's Response to Domestic/Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, and Stalking* pilot project was commissioned by the U.S. Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) to research, pilot, evaluate, and recommend outcome measures that OVW grantees can use to measure the success of law enforcement's (LE) response to domestic/dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking (VAWA crimes).[1] A full description of that project, including the conceptual model that guides the work, can be found in the final Conceptual Framework report. During the course of the project, the research team identified several key research questions that would lend precision and insight to high priority concepts which are outlined in a separate research agenda.

This dataset inventory **provides an orientation to national and local data sources** that OVW grantee sites engaged in law enforcement response activities might **use to supplement their own data reporting**, or that researchers and OVW could use to **explore and track national trends** related to these programs:[2]

- Supplement performance data reported to OVW;

- Answer important local or national research questions about the impacts of VAWA-funded programs on crime incidence and improving victim well-being; and,

- To understand important contextual factors that may impact these two objectives.

---

[1] In particular, this project focuses on identifying appropriate outcomes for *Improving Criminal Justice Responses to Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, and Stalking Grant Program (ICJR)*; the *Rural Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, and Stalking Program (Rural)*; and the *Tribal Governments Program (TG)*.

[2] In some instances, sites engaged in law enforcement activities may need an evaluator/researcher to assist with these undertakings.

Methods

The project team began our search by focusing on publicly available datasets on crime, victimization, and attitudes and perceptions about the criminal justice system's response to VAWA crimes, which include domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and teen dating violence. Once the team identified a dataset was identified, they reviewed its accompanying codebooks, user's manuals, reports, and publications to assess the dataset's applicability to evaluating VAWA-funded programs.

The research team identified national datasets on federal agency websites that are used to produce national estimates of crime, victimization, and other criminal justice outcomes. The supporting documents were gathered from searches of the National Archives of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD). For data not available from a national source, such as prosecutorial outcomes, the team examined a convenience sample of state and local law enforcement, prosecutor, and victim service provider websites to ascertain what types of information might be available; this search was not exhaustive, but was intended to represent the types of data that local grantees might also be able to find in their jurisdictions.

Finally, the project team investigated sources of data on related VAWA program outcomes, such as domestic violence shelter usage and other data sources outside the criminal justice system. Each of these categories is covered below.

This Dataset Inventory supports the final Conceptual Framework. Throughout this document we reference two additional accompanying reports: the Literature Review and Research Agenda.

Types of Available Data Sets

Many sources of data exist that can be used to measure the effectiveness of VAWA-funded law enforcement programs. However, measures of effectiveness included in national data tend to focus on law enforcement activities and not necessarily on positive victim outcomes that may to result from these activities. While changes in metrics like calls for service and arrests are often stated goals for VAWA-funded programs, as are more "downstream" objectives like increased prosecutions, data from sources focused on victimization, reporting decisions, or perceptions of safety help supplement traditional law enforcement data and provide more context for those traditional outcomes.

Below, we begin by discussing traditional administrative crime data before moving on to discuss victimization surveys, available prosecution and courts data, perceptual measures of safety and law enforcement, and shelter use data.

We also assess the applicability of self-reported offending data, program and training evaluation data, and law enforcement culture data.

Lastly, we review data sources that were assessed, but found inadequate, before making recommendations about the utility of using the various datasets by grantees seeking more evidence of program effectiveness. They may also be recommended by OVW for use in research evaluate national trends in VAWA crimes; see the accompanying Research Agenda developed for this project.

Federal Law Enforcement Data

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) compiles data submitted by law enforcement agencies from across the country to its Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program. The primary data collections that comprise the UCR program are the Summary Reporting System (SRS) and the National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS). We will separately discuss the strengths, weaknesses, and status of these data collections below.

UCR: Summary Reporting System (SRS)

The SRS was conceived in 1929 as a central repository for reliable crime statistics for the nation. Local law enforcement agencies (LEAs) and states began compiling their crime data and sending in summary information (aggregate counts of each required crime type) to the FBI. The FBI was responsible for collecting, publishing, and archiving these crime data for the nation. LEAs collected data on incidents known to police and arrests for Part I offenses (murder and non-negligent manslaughter, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, arson, and human trafficking) and Part II offenses (less severe violent, property, and public order offenses). Most VAWA crimes, such as IPV or stalking, fell under "less serious" Part II offenses since they are more often classified as misdemeanors than felonies.

The SRS remained largely unchanged for the entire period (1929-2020), including many of the same crime classifications introduced nine decades ago. Changes to the primary SRS data collection over time included the addition of arson and human trafficking to the Part I crime category and, most recently, changes to the definition of rape in 2012 to include other violations in addition to force vaginal penetration. In addition to information on Part I and Part II offenses, the SRS also collected separate, more detailed supplemental data on homicide, human trafficking, cargo theft, and hate crimes at regular intervals.

All LEAs in the United States (approximately 18,000) are eligible to submit their crime data to the FBI, but participation is voluntary (whether SRS or NIBRS, discussed below). Most of the 18,000 agencies participated in the SRS reporting program. Typically, LEAs submitted monthly counts of applicable crime data to state UCR repositories, who then curated it and submitted it to the FBI. The FBI compiled the SRS data received and used it to produce annual national estimates of crime in the US. In addition, SRS data were used to compile crime statistics at the regional, state and agency levels. SRS data has been the main source of crime information at national, regional, state, and local levels for scholars, policy makers, media, and the general public since its inception.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Given its long history and relative consistency, SRS data had unique strengths in terms of measuring trends in VAWA crime prevalence. Because SRS data were collected and reported to the public annually by the FBI, data users can get a snapshot of crime levels in the US, individual states, and specific jurisdictions for each year covered by the SRS (1929-2020). Moreover, since SRS data collection remained largely unchanged for decades, analysis of long-term crime trends is possible. The broad coverage of agencies from a wide range of settings rendered the SRS particularly useful for generating representative estimates of crime.

While standard SRS data and reports provide some statistics on offenders, the supplemental reports on homicide, human trafficking, and assaults of law enforcement officers dove deeper into data about victims and offenders that were unavailable for most other offense types in the SRS. Of particular interest to OVW and local grantees would be the Supplemental Homicide Reports (SHRs) that collected data on homicides involving violence against women since their launch in 1961.

However, while the SRS has been the primary source of crime data for nine decades, it is not without its shortcomings. Paramount among them is the fact that the FBI stopped accepting traditional summary data starting January 1, 2021. Now, they accept only NIBRS (incident-based data, described below) from states, leaving gaps in the ability to look at trends in crime spanning the two reporting systems because not all law enforcement agencies have converted to NIBRS collection and reporting. Given the inherent difficulties in switching data collection and reporting systems and the challenges law enforcement have faced during the COVID-19 pandemic, many agencies missed the proposed cutover date. Data from agencies unable to switch to NIBRS in time will not be included in national crime estimates until they convert their systems and practices, which could result in undercounts of VAWA crimes.

Secondly, reporting UCR data to the FBI is voluntary, which can lead to missing data. While nearly 16,000 of the 18,000 law enforcement agencies have annually reported at least some of their SRS data to the FBI in 2020, for example, agencies could choose not to report their data to their state repositories or the FBI for any given month. If agencies lapse in reporting, or choose to not report at all, it can affect estimates of trends in offenses over time. Estimates also rely on the accuracy of these voluntary reports. The FBI imputes missing data where possible to try to fill these gaps, but if there is not a sufficient number of months reported annually for a given agency, these estimates will not be accurate.

Thirdly, the VAWA crimes counted in the SRS data and their definitions have remained more or less the same for 90 years with the exception of rape, which was updated in 2012. However, the nature of how crimes are committed, and the number of crimes defined in statutory law, have changed over that time. Street crime was the most common focus when most crimes were defined for the UCR in 1929. Now, VAWA crimes may occur using the Internet and/or may include financial abuse, stalking, doxing, and more. Furthermore, state and local laws defining various crimes can differ. Therefore, local and state data on many crimes must be transformed to meet federal definitions before it is reported, which could result in misrepresentation of the number of offenses that occurred, especially for less serious or less traditional crimes.

Two other characteristics of SRS data impact estimates about the amount and types of VAWA crimes committed: 1) the SRS hierarchy rule and 2) the inherent inclusion only of crimes that were reported to police. The hierarchy rule in the SRS dictates that only the most serious offense committed in a criminal incident is counted in SRS statistics. Less serious crimes occurring as part of the same criminal event, often Part II or misdemeanor offenses, were therefore not counted toward agency, state, or national crime statistics generated from SRS data. For example, in a rape-homicide incident, only the homicide would be reported. Missing data may also be a problem with the SHRs, as some cases may be misclassified if homicides reported did not note that related crimes like domestic violence were also involved. Furthermore, many jurisdictions or states did not file the supplementary SHRs at all (Gelles, 2000).

Because the UCR only includes crimes that were reported to the police, it misses offenses that were not reported. Reasons why victims may not report crimes are discussed in the accompanying Literature Review for this project (e.g., mistrust of law enforcement, fear of reprisal, belief that crime is too trivial to report, shame). Finally, crime disposition (whether the crime was cleared by any means) was collected only for Part I offenses, while only arrest information was collected for Part II offenses, which is where most VAWA crimes fall. All crime reports, with the exception of special reports on homicide and other offenses, included information on the total number of reports and/or arrests for given offense types, but lacked important details about offenders, victims, and incidents.

Applicability to OVW-funded Programs

The aforementioned strengths and weaknesses apply to SRS data generally. However, using SRS data to measure VAWA program outcomes, particularly whether VAWA crime rates have decreased during time periods prior to 2021, introduces a separate but related set of considerations. The SRS contains in-depth data on few VAWA offenses; in particular, rape is the only VAWA crime included in Type I offenses where reports to the police and arrests are both captured. However, because the federal definition of rape changed in 2012, it is difficult to accurately examine changes in rape over long periods of time. While clearance rates, or the percentage of crimes known to police that result in arrest or exceptional clearance (discussed in the literature review), can be calculated for rape, such estimates are unavailable for Part II VAWA crimes as only arrests are reported.

Given that most VAWA crimes are characterized as Part II crimes and rank lower on the FBI's offense hierarchy list, the SRS hierarchy rule would exclude many such offenses from official statistics when they co-occur with other offenses further up the hierarchy of severity. NIBRS, however, includes information on all offenses committed within each incident—thus doing away with the hierarchy rule altogether. Recent analyses comparing available SRS and NIBRS data suggest that 10.6% of SRS incidents included multiple offenses. Besides the fact that NIBRS data is the only data accepted by the FBI now, the advantages of NIBRS over the SRS are discussed below.

UCR: National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS)

The FBI introduced NIBRS data collection to the UCR in 1989 to help improve the overall quality of crime data. Specifically, NIBRS captures all offenses within a criminal incident, along with a greater level of detail about each. Many characteristics of the SRS data collection are shared by NIBRS, such as voluntary agency participation and monthly submission of crime reports to state repositories, who report then report it to the FBI. Of the approximately 15,000 UCR-reporting law enforcement agencies across the United States, 63% are contributing to NIBRS. As of March 2022, 19 states fully report NIBRS data compared to 31 states with partial NIBRS reporting. The FBI has prioritized the nationwide implementation of NIBRS because it can provide more detailed statistics with respect to crime, which would promote greater constructive discussion, measured planning, and informed policing.

Strengths and Weaknesses

NIBRS extends the SRS data collection to provide a more complete picture of crime in reporting agencies, which is particularly valuable for understanding trends in VAWA crimes that can be underrepresented in the SRS data. First, instead of submitting summary crime counts for a limited number of crimes, NIBRS agencies submit incident-level data for 71 specific offenses in 28 "Group A" offense categories. Incident-level crime data also includes more nuanced information about victims, offenders, and other offense characteristics than traditional SRS data. Agencies also submit arrest data from 13 additional "Group B" offenses, which are general reporting categories and do not require specific offense codes for the individual offenses that may fall into a given Group B category.[3] Several Group B offenses fall under reporting code 90Z, "all other offenses," and the incident detail reported via other data elements provides the context. Second, NIBRS does not adhere to the hierarchy rule, instead including characteristics for each of up to 10 offenses committed as part of a single incident, which may provide a more accurate count of total crimes—and VAWA crimes—within a jurisdiction.

In addition to the above strengths, NIBRS also includes information on whether crimes were cleared, and by which means. Whereas the SRS groups all clearance types together, NIBRS differentiates between crimes cleared by arrest from those cleared by exceptional means (e.g., death of the offender, prosecutor declined to charge the offender, victim refusal to cooperate, or denial of extradition from a different jurisdiction). The ability to differentiate between clearance types allows for a more detailed analysis of how officers clear VAWA crimes, which could measure of how seriously police are taking VAWA crimes. For example, officer attitudes toward what constitutes "real rape" can impact decisions about which evidence to collect and whether to clear an incident via investigation and then arrest, or by exceptional means (Richards, Tillyer, & Wright, 2019). Changes in such attitudes may be reflected in increases in VAWA case clearances, which would make NIBRS data a useful source here because higher case clearance rates are associated with higher levels of community trust in, and cooperation with, the criminal justice system.

---

[3] See https://www.fbi.gov/file-repository/ucr/ucr-2019-1-nibrs-user-manual.pdf/ for more detail.

Moreover, decreases in prosecutor declinations could indicate increased prosecutor belief that they will be able to convict VAWA offenses, controlling for other factors influencing prosecutorial discretion or confidence in getting a conviction such as judges' attitudes and beliefs , among others.

While NIBRS improves upon the SRS as mentioned above, there are shortcomings associated with NIBRS data as well. The SRS collected annual data from approximately 15,900 of the 18,000+ law enforcement agencies across the US in 2020. But, while the number of NIBRS-reporting agencies has increased each year, just 9,880 agencies submitted NIBRS data to the FBI as of 2020 (62.1% of the agencies that previously reported SRS)[4] and most of the largest police agencies still have not made the transition (McCormack, Pattavina, & Tracy, 2017). Smaller and Southern agencies are overrepresented in the data, while Western jurisdictions are underrepresented (McCormack, Pattavina, & Tracy, 2017). Participation in NIBRS remains voluntary and participation from year to year is not consistent. Since participation in NIBRS is not yet at a national level, nor are agencies representative of the nation, it is not possible to easily use NIBRS for national trends in VAWA and other crimes, although BJS is working on methodology to do so. Nevertheless, NIBRS has been used to examine national trends, such as arrest patterns, since the passage of various reauthorizations of VAWA legislation (Wyma-Bradley, 2019). However, NIBRS could still be used to examine trends by local agencies who have submitted NIBRS data for a period of time.[5]

Applicability to OVW-funded Programs

NIBRS data offer participating VAWA-funded agencies several potential outcome measures beyond those offered by the SRS. First, with NIBRS it is possible to select a broader range of offenses that fall under the VAWA umbrella that may have been ignored under the SRS hierarchy rule and may provide a clearer picture of crime in jurisdictions. Second, the expanded set of offender, victim, victim-offender relationship (Hirschel, McCormack, & Buzawa, 2021), and incident characteristics allow for deeper analysis of crimes that involve intimate partners or other crimes covered by VAWA. For example, one robust study examined predictors of sexual assault case attrition by combining NIBRS data (case clearance by arrest or exceptional means, charges filed, and unfinished case statuses including "continuing investigation" or "unfounded") with case verdict information (convicted, acquitted, or dismissed) from prosecutor case files and qualitative interviews (Morabito, Williams, and Pattavina, 2019). Outcome measures captured in NIBRS may therefore be useful to illustrate changes in broader law enforcement activities, but should be combined with other local data if used by grantees to measure victim decision making processes that impact local crime statistics.

However, in summary, each police agency (grantee) can use the NIBRS format as a guide for looking at

---

[4] https://www.fbi.gov/news/pressrel/press-releases/fbi-releases-2020-incident-based-data
[5] The following link may be used to ascertain whether any grantee law enforcement agency currently reports NIBRS or SRS crime data: https://crime-data-explorer.fr.cloud.gov.

their own case data and assessing their own VAWA program results. The National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) provides a more representative dataset for national or regional VAWA crime estimates, as described below. In terms of useful outcome measures in UCR data (both SRS and NIBRS) that grantees and OVW might find of interest, the following SRS and NIBRS measures rise to the surface:

- Arrests (may indicate *increased victim safety or increased offender accountability*):

  - NIBRS captures all offenses that were part of an incident.
  - SRS captured only the most serious offense, so VAWA crimes may be underreported in SRS data.
  - Supplemental Homicide Reports (SHRs) also have incident level victim-offender data, with detail about VAWA-underlying factors.
  - Changes in counts of VAWA crimes may indicate *increases or decreases in occurrence*, although victimization surveys provide better data for this as they also include crimes not reported to police (see below). What appears as an increase in incidences in UCR data may also indicate an *increase in trust in the police* if greater proportions of those experiencing victimization are reporting.

- Clearance rates (by arrest or exceptional clearance):

  - NIBRS gives reason for exceptional clearance. These data can be used to track reductions in the use of exceptional clearances, which may reflect *changes in law enforcement and prosecutor attitudes and beliefs* about VAWA crimes.
  - Case clearance data can also be used to measure changes in victim attrition. Victim attrition is one of the reasons for exceptional clearance, and reductions in attrition may reflect *increased trust in the police, perceptions of procedural justice*, and/or *increased trust in the justice system*. NIBRS data could be combined with local data to examine which underlying factor is captured by this measure in a given jurisdiction.

Victimization Surveys

National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS)

The National Crime Victimization Survey is a nationally representative household survey conducted annually by BJS. The NCVS was designed in 1972 as a response to concerns with the UCR, specifically: that the SRS is a summary only of crime reported to police; that SRS statistics were susceptible to manipulation and misinformation; and that the SRS lacks sufficient information on victims, victimization, and offenders needed to develop effective crime policy. The NCVS helps provide information on the "dark figure of crime" and needed data on victims, offenders, and victim experiences.

All sampled household members aged 12 and above are surveyed in the NCVS about their victimization experiences in the previous six months, including VAWA crime victimizations. Households remain in the sample for seven interview cycles, regardless of whether the original respondents reside in the same household, in order to maintain the same general representation across socioeconomic status (SES) and geographic location. The Census Bureau administers the NCVS on behalf of the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and selects households from the primary sampling units (PSUs) in the United States census.

The ultimate goal is to select a sample that, when aggregated to the national level, represents the demographics of the US. Household response rates for the NCVS have historically been above 80%; however, recent response rates have mirrored declining response rates for household surveys in general. In 2018, the household response rate for the NCVS was 73%. Availability of NCVS data for public access lags survey administration times by about a year in order to allow for data cleaning and verification.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The NCVS asks respondents about their victimization experiences with personal and property crimes. Personal VAWA crime categories include rape, sexual assault, IPV-related aggravated assault, simple assaults, verbal threats of violence, and others. Property crime categories include household burglary, motor vehicle theft, and property theft. The general crime categories correspond with those reported by law enforcement agencies in the SRS, which allows for comparisons of these datasets to gain an understanding of the total amount of crime in the United States and the amount of crime that goes unreported. The NCVS contains

a larger list of crimes within those categories that is more comparable to NIBRS, and it also captures whether an offense was committed using internet technology, for example. The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2018) offers an extensive discussion of these characteristics.

The NCVS's present question structure includes behaviorally-focused language that corresponds to FBI offense definitions without expecting the respondent to know those definitions. For example, questions about sexual assault victimization ask respondents if they have been forced or coerced to participate in unwanted sexual activity in a way that aligns with the FBI definition of rape, but without assuming that all respondents hold the same definition of the word "rape." This also avoids the complications introduced by variations between local jurisdictions in defining these crimes.

Since the NCVS is a household survey, the Census Bureau and BJS can solicit additional information about each victimization incident. Similar to NIBRS, the NCVS collects a broad range of information about victims, offenders, and criminal incidents which allows for detailed analysis (Xie & Lynch, 2016).[6] For each victimization reported, the NCVS also asks *whether the victim reported* the crime to law enforcement or other authorities and the reasons why they did or did not report; this is one of the most common subjects for which researchers have used NCVS data (e.g., Cho & Wilke, 2005; Addington, 2008). Such measures can help elucidate why differences in NCVS and UCR estimates of crime exist. Moreover, reporting measures included in the NCVS may also serve as an indicator of national trends in *trust in the criminal justice system generally or trust in how the criminal justice system handles specific types of crimes*. For example, low victim reporting rates of VAWA crimes could suggest a lack of trust in the justice system.

Importantly, UCR measures crimes per capita (per 100,000 persons) whereas the NCVS counts crimes per household (per 1,000 households). Therefore, the crime rates that are estimated from each source differ (due to the unit of analysis as well as rates of victim reporting to police). Some other methodological concerns with the NCVS and/or victim surveys include the telescoping effect (distortions in memory about when an event happened as time progresses), memory issues that can impact participant description of offender characteristics, and failing to include persons not in fixed households (individuals experiencing homelessness or who live in congregate facilities).

Applicability to OVW-funded Programs

NCVS data are not well suited for local estimates. The national focus of the NCVS limits its usefulness for understanding the local trends in crime and associated outcomes to help shape local policy decisions.[7] BJS has recognized the increasing need for such local crime estimates, however, and has made significant progress on projects to produce more accurate subnational estimates—including revising their sampling methods. While studies into the feasibility of this began in 2013, the process is ongoing.

---

[6] Kruttschnitt, Candace, William D. Kalsbeek, and Carol C. House. (2014) Estimating the Incidence of Rape and Sexual Assault. The National Academies Press, Washington, D.C.

[7] Fay, R.E. and Diallo, M.S. (2015) Developmental Estimates of Subnational Crime Rates Based on the National Crime Victimization Survey. Prepared for the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C.: Westat.

The scope of present methodology developments have so far been useful for large metro areas and states with sufficient populations, and have begun to be generated for at least some rural areas, but subnational estimates using NCVS data are not yet possible at the local police agency (or OVW grantee) level.

While local grantees can also glean some data from NCVS, they might better be served by more local victimization survey information.

Nevertheless, the NCVS is an important instrument used to estimate the true level of crime in the US, and it is a potentially rich source of data for OVW to measure national or regional trends in the handling of VAWA crimes. In addition to incident-level data on reporting decisions, several other outcome trends of interest may also be measured using the NCVS:

- weapon use;
- injuries suffered;
- medical attention received and costs;
- types of self-protection employed;
- property damage and loss information; and,
- employment information, including time and pay lost due to VAWA crime victimization.

Measuring trends in these areas can help to evaluate whether VAWA-funded programming is achieving increased safety for vulnerable populations, harm reduction, and reduced victimization prevalence over time. While still better suited to national estimates at this time, smaller local estimation methods using NCVS data are continually improving.

National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS)

The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS), fielded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), is a nationally representative survey that gathers data on men's and women's experiences of sexual assault, stalking, and intimate partner violence in the US. As an expansion of the former National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS), NISVS solicits information on lifetime and annual prevalence of VAWA crimes and seeks to collect more information about the characteristics and consequences of victimization. In contrast to the NCVS, it focuses exclusively on VAWA-related crimes and takes a public health approach to these problems.

The NISVS is an ongoing nationally representative survey of noninstitutionalized, English- and Spanish-speaking adults ages 18 and older. NISVS utilizes random-digit dial telephone survey technology and includes a dual-frame sampling strategy to capture both landline and cellular telephones. As of the 2016 and 2017 NISVS, a greater proportion of the sample was allocated to cellphones over landlines to better reflect estimates of wireless phone ownership in the United States (71% and 29%, respectively; Kresnow et al., 2021).

The survey is conducted in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. The data can be analyzed at the state and national levels. Given the competing purposes of providing national and state-level estimates, a compromise had to be made in the sampling strategy. The optimum design for generating national-level estimates would use proportionate allocation across states; whereas, an equal allocation across states would be optimal for providing estimates at the state level. The NISVS attempts to strike a balance between these two by stratifying the sample by state, thus creating a balance between having stable state-level estimates and reduced weight variation in national-level estimates from oversampling in less populous states.

Strengths and Weaknesses

An advantage of the updated methodology used by the NISVS is the ability to examine victimization across many subgroups. Beginning in 2010, the NISVS sampled within each state to enable state-level estimates of VAWA crimes, though estimates for smaller areas were not available. However, by 2015, the NISVS reduced its sample size and eliminated the state-specific estimates. The NISVS does, however, include sufficient samples of respondents from unique subgroups often ignored or under-sampled in national surveys, such as members of the military, military spouses, and members of LBGTQ+ communities.

Also, in contrast with the NCVS, the NISVS does not produce annual estimates of victimization. Instead, the NISVS was first fielded in 2010 followed by further surveys every two to three years. Furthermore, methodological changes between the 2010 and 2012 NISVS make trends in lifetime and yearly victimization prevalence rates unreliable.

Much like the NCVS and other national surveys, the NISVS also suffers from lower-than-desired response rates. The NISVS relies on random-digit dialing (RDD) to contact prospective respondents, which is a methodology that has produced declining response rates for years as more people decline to answer calls from numbers they do not recognize (Ghandour et al., 2019). As a result, the NISVS response rate ranged between 26.4% and 33.6% in the three fieldlings of the NISVS. RDD also often misses at risk groups who may not have reliable access to landlines or cell phones. Ultimately, the NISVS methodology does not provide regular annual estimates of the number of VAWA crimes like the NCVS does, instead concentrating on lifetime prevalence.

Similar to other surveys on victimization, NISVS utilizes behaviorally-specific questions to assess for each type of violence, which has been shown to improve respondents' understanding of the questions as well as the accuracy in their responses. Unlike other surveys that collect data on violent victimization, the NISVS begins with a series of health-related questions to establish a health context and build rapport between interviewers and respondents.

There are also important distinctions between the NISVS and NIBRS crime data that are useful for determining which dataset to use for certain questions (Addington & Dixon, 2019). Specifically, the NISVS captures ongoing patterns versus the discrete events captured in NIBRS, but its definitions are broader and not limited by statutory definitions. That is, NIBRS will give more information about incidents while the NISVS will give more information on patterns, offenders, help-seeking victim service usage, and victim/offender relationships (see also Cho, Shamrova, Han, & Levechecko, 2020).

Applicability to OVW-funded Programs

Like NCVS, NISVS data are not well suited for localized estimates. While the NCVS and NISVS can both be used to estimate the prevalence of VAWA crimes, but there are important differences. First, the NISVS does not rely on legal statutes for their definitions. Instead, the public health approach first asks respondents a series of health-related questions to establish the health context for the respondent, and then relies on behaviorally based questions asking about components of sexual and intimate partner violence experiences. Next, analysts use this information to determine whether the behaviors described meet the legal definition for various VAWA crimes (e.g., included force or coercion). Proponents of the public health approach posit that such an approach produces more accurate estimates of crime because it does not depend on respondents knowing the law before responding. The NCVS has also moved in this direction, putting both victim surveys in contrast to law enforcement data.

Similar to the NCVS, the NISVS measures the impacts of VAWA victimization. For example, the NISVS asks victims whether they were concerned for their safety, were fearful of their victimizers, experienced psychological trauma, and experienced physical injury. In addition, victims are also asked whether they discussed their victimizations with police, medical professionals, mental health professionals, crisis hotline operators, or others. Moreover, the NISVS asks victims about types of assistance they received from individuals to whom they disclosed their victimization. Such follow ups can be useful for VAWA programs to track *usage of the services provided* when they are tied to specific incidents.

State Victimization Surveys

Several states have conducted their own victimization surveys (Lugo et al., 2018; Orchowsky et al., 2014). Orchowsky and colleagues (2014) examined a sample of 25 victimization surveys fielded by 14 state Statistical Analysis Centers (SACs), finding varying levels of scope and quality. Seven of these surveys were conducted by mail, while the remainder were conducted by phone or a combination of web-based and phone surveys (including some cellular phones). According to Orchowsky et al., all surveys collected data on individuals rather than households and included individuals ages 18 and older, unless they sampled from lists of valid driver's licenses, in which case individuals as young as 16 were included. This is in contrast with the minimum age of 12 included in the NCVS.

Sample sizes ranged from 200 to 5,508, with average sample sizes of 1,540 for phone surveys and 2,980 for mail surveys and response rates ranged from 9% to 70%. Nine of the 24 state reports resulting from these surveys failed to include response rates. A majority of states modeled their survey instruments after the NCVS or after other states' victimization surveys. At a minimum, all surveys asked about violent crime and property crime, with the exception of those focused only on rape or sexual assault (e.g., Alaska; see Lugo et al., 2018).

Of those reviewed, Illinois's 2002 victimization survey report provided an excellent methodology section (Hiselman, 2005). Arizona's 2013 report gave a detailed explanation of its sampling procedure and how representative the data were of the population (Stevenson, 2013). Wyoming described its weighting procedure, showing before-and-after calculations based on census data (Dorssom, Furgeson, & Lee, 2011). Most SACs, however, could have provided more detail about their sampling and methodologies either in their reports or appendices (Lugo et al., 2018). Work is underway in various states to improve and generate more robust state victimization surveys (Lugo et al., 2018).

While state victimization surveys have varied in coverage and quality, they may still be of use for local grantees who want to get a more detailed look at victimization rates and information in their area than they might glean from the NCVS. Grantees may find it worth investigating whether their state has done a recent survey and the quality of its methodology to answer pressing questions of interest. OVW may be interested in meta-analyses of studies that have used these state-level data to study VAWA crime outcomes already, and in funding future studies using these data to answer important questions.

Court and Prosecutor Data

Court and prosecution data, through which it would be useful to measure downstream outcomes of offender accountability resulting from VAWA-funded improvements in policework, are not as centralized as crime data. Each jurisdiction keeps its own court statistics and does not submit them to any central data collector, and few surveys are conducted that collect these data. Nevertheless, the research team explored some possible sources at the state and local levels to see what utility they offered to OVW grantees.

At the state level, State Court Processing Statistics (SCPS) were collected by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and used to estimate trends in case processing in large urban jurisdictions. Data were taken from a sample of felony court filings during the month of May in even numbered years between 1990 and 2006, and for the last time 2009, in the 75 most populous counties in the United States. Forty counties were selected for each data collection period. This data collection followed felony cases in selected counties from the time when charges were brought through pretrial, case outcomes, and disposition (including deferred adjudication or diversion).

The Cook County State's Attorney website provides an example of the type of local data that could be available for analysis, depending on jurisdiction. Local prosecutor and court case data, when it can be accessed, typically includes information on case participants, charges throughout the length of the case (since they may be added or dropped before disposition), verdict, plea or trial arrangements, disposition, and sentencing that can allow grantees to examine case decisions at each stage of the process. Prosecutor case files also often include the investigation and evidence reports from police.

Strengths and Weaknesses

After BJS found a number of data validity problems, they issued a data advisory before the last SCPS data collection was completed in 2009. BJS has recently funded a new pretrial data collection effort that may be useful when completed, but has not implemented a full case processing statistical collection since 2009.

Public availability of local-level data varies by the elected DA or States Attorney. Some jurisdictions, like Cook County, began publicly posting high-level data in an effort toward transparency with the community. Others posting data publicly may not break these data down by crime type, limiting their use for VAWA program assessment purposes. Other jurisdictions only make statistics available on request, but may share them for program evaluations, as Lexington County, KY's Criminal Justice Domestic Violence Court and Sheriff's Department did for Brame and colleagues (2015) evaluation of the impacts of proactive enforcement of no-contact orders on offender recidivism and victim wellbeing. Two other examples where data were shared for evaluations include the 2nd Judicial District in New Mexico (Broidy, Albright, & Denman, 2016) and Western New York (Cerulli, Edwardsen, Hall, Chan, & Konner, 2015; Cerulli, Kothari, Dichter, Marcus, Kim, Wiley, & Rhodes, 2015). Law enforcement grantees interested in capturing downstream prosecutorial outcomes for VAWA-funded improvements in police initiatives should therefore consult with their local DA's office on the process for accessing useful data.

Applicability to OVW-funded Programs

While the prior completed data collections are not recommended for our current purposes, they do offer insight into data points that could be useful for grantees to collect now in addition to standard local court statistics from their local district attorneys (DAs. In particular, the information collected at that time included types of pretrial diversion programs that may be related to VAWA funding as part of disposition and sentencing, such as batterer intervention programs (program data from those are discussed further below). The level of detail in sentencing collected by the SCPS, including information on jail, prison, probation, community service, fines, restitution, protective orders, electronic monitoring, and diversion program participation would also be extremely useful to collect now to understand changes in sentencing trends for convictions of VAWA crimes.

Other variables of interest include information on the most serious and second most serious charges at arrest and at prosecution. Combined with law enforcement investigation and arrest data, this could be used by grantees to assess the impacts of VAWA-funded activities at the local level, and even more so if grantees could include misdemeanor crimes in addition to the felonies to which the SCPS data are limited.

However, if OVW is interested in historical data, SCPS data could identify changes in pretrial decisions and case outcomes for sexual assault and other VAWA crimes that did receive felony charges, but these data are old and are not useful for small jurisdictions or nationally. For current data, it would even better for local jurisdictions to gather statistics from their local DA offices. Local agencies might also collect data from victim advocates or victim legal services providers in terms of whether advocacy and representation of victims' rights are improved over these time periods.

Gathering data from a large enough sample of courts to identify national trends for OVW will present greater challenges, given the dearth of publicly accessible data and the practicality of securing data-sharing MOUs with enough district attorney's offices across the United States. However, should OVW be interested in undertaking such a process in the future, they might think about working with the Office for Justice Programs to fund a partnership between a research group and a national

Offender Data

As recommended by the project advisory board, we examined types of data that might be available on offender outcomes. Sources explored in addition those above (e.g., investigation, arrest, court, and sentencing data) include surveys that have questions on offending. Some of these surveys are longitudinal and follow the subjects for some time period (e.g., Theobald, Farrington, Coid, and Piquero, 2015). This could especially be useful for programs focusing on teen dating violence and reducing IPV offender recidivism to understand the reasons behind patterns identified. Evaluations of programs like batterer intervention programs may also provide useful information; for example, some programs survey offenders before and after they have completed the program to learn of changes they have experienced as a result of participation.

Applicability to OVW-funded Programs

Sechrist and Weil (2018) used calls for service data, arrest data, local injury data, and offender recidivism data to evaluate a focused deterrence strategy program combatting IPV. To gain a sense of how much an offender's beliefs were changed as a result of VAWA-funded law enforcement programs, routinely collected data may be combined with surveys of such individuals before and after participation—with caution taken to assess how much of an offender's answers were accurate or were affected by social desirability response bias (see Tutty, Babins-Wagner, and Rothery, 2020 and further examples in the literature review). OVW could attempt to collect these data from local grantees, but pilot test participants said these data were part of court records that they could not access.

Shelter Use Data

Another potentially useful outcome for local grantees to capture, as an indicator of *increased victim safety*, is the impact of their VAWA-funded law enforcement programs on shelter use; one such outcome might include trends in referrals to shelters that result from their VAWA-funded activities. There are two well-known sources of national shelter data and numerous "one-off" studies regularly conducted on shelter use.

Of the two well-known and regular national data collections, the most well-established is the annual Domestic Violence Counts report that contains the annual shelter census generated by the National Network for Domestic Violence (NNEDV). This census is a single-day survey that most recently captured 1,669 out of 1,887 identified domestic violence programs in the United States, representing 88% of shelters contacted.[8] Measures captured during this census include the number of individuals accessing each type of service offered (bed nights, referrals, counseling, benefits access, etc.), the number of unmet requests, and the experiences of advocates interacting with survivors.

The Domesticshelters.org Data Center run by Theresa's Fund is another well-known source of shelter data (Domesticshelters.org, 2022). This interactive center of publicly available data collects shelter surveys and state profiles. Currently, out of the 2,869 shelters and programs listed in their database, 954 shelters and programs report their utilization data to the site (a reporting rate of 33%). Measures captured and aggregated at the state level include spending, pet shelter accommodations, number of people using domestic violence shelters, number of people turned away, profile strength (amount of information provided on shelter website and array of services), and "comprehensiveness" of services.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The strengths of a single-day census, as conducted by NNEDV, include the unlikelihood of double-counting the same victim and the use of aggregate data to protect victim safety and confidentiality. State counts are also generated. The use of a single day methodology at the same time each year leaves out possible seasonal changes, though, and it is also not possible to know the reasons for nonparticipation in the survey. Nevertheless, it is one of the most complete sources for national data on this subject and it may be beneficial for local grantees to get similar statistics from local shelter programs that are part of their task forces to note possible changes over time. While it would be difficult to attribute these changes specifically to improvements in police services funded by VAWA, outcomes that might be tracked include an increased number of client referrals to shelters coming from law enforcement and the outcomes for those clients. We would recommend combining that data with other safe housing placements, such as with safe friends or family, or relocation, as placement in a shelter environment may not be desired by every victim.

---

[8] https://nnedv.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/15th-Annual-DV-Counts-Report-National-Summary.pdf

The Domesticshelters.org Data Center provides potentially useful, current data, but their methodology is not clearly defined. It seems to be limited to reviewing what agencies post on their own websites or what they submit to the Theresa's Fund website. However, it could be useful as a starting place to gather information on various provider statistics and to get a snapshot of service utilization in a state or jurisdiction before diving deeper with individual local organizations. On the other hand, as of this writing, spot-checking reveals that information on individual agencies seems to have been updated within the last year.

Applicability to OVW-funded Programs

These two sources can provide some ideas for examining national trends and for local grantees who want to measure impacts on shelter use as a result of their individual programs, potentially as a proxy measure of increasing victim safety. We would advise, however, to combine shelter data with information on placements in other safe environments or relocations to really determine whether VAWA-funded activities are helping victims to reach safety.

Data Sources Explored, but Found Not Useful for These Purposes

During the course of this dataset inventory, several other promising data sources were explored, but found not useful for providing outcome data on VAWA-funded law enforcement or tribal programs at the national or local levels. These included emergency department data and a number of injury and vital statistics data collections administer by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). These are mentioned briefly in Appendix A, which summarizes all the data sources explored in this inventory. While public health data are always of interest as a metric for understanding the ramifications of VAWA crimes, most of these data collections were not useful for our purposes because there are too many other variables that affect the outcomes they capture. These include medical system protocols for dealing with suspected victims of VAWA crimes, the trust of victims in the medical system, whether victims feel safe disclosing to medical providers (for example, whether the abuser is present at the time of an exam), the efforts of victim services providers, and data aggregation and other methodological limitations. While these data may be useful to assess trends in general public health effects of VAWA crime victimization, the project team decided not to recommend these data sources for this project because the effects of individual VAWA-funded law enforcement programs on outcomes cannot be isolated using these data.

Recommended Uses for Various Datasets for VAWA-MEI Law Enforcement Programs

As shown above, various datasets assessed may be useful for grantees and/or for OVW to different degrees, alone or in combination with other sources of data, to assess trends in VAWA crimes and in the achievement of VAWA-funded law enforcement program outcomes.

Appendix A contains a table summarizing all the data sources evaluated, first including those recommended for use or as a basis for outcomes that OVW might ask grantees to report, and then listing the other data sources evaluated, but ultimately not recommended for these purposes. The following section identifies key outcome categories of interest identified by OVW, through the literature review, and via our expert panel and conceptual model process, and describes which of the recommended data sources may provide information useful for assessing trends in those categories at the grantee or national level. We categorize these by important concepts identified by our expert panel and included in our conceptual model. After this, we cite some examples where others have efficaciously combined data sources to answer specific research questions. In the corresponding Research Agenda, we recommend research questions that OVW may consider funding in future solicitations.

Increased Victim Reporting

Data sources that may provide useful information on *rates of victim reporting*, and the *decision-making processes behind reporting*, include the NCVS and NISVS. UCR data (including both SRS and NIBRS) and local police data can show trends in the number of reports they receive on various VAWA crimes from year to year, but the NCVS and NISVS will provide additional context behind incidents that are not reported. Local victim service provider data may also augment this at the grantee level. To expand this outcome category to include the concept of *participation in justice system solutions*, grantees may add measures of case attrition both at the police level and at the prosecution level, where local prosecutor cooperation would need to be secured. SRS and NIBRS can provide additional information on this at the national or regional level, but no similar data aggregation exists that would capture this for prosecutions—especially regarding VAWA offenses regularly charged as misdemeanors.

Increased Victim Safety

We broaden this idea to include victim access to needed resources. A number of items present in this dataset inventory could fall in this category, including *enforcement of protective orders, shelter or other safe placements, offender accountability* (described separately, below), *taking reports seriously, helping victims to increase their own safety planning*, and *reduced victimization incidence*, to name a few. Local courts data can be used to gather information on trends in protective orders along with police data that capture enforcement of violations. The NNEDV annual census provides the best national data on shelter use, but local grantees might do better to collect data from their local shelters and combine that with their own victim advocate data and include information on other safe victim placements and relocations. Taking reports more seriously could be captured by identifying downward trends in both exceptional clearances by police (available locally and in NIBRS data nationally) and in case declinations by prosecutors. NCVS data can be used to capture reductions in weapon use, injuries suffered, medical costs, self-protection used, and jobs lost, for example—particularly at the national level—and NISVS data can further illuminate use of services and mental health and trauma impacts.

Increased Offender Accountability

We broaden this category to include *reduced recidivism, access to offender interventions* such as diversion programs, and measures of such programs' impacts. Offender accountability is most obviously captured via law enforcement data (local and UCR), prosecution statistics (mostly local), and sentencing trends (mostly local court data). This might further be augmented by corrections, probation, and parole data, as well as by surveying offenders participating in diversion programs. Diversion programs were removed from our conceptual model since they fall outside the purview of these grantees, but may still be of interest to the larger field. Offenders that decline such programs and instead choose a more traditional sentencing option might also be surveyed; perhaps aggregated risk assessment results at sentencing and release might be tapped to assess changes over time for those offenders.

Increased Victim Wellbeing

We include *satisfaction with victim services and access to needed resources* in this category. Grantees might collect this information by surveying victims at the local level and through local program evaluations, but national trends might also be examined via the NCVS and NISVS which collect *information* on victim services received by those who report to police and those who do not. Local victim advocates within police departments can also report on service provision or referrals from their records, though victim outcomes after receiving such services are rarely tracked by law enforcement.

Victims' Experiences of Procedural Justice

Procedural justice concepts included in our conceptual model also include measures of trust and increased victim satisfaction with treatment and outcomes. Of the datasets covered here, the NCVS may be of some help for looking at national trends, but for grantees, victim satisfaction surveys conducted by themselves or their partners will be the best measure of whether victims believe they received procedural justice during and after reporting their victimization. Trust may be assessed in the long term, at the local and the national levels, using the above measures of increased victim reporting rates and lower victim attrition rates, though reason for attrition should also be captured as choosing not to engage in justice system solutions may also be an empowered victim decision. Therefore, procedural justice may also include measures of empowerment that results from fair treatment, such as the victim having the agency to make their own participation decisions throughout the prosecution process.. All the above caveats around those measures still stand.

Prevention of VAWA Crimes

Prevention is an area mentioned by our Advisory Board, but that was not incorporated into the final conceptual model. However, it is worthy of a mention here as programs often state prevention as a goal. Prevention is extremely difficult to measure, as it is not possible to count an event that did not happen. However, decreases in crime rates (using local police data, UCR data, NCVS data, and NISVS data, and even some public health data sources otherwise rejected but still listed in Appendix A) may offer some insights on whether VAWA crime incidence is increasing or decreasing. However, it will be difficult to use these data to tease out how much of a change in incidence is due to VAWA-funded programs, although the presence of other programs also in effect at the same time may be used as control variables in any such study.

Data Vizualization Tools

Many of the data uses recommended herein may be difficult for grantees to handle on their own, as few grantees and law enforcement agencies have dedicated researchers, and even fewer have dedicated researchers with the time to run long-term, big data projects. As described in the conceptual framework report, one key recommendation is to make resources available to grantees to increase their data and analysis capacity. However, it should be noted that there are several tools provided by BJS and the FBI to assist local agencies with quickly creating tables from large national datasets with little effort, and they bear mentioning here.

BJS provides several analysis tools to generate tables from the NCVS, corrections statistics, juvenile justice databases, and state prison recidivism—the link to access these is provided below in the footnote. A new tool is also in development for easy visualizations using NIBRS data. These tools allow grantees to input the parameters they want and then the tools will run the tables or visualizations for them. These are useful for quick summary tables that grantees can use for decision making, or to supplement what they report to VAWA-MEI.

The FBI also provides the Crime Data Explorer tool, which has similar functionality, which allows users to run tables that draw on SRS and NIBRS data reported. It should be noted that statistics available from these tools usually lag by about a year, so local data is still best for up-to-the-minute crime data. However, these data analysis and visualization tools could be used easily by grantees to access national data for a number needs while relieving the amount of effort needed to do so. OVW might also use these tools to gain snapshots of important issues on an ad hoc basis for operational or solicitation writing purposes.

Combining Data Sources Effectively to Measure Outcomes

While the applicability of individual data sources to various program outcomes is addressed above, the most powerful use of these data sources is in combination. Three such examples are discussed below that grantees may find useful to consider.

1. Morabito et al. (2019) combined NIBRS data about case clearance, unfinished case statuses, and charges filed with local prosecutorial case files and qualitative interviews to examine predictors of sexual assault case attrition. This combination of data produced a richer picture of attrition patterns than either data source could have provided alone.

2. Wentz (2019) used police reports and court records to examine agreement between police and prosecutor charges, factors leading to charge congruence, and factors leading to arrests of sexual assault offenders. This study analyzed whether victims incurred physical injuries, victim resisting the offender, timely reporting (within 24 hours), weapon use, physical evidence/victim completing rape kit, victim-offender relationship, witnesses, victim risk-taking, offender dangerousness, victim age, and crime seriousness.

3. Cerulli, Kothari, Dichter, Marcus, Kim, Wiley, & Rhodes (2015) triangulated court records for a midwestern county with administrative records from one prosecutor's office, 12 police departments, two criminal courts, one civil court, and eight emergency departments to examine victim satisfaction.

These examples show *how* various data points grantees may be asked to report could be used to gain deeper insight into whether their programs are producing desired impacts. Data that might seem unrelated on the surface can be brought together to create a rich picture of changes occurring, or areas for opportunity and course correction, in a framework of continuous improvement.

---

[9] https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=daa&utm_content=2020inreview&utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery

[10] https://crime-data-explorer.fr.cloud.gov/

Limitations

This dataset inventory has a few limitations that bear mentioning:

First, this inventory was a survey of publicly available datasets, supplemented by inquiries to various local organizations, police and prosecutor agencies, and national professional associations, but it is not exhaustive. While we consulted with our expert panel and others to ensure that key sources were assessed, and then recommended or rejected, there are inevitably possible sources that were still missed.

Second, national and local datasets are notoriously lacking in information on tribal jurisdictions. Programs in tribal jurisdictions are one of the three programs addressed by this project, but no datasets unique to tribal areas were found in public searches. While UCR and other data sources may provide some coverage of these areas, any trend analyses in tribal areas conducted using these data sources should be taken with caution as they do not account for differences in various tribal legal structures from other jurisdictions, cultural considerations, and many other factors that would limit the validity of using these datasets to assess tribal programs beyond some basic statistics. Cultural competency would be needed to interpret what the results of such trend analyses mean in different tribal contexts and vs. non-tribal contexts.

Last Words

This **data set inventory was conducted to assess how existing national, state, and local data might be used to provide information that individual grantees and/or OVW could use to:**

- Supplement performance data reported to OVW;

- Answer important local or national research questions about the impacts of VAWA-funded programs on crime incidence and improving victim wellbeing; and

- To understand important contextual factors that may impact these two objectives.

The recommendations included here are intended to help OVW consider how to use existing data to achieve these objectives, both by supporting the revamping of the VAWA-MEI performance data collections **to move from outputs to outcomes**, and by providing a basis for OVW to fund future research to **support the advancement of VAWA objectives nationally**.

References

Addington, L. A. (2008). *Current issues in victimization research and the NCVS's ability to study them*. Prepared for presentation at the Bureau of Justice Statistics Data User's Workshop. Washington, DC. https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/addington.pdf

Addington, L., & Dixon, E. (2019). *Intimate partner violence involving lesbian, gay and bisexual individuals: A look at national data* [Webinar Slides]. Washington, DC: Center for Victim Research.

Brame, R., Kaukinen, C., Gover, A. R., & Lattimore, P. K. (2015). No-contact orders, victim safety, and offender recidivism in cases of misdemeanor criminal domestic violence: A randomized experiment. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 40*, 225-249.

Broidy, L., Albright, D., & Denman, K. (2016). Deterring future incidents of intimate partner violence: Does type of formal intervention matter? *Violence Against Women, 22*(9), 1113-1133.

Cerulli, C., Edwardsen, E. A., Hall, D., Chan, K. L., & Conner, K. R. (2015). Improving coordinated responses for victims of intimate partner violence: Law enforcement compliance with state-mandated intimate partner violence documentation. *Violence Against Women, 21*(7), 897-907.

Cerulli, C., Kothari, C., Dichter, M., Marcus, S., Kim, T. K., Wiley, J., & Rhodes, K. V. (2015). Help-seeking patterns among women experiencing intimate partner violence: Do they forgo the criminal justice system if their adjudication wishes are not met? *Violence & Victims, 30*(1), 16-31.

Cho, H., Shamrova, D., Han, J.-B., & Levchenko, P. (2020). Patterns of intimate partner violence victimization and survivors' help-seeking. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21*-22, 4558-4582.

Cho, H., & Wilke, D. J. (2005). How has the violence against women act affected the response of the criminal justice system to domestic violence? *J. Soc. & Soc. Welfare, 32*, 125-139.

Criminal Justice Information Services Division (2021). *2021.1 National Incident-Based Reporting System user manua*l. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

Domesticshelters.org (2022). *Data Center*. Retrieved from www.Domesticshelters.org.

Dorssom, M., Furgeson, T., & Lee, J. V. (2011*). Wyoming Crime Victimization Survey*, 2011. Laramie, WY: Wyoming Survey and Analysis Center, University of Wyoming.

Fay, R.E. & Diallo, M.S. (2015) *Developmental Estimates of Subnational Crime Rates Based on the National Crime Victimization Survey*. Prepared for the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C.: Westat.

Federal Bureau of Investigations (2021). *Full report: NIBRS, 2020*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

Gelles, R. J. (2000). Estimating the incidence and prevalence of violence against women national data systems and sources. *Violence Against Women, 6*(7), 784-804.

Ghandour, L. A., El Hayek, G. Y., & Mehio Sibai, A. (2019). Cell phone survey. *Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences*. Springer, Singapore, 1403-1416.Hirschel, D., McCormack, P. D., & Buzawa, E. (2021). A 10-year study of the impact of intimate partner violence primary aggressor laws on single and dual arrest. *Journal of interpersonal violence, 36*(3-4), 1356-1390.

Hiselman, J. R. (2005). *The Extent and Nature of Adult Crime Victimization in Illinois, 2002. A report on the findings from the Illinois Crime Victimization Survey, 2002*. Chicago, IL: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.

Kresnow M, Smith SG, Basile KC, Chen J. The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey: 2016/2017 methodology report. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control; 2021.

Kruttschnitt, C., Kalsbeek, W. D., & House, C. C. (2014). *Estimating the Incidence of Rape and Sexual Assault.* Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Lugo, K. A. (2016). *The ties that bind: A social network analysis of a large gang sex trafficking network in the United States.* Doctoral Dissertation, American University.

Lugo, K., Przybylski, R., Farley, E., Howley, S., Liberman, A., Yahner, J., Dusenbery, M., Ervin, S., Henderson, E., Welsh-Loveman, J., Vasquez-Noriega, C., & Garcia, O. (2018). *Estimating the financial costs of crime victimization*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

McCormack, P. D., Pattavina, A., & Tracy, P. E. (2017). Assessing the coverage and representativeness of the National Incident-Based Reporting System. *Crime & Delinquency, 63*(4), 493–516.

National Network to End Domestic Violence (2021). *15th Annual Domestic Violence Counts Report*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from: https://nnedv.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/15th-Annual-DV-Counts-Report-National-Summary.pdf.

Morabito, M. S., Williams, L. M., & Pattavina, A. (2019). *Decision making in sexual assault cases: Replication research on sexual violence case attrition in the U.S*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from: https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/252689.pdf

Orchowsky, S., Trask, J., & Stabile, R. (2014). *Characteristics of SAC Victimization Surveys*. Washington, DC: Justice Research and Statistics Association. Retrieved from: http://jrsa.org/pubs/reports/sac-victimization-surveys.pdf

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). *Modernizing crime statistics: Report 2: New systems for measuring crime*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Richards, T. N., Tillyer, M. S., & Wright, E. M. (2019). When victims refuse and prosecutors decline: Examining exceptional clearance in sexual assault cases. *Crime & Delinquency, 65*(4), 474-498.

Sechrist, S. M., & Weil, J. D. (2018). Assessing the impact of a focused deterrence strategy to combat intimate partner domestic violence. *Violence Against Women, 24*(3), 243-265.

Stevenson, P. (2013). T*he 2013 Arizona Crime Victimization Survey*. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Criminal Justice Commission.

Theobald, D., Farrington, D. P., Coid, J. W., & Piquero, A. R. (2016). A longitudinal analysis of the criminal careers of intimate partner violence offender subtypes: Results from a prospective survey of males. *Violence and Victims, 31*(6), 999-1020.

Tutty, L. M., Babins-Wagner, R., & Rothery, M. A. (2020). The responsible choices for men IPV offender program: Outcomes and a comparison of court-mandated to non-court-mandated men. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 29*(3), 292-313.

Wentz, E. A. (2019). Funneled through or filtered out: An examination of police and prosecutorial decision-making in adult sexual assault cases. *Violence Against Women, 26*(15-16), 1919-1940.

Wyma-Bradley, A. J. (2019). *The impact of the 2005 reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act on arrest likelihood in rape and sexual assault cases*. MA Thesis, Georgetown University.

Appendix A: Summary of Data Sources Evaluated, with Strengths and Weaknesses[11]

Data Source	Description	Coverage of VAWA Crimes	Strengths	Limitations
Victimization Surveys				
National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS)	National, large-scale survey. Households interviewed every six months for seven intervals.	Violent crime including all VAWA crimes.	Measures victimizations not reported to police annually. Includes sex crimes against both men and women, which UCR does not. Large, nationally representative sample. Captures in-depth detail about every incident identified by the respondent. Is being refined to better facilitate small area estimates and rural victimization patterns. Illuminates the "dark figure of crime." Captures some information on reporting to police and on victim outcomes.	Excludes homicide, victims under 12. Homeless individuals, those living in congregate facilities, and others may also be missed. Respondents may not report victimizations they do not view as a crime. Series incidents (many forms of abuse occur over time) sometimes left out of victimization rate calculations, though recent work has improved this.
State Victimization Surveys	Victimization surveys conducted via a variety of modalities (telephone, in-person, etc.) at the state level.	Similar to NCVS, though VAWA crime types included, and sampling methods can vary by state.	More precise state/local estimates possible due to ability to customize for local circumstances, but still modeled often at least partially on NCVS, facilitating some comparability.	Crime types included and sampling methods can vary by state. Published reports are inconsistent in level of explicitness about methods. Regularity of data collection dependent on funding, which is not consistently available.
National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS)	Regular, national large-scale telephone (landline and cell phone) survey of adult women and men that began in 2010; successor to the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) conducted in the 1990s.	Intimate partner violence, sexual violence, psychological aggression, and stalking: a comprehensive list of violent behaviors is covered.	Public health approach covering many types of violence not covered before in surveys. Estimates rates of victimization among adult women, men, and LGBTQ individuals. Includes non-institutionalized English and/or Spanish speaking persons. Includes a graduated, informed-consent approach and a safety protocol in case interviewee's abuser enters during the interview. Behavior-oriented questions elicited higher disclosure rates and enabled consistency in data reported across states. Collected limited information about offenders. Captures lifetime victimization, victimizations in the last 12 months, and information about adverse health impacts of victimization. Enables national and cross-state comparisons.	Relies on self-report. Estimate generalizability was extrapolated based on census data with sensitivity testing for reliability; not all national or state estimates were shown to be reliable during these tests. Of limited use at the local grantee level as data are not organized by jurisdiction.

---

[11] Parts of this table were previously published in Lugo, Kristina, R. Przybylski, E. Farley, S. Howley, A. Liberman, J. Yahner, M. Dusenbery et al. "Estimating the financial costs of crime victimization." (2018). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Data Source	Description	Coverage of VAWA Crimes	Strengths	Limitations
Crime Data				
Unified Crime Reporting: Summary Reporting System (SRS)	Voluntary report crime data from local law enforcement agencies to FBI. Summary counts.	National. Offenses grouped by seriousness into Parts I and II offenses, only the most serious offense reported for each incident. While some changes have occurred over the years, general classifications unchanged since 1929. Supplemental data collections include Supplementary Homicide Reports (SHRs) and several others.	States are used to reporting SRS statistics. Gives good overall picture of crime in the U.S. SHRs capture incident level, victim-offender data. Covers most states.	FBI no longer accepts summary data as of 12/31/2020. Crimes reported have not changed much since 1929, while the number and nature of different criminal offenses have. Voluntary nature of reporting means that not all 18,000+ U.S. law enforcement agencies report, or do not report every month. Statistics limited to only incidents reported to police. Capturing only the most serious incidents misses other victimizations that may have also occurred (i.e., a homicide that also involved domestic violence). Can be biased based on what victimizations are both reported and recorded. Definitions of some crimes, such as sexual violence-related crimes, often hew to a narrow statutory definition and miss many harms. Does not include sex crimes against men.
Unified Crime Reporting: National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS)	Voluntary report crime data from local law enforcement agencies to FBI. Details on each incident.	National. Began in 1980s. Captures up to 10 offenses per incident, victim and offender characteristics, wider range of crime types.	Far more detail than SRS. Captures all crimes that were part of a single incident (up to 10) – no hierarchy rule to obscure a VAWA crime that may have been part of a homicide, for example. About 1/3 of law enforcement agencies had shifted to NIBRS reporting by 2015; progress remains slow. Captures incident level, victim-offender data. **Can determine whether a grantee has shifted to reporting to NIBRS by checking them in** https://crime-data-explorer.fr.cloud.gov.	Still represents undercounts, since only incidents reported to police are included. Slow uptake – agencies slow to shift from SRS. Same issues with voluntary reporting as SRS. Most large cities in the U.S. do not report NIBRS. Can be biased based on what victimizations are both reported and recorded. Definitions of some crimes, such as sexual violence-related crimes, often hew to a narrow statutory definition and miss many harms. Does not include sex crimes against men.

Data Source	Description	Coverage of VAWA Crimes	Strengths	Limitations
Courts Data				
State Court Processing Statistics	BJS data collection consisting of a sample taken from felony court filings during the month of May in even numbered years between 1990 and 2006, and for the last time 2009, in the 75 most populous counties in the US.	Rape, sexual assault, child or spouse abuse	Followed cases through to completion for those included in the sample. Includes various forms of disposition, including diversion, and most serious/second most serious charges at all stages of case processing.	Included only felonies – most IPV is misdemeanor. Ended in 2009. BJS is undertaking a new, similarly structured pretrial data collection program beginning in 2021, but there will be a gap between 2009 and the completion of that collection.
Local courts data	Case statistics at the grantee level, such as filing charges, cases accepted/declined, disposition, conviction charges, case attrition, sentencing. Downstream outcomes of well-built cases by LE	All	Trends in case acceptance, conviction, sentencing, and victim-centered prosecution procedures may be examined at the local level for individual grantee programs. Most useful at the grantee level, though OVW could identify some national trends by aggregating data reported by grantees.	Quality and access to local courts data varies between jurisdictions. Not reported to any centralized repository for national trend analysis.
Offender data: typically from surveys in BIP and other program evaluations	Program evaluation data including surveys of offenders and recidivism data for participants	IPV	Follow results of BIP offender-focused programs in a jurisdiction, especially diversion programs. Especially useful when combined with calls for service, arrest, and recidivism data	Surveys answered by offenders may reflect social desirability bias

Data Source	Description	Coverage of VAWA Crimes	Strengths	Limitations
Shelter Use Data				
Domestic Violence Counts Report (NNEDV annual census)	Annual single-day census of shelter use conducted by the National Network to End Domestic Violence	DV, IPV	88% response rate. Avoids double-counting someone. Measures include # of individuals accessing each type of service (bed nights, referrals, counseling, benefits access, etc.), the number of unmet requests, and the experiences of advocates interacting with survivors. Aggregation protects confidentiality of individual served.	Misses seasonal changes in shelter use. Should be combined with data on other types of safe placement if used as a measure of safety.
Theresa's Fund	Website where shelter providers report shelter use data and where administrators assess information on services available on shelter websites	DV, IPV	About 1/3 of shelters registered report their data; appears updated regularly.	Methods of data collection and quality control are not made explicit; reliability questioned
Individual shelter data	Data collected for individual shelter program evaluations or for grant reporting.	DV, IPV	Most useful at the local grantee level – grantees can work with shelters to customize data requests and can work with local victim advocates to gather information on other safe placements provided to victims.	Not useful at the national level. Some shelters may also have fraught relationships with police in some jurisdictions.

Data Source	Description	Coverage of VAWA Crimes	Strengths	Limitations
Date sources explored, but not found useful: <u>not enough info connect specific law enforcement VAWA-funded programs to outcomes</u>, but may be useful for supplemental exploration				
National Hospital Ambulatory Medical Care Survey (NHAMCS)	National sample of Emergency Departments and outpatient departments of non-institutional and short stay hospitals conducted by the CDC.	Victimizations involving physical harm requiring medical attention, including violent crimes and sex crimes.	Incident-based. Conducted annually. Provides good estimates for types of violent victimizations that most often require hospital treatment.	Leaves out Veterans Affairs hospitals, federal, and military cases. Misses those who see private physicians or seek no care at all.
National Ambulatory and Medical Care Survey (NACMS)	National survey of a sample of private care physicians conducted by the CDC.	Victimizations involving physical harm requiring medical attention, such as sex crimes.	Incident-based. Conducted annually. Provides good estimates for types of violent victimizations that most often require medical treatment.	Misses those who seek care only in hospitals or no care at all. Captures only a sample of physicians.
National Hospital Discharge Survey (NHDS)	Comprehensive surveillance data collection across systems on deaths in each locale.	VAWA crimes ending in fatality.	Incident-based. Triangulates multiple data sources, including police data, court data, restraining order registry, and medical examiner records.	Leaves out non-fatalities.
National Violent Death Reporting System (NVDRS)	Violent death data from all 50 states, D.C., and Puerto Rico as of 2018.	Violent fatalities, including DV, IPV, SA, etc. broken down by demographics.	Incident-based. Triangulates multiple administrative and surveillance data sources	Misses non-fatalities, not nationally representative.
National Survey of Children Exposed to Violence (NatSCEV)	Sponsored by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Programs and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.	Child maltreatment, victimization by peers and siblings, sexual victimization, and internet victimization for children ages 17 and younger.	Large sample, with care taken to oversample for certain populations to enable subgroup analysis.	It is not conducted annually, and individuals are interviewed once rather than re-interviewed as in the NCVS.