

THE SALT LAKE CITY COURT-MANDATED RESTORATIVE JUSTICE TREATMENT FOR DOMESTIC BATTERERS EXPERIMENT - PART I

Crim-PORT 1.0:

Criminological Protocol for Operating Randomized Trials

@ 2009 by Lawrence W. Sherman and Heather Strang

INSTRUCTIONS: Please use this form to enter information directly into the WORD document as the protocol for your registration on the Cambridge Criminology Registry of EXperiments in Policing Strategy and Tactics (REX-POST) or the Registry of EXperiments in Correctional Strategy and Tactics (REX-COST).

CONTENTS:

- 1. NAME AND HYPOTHESES**
- 2. ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK**
- 3. UNIT OF ANALYSIS**
- 4. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA**
- 5. PIPELINE: RECRUITMENT OR EXTRACTION OF CASES**
- 6. TIMING**
- 7. RANDOM ASSIGNMENT**
- 8. TREATMENT AND COMPARISON ELEMENTS**
- 9. MEASURING AND MANAGING TREATMENTS**
- 10. MEASURING OUTCOMES**
- 11. ANALYSIS PLAN**
- 12. DUE DATE AND DISSEMINATION PLAN**

1. NAME AND HYPOTHESES

1.1 Name of Experiment:

“The Salt Lake City Court-Mandated Restorative Justice Treatment For Domestic Batters Experiment - Part I”

1.2 Principal Investigator:

1.2.1 (Name) Linda G. Mills

1.2.2 (Employer) New York University

1.3 1st Co-Principal Investigator:

1.3.1 (Name) Briana Barocas

1.3.2 (Employer) New York University

1.4 2nd Co-Principal Investigator:

1.4.1 (Name) Rob Butters

1.4.2 (Employer) University of Utah

1.5 3rd Co-Principal Investigator:

1.5.1 (Name) Barak Ariel

1.5.2 (Employer) University of Cambridge

1.6 General Hypothesis:

A Duluth-based domestic violence treatment program (“BIP”¹) with restorative justice elements (“CP”²; collectively called “BIP+CP”) will reduce recidivism compared to BIP only.

1.7 Specific Hypotheses:

1.7.1 List all variations of outcome measures to be tested.

1.7.1.1 BIP+CP will reduce domestic violence arrest frequency compared to BIP only, measured by number of arrests within follow-up period (up to two years post random assignment)

¹ Batters Intervention Program

² Circles of Peace

1.7.1.2 BIP+CP will reduce non-domestic violence arrest frequency compared to BIP only, measured by number of arrests within follow-up period (up to two years post random assignment)

1.7.2 List all subgroups to be tested for all varieties of outcome measures.

1.7.2.1 Intimate partner violence cases versus family violence cases

1.7.2.2 Gender

1.7.2.3 Age (natural cut-off point)

1.7.2.4 With or without previous criminal records for domestic violence

1.7.2.5 Ethnicity (all subgroups available)

1.7.2.6 Salt Lake City, Utah Judge adjudicating treatment (n=6)

2. ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Multi-Agency Partnership:

2.1.1 Name of Operating Agency 1:

Salt Lake City Justice Court, Salt Lake City, Utah (referring domestic violence cases to treatment)

2.1.2 Name of Operating Agency 2:

Intermountain Specialized Abuse Treatment Center (ISAT) (delivery of treatments)

2.1.3 Name of Research Organizations 1:

University of Utah (field management and data collection)

2.1.4 Name of Research Organizations 2:

New York University (research oversight and design)

2.1.5 Name of Research Organizations 2:

University of Cambridge (design and analysis)

3. UNIT OF ANALYSIS

Domestic violence offenders

4. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

4.1 Criteria Required (list all)³

³ See Appendix I for undertaking by court judges to participate in study

- 4.1.1 Domestic violence (intimate partner and/or family violence) cases only
- 4.1.2 Cases of misdemeanour arrest in Salt Lake City
- 4.1.3 Mandated to domestic violence treatment after February 8, 2012
- 4.1.4 Offenders over 18 years old
- 4.1.5 Offenders admitted guilt for their charges
- 4.1.6 Offenders speak English proficiently enough to participate in English-speaking treatment

4.2 Criteria for Exclusion (list all)

- 4.2.1 Offenders actively psychotic or in need of acute detoxification or hospitalization
- 4.2.2 Offenders currently engaged in domestic violence treatment (within the last 30 days) with another treatment provider
- 4.2.3 Defendant is currently subject to the jurisdiction of another court and is receiving domestic violence, drug court or mental health court treatment services through that court
- 4.2.4 Offenders currently involved with the Utah Department of Human Services
- 4.2.5 Offenders facing jail time within treatment period
- 4.2.6 Related second offender to appear for an evaluation in dual arrest cases (e.g., cases in which the victim/partner was already randomly assigned as an offender to treatment for the study).

5. PIPELINE: RECRUITMENT OR EXTRACTION OF CASES

5.1 Where will cases come from?

Salt Lake City Justice Court

5.2 Who will obtain them?

Salt Lake City Justice Court

5.3 How will they be identified?

Eligible cases will be identified by Salt Lake City Justice Court (except inclusion rule 4.1.6 and exception rule 4.2.5 and assigned by Cambridge Randomiser at random).

5.4 How will each case be screened for eligibility?

ISAT (Operating Agency 2) will be doing the clinical evaluations. The University of Utah (Research Organization 1) will screen for eligibility using the Cambridge Randomizer.

5.5 Who will register the case identifiers prior to random assignment?

ISAT (Operating Agency 2)

5.6 What social relationships must be maintained to keep cases coming?

5.6.1 Weekly meetings between the Research Organisation 1 and the Salt Lake City Justice Court

5.6.2 Weekly meetings between Research Organisation 1 and ISAT

5.7 Has a Phase I (no-control, “dry-run”) test of the pipeline and treatment process been conducted? If so,

No.

6. TIMING: CASES COME INTO THE EXPERIMENT IN

A trickle-flow process, one case at a time

7. RANDOM ASSIGNMENT

7.1 How is random assignment sequence to be generated?

Cambridge Randomizer, with 1:1 allocation ratio.

7.2 Who is entitled to issue random assignments of treatments?

7.2.1 Role: Jeni Akalis (through Randomizer only)

7.2.2 Organization: ISAT with ongoing monitoring by Research Organizations with every assignment

7.3 How will random assignments be recorded in relation to case registration?

7.3.1 Name of data base: NSF Utah Study Part 1

7.3.2 Location of data entry: University of Utah, New York University, University of Cambridge

7.3.3 Persons performing data entry: Emogene Grundvig (graduate research assistant)

8. TREATMENT AND COMPARISON ELEMENTS

8.1 Experimental or Primary Treatment

8.1.1 What elements must happen, with dosage level (if measured) indicated.

8.1.1.1 Element A: 12 weekly BIP treatment sessions

8.1.1.2 Element B: 6 weekly CP treatment sessions

8.1.2 What elements must *not* happen, with dosage level (if measured) indicated.

8.1.2.1 Element A: additional non-ISAT domestic violence treatments incidents during treatment

8.2 Control or Secondary Comparison Treatment

8.2.1 What elements must happen, with dosage level (if measured) indicated.

18 weekly BIP only treatment sessions

8.2.2 What elements must not happen, with dosage level (if measured) indicated.

Additional non-ISAT domestic violence treatments incidents during treatment

9. MEASURING AND MANAGING TREATMENTS

9.1 Measuring

9.1.1 How will treatments be measured?

Dichotomous measurement of treatment assignment

9.1.2 Who will measure them?

Treatment Provider ISAT

9.1.3 How will data be collected?

Treatment records from ISAT

9.1.4 How will data be stored?

A secured system at the Utah Criminal Justice Center, University of Utah

9.1.5 Will data be audited?

Yes

9.1.6 If audited, who will do it?

Research Organisations

9.1.7 How will data collection reliability be estimated?

Cambridge calculations

9.1.8 Will data collection vary by treatment type?

Yes, see above.

9.2 Managing

9.2.1 Who will see the treatment measurement data?

ISAT

9.2.2 How often will treatment measures be circulated to key leaders?

Bi-monthly

9.2.3 If treatment integrity is challenged, whose responsibility is correction?

Research Organisation 2.

10. MEASURING AND MONITORING OUTCOMES

10.1 Measuring

10.1.1 How will outcomes be measured?

All X and O in terms of:

10.1.1.1 Arrest records

10.1.1.2 Conviction records

10.1.2 Who will measure them?

10.1.2.1 For arrest records – Bureau of Criminal Investigations (BCI) & Offender Management System (OMS) (jail data).

10.1.2.2 For conviction records – COURTLINK (Court data management systems) and BCI.

10.1.3 How will data be collected?

BCI, OMS, and COURTS will provide data to Research Organizations

10.1.4 How will data be stored?

A secured system at the Utah Criminal Justice Center, University of Utah

10.1.5 Will data be audited?

Yes

10.1.6 If audited, who will do it?

University of Utah

10.1.7 How will data collection reliability be estimated?

Reading of all incident reports during and after the experiment (both treatment and control), for measurement of accuracy and precision of data

10.1.8 Will data collection vary by treatment type?

No.

10.2 Monitoring

10.2.1 How often will outcome data be monitored?

Biweekly

10.2.2 Who will see the outcome monitoring data?

Research Organization 3

10.2.3 When will outcome measures be circulated to key leaders?

Biannual

10.2.4 If experiment finds early significant differences, what procedure is to be followed?

Discuss with leaders

11. ANALYSIS PLAN

11.1 Which outcome measure is considered to be the primary indicator of a difference between experimental treatment and comparison group?

11.1.1 Total number of subsequent domestic violence arrests during a follow-up period of 24 months

11.1.2 Total number of subsequent non-domestic-violence arrests during a follow up period of 24 months

11.1.3 Total number of subsequent domestic violence convictions during a follow-up period of 24 months

11.1.4 Total number of subsequent non-domestic-violence convictions during a follow up period of 24 months

11.2 Which outcome measure is considered to be the secondary indicator of a difference between experimental treatment and comparison group?

Cost-effectiveness, measuring cost of treatment per participant versus crime harm index indicator

11.3 What is the minimum sample size to be used to analyze outcomes?

Harmonic n of 300 (1:1 allocation ratio)

11.4 Will all analyses employ an intention-to-treat framework?

Yes, unless not meeting 11.5 in which case 2SLS regression analysis will be implemented.

11.5 What is the threshold below which the percent Treatment-as-Delivered would be so low as to bar any analysis of outcomes?

60%

11.6 Who will do the data analysis?

Cambridge University

11.7 What statistic will be used to estimate effect size?

Cohen's *D* or odds ratios, depending on the distribution of the outcome data.

11.8 What statistic will be used to calculate P values?

Independent samples t-test, frequency analyses and repeated measures of analyses.

- 11.9 What is the magnitude of effect needed for a one-tail $p = .05$ difference to have an 80% chance of detection with the projected sample size (optional but recommended calculation of power curve) for the primary outcome measure?**

$d = 0.285$ (see Appendix II)

12. DISSEMINATION PLAN

- 12.1 What is the date by which the project agrees to file its first report on CCR-RCT? (report of delay, preliminary findings, or final result).**

Within 6 months.

- 12.2 Does the project agree to file an update every six months from date of first report until date of final report?**

Yes.

- 12.3 Will preliminary and final results be published, in a 250-word abstract, on CCR-RCT as soon as available?**

Yes.

- 12.4 Will CONSORT requirements be met in the final report for the project? (See <http://www.consort-statement.org/>)**

Yes.

- 12.5 What organizations will need to approve the final report? (Include any funders or sponsors).**

US National Science Foundation

- 12.6 Do all organizations involved agree that a final report shall be published after a maximum review period of six months from the principal investigator's certification of the report as final?**

Yes.

- 12.7 Does principal investigator agree to post any changes in agreements affecting items 12.1 to 12.6 above?**

Yes.

- 12.8 Does principal investigator agree to file a final report within two years of cessation of experimental operations, no matter what happened to the experiment? (e.g., "random assignment broke down after 3 weeks and the experiment was cancelled" or "only 15 cases were referred in the first 12 months and experiment was suspended").**

Yes.

Appendix I

NON-BINDING STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLE FOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE TREATMENT REFERRALS DURING THE NEW YORK UNIVERSITY/UNIVERSITY OF UTAH BATTERER'S INTERVENTION STUDY

To maximize consistent referrals for appropriate Domestic Violence (DV) evaluation and treatment, recognizing the need to minimize confounding research factors to limit erroneous research conclusions, understanding that under the Utah Code of Judicial Conduct, Canon 1, Rule 1.2 a judge shall uphold and promote the independence and impartiality of the judiciary, that under the Utah Code of Judicial Conduct, Canon 2, Rule 2.2 a judge shall perform all duties of judicial office fairly and impartially, and without agreeing to be bound to any agreement regarding DV treatment referrals, I will make the best effort within the requirements and duties of my office during the duration of the New York University/University of Utah Batterer's Intervention Study to:

1. Make domestic violence defendant evaluation and treatment referrals to the State-licensed provider identified as the study agency.
2. To exclude defendants from the study only if:
 - Defendant does not speak English proficiently enough to participate in English-speaking group treatment; or
 - Defendant is actively psychotic or in need of acute detoxification or hospitalization; or
 - Defendant is currently engaged in DV treatment (has attended DV treatment session within the last 30 days) with another treatment provider; or
 - Defendant is currently subject to the jurisdiction of another court and is receiving DV, drug court or mental health court treatment services through that court.
 -

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2012.

Judge, Salt Lake City Justice Court

Appendix II – Power Calculations

