

Violence At Home:

Remembering, Learning and Preventing

A Report from the Child and Family Violence Fatality Review Team

> Richmond, Virginia October 2003



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Richmond Child and Family Fatality Review Team is a success because its participating agencies have an overwhelming commitment to the fatality review process and to system reform. Those who serve on this team are motivated toward improving the safety of our community by working to understand fatal events in order to improve collaborations and prevent future fatalities. Each member's expertise, vision and dedication serve as a testament to those persons whose lives have been lost and that their deaths were not in vain. Their memories will serve as motivation for change. Special thanks go to the following persons who serve as members of the Richmond Child and Family Violence Fatality Review Team:

Diane Abato, Deputy Commonwealth's Attorney, Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney

Chris Abbey, Parish Nurse, Catholic Diocese

Lynn Anderson, Second Responder Supervisor, Richmond Social Services

Diane Atkins, Director of Shelter Services, YWCA

Arlene Belfield, L.C.S.W., Director Child/Family Health, Richmond Behavioral Health Authority

Gay Cutchin, Sexual Assault Program Director, Virginia Commonwealth University

Robin Foster, M.D., Pediatric ER Chief, VCU Health System

Matthew Sasser, Lieutenant, Richmond Police Department

Jeanine Harper, Director, Greater Richmond SCAN (Stop Child Abuse Now)

Maureen Brown, Magistrate, Richmond City

Julie Hendricks, Chairperson, Domestic Violence Coordinating Committee

Deborah Kay, M.D., Assistant Chief Medical Examiner, Office of the Chief Medical Examiner

William Martin, Lieutenant, Richmond Fire Department

Sue Mayes, Director, 13th District Court Service Unit

Doris Moseley, Child and Family Division, Human Services Manager, Richmond Social Services

Trish Muller, Chief Operating Officer, Richmond Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court

Kent Radwani, Director Batterer Intervention, Commonwealth Catholic Charities

Jo Anne Robertson, Family Violence Prevention Program Supervisor, Richmond Social Services

Cornelius Robinson, Sergeant, Richmond Police Department

Richard Taylor, Judge, City of Richmond

Maura Vilkoski, Case Manager, Richmond CASA

Collectively, we give thanks to the City Attorney's Office and Manoli Loupassi for writing and sponsoring the resolution which the Richmond City Council endorsed supporting the development and work of the Richmond Child and Family Violence Fatality Review Team. We also appreciate the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner for its unending guidance during the team's development.



INTRODUCTION

The Richmond Child and Family Violence Fatality Review Team met from April 2002 to April 2003 and reviewed 8 events that resulted in 10 deaths in the years 2000 and 2001. The events were identified by the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner and the Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney. While much of the Team's organizational structure and meeting protocol was created prior to the first review taking place; the Team continued to improve upon their structure even through the last review. One challenge the Team faced was its uncertainty in knowing what information to collect and how that information would help identify trends.

The Office of the Chief Medical Examiner collects information on fatal family violence in Virginia and publishes an annual report entitled *Family and Intimate Partner Violence Homicide*. The report provides an overview of homicide in the State, with an emphasis on family and intimate partner related deaths. According to the OCME, the two-year average (years 2000 and 2001) of intimate partner homicide for the City of Richmond is 6 deaths, which equals to a rate of 3.88 deaths per 100,000 people. The two-year average of child homicide by caretaker for Richmond is 1.5 deaths, with a rate of 3.47 deaths per 100,000 people. A comparison of Richmond's rates to that of the State's for the same two-year period reveals that Richmond has over twice the rate of intimate partner homicide and child homicide by caretaker than that of the State. The State's rate for intimate partner homicide is 1.43 per 100,000 people; and the rate for child homicide by caretaker is 1.4 per 100,000 people.

The statewide data in relation to the eight events the Team reviewed illustrates the importance of the fatality review process and the significance of the Team.

SUMMARY OF CASES

The Team reviewed eight events in which a total of ten people lost their lives. Eight were adults and two were children.

The Team's mission is to identify and describe trends and patterns in family violence and child abuse ...

- Of the eight events, six were female and four were male.
- The manner of death included four firearms, three instruments such as knives and one death caused by hands.
- Seven of the eight events had a history of prior violence as reported by law enforcement, court records and by family. In six of the events, a public display of violence was reported. And in three of the events, a protective order had previously been issued on the defendant. Also, in three of the eight events, a recent separation between the defendant and victim was reported.
- In half of the events reviewed, family members reported they knew of previous violence by the defendant. In three events, the victim's children reported being aware of the violence.
- Substance abuse by the defendant was reported in over half of the events the Team reviewed. In one of these four, the victim also reported having a substance abuse



problem. And in one instance, substance abuse was reported yet no referral was made for intervention.

- Five events recorded the victim as unemployed and receiving TANF. In three events, the victim had previous utilized domestic violence shelters and services. Three of the six female victims had received mental health services while three victims also reported having suffered with depression.
- Child protective services had a previous relationship in three of the eight events, while three perpetrators had previously participated in a Batterer Intervention Program.
- Isolation and family were noted as barriers to possible interventions in two of the eight events.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

After completing each review, the Team asked a series of questions that helped identify interventions that may have prevented the fatal injuries. By examining which prevention strategies flowed from these interventions, which interventions worked, and which needed to be expanded and improved, the Team recognized developing trends and offered recommendation

The fatality review process enabled the participating agencies within the child and family violence response system to evaluate performances within and between agencies. While system response is not without need for improvement, the process allowed members to see how well agencies within this system work together and evaluate the numerous accomplishments and system changes that have been implemented to date toward improving the safety of family violence victims and children. The cases that posed the greatest challenge to everyone around the table were those in which the adult victim and children were isolated and did not know about or chose not to take advantage of the services available to them.



CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESPONSE RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court minimize continuances by hearing domestic violence case when all parties are present.

We recommend the Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney evaluate the defendants' need for substance abuse treatment as early as possible.

We recommend the Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney and the Richmond Police Department initiate referrals for supportive counseling in all cases where a child is a witness or a secondary victim through the loss of a parent.

We recommend the Richmond Police Department continue contacting the Second Responder Program in all homicide and violent crime cases, including events where children may or may not have witnessed the fatal event.



We recommend continued communication among the Department of Social Services, Police Department, VCU Health System's Forensic Nurses and Physicians and the OCME.



SOCIAL SERVICES RESPONSE RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend the Second Responder Program generate a report and department file on all cases even when all that is provided to the victim is information or referrals.

We recommend the Richmond Department of Social Services provide services as needed on all unfounded CPS complaints and we continue our support of their Differential Response System.

We recommend Richmond Department of Social Services mandate training on the identification of child abuse and neglect for daycare facilities.



ADVOCACY AND OUTREACH RESPONSE RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend Greater Richmond SCAN and Commonwealth Catholic Charities continue outreach to the Non-English speaking communities.

We recommend a media campaign to raise awareness about child and family violence and its effects on children and adults.

We recommend collaborative referrals among the Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney's Victim Witness Program, Richmond Department of Social Service's Child Protective Services, Family Violence Prevention Program and the Second Responder Program on all appropriate cases.

We recommend Richmond Social Services Family Violence Prevention Program and the Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney's Victim Witness Program follow up with surviving victims or witnesses of child and family violence within 72 to 96 hours of the event

TEAM HISTORY

In 1999, Virginia expanded its fatality review team legislation by giving localities the authorization to establish local or regional family violence fatality review teams. Virginia is one of a handful of states across the nation to enact such legislation. Virginia's Office

The Team's mission is to increase safety for victims and accountability for perpetrators of family violence and child abuse and neglect by promoting cooperation and communication among agencies investigating and intervening in family violence and child abuse.

of the Chief Medical Examiner (OCME) has provided training and guidance to localities interested in conducting fatality review. In 2001, with the help of the OCME, Richmond took steps to establish a combined Child and Family Violence Fatality Review Team.



In April 2001, David M. Hicks, Commonwealth's Attorney for the City of Richmond, Cathy Pond, Executive Director of the YWCA, and Richard Taylor, then Chief Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, invited local non-profits and government agencies to participate in an organizational meeting. Each agency that attended the initial meeting signed a collaborative agreement (See Appendix I) agreeing to participate in creating the Team's mission statement, protocols, reviews, findings and recommendations. The Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney agreed to be the lead agency.

The following are members of the Richmond Child and Family Violence Fatality Review Team: YWCA of Richmond, Richmond Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, Department of Criminal Justice Services, Richmond Behavioral Health Authority, VCU Sexual Assault Program, Richmond City Department of Social Services, VCU Health System, Greater Richmond SCAN, Virginia Department of Social Services, Richmond's Court Services Unit, Richmond Police Department, Commonwealth Catholic Charities, Richmond Magistrate's Office, Richmond Fire Department, Office of the Chief Medical Examiner, Richmond CASA and the Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney (Chair).

The Virginia Code § 32.1-283.3 (C) requires family violence fatality review teams have the endorsement of their local government. The Team met monthly to prepare a resolution for Richmond City Council asking for its endorsement of the fatality review process. A mission statement was developed and the team outlined review procedures. Participating agencies signed cooperative and confidentiality agreements, as well as committed to a consensus decision-making process. On October 8, 2001 the Richmond City Council passed the resolution establishing the Team and supporting the Team's recommendation that the Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney chair the team. (See Appendix II)

The Team's mission is to formulate recommendations for policies, services, resources and legislation designed to keep families and children safe.

The purpose of local fatality review is for Team members to gain a better understanding of the events that led up to the fatality, evaluate how the system responded to the case and take part in a discussion about recommendations to prevent future child and family violence fatalities. The Team's protocol includes the following elements:

- Team members sign a confidentiality agreement (See Appendix III) at the beginning of each review meeting and present their agency's information about the case.
- The chairperson takes notes and fills out an assessment tool (See Appendix IV) during the Team's discussion and keeps the records for the Team.
- The Team does not copy or duplicate any individual agency file information.
- Team members return their files back to their agency.
- Team members not leave the meeting with any written information.
- Decisions are made by consensus.



In April 2002, one year after the first organizational meeting, the Team reviewed its first case. The Team's mission is to prevent future deaths from family and child abuse by examining the circumstances surrounding each case by making recommendations to increase coordination and communication between agencies. Using the OCME's

definition of fatal family violence, the Team reviewed only Richmond cases that had been fully adjudicated or cases that would never be adjudicated (like cases of homicide/suicide). At all times the privacy of the victim and the confidentiality of the information are maintained.

Fatal Family Violence is any fatality, whether homicide or suicide, occurring as a result of abuse between family members or intimate partners.

(Family and Intimate Partner Violence Fatality Review Team Protocol, March 2001)

NEXT STEPS

The City of Richmond's Child and Family Fatality Review Team is a work in progress. After each review, members often made recommendations to improve the Team's protocol. Based on these recommendations, the Team has agreed to increase its membership and expand the types of cases it reviews.

- The Team plans to recruit regular participation from the Sheriff's Department, VCU Health Systems Social Work Department, Richmond Health Department, Adult Probation and Parole, Richmond's Office of Community Corrections, Richmond's Ambulance Authority and Richmond City Schools. Several Team members have identified contacts for the various agencies and the chairing agency will extend the invitations to join the Team. Furthermore, the Team will work through local non-profit agencies that focus on the health and safety of children.
- The Richmond Child and Family Violence Fatality Review Team will expand its review to include any violent death of a child under 18.

When suggestions to improve prevention strategies through policy or procedure were offered, many were also immediately implemented.

- Greater Richmond SCAN and the Catholic Diocese began working together to reduce the communication barrier by creating materials and brochures in Spanish aimed to help victims of child and family violence.
- The Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney was instrumental in the development of a training video for mandated reporters of child abuse and neglect, such as day care workers.
- Greater Richmond SCAN lobbied the General Assembly to extend the length of time the Department of Social Services is to maintain a record of unfounded Child Protective Service Complaints from one year to three years.

The Richmond Child and Family Violence Fatality Review Team will continue to recommend the integration of services and communication among different agencies and different programs within agencies to reach more potential victims resulting in fewer child and family violence fatalities.

APPENDIX I

RICHMOND CHILD AND FAMILY VIOLENCE FATALITY REVIEW TEAM INTERAGENCY COOPERATION AGREEMENT

| Org | ganization: | | | |
|------------|--|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Re | presented by: | | | |
| | is cooperative agreement is made this no serve on the Richmond Child and Family | | | and all agencies and individuals |
| On Tea | behalf of theam: | I indicate sup | port of the objectives of the Richmon | d Child and Family Violence Fatality Review |
| | rough the process of conducting a formal re Richmond Child and Family Violence Fat | | which family violence or child negle | ect or abuse is considered a significant factor, |
| 1. | Identify and describe trends and patterns documenting trends and patterns in | | | views conducted over the course of a year. |
| 2. | Increase safety for victims and accounta promoting cooperation and community | | ily violence and child abuse and negl vestigating and intervening in family | |
| | formulating recommendations for | policies, services, resources | and legislation designed to keep fami | lies and children safe. |
| 3. | Formulate recommendations for collabo | ration on family violence and | d child abuse investigation, intervent | ion and prevention. |
| | be | | nbership of the Richmond Child and ocates, law enforcement, judiciary, m | Family Violence Fatality Review Team edical, public health, social services, medical |
| Tea | is participation will include providing an or am and providing necessary information to a fatality shall be confidential in accordance | support the Review Team's | operations. All information and reco | gular basis as the member of the Review rds obtained or created regarding the review |
| | nderstand and acknowledge that the unauth minal liability. | orized disclosure of confider | ntial records, reports, investigation m | aterials and information may result in |
| of t | the Review Team shall agree to the limits of | f what they may reveal in the | eir capacity as an agency representati | many of the involved reports, each member ve. All members will sign a confidentiality rial may be used for reasons other than which |
| The Fat | e agrees t tality Review Team to the media. | hat no one associated with th | is agency will represent the views of | the Richmond Child and Family Violence |
| | my capacity as authorized representative, I ild and Family Violence Fatality Review T | | 's participation, | support and assistance to the Richmond |
| Sig | gnature: | | | |
| Tit | ile: | | | |
| Da | ite: | | | |

APPENDIX II

A RESOLUTION

To establish the Richmond Family Violence Review Team for the purposes of examining fatal family violence incidents, creating a body of information to help prevent future family violence fatalities, and reviewing the facts and circumstances of fatal family violence incidents that occur within the City of Richmond.

Patron- Mr. Loupassi

Approved as to form and legality By the City Attorney

WHEREAS, family violence has destructive consequence upon individuals and families within the City of Richmond;

WHEREAS, careful examination of family violence fatalities can help prevent similar tragedies from recurring;

WHEREAS, a thoughtful and non-judgmental method of evaluating the events that lead to family violence fatalities can create a safer community; and

WHEREAS, the General Assembly enacted section 32.1-283.3 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, to permit the City of Richmond to establish a family violence fatality review team to examine fatal family violence incidents and to create a body of information to help prevent future family violence fatalities; NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND:

That the Richmond Family Violence Fatality Review Team is hereby established pursuant to section 32.1-283.3 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND:

That a representative of the Richmond Commonwealth's Attorney's Office shall serve as chairperson of the Richmond Family Violence Fatality Review Team and shall appoint members of the team pursuant to section 32.1-283.3 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND:

That the Richmond Family Violence Fatality Review Team shall examine fatal family violence incidents, shall create a body of information to help prevent future family violence fatalities, and shall have the authority to review the facts and circumstances of all fatal family violence incidents that occur within the City of Richmond.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND:

That the Richmond Family Violence Fatality Review Team shall establish rules and procedures to govern the review process prior to the first fatal family violence incident review that it conducts.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND:

That the Council of the City of Richmond encourages the Richmond Family Violence Fatality Review Team to also review child fatalities resulting from violence and to engage agencies, organizations and systems that provide services to victims and perpetrators of violence against children in order to identify gaps in system responses and in order to improve coordination among the agencies involved.

APPENDIX III

RICHMOND CHILD AND FAMILY VIOLENCE FATALITY REVIEW TEAM INTERAGENCY CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

To be signed by each person in attendance at each Family Violence and Child Fatality Review Team Meeting.

By signing this form, I do hereby acknowledge and agree to the following:

I agree to serve as a member of the Richmond Family Violence and Child Fatality Review Team. I acknowledge that the effectiveness of the fatality review process is dependent on the quality of trust and honesty team members bring to it. Thus, I agree that I will not use any material or information obtained during the Family Violence and Child Fatality Review Team's closed death review meetings for any reason other than that which it was intended.

I further agree to safeguard from unauthorized disclosure all records, reports, investigation material, and information I receive as part of a death review. I will not take any case identifying material from a closed meeting other than that which originated in the agency I represent. Thus, I will not make copies or otherwise document/record material made available in these reviews, including electronically. I will return all material shared by others at the end of each meeting.

I understand and acknowledge that the unauthorized disclosure of confidential records, reports, investigation materials and information may result in criminal liability and exclusion from the Family Violence and Child Fatality Review Team.

I agree to refrain from representing the views of the Family Violence and Child Fatality Review Team to the media.

| Print Name | Signature | Date |
|------------|-----------|------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |



Child and Family Violence Fatality Review Form

| Child and Family Violence | Fata | lity Review Case # | | Multiple Homicide ! Murder Suicide | | |
|---|------|------------------------|------|------------------------------------|--------|---------------------------------|
| Date review initiated: | | | Da | te review comple | ted: _ | |
| I.Background | | | | | | |
| Case Type: | | | | | | |
| ! Homicide | ! | Suicide | ! | Multiple Homic | ide | ! Murder Suicide |
| What was the nature and his perpetrator and children? | tory | of the violence and | d at | ouse in relationshi | ps be | tween the victim, |
| Nature: ! Physical abuse | ! | Emotional Abuse | ! | Sexual Abuse | ! | No Abuse |
| History: 1 < 30 days | | 1-6 months | | | - 1 | 1_{-} 2 years 1_{-} 2 years |

Do any law enforcement reports, charging papers or protection order narratives include descriptions of the following (if yes, indicate date if possible):

| | Law | Charging | Protection | Reported in | Reported to/ |
|------------------------------|-------------|----------|------------|-------------|----------------|
| | Enforcement | Papers | Order | counseling/ | witnessed by |
| | Reports | | Narratives | advocacy | family/friends |
| Previous episodes of | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| violence | | | | | |
| Public display of violence | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| Separation | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| Depression | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| Acute Mental Health problems | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| Sexual violence | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| Threats to kill dv victim | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| Threats to kill children, | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| family member or friends | | | | | |
| Suicide threats | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| Suicide attempts | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| Choking | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| Stalking | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| Hostage Taking | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| Knife brandished | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| Knife used | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| Gun brandished | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| Gun used | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| Blunt object brandished | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| Blunt object used | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |
| Other: | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P | ! V ! P |

II. Systems Response

Who knew of or suspected violence?

! Relative ! Child ! Friend ! Neighbor ! Employer ! Co-worker

! Other

To the team's knowledge, were any of the following agencies involved with the family violence victim, perpetrator and children in the past five years prior to the fatality? And if so, does the organization have a DV assessment tool in place?

| DV Victim | DV Children | | Organization | DV Assessment |
|-----------|-------------|--|---------------------------------|------------------|
| | Perpetrator | | | Used |
| | | | Law enforcement | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | Magistrate | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | Bondsman | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | Probation/Parole | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | Community Corrections | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | Criminal Courts | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | Civil Courts | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | Mental Health | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | Court Services Unit | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | Hospital/Medical | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | Ambulance Service | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | Fire Dept. | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | Private HMO Dr. | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | DSS: CPS, Foster Care | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | DSS: TANF employment | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | BIP, Anger Mgmt, S/A program | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | Immigrant Advocacy Organization | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | Animal Control | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | School | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | Homeless shelter | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | DV Victim services | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | DV Victim shelter/ safehouse | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | Sexual Assault Program | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | Day care | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | Church/Temple/Mosque/religious | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | community | |
| | | | Culturally specific | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |
| | | | organization: | |
| | | | Other: | ! Yes ! No ! Unk |

Of the persons who knew/suspected violence and of the organizations involved, were interventions offered, provided or declined?

- ! Offered Type of intervention and to whom it was offered?
- ! Provided Type of intervention and to whom it was offered?
- ! Declined Why?

Of the persons who knew/suspected violence and of the organizations that offered and provided interventions, when did they occur?

Which agencies were not involved but needed to be?

| | ten ageneres were not m | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---|--|
| ! | Law enforcement | ! | Ambulance Service | ! | DV Victim services |
| ! | Magistrate | ! | Fire Dept. | ! | DV Victim shelter/ safehouse |
| ! | Bondsman | ! | Private HMO Dr. | ! | Sexual Assault Program |
| ! | Probation/Parole | ! | DSS: CPS, Foster Care | ! | Day care |
| ! | Community Corrections | ! | DSS: TANF employment | ! | Church/Temple/Mosque/religious community |
| ! | Criminal Courts | ! | BIP, Anger Mgmt, S/A program | ! | Culturally specific organization: |
| ! | Civil Courts | ! | Immigrant Advocacy Organization | ! | Other: |
| ! | Mental Health | ! | Animal Control | ! | DV Victim services |
| ! | Court Services Unit | ! | School | ! | DV Victim shelter/ safehouse |
| ! | Hospital/Medical | ! | Homeless shelter | ! | Sexual Assault Program |

What barriers existed! obtaining and/or! maintaining services for the victim, perpetrator and children?

| | Barrier | Victim | Perpetrator | Child(ren) |
|---|-------------------------------|--------|-------------|------------|
| ! | Income | | | |
| ! | Familial support | | | |
| ! | Medical needs | | | |
| ! | Phone | | | |
| ! | Housing | | | |
| ! | Literacy | | | |
| ! | Access to community resources | | | |
| ! | Substance abuse | | | |
| ! | Mental illness | | | |
| ! | Access to transportation | | | |
| ! | Non-Compliance | | | |
| ! | Coordination of Services | | | |
| ! | Other: | | | |

III. Family Violence Review Team Summary

Of the interventions that worked, what needed to be expanded and improved?

What interventions could have resulted in a better outcome?

| What does a review of various a | igency po | licies, | protoco | ls reve | al? |
|---------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|-----|
| Were policies followed? | Yes | ! | No | ! | Unk |
| Are current polices adequate?! | Yes | ! | No | ! | Unk |

Were relevant statutes regarding family abuse, P.O and stalking enforced?! Yes! No! Unk

What interagency communications/collaboration was initiated in response to the case?

What does the event timeline tell the team?

Does the team have all the pertinent information needed to complete the review?! Yes! No If not, what is missing?

What prevention strategies flow from these interventions?

| ! Increase existing services for DV victims | ! Changes in government agency practice | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| ! Create new services for DV victims | ! Changes in non-profit agency practice | | |
| ! Increase services for DV perpetrators | ! Changes in other agency/organization practice | | |
| | (specify) | | |
| ! Create new services for DV perpetrators | ! New programs | | |
| ! Legislation change | ! Increased coordination/ cooperation/ communication | | |
| | between and | | |
| ! Community safety project | ! Increased training for on | | |
| | <u> </u> | | |
| ! Public forum | ! Changes in TANF policy/implementation | | |
| ! Education activities in schools | ! Education through media | | |

What if any, recommendations does the team make as a result of the case review?

Which agencies were present and participated in the review?

| ! | Safehouse/shelter | ! | BIP |
|---|-------------------|---|------------------------------|
| ! | Law enforcement | ! | Court advocate |
| ! | City prosecutor | ! | DSS |
| ! | JD& R Court | ! | Probation |
| ! | Magistrate | ! | Court/Judge |
| ! | Mental Health | ! | Educator |
| ! | Victim Witness | ! | Other |
| ! | Health Care | ! | Other social services agency |
| | | | (specify) |
| Ţ | Medical Examiner | | |

14

For additional copies contact:
Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney
Diane Abato
400 N. 8th Street
Richmond, VA 23223
804-646-3500
abatodm@ci.richmond.va.us