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Intimate Partner Violence

- 49.1% of Oklahoma women experienced lifetime IPV (rape, physical violence, and/or stalking)\(^1\)
- 18% of homicides in Oklahoma are intimate partner violence-related\(^2\)
  - 42% of homicides of females were IPV-related
  - Average of 35 deaths annually, including victims, bystanders, and perpetrators who committed suicide
- ~23,000 domestic abuse reports filed annually by Oklahoma law enforcement agencies\(^3\)
  - 7.1% decrease from 2004 - 2013

---

\(^1\)CDC, National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, 2011.
Intimate Partner Violence

- 67-80% of intimate partner homicides involve physical IPV preceding the homicide\(^1\)
- Victims call the police more often than they utilize any other help seeking strategy\(^2\)
- Calls to police increase as the severity and/or frequency of abuse increases\(^3\)
- Shelter services are most protective strategy against severe and moderate reassault\(^4\)

---

\(^2\) Catalano, Smith, Snyder, and Rand. Female Victims of Violence, Bureau of Justice Statistics, September 2009, NCJ 228356.
Lethality Assessment Program (LAP)

• Created by the Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence in collaboration with researchers and practitioners (http://www.mnadv.org/lethality.html)
• Brief assessment and intervention at the scene of a domestic violence incident
• Brief 11-item Lethality Assessment screen by police to determine if victim is at high risk for homicide
• Immediate coordination with local collaborating domestic violence service provider
The **Danger Assessment** helps to determine the level of danger an abused woman has of being killed by her intimate partner. It is free and available to the public. Using the Danger Assessment requires the weighted scoring and interpretation that is provided after completing the training. The Danger Assessment is available in a variety of languages.
Lethality Assessment Protocol

- Police complete their criminal justice intervention
- Police officer asks victim 11 questions on the Lethality Screen to determine if victim is at high risk for homicide
- Triggers for conducting the LAP
  - Intimate partner violence assault has occurred
  - Parties or home is a repeat call for service
  - Officer has a belief that the victim is in danger
# Lethality Screen

## DOMESTIC VIOLENCE LETHALITY SCREEN FOR FIRST RESPONDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Case #:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim:</td>
<td>Offender:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Check here if victim did not answer any of the questions.**

- **A "Yes" response to any of Questions #1-3 automatically triggers the protocol referral.**
  1. Has he/she ever used a weapon against you or threatened you with a weapon? □ Yes □ No □ Not Ans.
  2. Has he/she threatened to kill you or your children? □ Yes □ No □ Not Ans.
  3. Do you think he/she might try to kill you? □ Yes □ No □ Not Ans.

- **Negative responses to Questions #1-3, but positive responses to at least four of Questions #4-11, trigger the protocol referral.**
  4. Does he/she have a gun or can he/she get one easily? □ Yes □ No □ Not Ans.
  5. Has he/she ever tried to choke you? □ Yes □ No □ Not Ans.
  6. Is he/she violently or constantly jealous or does he/she control most of your daily activities? □ Yes □ No □ Not Ans.
  7. Have you left him/her or separated after living together or being married? □ Yes □ No □ Not Ans.
  8. Is he/she unemployed? □ Yes □ No □ Not Ans.
  9. Has he/she ever tried to kill himself/herself? □ Yes □ No □ Not Ans.
  10. Do you have a child that he/she knows is not his/hers? □ Yes □ No □ Not Ans.
  11. Does he/she feel or spy on you or leave threatening messages? □ Yes □ No □ Not Ans.

- **An officer may trigger the protocol referral, if not already triggered above, as a result of the victim’s response to the below question, or whenever the officer believes the victim is in a potentially lethal situation.**

  Is there anything else that worries you about your safety? (If “yes”) What worries you?

- **Check one:** □ Victim screened in according to the protocol
  - □ Victim screened in based on the belief of officer
  - □ Victim did not screen in

- **If victim screened in:** After advising her/him of a high danger assessment, □ Yes □ No did the victim speak with the hotline counselor?

---

*Note: The questions above and the criteria for determining the level of risk a person faces is based on the best available research on factors...*
Lethality Assessment Protocol

- If the victim is at high risk, the collaborating domestic violence service provider is called
- Victim put on phone with DV advocate
- Advocate/victim discuss safety plan; police assists with any immediate safety actions (e.g., transport to shelter)
- If victim doesn’t want to talk, officer talks with advocate and conveys safety information
Oklahoma Lethality Assessment (OKLA) Study

- **Police Departments’ Use of the Lethality Assessment Program: A Quasi-Experimental Evaluation**
- **National Institute of Justice**
  - Evaluates the effectiveness of the Maryland Lethality Assessment Protocol (LAP; [http://mnadv.org/lethality/](http://mnadv.org/lethality/))
- **Hypotheses:**
  - The LAP increases safety behaviors (e.g., safety planning, shelter, etc.)
  - The LAP decreases the severity and/or frequency of violence
The Oklahoma Lethality Assessment (OKLA) Study

- 7 sites participating - police departments and collaborating domestic violence service providers
- Oklahoma City, Tulsa, Broken Arrow, El Reno, Stillwater, Tahlequah, Cherokee Nation Marshal Service
- Study conducted during 2009-2013
  - Recruitment lasted 189 weeks (3.6 years)
  - Average of 16.7 referrals per week (range 1-62 per week)
*Includes all victims (males, females, and bystanders) killed in intimate partner homicide incidents from 1999-2008
Phase 1 – Comparison Group
- Police respond to domestic violence incident as usual
- Recruit participants to the study

Phase 2 – Intervention (LAP)
- Police conduct brief 11-item screen
- Phone local domestic violence provider if victim screens as high risk for homicide
- Recruit participants to the study
Measures

Two structured telephone interviews conducted approximately 7 months apart assessed:

- Their demographic and relationship information
- The violence that they had experienced prior to interview #1, between interviews #1 & #2 (self risk assessment, intimate partner violence and abuse assessment using CTS-2)
- Risk of homicide on the Danger Assessment
- Protective actions taken (prior to interview #1, immediately after the intervention, between interviews #1 & #2)
Participants

Comparison Group
Jan 2009 – Oct 2010

1,137 women referred
– 604 eligible contacted

440 participated in the
baseline interview – 342 high risk

212 participated in follow-up interview

Intervention Group
Oct 2010 – Feb 2013

2,011 women referred
– 938 eligible contacted

657 participated in baseline interview – 538 high risk

347 spoke with hotline counselor

202 participated in follow-up interview
## Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Comparison Group N (%)/Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Intervention Group N (%)/Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>32.78 (9.758)</td>
<td>32.26 (10.130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>141 (41.35%)</td>
<td>147 (44.28%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>107 (24.83%)</td>
<td>91 (26.61%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>36 (10.56%)</td>
<td>31 (9.34%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>22 (6.45%)</td>
<td>31 (9.34%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>29 (8.50%)</td>
<td>23 (6.93%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6 (1.76%)</td>
<td>9 (2.71%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born Outside the U.S.*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>333 (97.65%)</td>
<td>321 (94.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8 (2.35%)</td>
<td>19 (5.58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS degree</td>
<td>73 (21.35%)</td>
<td>95 (27.38%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS degree/higher</td>
<td>269 (78.65%)</td>
<td>252 (72.62%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full/Part Time</td>
<td>146 (42.69%)</td>
<td>133 (38.33%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>196 (57.31%)</td>
<td>214 (61.67%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26 (7.93%)</td>
<td>23 (7.06%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>302 (92.07%)</td>
<td>303 (92.94%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant differences between groups
## Relationship Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Comparison Group N (%)/Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Intervention Group N (%)/Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)/Mean (SD)</td>
<td>N (%)/Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently living with partner</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>284 (83.04%)</td>
<td>289 (83.29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58 (16.96%)</td>
<td>58 (16.71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status*</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>197 (58.28%)</td>
<td>221 (64.62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>77 (22.78%)</td>
<td>83 (24.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>17 (5.03%)</td>
<td>17 (4.97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>47 (13.91%)</td>
<td>21 (6.14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in household</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>110 (32.16%)</td>
<td>128 (36.89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>232 (67.84%)</td>
<td>219 (63.11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with partner</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>186 (54.39%)</td>
<td>188 (54.18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>156 (45.61%)</td>
<td>159 (45.82%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant differences between groups
Physical Violence

- Nearly 90% of participants reported severe or near-lethal violence.
  - Used a knife or gun on you/threatened you with a weapon
  - Punched you/hit you with something that could hurt
  - Strangled/ tried to strangle you
  - Beat you up
  - Burned or scalded you on purpose
  - Kicked you
  - Did anything that might have killed you/nearly killed you
  - Tried to kill you
## Main Findings – Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Weighted Frequency by Severity CTS-2 Score</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coefficient (95% CI)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Group</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-14.71 (-28.60 to -0.81)</td>
<td>p=.038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger Assessment Category</td>
<td>Ordinal (0-3)</td>
<td>-23.10 (-29.78 to -16.43)</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Referent</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-13.43 (-29.56 to 2.69)</td>
<td>p=.102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>23.98 (-13.22 to 61.17)</td>
<td>p=.206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>16.36 (-6.49 to 39.22)</td>
<td>p=.160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Status</td>
<td>Born outside the US</td>
<td>-16.48 (-51.24 to 18.28)</td>
<td>p=.352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time between baseline and follow-up interviews</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>-1.66 (-3.91 to .60)</td>
<td>p=.149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fit Statistics: F(7,397) = 8.29, p<.001, Pseudo R2 =.1121
### Main Findings – Immediate Protective Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protective Action / Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Comparison Group n(%)</th>
<th>Intervention Group n(%)</th>
<th>Conditional OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Removed or hid their partner’s weapons (n=689)</td>
<td>13 (3.8)</td>
<td>27 (7.8)</td>
<td>2.48 (1.14-5.37)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received services related to domestic violence (n=681)</td>
<td>75 (21.9)</td>
<td>106 (30.5)</td>
<td>1.79 (1.25-2.56)</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Main Findings – Protective Actions at Follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protective Action / Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Comparison Group n(%)</th>
<th>Intervention Group n(%)</th>
<th>Conditional OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established a code with family and friends at follow-up (n=409)</td>
<td>84 (39.6)</td>
<td>97 (48.0)</td>
<td>1.63 (1.07-2.49)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained something to protect yourself at follow-up (n=409)</td>
<td>50 (23.6)</td>
<td>75 (37.1)</td>
<td>2.17 (1.37-3.45)</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in other protective actions at follow-up (n=409)</td>
<td>80 (37.7)</td>
<td>90 (44.6)</td>
<td>1.54 (1.01-2.35)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied for a protective order at follow-up (n=409)</td>
<td>66 (31.1)</td>
<td>83 (41.1)</td>
<td>1.64 (1.07-2.53)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Action / Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Comparison Group n(%)</td>
<td>Intervention Group n(%)</td>
<td>Conditional OR (95% CI)</td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received an order of protection at follow-up (n=409)</td>
<td>50 (23.6)</td>
<td>69 (34.2)</td>
<td>1.59 (1.01-2.51)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received medical care due to violence at follow-up (n=409)</td>
<td>22 (10.4)</td>
<td>33 (16.3)</td>
<td>1.88 (1.02-3.45)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went somewhere partner could not find you at follow-up (n=409)</td>
<td>72 (34.0)</td>
<td>82 (40.6)</td>
<td>1.61 (1.04-2.48)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner went somewhere he could not see you at follow-up (n=409)</td>
<td>66 (31.1)</td>
<td>92 (45.5)</td>
<td>2.53 (1.62-3.95)</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Findings

- Percent of participants speaking with advocate varied by site from 42% - 78%
- Participants in intervention group were significantly more satisfied with the police response than the comparison group (t=4.21, p<.01)
- No homicide deaths of participants occurred during the study period
Conclusions

The Lethality Assessment Program

- Decreased women’s violent victimization
- Increased immediate protective actions
- Increased protective actions at 7 months follow-up
- The results show support for the effectiveness of the LAP, and it is a promising practice, but we need more studies
- Collaboration plays a critical role in intervention success
Limitations

- Generalizability: Oklahoma may not be representative.
- Selection bias: Police officers did not refer everyone. Women who chose to participate may not be representative.
- Attrition: Nearly 40% did not participate in the follow-up interview.
- Historical comparison group: Something may have happened between comparison and intervention phases.
- The Lethality Screen is sensitive, not specific – it casts a wide net.
More Information

- NIJ full report: *Police Departments’ Use of the Lethality Assessment Program: A Quasi-Experimental Evaluation*

- MNADV Lethality Assessment
  [http://mnadv.org/lethality/](http://mnadv.org/lethality/)
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Learning Objectives

• Become familiar with the lethality assessment protocol for intimate partner violence.
• Describe study methods and results of the lethality assessment study.
• Explore the continuum of research, practice, and policy to prevent intimate partner violence.