

Final Report on the Evaluation of the Judicial Oversight Demonstration

Adele V. Harrell, Lisa C. Newmark, Christy Visher, Jennifer Yahner

The nonpartisan Urban Institute publishes studies, reports, and books on timely topics worthy of public consideration. The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders.

Document date: July 17, 2007

Released online: July 17, 2007

Final Report on the Evaluation of the Judicial Oversight Demonstration: Executive Summary

The Judicial Oversight Demonstration (JOD) was designed to test the feasibility and impact of a coordinated response to intimate partner violence (IPV) that involved the courts and justice agencies in a central role. The primary goals were to protect victim safety, hold offenders accountable, and reduce repeat offending. The JOD model called for a strong judicial response combined with coordinated community services and integrated justice system policies in IPV cases. JOD consolidated gains in legal protections for domestic violence victims made in the past two decades within justice agencies and incorporated lessons on effective responses to IPV identified in studies of law enforcement, prosecution, court specialization, victim services, and coordinated community action. To test this model, three sites -- Dorchester, Massachusetts, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and Washtenaw County, Michigan --received support for multi-year demonstration projects.

Support for JOD innovations was grounded in recognition of the challenges that domestic violence cases pose to criminal justice agencies and the need to take steps to better protect victims from repeat violence. Key recommendations of the 1984 report of the U.S. Attorney General's Task Force on Family Violence are embodied in JOD: (1) family violence should be recognized and responded to as a criminal activity; (2) law enforcement officials, prosecutors, and judges should develop a coordinated response to family violence; and (3) a wide range of dispositional alternatives should be considered in cases of family violence. In addition, the Task Force recommended that in all cases prior to sentencing, judges should carefully review and consider the consequences of the crime on the victim, and in granting bail or releasing the assailant on his/her own recognizance, the judge should impose conditions that restrict the defendant's access to the victim and strictly enforce the order. However, it is only in the past few years that criminal courts have begun to assume a leadership role in coordinated responses through innovations such as specialized domestic violence courts that have introduced increased judicial supervision supported by case management, victim services, and required treatment for eligible offenders.

National partners in the JOD initiative were the U.S. Department of Justice's Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) and the Office of Justice Program's National Institute of Justice (NIJ). OVW funded and managed the demonstration activities and funded the Vera Institute of Justice to provide the technical assistance required to support implementation of the JOD model. NIJ funded the Urban Institute (UI) to conduct the national evaluation and supported local evaluation activities.

The two primary evaluation objectives were: 1) to test the impact of JOD interventions on victim safety, offender accountability, and recidivism, and 2) to learn from the experiences of well-qualified sites who were given resources and challenged to build a collaboration between the courts and community agencies to respond to intimate partner violence. The national evaluation of JOD began in 2000 with the start of demonstration activities and continued throughout and beyond the intervention period.

Download the complete [Executive Summary](#) in PDF format

Evaluation of the Judicial Oversight Demonstration: The Impact of JOD in Dorchester and Washtenaw County (Volume 1)

This report summarizes the results of the impact evaluation of the Judicial Oversight Demonstration in two of the three sites. The evaluation in Milwaukee is presented in a [separate report](#). An executive summary and six chapters provide details on the implementation of JOD, the evaluation design and study methodology, and findings regarding whether the demonstration significantly affected victim services and safety, offender attitudes and compliance, and the recurrence of violence following JOD interventions.

Download [Volume 1](#) in PDF format

Evaluation of the Judicial Oversight Demonstration: Findings and Lessons on Implementation (Volume 2)

This report provides a detailed process evaluation of the Judicial Oversight Demonstration intervention in the three sites -- Milwaukee, Washtenaw County, and Dorchester – including descriptions of the innovations in each agency involved in the demonstration. It summarizes lessons learned in implementing the innovative, comprehensive demonstration across multiple justice system and community agencies in each demonstration site.

Download [Volume 2](#) in PDF format

Evaluation of the Judicial Oversight Demonstration: Findings from JOD Victim and Offender Focus Groups (Volume 3)

As part of the evaluation of the Judicial Oversight Demonstration, focus groups with offenders and victims in intimate partner violence cases were conducted in the three sites -- Milwaukee, Washtenaw County, and Dorchester. This report summarizes the findings from those focus groups, paying special attention to victim and offender perceptions of procedural justice – being treated fairly and with respect – regarding their interactions with police, prosecutors, defense attorneys, probation officers, the court, the judge, victim service agencies, and batterer intervention programs.

Download [Volume 3](#) in PDF format

Evaluation of the Judicial Oversight Demonstration: Survey Methodology (Volume 4)

This report presents details of the study methodology for the evaluation of the Judicial Oversight Demonstration in Dorchester and Washtenaw County, including the quasi-experimental impact analysis design, human subject procedures, field work procedures and response rates. It also includes a detailed comparison of the demonstration and comparison samples and an analysis of attrition. Attachments include interviewing training manuals, consent forms, staff confidentiality pledge, data security plan, and the victim and offender questionnaires.

Download [Volume 4](#) in PDF format

Other Publications by the Authors

- [Adele V. Harrell](#)
- [Lisa C. Newmark](#)
- [Christy Visher](#)
- [Jennifer Yahner](#)

Usage and reprints: Most publications may be downloaded free of charge from the web site and may be used and copies made for research, academic, policy or other non-commercial purposes. Proper attribution is required. Posting UI research papers on other websites is permitted subject to prior approval from the Urban Institute—contact publicaffairs@urban.org.

If you are unable to access or print the PDF document please [contact us](#) or call the Publications Office at (202) 261-5687.

Disclaimer: *The nonpartisan Urban Institute publishes studies, reports, and books on timely topics worthy of public consideration. The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Copyright of the written materials contained within the Urban Institute website is owned or controlled by the Urban Institute.*

Source: The Urban Institute, © 2012 | <http://www.urban.org>