

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

001. list	Domestic Violence Hotline-Roosevelt Room Participants (3 pages)	02/20/96	P6/b(6)
-----------	---	----------	---------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential records
Domestic Policy Council
Bruce Reed (Crime)
OA/Box Number: 8412

FOLDER TITLE:

Domestic Violence

rs7

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advise between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

*Crime -
Domestic Violence*

HHS NEWS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Wednesday, Feb. 21, 1996

Contact: Michael Kharfen
(202) 401-9215

PRESIDENT ANNOUNCES NATIONWIDE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE HOTLINE

President Clinton today announced a new, nationwide, 24-hour toll-free domestic violence hotline. The voice number is 1-800-799-SAFE, and the TDD number for the hearing impaired is 1-800-787-3224.

The hotline will provide immediate crisis intervention assistance to those in need. Callers can receive counseling and be connected directly to help in their communities, including emergency services and shelters. Also, operators can offer information and referrals, counseling and assistance in reporting abuse to survivors of domestic violence, family members, neighbors, and the general public. Help is available to callers in Spanish and to other non-English speakers and the hearing impaired.

"The Clinton Administration is working to create a seamless system, so that no woman suffering from domestic violence falls through the cracks," said HHS Secretary Donna E. Shalala. "Now, with this national hotline, every woman will have access to the help she needs, wherever and whenever she needs it."

Violence against women is an urgent criminal and public health problem with devastating consequences for women, children, and families. According to the Department of Justice, 29 percent of violence against women by a single offender is committed by an intimate -- a husband, ex-husband, boyfriend, or ex-boyfriend. This

- 2 -

translates into roughly one million women who are victims of such violence each year.

Funded under the Violence Against Women Act within the 1994 Crime Bill, the hotline will operate throughout the 50 states, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The Texas Council on Family Violence in Austin, a leader and vital support to families in crisis for over 17 years, will staff and operate the hotline. The hotline is funded by three HHS agencies: Administration for Children and Families, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

###

Note to Correspondents: A fact sheet on domestic violence and the new hotline is available by calling (202) 401-9215. For more specific inquiries regarding the hotline, call (512) 453-8117.

Note to Broadcast Reporters: Actuality from HHS Secretary Donna E. Shalala is available at (202) 690-8317 or 1-800-621-2984.

HHS FACT SHEET

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

February 21, 1996

For further information, contact:

Justice: Greg King, (202) 616-2777

HHS: Michael Kharfen, (202) 401-9215

CLINTON ADMINISTRATION ACTS TO PREVENT VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

"I call on American men and women in families to give greater respect to one another. We must end the deadly scourge of domestic violence in our country."

-- President Clinton, State of the Union address, 1996

The National Domestic Violence Hotline

The Clinton Administration is committed to ensuring that every woman has access to information and emergency assistance, wherever and whenever she needs it. This 24-hour, toll-free, national domestic violence hotline will provide crisis assistance, counseling, and local shelter referrals to women across the country. Hotline counselors will also be available for non-English speakers and for people who are hearing impaired.

The voice number is 1-800-799-SAFE, and the TDD number for the hearing impaired is 1-800-787-3224.

The hotline is operated by the Texas Council on Family Violence, through an HHS grant authorized under the Violence Against Women Act. HHS's Administration for Children and Families, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration contribute funding for the hotline. HHS authorization from FY 1995 to FY 2000: \$3 million. (\$1 million in start-up funding, plus \$400,000 a year in maintenance payments).

The Violence Against Women Act

The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), passed as part of the Crime Act of 1994, is landmark bipartisan legislation -- combining tough new penalties with programs to prosecute offenders and help women victims of violence.

- 2 -

VAWA is authorized to provide \$1.6 billion over five years to hire more prosecutors and improve domestic violence training among prosecutors, police officers, and health and social services professionals. It provides for more shelters, counseling services, and research into causes and effective public education campaigns. In addition, VAWA establishes new laws that enable victims to sue in federal court and allow law enforcement officers to pursue perpetrators across state lines.

The Justice Department and HHS are leading the following initiatives under the Violence Against Women Act:

The Advisory Council on Violence Against Women

- o The Advisory Council on Violence Against Women was created on July 13, 1995. Co-chaired by Attorney General Janet Reno and Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna Shalala, the Council consists of 46 experts -- representatives from law enforcement, media, health and social services, victim advocacy, and survivors -- working together to prevent violence against women.

Justice Department Programs under VAWA

- o In 1995, states received \$26 million under the STOP (Services, Training, Officers, Prosecutors) Violence Against Women Grant program. Every state was awarded approximately \$420,000 to develop and strengthen law enforcement and prosecutorial strategies and improve victims services in cases involving violent crimes against women. (\$130 million was appropriated for this program in FY 1996).
- o The latest innovative COPS initiative is the Community Oriented Policing to Combat Domestic Violence program. This COPS program will make \$20 million available to police departments nationwide that are interested in applying community policing techniques to fight domestic violence.
- o The Justice Department is finalizing guidelines to implement the Jacob Wetterling Act, which gives states a financial incentive to adopt effective registration systems for persons convicted of sexually violent crimes and for convicted child molesters. The guidelines will be finalized in early 1996.
- o In March of 1995, President Clinton appointed former Iowa Attorney general Bonnie J. Campbell to head the Justice Department's Violence Against Women Office. The office coordinates the Federal government's efforts to implement the Violence Against Women Act.

- 3 -

- o Note: For the current fiscal year, Congress has authorized the following funding levels for these VAWA programs: \$500,000 for victim counselors, \$1 million for training programs, \$28 million to encourage mandatory arrest policies, \$7 million for rural domestic violence programs, \$1.5 million for national stalker reduction programs, and \$200,000 for a study on campus sexual assault. However, none of these programs was funded by Congress under the current Continuing Resolution.

Health and Human Services Programs under VAWA

- o Grants for Battered Women's Shelters. In 1995, IHS awarded \$32.6 million to states, territories, and tribes to provide shelter services to victims of family violence and their dependents and for related services, such as alcohol and substance abuse prevention and family violence prevention counseling. The Crime Bill provided new resources to extend these services under the existing Family Violence Prevention and Services Act. HHS authorization from FY 1996 to FY 2000: \$325 million.
- o Education and Prevention Grants to Reduce Sexual Assaults Against Women. State grant will be available for rape prevention and education programs conducted by rape crisis centers or similar nongovernmental, nonprofit entities. The funds will support educational seminars, the operation of hotlines, training programs, preparation of informational materials, and other activities to increase awareness of and to help prevent sexual assault. States receiving grants must devote at least 25 percent of their funds to education programs targeted to middle school, junior high school, or high school students. HHS authorization from FY 1996 to FY 2000: \$205 million. (CDC received an appropriation of \$28.5 million, or 81 percent of the President's request, for FY 1996).
- o Community Programs on Domestic Violence. This program, administered by CDC, will help build new community programs aimed at reducing domestic violence, as well as strengthen and better coordinate existing community intervention and prevention programs. The program will also evaluate the impact of comprehensive community programs on reducing domestic violence. This program was appropriated \$3.1 million for FY 1996 under the current Continuing Resolution.
- o Youth Education on Domestic Violence. Four model curricula for youth education about domestic violence will be created for primary, middle and secondary schools, as well for as higher education levels. The curricula will be chosen by HHS and the Department of Education, and will then be used as model programs for schools across the country. This program was authorized at \$400,000 in FY 1996, but has not been funded under the current Continuing Resolution.

- 4 -

Other Efforts at the Department of Health and Human Services

- o Since 1984, HHS has provided funding under the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act for battered women's shelters, information and referral services, and public education prevention campaigns.
- o In 1994, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and its National Injury Center, working with the Justice Department, expanded their public prevention and awareness efforts in a new initiative to research the prevalence of domestic violence.
- o The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMSHA) administers several programs that both research and work to address substance abuse and mental health issues among victims of domestic violence.
- o The Administration on Aging and the National Institute of Mental Health have joined to create the National Center on Elder Abuse to research the causes and impacts of domestic abuse of seniors. In addition to this project, HHS funds four national resource centers which provide information, technical assistance, and research findings on domestic violence.
- o HHS also funds several programs that aim to strengthen families, prevent the abuse of women and children, and help families provide a healthy and safe environment for children. These programs include the Family Preservation and Support program; Community Schools; and Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act grants.

Background

Recent statistics show that 29 percent of all violence against women by a single offender is committed by an intimate -- a husband, ex-husband, boyfriend, or ex-boyfriend. This translates into roughly one million women who are the victims of such violence each year.¹

¹ These figures exclude homicides. Source: Department of Justice, National Crime Victimization Survey, August 1995.

**National Domestic Violence Hotline
Questions and Answers**

Q: How did this hotline come about?

A: The Violence Against Women Act, part of President Clinton's 1994 Crime bill, contains a provision to establish a national domestic violence hotline. The Department of Health and Human Services was authorized to provide a \$1 million grant to establish the hotline, with an additional \$400,000 in annual funding to maintain the service for the next five years. Private donations are also helping to fund the hotline.

Q: What exactly does this hotline do?

A: The hotline provides help for domestic violence victims across the country -- 24-hours a day, 365 days a year. The service is toll-free, operating throughout the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

When someone calls the hotline, they will speak to a trained advocate, who can offer them crisis intervention, support, and referrals to local services in their communities. The hotline will help create a more seamless system among local, state, and national service providers. (In emergencies, the hotline is equipped to connect callers to their local police, but calling "911" directly for immediate help is always the best course of action).

Q: Why do you need a national hotline when so many cities and states have their own local hotlines?

A: Although we've made progress over the last few years in recognizing domestic violence as the criminal and public health epidemic that it is, many areas in this country still lack a comprehensive response system, and many victims still fall through the cracks because they lack access to the help they need. The national hotline is especially important for victims who live in rural or isolated areas which may lack their own local hotlines or other comprehensive domestic violence services. This hotline is also toll-free and can be accessed from anywhere at anytime.

This hotline is a crucial step towards creating a seamless system of domestic violence prevention and intervention. Other components of the Violence Against Women Act -- training for prosecutors and police, funding for shelters, and educational campaigns in our schools and communities -- will work in conjunction with the hotline to treat domestic violence as the serious crime that is, and to prevent domestic violence before it starts.

Q: Is this the first national domestic violence hotline?

A: This is the first Federal government-funded hotline. Some states and communities do have their own local hotlines, but there is currently no comprehensive system for linking domestic violence victims across the country to the help they need. (A national hotline was operated by the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence in Washington, D.C., but escalating costs, coupled with increasing demand for hotline services, eventually led to its closing).

Q: Why the Texas Council? How were they chosen for the grant?

A: The Texas Council was chosen in accordance with the Department of Health and Human Services' competitive review process. The applicants were required to meet stringent criteria and submit their proposals for review by a panel of experts. The Texas Council is a statewide association that supports battered women's shelters and other domestic violence programs in the state and has been helping domestic violence victims for the past 18 years.

Q: What happens when a person calls the hotline?

A: When a caller phones into the hotline, she will speak to a trained domestic violence advocate. The advocate has access to a national database that contains the most current information on emergency shelters, legal advocacy, social services, and other programs in communities across the country. Help is offered in English or Spanish and to the hearing impaired. Translators are also available in other languages.

Q: How many calls can the hotline handle?

A: The national hotline anticipates that it will receive about 10,000 calls a month. The hotline has 40 lines that will be taking calls. (Twenty-four of which are directly incoming, and 16 that can be used to accommodate peaks and overflow). Again, it is important to note that callers who need help in an emergency should always call "911" directly for immediate assistance.

Q: Is the funding of the hotline in jeopardy, given the current budget situation?

A: No. The hotline was authorized \$1 million in start-up funding from the Department of Health and Human Services last year. For FY 1996 to 2000, the hotline is authorized to receive \$400,000 in annual maintenance funding. This funding is included under the current Continuing Resolution, although many other domestic violence programs are being shortchanged.

Q: What about other Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) programs? Have they been fully funded?

A: Most VAWA programs are administered by the Justice Department and the Department of Health and Human Services. While some programs are funded under the current Continuing Resolution, many are not. For example, HHS's CDC-administered programs have received funding through September 30, 1996. Other programs such as the hotline, which received funding in FY 1995, are funded through March 15, 1996, under the current Continuing Resolution at a pro-rata amount based on FY 1995 funding. Still other HHS and Justice programs which didn't receive funding in FY 1995 are not funded under the current Continuing Resolution.

HHS Programs: Overall, Congress has authorized \$96.9 million for VAWA programs administered by HHS, but has appropriated only \$31.6 million. The programs that are currently funded are the hotline and those programs administered by CDC: the Education and Prevention grants and the Community Partnership grants.

Justice Programs: Justice's STOP program, which gives grants to states to improve law enforcement and prosecution of domestic violence, has received \$130 million for FY 1996. Congress has authorized the following funding for these other Justice VAWA programs: \$500,000 for victim counselors, \$1 million for training programs, \$28 million to encourage mandatory arrest policies, \$7 million for rural domestic violence programs, \$1.5 million for national stalker reduction programs, and \$200,000 for a study on campus sexual assault. However, since these programs were not funded in FY 1995, they are not funded under the current Continuing Resolution.

Q: What else is the Administration doing to address domestic violence?

A: President Clinton's 1994 Crime bill included the Violence Against Women Act, an historic piece of bipartisan legislation. The Violence Against Women Act is authorized to provide \$1.6 billion over five years to hire more prosecutors and improve domestic violence training among prosecutors, police officers, and health and social services professionals. It provides for more shelters, counseling services, and research into causes and effective public education campaigns. In addition, VAWA establishes new laws that enable victims to sue in federal court and allow law enforcement officers to pursue perpetrators across state lines. The President also appointed Bonnie Campbell to head the Violence Against Women Office at the Justice Department, which coordinates the Federal Government's efforts in this area.

In addition, the Justice Department has given grants to states to help strengthen law enforcement and prosecution of domestic violence, and to improve victim services in these cases. Justice is also using the COPS program to apply community policing strategies to fight domestic violence, and the Department will soon be releasing guidelines to help states create effective registration systems for people convicted of sexually violent crimes.

HHS also administers other domestic violence programs outside of the Violence Against Women Act. These include the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act which supports battered women's shelters, information and referral services, and public education prevention campaigns. CDC has a new initiative to research the prevalence of domestic violence, and the Administration on Aging and the National Institute of Mental Health have joined to fund the National Center on Elder Abuse to research the causes and impacts of domestic abuse on seniors.

In addition, the President has called on all federal agencies to institute employee awareness campaigns on domestic violence. Attorney General Janet Reno and Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna Shalala have also created an Advisory Council on Violence Against Women. The Council consists of 46 experts -- representatives from law enforcement, media, health and social services, victim advocacy, and survivors -- working together to prevent violence against women.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. list	Domestic Violence Hotline-Roosevelt Room Participants (3 pages)	02/20/96	P6/b(6)

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential records
Domestic Policy Council
Bruce Reed (Crime)
OA/Box Number: 8412

FOLDER TITLE:

Domestic Violence

rs7

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advise between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE HOTLINE - ROOSEVELT ROOM PARTICIPANTS

1. **Secretary Donna Shalala**

2. **Bonnie Campbell**
Director, Violence Against Women Office
DOB: 4/9/48
SSN: [REDACTED]
Ph: 202-616-8894
Fx: 202-307-3911

3. **Ellen Fisher**
Executive Director, National Domestic Violence Hotline
Austin, TX
DOB: 1/23/50
SSN: [REDACTED]
Ph: (512) 453-8117
Fx: (512) 453-8541

4. **Deborah Tucker**
Director, Family Council on Domestic Violence
Austin, TX
DOB: 5/26/53
SSN: [REDACTED]
Ph: (512) 459-7070

5. **Candice Slaughter**
Peacepower Foundation
San Antonio, FL
DOB: 10/28/51
SSN: [REDACTED]
Ph: (352) 567-9116

6. **Susan Kelly-Dreiss**
Director, Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence
Harrisburg, PA
DOB: 10/30/42
SSN: [REDACTED]
Ph: 717-545-6400
Fx: 717-545-6400

7. Margaret (Peggy) Reyna
Survivor
DOB: 9/20/41
SSN: [REDACTED]
8. Rev. Marie Fortune
Director, The Center for the Prevention of Sexual and Domestic Violence
Seattle, Washington
DOB: 6/22/50
SSN: [REDACTED]
Ph: 206-633-0572 (h); 206-634-1903 (o)
Fx: 206-545-1720
9. Donna Edwards
Director, DC Coalition Against Domestic Violence
Washington, DC
DOB: 6/28/58
SSN: [REDACTED]
Ph: (202) 543-0773
10. Roberta Ramo
President, American Bar Association
Albuquerque, NM
DOB: 8/8/42
SSN: [REDACTED]
Ph: 505-848-1800
Fx: 505-848-9767
11. John Butterworth
Sheriff, Marion County, OH
DOB: 1/21/51
SSN: [REDACTED]
Fx: Info to Doubletree Hotel
12. Judge Marcus Williams
Fairfax, Virginia
DOB: 10/24/52
SSN: [REDACTED]
Ph: 703-246-3391

13. Attorney General Jim Doyle
Madison, WI
DOB: 11/23/45
SSN: [REDACTED]
Ph: 608-266-1220
Fx: 608-267-2779
14. U.S. Attorney Eric Holder
Washington, DC
DOB: 1/21/51
SSN: [REDACTED]
Ph: 202-514-7566
Fx: 202-307-3569
15. Ana Rodriguez
Survivor
Philadelphia, PA
DOB: 7/3/58
SSN: [REDACTED]
16. Vickii Coffey
Chicago, IL
DOB: 5/29/51
SSN: [REDACTED]
Ph: (312) 779-6017
Fx: (312) 779-6017
17. Rosalyn Weinman
Vice President, NBC
DOB: 10/11/50
SSN: [REDACTED]
Ph: (212) 664-5443
Fx: (212) 664-5792
18. Gwen Moore-Lockett
Survivor
Bayville, NJ
DOB: 2/26/54
SSN: [REDACTED]
19. Eileen Hudon
Minnesota Coalition for Battered Women
DOB: 6/10/46
SSN: [REDACTED]
Ph: (612) 642-0251



U.S. Department of Justice

*Crime -
Domestic Violence*

Washington, D.C. 20530

**THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT:
*BREAKING THE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE***

DRAFT

DRAFT

Executive Summary

Enacted as part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, the Violence Against Women Act is landmark legislation -- combining tough law enforcement strategies with important safeguards for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. In its first year, the Violence Against Women Act and related provisions have proven extremely effective in our effort to curb domestic violence offenses and to provide protection and peace of mind for women and their families concerned about violent sex offenders. The Department of Justice has adopted an aggressive strategy for fighting violence against women -- working in close coordination with state, tribal, and local law enforcement and other federal agencies.

Federal action on this front comes at a critical time. A recently released Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics report, based on the National Crime Victimization Survey, confirms that violence against women in America persists:

- In 1992 and 1993, women age 12 or older annually sustained almost 5 million violent victimizations.
- Nearly 75% of all lone-offender violence against women was perpetrated by offenders whom the victims knew.
- In 29% of all violence against women by a lone offender, the perpetrator was an intimate -- a husband, ex-husband, boyfriend or ex-boyfriend.
- Women were about 6 times more likely than men to experience violence committed by an intimate.
- Women annually reported, to interviewers, about 500,000 rapes and sexual assaults. Friends or acquaintances of the victims committed over half of these rapes or sexual assaults. Strangers were responsible for about 1 in 5.
- Women of all races and Hispanic and non-Hispanic women were about equally vulnerable to violence by an intimate.
- Female victims of violence by an intimate were more often injured by the violence than females victimized by a stranger.

Prosecution and Penalties

The Violence Against Women Act increases penalties for sex offenders and domestic abusers -- doubling the maximum term of imprisonment for repeat sex offenders and authorizing severe federal sentences for abusers who travel interstate with the intent to injure, harass or intimidate a domestic partner or violate a protection order. Initial guidance has been issued to U.S. Attorneys about these new provisions. In May, the Department won its first conviction under the Violence Against Women Act's new interstate domestic violence offense. Christopher Bailey was sentenced to life in prison for kidnapping and interstate domestic violence after his conviction by the US Attorney in the Southern District of West Virginia. Federal prosecutors are also using changes in the Federal Rules of Evidence that broaden the admissibility of evidence that the defendant has committed other similar offenses in federal sexual assault and child molestation cases.

Federal Resources

Over the next five years, a total of \$800 million in federal funds is authorized to assist states in restructuring law enforcement's response to crimes of violence against women. All 50 states and eligible territories have received the first installment of funds under the Office of Justice Programs-administered S.T.O.P. (Services*Training*Officers*Prosecutors) Violence Against Women grant program, the only Department Of Justice Violence Against Women grant program funded in Fiscal Year 1995. In keeping with the Act's emphasis on collaboration, the S.T.O.P grants require states to develop a joint strategy among law enforcement, prosecutors and victim service providers. Collaboration is also the focus of a new initiative funded by the Department's Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Office. The COPS \$20 million "Community Policing to Combat Domestic Violence Program" is open to police departments interested in applying community policing techniques to fight domestic violence. Future Violence Against Women Act law enforcement grants will encourage mandatory arrest policies and target domestic violence and child abuse in rural areas.

The long-awaited National Domestic Violence Hotline is scheduled to be up and running early this year. The Department of Health and Human Services recently awarded \$1 million to the Texas Council on Family Violence to set up this national, toll-free hotline for victims of domestic violence.

Peace of Mind

The Department is successfully implementing a number of provisions designed to stop sex offenders before they strike. Guidelines are being finalized by the Department implementing the Jacob Wetterling Act. This Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act provision provides states with a financial incentive to adopt effective registration systems for convicted child molesters and other persons convicted of sexually violent crimes. The Violence Against Women Act also requires the Attorney General to insure that relevant sex offender treatment information is provided to sex offenders prior to release from prison. The Bureau of Prisons (BOP) has coordinated its efforts with two offender treatment program information clearinghouses in the United States. BOP, together with the U.S. Probation Office, is also ensuring that released sex offenders follow-up with community-based treatment.

Under other Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act provisions, the FBI issued guidelines implementing the National Child Protection Act, which establishes a national background check system for child care providers to determine whether employees and prospective employees have criminal records involving child abuse offenses. Grants recently awarded by the Department of Justice under the National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP) will also assist states in improving the accessibility and completeness of records that may be relevant in background checks under the National Child Protection Act and other laws.

The 1994 Violent Crime Control Act also increases protection to victims of domestic violence. The Act included a provision that makes it unlawful for persons subject to certain restraining orders to possess firearms. The first prosecution under this new provision occurred in South Dakota. The Department is also working with state and local law enforcement groups and United States Attorneys on effective implementation of this law. On a related front, the FBI is creating a national database concerning persons subject to protection orders, which will be available for criminal justice purposes, and to civil courts in domestic violence cases. This database will serve to increase the ability of states to verify the existence of restraining orders throughout the United States and will facilitate implementation of the "full faith and credit" provision, as well.

Victims' Rights and Other Safeguards

The revised Attorney General Guidelines for Victim and Witness Assistance, signed in May, provide initial guidance on a variety of reforms that enhance the rights of victims of crime in Federal court. These measures include provisions strengthening restitution for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault crimes, payment for sexually transmitted disease testing for victims of sexual assault offenses, and a provision affording victims of violent and sexual abuse crimes the right to address the court at the sentencing of the offender.

The Violence Against Women Act contains other important safeguards that the Department is working to enforce. The Act's "full faith and credit" provision requires states to honor protection orders issued by other jurisdictions. The Department is devising an aggressive strategy for implementation of this protection for battered women who hold protection orders and move to another state, only to have their abusers follow them there. In addition, the Immigration and Naturalization Service is finalizing regulations implementing the Act's special measures for battered immigrant women seeking lawful permanent residence.

In the Violence Against Women Act, the civil rights remedy was designed to complement existing federal civil rights laws which do not protect women from gender-motivated violence. Now, for the first time, victims of gender-motivated violent crimes, e.g. rape and domestic violence, have the right to sue their attackers for damages.

Understanding the Problem

A number of studies authorized under the Act are underway -- including evaluation of needed improvements in incidence reporting, a report on the problem of sexual assault on college campuses, a study of the use of battered women's syndrome evidence at trial, and an assessment of ways to protect the confidentiality of address information for victims of domestic violence. The Department of Justice will soon complete assessments of what states are doing to collect data on these crimes and to protect the confidentiality of communications between sexual assault and domestic violence victims and their counselors. A first annual report focussing on state stalking laws is also imminent. Through grants provided under the Act in the 1996 fiscal year, greater knowledge will also be obtained about the benefits of pro arrest policies. Once completed, all of these Violence Against Women Act studies will provide a more complete and accurate picture of the nature and extent of violence against women and improve our ability to track and respond to these crimes.

Also under the Violence Against Women Act, a panel of the National Academy of Sciences is developing a research agenda to increase the understanding and control of violence against women, including rape and domestic violence. And finally, research evaluation related to violence against women programs will provide important information on the implementation and the impact of the programs for refining and improving various programs designed to address violence against women.

Collaboration

The Department's Violence Against Women Office is headed by Bonnie Campbell. Ms. Campbell is responsible for the overall coordination and focus of Department of Justice efforts to combat violence against women. She serves as the Department's primary point of contact for other federal agencies, state and local governments, outside organizations, and Congress. Within the Department of Justice, Ms. Campbell works closely with the COPS Director, Joseph Brann, and with community police officers to help reduce domestic violence and other crimes against women in America's neighborhoods. She also works extensively with the Department's Office of Justice Programs Bureaus, the Offices of Policy Development and Legislative Affairs, the FBI and the Criminal Divisions, and the 93 U.S. Attorneys, among others.

In July, a joint Health and Human Services-Department of Justice Advisory Council on Violence Against Women was named and held its first meeting. This group of national leaders from a variety of fields and professions will provide the Attorney General and the Secretary of Health and Human Services with practical and general policy advice concerning implementation of the Act. The Violence Against Women Office and the Advisory Council will work together to promote greater awareness of the need for innovative solutions to the problem of violence against women.

The Violence Against Women Office is also spearheading an employee awareness campaign to educate Department of Justice employees about the issue of domestic violence. The campaign includes a training video, information fair, workplace guidelines and educational materials. The Department of Justice program will serve as a model for other federal agencies which were recently directed by the President to initiate workplace awareness efforts on this issue. A Violence Against Women Office home page will also provide access on the internet to the latest information on efforts relating to domestic violence and sexual assault, as well as links to other sources of information on these subjects.

S*T*O*P Violence Against Women

In Kentucky, battered women travelling outside their local communities had little protection against their abusers. Protective orders in one county were often not enforced in other counties because records of such orders were not readily available.

To respond to this problem, Public Safety Commissioner Mike Troop's office enabled protective orders to be recorded on the Law Informational Network of Kentucky (LINK), a system which was designed to enable law enforcement officers throughout Kentucky to have instant access to arrest records and other criminal justice-related information. Now these officers also have instant access to protection orders issued throughout the state. As a result, enforcement of these orders has increased dramatically.

The Provision

The Department of Justice S*T*O*P Violence Against Women Grant Program provided \$26 million in 1995 directly to states and Indian tribes through the discretionary grant program, as a first step in helping restructure the criminal justice system's response to crimes of violence against women. States, territories, and tribes can use Violence Against Women Act funding to:

- develop and enhance victim services programs (including domestic violence shelters);
- train law enforcement officers;
- expand the number of personnel in law enforcement and prosecution agencies to target violence against women;
- develop more effective policies, protocols, orders and services to prevent violent crime against women; and
- apply advanced technology to improve communications and data collection systems to identify and track arrests, protection, and prosecution.

The Impact

The S*T*O*P grant program requires and encourages collaboration between those who encounter victims of domestic and sexual violence. Each state and territory has developed a comprehensive strategy for combating domestic violence and sexual assault in consultation with representatives from law enforcement, prosecution and victim service programs.

As a condition to receiving grants, states must certify that they will incur full out-of-pocket costs of forensic medical examinations for victims of sexual assault. They must also certify that within two years, victims of sexual assault will bear no costs associated with the filing of criminal charges or protection orders.

Because of the condition for receiving grants, Alabama and Delaware passed laws to fund all forensic medical examinations for victims of sexual assault, thereby ensuring that criminal investigations in sexual assault cases are funded like all other criminal investigations -- by the state and not by the victim.

S*T*O*P funding could provide such improvements as:

- Crisis centers and battered women's shelters serving tens of thousands of victims a year;
- Hundreds of new prosecutors for specialized domestic violence or sexual assault units; or
- Hundreds of volunteer coordinators to help run domestic violence hot-lines.

The Success

By the end of July 1995, the Department of Justice awarded \$426,364 to each state and major territory. Following these awards, more than 350 delegates from all of the states and territories participated in the Violence Against Women Conference on July 27-29, 1995. Representatives from law enforcement, prosecution, victim services, and state government shared information about the best practices and strategies to enhance collaboration and develop a coordinated response to violent crimes against women.

The Department also has awarded approximately \$1 million to tribal governments through the S*T*O*P Violence Against Indian Women Discretionary Grant Program, with the goal of strengthening the response of tribal court systems to violent crimes against women.

The Future

Over the next five years, a total of \$800 million in S*T*O*P grant funds is authorized. The formula grants to states will be allocated according to population, with each state guaranteed a base amount.

Federal Offense of Interstate Domestic Violence

In November of 1994, Christopher Bailey of St. Albans, West Virginia beat his wife Sonya until she collapsed. Then he put her in the trunk of their compact car and drove for five days through West Virginia and Kentucky before taking her to an emergency room. Along the way he withdrew over \$2400 in cash from their bank accounts, and purchased various supplies, including sweat pants and adult diapers for Sonya. Sonya Bailey suffered irreversible brain damage and remains in a permanent vegetative state.

The Provisions

The Violence Against Women Act establishes new federal offenses in cases like this one where an abuser crosses state lines to violate a protection order or injure, harass or intimidate a spouse or intimate partner. These new federal remedies are important tools in cases where movement across state lines makes state prosecution difficult and where state law penalties may not be tough enough. They also offer important benefits for victims, including strengthened restitution provisions and an opportunity to address the court concerning the danger posed by a defendant prior to any pre-trial release.

The Impact

Victims of domestic violence often seek safety and shelter with friends and relatives living elsewhere. The Violence Against Women Act insures that the law follows an abuser who crosses state lines and will provide victims with protection throughout the United States.

The Success

On May 23, 1995 the United States Attorney for the Southern District of West Virginia won the nation's first conviction under the Violence Against Women Act. And on September 1, Christopher Bailey was sentenced to life in prison for the abuse and kidnapping of his wife Sonya.

This case illustrates the value of federal action against interstate domestic violence. Bailey was arrested in Kentucky, but local police dropped the charges because they were unable to document what had occurred in their jurisdiction. Under West Virginia law, he might have received less than a two-year sentence for his brutal assault.

The United States Attorney for the Eastern District of California won the nation's second conviction under the Violence Against Women Act in December 1995. Ricky Steele beat his domestic partner in Oregon, and then forced her to drive with him to California. On December 11, 1995 Steele was sentenced to 87 months in prison and was ordered to pay restitution of \$1,018 for interstate domestic violence.

The Future

Federal prosecutors have initiated other cases under the Violence Against Women Act. In the third reported case brought under the interstate domestic violence provision, on November 8, 1995, prosecutors in the Southern District of Ohio charged Derek Page with beating his girlfriend in Ohio and then kidnapping and transporting her to Pennsylvania.

Most recently, on December 19, 1995, Wayne Hayes was indicted in the Eastern District of New York on charges of traveling interstate with the intention of violating court orders that prohibited repeated harassment of his ex-wife, and repeatedly mailing threatening communications to her. The indictment marks the first use of the Violence Against Women Act provision that prohibits traveling across a state line in order to violate certain protection orders.

The Department of Justice continues to work with state and local law enforcement to combat interstate domestic violence and identify cases where use of these new federal remedies is the most appropriate response.

Similar Crimes Evidence in Sex Offense Cases

Joey Sanza raped and murdered Theresa Cha when she came to meet her husband in the building where Sanza worked. There was extensive physical and circumstantial evidence of Sanza's commission of the crime, and the jury was informed about three other rapes that he had committed in another state. Sanza's other offenses were relevant to help confirm his identity as Theresa Cha's attacker by showing his propensity and capacity to commit sexually violent crimes. Nevertheless, Sanza's conviction for raping and murdering Theresa Cha was reversed on appeal because the jury was told of his other crimes. People v. Sanza, 509 N.Y.S.2d 311 (App. Div. 1986).

The Provision

The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 enacted general rules of admissibility in federal sexual assault and child molestation cases for evidence that the defendant has committed other similar offenses. These evidence rules facilitate the effective prosecution of habitual sex offenders. They provide the basis for informed decisions by juries regarding questions of propensity to commit future crimes in light of the defendant's past conduct.

The Impact

This reform has broader import as a model for law reforms by the states, which prosecute the vast majority of sexual offenses. California has recently enacted an evidence provision for its sexual offense cases that is modeled on the Federal Rules. The Department of Justice facilitated this reform through provision of technical assistance and participation in California legislative hearings.

The Success

Rules for federal sexual offense cases went into effect on July 10, 1995. Federal prosecutors have begun to seek the admission of evidence under these new rules in appropriate cases.

The Future

The Department of Justice will (1) seek to ensure judicial interpretations and applications of the new federal evidence rules that are faithful to Congress's intent in enacting this reform, and (2) continue to assist and encourage additional states to adopt comparable reforms.

Sex Offender Registration and Community Notification

On July 29, 1994, a seven-year-old New Jersey girl, Megan Kanka, was sexually assaulted and murdered by a twice-convicted sex offender who moved in across the street from her family. Promising to show her his new puppy, the defendant lured Megan to his home and subsequently raped and killed her. Her body was later found nearby. At the time, there were no state law provisions for notifying local law enforcement or the community concerning a sex offender's criminal history or presence in the neighborhood.

The Provision

The Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act provides states with a financial incentive to adopt effective registration systems for convicted child molesters and other persons convicted of sexually violent crimes. Community notification concerning the location of registered offenders is permitted where necessary for public safety.

The Impact

Most states have some form of sex offender registration but few regularly verify an offender's address. The Jacob Wetterling guidelines will provide minimum national standards and will help state law enforcement agencies communicate with each other regarding sex offenders who cross state lines.

In general, registration systems help the investigation of sex crimes by informing the authorities of the identities and whereabouts of convicted sex offenders. These systems may also inhibit offenders -- who know that the authorities know who they are and where they are -- from committing additional crimes. Community notification enables communities to take common sense measures to protect themselves and their families, such as ensuring that their children do not associate or visit with known child molesters.

The Success

The Department of Justice published proposed guidelines for state registration systems in April 1995. The original 90 day comment period was extended, and final guidelines will be issued in the near future.

The Department of Justice has also participated in state and federal litigation defending the validity of "Megan's Law," the New Jersey sex offender registration and notification system. The Department has participated in three legal challenges to Megan's Law, seeking to protect the federal interest in promoting state sex offender registration laws.

On July 25, 1995, the New Jersey Supreme Court upheld Megan's Law, adopting the position advocated by the state and the federal government that Megan's Law is constitutional. Most recently, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit Court heard oral arguments on Megan's Law in October, and the Department of Justice is awaiting the court's decision.

The Future

The Department of Justice will work to encourage and assist the states to adopt effective sex offender registration systems. The Department will also continue to participate in litigation defending the constitutionality of state registration systems.

Background Checks for Child Care Providers

In 1972, Eric James Long was convicted of molesting a child. In 1980, he was convicted of molesting a second child he coached in soccer for a county recreation department. In 1985, he pleaded guilty to child abuse and sex offense charges related to allegations that he had abused numerous children at the school where he worked as a gymnastics instructor and in his neighborhood. The school, which had hired Long in 1978, had no knowledge of his offenses, and no means existed for obtaining criminal history information on employees or prospective employees. Washington Post, Feb. 5, at A1, Sept. 6, at C7 (1985).

The Provision

The National Child Protection Act, enacted in 1993, establishes a national background check system that enables child care providers to determine whether employees and prospective employees have criminal records involving child abuse offenses. As a result of amendments adopted by the Violent Crime and Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, the National Child Protection Act system also covers background checks for elder care and providers of care to persons with disabilities.

The Success

The FBI issued guidelines in July that implement the National Child Protection Act. Currently, 38 states have approved statutes that will enable them to access national criminal history records information in child care background checks. Eight states have approved statutes of this type relating to care of the elderly, and 13 states have approved statutes relating to providers of care to persons with disabilities.

One hundred million dollars has been appropriated in fiscal year 1995 for the National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP). NCHIP assists states in improving the accessibility and completeness of records that may be relevant in background checks under the National Child Protection Act and other laws. The funding includes \$88 million for direct awards to states to automate and improve their criminal history records. The Department of Justice has awarded grants totaling more than \$69 million to 47 states as part of NCHIP, and it is expected that every state will receive an NCHIP award this fiscal year.

The Future

The Department of Justice will continue to encourage and assist states to adopt and obtain approval of statutes enabling them to participate fully in the background check system under the National Child Protection Act, and to provide funding assistance as appropriated to states to automate and upgrade criminal records relevant to such background checks.

Federal Remedies for Battered Immigrant Women and Their Children

Cecilia, from South America, has been married to Jose, a lawful permanent resident, for 18 years. Together they have eight children born in the United States, ranging in age from one to 18. While Jose once began the process of obtaining lawful permanent resident status for Cecilia, he later withdrew the petition. Throughout their relationship, Jose has been physically violent to Cecilia. His abuse of her was both physical and mental. He hit her in the abdomen when she was pregnant, and at other times bruised and beat her. Jose also restrained her physical freedom and access to financial assets. He threatened to kill her if she ever left him. Jose was physically abusive to the children also, and is believed to have sexually abused at least two of them. Nevertheless, Cecilia was afraid to leave because of her dependence on her husband to obtain lawful permanent resident status for her.

Cecilia and the children did finally leave Jose. She currently lives in fear of both her husband and the INS. She is having a difficult time finding housing and a means of supporting herself.

The Provision

The Violence Against Women Act establishes new federal remedies for abused immigrant spouses and children. Specifically, battered women are now eligible to apply for permanent resident status for themselves and their children and are no longer forced to rely on their abusive husbands to apply for such status.

The Impact

Immigrant women and children who are battered face unique obstacles. In addition to the physical violence, the threat of deportation or release of information about legal status has been used as a control mechanism to instill fear and dependency and to lock the abused person into the relationship. Prior to the new federal statute, immigrant spouses were dependent on their citizen or permanent resident spouses to petition on their behalf for permanent resident status. Spouses could withdraw the request at any time.

The Success

The Immigration and Naturalization Service is in the final stages of drafting regulations to implement the new federal statute. Once these regulations are completed, the procedures for self-petitioning by the abused spouse will be in place.

The Future

Under the new law, women like Cecilia will be able to file their own petitions for lawful permanent resident status for themselves and for their children.

Confidential Communications for Rape Victims

In June 1994, the state supreme court ordered the YWCA in Springfield, Massachusetts, which administers a rape crisis counseling program, to provide confidential files to defense counsel in a rape case. Although the YWCA sought to protect the victim's privacy and initially defied the court order, the center eventually turned over the records as contempt penalties mounted. The center's attorney said that while legal advocates have been seeking and winning legal protections for rape counselors, only a few states grant rape counselors a testimonial privilege comparable to that of a doctor or priest. She said "Rape crisis centers can't function without confidentiality. [V]ictims must choose between prosecution and healing. If they choose prosecution, they must suffer in silence" as defendants gain access to information they have confided to their counselors. (Washington Post, June 24, 1994)

The Provision

The Violence Against Women Act requires the Department of Justice to study and evaluate the manner in which states have taken steps to protect the confidentiality of communications between sexual assault and/or domestic violence victims and their counselors.

The Impact

Often when a woman who has been victimized by sexual assault or domestic violence seeks help from a counselor to deal with the crime's shattering effect on her life, she finds herself victimized again when a defense attorney issues subpoenas for her counseling records. Because many sexual assault and domestic violence counselors are not psychologists or psychotherapists, they cannot claim testimonial privileges found in most state statutes.

Victims must be able to communicate freely with their counselors, secure in the knowledge that the private thoughts they reveal during counseling will remain confidential. Without assurances of confidentiality, sexual assault and domestic violence victims will continue to be reluctant to contact rape crisis centers or battered women's shelters, and to report crime and otherwise aid in the prosecution of their attackers. Establishing statutory testimonial privileges for sexual assault and domestic violence counselors will help ensure that these important communications will remain confidential.

To date, 27 states and District of Columbia have enacted statutes that protect these confidential communications. These statutes differ in the degree to which confidential communications are protected from disclosure and in whether they address both sexual assault counselors and domestic violence counselors.

The Success

The Department has completed its report which includes a state-by-state survey and will soon release the results. The Department has also developed model statutes that provide the maximum protection possible for the confidentiality of such communications.

The Future

The Department of Justice will disseminate model legislation and report, to governors, attorneys general and legislators in states where these communications are not protected, encourage those states to adopt legislation. The Department plans to engage in efforts to raise the awareness of victims, advocates, counselors and attorneys, and evaluate the necessity for judicial training on this issue. The Department will also review the Judicial Conference of the United States's report, if any, on the need for amendments to the Federal Rules of Evidence to guarantee that the confidentiality of communications between sexual assault victims and their counselors will be adequately protected in federal court proceedings.

Full Faith and Credit

In February 1993, a woman living in Metropolis, Illinois went to court to obtain a protection order against her abusive live-in boyfriend. Upon her return home from court, police searched the woman's home to check that her boyfriend was not on the premises and that her safety was assured. After the police departed, the boyfriend left his hiding place in the ceiling of the woman's home and threatened her. The boyfriend was not arrested because the police had not witnessed the violation of the protection order. A few months later, he severely beat her.

Officials at the Metropolis Domestic Violence Center immediately and covertly relocated the woman to Paducah, Kentucky, a larger town just over the Ohio River from Metropolis. Shortly thereafter, the woman was beaten and her Paducah apartment was destroyed by arson. The woman's boyfriend was convicted and sent to jail for the beating.

After a few months in jail in April 1995, he was released and followed the woman to a Paducah gas station. He then kidnapped, beat and sexually assaulted her. When the woman was found in Kentucky, local police declined to arrest the boyfriend because they deemed the Illinois protection order to be invalid within the Kentucky borders. The woman's boyfriend was never arrested for the assault and the woman was told her only relief would be to seek an emergency protection order in a Kentucky court.

When the Metropolis Domestic Violence Center questioned the Paducah Police as to why the woman's Illinois protection order had not been upheld under the Full Faith and Credit provision of the Violence Against Women Act, they responded that they had never heard of such a provision. As a result, the Illinois Attorney General issued a two page fact sheet describing the major provisions of the Violence Against Women Act, including Full Faith and Credit. The sheet has since been posted on the bulletin boards of local police stations. The woman has relocated again but continues to live in fear for her safety although the police are aware of her situation.

The Provision

The Violence Against Women Act provides that a civil protection order issued by the court of one state or tribe shall be accorded full faith and credit by the court of another state or Indian Tribe, and shall be enforced as if it were the order of the court of the second state or tribe. Failure by the issuing state to satisfy due process requirements will not entitle a protection order to full faith and credit. Mutual protection orders are not entitled to full faith and credit if a cross or counter petition, complaint or other written pleading has not been filed seeking such a protection order or if a cross or counter petition has been filed and the order was issued upon a showing of mutual abuse. The issuing court must have had both personal and subject matter jurisdiction and the respondent must have received reasonable notice and an opportunity to be heard for the provision to be in effect.

The Impact

Prior to the enactment of the Violence Against Women Act, a victim with a protection order often could not use that order as the basis for protection if the victim went to work, traveled or moved to most other states. Under this provision, the second state must afford full faith and credit to an order issued by another jurisdiction, even if the victim otherwise would be ineligible for protection in the new state. A victim does not have to wait for abuse to occur in the new state nor does a victim need to be concerned if he or she cannot meet its jurisdictional requirements. Furthermore, a victim does not have to register a protection order in the new state -- the protection order of the issuing state should provide continuous protection to the victim.

The Success

The Department has made the implementation of full faith and credit a top priority. An internal working group has been established and guidance on the full faith and credit provision of Violence Against Women Act has been distributed to all U.S. Attorneys' offices.

The Department has awarded funding to the Battered Women's Justice Project for a cooperative agreement to support the development of models, tools, technical assistance, training, and a resource clearinghouse to facilitate the implementation of the full faith and credit provision of Violence Against Women Act.

The Future

The Department of Justice has adopted an aggressive multi-faceted implementation campaign involving federal leadership through outreach, research and the provision of training, technical assistance and opportunities for collaboration at the national and state or district levels.

In addition, the National Crime Information Center Protection Order File, which the FBI is working to have states linked to by 1998, will provide information on protection orders for use in domestic abuse cases and interface with the National Instant Criminal Background Check System to support the identification of persons who are prohibited from purchasing a firearm. This system will further facilitate the implementation of full faith and credit for protection orders.

Firearms Disability Provision

On October 18, 1994, Robert M. Goben, of South Dakota, became subject to a court order restraining him from harassing or threatening his estranged wife. Consequently, a new federal law applied that prohibited Mr. Goben from possessing a firearm while the restraining order remained in effect. Approximately five months later, while still subject to the restraining order, local police discovered that Mr. Goben possessed a loaded .22-caliber magnum revolver. Mr. Goben was arrested and on September 11, 1995, pled guilty to illegally possessing a firearm in violation of federal law.

The Provision

The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 makes it unlawful for any person subject to a court order restraining that person from harassing, stalking, or threatening an intimate partner or the child of an intimate partner, to possess firearms or ammunition. Intimate partners include spouses or former spouses but not girl friends or boy friends with whom the defendant has not cohabited. This, like other federal firearms disabilities, exempts on-duty, federal or state law enforcement officers and members of the military.

The Impact

The firearms disability provision provides security to victims who can now rest assured that their abusers can be arrested if they attempt to purchase or possess firearms during the period of the restraining order.

The Success

On January 22, 1995; Mr. Goben was sentenced to twelve months in prison followed by two years of supervised release during which time he is to have no contact with his now former wife. Following the Goben case, federal prosecutors in the Northern District of Iowa brought another case under the new federal law. On October 24, 1995, Shawn A. Hungate, 25, of Fort Dodge, Iowa, was charged with illegally possessing a firearm while subject to a restraining order. According to the complaint, while subject to a "no contact order," Hungate purchased a firearm at a Wal-Mart in Fort Dodge. When purchasing the firearm, Hungate allegedly answered "No" to a question on a government form regarding whether he was subject to a restraining order. The complaint also alleges that Hungate shot himself in the shoulder with the firearm and proceeded to his wife's place of employment and began yelling for her. If convicted on the firearms charge, Mr. Hungate faces up to ten years in prison and a \$250,000 fine or both.

The Future

The Department of Justice is working with state and local law enforcement groups to implement the spirit as well as the letter of the firearms disability provision without hampering law enforcement. In that regard, the Department of Justice is developing guidelines for application of the provision to Department of Justice law enforcement officers, which might serve as a model to local law enforcement.

Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies

Police officers traditionally have been reluctant to become involved in domestic violence disputes, largely because such calls for police assistance are among the most complex and sensitive -- and potentially dangerous -- situations police must respond to. Law enforcement officers may not take affirmative steps on behalf of the victim because they have not been trained to identify patterns of abuse or to provide immediate support and protections a victim requires (e.g., short and long-term medical care, safe shelter, counseling, safety planning, legal advocacy, and long-term treatment for the batterer).

Additionally, officers who are the "first responders" are often without the benefit of the clarity and authority that a departmental protocol for responding to such incidents offers. A clear policy on arrest can mitigate this problem, which often puts police officers in difficult situations.

However, the arrest of a perpetrator at the scene will not necessarily stop the violence, nor guarantee the safety of the victim. A strong pro arrest policy must be accompanied by a community and criminal justice system which also takes a strong stand against domestic violence and makes every attempt to provide safety for the victim.

The Provision

The Department's Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies, a new program funded in Fiscal Year 1996, helps states, localities and tribal governments treat domestic violence as a serious criminal offense. This program recognizes that for mandatory arrest to be a fully effective intervention, it must be part of a coordinated, integrated criminal justice response to domestic violence with consistent follow-through by victim service providers, prosecutors, and judges.

The Impact

Mandatory arrest and pro arrest policies are critical elements of an overall community strategy to address domestic violence. A mandatory arrest policy requires that police must arrest a domestic assault offender whenever the officer determines that a crime has been committed and probable cause for arrest exists. The primary goal of these policies and the immediate and primary responsibility of the arresting officer must be to ensure the safety of the victim.

Currently, 27 states and the District of Columbia have adopted laws requiring the arrest of a person when there is probable cause that he or she has assaulted a family member or has violated a domestic violence protection order. Pro arrest or mandatory arrest policies convey a message to the victim, the family, and the community that domestic violence is a serious crime that will not be tolerated.

The Future

The Department of Justice currently is developing program regulations to be disseminated and is prepared to implement the program with Fiscal Year 1996 funding.

Rural Domestic Violence and Child Abuse Enforcement

If a domestic violence victim in rural areas of Western Massachusetts decides she wants to obtain assistance, she may face many obstacles. With very few patrol police officers in small rural communities, it may be too late once a call for assistance is answered. And if a victim were to report domestic violence, she would live with the fear that an entire tight-knit community will know about the abuse. Lastly, staff at the local domestic violence shelter and sexual assault program, New England Learning Center for Women in Transition, in Greenfield, Massachusetts, speaks of problems maintaining the confidentiality of their shelter within this small community.

The Provision

This Fiscal Year 1996 grant program addresses the issues of domestic violence and child abuse in rural states. These grants will encourage development of collaborative efforts, creation of training programs for "front-line" agencies and personnel (such as law enforcement, shelter workers, health care providers, and clergy), creation of public awareness and community education campaigns, and expansion of direct services for rural and Native American victims and their children. A variety of entities, including states, tribal and local governments, and public and private organizations in rural states, are eligible to receive funding.

The Impact

Few statistics exist on the extent of domestic violence and child abuse in rural communities. The limited statistics available reflect only the women and children who have succeeded in accessing services, but there is no reason to assume that these problems are less common in rural areas. Instead, it is more likely that the isolation and culture of rural communities discourage victims from reporting abuse.

Geographic isolation, culturally close communities, and lack of domestic violence information and services (including availability of civil and criminal remedies) are among the problems unique to rural areas. Victims in rural areas also may not trust an "outside" system to protect them from their abusers and may continue to live in emotional isolation rather than seeking help. Rural areas in the United States also are experiencing growth in immigrant communities, which may be further isolated as a result of language and cultural barriers.

The Future

The Department has convened an internal working group to identify key issues and develop program guidelines.

Community Oriented Policing Services to Combat Domestic Violence

When Jackie, a 39-year-old assistant in an Alexandria, Virginia consulting firm, went to the hospital with a black eye and cuts needing stitches in 1992, she told the nurse that her husband had caused her injuries. Jackie asked the nurse not to call the police because she feared retaliation from her husband. But once the police came, she said, they made it easy for her to get help. They charged her husband with abuse and later escorted her back home and to the city's shelter for battered women. With counseling from the shelter, Jackie was able to get a protective order from the court and return to her apartment without her husband's being there. The court ordered him into an anger management program, and she and her three children continued to receive free counseling from the shelter. 'Had I not known about the shelter, I would probably be in a violent relationship today,' Jackie said. Washington Post, Sept. 9, at B4 (1995).

The Provision

The COPS (Community Oriented Policing Services) Program is President Clinton's program, enacted as part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, to place an additional 100,000 law enforcement officers on the street and promote community policing. The Community Policing to Combat Domestic Violence Program, initiated as part of the COPS Program, provides law enforcement agencies with a unique opportunity to execute well-planned, innovative strategies employing community policing to combat domestic violence. To be eligible for this funding, police departments must partner with non-profit, non-governmental victim service programs, domestic violence shelters, or community service groups to coordinate efforts to fight domestic abuse. Twenty million dollars is available through this grant program to all state, local, Indian Tribal, and other public and private law enforcement agencies which are committed to using community policing to address domestic violence.

The Impact

Domestic violence was the second highest reported crime for COPS FAST grant applicants, second only to property crimes. As a few jurisdictions have already learned, community policing, a strategy which emphasizes problem solving and community partnership, can be an effective weapon in the fight against domestic violence.

The Success

Less than twelve months after its inception, the COPS program has already put more than 25,000 community law enforcement officers on the street - a quarter of the goal after just one year of the six year program. Flexible and innovative COPS grants have helped fiscally-strained departments pay for new technology and equipment, as well as administrative staff to free up more rank and file officers to walk the beat. The COPS program customer response center has cut red tape, simplified procedures, and delivered funds directly to police departments with no middleman.

The latest innovative COPS initiative, the Community Oriented Policing to Combat Domestic Violence Program, has generated tremendous interest. In response to thousands of inquiries from law enforcement agencies nationwide, the Department doubled the amount of funds available under this COPS program from \$10 million to \$20 million.

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs

Crime
Domestic Violence



Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report

August 1996, NCJ-154348

National Crime Victimization Survey

Violence against Women: Estimates from the Redesigned Survey

By Ronet Bachman, Ph.D.
Bureau of Justice Statistics, Statistician

Linda E. Saltzman, Ph.D.
Centers for Disease Control and
Prevention, Senior Scientist

Estimating rates of violence against women, particularly sexual assault and other incidents which are perpetrated by intimate offenders, continues to be a difficult task. Many factors inhibit women from reporting these victimizations both to police and to interviewers, including the private nature of the event, the perceived stigma associated with one's victimization, and the belief that no purpose will be served in reporting it.

The redesign of the National Crime Victimization Survey

After an extensive 10-year redesign project, the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) has been revised. A redesigned questionnaire was in wide use by January 1992. One goal of the redesign was to produce more accurate reporting of incidents of rape and sexual assault and of any kind of crimes committed by intimates or family members.

The new NCVS questionnaire encourages reporting of incidents in several ways. Questions were added to let respondents know that the interviewer

is interested in a broad spectrum of incidents, not just those involving weapons, severe violence, or violence perpetrated by strangers. New methods of asking respondents about potential experiences with victimizations

increased the range of incident types that are being reported to interviewers. And behavior-specific wording has replaced criminal justice terminology to make the questions more understandable.

Highlights

- Women age 12 or older annually sustained almost 5 million violent victimizations in 1992 and 1993. About 75% of all lone-offender violence against women and 45% of violence involving multiple-offenders was perpetrated by offenders whom the victim knew. In 29% of all violence against women by a lone offender, the perpetrator was an intimate (husband, ex-husband, boyfriend, or ex-boyfriend).
- Women were about 8 times more likely than men to experience violence committed by an intimate.
- Women annually reported about 500,000 rapes and sexual assaults to interviewers. Friends or acquaintances of the victims committed over half of these rapes or sexual assaults. Strangers were responsible for about 1 in 5.
- Women of all races and Hispanic and non-Hispanic women were

about equally vulnerable to violence by an intimate.

- Women age 19 to 29 and women in families with incomes below \$10,000 were more likely than other women to be victims of violence by an intimate.
- Among victims of violence committed by an intimate, the victimization rate of women separated from their husbands was about 3 times higher than that of divorced women and about 25 times higher than that of married women. Because the NCVS reflects a respondent's marital status at the time of the interview, which is up to 6 months after the incident, it is possible that separation or divorce followed the violence.
- Female victims of violence by an intimate were more often injured by the violence than females victimized by a stranger.

Victim-offender relationship for lone-offender victimizations

Among victims of offenders acting alone, men were just as likely to be victimized by a stranger as by someone they knew (table 4). By contrast, women were more likely to be victim-

ized by known offenders than by strangers. About three-quarters of all lone-offender violence against women was perpetrated by an offender whom the victim knew. In 29% of all violence against women by a lone offender, the perpetrator was a husband, ex-husband, boyfriend,

or ex-boyfriend — an intimate. Compared to men, women were about 6 times more likely to experience violence committed by an intimate.

Violence at the hands of an intimate involved about 9 in 1,000 women annually (table 5). This rate translates into about 1 million women who became the victims of such violence every year.

Men were about twice as likely as women to experience acts of violence by strangers. Men were victims of almost 2 million acts of stranger-perpetrated violence annually, while women experienced about 800,000.

Table 4. Victim-offender relationship and sex of victim, by type of violent victimization committed by lone offenders, 1992-93

Victim-offender relationship	Average annual percent of victimizations				
	Total	Rape/Sexual assault	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Simple assault
Female victims					
Intimate	29%	26%	28%	28%	29%
Spouse	9	5	6	5	11
Ex-spouse	4	5	5	5	4
Boy/girlfriend (or ex-)	16	16	18	17	15
Other relative	9	3	5	7	11
Acquaintance/friend	40	53	19	36	41
Stranger	23	18	48	30	19
Male victims					
Intimate	4%	-	3%	5%	3%
Spouse	1	-	-	1	1
Ex-spouse	1	-	-	-	1
Boy/girlfriend (or ex-)	2	-	2	3	1
Other relative	3	-	2	4	3
Acquaintance/friend	44	54	28	40	49
Stranger	49	46	69	51	45

Note: Excludes homicide. Intimate includes spouse or ex-spouse, boyfriend or girlfriend, and ex-boyfriend or ex-girlfriend. Detail may not add to total because of rounding.
*Ten or fewer sample cases.

Table 5. Average annual rate of violent victimization, by sex of victim, victim-offender relationship, and type of crime committed by lone offenders, 1992-93

Type of crime	Average annual rate per 1,000 persons age 12 or older			
	Intimate	Other relative	Acquaintance/friend	Stranger
Female victims				
Crimes of violence	9.3	2.8	12.9	7.4
Rape/Sexual assault	1.0	.1	2.0	.7
Robbery	.7	.1	.8	1.2
Aggravated assault	1.5	.4	2.0	1.5
Simple assault	6.1	2.2	8.5	3.9
Annual average number of violent crimes	1,008,000	304,500	1,402,500	802,300
Male victims				
Crimes of violence	1.4	1.2	17.2	19.0
Rape/Sexual assault	-	-	.2	.2
Robbery	.1	.1	.9	2.4
Aggravated assault	.5	.4	3.8	4.8
Simple assault	.8	.7	12.4	11.6
Annual average number of violent crimes	143,400	122,000	1,754,000	1,933,100

Note: Excludes homicide. Intimate includes spouse or ex-spouse, boyfriend or girlfriend, and ex-boyfriend or ex-girlfriend. Average annual numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100.
*Ten or fewer sample cases.

* Violence at the hand of an intimate, where intimate is defined as spouse, ex-spouse, boyfriend, ex-boyfriend is considered to be domestic violence.

Table 6. Average annual rate of violent victimizations of women by a lone offender, by victim characteristics and victim-offender relationship, 1992-93

Victim characteristic	Average annual rate of violent victimizations per 1,000 females age 12 or older				
	Total	Intimate	Other relative	Acquaintance/friend	Stranger
Crimes of violence	36.1	9.3	2.8	12.9	7.4
Race					
White	35.2	9.1	2.6	12.5	7.1
Black	44.6	10.9	3.5	17.2	9.5
Other	27.8	6.5	4.5	8.4	5.7
Ethnicity					
Hispanic	33.9	7.3	3.2	10.0	9.0
Non-Hispanic	36.3	9.4	2.8	13.2	7.2
Age					
12-18	74.6	9.6	6.1	39.1	11.9
19-29	63.7	21.3	4.7	18.2	13.9
30-45	37.5	10.8	2.9	12.4	7.4
46-64	12.5	2.2	1.2	4.1	3.7
65 or older	4.8	1.2	0.3	1.1	1.2
Education					
Some high school or less	47.7	9.9	4.7	20.5	7.6
High school graduate	27.9	8.2	2.2	8.8	4.8
Some college or more	35.9	6.7	2.1	11.8	8.6
Annual family income					
\$9,999 or less	67.1	19.9	6.1	18.5	7.8
\$10,000-\$14,999	46.8	13.3	4.0	14.1	9.1
\$15,000-\$19,999	42.2	10.9	3.1	17.3	7.0
\$20,000-\$29,999	38.0	8.5	2.7	14.8	7.9
\$30,000-\$49,999	30.8	5.4	1.8	11.5	8.4
\$50,000 or more	24.8	4.5	1.8	9.7	6.3
Marital status					
Married	16.9	2.7	1.6	5.7	4.9
Widowed	10.4	1.9	0.8	3.8	2.5
Divorced	61.8	23.1	4.2	19.5	10.2
Separated	123.5	82.2	10.0	19.8	7.4
Never married	63.9	12.0	4.6	27.2	12.8
Location of residence					
Urban	45.4	10.7	3.0	15.9	10.8
Suburban	33.6	9.2	2.7	11.5	7.1
Rural	29.5	7.7	2.7	12.2	3.7

Note: Rates of violence for this table include rapes, sexual assaults, robberies, and aggravated and simple assaults from the NCVS. Rates exclude homicide victimizations. Relationship-specific rates do not add to the total because some victims did not identify their relationship to the offender.

Demographic and contextual characteristics of violence against women

Violence against women perpetrated by intimates was consistent across racial and ethnic boundaries. No statistically significant differences existed between these groups. Black and white women and Hispanic and non-Hispanic women sustained about the same amount of violence by intimate partners (table 6).

Compared to all other age groups, women age 19 to 29 reported more violence by intimates. Women age 12 to 18 were more likely than women older than 18 to report violence against them by friends or acquaintances. In general, women age 65 or older were the least likely to experience an act of violence.

Women with an annual family income under \$10,000 were more likely to report having experienced violence by an intimate than those with an income of \$10,000 or more.

Among victims of violence committed by an intimate, the victimization rate of women separated from their husbands was about 3 times higher than that of divorced women and about 25 times higher than that of married women. Because the NCVS reflects a respondent's marital status at the time of the interview, it is not possible to determine whether a woman was separated or divorced at the time of

Homicide of men and women

Because the NCVS is a survey of individuals about their victimization experiences, it does not gather data on homicides. The Uniform Crime Reports (UCR), collected by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, provides the number of homicides known to police.

The 1992 UCR reported the victim-offender relationship for 61% of the homicide incidents. The reported patterns of intimate perpetration for men and women were similar to those for other types of victimizations collected by the NCVS.

Female victims of homicide were significantly more likely to be killed by a husband, ex-husband, or boyfriend than male victims were to be killed by their wife, ex-wife, or girlfriend. In 1992 approximately 28% of female victims of homicide (1,414 women) were known to have been killed by their husband, ex-husband, or boyfriend. In contrast, just over 3% of male homicide victims (637 men) were known to have been killed by their wife, ex-wife, or girlfriend.

Homicide	Percent of all homicides in 1992	
	Female victims	Male victims
Victim-offender relationship		
Spouse/ex-spouse	18.0%	2.2%
Boy/girlfriend	10.3	1.4
Other relative	10.2	5.5
Acquaintance/friend	22.0	34.6
Stranger	8.6	15.0
Relationship not identified	30.9	41.3
Number of incidents		
Relationship identified	3,454	10,351
Relationship not identified	1,547	7,824
Total number of incidents	5,001	17,635

Note: Because in 41% of male homicides and 31% of female homicides the victim-offender relationship was not identified, readers are urged to use caution in interpreting these estimates. Source: FBI, Uniform Crime Reports, 1992.

the violence or whether separation or divorce followed the violence.

In general, there was little variation in the extent to which women living in urban, suburban, and rural locations experienced violence by intimates. However, urban women were more likely than either suburban or rural women to experience violence by strangers.

Weapons and violence against women

About a fifth of all lone-offender violence against women involved a weapon. Compared to known offenders, violent offenders who were strangers to the female victim were more likely to carry or use a weapon.

	Percent of violent victimizations against women involving weapons
All lone-offender violent crimes	20%
Victim-offender relationship	
Intimate	18%
Other relative	17
Acquaintance/friend	16
Stranger	30

Injured female victims of crime

Women were more likely to be injured in violent incidents committed by intimates than in incidents committed by strangers. However, there was no significant difference across relationship categories in the extent to which injured victims required medical care. This lack of difference may reflect less severe injuries for intimate victims or may reflect factors which keep some women from seeking medical care.

	Female victims	
	Sustaining injury	Percent of injured who required medical care
All lone-offender violent crimes	33%	41%
Victim-offender relationship		
Intimate	52%	41%
Other relative	38	36
Acquaintance/friend	26	43
Stranger	20	37

Women's Injury and reporting to police

Compared to violence without injury, a higher percentage of violence against women involving injury was reported to police. Victimizations that resulted in injury were equally likely to be reported to police regardless of the relationship between the victim and offender.

Percent of violent victimizations against women reported to police

All lone-offender violent crimes	
Injured	84%
Not injured	39
Victim-offender relationship	
Intimate	
Injured	56%
Not injured	46
Other relative	
Injured	52
Not injured	39
Acquaintance/friend	
Injured	60
Not injured	33
Stranger	
Injured	66
Not injured	42

Rapes and other sexual assaults against women

The redesigned NCVS now obtains information on a broad scope of sexual assaults, ranging in severity from a completed rape to a verbal threat of sexual assault. Sexual assaults other than rape were not measured in the earlier victimization survey.

A completed rape is a report of a respondent physically forced or psychologically coerced to engage in sexual intercourse. Intercourse is an act of vaginal, anal, or oral penetration by the offender(s), including penetration by a foreign object. (For more information on NCVS methodology as it relates to rape and sexual assault, see *Methodology* on pages 6-7. Also see the forthcoming *Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1993*, NCJ-151857, Appendix.)

Victimizations not involving completed or attempted sexual intercourse but having some form of sexual behavior forced on the victim were categorized as sexual assault. These crimes in-

Table 7. Number and rate of rapes and sexual assaults of female victims age 12 or older, by type of assault, 1992-93

Type of victimization	Average annual number of incidents	Percent of all rapes/sexual assaults	Average annual rate per 1,000 females age 12 or older
Rape/Sexual assault	500,200	100%	4.8
Completed rape	172,400	34	1.6
Attempted rape	141,200	28	1.3
Sexual assault with serious injury	23,600	5	0.2
Sexual assault with minor injury	20,700	4	0.2
Sexual assault without injury	75,900	15	0.7
Verbal threat of rape	28,200	6	0.3
Verbal threat of sexual assault	37,300	7	0.3

Note: Detailed numbers and percentage distribution may not add to total because of rounding. Average annual numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100. This table does not include sexual contact without force.

Table 8. Victim-offender relationship in rapes and sexual assaults of female victims age 12 or older, by type of assault, 1992-93

Type of victimization	Percent of lone-offender victimizations against females				
	Total	Intimate	Other relative	Acquaintance/friend	Stranger
Rape/Sexual assault	100%	28%	3%	63%	18%
Completed rape	100	39	-	60	8
Attempted rape	100	24	-	48	23
Sexual assault with injury	100	23	-	42	28
Sexual assault without injury	100	13	-	75	-
Verbal threat of rape or sexual assault	100	-	-	63	42

Note: This table does not include sexual contact without force. Percentage distributions may not total 100% because some victims did not identify the offender's relationship to them and because of rounding.
*Ten or fewer sample cases.

cluded assaults and threats, and they generally involved sexual contact, such as the offender's grabbing or fondling of the victim.

Sexual assaults also included incidents in which the offender's motive was not clear. If victims reported that they had been sexually attacked but could not or would not say that it was a rape or an attempted rape, the incident was classified as a sexual assault. (For more information about screening questions, see *Methodology* and the comparisons on page 8.)

Each year an estimated 500,000 women were the victims of some form of rape or sexual assault (table 7). Thirty-four percent of these victimizations were completed rapes, and an additional 28% were attempted rapes.

Women were more likely to report being raped or sexually assaulted by friends or other acquaintances than by intimates, relatives, or strangers (table 8). Friends and acquaintances committed about half of all rapes and sexual assaults. Intimates committed an additional 28%. Altogether, offenders known to the victim accounted for about three-quarters of all rapes and sexual assaults against women. Strangers committed 18% of such assaults.

Methodology

Except for homicide data provided by the Uniform Crime Reports, the tables in this report include data from the redesigned National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) for 1992 and 1993. The NCVS obtains information about crimes, including incidents not reported to police, from a continuous, nationally representative sample of households in the United States. Approximately 50,000 households and 100,000 individuals age 12 or older are interviewed for the survey annually. References in this report to "women" or "females" include adolescents, but not children under age 12. For more information about the NCVS sample, see *Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1993*, NCJ-151657, forthcoming, published in an annual series by the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

This report includes data on series victimizations. A series crime incident is defined by the NCVS as a crime in which a respondent experienced at least six similar victimization incidents during the given reference period (previous 6 months) but could not report the date and details of each clearly enough to report them separately. These incidents are recorded as one series incident and included in all tables. The characteristics of the incident are based on those represented in the last incident in the series.

The redesigned screening instrument

A goal of the NCVS redesign was to produce more accurate reporting of incidents of rape and sexual assault and other crimes committed by intimates and family members. The new NCVS methodology encourages respondents to report incidents of this nature in a number of ways. Questions were added to let respondents know that the interviewer is interested in a broad spectrum of incidents, not just those involving weapons, severe violence, or violence perpetrated by strangers. In addition to the new questions, new methods of cueing respondents about potential experiences with victimizations have also been added. For example, instead of the yes/no question-and-answer format of the previous screener, the new screener provides an extended list of cues regarding crime victimizations and situations in which victimizations might have occurred. (See page 8.) Another general change in the new screener has been the replacement of criminal justice terms with more behavior-specific language.

The redesign's enhanced ability to measure sexual assaults and intimate-perpetrated violence

To more accurately capture sexual assaults and intimate-perpetrated violence, two frames of reference have been added or more explicitly defined in the NCVS screener. The first relates to crimes being committed by someone the respondent knows, and the second relates to possible locations of a crime or activities the respondent may have been involved in.

In addition, explicit cueing for rape and other sexual assault is included in the new screening instrument.

Definitions of relationships

Intimates: Includes spouses or ex-spouses, boyfriends and girlfriends, or ex-boyfriends and ex-girlfriends.

Other relatives: Parents or step-parents, children or stepchildren, brothers or sisters, or some other relative.

Acquaintances/friends: Friends or former friends, roommates or boarders, schoolmates, neighbors, someone at work, or some other known nonrelative.

Strangers: Anyone not known previously by the victim.

Definitions of violent crimes

Rape: Carnal knowledge through the use of force or threat of force, including attempts; attempted rape may consist of verbal threats of rape. It includes male as well as female victims.

The definition from the NCVS interviewer's manual is as follows: "Rape is forced sexual intercourse and includes both psychological coercion as well as physical force. Forced sexual intercourse means vaginal, anal, or oral penetration by the offender(s). This category also includes incidents where the penetration is from a foreign object such as a bottle."

Respondents are asked a series of questions about attacks, rapes, attempted rapes, sexual attacks, and forced or coerced unwanted sex. These questions are asked directly and are accompanied by cues about the offender (casual acquaintance, co-worker, neighbor, friend, relative, and so on). If the respondent replies in the affirmative to any of these questions or cues, an Incident Report is filled out to gather details. In gathering these details, interviewers are instructed to ask "Do you mean forced or coerced sexual intercourse?" to determine whether the incident should be recorded as a rape. If the respondent requests clarification of the terms

"rape" or "sexual intercourse," interviewers may read the above definition from the interviewer's manual.

Assault: An unlawful physical attack, whether aggravated or simple, on a person. It includes attempted assaults with or without a weapon, but excludes rape, attempted rape, and attacks involving theft or attempted theft (classified as robbery). Severity of assaults are classified into two major subcategories:

1. **Simple assault:** An attack without a weapon resulting either in minor injury (that is, bruises, black eyes, cuts, scratches, or swelling) or in undetermined injury requiring less than 2 days of hospitalization. It also includes attempted assault without a weapon and verbal threats of assault.

2. **Aggravated assault:** An attack or attempted attack with a weapon regardless of whether an injury occurred as well as an attack without a weapon when serious injury results. Serious injury includes broken bones, loss of teeth, internal injuries, loss of consciousness, and any injury requiring 2 or more days of hospitalization.

Sexual assault: A wide range of victimizations, separate from rape or attempted rape. These crimes include attacks or attempted attacks generally involving (unwanted) sexual contact between victim and offender. Sexual assaults may or may not involve force and include such things as grabbing or fondling. Sexual assault also includes verbal threats.

Robbery: Completed or attempted theft, directly from a person, of property or cash by force or threat of force, with or without a weapon.

Definitions of locations

To define the location categories, this report utilizes the Office of Management and Budget's concept of Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA's) and classifies units of analysis into three segments based on their relationship to an MSA: central city, outside central city, and nonmetropolitan area — labeled in this report as urban, suburban, and rural. A more detailed description of these areas follows:

Urban: The largest city, or grouping of cities, in an MSA. In this report, city areas are categorized as those portions of metropolitan areas located in "central cities."

Suburban: A county or group of counties containing a central city, plus any contiguous counties that are linked socially and economically to the central city. In this report, suburban areas are categorized as those portions of Metropolitan Statistical Areas situated "outside central cities."

Rural: A county or group of counties not located inside a Metropolitan Statistical Area. This category includes a variety of localities, including smaller cities with populations less than 50,000; however, it is primarily comprised of sparsely populated areas.

Definition of weapons

Items such as guns (pistols, revolvers, rifles, and shotguns) and knives are always considered weapons. Other objects are considered weapons when they are used as weapons or when respondents felt threatened by them.

Calculation of NCVS rates

The rates in this report were annual average rates for 1992-93. The numerator of a given rate was the sum of the estimated victimizations that occurred both years for each respective demographic group; the denominator was the sum of the annual population totals for these same years and demographic groups.

Application of standard errors

The results presented in this report were tested to determine whether the observed difference between groups was statistically significant. Most comparisons mentioned in the report passed a hypothesis test at the .05 level of statistical significance (or the 95-percent confidence level), meaning that the estimated difference between comparisons was greater than twice the standard error of that difference. However, some comparisons were significant at the 90-percent confidence level only. These comparisons

were qualified by phrases such as "somewhat" or "some evidence of a difference." Comparisons that failed the 90-percent hypothesis test were not considered statistically significant.

Although the data in this report were collected over a 2-year period, some estimates were based on a relatively small number of sample cases, particularly for certain demographic groups. The data tables note when estimates were based on 10 or fewer unweighted sample cases. Because standard errors cannot be accurately computed for such estimates, it is inadvisable to compare them to other estimates. Furthermore, caution should be used when comparing estimates not discussed in the text because since seemingly large differences may not be statistically significant at the 95-percent or even the 90-percent confidence level.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics is the statistical agency of the U.S. Department of Justice. Jan M. Chaiken, Ph.D., is the director.

BJJ Special Reports address a specific topic in depth from one or more datasets that cover many topics.

Ronit Bachman, Ph.D., BJS, and Linda E. Saltzman, Ph.D., Family and Intimate Violence Prevention Team, Division of Violence Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, wrote this report. Tom Heeter and Tina Dorsey edited the report. Marilyn Marbrook, assisted by Jayne Robinson and Yvonne Boston, administered production.

August 1995, NCJ-164348

Appendix: Comparison of new and old screener questions

Screener questions for violent crimes

New (beginning January 1992)

1. Has anyone attacked or threatened you in any of these ways—
 - a. With any weapon, for instance, a gun or knife—
 - b. With anything like a baseball bat, frying pan, scissor, or stick—
 - c. By something thrown, such as a rock or bottle—
 - d. Include any grabbing, punching, or choking.
 - e. Any rape, attempted rape or other type of sexual assault—
 - f. Any face to face threats—

OR

- g. Any attack or threat or use of force by anyone at all?
Please mention it even if you were not certain it was a crime.

2. Incidents involving forced or unwanted sexual acts are often difficult to talk about. Have you been forced or coerced to engage in unwanted sexual activity by—
 - a. Someone you didn't know before
 - b. A casual acquaintance OR
 - c. Someone you know well.

Screener questions for all types of crimes

New

1. Were you attacked or threatened OR did you have something stolen from you—
 - a. At home including the porch or yard—
 - b. At or near a friend's relative's, or neighbor's home—
 - c. At work or school—
 - d. In place such as a storage shed or laundry room, a shopping mall, restaurant, bank or airport—
 - e. While riding in any vehicle—
 - f. On the street or in a parking lot—
 - g. At such places as a party, theater, gym, picnic area, bowling lanes, or while fishing or hunting.
 OR
 - h. Did anyone ATTEMPT to attack or attempt to steal anything belonging to you from any of these places?
2. People often don't think of incidents committed by someone they know. Did you have something stolen from you OR were you attacked or threatened by—
 - a. Someone at work or school—
 - b. A neighbor or friend—
 - c. A relative or family member—
 - d. Any other person you've met or known?
3. Did you call the police to report something that happened to YOU which you thought was a crime?
4. Did anything happen to you which you thought was a crime, but did NOT report to the police?

Old (1972-92*)

1. Did anyone take something directly from you by using force, such as by a stickup, mugging, or threat?
2. Did anyone TRY to rob you by using force or threatening to harm you?
3. Did anyone beat you up, attack you, or hit you with something, such as a rock or bottle?
4. Were you knifed, shot at, or attacked with some other weapon by anyone at all?
5. Did anyone THREATEN to beat you up or THREATEN you with a knife, gun, or some other weapon, NOT including telephone threats?
6. Did anyone TRY to attack you in some other way?

*During 1992 half of the sampled households responded to the old questionnaire, and half to the redesigned survey.

Old

1. Was anything stolen from you while you were away from home, for instance, at work, in a theater or restaurant, or while traveling.
2. Did you call the police to report something that happened to YOU that you thought was a crime?
3. Did anything happen to YOU that you thought was a crime, but did NOT report to the police?

The table below compares results from this report, based on the redesigned NCVS methodology, with results from an earlier report, using data from the old questionnaire (*Violence against Women, NCJ-145325, January 1994*).

The new survey instrument captures more incidents of violence across all categories than did the old questionnaire. The extent of increase, however, does vary according to the sex of the vic-

	Average annual rate of violent victimizations per 1,000 persons	
	Female	Male
Old survey methodology, 1987-91		
Intimate	5.4	.5
Other relative	1.1	.7
Acquaintance/friend	7.6	13.0
Stranger	5.4	12.2
New NCVS methodology, 1992-93		
Intimate	9.3	1.4
Other relative	2.8	1.2
Acquaintance/friend	12.9	17.2
Stranger	7.4	18.0

tim and the victim-offender relationship. The rates presented in this table are based on different time periods; however, analysis of data for overlapping periods confirms these patterns. (See *Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1993, NCJ-151857, Appendix, forthcoming*, by the Bureau of Justice Statistics.)

Appendix table

the violence or whether separation or divorce followed the violence.

In general, there was little variation in the extent to which women living in urban, suburban, and rural locations experienced violence by intimates. However, urban women were more likely than either suburban or rural women to experience violence by strangers.

Weapons and violence against women

About a fifth of all lone-offender violence against women involved a weapon. Compared to known offenders, violent offenders who were strangers to the female victim were more likely to carry or use a weapon.

	Percent of violent victimizations against women involving weapons
All lone-offender violent crimes	20%
Victim-offender relationship	
Intimate	18%
Other relative	17
Acquaintance/friend	16
Stranger	30

Injured female victims of crime

Women were more likely to be injured in violent incidents committed by intimates than in incidents committed by strangers. However, there was no significant difference across relationship categories in the extent to which injured victims required medical care. This lack of difference may reflect less severe injuries for intimate victims or may reflect factors which keep some women from seeking medical care.

	Female victims	
	Sustaining injury	Percent of injured who required medical care
All lone-offender violent crimes	33%	41%
Victim-offender relationship		
Intimate	52%	41%
Other relative	38	35
Acquaintance/friend	28	43
Stranger	20	37

Women's Injury and reporting to police

Compared to violence without injury, a higher percentage of violence against women involving injury was reported to police. Victimization that resulted in injury were equally likely to be reported to police regardless of the relationship between the victim and offender.

	Percent of violent victimizations against women reported to police
All lone-offender violent crimes	
Injured	54%
Not injured	39
Victim-offender relationship	
Intimate	
Injured	56%
Not injured	46
Other relative	
Injured	52
Not injured	39
Acquaintance/friend	
Injured	50
Not injured	33
Stranger	
Injured	58
Not injured	42

Rapes and other sexual assaults against women

The redesigned NCVS now obtains information on a broad scope of sexual assaults, ranging in severity from a completed rape to a verbal threat of sexual assault. Sexual assaults other than rape were not measured in the earlier victimization survey.

A completed rape is a report of a respondent physically forced or psychologically coerced to engage in sexual intercourse. Intercourse is an act of vaginal, anal, or oral penetration by the offender(s), including penetration by a foreign object. (For more information on NCVS methodology as it relates to rape and sexual assault, see *Methodology* on pages 6-7. Also see the forthcoming *Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1993*, NCJ-151857, Appendix.)

Victimizations not involving completed or attempted sexual intercourse but having some form of sexual behavior forced on the victim were categorized as sexual assault. These crimes in-

Table 7. Number and rate of rapes and sexual assaults of female victims age 12 or older, by type of assault, 1992-93

Type of victimization	Average annual number of incidents	Percent of all rapes/sexual assaults	Average annual rate per 1,000 females age 12 or older
Rape/Sexual assault	600,200	100%	4.8
Completed rape	172,400	34	1.8
Attempted rape	141,200	28	1.3
Sexual assault with serious injury	23,600	6	0.2
Sexual assault with minor injury	20,700	4	0.2
Sexual assault without injury	75,800	15	0.7
Verbal threat of rape	26,200	8	0.3
Verbal threat of sexual assault	37,300	7	0.3

Note: Detailed numbers and percentage distribution may not add to total because of rounding. Average annual numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100. This table does not include sexual contact without force.

Table 8. Victim-offender relationship in rapes and sexual assaults of female victims age 12 or older, by type of assault, 1992-93

Type of victimization	Percent of lone-offender victimizations against females				
	Total	Intimate	Other relative	Acquaintance/friend	Stranger
Rape/Sexual assault	100%	28%	3%	53%	18%
Completed rape	100	39	*	60	8
Attempted rape	100	24	*	49	23
Sexual assault with injury	100	23	*	42	28
Sexual assault without injury	100	13	*	75	*
Verbal threat of rape or sexual assault	100	*	*	53	42

Note: This table does not include sexual contact without force. Percentage distributions may not total 100% because some victims did not identify the offender's relationship to them and because of rounding.
*Ten or fewer sample cases.

cluded assaults and threats, and they generally involved sexual contact, such as the offender's grabbing or fondling of the victim.

Sexual assaults also included incidents in which the offender's motive was not clear. If victims reported that they had been sexually attacked but could not or would not say that it was a rape or an attempted rape, the incident was classified as a sexual assault. (For more information about screening questions, see *Methodology* and the comparisons on page 8.)

Each year an estimated 500,000 women were the victims of some form of rape or sexual assault (table 7). Thirty-four percent of these victimizations were completed rapes, and an additional 28% were attempted rapes.

Women were more likely to report being raped or sexually assaulted by friends or other acquaintances than by intimates, relatives, or strangers (table 8). Friends and acquaintances committed about half of all rapes and sexual assaults. Intimates committed an additional 26%. Altogether, offenders known to the victim accounted for about three-quarters of all rapes and sexual assaults against women. Strangers committed 18% of such assaults.

Methodology

Except for homicide data provided by the Uniform Crime Reports, the tables in this report include data from the redesigned National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) for 1992 and 1993. The NCVS obtains information about crimes, including incidents not reported to police, from a continuous, nationally representative sample of households in the United States. Approximately 50,000 households and 100,000 individuals age 12 or older are interviewed for the survey annually. References in this report to "women" or "females" include adolescents, but not children under age 12. For more information about the NCVS sample, see *Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1993*, NCJ-151657, forthcoming, published in an annual series by the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

This report includes data on series victimizations. A series crime incident is defined by the NCVS as a crime in which a respondent experienced at least six similar victimization incidents during the given reference period (previous 6 months) but could not report the date and details of each clearly enough to report them separately. These incidents are recorded as one series incident and included in all tables. The characteristics of the incident are based on those represented in the last incident in the series.

The redesigned screening instrument

A goal of the NCVS redesign was to produce more accurate reporting of incidents of rape and sexual assault and other crimes committed by intimates and family members. The new NCVS methodology encourages respondents to report incidents of this nature in a number of ways. Questions were added to let respondents know that the interviewer is interested in a broad spectrum of incidents, not just those involving weapons, severe violence, or violence perpetrated by strangers. In addition to the new questions, new methods of cuing respondents about potential experiences with victimizations have also been added. For example, instead of the yes/no question-and-answer format of the previous screener, the new screener provides an extended list of cues regarding crime victimizations and situations in which victimizations might have occurred. (See page 8.) Another general change in the new screener has been the replacement of criminal justice terms with more behavior-specific language.

The redesign's enhanced ability to measure sexual assaults and intimate-perpetrated violence

To more accurately capture sexual assaults and intimate-perpetrated violence, two frames of reference have been added or more explicitly defined in the NCVS screener. The first relates to crimes being committed by someone the respondent knows, and the second relates to possible locations of a crime or activities the respondent may have been involved in.

In addition, explicit cuing for rape and other sexual assault is included in the new screening instrument.

Definitions of relationships

Intimates: Includes spouses or ex-spouses, boyfriends and girlfriends, or ex-boyfriends and ex-girlfriends.

Other relatives: Parents or step-parents, children or stepchildren, brothers or sisters, or some other relative.

Acquaintances/friends: Friends or former friends, roommates or boarders, schoolmates, neighbors, someone at work, or some other known nonrelative.

Strangers: Anyone not known previously by the victim.

Definitions of violent crimes

Rape: Carnal knowledge through the use of force or threat of force, including attempts; attempted rape may consist of verbal threats of rape. It includes male as well as female victims.

The definition from the NCVS interviewer's manual is as follows: "Rape is forced sexual intercourse and includes both psychological coercion as well as physical force. Forced sexual intercourse means vaginal, anal, or oral penetration by the offender(s). This category also includes incidents where the penetration is from a foreign object such as a bottle."

Respondents are asked a series of questions about attacks, rapes, attempted rapes, sexual attacks, and forced or coerced unwanted sex. These questions are asked directly and are accompanied by cues about the offender (casual acquaintance, co-worker, neighbor, friend, relative, and so on). If the respondent replies in the affirmative to any of these questions or cues, an Incident Report is filled out to gather details. In gathering these details, interviewers are instructed to ask "Do you mean forced or coerced sexual intercourse?" to determine whether the incident should be recorded as a rape. If the respondent requests clarification of the terms

"rape" or "sexual intercourse," interviewers may read the above definition from the interviewer's manual.

Assault: An unlawful physical attack, whether aggravated or simple, on a person. It includes attempted assaults with or without a weapon, but excludes rape, attempted rape, and attacks involving theft or attempted theft (classified as robbery). Severity of assaults are classified into two major subcategories:

1. **Simple assault:** An attack without a weapon resulting either in minor injury (that is, bruises, black eyes, cuts, scratches, or swelling) or in undetermined injury requiring less than 2 days of hospitalization. It also includes attempted assault without a weapon and verbal threats of assault.

2. **Aggravated assault:** An attack or attempted attack with a weapon regardless of whether an injury occurred as well as an attack without a weapon when serious injury results. Serious injury includes broken bones, loss of teeth, internal injuries, loss of consciousness, and any injury requiring 2 or more days of hospitalization.

Sexual assault: A wide range of victimizations, separate from rape or attempted rape. These crimes include attacks or attempted attacks generally involving (unwanted) sexual contact between victim and offender. Sexual assaults may or may not involve force and include such things as grabbing or fondling. Sexual assault also includes verbal threats.

Robbery: Completed or attempted theft, directly from a person, of property or cash by force or threat of force, with or without a weapon.

Definitions of locations

To define the location categories, this report utilizes the Office of Management and Budget's concept of Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA's) and classifies units of analysis into three segments based on their relationship to an MSA: central city, outside central city, and nonmetropolitan area — labeled in this report as urban, suburban, and rural. A more detailed description of these areas follows:

Urban: The largest city, or grouping of cities, in an MSA. In this report, city areas are categorized as those portions of metropolitan areas located in "central cities."

Suburban: A county or group of counties containing a central city, plus any contiguous counties that are linked socially and economically to the central city. In this report, suburban areas are categorized as those portions of Metropolitan Statistical Areas situated "outside central cities."

Rural: A county or group of counties not located inside a Metropolitan Statistical Area. This category includes a variety of localities, including smaller cities with populations less than 50,000; however, it is primarily comprised of sparsely populated areas.

Definition of weapons

Items such as guns (pistols, revolvers, rifles, and shotguns) and knives are always considered weapons. Other objects are considered weapons when they are used as weapons or when respondents felt threatened by them.

Calculation of NCVS rates

The rates in this report were annual average rates for 1992-93. The numerator of a given rate was the sum of the estimated victimizations that occurred both years for each respective demographic group; the denominator was the sum of the annual population totals for these same years and demographic groups.

Application of standard errors

The results presented in this report were tested to determine whether the observed difference between groups was statistically significant. Most comparisons mentioned in the report passed a hypothesis test at the .05 level of statistical significance (or the 95-percent confidence level), meaning that the estimated difference between comparisons was greater than twice the standard error of that difference. However, some comparisons were significant at the 90-percent confidence level only. These comparisons

were qualified by phrases such as "somewhat" or "some evidence of a difference." Comparisons that failed the 90-percent hypothesis test were not considered statistically significant.

Although the data in this report were collected over a 2-year period, some estimates were based on a relatively small number of sample cases, particularly for certain demographic groups. The data tables note when estimates were based on 10 or fewer unweighted sample cases. Because standard errors cannot be accurately computed for such estimates, it is inadvisable to compare them to other estimates. Furthermore, caution should be used when comparing estimates not discussed in the text because since seemingly large differences may not be statistically significant at the 95-percent or even the 90-percent confidence level.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics is the statistical agency of the U.S. Department of Justice. Jan M. Chaiken, Ph.D., is the director.

BJS Special Reports address a specific topic in depth from one or more datasets that cover many topics.

Ronit Bachman, Ph.D., BJS, and Linda E. Saltzman, Ph.D., Family and Intimate Violence Prevention Team, Division of Violence Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, wrote this report. Tom Hester and Tina Dorsey edited the report. Marilyn Marbrook, assisted by Jayne Robinson and Yvonne Boston, administered production.

August 1995, NCJ-154348

Appendix: Comparison of new and old screener questions

Screener questions for violent crimes

New (beginning January 1992)

1. Has anyone attacked or threatened you in any of these ways—
 - a. With any weapon, for instance, a gun or knife—
 - b. With anything like a baseball bat, frying pan, scissors, or stick—
 - c. By something thrown, such as a rock or bottle—
 - d. Include any grabbing, punching, or choking.
 - e. Any rape, attempted rape or other type of sexual assault—
 - f. Any face to face threats—

OR

 - g. Any attack or threat or use of force by anyone at all? Please mention it even if you were not certain it was a crime.
2. Incidents involving forced or unwanted sexual acts are often difficult to talk about. Have you been forced or coerced to engage in unwanted sexual activity by—
 - a. Someone you didn't know before
 - b. A casual acquaintance OR
 - c. Someone you know well.

Old (1972-92*)

1. Did anyone take something directly from you by using force, such as by a stickup, mugging, or threat?
2. Did anyone TRY to rob you by using force or threatening to harm you?
3. Did anyone beat you up, attack you, or hit you with something, such as a rock or bottle?
4. Were you knifed, shot at, or attacked with some other weapon by anyone at all?
5. Did anyone THREATEN to beat you up or THREATEN you with a knife, gun, or some other weapon, NOT including telephone threats?
6. Did anyone TRY to attack you in some other way?

* During 1992 half of the sampled households responded to the old questionnaire, and half to the redesigned survey.

Screener questions for all types of crimes

New

1. Were you attacked or threatened OR did you have something stolen from you—
 - a. At home including the porch or yard—
 - b. At or near a friend's relative's, or neighbor's home—
 - c. At work or school—
 - d. In place such as a storage shed or laundry room, a shopping mall, restaurant, bank or airport—
 - e. While riding in any vehicle—
 - f. On the street or in a parking lot—
 - g. At such places as a party, theater, gym, picnic area, bowling lanes, or while fishing or hunting.

OR

 - h. Did anyone ATTEMPT to attack or attempt to steal anything belonging to you from any of these places?
2. People often don't think of incidents committed by someone they know. Did you have something stolen from you OR were you attacked or threatened by—
 - a. Someone at work or school—
 - b. A neighbor or friend—
 - c. A relative or family member—
 - d. Any other person you've met or known?
3. Did you call the police to report something that happened to YOU which you thought was a crime?
4. Did anything happen to you which you thought was a crime, but did NOT report to the police?

Old

1. Was anything stolen from you while you were away from home, for instance, at work, in a theater or restaurant, or while traveling.
2. Did you call the police to report something that happened to YOU that you thought was a crime?
3. Did anything happen to YOU that you thought was a crime, but did NOT report to the police?

The table below compares results from this report, based on the redesigned NCVS methodology, with results from an earlier report, using data from the old questionnaire (*Violence against Women*, NCJ-145325, January 1994).

The new survey instrument captures more incidents of violence across all categories than did the old questionnaire. The extent of increase, however, does vary according to the sex of the vic-

	Average annual rate of violent victimizations per 1,000 persons	
	Female	Male
Old survey methodology, 1987-91		
Intimate	6.4	.5
Other relative	1.1	.7
Acquaintance/friend	7.6	13.0
Stranger	6.4	12.2
New NCVS methodology, 1992-93		
Intimate	9.3	1.4
Other relative	2.8	1.2
Acquaintance/friend	12.9	17.2
Stranger	7.4	19.0

tim and the victim-offender relationship. The rates presented in this table are based on different time periods; however, analysis of data for overlapping periods confirms these patterns. (See *Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1993*, NCJ-151657, Appendix, forthcoming, by the Bureau of Justice Statistics.)

Appendix table

THIS SEARCH	THIS DOCUMENT	GO TO
Next Hit	Forward	New Search
Prev Hit	Back	HomePage
Hit List	Best Sections	Help
	Doc Contents	

Crime - Domestic Violence

References to this bill in the Congressional Record	Digest and Status Information About this Bill.	Download this bill. (5,748 bytes).
---	--	------------------------------------

Domestic Violence Victims Insurance Protection Act of 1995 (Introduced in the House)

HR 1920 IH

104th CONGRESS

1st Session

H. R. 1920

To protect victims of domestic violence from health insurance discrimination.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

June 22, 1995

Ms. MOLINARI (for herself, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KING, and Mr. PAXON) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce

A BILL

To protect victims of domestic violence from health insurance discrimination.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the 'Domestic Violence Victims Insurance Protection Act of 1995'.

SEC. 2. PROTECTION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIMS FROM HEALTH INSURANCE DISCRIMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL- An insurer may not deny or cancel health insurance coverage for an individual solely on the basis that the individual is or has been the subject of an act of domestic violence.

(b) INTERPRETATION- Nothing in this section shall prevent an insurer from underwriting, issuing, or renewing health insurance coverage on the basis of the physical or mental history of an individual so long as the insurer does not take into consideration whether such individual's condition was caused by an act of domestic violence.

(c) STANDARDS-

(1) **IN GENERAL-** The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall request the National Association of Insurance Commissioners to develop, within 9 months after the date of the enactment of the Act, model regulations that specify standards with respect to the requirements of this subtitle as applicable to carriers and health insurance coverage.

(2) **REVIEW OF STANDARDS-** If the National Association of Insurance Commissioners develops recommended regulations specifying such standards within such period, the Secretary shall review the standards. Such review shall be completed within 60 days after the date the regulations are developed. Unless the Secretary determines within such period that the standards do not meet the requirements, such standards shall serve as the standards under this section, with such amendments as the Secretary deems necessary.

(3) **APPLICATION OF STANDARDS-** Each State shall submit to the Secretary a report on steps the State is taking to implement and enforce the standards established under paragraph (1) with respect to carriers and health insurance coverage offered or renewed.

(d) **DEFINITIONS-** For purposes of this section:

(1) **ACT OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE-** The term 'act of domestic violence' means, with respect to an individual, the occurrence of one or more acts of harassment, menacing, reckless endangerment, kidnapping, assault, attempted assault, or attempted murder, in violation of Federal or State law, between household or family members (including in-laws or extended family), spouses or former spouses, or individuals engaged in or formerly engaged in a sexually intimate relationship, where such an act has resulted in actual physical or emotional injury, or has created a substantial risk of physical or emotional harm to such individual or such individual's child.

(2) **HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE-**

(A) **IN GENERAL-** Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term 'health insurance coverage' means any hospital or medical service policy or certificate, hospital or medical service plan contract, or health maintenance organization contract offered by an insurer.

(B) **EXCEPTION-** Such term does not include any of the following:

(i) Coverage for accident only, dental only, vision only, disability income, or long-term care insurance.

(ii) Medical supplemental health insurance.

(iii) Coverage issued as a supplement to liability insurance.

(iv) Liability insurance, including general liability insurance and automobile liability insurance.

(v) Worker's compensation or similar insurance.

(vi) Automobile medical-payment insurance.

(vii) Coverage for a specified disease or illness.

(3) **INSURER-** The term 'insurer' means an insurance company, insurance service, or insurance organization licensed to engage in the business of insurance in a State, and health maintenance organization.

(4) **STATE-** The term 'State' means any State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam.

[Next Hit](#)
[Prev Hit](#)
[Hit List](#)

[Forward](#)
[Back](#)
[Best Sections](#)
[Doc Contents](#)

[New Search](#)
[HomePage](#)
[Help](#)



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Melissa T. Skolfield

Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs

Phone: (202) 690-7850 Fax: (202) 690-5673

To: Bruce Reed

Fax: 456-5557 Phone: _____

Date: 5/2 Total number of pages sent: 2

Comments:

FYI re: that troublesome ad.
m.

CONTACT:

YOLANDA CHAVEZ
(213) 628-9230FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
MAY 1, 1996HENRY CONTRERAS
(202) 225-1766*Domestic Violence***ROYBAL-ALLARD JOINS N.O.W. IN RELEASING NEW STUDY SHOWING
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND WELFARE DEPENDENCY**

Washington, D.C.— Congresswoman Lucille Roybal-Allard (D-Los Angeles) and Patricia Ireland, President of the National Organization for Women (N.O.W.), held a national press conference releasing the results of a study documenting the interrelationship between domestic violence and dependence on welfare. The study entitled "Prisoners of Abuse" was conducted by Jody Raphael of the Taylor Institute and found that between fifty percent to eighty percent of women receiving welfare are current or past victims of domestic abuse.

"This groundbreaking research offers valuable insights as to why so many women become trapped in the cycle of welfare dependency. It also illustrates why it is so difficult for poor women to become self-sufficient when, in addition to traditional obstacles such as the lack of child care and health care coverage, they are also victims of domestic violence," stated Rep. Roybal-Allard.

The study is designed to provide valuable insights and perspectives to policy makers as Congress continues to consider major welfare reform legislation. A number of pending welfare reform measures call for the repeal of AFDC and the JOBS program, mandate job training, impose "caps" on the number of children eligible for benefits, and place restrictions on the time periods in which benefits may be received. In light of the study's findings, Rep. Roybal-Allard announced that she will introduce a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that any welfare reform legislation will not further penalize women victimized by domestic violence and that safeguards will be included to address the impact of domestic violence on poor women. Senator Paul Wellstone (D-MN) will introduce a companion resolution in the Senate.

Three survivors of domestic violence spoke at the press conference. They told poignant stories of years of living with abusive partners, their fears for their lives and the lives of their children, and the difficulties they faced in leaving these relationships without assurances they would be able to financially support their children. The survivors spoke about the critical role welfare programs played in escaping these abusive situations. According to one woman, the welfare system was her only hope for freedom from an abusive relationship which had spanned more than 12 years. Another survivor, who had been a victim of domestic violence since age 16, stated that public assistance enabled her to finish high school and realize her dream to attend Howard University. The women unanimously agreed that without welfare, they would have been forced to live with their batterers, and that they and their children undoubtedly would have been severely injured or killed by their batterers.

"Congress and the Administration must clearly understand that welfare reform proposals that impose arbitrary time limits and deny benefits to women and children living in poverty are particularly cruel. Many of these provisions, if enacted, would make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for battered women to support their children and may, in fact, force them to remain in an abusive environment or return to their batterers for financial support," continued Roybal-Allard.

Rep. Roybal-Allard and N.O.W. were joined at the press conference by Senator Wellstone and Senator Arlen Specter (R-PA) and Representatives Bob Matsui (D-CA), Eva Clayton (D-NC), Zoe Lofgren (D-CA), Elizabeth Furse (D-OR), Eddie Bernice Johnson (D-TX), and Lynn Woolsey (D-CA).

###