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The NNSC: An Overview
Overview of the NNSC

NNSC is a partnership between action researchers at John Jay College of Criminal Justice and public safety stakeholders in cities around the United States and the world.

Together we focus on implementing proven strategic interventions to reduce violence and improve public safety, minimize arrest and incarceration, strengthen communities, and improve relationships between law enforcement and the communities it serves.

NNSC Principles

1. Most serious crime driven by small number of offenders
2. Create certainty
3. Provide clear information about risk
4. Mobilize moral voice of the community
5. Offer support & outreach
6. Face-to-face communication
7. Enhance legitimacy and procedural justice
8. Follow up: keep your promises
9. Assess and evaluate

NNSC: Theory of Change

1. Pick an important, intractable problem:
   - GVI / IPVI: most serious crime driven by small N
2. Assemble frontline coalition of the willing
3. Unpack the problem
4. Design and implement a solution
   - Create certainty; provide clear information about risk; mobilize moral voice of the community; offer support & outreach; face-to-face communication
5. Create new facts on the ground
6. Use new facts to drive change
   - Enhance legitimacy and procedural justice; follow-up and keep your promises; assess and evaluate
**NNSC Portfolio**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions and Initiatives</th>
<th>Innovations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Group Violence Intervention (GVI)</td>
<td>• Swift, Certain &amp; Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice (NI)</td>
<td>• Custom Notifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intimate Partner Violence Intervention (IPVI)</td>
<td>• Social Network Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Drug Market Intervention (DMI)</td>
<td>• Support and Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prison Violence Intervention (PVI)</td>
<td>• Reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Larceny Intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chicago PSN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NNSC International</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Battered Women’s Justice Project**

**Mission**: develop and promote innovations in policy and practice that improve the response to IPV in communities across the country.

• The Battered Women’s Justice Project (BWJP) serves as the national resource center on civil and criminal systems response to intimate partner violence (IPV)

• Comprehensive TA provider for OVW grant recipients of Improving Criminal Justice Response (ICJR) program

**BWJP’s Focus**

BWJP focuses on a multidisciplinary and coordinated response to IPV, working with:

• Law enforcement
• Prosecutors
• Civil attorneys
• Community advocates
• Victim-witness liaisons
• Judges
• Probation officers
• Mediators, GALs and custody evaluators
**BWJP and the NNSC**

BWJP partners with the NNSC on the work with OVW and supporting IPVI

- Assist site practitioners with assessing their current practices and response to IPV cases
- Identify and help implement, within the IPVI model, best practices to improve that response
- Provide any needed training or technical assistance to practitioners – together and individually – to overcome challenges with the implementation of IPV best practices

---

**Underpinnings of Intimate Partner Violence Intervention (IPVI)**

- Pioneered by David Kennedy and colleagues as “Operation Ceasefire” in Boston during the 1990’s
- GVI has repeatedly demonstrated that violence can be dramatically reduced when a partnership of community members, law enforcement, and social service providers directly engages with the small number of people actively involved in street groups in a meaningful way
- Since its inception in Boston, GVI has been successfully implemented in various jurisdictions across the country and internationally
Emerging Consensus
A Campbell Collaboration Systematic Review of the strategies, and others related to them, concluded that there is now “strong empirical evidence” for their crime prevention effectiveness.

"Focused deterrence…has the largest direct impact on crime and violence, of any intervention in this report.”

"Focused deterrence strategies can have a significant impact even in the most challenging of contexts.”

Innovation Upon an Established Framework
The NNSC’s Intimate Partner Violence Intervention (IPVI) is a new, innovative approach to reducing serious intimate partner violence, grounded in the same core principles and focused deterrence theory that drive David Kennedy’s other evidence based interventions.

Through a close partnership between law enforcement, social service providers, and community members, the IPVI strategy provides jurisdictions with a framework to identify and deter the most serious IPV offenders, reduce IPV, and reduce harm to victims.

The Driving Idea
When somebody whose name we know is repeatedly brutalizing someone else whose name we know, we should make them stop. We have been utterly failing to do that.
Are IPV Offenders Different from Other Violent Offenders?

National and High Point analyses say no, not as much as we thought.

Proportion of Male Batterers with Histories of Other Antisocial Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Antisocial Behavior</th>
<th>Proportion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faulk 1974</td>
<td>Previous criminal assault</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flynn 1977</td>
<td>Nonfamily criminal assault</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayford 1975</td>
<td>Previously incarcerated (one-third of above for violent offenses)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steacy and Shupe 1983</td>
<td>Arrest record (one-third of above for violent offenses)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker 1979</td>
<td>Previous arrest</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundyville 1978</td>
<td>• Arrest record</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Previous incarceration</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nonfamily violence</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fagan, Stewart, and Hansen 1983</td>
<td>Previous arrests other violence</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne 1984</td>
<td>(batterers who were killed by their wives)</td>
<td>Previous arrest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Langford, et al, “Criminal and restraining order histories of intimate partner-related homicide offenders in Massachusetts.”

UNC Greensboro Analysis of High Point

1,033 # of people charged w/ a DV-related offense between 2000 and 2010

The average DV offender had 10 other charges

10,328 # of charges amongst the 1,033 charged w/ a DV-related offense
Driving Factors

- Criminal justice response is frequently “one size fits all” and historically ineffective
- “Experiential effect” – criminal justice system teaching offenders they will get away with it
- “Specialists” v. “Generalists”
  - Chronic and serious IPV offenders aren’t as different from other violent offenders as many people thought
- Offenders known to criminal justice system

Intimate Partner Violence Intervention (IPVI)

- Do no harm
- Protect victims who are most at risk from the most dangerous offenders
- Deter or prevent offending
- Take the burden off victims and place it on the CJ system
- Establish state, not victim, as addressing violence

IPVI Goals

- Addresses as many offenders as possible: counters the “experiential effect,” establish new norms
- Match with best possible victim support and protection
- Mobilize the community’s moral voice against violence
IPVI Operational Elements

- Conduct qualitative and quantitative data analysis of local dynamics ("problem analysis")
- Identify levels of offenders
- Engage each level of offender with a specific approach and offer of help
- Elevate offenders to the appropriate higher level if continued offending occurs, emphasize risks
- Provide affirmative outreach to victims at every level

Range of IPV

- Fatality and Serious Physical Harm
- Physical Abuse
- Control and Psychological Abuse

Intimate partner violence

- Unknown to law enforcement
- Known to law enforcement
- Non-chronic offender
- Chronic offender
- Ordinary deterrence regime
- Special deterrence regime
IPVI Approach

Traditional Model vs IPVI Model

Low Intensity Response
High Intensity Response

A-level
Undeterred, serious offender

B-level
Demonstrated repeat offending

C-level
First known offense

D-level
Indication of IPV

IPVI Approach

A
B
C
D

Logic Model

D-level
A-level
C-level
B-level

Offenders identified, evaluated

rscommunities.org
Operationalizing IPVI

IPVI Operational Elements

- Conduct qualitative and quantitative data analysis of local dynamics ("problem analysis")
- Identify levels of offenders
- Engage each level of offender with a specific approach and offer of help
- Elevate offenders to the appropriate higher level if continued offending occurs, emphasize risks
- Provide affirmative outreach to victims at each level

How Is This Accomplished?

- A partnership between:
  - Law enforcement (local, state, federal)
  - Community-based victim advocates
  - Social service providers
  - Community members
- Direct, consistent and sustained engagement with IPV offenders and victims by the partnership standing and acting together
- Clear prior explanation of how law enforcement will operate – replace enforcement as much as possible with communication and transparency
- Explicit commitment to enhancing procedural justice in interactions with victims and offenders
Sample IPVI Operational Structure

Data Driven Approach

- Inconsistent terminology and broad use of ‘domestic violence’ to refer to both family and intimate partner violence complicates the ability to focus on IPV
- One of the key aspects of IPVI is challenging jurisdictions to conceptualize IPV independently, and denote it as a distinct type of crime
- The scope of IPV offending varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction
- Knowledge of local offending dynamics is critically important to adapting the strategy to the community it is intended to serve
- Data is utilized to understand the historical trends of offending in a jurisdiction, not to predict future offending.

Problem Analysis

Use both existing and new information to identify the small number of offenders that drive the most serious violence
- Extricate IPV from overall DV incidents
- Review 3 years of IPV-related incidents in detail
- Review offender criminal histories
Data Tracking

Development of system to identify, flag, and track IPV offenders
- Separation of IPV from DV incidents
- Recoding RMS
- Creation of an enhanced system of tracking for law enforcement

Sample Reoffending Structure

D – Level First Contact
Call for service; No IPV charge; Potential for violence exists

C – Level First Charge
First charge for IPV-related offense

B – Level Repeat Offender
Second charge for IPV-related offense or violation of prohibited behavior

A – Level Most Dangerous
3+ IPV charges; Violent record; Violation of protective order; Convicted felon; Used weapon

Parallel Notifications

Methods for law enforcement, community, and service providers to talk directly to offenders and victims:

Offenders: removing anonymity, providing a clear message of legal consequences for further offending, stressing that criminal justice response is not coming from victim, offering support & outreach to those who want it.

Victims: advising them of all contacts with offenders, providing resources and support to plan for safety, informing them that the burden to stop the violence is not on them.
Transparency & Legitimacy

The criminal justice process can be confusing for victims and offenders.
Not all criminal justice actors clearly explain what IPV crime was committed, its consequences, what victims and offenders can expect from the process, or what the next steps are.
Therefore, victims may not know their options, and offenders do not face accountability.
A procedurally just approach can transform the law enforcement response to IPV and achieve better outcomes.

Sample Reoffending Notification and Response

D – Level First Cease
Notification letter from partnership, delivered by LE, explains IPV and LE procedures. Offer of help. Affirms this is not by victim request.

C – Level First Charge
Face-to-face deterrent message from LE. Notification letter from partnership delivered by LE. Offer of help. Affirms this is not by victim request.

B – Level Repeat Offender
Face-to-face deterrent message from LE. Notification letter from partnership with custom legal assessment. When appropriate, face-to-face LE and community message (call-in). Offer of help. Affirms this is not by victim request.

A – Level Most Dangerous
Addressed by any legal means available to the partnership (pulling levers).

Strategic Law Enforcement

• Collaboration and communication
  • (i.e. Arrest alert system, intel meetings, information sharing)
• Clear legal message about the consequences of further violence
  • Clear prior explanation of how law enforcement will operate
    – replace enforcement as much as possible with communication and transparency
  • Explicit commitment to enhancing procedural justice in interactions with victims and offenders
• Dramatically increase chronic offenders’ legal risks
Community Moral Voice

- Clear, direct community stand and support from respected community leaders, clergy, activists, ex-offenders, folks of moral authority, etc.
- Enhances law enforcement legitimacy
- Mobilizes community partners and encourages culture change around community’s understanding and tolerance of IPV
- This may look different in every city but it is critical to the success and survival of the overall strategy

Support and Outreach for Offenders

Development of an offender support model that:

- Provides a genuine offer of help
- Treats offender with respect: procedural justice
- Mobilizes community partners
- Emphasizes accountability
- Addresses trauma
- Affirmative outreach
- Links to traditional social services
- Offer “big small stuff” – crucial real-time needs
  - Supplement traditional social services with the things nobody will pay for
  - Fill in where social service programs can’t reach
  - More realistically, immediately, and fluidly address people’s needs

Prioritize Victim Safety

Maintain awareness that any interventions made on behalf of victims may put them at risk

There must be an absolute commitment to victim safety—no implementation until this standard is satisfied
General Victim Notification and Response Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D - Level 1st Contact</td>
<td>Explanation of IPV model and available services; Affirmative outreach from victim advocates; Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - Level 1st Charge</td>
<td>Explanation of IPV and available services; Affirmative outreach from victim advocates; Letter; Follow-up from LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - Level Repeat Offender</td>
<td>Affirmative outreach; Letter; Notice of offender being called-in; Review of message; Safety planning; Post-call-in contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - Level Most Dangerous</td>
<td>Victim assessed on scene if possible for emergency needs; Affirmative outreach and communication regarding all offender contacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Victim Notifications

- Develop notification strategy that “matches”
- Notification language is clear and straightforward about the strategy, partners, and help that is available
- Share the same information that was given to offenders with victims
- When circumstances allow, affirmative outreach prior to offender notifications
  - At higher levels, affirmative outreach before and after any offender contact

Support & Services for Victims

- Active and recurrent safety planning that engages support systems and assesses risk
- Holistic, informed, and comprehensive services that meet victims where they are:
  - Address trauma
  - Counseling—individual, group
  - Shelter and housing assistance
  - Economic empowerment services
  - Civil legal assistance
  - Advocacy
  - “Big small stuff”
High Point OFDVI: Impact Assessment

Impact on High Point

1 out of 3 remaining homicides were DV related including two murder/suicides

HPPD Officers responded to more than 5,000 DV calls per year, including 5,352 in 2010

Average on scene time is 26 minutes x 2 officers = 6,472 hours on DV calls that year

Focus on Most Dangerous Offenders

Summer 2009
Begin focus on A-level offenders

2009 2010 2011 2012 2013

Feb. 21, 2012
First B-level call-in

Jan. 20, 2011
Research complete

Apr. 1, 2012
Implement C-level and D-level responses
Results
IPV Homicides in High Point

![Graph showing IPV Homicides over years](image)

Results
IPV Homicide in High Point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-08</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results, cont’d
IPV Incidents with Injuries to Victims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPV Incidents</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons Learned

• Procedural justice can deter crime
• Offender accountability is increased when:
  • Law enforcement clearly notifies offenders about the legal consequences of their actions
  • Protective orders are explained and consistently enforced
• Increased victim trust can deter and interrupt IPV:
  • When victims know what to expect from the CJ system, they're more likely to reach out for help
  • Victims are more likely to report crimes earlier and more often
  • This helps law enforcement both stop and effectively prosecute IPV crimes, especially before they escalate or become lethal

Rachel Teicher
Director, IPVI
rteicher@jjay.cuny.edu

Sandi Tibbetts Murphy
Legal & Policy Advisor
smurphy@bwjp.org

nccomunities.org
Intimate Partner Violence Intervention
Issue Brief

Overview

Between 40 and 50 percent of female homicide victims are killed by intimate partners and intimate partner violence comprises 15 percent of all violent crime. Traditional approaches to intimate partner violence have been ineffective at controlling the most dangerous abusers, and have burdened victims by asking that they leave the relationship and their support networks, relocate themselves and their children, and take criminal justice steps that could put them and their families at further risk. Developed by the National Network for Safe Communities (NNSC), the Intimate Partner Violence Intervention (IPVI) is an offender-focused, victim-centered approach that addresses the most serious intimate partner violence. The strategy aims to reduce harm to victims; intervene early in cycles of victimization; and shift the burden of preventing intimate partner violence from victims to a partnership of criminal justice actors, advocates, service providers, and community figures.

Strategy

Intimate partner violence is often thought of as fundamentally different from other types of violence, but a considerable body of evidence shows that, as with other serious violence, the gravest intimate partner violence with respect to the most vulnerable victims tends to be driven by “chronic” offenders who commit a wide variety of crimes at relatively high rates. Research also demonstrates that intimate partner violence offenders who do not fit this profile can be deterred by relatively low-level sanctions; IPVI aims to create meaningful deterrence for the most chronic and dangerous offenders as well.

The goals of the strategy are to identify and intervene in patterns of abuse as early as possible; counter the “experiential effect” by which ineffective criminal justice responses teach abusers that they will not be held accountable; communicate strong community norms against intimate partner violence; and to deter and if necessary incapacitate the most dangerous abusers by any legal means available, including through “pulling levers” on other actionable offenses.
such as a probation or parole violation or a weapons charge. Throughout this process, advocates and providers reach out to victims to assess safety and offer appropriate services.

**Implementation**

The IPVI strategy addresses all intimate partner violence offenders known to the criminal justice system. First, law enforcement analyzes crime data and arranges offenders into a hierarchy based on their histories of intimate partner violence. At each level of offending, a partnership of law enforcement, community representatives, and service providers clearly communicates to offenders that intimate partner violence will not be tolerated, and gives explicit notice of the criminal justice action that will be taken both at that and the next level. The partnership also emphasizes to offenders that victims are not directly involved in any action that law enforcement takes.

To ensure victim safety, IPVI utilizes a parallel affirmative outreach structure, corresponding to each level of offending, that matches support services to

---

**Example of Offender Hierarchy**

Jurisdictions create a hierarchy of offending according to local patterns of IPV

- **Level A**
- **Level B**
  - Two IPV charges
  - OR Violation of prohibited behavior
- **Level C**
  - One IPV charge, no previous offenses
- **Level D**
  - Suspected of IPV, no probable cause for arrest

- 3 or more IPV-related charges
- Violation of Order of Protection
- Violent criminal history
- Charged with IPV offense involving
victims and addresses issues of safety. Led by local victim advocates, this includes an enhanced protocol of written and in-person outreach informing victims of available services, as well as safety planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Offending</th>
<th>Law Enforcement Action</th>
<th>Victim Outreach Protocol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>Legal action by any means available. Law enforcement may employ “pulling lever” non-IPV actions that do not require victim cooperation or produce more effective sanctions than IPV options.</td>
<td>Victims assessed on-scene for emergency needs and offered all available support and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>Offender must attend “call-in” meeting where they receive moral and legal message against IPV as well as offer of help. Law enforcement message includes an explicit warning about enhanced agency attention offenders are now exposed to, including “pulling lever” actions mentioned above.</td>
<td>Victim receives notice before offender is called in. Victim advocates conduct risk assessment and safety planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>Detective gives offender face-to-face deterrent message explaining IPVI and legal consequences for further offending such as increased bail, enhanced prosecution, and tightened probation conditions.</td>
<td>Victim notified of available services. Victim advocates make in-person visits to offer services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Offender receives letter detailing close police monitoring; community moral message against IPV; and personal legal consequences for further offending.</td>
<td>Victim receives letter explaining IPVI and available services. Victim advocates conduct outreach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

An evaluation of the pilot IPVI implementation in High Point, North Carolina found dramatic reductions in intimate partner homicides, reoffending among notified intimate partner violence offenders, and victim injuries.

The results in High Point suggest an approach that holds great potential for other American cities seeking a new way to address serious intimate partner violence. As a result of the successful pilot implementation, NNSC and the Department of Justice are supporting expanded implementation in three cities nationally and making the underlying logic of the intervention available to both law enforcement and victim advocate communities.
ENDNOTES


The National Network for Safe Communities at John Jay College supports cities to implement and advance proven strategies to reduce violence and improve public safety, minimize arrest and incarceration, strengthen communities, and improve relationships between law enforcement and communities.
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