

This evaluation of the Polk County Intra-family Sexual Abuse Program (IFSAP) was completed under the auspices of the Polk County Attorney by County Attorney staff and volunteers, Staff of the various IFSAP Program components and IFSAP participants. The internal program assessment and external evaluation took place over a four month period ending in April of 1984.

This report is organized as follows:

- A. History/Program Development
- B. Original Intra-Family Sexual Abuse Program Procedures
- C. Current Definitions and Goals of the IFSAP Program
- D. Evaluation/Assessment Design
- E. Summary of Recommendations
- F. Evaluation Results and Discussion
 - 1. Program Coordination
 - a. Weekly Meetings
 - b. IFSAP Program Manager's Role
 - c. Training, Protocol and Procedures in IFSAP Cases
 - d. Public Education Efforts
 - 2. Investigative Component
 - a. Police Investigation Problems - Des Moines Police Department
 - b. Joint Child Protective/Law Enforcement Investigations
 - c. Taping of Investigative Interviews
 - d. Timeliness of Investigations of Incest Cases
 - e. Thoroughness and Usefulness of the Investigations
 - f. Access to Assistant County Attorney for Evidence Review and Charging
 - g. Immediate Notification of Program Manager
 - h. Arrest/Confession Rate

3. Intervention With the Family

- a. Providing Protection While Addressing Longer Term Needs
- b. Providing Timely and Effective Intervention With the Family
- c. Addressing the Needs of the IFSAP Family to Decrease the Likelihood of Future Victimization of the Children in the Family Unit

4. Juvenile Court Component

- a. Timeliness of Juvenile Court Intake
- b. Provision of a Guardian Ad Litem
- c. Extent of Juvenile Court Monitoring to Assure Services are Provided
- d. Protection Afforded Through Juvenile Court
- e. Juvenile Court Efforts to Address Immediate and Long Term Needs
- f. Sensitivity of the Juvenile Court to the Victim's Needs

5. Treatment Component

- a. Coordination of Treatment for all Family Members
- b. Immediacy of Treatment Once an IFSAP Family is Identified
- c. Adequacy of Treatment Resources
- d. Timeliness and Adequacy of Reports From Treatment Staff
- e. Problems Identified by Treatment Staff
 - Communication
 - Cost
 - Treatment Evaluation
 - Other Concerns Identified

6. Prosecution Component

- a. Prosecutions/Convictions
- b. Availability for Evidence Review
- c. Prosecution Assistance - Legal Advice/Participation in Weekly Meetings
- d. Follow-through with No-Contact Order Violations
- e. Prosecutor's Monitoring of Active IFSAP Cases
- f. Sentencing of Child Sexual Abuse Offenders

HISTORY/PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Polk County's effort to develop an effective, organized approach to the incest problem spanned several years. In April of 1978 the Polk County Rape/Sexual Assault Care Center co-sponsored a 3-day workshop on Violence within the Family at which Henry and Anna Giarretto, founders of the Child Sexual Abuse Treatment Program of Santa Clara County, California, were the major speakers. Considerable local enthusiasm was generated, and a coalition of individuals began working toward the establishment of a Polk County program modeled after the Giarretto project. In the fall of 1979, Polk County requested LEAA funding for an Intra-Family Sexual Abuse Treatment Program, however the request was denied. The following year saw the concept finally entrenched in the "talk, talk, talk" stage of development, with no organization willing to assume responsibility for the development of a "no-funds" program.

In July of 1980 the Polk County Attorney, an Assistant Attorney General and a Polk County Department of Social Services Case Manager attended a week-long workshop at the Giarretto's California-based Program. The County Attorney was so enthusiastic upon his return that he designated two of his staff to concentrate on the investigation and prosecution of incestuous offenders. This Investigator/Prosecutor team worked with the County Attorney's Planner to encourage the other components within the community to develop treatment and training programs to deal with the victims and families where intra-family sexual abuse of children had occurred. The County Attorney brought Sergeant Larry Brown of the San Jose Police Department to Des Moines to train local police officers and Department of Social Services Child Protective Services (CPS) workers in the identification and investigation of suspected child sexual abuse.

By September of 1980, the trained CPS workers joined forces with the trained law enforcement officers (relying primarily upon the County Attorney's assigned Investigator) to conduct thorough, joint investigations of incestuous activity. Momentum increased when the Sands Psychiatric Unit at Broadlawns Polk County Hospital agreed to provide a "treatment program" for the offender, the non-offending spouse and the victim. Up until this point, while offenders were identified, there were virtually no options for the family or the system other than straight criminal prosecution with a VERY reluctant witness. By mid 1981, with no program funding, and using only existing staff, the basic parameters of the program had been established. The County Attorney's Planner, along with his other duties, served as the project coordinator, assuring that a no-contact order was secured following arrest, doing follow-up on cases, assuring that all components had appropriate information on each case, and attempting to firm up procedures, protocol and agency commitments. The County Attorney's Investigator did 90% of the investigations and a special prosecutor was available to review the evidence on each case, determine eligibility for the program, establish a target charge and provide assistance to the Intra-Family Sexual Abuse of Children Program (IFSAP) team throughout the family's involvement. CPS workers assumed primary responsibility on investigations and the Juvenile Court staff became actively involved with the cases on behalf of the victim. "Staff" meetings were held every Thursday with all components represented.

As the caseload grew (from zero substantiated cases prior to September of 1980 to 36 substantiated cases and 21 confessions by June of 1981), it became obvious that the County Attorney's Planner could no longer provide adequate coordination on a part-time basis, and the County Attorney's Investigator could not investigate all of the cases. Reported cases increased from 31 in the four months from September through December of 1980 (with 6 substantiated cases) to over 100 investigations (with 30 substantiated cases) in the first six months of 1981. The average time for an investigation is 10 hours for the police officer and 16 hours for the CPS worker. It is important that the offender be interviewed within hours of the child's interview to avoid "forewarning" the offender and threats/pressure being applied to the victim/witnesses.

It became clear that a full-time Program Manager would be needed for the program AND local law enforcement officers would have to be more actively involved and trained to take pressure off the County Attorney's Investigator. A Coordinator or Program Manager was needed to provide case management, develop procedures and protocol, manage case staffings, assure information flow, provide training, and negotiate with the involved agencies to remove barriers to the effective functioning of the program.

In December of 1981 a full time Program Manager was hired as part of the County Attorney's staff. That position was transferred to the Department of Social Services Victim Services Division in July of 1983.

ORIGINAL IFSAP PROCEDURES

The procedures for handling incest investigation, prosecution and therapy is written up in the "Intra-Family Sexual Abuse Program Procedures Manual", completed by Julie Johnston, the first Program Manager, and members of the IFSAP team. The manual contains a section on investigation (one section for Child Protective Investigation and one for police investigation), prosecution, program management, juvenile court involvement and treatment. It contains step-by-step instructions, expectations and helpful hints. An updated version of this manual will be ready for distribution in July of 1984.

Some of the procedures which are considered key to the program are described below.

Program involvement generally begins with a report to the Child Protective Services Agency within the Department of Human Services. For the purpose of this program, the Child Protective Investigation (CPI) workers combine their efforts with an investigator from a law enforcement agency or the County Attorney's Office so the CPI and criminal investigation can occur simultaneously. Interviews with the victim, the non-offending parent(s), other witnesses and the offender are taped. The taped interviews serve a multitude of purposes. It can be used with a very young victim to attempt to "qualify" them on the tape (show the youth knows truth from fiction) for prosecution purposes. While the original goal was to use the tape in court in lieu of having the victim testify, this has not been the case. The prosecutor feels the victim's presence in court is crucial for the case; however, the tape allows the prosecutor to assess the victim's potential as a witness at the evidence screening stage. The tape is also used to provide information and tools to the various IFSAP components (Department of Human Services, Juvenile Court, Prosecutor, treatment, Program Manager). The tape may be played back to the offender who begins to deny his actions in treatment. The CPI and police investigators were trained to avoid "leading" the child witness while still getting a complete verbal description of what transpired, including identifiable names of body parts, dates, timing and frequency of occurrences, etc. The tape can also be used against the offender in later prosecution should the offender fail to cooperate with the IFSAP program or refuse to plead to the target charge at the completion of the program.

The IFSAP Program Manager is to be alerted immediately upon arrest of an offender; he assures that the offender signs a no-contact order (guaranteeing there will be no contact with the victim or other minor members of the family) prior to being released from jail. In this manner, it is the offender, rather than the victim who is removed from the home. At this time the offender is told to have his attorney contact the IFSAP prosecutor if there is interest in the IFSAP program, and generally a referral to the Juvenile Court will take place to initiate a CINA petition to protect the child independent of what happens to the offender. This also insures that a probation officer and guardian ad litem will be appointed for the victim (further monitoring and advocacy resource, and a means of getting treatment to a victim in a reluctant family).

The entire family is referred to the treatment program at the Sands Center for an intake interview to determine whether the individual family members are "treatable", and to initiate the treatment process.

Staff involved with the family from Child Protective Investigation (CPI), Child Protective Treatment (CPT), Juvenile Court, County Attorney, law enforcement, Sands, Youth Law Center, etc. meet every Thursday at 3:00 p.m. to review new cases, confer on continuing cases and discuss procedural problems. The "team" also has the opportunity to make recommendations for the Pre-Sentence Investigation completed on each IFSAP graduate after the plea is taken to the target charge.

As the family progresses in therapy, they go through various treatment modes, to include individual, group and family therapy and a session between the offender and victim where the offender takes responsibility for and apologizes for the incest incident. Supervised visits with the offender, followed by short home visits may eventually lead to reuniting the family in some cases where this seems feasible. The therapy includes a strong focus on the non-offending parent to attempt to build that parent into a strong support and protection resource for the child regardless of what happens to the offender.

The program also envisions an active Parents United group to provide support to incestuous families and to encourage them to deal with the problem in realistic terms. The program provides trained volunteer facilitators to assist with the Parents United meetings. After adjudication in criminal court the family is encouraged to maintain their involvement in Parents United and the Victim's Groups.

INTRA-FAMILY SEXUAL ABUSE PROGRAM - CURRENT DEFINITION/GOALS

An internal program assessment undertaken in the fall of 1983 and finalized in December of 1983 defined the primary goal of the IFSAP program as providing protection from further abuse for victims and providing treatment for the victims and their families.

The capacity to file a Child In Need of Assistance petition was determined to be the most logical basis for deciding whether a child sexual abuse case would be coordinated through the IFSAP program. The specific criteria for CINA filing in these cases is:

- A. The child was sexually abused by his or her parent, guardian, custodian; or
- B. The child was sexually abused by some other member of the household in which the child resided; or
- C. Failure to protect the child from sexual exploitation or harm occurred, in that child's parent, guardian or custodian did not exercise a reasonable degree of care in supervising the child; or
- D. Failure to protect the child from further sexual exploitation or harm occurred in that the child's parent, guardian or custodian will not or cannot exercise a reasonable degree of care in supervising the child.

In the situations described above the child victim is vulnerable because the protective nature of the parental (guardian, custodian) relationship has been broken. These cases must be handled in a manner that assures the child safety in the future. Also the effect of the sexual abuse in this context may have a tremendous impact on the child's sexual development, making evaluation and treatment important.

PROGRAM GOALS

Protection of the Victim - The protection of the victim from further abuse after intervention is of paramount concern. The abuse may take the form of physical abuse, sexual abuse or intimidation to get the victim to recant their statements. As a general policy the offender should be removed from the home and the victim allowed to remain in a safe, supportive environment. If it is not believed that the victim will be safe or supported by the non-offending parent, removing the child should be considered.

Treatment - By the nature of the situation as described above the child victim can be court-ordered to evaluation and treatment, as can the parent (guardian, custodian). The offender may also be court-ordered depending on his or her relationship to the victim. Significantly more control over the offender is possible when criminal prosecution is also involved.

Prosecution - The offender will be eligible for admission to the "alternate prosecution" program if he/she is a parent, guardian or custodian to the victim; or is a member of the household in which the victim resides and is likely to have an ongoing relationship with the victim; and admits to the offense. Exceptions may be based on the following factors:

1. A history of sex crimes;
2. A history of violence against persons;
3. A history of unreliability, in a legal sense, that would indicate the offender would likely not impose the restrictions, terms and conditions of the program.

If, after being accepted into the "alternate prosecution" program, the offender breaks the No-Contact Agreement and/or violates the terms and conditions of treatment he/she can be rejected from the program and/or held in contempt of court. If the offender is not making progress in treatment he/she may be dropped from treatment and the County Attorney may prosecute on the original charge.

EVALUATION/ASSESSMENT DESIGN

Table I depicts the IFSAP project goals and objectives addressed by this evaluation, and the means used to assess the project's level of success in reaching those goals.

Four separate approaches were expected to be utilized in this evaluation. Due to the lack of information in the IFSAP files a number of compromises, as discussed below, had to be made. The four approaches included: A) a structured questionnaire administered to staff of all the program components; B) a case assessment form to be completed on each case referred through the IFSAP Program Coordinator; C) Collection and analysis of criminal courts disposition information on each alleged offender; and D) program participant assessment through Parents United.

A. Structured Questionnaire

The structured questionnaire, included in Appendix I, pages i-2 to i-12 was given to a total of 50 staff from Child Protective Treatment, the Youth Law Center, Des Moines Police Department Youth Section Officers, Victim Services Agency, Polk County Attorney's Office, The Sands Center Psychiatric Unit and Juvenile Court. A total of 45 questionnaires were returned for a 90% return rate. The number of returned questionnaires by component is included in Appendix I, page i-1. Also included are the Summary Sheets (pages i-13 to i-40), which combine all the questions relating to a specific goal, derive an average rating, compare the ratings given by each component, and include unedited "comments" by component. "Don't Know" responses are also identified by component (in the hopes of identifying information dissemination/communication gaps).

The differences in average ratings detected between the respondents of each program component do not appear to be significant. Rather, the differences tend to persist throughout the questionnaire, with consistently higher ratings given, e.g., by the treatment staff, and consistently lower ratings given by law enforcement.

The actual numerical ratings from the questionnaires are not considered particularly relevant for this evaluation; rather they serve as a baseline against which to assess future improvement, and as a means to compare relative satisfaction.

B. Case Assessment Form

The case assessment form was developed to provide a means of determining, on a case-by-case basis, whether the established program criteria were met. The form (Appendix II, pages ii-1 to ii-2) allows the evaluators to rate the case as a success (yes), a failure (no), an exception (meeting specific exclusion criteria) or as unknown for each project criteria specified. Unfortunately, the IFSAP files were so incomplete, the vast majority of responses were "Unknown". Hence the evaluators had to go to original source agencies (e.g. Child Protective Investigation for 96 hour letters, police agencies for police reports, Juvenile Court for temporary removal and CINA Status information, etc.) to complete the information for the evaluation. A modified case assessment form will be included (and completed) within each IFSAP case file from this time forward, allowing a more complete evaluation in the future.

TABLE I
POLK COUNTY INTRA-FAMILY SEXUAL ABUSE OF CHILDREN PROGRAM

ISSUES TO BE EVALUATED/METHODS TO BE USED

| | Structured Questionnaire for Program Component Staff | Case Assessment Form | Collection/Analysis of Criminal Court Disposition Information | Parents' United Participant Assessment of the Program |
|---|--|----------------------|---|---|
| <u>PROGRAM COORDINATION</u> | | | | |
| Is each planned component operational, adequately staffed and functioning, utilized by participants, integrated with other components, and functioning efficiently and effectively? | X | X | | X |
| Success of coordination through weekly "staffing" | X | | | |
| Assessment of IFSAP Coordinator's Role | X | X | | X |
| Assessment of IFSAP Training, Protocol and Procedures | X | X | X | X |
| Assessment of Public Education Efforts | X | | | |
| <u>INVESTIGATIVE COMPONENT</u> | | | | |
| Compliance with policies of joint investigation, taped interviews, and immediate notification of Program Coordinator following arrest | X | X | | |
| Timeliness, thoroughness and usefulness of investigations | X | | | X |
| Access to Assistant County Attorney for evidence review/charging | X | | | |
| Arrest/Confession Rate | | X | | |
| <u>INTERVENTION WITH THE FAMILY</u> | | | | |
| Providing timely and effective intervention with the family | X | X | | X |
| Providing Protection while addressing longer term needs | X | X | | X |
| Addressing the Needs of the IFSAP family to decrease the likelihood of future victimization of the children in the family unit | X | | | X |
| <u>JUVENILE COURT COMPONENT</u> | | | | |
| Timeliness of Juvenile Court intake | X | | | X |
| Use of Guardian Ad Litem | X | | | |
| Extent of protection through Juvenile Court and monitoring to assure services are provided as needed | X | | | X |
| <u>TREATMENT COMPONENT</u> | | | | |
| Coordination of treatment for all family members | X | | | X |
| Immediacy and adequacy of treatment | X | | | X |
| Timeliness and adequacy of treatment reports | X | | | |
| <u>PROSECUTION COMPONENT</u> | | | | |
| Prosecutions/Convictions/Sentencing | X | X | X | X |
| Prosecutor follow-through with no-contact order violations | X | X | | X |

C. Collection and Analysis of Criminal Courts Disposition Information

From the case assessment forms completed on each IFSAP case file, a complete list of alleged offenders was compiled.

Each of these names was compared with the computerized information management system to determine whether a criminal prosecution was ever initiated through the filing of a preliminary complaint. Criminal case files (which tend to be very complete in these cases) were reviewed in those cases which were eventually dismissed, to determine the reason for dismissal. In those cases where no criminal prosecution was indicated, the evaluators searched available file information for the names of workers involved with the case, and then contacted those workers to determine the facts of the case. Because the current Program Coordinator and County Attorney Prosecutors have been involved with the program for less than a year they were not familiar with many of the cases which had been closed out prior to that time.

The evaluators were able to come up with adequate criminal disposition information on all identified cases.

D. Program Participant Assessment

It was determined at the outset of this evaluation that there was no feasible way to secure unbiased participant input into the evaluation. Because of the sensitive nature of the offense, it was not reasonable to appear, uninvited, at the family home to conduct an interview. Nor would it be particularly safe for the interviewer.

Telephone interviews, in addition to creating a biased sample (those with telephones), would not be a reasonable way to approach this very sensitive topic. Mailed questionnaires would be suspect both in terms of the bias of the sample which would return the questionnaires and in the question of whether the respondent's views had been influenced by other family members.

Interviewing persons still involved with treatment would bias the sample to exclude those who rejected or were kicked out of the program.

In light of the limited research value of the available approaches, the evaluator determined that participant program assessment, at this time, would be kept very simple and subjective. The Mothers and Fathers groups of Parents United spent one entire evening, using the nominal group process to respond to the question of what needed to be improved within the program. All answers were recorded; the group then voted on those deemed most important, and further clarified the single issue deemed to be most critical.

ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES BY COMPONENT

| <u>ISSUE BEING ADDRESSED</u> | <u>JUV CT</u> | <u>L.E.</u> | <u>CPT</u> | <u>PROG MGT</u> | <u>TRMT</u> | <u>GAL</u> | <u>CPI</u> | <u>AVE. SCORE</u> | <u>VARIANCE*</u> | <u>Z SCORE**</u> |
|------------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------|---------------------|-------------|------------|------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Investigation (A) | 5.59 | 4.16 | 4.63 | 5.15 | 5.56 | 5.60 | 5.51 | 5.12 | .3266 | .114 |
| Sensitivity to Victim (B) | 5.50 | 5.21 | 3.90 | 4.28 | 5.80 | 5.07 | 5.47 | 5.06 | .4785 | <u>1.552</u> |
| Protection for Victim (C) | 5.20 | 5.17 | 4.07 | 5.42 | 5.70 | 5.03 | 5.51 | 5.08 | .2883 | .248 |
| Service Coordination (D) | 5.22 | 4.31 | 4.73 | 4.50 | 5.87 | 5.02 | 5.48 | 4.94 | .3127 | .017 |
| Family Treatment (E) | 4.49 | 5.25 | 5.13 | 5.58 | 6.24 | 4.91 | 5.39 | 5.12 | .3328 | .173 |
| Victim Assis/Trmt (F) | 5.29 | 5.57 | 4.82 | 5.76 | 5.78 | 5.00 | 5.58 | 5.32 | .1481 | <u>1.574</u> |
| | | | | | | | | | .01118 | |

*Variance is calculated by summing the squares of the difference between each component average response and the total average score and dividing that by N-1 (6). This provides some indication of the degree of difference between the responses of each component to each issue.

**The Z scores are calculated by finding the variance among the variances and computing from that the standard deviation (square root of variance). Then the difference between the Variance and the Mean Variance is divided by the calculated standard deviation for each issue (A through F). A Z score between -1 and +1 will occur by chance 68% of the time. A Z score greater than +2 or less than -2 will occur by chance only 5% of the time.

There appears to be closer agreement between components on issue F, Victim assistance/Treatment than is found in the remaining issues, and more disagreement between components on item B, sensitivity to victims. While the Z scores on both of these issues are greater than 1, they do not approach the 5% significance level, hence the differences will not be considered to be significant.

EVALUATORS

This evaluation was requested by and completed under the auspice of the Polk County Attorney, Dan Johnston.

The evaluation design was developed by Patricia Harlow, Planner, Polk County Attorney's Office. Ms. Harlow also designed the structured questionnaire and the Case Assessment form.

Three Drake University Seniors who have been long-term volunteers with the County Attorney's Office completed the case assessment forms. These students, John McDonald, Shawn McLeran and Peter Jacobs, and Legal Assistant Intern Becky McMurray will be assisting over the summer of 1984 to investigate further in order that the client assessment forms can be filled out more completely.

Staff from the various IFSAP components have been extremely helpful in tracking down information and in completing the structured questionnaires.

Mark German, Director of Family and Patient Services at Iowa Lutheran Hospital, assisted the evaluator by providing a wealth of information on evaluation tools. This information was used in designing the structured questionnaires and the case assessment forms.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

A. PROGRAM COORDINATION RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Attendance at weekly staff meetings needs to be improved. The Program Coordinators need to be in attendance each week, and should be responsible for designating an alternate in the few situations where attendance is not possible. Program Coordinators include the designated representative from Child Protective Investigation, Child Protective Treatment, Des Moines Police Department, Sands Treatment Unit, Juvenile Court Intake, County Attorney Prosecutor and the IFSAP Program Manager. The respective agencies need to make the commitment to do whatever is necessary to assure the attendance of their program coordinators. In the case of the County Attorney, this may mean designating a different prosecutor to be on call every Thursday from 2:00 to 4:30 p.m. to handle any Juvenile Court hearings that otherwise would be handled by the IFSAP prosecutor, Ray Blase. The line staff involved also need to be in attendance when one of their cases is scheduled for staffing. They need to be given an approximate time of the staffing, so they don't have to sit through the entire meeting, and their respective agencies need to stress their attendance. In those situations where the line staff

attendance is not possible, briefing of the program coordinator on the situation is mandatory. The IFSAP Program Manager, in return, needs to get the agendas out at least by Monday to allow workers to clear their schedules. Attendance of key line staff could be made easier by having some of the CPI, CPT and Law Enforcement Officers specialize in the cases involving the sexual abuse of children. The agencies, however, need to weigh the advantages of the specialization against the higher risk of staff "burn-out".

2. The IFSAP Program Manager should receive copies of ALL documents, reports and transcripts on IFSAP cases. The Program Manager should serve as the information repository and dissemination point, with the participating agencies identifying who else should be sent copies. The Program Manager's file should include, at a minimum, the No-Contact Order, any court orders which involve court dates, reports prepared for court hearings, any agreements, the target plea agreement, sentencing orders, transcripts, referrals to other treatment agencies and case summaries prepared by treatment staff. The CPI and police reports also need to be included. While this may make those files quite large, the IFSAP file is the only place where someone can expect to find all relevant information on a case, and the access to that information increases the Program Manager's ability to facilitate communication and cooperation among the program's components.

An additional advantage of using the Program Manager as a central repository of information is that the Program Manager, who is more accessible by phone than many of the other program participants, could serve as an information conduit between components.

3. At least every six months, the Program Manager should prepare, for review and adoption by the IFSAP management team and the Assistant Director for Victim Services, a plan of action showing personal and program goals, objectives, action to be taken and by whom and timetables for completion.

4. The Program Manager should set up a schedule of training to extend through the end of 1984 to provide basic training for each component and a series of monthly training sessions in special interest areas involving work with incestuous families.

5. Public education efforts should focus on prevention and earlier identification of intrafamily sexual abuse. Options include promotion of after-school TV specials, radio and TV public service announcements, work with schools and day care centers on prevention and awareness training with referral agents. The management team should select specific targets.

6. The Des Moines Police Department should establish a special unit for cases involving assaults on children, encouraging officers who have an interest in that type of investigation to "bid" into the unit. This would also allow those officers to develop special expertise in working with child witnesses in this very sensitive area. If the Des Moines Police Department is unable or unwilling to establish a specialized unit or to designate officers with a commitment to the program to assist with the investigations, one or more special investigators should be added to the County Sheriff's or County Attorney's staff to handle the investigation of child sexual abuse cases in the City of Des Moines, with the City assisting with the funding.

7. Extensive training should be provided for the child sexual abuse investigation teams (Child Protective and Law Enforcement Investigators) in the areas of interviewing child witnesses, program procedures, issues surrounding incest prosecution needs and kinds of evidence and testimony which can be used to corroborate the victim's statements.

8. Child sexual abuse investigations in the City of Des Moines should be initiated as joint CPI/Law Enforcement investigations unless the CPI Investigator determines that the allegation is highly suspect and wishes to do some checking prior to interviewing the child. When there is any reason at all to believe that the child has been sexually abused, the interview with the child should include the law enforcement investigator.

9. The CPI Supervisor should be responsible for routinely testing all the tape recorders and tapes used in the child sexual abuse investigations. Any law enforcement equipment used should also be tested regularly and replaced if necessary.

10. Should funds be available, it would be very helpful to have a secretary assigned to the IFSAP program for the purposes of transcribing the tapes of interviews with the child victim, non-offending spouse and offender. This could make the transcripts available on a more timely basis.

11. The investigation initiation requirements of Child Protective Investigation should be handled in a flexible enough way to allow for sensible planning of the investigation from start to finish. This may mean delaying the onset of the investigation (if the child is not in immediate danger) long enough to assure that it can be completed without delay once it is begun.

12. The County Attorney should insure that a trained Assistant County Attorney, knowledgeable in the issues and procedures concerning IFSAP and child sexual abuse, is available at all times to review evidence collected to determine if an arrest is warranted. Since the child and non-offending parent may not be available for an interview during normal working hours, the evidence review may be needed after normal working hours.

13. The County Attorney's Investigator should be reinolved in the child sexual abuse investigations both to assist in that workload AND to provide training for the new Child Protective Investigation workers. While the County Attorney's Investigator would not be expected to spend more than 50% of his time on these cases, he should be available to work at least one or two cases with new CPI workers for training purposes, and to assist with particularly complex or "needy" cases.

14. The County Attorney should assure that the IFSAP Prosecutor is available for IFSAP weekly meetings. This may entail assigning another prosecutor to cover Juvenile Court responsibilities from 2:00 to 4:30 PM every Thursday.

15. A Guardian Ad Litem should be appointed for the child victim as soon as it is determined that either Juvenile or Criminal Court action is to be taken.

16. An assessment of whether the victim is "safe" with the non-offending parent should be completed as soon as the family becomes identified as an IFSAP family, with the victim's safety and well-being continuously reassessed throughout the crisis. The responsibility for assessing the immediate needs of the victim must be assigned prior to the Juvenile Court involvement. There may be times that short term shelter (e.g. at the Iowa Runaway Service) is needed while the non-offending parent works through her feelings about her partner's removal from the home and her child's allegations.

17. Transcripts of taped interviews should be provided to the CPT worker, the Investigators, the Juvenile Court, County Attorney, IFSAP Program Manager and the treatment agency as soon as possible, and at least within four working days of the arrest. This may involve providing additional clerical assistance and making the Program Manager responsible for the distribution of the transcripts.

18. The needs of the siblings must be addressed in terms of immediate needs as possible victims themselves or at least as impacted by the arrest of the offender and the resulting turmoil in the home. The needs of the siblings should also be considered in terms of prevention of future assault on the sibling, who would be considered "high risk" for victimization. This would involve assessment of sibling needs, inclusion of the siblings in family counseling, a session in which the offender, where appropriate, "apologizes" to the sibling and absolves the victim of "blame", and group and individual counseling as needed for siblings, with the minimum involvement for siblings being group work on a preventative basis.

19. A strong Daughters/Sons United group needs to be developed to provide immediate support for victims of incest.

20. One-on-one pair-ups of new IFSAP families and Parents United members needs to take place as soon as the arrest is made to provide support for the family and to help the family work through initial resistance and trauma.

21. The time delays between Juvenile Court Intake and filing need to be shortened. With the current and expected case load this can be accomplished only with the addition of staff. The Juvenile Court is considering adding an Intake Officer who will be responsible for child sexual abuse intake AND IFSAP Program coordination. This would be a very positive step, and would assure active Juvenile Court involvement in the program management.

22. The Youth Law Center, Juvenile Court and IFSAP Program Manager need to establish a procedure to assure that a GAL is assigned immediately to the victim in a substantiated case, particularly if the victim is removed from the home.

23. In order to assure consistent monitoring of the cases, it is important that staff within ANY component who become aware of violations of agreements notify not only the Juvenile Court and/or prosecutor, but also the IFSAP Program Manager. The notification should be in writing to allow the Program Manager to monitor and follow-up on the response to the notification of the violation AND to respond to the person who reported the violation with an indication of what action was taken OR why no action could be taken. This also helps keep conflict between components to a minimum.

24. Because the Youth Law Center is allocated a specific amount of money by the Polk County Board of Supervisors for providing legal services to Polk County Youth (on a fee/case basis), once the funds are expended, the Center accepts no new cases. During FY 1984, the funds were depleted, additional funds were provided and those funds were also depleted before the end of April. The Youth Law Center, therefore, which was cited by all program participants as one of the strengths in addressing victim needs, will be accepting no new cases before July 1, 1984, due to lack of funds. Having to rely on private attorneys for Guardian Ad Litem coordination. The Board of Supervisors should consider targeting additional funds for YLC representation of sexual abuse victims.

25. Treatment staff should be required to complete a "termination summary", for inclusion in the Program Coordinator's IFSAP files, at the time a case is terminated from treatment or by the end of one year in treatment (prior to the expiration of the release of information waiver), whichever comes sooner.

26. Evaluation/Treatment reports must be provided on a timely enough basis to use for court hearings. This requires early notification of court dates AND a commitment to have the reports ready at least three working days prior to the court hearing.

27. In order to evaluate treatment efforts and learn which approaches seem to work with which offenders, treatment information MUST be made available to evaluators. Apparently, because the release of information is good only for one year, the evaluator would have to be placed temporarily on the Sands Unit staff while collecting the data, as existing staff are unable to allocate the time to complete this important function. It would probably take \$1,000 to \$1,500 to hire someone for one month to review all the files and pull out necessary information. In order to complete a useful longitudinal evaluation, a data instrument should be developed and used uniformly to identify:

- treatment goals (behavior specific, quantifiable OR assessed by tests);
- some assessment of the chances that the goal CAN be met (e.g. on a 1-6 scale);
- criteria to determine if the goal is attained OR approached; and
- at closing or at specific assessment intervals, an indication by the primary therapist of progress toward reaching these goals and any other benefits.

28. The IFSAP team should be included in staffing a case before treatment is considered completed. The treatment resource should be responsible for notifying the IFSAP Program Manager if any IFSAP family member does not show up for scheduled appointments and does not have a reasonable (to the therapist) excuse. If the IFSAP treatment is part of a probation agreement, the prosecutor should also be notified if the offender is not attending treatment as required.

29. The current prosecution resources dedicated to the IFSAP program and the prosecution of child sexual abuse defendants is not adequate to allow smooth functioning of the program. The IFSAP prosecutor (Ray Blase) is in the courtroom on Juvenile Court cases 80% of the time, hence is difficult to reach for consultation, and is often unable to attend weekly meetings. The prosecutor who handles non-IFSAP cases, because of her caseload, is also in the courtroom the majority of her time. The County Attorney needs to assess what kind of financial/resources commitment he is willing to make to this effort since growth in caseload does not seem to be leveling off. It is important, regardless of the commitment level established, that access to the prosecutor for screening of evidence, attendance at weekly meetings and proper preparation for cases being taken to trial be assured. This would require an increase over the current resources assigned.

30. The Guardian Ad Litem should be notified of depositions of the victim so the GAL could be present to provide support and counsel for the victim.

31. Whenever possible, depositions of the child victim should be done at the Juvenile Court in the room with the one-way glass so the defendant could observe the testimony and request, through his attorney, that issues be clarified, without having direct contact (e.g. across the table) with the victim. This is an area which could be promoted by the Guardian Ad Litem.

32. New IFSAP families need to receive a complete orientation, including written materials (brochure or booklet) describing what will happen to the family in general terms, time lines (ranges) that may apply, which tests are generally used in evaluation/treatment, what decisions are made by what people, who the IFSAP team is, etc. Part of the orientation should be an immediate contact from an experienced Parents United member. The criminal and juvenile justice procedures should also be explained.

33. The Parents United members stressed the need to focus more on family counseling for those families in which being reunited is a possibility. They stressed the need to have the offender explain to the entire family, not just to the victim, the role he played in what happened to the family and to stress that it was not the victim's fault. They suggested that family counseling, including the siblings begin after the "apology session".

34. Child care should be available for group and therapy sessions to allow fuller participation. Perhaps this could be arranged through the Victim Services Agency volunteer component.

35. The counseling needs of the resistant victim need to be addressed. When the victim refuses to accept help, the program should continue to make attempts to involve the victim in counseling rather than "write her off".

EVALUATION RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The IFSAP Program Manager position was developed to provide overall coordination, case management and program development capabilities to insure that all disciplines are represented at the weekly meetings, to promote communication, case coordination and effective service delivery between components, and to address training and public education needs.

The four areas to be addressed in the evaluation of the coordination of the program include the effectiveness of the weekly meetings, the effectiveness of the Program Manager, the area of training and establishment of procedures, and the public education efforts.

1. Weekly Meetings

Attendance and Participation in the Weekly Meetings - The weekly staff meetings were identified as the key to the success of the IFSAP Program. Particularly with the demanding schedules of the key program participants, the Thursday meeting is viewed as a critical opportunity to make contact with the other participants. It is also an opportunity to "staff" IFSAP cases and to discuss procedures, protocol, training, public education and problems within the program. In order to use time more efficiently, the meeting has recently been divided into a "Coordinator's Meeting" (the first part of the meeting) and "Staffing" (the last half of the meeting). This change was instituted to allow the line staff with specific concerns about a particular case to participate in the staffing of that case without having to sit through the entire meeting. Many of the comments on the written questionnaire regarding the weekly meetings referenced the line worker's frustration with the very heavy workloads and the time demands of the weekly meetings. A number of workers indicated they did not attend the meetings because of other demands on their time. Others complained about the fact that some components were not represented at the meetings (most notably law enforcement, although child protective investigators rarely attend anymore either). The opinion was almost uniformly expressed that at least the component Program Coordinators ought to be present to include someone officially representing CPI, CPT, Juvenile Court, County Attorney, Sands Center, and Youth Law Center. It was indicated that it is difficult to conduct business without Ray Blase, Candice Bennett, Jace Jamieson, etc. present. They also pointed out the importance of having the line workers associated with a case present when that case was being "staffed". Otherwise, the agency representatives should be sure that they are well-briefed on the status of the case. Someone also mentioned getting the agenda out early enough to allow the participants to arrange their schedules to attend if one of their cases was on the list to be staffed. Many of the comments which would appear to be quite

negative, are actually more indicative of the critical role of the Thursday meetings in a program encompassing a number of distinct but interrelated components than of an unacceptable program. Given the schedules of the participants and the IFSAP caseload, the meetings are actually quite well attended. There are rarely fewer than ten to fifteen persons at the meeting, but given that every case may involve up to ten line staff, any absences when a case needs to be discussed are frustrating, as are the absences of any of the program coordinators when a policy or procedure issue is addressed. The rating received on the written questionnaire on the level of satisfaction with the attendance and participation of the various personnel involved in the weekly meetings was 4.21 on a scale of 1 to 7. This placed the average response only slightly better than "Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied".

The importance and difficulty of having involved staff in attendance at the weekly meetings brings up the issue of whether it might be better to have a smaller number of "specialists" in each unit who do all of the sexual abuse of children cases. While this might make inter-agency communication and coordination easier, and may decrease the number of people who have a hand in the IFSAP cases, those advantages may be offset by the "burn out" that can occur when staff are dedicated to one specialty area that demands a great deal more of them in terms of time and energy than many of the other cases that they now address. This issue needs to continue to be assessed with the objective being to increase the attendance of line staff at staffings of their cases more (some of this involves the expectations of management that the staff people will make arrangements to be there). Hopefully the recent change to place staffings at the end of the meeting will help (participants are given an estimate of when the case should come up on the agenda). All agencies should make the commitment to do whatever is necessary to assure that their representatives to the program are in attendance at the meeting each Thursday. It is the opinion of this evaluator that the complexity of the IFSAP program and the related coordination problems are sufficient to justify whatever action is necessary to assure that the program coordinators are in attendance at the Thursday meetings.

Effectiveness/Productivity of the Thursday Meetings - On the written questionnaire, the effectiveness and productivity of the weekly meetings received an average rating of 4.56, midway between "Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied" (4) and "Slightly Satisfied" (5). The comments raised the same issues as those regarding the attendance and participation in the weekly meetings, again focusing on the frustration of the other participants when a key person is not in attendance when an issue needing his/her input comes up. Particularly in light of the heavy caseloads of the program participants, attendance at the weekly meeting is viewed as a substantial commitment, and the line staff resent not having that time used efficiently. One respondent commented that "as a worker dealing with only one specific client during an hour and a half meeting I do not enjoy arriving at 3:00 PM to deal with a

case that comes up for discussion as the last item of business. . . even more distressing is having to listen to a review of what has been discussed so a late arriver can catch up on the discussion". Recognizing that the needs of the program coordinators and the line staff differ in the weekly meetings, the agenda format has been altered to attempt to give the line staff an idea of exactly when their case will be discussed, and the issues relating to the program coordination and procedures are addressed during the first half of the meeting so the staff who want to participate only in the staffing portion of the meeting can arrange not to be present for the coordinator's meeting. Again, the weekly meetings cannot be effective without the commitment of each program component to have its representative present at the meeting.

Program Manager's Preparation for Weekly Meetings - On the written questionnaire, the Program Manager's preparation for the weekly meetings received a 5.54 rating, which falls midway between "Slightly Satisfied" (5) and "Satisfied" (6). One of the respondents noted that "Joe does a pretty good job--there have been a couple of times I've asked to have Jace prepared about a case and he has little direct knowledge and hadn't checked on the case". Another commented that "Joe needs to keep the meetings moving and flow smoothly, we very often get off the subject and waste alot of time". The preparation for the "staffing" portion of the meeting could best be improved by sanctions and support from the supervisors within each component to assure that the workers involved with each case being staffed are present at the meetings at the time set for the staffing. The IFSAP Program Manager needs to be sure that the agenda is out at least by Monday to allow the workers to clear their schedules for Thursday. The most effective way of improving the meetings overall would be for each program component Director to assure that any necessary adjustments are made to assure that their agency representative is able to attend the meeting each week and is also prepared to address the cases being staffed.

Manner of Resolving Interagency Problems - On the written questionnaire, this issue received a rating of only 4.08 or slightly over "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" (4). Generally people indicated that the program functioned remarkably well for the number of agencies/people involved, but felt that while everyone works hard to get things straightened out, sometimes there are inherent differences in the goals and procedures of different components that create barriers. Some of the comments illustrate these inherent difficulties. One of the treatment staff commented that "problems on the legal end are not always handled in the best interest of the child; e.g. _____ is still living across the street from the victim - causing emotional stress to all members of the family". It is often difficult for those staff working directly with the victim to understand the limitations of the legal system, and to not view the lack of legal

action as insensitivity. It is also difficult at times for those staff working within the criminal or juvenile justice system to accept the fact that the social worker is and must be concerned about a child's victimization even if there is not and never will be enough evidence to prosecute the perpetrator. The best that can be accomplished within a program which must draw all of these people together is that the difficulties are addressed "head on", so that the participants can understand why the other person feels or responds as he does, rather than going behind his back or writing off all the staff and efforts of that component.

2. The IFSAP Program Manager's Role

The role of the IFSAP Program Manager was assessed in terms of his accessibility and helpfulness in addressing IFSAP problems, his knowledge of and monitoring of active cases, and his ability to secure cooperation and coordination among components. Other aspects that impinge on his ability to coordinate efforts effectively include his access to information and materials on IFSAP cases, and his immediate notification once an incestuous family is identified. All but one respondent indicated that the immediate notification of the IFSAP Program Manager was no longer a problem. Many of the respondents, however, including the IFSAP Program Manager, indicated that access to all information on a case was a problem. This was verified in the review of case files. In the majority of files reviewed, there was not enough information in the file to properly coordinate activities and services. The CPI report, which would be considered a key document in the case is not provided to the IFSAP Manager. The Manager should immediately begin receiving copies of this document in every IFSAP case. If the report cannot be provided through CPI, it should be provided by the County Attorney, who is supposed to receive a report on every case. In addition, the Program Manager should receive a copy of the transcripts on every case. In order to most efficiently keep all components abreast of information that they need to know, each participant should send a copy of any information developed or processed by that person to the Program Manager along with a note of who else should receive a copy. This places the responsibility for the actual dissemination with the Program Manager, saving time for the other participants, yet leaves the decision of who should have access to the information with the person who originates the information. Other pieces of information that should routinely be found in the Program Coordinator's IFSAP file include the "no-contact order", any court orders, any reports prepared for court hearings, any agreements, the target plea agreement, sentencing orders, referrals to other treatment agencies, and the case summaries prepared by the Sands Center staff at the time the case is terminated from treatment. If the case is not terminated within one year of intake, a report should still be prepared and delivered to the IFSAP Program Manager before the release of information is no longer valid. While this may make the IFSAP files quite large, the IFSAP file is the only place where someone

would expect to find all relevant information on a case. As this evaluator discovered, a true evaluation is close to impossible when information is scattered among six different agencies, each with different "release of information" policies.

The IFSAP Program Manager received a rating of 5.50 on the written questionnaire in response to a question of how satisfied the respondents were with his accessibility and helpfulness. This falls halfway between "slightly satisfied" (5) and "satisfied" (6). The Program Manager received a 5.28 rating on his knowledge of and monitoring of active cases. His average rating was lower (4.77) on his ability to get coordination and cooperation from the program components. This falls between "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" (4) and "slightly satisfied" (5). The comments pointed out, however, that "coordination problems have as much to do with the problems in the components as it does with the coordinator's efforts and/or abilities". Some specific comments concerning the IFSAP Program Manager include, "I have been very pleased with my work with Joe and look forward to the time we have for consultation and information exchange. . . . Problems in coordination are inherent when so many people are involved"; "I have been very satisfied with assistance on cases"; and "I am satisfied with Joe's efforts - I'm not sure the efforts of others match his". Another respondent commented that "coordination is usually available and quite helpful. . . what appears to be lacking is consistent information and cooperation by other parties involved. . . often cases are left in limbo or a gray area with no one taking responsibility, and all that is accomplished is an exchange of information". In a related vein, a respondent commented that the Program Manager is not given the power to achieve the results for which he is held accountable. While the Program Manager does not have the power to require people to take specific actions in the "gray area" cases referenced above, as long as each component is represented at the weekly meeting by someone authorized to make decisions, the Coordinator should be able to clarify a plan of action (even if that means formally "giving up" on the family) for cases which seem to be mired in inaction. One of the respondents commented that "treatment team case plans, progress reports and termination summaries have not been provided in written form". Particularly now that Child Protective Treatment (CPT) has been added as an intervention/monitoring/treatment resource, the existence of a "treatment plan" is important. The Sands Center Clinical Coordinator (Jamieson) indicated that the CPT worker and ICFS Homemaker (when involved) could be used more effectively if the Sands treatment staff could provide them with treatment goals and how they may be able to assist the family in reaching those goals. The IFSAP Program Manager is the logical person to facilitate this kind of treatment coordination. There were only two real criticisms of the IFSAP Program Manager. One related to his perceived lack of support for involvement in Parents United, and this will be discussed further in the section on Parents United, following the treatment review. The other criticisms related to the occasional lack of follow-through by the Program Manager.

Given the nature of the job, there may be requests made of the Program Manager which later turn out to be impossible to address; the person who asked for help, however, may never know why it was not addressed. The Program Manager needs to make a concerted effort to respond in writing to any reasonable request that is made to indicate what has happened with the request, and what further action will be taken. If it turns out that the Program Manager cannot address the issue, he should indicate where the person may go for assistance. Given the complex nature of the IFSAP program and the multitude of needs and issues which should be addressed, it would be helpful for the Program Manager to prepare and distribute at least every six months a plan of action showing personal and program goals, objectives, action to be taken and by whom, and timetables for completion. This would also allow input by the other program components on priorities.

3. Training, Protocol and Procedures in IFSAP Cases

Procedures - One of the first goals of the IFSAP Program was the development of standard procedures for each of the IFSAP components. The procedures were intended not only as a guide to the handling of cases, but also as a training tool for the staff within each component. The Procedures Manual, completed by Julie Johnston, the first IFSAP Program Manager, in conjunction with the members of the IFSAP team, was printed and distributed the summer of 1982. Guidelines were also developed for handling juvenile incest offenders and cases in which the offender is not involved in the IFSAP program, but in which the Juvenile Court has filed a CINA petition. The original procedures manual is going through a complete updating which should be completed (and new manuals printed) by the summer of 1984. A great deal of effort was also given initially to training staff with each IFSAP component. In January of 1982 the IFSAP Program Manager, the Sands Center Clinical Director, the Child Protective Services Supervisor, the County Attorney's Investigator and Prosecutor assigned to IFSAP, the DMPD Liaison Officer to IFSAP and the Juvenile Court Supervisory Probation Officer for Girls went to California as a team to train with the staff of the Giarretto Project. One of the major benefits of the training was the cohesiveness that developed among those who attended the training. From a learning prospective, however, the major discovery was that in many ways the Polk County project was doing things more effectively than the project that it had modeled itself after. During April and May, extensive training was provided in Des Moines for all law enforcement, child protective and juvenile court staff (at separate sessions). Throughout FY 1983 training continued to be a major focus of the Program Manager, both locally and throughout the state.

Partly because of the substantial turnover within the IFSAP components (of the original group to train in California, only four of the seven are still involved), and partly because with over two years of experience in the treatment of incestuous families, staff have learned some things they did not know in 1982, it is time to begin systematically retraining all of the staff within the IFSAP components. The Program Manager should set up a schedule of training to extend through the end of 1984 to provide basic training for each component and a series of monthly training sessions in special interest areas involving work with incestuous families.

4. Public Education Efforts

For the first two years of the IFSAP project the training/public relations efforts were focused on other agencies/organizations which would be in the position to identify and refer incestuous families. The public education efforts in some ways were deliberately low key to avoid "overloading" the project with referrals. An excellent filmstrip was developed, but it was used primarily with other agencies/organizations to sensitize them to the procedures used, services available and basic issues surrounding incests.

The Greater Des Moines Child Abuse and Neglect Council, Inc. has adopted the area of child sexual abuse as its major emphasis for 1984. The IFSAP Program Manager is on the Executive Board of Directors for the Council, and it is anticipated that part of the emphasis for the Council will be public education regarding intra-family sexual abuse of children. In addition, work is currently being done on Public Service Announcements for radio and TV. These should begin being used by July of 1984. The public education efforts which have been most successful have actually come from outside the IFSAP project. The issue of child sexual abuse has become a "popular" one for newspaper, TV news and feature article coverage, and the public consciousness of these issues has risen significantly over the last two years. The showing of "Something About Amelia" on both cable and public TV may have been the most significant public education event in 1983. Following that movie, program staff took phone calls until 1:30 in the morning.

The entire staff of the Victim's Services Agency and staff from other program components regularly do "prevention" sessions with PTA's, Girl Scouts, etc. to discuss basic issues such as "the right way to say no" and "who do you tell". From these discussions the staff hope to encourage victims and mothers of victims to reach out at earlier stages, at the same time that the participants are learning ways to decrease their chances of becoming victims. The majority of respondents to the written questionnaire indicated they "did not know" when they were asked to rate the IFSAP Program Coordinator's public education efforts. This is probably an indication that the public education efforts

need to be emphasized more and be included as part of the Program Manager's "six month plan".

Other suggestions from the persons interviewed include: promotion of after-school TV specials, radio and TV public service announcements speaking to different groups and organizations; work with schools and day care centers on preventive education; and making presentations to referring agencies. In these efforts it will be important for the IFSAP team to develop specific targets. Also, development of a speaker's group through VSA would be helpful.

B. INTRA-FAMILY SEXUAL ABUSE OF CHILDREN PROGRAM - INVESTIGATIVE COMPONENT

Throughout this evaluation, the persons who have been interviewed have stressed that the IFSAP program's success is largely a result of the extraordinary commitment of staff within each of the IFSAP components. Without this commitment, in light of the large and ever-increasing caseload, the program could not succeed. It was expressed equally often that the Des Moines Police Department Investigators, on the whole, did not share this commitment, and represented the weakest link in the program. Because the issue was raised so often and by so many different people, it will be addressed as a separate topic of this evaluation.

1. Police Investigation Problems - Des Moines Police Department

The criticisms of the Des Moines Police Department participation centered around the lack of support and cooperation with other system components, poor interviewing skills with the child victims, and little sensitivity to the needs of the victim and his/her family. Respondents indicated that the Des Moines detectives were often unwilling or unable to participate in the investigation when they were needed, and that they had indicated an unwillingness to initiate an investigation until the Child Protective Investigator had established at least some firm evidence that the assault had, in fact, occurred. This meant that the investigation must be initiated by the CPI worker alone, and interrupted, once adequate evidence of the assault had been obtained, until the police investigator could join the investigation. This violates the procedural recommendation that whenever possible the investigation, once commenced, continue until an arrest is made to protect the victim from coercion by the offender. Many of the respondents shared the view that "we have

had more than our share of problems with the Des Moines Police Department. . . Paul Houston does an excellent job, but is not available very much now. . . we've had good luck with other departments and the Sheriff's Office. . . . If the DMPD situation cannot be improved, another County Attorney Investigator should be hired to work with the program". Some of the respondents indicated that the DMPD officers need help in understanding the need for a quick arrest and the trauma that child victims experience, particularly if removal from home is necessary. Many commented on the very negative attitudes of the DMPD officers, contrasted with the "dramatically more positive" attitudes of the other departments. The Officer's tendency to "interrogate" rather than "interview" small children was also a common theme. One respondent commented that the DMPD's "interrogation" approach with the child victim tended to make the victim "clam up" and deny that anything had happened, and that this denial was then used by the Officer as proof that there was no case and the investigation was a waste of time. Most of the respondents saw the problem as getting worse rather than better.

It is important to clarify, however, that the respondents to the written questionnaire and the oral interviews are likely to focus on those experiences which have caused frustration in the implementation of the program. Because the vast majority of cases will fall within the jurisdiction of the DMPD, there is ample opportunity for their cases to go awry. In reality, there are DMPD officers who are both skilled in these investigations and willing to commit the time necessary for a timely and thorough investigation. The peer pressure, however, with the Youth Section, would tend to inhibit those officers and encourage those who view the investigations of sexual abuse of children as a waste of time.

While it is possible to provide training in the skills and techniques used in interviewing incest victims, and to provide information and experience which can sensitize staff to the problems and needs of incest victims and their families, these efforts will not succeed if the staff involved have little interest in and little commitment to their involvement with incest cases.

In the case of the DMPD, the incest investigations are assigned to the Youth Division rather than the Crimes Against Persons Division. All but two of the Youth Division officers are also Police-School Liaison Officers, meaning that they have regularly assigned school hours. This makes scheduling of an incest investigation, which often takes from eight to ten hours to complete, very difficult. If the investigation is completed without interruption, as recommended in the IFSAP policies and procedures, it will mean overtime hours for the officer who must first complete a three hour stint in his school. In addition, from an attitude perspective, the Youth Bureau Officer is accustomed to relating to the child as the offender rather than the victim of a crime. While the DMPD respondents made relatively

few comments on the written questionnaire, the comments that were made generally reflected conflict with IFSAP program policies. Those respondents who commented on the Thursday meetings indicated they had never been to a meeting and had not met the Program Manager. One of the officers indicated that "much time is wasted on tape recording interviews before it is determined that there is evidence of a valid case". The problem, of course, with not taping until the evidence is established, is that once it would be determined that the evidence supported the allegation of abuse, the information that led to that conclusion would not be on tape and would have to be recaptured. With a child victim, this would mean going back to square one to get the victim's statement on tape. Since the tape is also used by the Prosecutor to assess the potential of the victim as a State's Witness, it is helpful for the prosecutor to be able to hear the entire conversation between the investigator and the witness to assure that the investigator did not lead the victim or inadvertently "plant" ideas in the child's mind. Obviously this cannot be assessed if the entire conversation is not on tape. Another officer indicated that there was "much wasted time when there is no basis for a charge; just family members mad at each other". There were essentially no "positive" comments made concerning the program, while all of the other program components tended to be far more positive than negative.

It would be unfair to address the negative comments concerning the DMPD without also indicating that the respondents had very positive comments on the leadership of Sgt. Vandermeide, and the early indications of support from Lt. Stookey. Sgt. Vandermeide, with the support of Lt. Stookey, has proposed to the DMPD management that a special unit be established to work with the child assault cases. The two Youth Bureau Officers who are not assigned to a school would be joined by two additional investigators who would "bid" into the unit. In this way, the department could identify officers who express some commitment to these investigations and provide special training to establish the necessary level of expertise. By setting up a unit without specific school assignments, the officers would also have the flexibility to be available as needed for the timely initiation and completion of investigations. This proposal has received strong support from other IFSAP program participants. Should the department be unable or unwilling to establish this type of unit, an alternate resource such as a "metro squad" under the Sheriff or an additional Polk County Attorney Investigator who would be available for investigations of child assaults should be pursued (with some funding from the City of Des Moines). If either of these alternatives were adopted, it would be important to have the investigators assigned to the special unit undergo extensive training in interviewing child witnesses, evidentiary requirements, program procedures and issues surrounding incest cases. CPI investigators and investigators from other police agencies should also be included in this training. It is also important that the key law enforcement participants become involved in the Thursday meetings to increase the likelihood that

problems and misunderstandings that are inevitable between program components can be addressed constructively rather than by "behind the back" gossip.

2. Joint Child Protective/Law Enforcement Investigations

For the purposes of the IFSAP program, the Child Protective Investigation (CPI) workers combine their efforts with a detective from a law enforcement agency or the County Attorney's Investigator so the CPI and criminal investigation can occur simultaneously. The joint investigation strengthens the case and improves the investigative process in these very sensitive cases by combining the skills of the social worker with those of a trained criminal investigator, while eliminating the need for witnesses to repeat their story to the law enforcement officer once the CPI worker has established that criminal assault occurred.

As indicated under section 1, on the Des Moines Police Department, some of the investigations are not initiated as a joint investigation because of the DMPD policy that detectives do not participate in the investigation until the CPI worker determines that there is some concrete proof of sexual assault. In addition, because the CPI rules require that an investigation be initiated within an hour of the time a referral is received, the DMPD investigator is often not available within that time frame and the CPI worker must begin the investigation alone. The joint investigation, however, is still an integral part of the IFSAP procedures, and is apparently not a problem with the other law enforcement units. On the written questionnaire, in response to the question of how often the incest investigations involve the joint efforts of CPI and law enforcement, the average rating was 5.64, midway between "often" (5) and "usually" (6). Of the 105 cases reviewed in which it could be determined whether or not a joint investigation was done, 82% (86) of the cases were jointly investigated. (See Appendix II). During the time that the County Attorney's Investigator was deeply involved in the incest investigations, 100% of the investigations were being conducted on a joint basis. While much of the problem on this would seem to rest with the DMPD policy on involvement in the investigations, the CPI policy of initiating the investigation within one hour of the referral also makes the joint investigation difficult. If one asserts that the timely completion of the investigation is more important than an immediate initiation of the investigation, law enforcement involvement in the investigation may be facilitated. If no event has occurred that will bring the referral to the offender's attention immediately, the investigation may go more smoothly if it can be planned out, to commence the following morning rather than commencing late in the day. Most of the respondents indicated that joint investigations are still an integral goal of the program, and suggested that this program area needs immediate attention.

3. Taping of Investigative Interviews

The taping of interviews with the victim, non-offending parent(s), other witnesses and the offender serves a multitude of purposes. It can be used with a very young or mentally retarded victim to "qualify" them on tape (show the youth knows truth from fiction) for prosecution purposes. Particularly with mentally retarded and very young victims, videotaping is used. In at least one case recently, the Judge ruled that a mentally retarded boy was a competent witness on the basis of the videotape. The tape is also a valuable prosecution tool to assess how the victim or witness will function as a state's witness if the case does go to trial. While the original goal was to have the tape used in court in lieu of having the child testify, this has not been the case. The prosecutors feel the victim's presence in court is crucial for the case, and the defense often requests that child victims be deposed. The original tape, however, allows the prosecutor to assess the victim's potential as a witness at the evidence screening stage, and also allows the prosecutor to identify additional evidence needs prior to filing charges against the offender. The tape is also transcribed, and copies are supposed to be provided to each program component (CPI, CPT, Treatment, Juvenile Court, Law Enforcement, County Attorney and the Program Manager) to use as a tool in accomplishing the goals of each of those units without having to have the victim and witnesses repeat their story for each component. The tape may be valuable in treatment to play back to the offender who begins to deny his actions or responsibility for same in treatment. The CPI and police investigators have been trained to avoid "leading" the child witness while still getting an acceptable and complete verbal description of what transpired, including identifiable names for body parts, dates, timing and frequency of occurrences, etc. Because of the rapid turnover at CPI, however, this kind of training needs to be repeated regularly, and the tapes can provide the means of assessing training needs. The taped confession can also be used against the offender in prosecution should the offender fail to cooperate with the IFSAP program or refuse to plead to the target charge at the completion of the program.

While program assessment respondents indicated uniformly that they thought all interviews were, in fact, taped, there were some concerns about the quality of the tapes and the typing and distribution of transcripts. Some of the tapes could not be transcribed because they could not be heard/deciphered. It is important that all the tapes and tape recorders be tested routinely to assure that they are functioning properly. Perhaps this responsibility should lie within CPI supervision. A bad tape could result in the permanent loss of necessary evidence. Another problem has been assuring the timely transcription and distribution of the transcripts. Incest interviews are often lengthy, involve a number of collateral interviews, and are difficult to transcribe because the child witness is difficult to hear and understand. The transcriptions represent a significant clerical drain, yet there have never been any secretaries added to

any of the components to accomplish this task. The responsibility tends to fall to the law enforcement agency involved in the investigation (e.g. County Attorney for Paul Houston and Law Enforcement Unit for the rest). More recently the County Attorney has been "saddled" with the total responsibility for this transcription. Since many of the respondents indicated they were not receiving copies of the transcripts, and needed those to complete their role effectively, something needs to be done to assure that the distribution takes place. This could probably be done most effectively by having the CPI worker tell the IFSAP Program Manager how many tapes were made for a particular case and make the IFSAP Program Manager responsible for receiving the transcriptions and distributing them to all appropriate parties. If the IFSAP Program Manager has not received the transcriptions within one week of the interviews, he should follow-up with the appropriate police agency. It would certainly be helpful to have a secretary assigned to the IFSAP program for the purpose of providing timely transcriptions of child sexual abuse investigations, if the funds to accomplish this could be secured. In the 99 cases in which it could be determined whether or not the interviews were taped, 85% (85) of the interviews were taped. Nineteen other cases were marked as unknown because no transcripts were found in the file even though it was likely that it was taped.

4. Timeliness of the Investigations of Incest Cases

The original goal of the program was to have the investigation completed, without interruption, in as short a time as possible from the initial interview to assure that the offender does not have the opportunity to contact and coerce the victim or other family members. At a minimum, it was anticipated that the victim would not have to remain in the home with the offender overnight after the investigation had reached the stage where the offender was aware of it. Therefore, it was considered to be a better practice to delay the onset of the investigation than to initiate the investigation knowing that it would be interrupted and could not be completed the same day. The time frame regulations under which the Child Protective Services Unit operates, however, makes the approval of any delay difficult. In addition, if it appears that the child is in immediate danger, the investigation must commence within one hour. This makes immediate access to a law enforcement investigator who has the flexibility to devote eight to ten straight hours to a case more critical. It also makes immediate access to a prosecutor who can review the evidence and determine whether a charge should be filed critical. Since some of the interviews may not be able to be accomplished during the normal office hours, the arrest decision must often be made during the evening or weekend hours. The screening attorney must be accessible during those hours in order for the program goals to be reached. Even if all the components function properly, there will still be cases which cannot be completed within the ideal time frame because of investigation leads which

cannot be immediately pursued. In the written questionnaire, in response to the question about how often the investigations are initiated and completed on a timely basis, the timeliness of the initiation of the investigation was rated 5.58 and the timeliness of the completion was rated 5.02 with both answers falling between "often" (5) and "usually" (6). In the comments made, it appeared that most of the cases where action was delayed involved situations in which the offender did not currently live in the home with the victim. There was, however, one reference to a case in which the arrest was not made until one week after the mother and victim were interviewed, and the offender was still in the home. Hopefully this case was a rarity. There were also comments concerning the difficulty in reaching the IFSAP prosecutor and the Juvenile Court Intake Officer; however, these comments were always tempered with statements indicating they understood the overwhelming workload under which these people worked, and felt that the program was receiving the full support of these staff. In an attempt to resolve the problems with reaching the Assistant County Attorney for charging decisions, the County Attorney assigned those charging decisions to the Pre-Trial Bureau attorneys rather than the attorneys assigned to the IFSAP program and the prosecution of the other cases of sexual abuse of children. Since the original project design assumed that it was important to have the attorney who would end up prosecuting the case making the screening decisions, this new arrangement should be assessed in three to four months to see how it is working. Any attorneys who are involved in the screening decisions should receive extensive training the program's purposes and operations and evidentiary requirements in child sexual abuse cases. The IFSAP Program Manager should accept the responsibility for reviewing each new case as it is referred in order to determine if the investigation was handled in a timely fashion and if the greatest protection possible was afforded to the victim during the investigation. Any problems which are uncovered should be brought to the Thursday Coordinator's meeting to assure that those problems are addressed.

5. Thoroughness and Usefulness of the Investigations

The rating received in the written questionnaire to the question of how thorough and useful the investigations are was relatively low (4.40 on a scale of 1 to 7). The rating falls midway between a response of "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" (4) and "slightly satisfied" (5). The comments tend to dwell on some of the perceived problems of the Des Moines Police Department, stressing that "a lot of training needs to be done in this area to improve quality, especially with the DMPD". Respondents also commented that "DMPD investigations are not as thorough as those done by Paul Houston". Perhaps the most accurate description of the situation is that "the quality of sexual abuse investigation reports is extremely uneven, with some good reporting and some extremely shoddy reporting, investigating and follow-through...Lack of consistency occurs and I see no effort being made to remedy the situation, and the quality of the

investigations appears to be decreasing". In addition to some of the problems with the DMPD Investigators, and the fact that Paul Houston, who is highly skilled in this area is no longer devoting a major portion of his time doing these investigations, it should be noted that all but four of the original CPI workers trained to work in this area have left the agency. This means that 12 of the 16 current CPI workers have not received special training in the investigation of incest cases, and the new CPI workers have come at a time that heavy workload prevent the more experienced workers from spending much time with the new workers.

It appears to be time for the program participants to reassess their involvement in and commitment to the IFSAP Program. In the area of investigations, it is important to have investigators assigned to these cases who have expressed an interest in and commitment to the program. These people who would undergo specialized training and make the commitment to be available routinely during non-working hours and for periods of eight to ten hours at a stretch for a single investigation. The investigators need to have immediate access, for evidence review, to an equally committed Assistant County Attorney. The decreased time commitment from the County Attorney's Investigator should be reassessed, both in terms of the investigations themselves AND in terms of training. It would be helpful for the new child protective investigators to work at least one to two cases with the County Attorney's Investigator as a training tool. At least one training session should be set up for CPI, law enforcement investigators and other IFSAP participants to review the evidence needs from a prosecution perspective. Since videotapes are supposed to be made of victims under the age of eight, those videotapes should be used as a training tool, not only in terms of providing feedback to the investigators involved in that specific case, but also to use with all investigators to point out good techniques and commonly made mistakes.

6. Access to Assistant County Attorney for Reviews of Evidence and Approval of Complaint

In the written questionnaire, the availability of the Assistant County Attorney to review the evidence and advise the investigators was rated at 4.74 which is slightly less than "often available" (5). Comments indicated that "this has become a real problem in the last few months - Ray is spending so much time in court he is not available" and "not to the fault of the individual - Ray is excellent. . . He is just spread way too thin". Most of the comments, while expressing dissatisfaction with the access to the prosecutor, stressed that they were "aware that the effort is made to be available, but a problem in the workload of the Assistant County Attorney creates a barrier re-his availability". One of the comments, however, indicated that it "seems a very long time between interviews and hearing back - especially on a shaky case, or when the offender is not too accessible...It seems 'low priority' cases can get put off for months - leaves CPI and the family hanging". In an attempt to resolve this problem, the

County Attorney shifted the responsibility for case screening from the IFSAP attorney to the Pre-Trial Bureau attorneys. This provides more immediate access, but less continuity in terms of one attorney working with the program. The success of this alteration should be assessed in the next three to four months.

7. Immediate Notification of Program Manager

The notification of the IFSAP Program Manager when an incestuous family is identified seems to be no problem, with the notification being both timely and routine. The comments in the written questionnaire indicated that no one was aware of any deviations from this policy. That represents a definite improvement from when the program began; the CPI workers, who have the primary responsibility for notifying the IFSAP Program Manager, receive credit for the improvement.

8. Arrest/Confession Rate

The original program design anticipated a 75% confession rate on incest case. That goal was probably unrealistic, particularly when the public education effort begins to encourage reporting of cases where the evidence is not adequate for criminal prosecution. In cases where the evidence is insufficient for criminal prosecution but the abuse is substantiated, the case is handled through the Juvenile Court, using a CINA petition to provide some protection for the child and necessary services to the family. CINA cases are also referred to the Sands Center for treatment. In a review of 113 cases in which the case was founded and the suspect identified, 59 confessions were obtained for a 52% confession rate (See Appendix II). Of 92 cases in which the project goals would have required an arrest, 81 arrests were made, for an 88% clearance rate. The summary data is included in Appendix II, and conviction data is included in Section 6, Prosecution Component, page 52. Compared to the pre-project activity of three incest arrests and no convictions in the three years prior to project implementation, the program is a tremendous success from a criminal justice perspective. Since the program began a total of 44 offenders identified through the project have been convicted and sentenced.

C. INTRA-FAMILY SEXUAL ABUSE PROGRAM-INTERVENTION WITH THE FAMILY

In the informal assessment of the IFSAP program completed in the fall of 1983, the IFSAP team affirmed as its primary goal providing protection from further abuse for victims and providing treatment for victims and their families.

1. To Provide Protection for the Victim of Intra-Family Sexual Abuse While Addressing the Longer Term Needs

The issue of protection for the victim is impacted by the timeliness of the investigation of abuse, the use and enforcement of no-contact orders, the assignment of a Guardian Ad Litem (GAL), the timeliness of Juvenile Court Intake, and the Juvenile Court's ability to protect the victim when criminal justice sanctions fail. The average rating, on a scale of 1 to 7, of the aggregate of these issues on the written questionnaire, was 5.08. Most of the protection issues are addressed under the sections on Investigation and Juvenile Court. One issue not addressed in either of those sections is the question of whether it is always in the best interests of the victim to remain in his/her home with the non-offending parent. Some of the respondents indicated that it is important to assess whether the victim is, in fact, "safe" with the non-offending parent. Since the completion of this evaluation changes have been made to provide for the immediate involvement of a Child Protective Treatment (CPT) Worker. One of the CPT worker's responsibility is to assess the child's safety in the home. Earlier involvement of the Guardian Ad Litem would also be helpful in assuring that the victim is protected and is removed from the home when that turns out to be necessary. The CPT Worker can now request, through the Juvenile Court, that a Guardian Ad Litem be assigned to the child.

The immediate involvement of Child Protective Treatment workers in IFSAP cases has provided some means for assuring that monitoring of the welfare of the victim is being done on an immediate basis. The Iowa Runaway Service shelter has been used recently on a 12-72 hour basis as a means of stabilizing the home (and the non-offending parent) so that it could become a supportive environment for the victim.

Of the 81 cases identified in which an arrest was made (See Appendix II) in 50 cases the child remained in the home with the suspect prohibited from making contact. In two cases the no-contact order status could not be found and in three cases it was determined that a no-contact order should have been secured and was not. In 22 cases, the child was removed from the home because the remaining parent could not provide proper care for the youth, and in four other cases, the youth refused to stay in the home.

2. To Provide Both Timely and Effective Intervention with the Family of Incest Victims; To Promote Both Eradication of the Problem and Protection of the Victim and Other Siblings.

The intervention with the IFSAP family has been significantly strengthened since the IFSAP program was initiated. In a program assessment completed in the fall of 1983, the biggest gap in resources was identified as the period following the arrest before the treatment services were in place. That period could be particularly devastating to a victim who was being "blamed" by her

siblings and the non-offending spouse for the removal of the offender. There is also a good chance at this stage that the non-offending spouse will be having a hard time believing the victim, and this can add to the victim's duress.

A major improvement in this area has been the arrangement with Child Protective Treatment that the CPT worker will be alerted and placed on "stand-by" as soon as the investigation is initiated. In this way, the CPT worker can initiate contact with the family as soon as the IFSAP Program Manager gives the worker the go-ahead. Prior to this time, the CPT worker was not involved until after the CPI written reports were received and the case was formally assigned, which could take anywhere from two days to a week. The CPT component received the highest ratings of any of the IFSAP components in the written questionnaire. The CPT Unit received a rating of 6.27 on availability, 6.00 on timeliness of the intervention, and 6.16 on helpfulness. The Unit, therefore, fell between "usually" (6.0) and "always" (7.0) in response to the question of how often the services were available when needed and provided on a timely basis. The Unit was rated between "helpful" (6.0) and "very helpful" (7.0) in the assessment of effectiveness. Respondents commented that the CPT involvement "has been a real plus in improved quality. . . we now get them involved sooner and they are a major support base for the family", and "the CPT Unit is excellent and the mothers appear to get much support, direction, confrontation when needed".

Since the more extensive CPT involvement has just been initiated, it will be important to monitor CPT caseload to assure that the workers do not get so overloaded with these cases that they can no longer do a good job.

Further recommendations for improvement include faster transcription of taped interviews and more complete distribution of the transcripts so they can be used in the preparation of treatment plans; better attention to the needs of siblings; better use of Parents United to provide support for the family; and development of a strong Daughters/Sons United group to provide immediate support for victims.

3. To Increase Efforts and Success in Addressing the Needs of the IFSAP Family; To Decrease the Likelihood that Future Incidents of Intra-Family Sexual Abuse of Children Will Occur With that Victim or His/Her Siblings.

As indicated in the treatment section, to follow, one of the most serious problems in the IFSAP program is that the program has largely disregarded the needs of siblings. In addition to representing a "high risk" group for future abuse, and a population in which past sexual abuse is not unlikely, the siblings of the incest victim often have strong feelings about the removal of the offender and the turmoil into which the family has

been thrown, which need to be addressed. Often the sibling's response may be hostility toward the victim; these feelings can increase the difficulty the victim is already having. The development of a "siblings group", preliminary evaluation of siblings and treatment for those who evidence more serious problems should be included in the plans for the next six months.

Criteria should also be developed for the removal of the victim from the home, the use of the Iowa Runaway Service for short-term shelter in these cases, and criteria for the return of the child to the home once removed.

Assessments from the written questionnaire on the helpfulness of a variety of intervention/treatment resources are shown below:

Family Crisis Intervention Unit - This Unit received an average rating of (5.46), midway between "slightly helpful" (5) and "helpful" (6). Comments indicated that "many families do need crisis intervention initially and the crisis intervention unit is quite helpful", however, one respondent indicated that the FCIU policy of working with families only on a voluntary basis means that the child can be in desperate need of support, but the parent can refuse to work with the FCIU. For this reason, the CPT involvement is more helpful.

Private Therapists - The helpfulness of private therapists received only a 4.96 rating, falling slightly below "slightly helpful" (5). A number of the comments, however, pointed out that Barbara Cavallin is "excellent but overloaded". Most indicated that "while private therapists are helpful, many are not trained in the dynamics of incest as are the Sands staff", and "if they don't understand the program they can be harmful". It was also pointed out that "with the exception of Barbara Cavallin, private therapists are hard to work with in terms of the 'team' concept and approach".

Des Moines Child Guidance Center - As discussed under the "treatment" section, the Child Guidance Center was rated at 5.52 in helpfulness. The addition of the Child Guidance Center was viewed as "very helpful in the treatment of children, but a permanent plan has not been developed for this crucial part of the program and coordination is still poor". Since the questionnaire was administered, the Sands Center has hired a child psychiatrist experienced in the treatment of young incest victims.

Child Protective Treatment - is described in the preceding section.

The Sands Psychiatric Unit - this program is addressed at length under the treatment section.

Parents United - Parents United was rated at 5.43 on the "helpfulness scale". One respondent commented that "Parents United will need to continue to grow and gain credibility". Another indicated that "Parents United is not actively involved in working with offenders immediately after arrest and prior to entry into the program. . . they could be better utilized in this regard". Respondents indicated that a Daughters and Sons United should be developed, and that Parents United should be involved as a family support aid earlier on in the process.

Concerns expressed by Parents United Members -

Table C.3 provides a review of those issues identified by Parents United as needing improvement. The nominal group process was used with participants responding to the question "What are the weaknesses in the IFSAP program from the parent's perspective". All answers were recorded and then the group voted on those that they felt were the most important, and elaborated on the one chosen to be the highest priority.

The major concern identified by the Mothers' Group was the need for more family counseling. They felt that family counseling, including the victim AND siblings, should start immediately after the father/daughter (apology) session, with the father explaining also to the siblings, at the first family session, what has happened and the role he played in it. They felt strongly about not leaving the siblings out of the treatment, since they also need an opportunity to vent their anger and work through what has happened to the family. They felt that the family AND marital counseling should continue until the family group feels more relaxed, consistent and loving. The Parents United participants also stressed the need to NOT give up on resistant victims in the counseling efforts.

The major concern identified by the Fathers' Group was to provide a comprehensive orientation for the new IFSAP participants that begins immediately upon arrest. They related the fear they had experienced upon referral to Sands (e.g. 'are they going to use shock treatments?') and the fact that they were not given any indication of the full picture until they were pretty much through it. Obviously some of this could be a result of the program being new, and no one being totally sure of what would happen.

Offenders Group

1. Counselors need to explain what they mean especially when changing a counselor.
2. More therapy for victim, especially if initially resistant.
3. Arresting officer needs to be more human.
4. When a problem develops between a client and a therapist a system needs to be in effect to resolve that problem.
5. How dynamics in the home result in the incest happening.
6. Some basic issues aren't resolved by whole group (four different answers from four different individuals).
7. All people referred to IFSAP need an orientation to the program.
8. All family members should be involved in the program.
9. Help with dealing with the children's behaviors and problems (how to better parent).
10. JPO and CPT need to know what people have accomplished through the IFSAP program.
11. Give direct answers to direct questions.
12. Schedule new offender marathons for late afternoon or weekend.
13. Program needs consistency. Visits by CPT, JPO, visits to PO, Sands, no contact, etc.

Specific Suggestions

Print up a program - include the following

1. Tests you will take.
2. Expected time line - how long in each phase.
3. What the phases are.
4. What won't happen to you.
5. Tell about PU groups.
6. What people would be involved with your life and their role.
7. If you run into a person you have problems with contact a PU member.
8. Explain contacts with attorney.
9. Explain criminal and Juvenile Court proceedings.

March, 1984

What parts of the IFSAP need improvement from the client/family perspective?

From non-participating parent.

1. Police leave children alone at home at the time of arrest.
2. CPI workers do not handle interview with non-victim children sensitively.
3. Social workers on case (Juvenile Court) don't have any personal contact with children and parents - interferes with reuniting family.
4. Victim's counselor should work on incest issues - right away or sooner or later at least.
5. Program leaves you in dark about what will happen.
6. Child care is not available for group and therapy sessions.
7. More family counseling is needed.
8. Non-victim children in family need help.
9. Police treat the mothers like a criminal.
10. Court dates should be set up sooner (Juvenile Court).
11. Female victims should have a female counselor.
12. Counselors need more supervision and direction.
13. It felt like Juvenile Court and Social Services were trying to break up family.
14. PO (adult) should keep a closer watch on clients- should see them and not just have papers sent in.
15. Juvenile's attorney encourages kids to leave home.
16. The three year statute of limitations is unfair to the victim who has to live with it for the rest of her life.
17. Police don't respond to mothers when fathers are harassing them.
18. Counselors need to have more after school appointments so kids don't have to be embarrassed to go.
19. Victims shouldn't have to attend Juvenile Court proceeding since lawyers don't ask to talk with them.
20. Male counselors need to help husbands understand what wife is going through (and be more understanding themselves).
21. The children should not be encouraged to make the marital decision (divorce or stay together).
22. Family should be reassessed more frequently for reuniting (at least every three months).

The following items got votes as highest priority.

1, 5, 6, 7, 13, 15, 20.

Major Concern - # 7 More family counseling - specific suggestions

1. Needs to start right after first father/daughter (apology) session.
2. Siblings need more help and shouldn't be left out and deprived.
3. Help bring family back together.
4. Should continue until the family group feels more relaxed, consistent, loving.
5. There should be both marital and family sessions and after care.
6. Fathers need to explain to siblings as well as victims - can happen at family session.
7. Sessions should be provided for victims and siblings to talk out what happened.
8. Victims and siblings need a chance to vent anger.
9. There need to be more Cindy Davis doing program.
10. Counselors need to understand each person's perspective and support each with fairness.

The parents recommended that a Parents United member be contacted immediately upon arrest, so that a contact with the mother and the offender could be made prior to the offender's Initial Appearance. The Parents United Officers are willing to assume the responsibility for doing the "match-up", using people who have already successfully completed the program. They also stressed the need to have a brochure or pamphlet for family members (provided by the Child Protective Treatment Worker who will begin making the initial contact immediately upon arrest). The brochure would describe the types of tests to be given at Sands (assuring no lobotomies or shock treatments), what the treatment components are and general ranges of times people may be involved in the different phases, conviction and sentencing information (based upon program experience so far), what a "treatment team" is, who the key IFSAP program managers are and how they coordinate their efforts, the fact that you do need to have an attorney and what the criminal and juvenile justice processes will be.

D. INTRA-FAMILY SEXUAL ABUSE PROGRAM - JUVENILE COURT COMPONENT

The issues addressed as part of the Juvenile Court involvement in the IFSAP Program include the timeliness of Juvenile Court Intake, the use of a Guardian Ad Litem, the effectiveness of Juvenile Court monitoring to assure the needs of the victim and family are met, the effectiveness of Juvenile Court's efforts to address immediate and long term needs of the victim and her family, and the sensitivity of the Juvenile Court to the needs of the incest victim.

1. Timeliness of Juvenile Court Intake

On the written questionnaire the average response to the question of how satisfied are you with the timeliness of the Juvenile Court intake process was a 3.80, one of the lowest ratings in the questionnaire. The rating, which fell between "slightly dissatisfied" (3) and "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" (4) was tempered by uniformly positive comments on the efforts and dedication of Candice Bennett, the primary intake officer assigned. The unanimous opinion of the respondents was that no matter how hard Candice tries, she cannot keep up with the workload, and she needs help. Comments such as "Ray and Candice are excellent - they work long and hard and are way overloaded" were common. While the respondents went out of their way to clarify that it was not the fault of the Juvenile Court Intake Officer, people stressed that "the Juvenile Court intake/CINA filing delays are one of the major problems of the program right now". People also stressed that the long delays between referral and filing resulted in having Guardian

Ad Litem appointed (respondents uniformly viewed the involvement of the GAL as a positive step) and having cases assigned to field probation officers. Since the other program components rely on the CINA petition and the Juvenile Court leverage to secure the cooperation of families who will not otherwise place the needs of the victim first, the Court must do something to address the workload problem at Intake. In addition, the IFSAP Program Manager should continue to monitor this problem area.

2. Provision of a Guardian Ad Litem

The original project design did not address involvement of the Guardian Ad Litem. This came about in response to the Youth Law Center's attendance at the weekly meetings when one of the cases they represented was being staffed. The Youth Law Center involvement, however, has turned out to be one of the major strengths of the program, and a component that received unanimous high marks from the evaluation respondents. The advantage that the Guardian Ad Litem (GAL) has for the IFSAP Program is that this is the only component which has as its only concern the well-being of the victim. While others may have to cope with the reality of imperfect systems and imperfect families, the GAL can help keep all the other components honest by continuing to redirect attention to the needs of the victim. This focus on the child rather than the family serves as another means of protecting the victim. Comments included "Youth Law Center (YLC) does a good job", "if YLC gets the case they are outstanding" and "I am impressed with the thoroughness and dedication of the YLC staff". On the written questionnaire people responded to the question of whether a victim of incest is provided with adequate legal representation (GAL) with an average response of 5.79, which falls between "often" (5) and "usually" (6). A number of respondents indicated that the YLC needs to be involved earlier in the process, particularly when the Juvenile Court takes so long to get a petition filed. One of the Juvenile Court respondents stressed that "due to the delays at Juvenile Court, children are unrepresented (by a GAL) at the crucial point in the case". One respondent from Child Protective Treatment indicated that two children who had been removed for ten days still did not have a GAL appointed. The Youth Law Center, Juvenile Court and IFSAP Program Manager need to establish a procedure to assure that a GAL is assigned immediately to the victim in a substantiated case, particularly if the victim is removed from the home.

3. Extent of Juvenile Court Monitoring to Assure Services are Provided

On the written questionnaire this question received an average rating of 4.53 which falls midway between "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" (4) and "slightly satisfied" (5). The

comments shed light on the relatively low rating. People referenced little or no follow-up or contact from the probation officer after the initial intake. It is possible, from previous comments on intake delays, that in many cases the lack of contact may reflect the fact that the case has never reached the point where a field probation officer is assigned. In addition, as one respondent commented, "this varies from officer to officer - it is not consistent". One person indicated that on one of the cases the probation officer was contacted concerning a mother who had stopped coming to treatment (where that had been a condition of the Juvenile Court agreement) and the probation officer did nothing about it. Another person commented that this role has been assumed by Child Protective Treatment workers. In order to assure consistent monitoring of cases, it is important that staff within any component who become aware of violations of agreements (particularly of no-contact orders or discontinuation of treatment) notify not only the Juvenile Court and/or prosecutor, but also the IFSAP Program Manager. This notification should be in writing. This allows the IFSAP Program Manager to monitor and follow-up on the response to the notification of the violation and to respond to the person who reported the violation with an indication of what action was taken or why no action was or could be taken. This also helps keep conflict between components to a minimum.

4. Protection Afforded Through Juvenile Court

On the written questionnaire, the response to the protection afforded the abused child through the Juvenile Court was rated at 4.82 with 5 being "slightly satisfactory". While people tend to become very frustrated with the limitations of the Juvenile Court, sanctions which can be applied to a non-cooperative family, those sanctions, particularly in cases where sufficient evidence for criminal prosecution is lacking, are the only ones available. The Juvenile Court's options are limited to the removal of the child in the most serious cases, and often the removal is not what people want to accomplish. There are no legal methods, however, of forcing a non-protective mother to be involved in treatment - one can only threaten to remove the child if she does not. This explains the comments like "efforts are good, but barriers lead to disappointing results". If the family is at all willing to follow the plan outlined by the Juvenile Court, the Juvenile Court sanctions are very effective, but if the family says "fine, come take the kid out of here" the relative impotence of the Court becomes obvious. This is not a criticism of the Court, but a reflection of reality. One respondent commented that the "Juvenile Court protection is seen as more powerful and long-lasting from the Mom's point of view". Another commented that "we use the Juvenile Court no-contact provision and it has worked well, although there is a lag in getting the Juvenile Court involved". It was stressed again that the protection which can be provided by the Juvenile Court is meaningless without timely intake and filing of the petition. This is particularly relevant

in cases where the family environment initially "looks" protective, and then it is discovered that it is not. The recommendations in the preceding section 3 apply equally to this area.

5. Juvenile Court Efforts to Address Immediate and Long Term Needs

On the written questionnaire the average response to the Juvenile Court's efforts to address the immediate (4.72) and long-term (4.55) needs of the victim and family fell between "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" (4) and "slightly satisfied" (5). A number of respondents pointed out that this was actually the responsibility of the treatment components (Sands and CPT) with the Juvenile Court role being one of "support" or enforcement of sanctions if cooperation is not forthcoming. This is most relevant in the case of a victim who needs treatment, where the parent is unwilling to take the child to the treatment facility for appointments. The majority of the victims are too young to make their own arrangements to go to individual or group counseling sessions. The Juvenile Court can "order" the parent to make arrangements to allow the child to attend treatment. In order to effectively use the Juvenile Court sanctions, it is important that the CPT or Sands worker notify (in writing) the Juvenile Court and the IFSAP Program Manager of the problem.

6. Sensitivity of the Juvenile Court to the Needs of the Victim

On the written questionnaire, the average response to the assessment of the Juvenile Court's sensitivity, awareness and knowledge concerning the problem of intra-family sexual abuse of children was 5.43 which fell midway between "has improved some" (5) and "has improved quite a bit" (6). The comments clarified that the vast majority of respondents felt the Juvenile Court attitude has always been good in this area, hence significant improvement was not needed. The only comment suggesting a need for further improvement stressed the need for Juvenile Court workers to improve their knowledge of the working dynamics of incest (therapeutic issues) to better understand the behaviors, feelings and actions of the victim and other family members.

E. INTRA-FAMILY SEXUAL ABUSE PROGRAM TREATMENT COMPONENT

When the IFSAP Program was first developed, the most difficult component to address was treatment. This would be expected to be the most expensive part of the program, without which the rest of the program would be rather meaningless. The community treatment resources were being asked to take on this responsibility with no commitment of public funding and with virtually NO information on what kind of treatment could work with incest offenders other than some basic premises developed by the Giarretto program. For quite some time, while discussions continued between representatives of the County Attorney, Social Services, Juvenile Court and the Rape Center, no treatment agencies came forward with an offer to become involved. It was a major breakthrough when the Sands treatment unit indicated a willingness to be the treatment arm for the entire family in return for the normal patient, insurance and public payments that are used to support all clients in treatment. There are three major benefits to this solution:

--since the payments are provided on the basis of number of clients, the treatment resources can grow as the number of families grows. If a specific number of therapists had been hired to work with IFSAP families, they would have been unable to continue to accept more families once the available resources had been consumed;

---it is unlikely that the program could ever had been "sold" to the funding bodies, regardless of need and soundness of the program, if the treatment costs had been included in the funds needed to implement the program; and

---by using a program such as the Sands Center, which addresses all areas of mental health, multi-problem families can be treated as needed without detracting from the incest treatment effort.

The following five areas will be addressed as they relate to the IFSAP Treatment Component:

---Coordination of treatment to all family members;

---Immediacy of treatment once an Incest family is identified;

---Adequacy of treatment resources in addressing the problems facing an Incest victim and her family;

---Adequacy and timeliness of reports and other feedback from the treatment component to other IFSAP components; and

---Problems or concerns in the treatment area.

1. Coordination of Treatment for all Family Members

When a family is referred to the Sands treatment unit, each member is seen individually for Intake by Dr. Jace Jamieson, the Clinical Director. At this time he explores the client's perceptions of what happened, and what is needed, and he lets the client know what can be expected from the treatment staff. He sets an appointment with that person's therapist. Each member will have his/her own therapist for individual therapy and any necessary testing.

The entire treatment process anticipates involvement in individual and group therapy, mother/daughter counseling, father/daughter counseling, conjoint marital and family therapy (for those families which will be reunited). The sequence, timing, frequency and duration of each of those treatment regimens is tailored to meet the needs of the client. In order to work effectively with the client families, communication and coordination among the treatment personnel is critical. This is a major strength of the treatment program under the Sands Center. Because all of the treatment staff work in the same unit, they have ready access to and communication with each other. In addition, staffing is held each Wednesday, allowing for structured case planning and information sharing. The involvement of Dr. Jamieson in the Thursday afternoon IFSAP staffings is very helpful in overall program coordination.

The only drawback for the Sands Center in the area of treatment coordination has been in the area of treatment for the very young (pre-school age) victim. Since the Sands Center was not providing services for the very young victim, the IFSAP Program Manager negotiated with the Des Moines Child Guidance Center to provide therapy for those victims. While this is certainly a better alternative than NOT providing services to the young victim, it has resulted in some fragmentation of the treatment effort. The Child Guidance Center staff do not meet regularly either with the Sands Center staff nor with the IFSAP team (Thursday meetings). Since the treatment programs are not reimbursed for the time they must spend in staffing and coordination activities, it has not been possible to insist on that level of participation from the Child Guidance Center. The Sands Center will be gaining a new child psychiatrist who has worked with the incest program in Minnesota. They are also advertising for a child psychologist. While neither of these positions is dedicated solely to the incest program, the addition of these two staff should allow the Sands Center to develop an adequate treatment program for the very young victims.

2. Immediacy of treatment once an Incest Family is Identified

As soon as an incestuous situation is identified, the non-offending spouse is advised to contact the Clinical Director at the Sands Center to set up an intake interview for both the non-offending spouse AND for the victim(s). The Intake interview is set within three days, and a subsequent appointment with the client's individual therapist is set for 7-10 days later unless the level of crisis within the family dictates more immediate onset of treatment. The same situation is true of the offender once he is accepted into the program. The only problem, then, that should arise in terms of immediate access to treatment, is the non-offending spouse who is resistive to treatment for herself and/or the victim. In these cases it is particularly important that the CINA petition be filed quickly to allow the Juvenile Court to assure that the victim(s) have access to treatment and to provide incentive for the non-offending parent to participate.

3. Adequacy of Treatment Resources

Both the Sands Center and the Des Moines Child Guidance Center received relatively high ratings on the "Intra-Family Sexual Abuse of Children Program Evaluation Questionnaire" in response to the statement that "The following programs/services are, in my opinion, (very harmful to very helpful) in dealing with the problem of intra-family sexual abuse of children". On a scale of 1 (very harmful) to 7 (very helpful), the Des Moines Child Guidance Center received an average score of 5.52 and the Sands Center received an average score of 5.94.

The Polk County IFSAP program was originally designed to replicate the Giarretto program in Santa Clara County, California. The treatment component was designed to address the nuclear incestuous family with an offender (father), non-offending spouse (mother) and victim (daughter), all of whom cared about the welfare of the other family members and shared the goal of reunification of the family once the problems leading to the incest were resolved. The treatment component included individual therapy for each member of the family (including siblings where appropriate), group therapy for the offender, non-offending spouse and a victim, a specific session between father and daughter where the father would accept total responsibility for what had transpired and would apologize to his daughter, mother-daughter counseling, marital therapy for father-mother, and family therapy at the point that the family is preparing for reunification. Supervised visits by the father would be followed by trial unsupervised visits, weekend visits, etc. until the family was eventually ready to reunite (this would be done only with the permission of the IFSAP team).

The program planners had received no forewarning from the Giarretto program staff about the following realities that do not fit nicely into the Giarretto model:

- many of the offenders either were not part of the nuclear family at the time of the incident, or have since permanently left that family unit (e.g. ex-husbands, boyfriends, live-in relatives);
- some of the offenders are juveniles (e.g. teenage brother);
- many of the "non-offending spouses" range from ineffective in their ability to protect their children from sexual assault to hostile toward the child victim because that child represents a threat to the continuing relationship between the mother and the offender;
- some extended families appear to be "tribal" in nature, with incestuous relationships being an accepted part of the family structure. In these situations a child may be victimized by more than one offender, and there may be little support for the mother who attempts to insulate her daughter from this kind of exposure.
- many of the incestuous incidents, rather than being inappropriate expressions of caring by the offender, have more in common with stranger-to-stranger sexual assaults; and;
- many of the offenders have significant problems unrelated to the incestuous behavior (e.g. chemical dependencies, mental dysfunctions) which are barriers to the success of the incest treatment.

In spite of these problems or unexpected variances, the treatment component seems to be functioning well.

One of the biggest challenges, in addressing the treatment needs of victims, has been how to handle the very young victim. As indicated under subsection 1, "Coordination of Treatment for all Family Members", the Sands Center has not to this time been able to provide therapy for very young victims. This problem should be resolved shortly. Another goal, however, of the program as it was developed, was that siblings should be involved in the treatment effort as it relates to prevention. Given the difficulty in addressing the victims themselves, little attention has been given to working with the siblings. It is apparent, however, from the program's experience with families thus far, that younger siblings are occasionally exposed to the same assaults that the original victim was. It is equally apparent that the younger siblings have occasionally been victimized,

although to a lesser degree than the identified victim, by the offender. For these reasons, the program needs to continue to strive to include younger siblings in prevention-oriented treatment, either through a siblings group or through one-on-one counseling. At a minimum, the siblings should at least be evaluated to determine if there are treatment needs.

While establishment of the victims groups has been a challenge, there has been significant progress in this area. The "Mothers' Group" was relatively easy to start, and has been consistently strong since the program began. The "Mothers' Group" is discussed further under "Non-Offending Spouse Treatment" below. The "Offenders' Group" was also easy to initiate, and has functioned well and consistently. The "Victims' Group", however, was difficult to initiate because not all victims could be included in the same group. The first group to begin was the Adolescent Victim Group. For some time, victims who were not adolescents did not have access to a victims' group. Since that time, however, there has been significant progress. There are now three active victim's groups; two adolescent groups and one pre-adolescent group. The youngest participant at this time is eight years old. While there are many victims who are younger than that, the use of group therapy with the younger client has not proven effective. It is hoped that the new Child Psychiatrist at Sands will consider the possibility of a prevention-oriented group for the younger victims and siblings on issues such as "who do you tell", "keeping secrets", "having the right to say no", etc. There has not been a male victim group developed yet because of the lack of adequate numbers of male victims who are similar age; this is an area, however, that is receiving attention.

While the program initially attempted to fit all "clients" into the program as it was designed, as the program gains experience it also gains the insight and information to identify people who may not respond to the treatment regimen that can be offered. Some of the offenders who have significant chemical dependency problems are now directed into the chemical dependency treatment BEFORE they begin in the incest treatment components. Some of the offenders whose assaults are more violent or rape-like in nature, or those who feel sexual assault of children is a normal part of their culture are identified as far less likely to respond to treatment, but are often included in the program because of the lack of viable alternatives for treatment. Particularly in cases where the evidence can support on the outside a class D felony, an ATTEMPT at treatment may be considered a better option than a relatively short time in prison which accomplishes only public protection for the length of the prison term. Different choices MIGHT be made if the prison system, through Oakdale, could develop a viable rehabilitation program for sex offenders.

Offender treatment - As of September of 1983, the Sands Center had enrolled 110 offenders in the treatment program. Simply because of the number of offenders who have been involved in the program, a fairly strong and stable group of offender "graduates" of the group therapy program has strengthened the Parents United component, which is considered key to a successful IFSAP program.

Non-Offending Spouse Treatment - As of September of 1983, 97 mothers had been involved in treatment at Sands through the IFSAP Program. The work with the mothers has turned out to be perhaps the greatest strength in the Sands program. Particularly since some children in the program have experienced multiple victimizations by multiple offenders, it is obvious that it is not sufficient, for the protection of the victims, to simply address the aberrant behavior of the identified offender. The mother must be taught to PROTECT the children if the child's safety is to be assured in the future. The treatment staff have indicated that the biggest strides have come in working with mothers who are either unable or unwilling to protect the child. Particularly the focus of the mother's group has been on the issue of protection, as has the Juvenile Court activity. The Mother's Group has been one of the strongest program links, and the progress of Parents United to this point has largely been the result of the efforts of the active mothers in the program. The key role of the mother in eliminating incestuous behavior has also resulted in that being the major focus of the Juvenile Court workers.

Victim Treatment - As of September of 1983, 163 victims had been involved in treatment at the Sands Center. In addition, some victims (particularly the very young victim) were seen in private therapy/evaluation. In terms of progress made, the greatest strides have been in the area of the victim's group, as described previously.

4. Timeliness and Adequacy of Reports from Treatment Staff

Written reports from the treatment staff are used within the IFSAP program both in Juvenile Court hearings and in the criminal court. The recommendations of the prosecutors or Juvenile Court staff may rely heavily on the assessments made by the treatment staff. For this reason, the timeliness and adequacy of the written reports is key to the program success. In the "Intra-Family Sexual Abuse of Children Program Evaluation Questionnaire" the Sands Center received an average score of 3.69 (timely) and 4.38 (complete) when the respondent was asked whether reports from the IFSAP treatment staff are (never to always) timely and

complete. The 3.69 rating would convert to midway between "sometimes" (3) and "half the time" (4), while the 4.38 rating would convert to midway between "half the time" (4) and "often" (5). The ratings for the Des Moines Child Guidance Center were slightly higher at 4.88 (timely) and 5.25 (complete). The 5.25 rating would fall between "often" (5) and "usually" (6).

The Sands Center Clinical Coordinator indicated that the timeliness of reports has occasionally been a problem. He indicated that sometimes the problem has been with the treatment staff not responding quickly enough, and sometimes the problem has been with the Juvenile Court not providing enough notice of hearings. Both of those problems have been identified, and both sides are attempting to assure that the reports can be provided on a timely basis.

5. Problems Identified by Treatment Staff

While indicating that the IFSAP program, in his assessment, has far outperformed the initial expectations, the Sands Clinical Director, Dr. Jase Jamieson, identified three problem areas.

Communication - Interagency communication is a major problem simply because the key program staff are all "over-worked", and are rarely available at the time that someone may call on the phone. Call-backs become very frustrating, because the person who called is seldom available at the time of the call-back. It may take fifteen to twenty calls before two of the staff actually make contact, and this process becomes very time-consuming. While the weekly staff meeting provides an effective way of communicating at least once per week, there appears to be no easy resolution to the communications problems on things that must be addressed before the next staff meeting. Certainly wherever it is an option, the participating agencies should assign staff to the IFSAP effort who are not constantly "out of the office" or "in conference". The Program Manager may also attempt (although it may not be possible) to work with the key staff to designate set times that those staff would not set other appointments and would be available for consultation. In addition, the IFSAP Program Manager, who generally is available by phone, can be used more effectively as a go-between.

Cost - The treatment costs to the Sands Center for IFSAP families are quite high in comparison to most other cases. This is because of the length of the treatment process (generally a year) and the substantial commitment of time to non-therapy requirements. The

treatment staff are both paid and assessed on the basis of direct client contact hours. In most mental health treatment for a single client, there is relatively little "down time" needed for case planning and completion of reports. In IFSAP cases, however, for every hour of actual therapy, there is at least another hour of time committed to case management (reports, phone calls, testifying and staffings with other therapist involved with the other family members). While there is no "solution" to this "problem", the involvement with IFSAP creates a significant resource drain at the Sands Center, and occasionally the issue of "what portion of the total resources can actually go to this problem" must be addressed.

Treatment Evaluation - There has not been, nor is there planned for the immediate future, any kind of longitudinal evaluation of the impact of the treatment for incest families. While each patient has a rather complete case file, those files are not available to evaluators outside of the agency (apparently release of information forms are good only for one year, which is not helpful when the term of treatment is over one year). At the same time, the Sands Center indicates it does not have adequate staff to go through the case files to pull evaluation information, nor does it have adequate staff to construct any kind of data collection instrument that could be kept routinely to make the necessary information easily redeemable. There apparently would be a possibility of accomplishing a treatment evaluation if funds could be provided (e.g. \$1,000 to \$1,500) to put someone on the Sands Center staff for the purposes of collecting information (if the person were on the Center's staff, release of information would be a mute issue).

It would be particularly helpful if a data instrument could be developed and maintained in each file to identify:

- treatment goals (behavior specific, quantifiable OR assessable by test results);
- some assessment of the chances that the goal CAN be met (e.g. on a scale of 1 to 6);
- criteria to determine if the goal is attained OR approached; and
- at closing or a specific assessment intervals, an indication by the primary therapist of progress toward reaching those goals.

While the treatment staff may feel that they are making progress in learning how to treat incestuous families, the knowledge we should be gaining by experience with sheer numbers cannot be effectively gathered nor used without some method of formally collecting and assessing treatment impact information.

Other Concerns Identified - Some members of the IFSAP team recommended that quarterly reports on the family's progress ought to be provided, and that the IFSAP team should be included in a staffing on the case before treatment is considered completed. The team also requested that the treatment resource be responsible for notifying the IFSAP Program Manager if any IFSAP family member does not show for scheduled treatment appointments if an acceptable (to the therapist) reason has not been provided for failing to keep the appointment.

F. INTRA-FAMILY SEXUAL ABUSE PROGRAM - PROSECUTION COMPONENT

When the IFSAP program began, the County Attorney's Office designated a full-time prosecutor to screen the evidence on all child sexual abuse cases, attend IFSAP weekly staff meetings, handle all prosecution functions on all IFSAP cases, including the enforcement of no-contact orders, AND prosecute child sexual abuse offenders who were not included in the IFSAP program. It was possible for one prosecutor to handle all of these responsibilities because there were so few child sexual abuse cases reaching the attention of the prosecutor. Since the Assistant County Attorney assigned spent very little time in the courtroom, she was available whenever needed to review evidence and consult with the investigative teams.

As of March of 1984, a full time prosecutor was assigned to the prosecution of child sexual abuse cases NOT involved in the IFSAP program, an additional prosecutor was assigned to the IFSAP cases, and the screening was being done through the Pre-Trial Bureau Intake Unit, and there were still too many cases to handle effectively with the available resources. This is an indication of what has been accomplished through the increased public education efforts and the more intensive investigations. Prior to the implementation of the IFSAP program, only three cases of child intra-family sexual abuse, in as many years, were recorded among the County Attorney's prosecutions. As of March 21, 1984, the Assistant County Attorney handling the prosecution of NON-IFSAP child sexual abuse cases had an active caseload of 31 child sexual

abuse offenders who were at various stages of prosecution. That caseload is far too high for a single attorney when considering the amount of time the prosecutor must spend with the child victim and his/her parents to prepare them for the courtroom. Many of the defense attorneys request that depositions be taken, further increasing the time required for the prosecutor. The prosecutor makes arrangements with the child's parents to put the child on the stand in the assigned courtroom the night before the trial to help her adjust to the physical surroundings, the use of the microphone, etc. Child victims are less predictable witnesses, and often are very nervous the day of the trial; no matter how much time is spent with the witness in preparation of the trial, the day of trial the witness may be so nervous that her answers appear to make no sense or she may refuse to testify altogether. The stress level for the prosecutor in these cases is understandably very high. To be in the courtroom or in depositions with child victims non-stop for weeks on end provides no opportunity to reduce the stress level long enough to rejuvenate.

At this time, in addition to the IFSAP Prosecutor and the Assistant County Attorney who handles the prosecution of the Non-IFSAP offenders and the prosecutors from the Pre-Trial Bureau who screen the evidence in the new child sexual abuse cases, the County Attorney contributes a portion of the Juvenile Court Investigator's time to this effort. Therefore, while it is evident that the available resources are not adequate to handle the present caseload, the County Attorney is hard-pressed to continue to increase his staff commitment to this effort which, four years ago, involved no County Attorney staff. All of the IFSAP components are faced with similar problems. The sexual abuse of children has always occurred; but by being disregarded and poorly handled, it did not consume the resources of the juvenile and criminal justice systems. As a society and a criminal justice system, we must decide what level of financial commitment should be made to the area of sexual abuse of children, since the current dilemma for all system components is that any resources dedicated to this effort must be taken away from some other area of endeavor.

1. Prosecutions/Convictions

As mentioned previously, in the three years prior to the inception of the IFSAP program, the County Attorney's Office initiated prosecution of three cases of child intra-family sexual abuse; no convictions were obtained. Since the program's inception, the County Attorney has obtained 44 convictions in cases involving intra-family sexual abuse of children. This level of prosecution has been made possible only by the cooperative efforts of all the IFSAP components. In addition, because all of the sexual abuse of children cases are now being investigated more

thoroughly, and the victim is being given more support throughout the process, the County Attorney has been successful in obtaining convictions in non-IFSAP prosecutions of child molesters. Table F.1 provides information on the 97 suspects involved in "founded" cases of intra-family sexual abuse through December of 1983. The 82% conviction rate on cases disposed is much higher than was expected.

The County Attorney must find some way to address the workload problem for the attorney who handles the prosecution of non-IFSAP cases. In addressing this problem, he must keep in mind that the increase in cases is due, in part, to the reputation the prosecutor has established for being sensitive to the victim and the victim's family, and being willing to "go the extra mile" in preparing a case. If additional resources are devoted to this effort, it is important that the person assigned be equally committed to this standard of prosecution.

The issue of depositions should also be addressed. Initially it was not anticipated that the child victim would routinely be faced with having to testify, with the offender across the table, in depositions. These have, however, been relatively common. The offender's right to observe the proceedings could be met, without the victim having to testify "in front of the offender", by using the one-way mirrored interview room at the Juvenile Court. While this would be less convenient for the court reporters, it would seem to be worth the extra effort to decrease the trauma for the victim. It would also be helpful to have the victim, at this stage, accompanied by his/her Guardian Ad Litem, who is in the unique role of being able to place the victim's rights and well-being above all other concerns. In order for the GAL to be involved at this stage, the GAL must have been appointed (while this is normally done upon filing of a CINA petition, perhaps being deposed is adequate grounds for the assignment of a GAL), and notified of the time/place of depositions. This could best be done by having the County Attorney's Witness Coordinator, who keeps track of court hearings, routinely notify the Guardian Ad Litem when the child victim is scheduled to testify. The Witness Coordinator would check with the IFSAP Program Manager to determine who the GAL would be.

2. Availability of Prosecutor for Evidence Review

As discussed under the section on IFSAP Investigations, there have been problems with gaining access to the prosecutor on a timely basis to review evidence. This has been a result of the workload and close to continuous "in-court" time of both prosecutors working with child sexual abuse cases. The screening of evidence has now been turned over to the Pre-Trial Bureau to allow quicker access to a prosecutor; this change should be assessed in three to four months.

PROSECUTION/DISPOSITION OF INTRA-FAMILY CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE CASES

TABLE F.1

| STATUS/METHOD OF DISPOSITION | IN IFSAP OR SUCCESSFUL COMPLETE | | | KICKED OUT OR NEVER IN IFSAP | | | TOTAL SUSPECTS | | |
|--|------------------------------------|------|-------|---------------------------------|------|-------|----------------|------|-------|
| | Pre-83 | 1983 | Total | Pre-1983 | 1983 | Total | Pre-1983 | 1983 | Total |
| COMPLAINT FILED | 20 | 9 | 29 | 14 | 27 | 41 | 34 | 36 | 70 |
| CASE PENDING | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 14 | 14 |
| % Pending | 0 | 89% | 28% | 0 | 22% | 15% | 0 | 39% | 20% |
| CASE DISPOSED | 20 | 1 | 21 | 14 | 21 | 35 | 34 | 22 | 56 |
| CONVICTIONS | 20 | 1 | 21 | 10 | 15 | 25 | 30 | 16 | 46 |
| % CONVICTED | 100% | 100% | 100% | 71% | 71% | 71% | 88% | 73% | 82% |
| Trials - Guilty | -- | - | -- | 5 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 12 |
| Guilty Pleas | 20 | 1 | 21 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 25 | 7 | 32 |
| Revoked on Other | -- | - | -- | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| NOT GUILTY | -- | - | -- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| % of Trials | -- | - | -- | 17% | 22% | 20% | 17% | 22% | 20% |
| DISMISSED | -- | - | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| % Dismissed | -- | - | 0 | 25% | 19% | 21% | 9% | 18% | 13% |
| NO COMPLAINT FILED | | | | | | | 7 | 20 | 27 |
| % Non-Prosecution | | | | | | | 21% | 36% | 29% |
| TOTAL SUSPECTS | | | | | | | 41 | 56 | 97 |
| REASON FOR NO PROSECUTION | Pre-1983 | 1983 | Total | Percent | | | | | |
| Juvenile Offender | 4 | 9 | 13 | 48% | | | | | |
| Other Jurisdiction (Incident Outside Polk) | 0 | 3 | 3 | 11% | | | | | |
| Prevention Contact Only (No crime by code) | 2 | 5 | 7 | 26% | | | | | |
| Crime Occurred, but Insufficient Evidence | 1 | 2 | 3 | 11% | | | | | |
| Victim Changed Story or Otherwise found Unreliable | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4% | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 7 | 20 | 27 | 100% | | | | | |

3. Prosecution Assistance - Legal Advice and Participation in Weekly Meetings

The IFSAP Prosecutor received "glowing reviews" in spite of the frequently expressed concern that he was "too busy and too many things are put off, leaving the family and Investigator hanging". Comments included, "Ray gets four stars in my book - aggressive, dedicated, helpful. . . does an excellent job . . . he is totally overloaded and I'm afraid we'll lose him if he doesn't get some relief. . . a real asset to IFSAP" and "Ray is cooperative, knowledgeable and helpful when you can reach him" and "Ray personally does a great job; the problem is he is overworked and not available and cannot always attend meetings". In spite of the access problem, the Prosecutor received relatively high ratings from the written questionnaire in response to the questions on the prosecutor's "advice concerning legal issues on IFSAP cases" (5.88) and his "participation in staff meetings" (5.41). Both responses fell between "slightly satisfied" (5) and "satisfied" (6).

4. Follow-through with No-Contact Order Violations

The contrast between the response to question #24b, "I am _____ with the Prosecutor's willingness to follow-through with No-Contact Order violations" (5.9) and question #6b, ". . . a No-Contact order is _____ enforced" (4.66) illustrates the difference between the willingness to enforce and the actual ability to cause the violator to go to jail following a finding of contempt. In spite of the difficulty in enforcing the No-Contact order when the family is uncooperative, the No-Contact order is seen as a valuable tool. One respondent commented that "enforcement has been good but difficult. . . they took one person in on contempt". Other comments include "in cases with which I've been involved, people appear quite diligent about this" and "it can be a problem, but I feel it works well" and "it usually is" (but went on to cite three cases in which it wasn't). One respondent pointed out that "the Parents United mothers find the concreteness of no-contact orders to be reliable tools to put some order in their chaotic family...they seem to understand the gravity of breaking the order and it is something they can rally around in protecting their kids". Some of the comments were indicative of the difficulty of enforcement when the "threat" of the no-contact doesn't work. "Follow-up is always available, but it seems to be unsuccessful." One respondent commented that "the family is often collusive enough to hide a violation; there aren't many meaningful sanctions for violations". Another indicated that it is "hard to get evidence of a no-contact violation when the family is collusive; we need people like Paul (Houston) to help on surveillance". In 18 cases in which it was determined that a violation of the No-Contact Order occurred (See Appendix

II), warnings were issued in 17 (94%). In nine of the cases it was impossible to determine if further action occurred. In six cases there definitely was no further action, and in one case there was no proof of the violation. In two cases the offender was cited for contempt and jailed.

5. Prosecutor's Monitoring of Active IFSAP Cases

The average response to the question of how satisfied people were with the prosecutor's "monitoring of active IFSAP cases" was 5.48, midway between "slightly satisfied" (5) and "satisfied" (6). Key factors in the Prosecutor's ability to monitor active IFSAP cases are a) attendance at the weekly IFSAP meetings, b) access to case information (which will be increasing by assuring the IFSAP Coordinator's access to information), and c) the prosecutor's accessibility to other IFSAP team members to discuss cases. All of these issues have been addressed in previous sections.

G. SENTENCING OF INTRA-FAMILY SEXUAL ABUSE OFFENDERS

When the IFSAP Program was initiated, the County Attorney asserted that the sentence for a successful IFSAP graduate should include some jail time as a statement of public condemnation of the offender's acts and as a sign to the victim that society does not condone her victimization. The program's experience, however, has been that the offenders are given suspended sentences without any actual jail time beyond that done following the initial arrest. Only one of the 19 "successfully completed" offenders were placed at the Fort Des Moines correctional facility after sentencing. It should also be noted, however, that the offender has been removed from the home following arrest, which for many of them has meant relocation to a lower standard of housing, such as the Bethel Mission, sleeping rooms, cheap hotels, etc.

The average response to the question of how satisfied people are with the sentencing practices for offenders convicted of intra-family sexual abuse was quite low (3.9). This was slightly below "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied". The low rating is largely a function of the feeling that IFSAP graduates do not receive significantly "easier" sentences than those who undergo traditional prosecution. It is more likely, however, given the sentencing information included on Table G, that the County Attorney has not done as adequate job of letting people know the aggregate results of child sexual abuse prosecutions.

One item of interest on Table G is that only one of the nineteen (5%) successful graduates were convicted of a felony level offense, while 7 of the 10 (70%) who were ejected from the program were convicted of felonies, and 5 of the 10 (50%) were given prison terms. Two additional defendants were required to

receive in-patient treatment at Oakdale, meaning that only 3 (30%) of the IFSAP Program rejects received straight probation with treatment.

This would indicate that the sentencing practices, in fact, have been in line with the program philosophy, and simply need to be made public and shared with program participants.

TABLE G

CONVICTION OFFENSES AND SENTENCES FOR CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE DEFENDANTS

| CONVICTION OFFENSE AND SENTENCE RECEIVED | IN IFSAP/ COMPLETED | KICKED OUT OF IFSAP | NEVER IN IFSAP | TOTAL |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------|
| PENDING SENTENCING (1 Sexual Abuse 2nd - 24260 and 2 Sexual Abuse 3rds - 24100/23733) | | | 3 | 3 |
| <u>SIMPLE ASSAULT</u> 30 Days, Polk County Jail | | | 3 | 3 |
| <u>WANTON NEGLECT OF MINOR</u> 2 yrs, susp, probation, IFSAP treatment | 4 | | | 4 |
| <u>ASSAULT W/INTENT SER INJ</u> 2 yrs, susp, probation, IFSAP treatmt | 5 | | | 5 |
| 2 yrs, susp, probation, counseling | 2 | | 1 | 3 |
| <u>FALSE IMPRISONMENT</u> 2 yrs, susp, 2 yrs probation, Fort Des Moines, max ben, psychiatric eval/trtmt | | | 1 | 1 |
| <u>ASSAULT W/INTENT SEX ABUSE</u> 2 yrs, susp, prob, Fort DM max ben, Treatment, alcohol treatment, Commun Serv | 1 | | | 1 |
| <u>INDECENT CONTACT</u> 2 yrs, susp, prob, IFSAP | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| 2 yrs, susp, prob, In-patient Oakdale | | 1 | | 1 |
| 2 yrs, susp, prob, In-patient at Clarinda, then Ft DM max ben | | | 1 | 1 |
| 2 yrs, susp, prob, IFSAP, drug trtmt | 4 | | | 4 |
| 2 yrs, susp, prob, AA max ben, \$1000 | | 1 | | 1 |
| 2 yrs plus 2 yrs (4), susp, Commun Serv, Restit, Psychiatric trtmt | | | 1 | 1 |
| <u>LASCIVIOUS ACTS</u> 5 yrs, susp, prob, IFSAP trtmt | | 1 | | 1 |
| 5 yrs, susp, prob, In-patient Oakdale | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 5 yrs, susp, prob, AA max ben, CSS | 1 | | | 1 |
| 5 yrs Prison | | 2 | | 2 |
| <u>SEX ABUSE 3RD</u> 10 yrs Prison | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| <u>SEX ABUSE 2ND</u> 25 yrs Prison | | 2 | | 2 |
| TOTAL | 19 | 10 | 15 | 44 |

APPENDIX I

Structured Questionnaire Groupings/Response Rate

Page i-1

Copy of Structured Questionnaire used

Page i-2 to 12

Summary Sheets of Structured Questionnaire

Page i-13 to i-48

STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRE GROUPINGS/RESPONSE RATE

| GROUP NUMBER & TYPE OF RESPONDENT | # Questionnaires Sent Out | # Questionnaires Returned | Return Rate |
|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|
| 1-Law Enforcement | 13 | 11 | 85% |
| 2-Program Management | 2 | 2 | 100% |
| 3-Treatment Staff | 6 | 6 | 100% |
| 4-Child Protective Investigators | 8 | 6 | 75% |
| 5-Juvenile Court | 6 | 6 | 100% |
| 6-Child Protective Treatment | 8 | 8 | 100% |
| 7-Guardian Ad Litem | 4 | 4 | 100% |
| 8-Other (Parents United & Prosecution) | 3 | 2 | 67% |
| TOTAL RESPONDENTS | 50 | 45 | 90% |

INTRA-FAMILY SEXUAL ABUSE OF CHILDREN PROGRAM

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

RESPONDANT _____

PROGRAM INVOLVEMENT: CPI _____ CPT _____ LAW ENFORCEMENT _____

JUVENILE COURT _____ PROSECUTION _____ GUARDIAN AD LITEM _____

DEFENSE ATTY _____ JUDICIARY _____ TREATMENT _____ PARENTS UNITED _____

OTHER _____

1. The child sexual abuse investigations are (please indicate) initiated within a reasonable period of time from the report of abuse, and are (please indicate) completed on a timely basis to assure that the offender does not have the opportunity to contact and coerce the victim.

INVESTIGATION
INITIATED COMPLETED

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|-----------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Always | COMMENTS: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Usually | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Often | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Half the Time | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Seldom | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Never | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know | _____ |

2. The intra-family sexual abuse investigations (please indicate) involve the joint efforts of a Child Protective Investigator and a detective or the County Attorney's Investigator.

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Always | COMMENTS: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Usually | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Often | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Half the Time | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Seldom | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Never | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know | _____ |

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE TO TRISH HARLOW AT THE POLK COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE BY JANUARY 27, 1984. YOU MAY WITHHOLD YOUR NAME IF YOU WISH. COMMENTS WILL NOT BE ATTRIBUTED TO SPECIFIC INDIVIDUALS IN THE EVALUATION REPORT.

3. Investigative interviews with the victim and other witnesses in intra-family sexual abuse cases are (please indicate) tape recorded.

☐ Always
☐ Usually
☐ Often
☐ Half the Time
☐ Sometimes
☐ Seldom
☐ Never
☐ Don't Know

COMMENTS:

4. The Assistant County Attorney is (please indicate) available as the investigation proceeds to review the evidence and advise the investigators.

☐ Always
☐ Usually
☐ Often
☐ Half the Time
☐ Sometimes
☐ Seldom
☐ Never
☐ Don't Know

COMMENTS:

5. I am (please indicate) that the intra-family sexual abuse investigations are thorough and useful in addressing the problem on a case by case basis.

☐ Completely Satisfied
☐ Satisfied
☐ Slightly Satisfied
☐ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
☐ Slightly Dissatisfied
☐ Dissatisfied
☐ Completely Dissatisfied
☐ Don't Know

COMMENTS:

6. Following an arrest in an intra-family sexual abuse case, a no-contact order is (please indicate) secured and (please indicate) enforced.

SECURED ENFORCED

☐ Always
☐ Usually
☐ Often
☐ Half the Time
☐ Sometimes
☐ Seldom
☐ Never
☐ Don't Know

COMMENTS:

7. The local law enforcement officer's sensitivity, awareness and knowledge concerning the problem of intra-family sexual abuse in the Polk County area has (please indicate).

☐ Has improved greatly
☐ Has improved quite a bit
☐ Has improved some
☐ Has not changed
☐ Has gotten a little worse
☐ Has gotten alot worse
☐ Has totally deteriorated
☐ Cannot assess

COMMENTS:

8. The Intra-family Sexual Abuse Program Coordinator (Joe Moklebust) is (please indicate) notified immediately of an IFSAP arrest.

☐ Always
☐ Usually
☐ Often
☐ Half the Time
☐ Sometimes
☐ Seldom
☐ Never
☐ Don't Know

COMMENTS:

9. The IFSAP Coordinator (please indicate) receives materials on new cases on a timely enough basis to assure coordination of services.

- ☐ Always
☐ Usually
☐ Often
☐ Half the Time
☐ Sometimes
☐ Seldom
☐ Never
☐ Don't Know

COMMENTS:

10. I am (please indicate) with the IFSAP Coordinator's
a) accessibility and helpfulness in addressing IFSAP problems,
b) preparation for staff meetings,
c) knowledge of and monitoring of active cases,
d) ability to secure cooperation and coordination among components,
e) public education efforts, and
f) training efforts.

- | a | b | c | d | e | f | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Completely Satisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Satisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Slightly Satisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Slightly Dissatisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Dissatisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Completely Dissatisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Don't Know |

COMMENTS:

11. How satisfied are you with the attendance and participation of the various personnel involved in the weekly meetings?

- ☐ Completely Satisfied
☐ Satisfied
☐ Slightly Satisfied
☐ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
☐ Slightly Dissatisfied
☐ Dissatisfied
☐ Completely Dissatisfied
☐ Don't Know

COMMENTS:

12. When a problem arises in a case, how satisfied are you with respect to the manner in which the problem is addressed/resolved?

- ☐ Completely Satisfied
☐ Satisfied
☐ Slightly Satisfied
☐ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
☐ Slightly Dissatisfied
☐ Dissatisfied
☐ Completely Dissatisfied
☐ Don't Know

COMMENTS:

13. I am (please indicate) with the effectiveness, productivity and organization of the weekly meetings.

- ☐ Completely Satisfied
☐ Satisfied
☐ Slightly Satisfied
☐ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
☐ Slightly Dissatisfied
☐ Dissatisfied
☐ Completely Dissatisfied
☐ Don't Know

COMMENTS:

14. A child victimized by intra-family sexual abuse is (please indicate) provided with adequate legal representation (guardian ad litem).

- ☐ Always COMMENTS:
☐ Usually
☐ Often
☐ Half the Time
☐ Sometimes
☐ Seldom
☐ Never
☐ Don't Know

15. When the criminal process against the offender fails, the protection afforded the abused child through the Juvenile Court is (please indicate).

- ☐ Completely Satisfactory COMMENTS:
☐ Satisfactory
☐ Slightly Satisfactory
☐ Neither Satisfactory nor Dissatisfactory
☐ Slightly Dissatisfactory
☐ Dissatisfactory
☐ Completely Dissatisfactory
☐ Don't Know

16. The extent of Juvenile Court monitoring to assure the child victim and her family receive counseling and other necessary services has been (please indicate).

- ☐ Completely Satisfactory COMMENTS:
☐ Satisfactory
☐ Slightly Satisfactory
☐ Neither Satisfactory nor Dissatisfactory
☐ Slightly Dissatisfactory
☐ Dissatisfactory
☐ Completely Dissatisfactory
☐ Don't Know

17. To what extent are you satisfied that the Juvenile Court intake on IFSAP cases is completed within a reasonable period of time?

- ☐ Completely Satisfied COMMENTS:
☐ Satisfied
☐ Slightly Satisfied
☐ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
☒ Slightly Dissatisfied
☐ Dissatisfied
☐ Completely Dissatisfied
☐ Don't Know

18. The Juvenile Court's sensitivity, awareness and knowledge concerning the problem of intra-family sexual abuse of children in the Polk County area has

- ☐ Has improved greatly COMMENTS:
☐ Has improved quite a bit
☐ Has improved some
☐ Has not changed
☐ Has gotten a little worse
☐ Has gotten alot worse
☐ Has totally deteriorated
☐ Cannot assess

19. I am with the Juvenile Court's efforts to address both the immediate and the long term needs of the child victim and her family.

- | IMMEDIATE NEEDS | LONG TERM NEEDS |
|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Completely Satisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly Satisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Neither satisfied nor Dissatisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly Dissatisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Dissatisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Completely Dissatisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know |

COMMENTS:

20. Child Protective Treatment Services are (please indicate) available when needed. When requested, these services are (please indicate) provided on a timely basis.

| AVAILABLE | TIMELY | COMMENTS: |
|-------------------------------------|--|-----------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Always | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Usually | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Often | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Half the Time | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Seldom | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Never | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know | |

21. The following programs/services are, in my opinion, (please indicate) in dealing with the problem of intra-family sexual abuse of children.

| FAMILY CRISIS INTERVENTION UNIT | DES MOINES CHILD GUIDANCE CENTER | THE SANDS PSYCHIATRIC UNIT | CHILD PROTECTIVE TREATMENT | PARENTS UNITED | PRIVATE THERAPISTS | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Very Helpful |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Helpful |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Slightly Helpful |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Neither Helpful nor Harmful |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Slightly Harmful |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Harmful |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Very Harmful |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Don't Know |

COMMENTS:

22. I am (please indicate) with the operation of the Intra-Family Sexual Abuse Treatment Program through the Sands Center.

OFFENDER ASSESSMENT/TREATMENT

| | COMMENTS: |
|---|-----------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Completely Satisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly Satisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly Dissatisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dissatisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Completely Dissatisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know | |

NON-OFFENDING SPOUSE ASSESSMENT/TREATMENT

| | COMMENTS: |
|---|-----------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Completely Satisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly Satisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly Dissatisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dissatisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Completely Dissatisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know | |

VICTIM ASSESSMENT/TREATMENT

| | COMMENTS: |
|---|-----------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Completely Satisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly Satisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly Dissatisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dissatisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Completely Dissatisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know | |

23. Reports from the IFSAP treatment component staff are (please indicate) timely and complete.

| SNDS CENTER STAFF | | DES MOINES CHILD GUIDANCE | | COMMENTS: |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--|-----------|
| TIMELY | COMPLETE | TIMELY | COMPLETE | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Always | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Usually | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Often | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Half the Time | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Seldom | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Never | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know | |

24. I am (please indicate) with the Prosecutor's (Ray Blase)

- a) accessibility and helpfulness in screening evidence;
b) willingness to follow-through with no-contact order violations;
c) participation in staff meetings;
d) monitoring of active IFSAP cases; and
e) advice concerning legal issues on intra-family sexual abuse cases.

| (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Completely Satisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly satisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly Dissatisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Dissatisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Completely Dissatisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know |

COMMENTS:

25. I am (please indicate) with the sentencing practices in Polk County for offenders convicted of intra-family sexual abuse.

| | COMMENTS: |
|---|-----------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Completely Satisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly Satisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly Dissatisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dissatisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Completely Dissatisfied | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know | |

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE IN COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.
IF YOU HAVE ANY OTHER COMMENTS, SUGGESTIONS OR CONCERNS, PLEASE
FEEL FREE TO INCLUDE THEM BELOW.

ITEM A

ISSUE BEING EVALUATED: To increase the effectiveness of the investigation and prosecution of incidents of intra-family sexual abuse of children.

| QUESTIONS INCLUDED | AVE SCORE | RESPONSES | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------|----|----|---|----|---|---|----|--|
| | | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | ? | |
| #1b TIMELY COMPLETION OF INVESTIGATIONS | 5.02 | 1 | 15 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 8 | |
| #2 JOINT CPI/POLICE INVESTIGATIONS | 5.64 | 8 | 16 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 9 | |
| #3 TAPED INTERVIEWS | 6.18 | 15 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | |
| #4 AVAILABILITY OF ASST CA FOR EVIDENCE REVIEW | 4.74 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 12 | |
| #5 THOROUGHNESS/USEFULNESS OF INVESTIGATIONS | 4.40 | 0 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 | |
| #10f TRAINING EFFORTS | 4.46 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 29 | |
| #24a ASST CA ACCESS/HELPLESSNESS FOR EVID REV | 4.70 | 7 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 13 | |
| #24b Asst CA willingness to follow-through with No-contact order violations | 5.90 | 14 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13 | |
| #24c ASST CA STAFF MEETING PARTICIPATION | 5.41 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 21 | |
| #24d ASST CA MONITORING OF ACTIVE CASES | 5.48 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 22 | |
| #24e ASST CA ADVICE RE LEGAL ISSUES | 5.88 | 12 | 15 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | |
| #25 SENTENCING PRACTICES FOR OFFENDERS | 3.48 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 14 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 5.12 | | | | | | | | | |

Juvenile Court - 5.59 (26% Unknown), Law Enforcement - 4.16 (33%), CPT-4.63 (38%)
Program Management-5.15 (14%), Treatment-5.56 (51%), GAL-5.60 (12%), CPI-5.51 (45%)

COMMENTS: Group 1: (1b) Some reports are several months old when reported and are only reported after someone in the family gets mad over something else and reports it to get even. (2) Very little co-operation between county attorney's office and police department or C.P.S. (3) Much time is wasted tape recording interviews before it is determined if there is evidence of a valid case. (4) It is very unusual to someone available when you need them. (5) Much wasted time when there is no basis for a charge, just family members mad at each other. (24a,b,c,d,e) Never available. (25) I feel it is nonexistent. (24a,b,c,d,e) Can never get ahold of him--will not return calls. (1b) Still waiting on a case from 12/6/83 to 1/26/84

ITEM A, cont.

still no charges filed. (2) Is not necessary (10f) I have never met the coordinator. (24a,b,c,d,e) He is in court a lot of the time.

Group 2: (1b) I think there could be improvement in getting the investigation completed and reports out to CPT and Juv. Ct. (2) This is still an area that needs a lot of work and movement is underway in re-writing the procedures. (3) There have been cases where they will talk with the person to see if they are going to make a statement before they tape it. Also we are trying to video tape all victims under nine which is more difficult. (4) This has become a real problem in the last few months, Ray is learning to spend so much time in court he is not available. (5) I think a lot of training needs to be done in this area to improve quality especially with the DMPD.

(10f) Because of time constraints PR and most training is done on a response basis. (24a,b,c,d,e) Ray personally does a great job, the problem is he is over worked and is not available and cannot always attend meetings. (25) I think for the most part it has gone as it should. Those offender who have not done well in the program have usually not been placed on probation. (1b) This is third-hand information, I don't know for sure. (4) Third-hand information. (25) I perceive that there is still a problem with the Juv. offender cases.

Group 3: (3) I assume always, but frequently never see transcripts. (5) Children are interviewed too many times, results of interviews (transcripts) often don't come to us. (1b) Based on information gathered from the patients and their individual cases. (3) They have been in all the cases with which I have worked. (5) It would be even more helpful if we could always have a copy of each transcript (especially for the victims and the offenders). This is particularly useful when we get an offender who denies, we are able to read the transcripts to them and then confront the issues. (24a,b,c,d,e) I'm not sure about this one (b). I do know that essentially nothing has happened when certain offenders have broken the no-contact, but I'm not sure if it's Ray's fault, the investigators fault, the court's, or whose. (25) Many offenders who deserved worse got off easy, while others who should have gotten off a little easier got worse. (1b) Have heard only occasional problems in this area. (2) Not certain of the frequency of this happening. However, am aware of problems with cooperation from police in investigating these cases. I think this continues to be a significant issue per program. (4) Am aware that the effort is made to be available. Think problem in work load of assistant county attorney creates barrier re: his availability. (5) Observe range of differences

ITEM A, cont.

re: quality of transcripts. (10f) This obviously is a critical position. I think coordination problems have as much to do with problems in the components as it does with the coordinators efforts and/or abilities. (24a,b,c,d,e) Ray's time is a major issue. Availability and accessibility are problematic re: his tight schedule. Makes a real effort with constraints of his position. (5) I am aware of some improper questioning during interviews, I believe by the DMPD. (25) I question other basis on which some offenders are sent to jail or to the Fort Des Moines facility.

Group 4: (1b) Depends what a reasonable period of time is and when CPI is available, usually within 25 hours, if perpetrator is in house--action taken immediately. (2) Depends on the allegations--where the perpetrator is. A detective is always worked with, but sometimes we establish abuse first--if allegations are unclear. (3) Always taped to my knowledge. (4) Case load for assistant county attorney is extremely high but he is always available if needed. (5) Hope I am never completely satisfied with the investigation--might get lazy with total satisfaction. (10f) Training is elementary compared to real life situation, but I feel training is a good orientation. (24a,b,c,d,e) My only concern is his caseload--too high for one person. (25) Not sure how I feel about the sentencing practices--if others are satisfied--I am too. (4) Other tasks have made assistant county attorney occasionally unavailable. (2) Detectives are not always willing to become involved--especially if the case is questionable. Frequently are not available in a timely way. (3) Most of the time, occasionally recorders don't work. (4) Is doing an excellent job, but appears way overscheduled. (24a) He's helpful when available. (1b) Have had problems when cases came to our attention at nite or weekends or with non-school age children. Also law enforcement usually wants to interview at school or at DMPD offices so that delays by workers having to arrange that. (2) I have had problems with law enforcement--especially when small children or special children (who might not make good witnesses) are involved--getting detectives to go along.

Also frequently have problems after child and non offender spouse interview is over--getting cooperation interviewing offender and long turnaround time getting information re: interviewing offender from county attorney and or law enforcement. (4) Seems a very long time bet. Interviews and hearing back--especially if shaky case or offender not to access/ble--seems "low priority" cases can get put off for months--leaves CPI and family hanging. (5) I am not satisfied with myself, my abilities, my training or with the extent to which most of the detectives will go to investigate. It seems they too often will only help by interviewing or being present while interview is done at their office at their convenience. I don't feel a spirit of cooperation. (24a,b,c,d,e) Ray is cooperative, knowledgeable, and helpful when you can reach him. Very inaccessible--needs help--too busy--too much put off and not dealt with

in timely fashion--delays my work and leaves family hanging. (2) We have had more than our share of problems with the DMPD, that appears to be improving. Paul H. does an excellent job, but is not available much now. Have had real good luck with other police departments and Sheriff. (4) Not to the fault of the individual--Ray is excellent. He is just spread way to thin. (5) When it works and all the components are functioning we are successful. If one part drops the ball the victim suffers. It works most of the time. (24a,b,c,d,e) Ray gets four stars in my book. Aggressive, dedicated, helpful. Does an excellent job. He is totally overloaded. I'm afraid we'll lose him if he doesn't get some relief. Of real accent to the IFSAP program. (25) It varies. (10f) I haven't worked with the new coordinator.

Group 5: (1b) When this system breaks down, it causes problems, but usually this is not the case. (2) Again when law enforcement is not involved it causes problems. We need better trained detectives in law enforcement who are available at all times to aid in the investigation. Lacking this we are overworking Paul Houston, the county attorney. Maybe if we can't improve the police departments, we will need another county attorney special investigator on the case. (3) Again, when they are not taped it causes problems. Quality of the tape is a problem. Sometimes you can't hear the voices very well. (4) This is an area I'm not familiar with. (5) This is a real effort to be thorough, but this is an area that needs improvement. (10f) I think Joe M. is trying in these areas but there is need for improvement and not all of these things are something he can control. (24a,b,c,d,e) The real problem here is that Ray Blase is overworked. He either needs some help to handle cases or he needs to be untied of some of his other duties so he has more time for ISAFP cases. (25) We need to continue efforts to educate the criminal judges regarding the IFSAP program. We also need a more standard way to submit reports to the sentencing judge. (4) Sometimes he is difficult to reach at the time someone most needs to talk to him, but is supposed to be always available and generally assists as much as he can. (1b) CPI Worker was way behind in getting a report to J.C. the girl had recanted, but we still needed an updated report. (3) As far as I know--have not received transcripts or complete transcripts on most cases. However, Ray Blase usually has whatever he needs. (4) I'm not involved at that point. (5) Again, the _____ case. Although some cases are just plain tough. (25) Who is? (2) Additional county attorney investigators are needed. (4) Additional county attorney assistance is needed to assure that investigations are sufficient for criminal proceedings. (5) DMPD investigations are not as thorough as those done by Paul Houston. (2) Not always. (4) Time commitments restrict his availability. (24a,b,c,d,e) Ray is so busy it is often difficult to corner him. Once you can get him, he is helpful. (25) It has been some time since I had a case with an offender in Polk Co. back then I would have been completely dissatisfied. It appears this area has improved some.

ISSUE BEING EVALUATED: To increase the sensitivity and awareness of prosecutors,
law enforcement officers, juvenile court staff, etc to the
plight and needs of victims of intra-family sexual abuse.

ITEM B

| QUESTIONS INCLUDED | AVE SCORE | RESPONSES | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|--|
| | | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | ? | |
| #7 Local law enforcement officer's sensitivity awareness and knowledge of intra-family sex abuse | 4.68 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 11 | |
| #3 TAPING OF VICTIM INTERVIEWS | 6.18 | 15 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | |
| #10e PUBLIC EDUCATION EFFORTS | 4.64 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 29 | |
| #10f TRAINING EFFORTS | 4.38 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 29 | |
| #18 Juvenile Court's sensitivity, awareness and Knowledge of intra-family sex abuse | 5.43 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 13 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 5.06 | | | | | | | | | |

Juvenile Court-5.50 (50% Don't Know), Law Enforcement-5.21 (40%), CPT-3.90 (73%), CPI-5.47 (28%),

Program Mgt-4.28 (30%), Treatment-5.80 (50%), GAL-5.07 (30%)

COMMENTS: Group 1: (18) Good. (3) Much time is wasted on tape recording interviews before it is determined if there is evidence of a valid case. (7) When no visible action is taken after charges are filed it is hard to be interested in a case. There are too many social programs to save the offender and forget the victim. (10e,f) I have never met the coordinator. (18) Have always been good.

Group 2: (3) There have been cases where they will talk with the person to see if they are going to make a statement before they tape it. Also we are trying to video tape all victims under nine which is more difficult. (7) I haven't noticed any change, but I believe Vandermiede and Stooky are willing for some training. What we really need is specialized investigators. (10e,f) Phone accessibility is a problem with the current set-up. Also it is difficult to stay on top of the case because of the volume and because information is not automatically sent to me about cases. Also because of the overload in other areas and is sometimes hard to get movement at time, i.e. Juv. Crt., intake and Cty. Att., office because of time constraints PR and most training is done on a reponse basis. (18) I feel good about where they are at it, they can work out the intake problem. (10e,f) Bingo! These are good topics. Also hear complaints about his support of Parents United--he gets a "dissatisfied" on that one.

ITEM B, cont

Group 3: (3) I assume always, but frequently never see transcripts. (7) Haven't have contact with. (10e,f) I have been very pleased with my work with Joe and look forward to the time be have for consultation and information exchange. Problems in coordination inherent with so many people involved. (3) They have been in all the cases with which I have worked. (7) Sensitivity to victims needs, needs much improvement in all counties. Many victims and mother s (even recently) have reported being treated more like prostitutes than victims. Attached are some examples of how investigators might reduce the amount of trauma the victim experiences as a result of questioning. (18) Still needs to improve knowledge of the working dynamics of incest (therapeutic issues) to better understand the behaviors, feelings, actions, etc. (7) This again appears to be significant problem in the program. (10 e,f) This obviously

is a critical position. Think coordination problems have as much to do with problems in the components as it does with the coordinators efforts and/or abilities.

Group 4: (3) Always taped to my knowledge. (7) Experience with Polk County Police is limited--hearsay--"has improved at some degree". (10e,f) Too busy with investigations to check on his public education efforts. Training B elementary compared to real life situations, but I feel training is a good orientation. (18) Intake officers Jan and Candre, perfectly satisfied with their sensitivity, awareness and knowledge. (7) Varies with jurisdiction. (18) Has been generally satisfactory from beginning. (3) Most of the time--occasionally recorders don't work. (7) They need help in understanding need for quick arrest. They have difficulty understanding trauma to child of removal. At least one was a full interviewing child. Lonie does a great job. (10e,f) I have been less involved since new coordinator assigned--have been impressed with efforts re: d,e,f really don't know. Have been very satisfied with assistance on cases. (7) Seems pretty negative at DMPD Youth Service. Other jurisdictions in Polk County seem to have a dramatically more positive attitude. (7) With most of the DMPD officers, Phil Vander Maede does a great job in a terribly tough situation. The others are just as bad as before. With officers and departments outside of Des Moines. (10e,f) Could do more outreach--public speaking--show more enthusiasm. (18) Great! (10e,f) I haven't worked with the new coordinator.

Group 5: (3) Again, when they are not taped it causes problems. Quality of tape is a problem, sometimes you can't hear the voices real well. (7) We still have room for much improvement in this area. This will have to be done through education and an attitude change at the top of administration. (10e,f) I think Joe M. is trying in these areas but there is much for improvement and not all of these things are something he can contrive. (18) Again this is not consistent. some probation officers are better than others. (3) As far as I know--have not received transcripts or complete transcripts on most cases. However, Ray Blase usually has whatever he needs. (7) See #18. (18) There are some more concerned than others--so it varies with personnel. (10e,f) In my limited contact with the program, Joe Molkebust and Julie Johnston, I have found it difficult to determine what their job responsibilities are. (18) Court's always keenly aware but referrals were not as numerous. Removing offending parent, etc., had been a definite sign of awareness and sensitivity and has removed the blame from the victim and put it on the offender.

Group 6: (18) This is not to say that Candice is not concerned she is, but she needs her work load eased. (10e,f) Joe needs to keep the meetings moving and flow smoothly, we very often get off the subject and waste a lot of time. (18) Juv. Cr., is so back logged that often it is just paper pushing one case to the next person and ongoing P.O.'s rarely see family after adjudication. They rely heavily on CPT to monitor. (7) In the two cases involving my direct involvement-clients were feeling they were treated badly by law enforcement officers either during the interview or during the issuing of warrants. (3) Don't have any knowledge of this. (3) Although interviews are recorded it appears that the tape is faulty, the recording is inevitable, the tape becomes lost or the transcript is lost. This potentially valuable aide appears to be worthless at the present time and no one appears to accept any responsibility for these problems. (7) Comments I have received from clients and families seems to indicate that most officers have little interest in those cases and that it is apparent to the clients involved. (10e,f) Coordinator usually available and quite helpful. What appears to be lacking is consistent information and cooperation by other parties involved. Often cases are left in limbo or a gray area with no one taking action or responsibility-all that is done is merely an exchange of information. (18) Ther had been little change except greater awareness at the intake level. (10e,f) Treatment team case plans, progress reports and terminations summaries have not been evidenced in written form.

Group 7: (7) Better interviewing techniques are needed. (10e,f) The IFSAP coordinator is given too little power to achieve the results for which he is responsible. He is very adept at easing friction however. (7) Has gotten alot worse recently. (3) I think it may be happening, but not always getting into the Juv, Cr., file quickly enough for us to get them. (18) Excellent.

Group 8: (3) I don't know. I had one case at Broadlawns 1st summer where the interview of an inpatient by a detective and CPI worker was not recorded. (7) I haven't talked with a police officer for a long time about CSA. A detective I watched do an interview last summer appeared quite anxious but the child was very young. (10e,f) Joe, has not met the needs of Parents United; there has been no facilitator found for the mens group since 8-83. He has met with Mothers' group facilitators only once since 8/83. We asked for training in effective listening for the parents in 7-83 and haven't gotten that. The mothers frequently find him unresponsive to their calls, he brought a TV crew in to film a meeting without prior permission of the clients or facilitators. I don't think Joe has taken advantage of the training needs of the community--he doesn't do enough. He also seems to have a lack of knowledge of ongoing cases when I ask him where they are in the system. In genreal I don't feel any support from him as a volunteer for P.U. (18) My contacts with PO's lead me to believe they are very interested in the cases.

ISSUE BEING EVALUATED: To provide protection for the victim of Intra-family sexual abuse while addressing the longer term needs.

ITEM C

| QUESTIONS INCLUDED | AVE. SCORE | RESPONSES | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|
| | | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | ? |
| #1a TIMELY INITIATION OF THE INVESTIGATION | 5.55 | 3 | 24 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 10 |
| #1b TIMELY COMPLETION OF THE INVESTIGATION | 5.02 | 1 | 15 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 9 |
| #6a NO-CONTACT ORDER SECURED FOLLOWING ARREST | 5.91 | 8 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| #6b NO-CONTACT ORDER ENFORCED | 4.66 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 12 |
| #14 GUARDIAN AD LITEM PROVIDED | 5.79 | 9 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 10 |
| #15 JUVENILE COURT PROTECTION PROVIDED | 4.82 | 0 | 17 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| #17 TIMELINESS OF JUVENILE COURT INTAKE | 3.80 | 1 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 8 |
| TOTAL | 5.08 | | | | | | | | |

Juvenile Court-5.20 (5% Don't Know); Law Enforcement-5.17 (33%), CPT-4.07 (29%), Program Mgmt-5.42 (42%), Treatmt-5.70 (27%), GAL-5.03 (0%), CPI-5.51 (26%)

COMMENTS: Group 1: (1) Some reports are several months old when reported and are only reported after some one in the family gets mad over something else and reports it to get even. (17) Very slow and absolutely no feed back on cases. (1a,b) Still waiting on case from 12-6-83 to 1-26-84 still no charges filed.

Group 2: (1 a,b) I think there could be improvements in getting the investigation completed and reports out to CPT and Juv. Cr. (6a,b) There are exceptions--some offenders we don't want out, but they are out on bond anyway. I'd say enforcement has been good though difficult--we have taken one person in on contempt. (14) YLC handles most of the cases and they do a good job-- I wish we could get them involved sooner. (15) We do use the Juvenile no contact improvision and that has worked well-- we do have a lag in getting Juv. Cr., involved. (17) It's one of the major problems right now. (1a,b) This is third hand information--I don't know for sure.

Group 3: (6) In cases with which I've contacted, people appear quite diligent about this. (15) Still waiting to see how that goes. This issue worries me a great deal as a therapist: how does child feel when the system withdraws? (1a,b) Based on information gathered from the patients and their individual cases. (6a,b) Initially they were not always issued. I under-

ITEM C, cont.

stand they are supposed to be now on every case--I strongly encourage this. I believe more effort should be placed on enforcing the no-contact, with consequences falling on those who break it. Examples of where this has failed are the following cases:

(15) Many times a family environment "looks" protective, but when we work with the family members we find it is not. It might be more helpful if J.C. would recommend in-home studies, as part of the initial investigation.

(1a,b) Have heard only occasional problems in this area. (6a,b) Enforcement can be a problem, but generally feel it works well. (17) Too much delay in filing CINA's. (6a,b) It is difficult to enforce. (6a,b) We have seen the no-contact order violated. F/U is always available bus. seems quite unsuccessful.

Group 4: (1a,b) Depends what a reasonable period of time is and when CPI is available--usually within 25 hours--if perpetrator is in house--action taken immediately.

(6a,b) I am not totally aware of all involved with process during/after the arrest--I have confidence in the system to make me aware if a problem should arise with procedure. (14) As far as I know. (17) I have had no problem with Jan or Candice but feel their caseload is unrealistic for two HUMAN BEINGS. (4) Is doing an effective job but appears way over scheduled. (6a,b) To my knowledge--it generally happens--enforcement is a problem occasionally. (14) Youth Law Center does a good job--only unsatisfied with one out of many. (17) Sometimes too long--occasionally never. (1a,b) Have had problems when cases come to our attention at nite or weekends or with non-school age children. Also law enforcement usually wants to interview at school or at DMPD offices so that delays by worker having to arrange that. (14) If it ever gets to court, many of mine don't. (6a,b) A must. We have let a few slip through, but minimal. Another crucial aspect is enforcing the order. (14) If Youth Law Center gets the case. They are outstanding. (15) Many more CINA's filed--Juv. Cr., works hard. Candice is way overloaded, needs help. (17) Ray and Candice are excellent. Work long and hard. Way overloaded.

Group 5: (1a,b) When this system breaks down, it causes problems--but usually this is not the case. (6a,b) We are doing a pretty good job of getting the no-contact order, but there is really not a good system for enforcing it. No one policies it. When there are violations it seems there is delay in taking action. Even then, you can't automatically pick up the offender and put him in jail. You have to file contempt and have a hearing. (14) But not soon enough. There is a delay at intake in the juvenile court which leaves children unrepresented at a crucial point in the case. (15) It is never as effective as when you have a criminal case also. (17) There is a real problem of delay in getting CINA costs filed and passed on the field. It has turned out to be a much bigger job and Candice Bennett is not keeping up with it. Her supervisor should be contacted and asked to correct the problem. (17) Problems occur when they are left sitting in intake for period of time prior to being passed on the the field office for monitoring--lots of lag on down time in the process. Not enough information given, usually on CPI reports, etc. (6a,b) First of all, the family is often collusive enough to hide the fact the perpetrator is seeing the family; secondly, if the perpetrator is arrested for violating his no-contact order, he might receive a short jail stay or evaluation at Oakdale, but goes out on the street. (1a,b) case: Luan Pumphrey was way behind in getting a report to J.C. the girl had recanted, but we still needed an updated report. (6a,b) In my cases--has been appropriated. (14)

(17) Not sure that our intake person is real thorough in that department. (14) Always has attorney when CINA petition is filed per code. (15) Each IFSAP case I have had, the criminal process failed, not always Polks fault. Offenses happened in other states who refused to file. (17) Information supplied to the field P.O. is only that available in referral reports, which do not always contain information necessary but not concerning offense.

Group 6: (1a,b) I understand the need for time when there are very sensitive clients, but it does seem that time seems to slip away from some investigations. Also with the involvement of the police, Ray Blase and Candice Bennett coordination of time can be a problem. (6a,b) I understand we can't place a guard at the house of the victim 24 hours a day and that spouses often sabotage, but occasionally when the no-contact orders are lated nothing is done. I attribute this problem to time constraints on Ray Blase and Candice Bennett. (15) Again Candice is swamped and often things slide. (14) Only when they are represented by the Youth Law Center, but not all cases have been. (17) There is more work than Candice can possible do herself! (1a,b) Many times investigators appear to take 2-4 weeks to complete. This makes follow up difficult with the client in CPT when we have not been involved at the onset or at least within a short period of time. (14) Youth Law usually does an excellent job. (15) It is difficult to get Juv. Cr. to file in a timely fashion. (17) CPT rarely involved in intake phase, I feel we should be. (6a,b) My experience has been that the no-contact order is not always secured in a timely way.. (14) In my experience they have. (17) In the one case I had in court--immediate action was taken to remove the children. (6a,b) Not enough knowledge of this process. (14) In my cases I've had difficulty getting any information. (15) In the cases I've worked with I've had to harrass Juv. Cr. to get anything done. (17) It has taken up to three months to get through intake. (1a,b) Investigations might be started in a timely fashion, but are rarely completed in a timely manner nor are reports and information received in a timely fashion. General communication from CPI is haphazard and incomplete. (6a,b) I am not certain how often no-contact orders are obtained, but I see no effort at enforcement and this is another area where no one accepts responsibility for follow through--again--could be due to staffing problem and workload. (14) The Youth Law Center does an excellent job defending victims. (15) Uneven--often non-existent depending on field P.O. assigned. (17) Intake unit is understaffed and process takes much too long. (17) It is my impression that Juv. Cr., is generally overwhelmed with intake duties. Priority ranking may dictate IFSAP cases not being filed when family cooperates with service; however, it seems that, on occasion treatment may near completion before J.C. has time to perform even an initial meeting of the victim. (14) Time lag. Two children removed on the 16th don't have a lawyer (g.a.l.) on 26th.

Group 7: (6a,b) It's hard to get enough evidence that a no-contact order has been violated--this also where an assistant for Paul would be useful. (14) However guardian ad litem need to be appointed as soon as a petition is filed. (17) Cases at intake need to be expedited and assigned to a field P.O. faster. Intake worker needs additional support staff. (1a,b) Had this question omitted. The underlined language it might have been answered differently. (14) The lack of timeliness in appointment of GAL does not conform with standards of in Re Avall counsel and _____ proceedings continue to be a last step in the process. Advice of counsel for incest victims on an ad hoc basis at an early stage is available in Polk County but seldom utilized. (15) Often Juvenile prosecutions will fail for same reasons. Juvenile Court does not always have enough leverage. (17) Most petitions are being filed months after the abuse occurs. (1a,b) Not always able to be as thorough as I would like. (6a,b) People in program work very hard at this. Need more resources for surveillance and more cooperative criminal judges. (14) We are not getting cases soon enough. (15) Ultimate dispositions tend to be very good. The process is still too slow. (17) Staff people overwhelmed. Need additional support.

Group 8: (14,b) I have known of two cases where the arrest took place over one week after the child and mother were interviewed. This made for an anxious week while the offender was still in the home--and I think it increases the chance of the victim recanting the facts. It doesn't seem that joint investigations are as frequent. (6a,b) The mothers in the group find the concreteness of no-contact orders to be reliable tools to put some order in their chaotic family. They seem to understand the gravity of breaking the order and it is something they can rally around in protecting their kids. (14) Comments in mothers' group indicate that the guardian ad litem are generally actively involved in the cases. (15) Juv. Crim., protection usually seems to be more powerful from the mothers point of view--and more long lasting. (14) I am impressed with the thoroughness and dedication of the Youth Law Center. (17) Delinquency charges involving IFSAP offenders are often not handled in a timely manner.

ISSUE BEING EVALUATED: To provide overall coordination, case management and program development capabilities. To insure that all disciplines are represented at weekly staffings, to promote communication, case coordination and effective service delivery between system components.

| QUESTIONS INCLUDED | AVE SCORE | RESPONSES | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|----|---|---|----|---|---|----|
| | | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | ? |
| #2 JOINT CHILD PROTECTIVE/POLICE INVESTIGATN | 5.64 | 8 | 16 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 9 |
| #4 Access to Assistant County Attorney for advice and evidence review | 4.74 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 12 |
| #5 THOROUGHNESS/USEFULNESS OF INVESTIGATNS | 4.40 | 0 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| #11 ATTENDANCE/PARTICIPATION WEEKLY MEETINGS | 4.21 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 21 |
| #12 MANNER OF RESOLVING INTERAGENCY PROBLEMS | 4.08 | 1 | 10 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 5 |
| #13 EFFECTIVENESS/PRODUCTIVITY WEEKLY MTGS | 4.56 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 17 |
| #8 IMMEDIATE NOTIFICATION/IFSAP COORDINATOR | 6.14 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| #9 IFSAP COORDINATOR RECEIVES MATERIALS ASAP | 5.21 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| #10a COORDINATOR'S ACCESSIBILITY/HELPLEFULNESS | 5.50 | 9 | 13 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 9 |
| #10b PREPARATION FOR WEEKLY MTGS BY COORDIN. | 5.54 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 19 |
| #10c COORDINATOR'S KNOWLEDGE/MONITORING OF CASE | 5.28 | 3 | 13 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 15 |
| #10d COORD. ABILITY TO GET COORD/COOPERATION | 4.77 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 16 |
| #10e PUBLIC EDUCATION EFFORTS | 4.64 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 29 |
| #10f TRAINING EFFORTS | 4.46 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 29 |
| TOTAL | 4.94 | | | | | | | | |

Juv Court-5.22 Law Enforcement-4.31 CPI-4.73 Program Mgmt-4.50 Treatment-5.87 CPI-5.48 GAL-5.02

Group 2

COMMENTS: (2) This is still an area that needs a lot of work and movement is underway in rewriting the procedures. (4) This has become a real problem in the last few months-- Ray is learning to spend so much time in court he is not available. (5) I think a lot of training needs to be done in this area to improve quality especially with DMPD. (8) There have been a couple of foul ups but usually I know. (9) I know what cases have been reappointed to CPI and I follow up with workers but I do not receive written reports, which would be very helpful. (10) Phone accessibility is a problem with the current set-up, also it is difficult to stay on top of the case because

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

ISSUE D, cont.

of the volume and because information is not automatically sent to me about cases. Also because of the overload in other areas, and is sometimes had to get movement at time, ie., Juvenile court intake and County Attorney's Office because of time constraints Public Relations and most training is done on a response basis. (11) Because of work overloads Ray (Cty) and Candice (Juv.) sometimes don't make it. It's really hard to do administrative business if a program co-ordinator is missing. Case staffing is well. (12) I feel everyone works hard to get things straightened out, sometimes there are structural constraints that get in the way. (13) I think we have recently improved that by dividing the meeting into a coordinators meeting and a staff meeting. (4) Third-hand information. (8) I understand there is a problem with this. (10) Bingo! these are good topics. Also hear complaints about his support of Parents United--he gets a "dissatisfied" on that one.

(11) They have verbally expressed less commitment than a year or so ago. (12) I am aware of one case recently where there was quite a rift between victim services staff and CPI -- I was extremely disappointed in the communication breakdown. (2) I'm not sure what the criteria are anymore. At the hospital (Broadlawn) it seems that the police aren't involved as often. (4) Usually the mothers I work with know who the County Attorney is and how and when to contact him/her. There are infrequent complaints that calls weren't returned or that mothers weren't notified of court proceedings. (5) Overall the investigations have improved over the past 3 years greatly. I have been involved in a few cases that "slipped between the cracks." Most of the CPI appear to understand the concepts of systematic sexual abuse investigation. From the hospital perspective, however, the victims service counselors are more helpful and available for medical exams and in knowing procedures. (10) Joe, has not met the needs of Parents United; there has been no facilitator found for the mens' group facilitators only once since 8-83, we asked for training in effective listening for the parents in 7-83 and haven't gotten that. The mothers frequently find him unresponsive to their calls, he brought a TV crew in to film a meeting without prior permission of the clients or facilitators. I don't think Joe had taken advantage of the training needs of the community--he doesn't do enough. He also seems to have a lack of knowledge of on going cases when I ask him where they are in the system. In general I don't feel any support from him as a volunteer for P.U. (12) My only contact with the

ISSUE D, CONT.

rest of the program is Joe. It has been my experience that he's a good listener when I go to him with a problem and he gives me the impression something will be done, then nothing happens towards the solution.

Group 1: (11) Don't attend. (13) Don't attend (2) Very little co-operation between County Attorney's Office and Police department or C.S.P.

(4) It is very unusual to find someone available when you need them.

(5) Much wasted time when there is no basis for a charge, just family members mad at each other. (12) If a problem had come up in the past, the C.P.I. worker hasn't confronted me with it, but rather goes behind my back with their attacks. (10) I have never met the coordinator. (13) I have never been to a weekly meeting.

Group 3: (5) Children are interviewed too many times--results of interviews (transcripts) often don't come to us. (8) I assume always. (9) Sometimes facts get established later. (10) I have been very pleased with my work with Joe and look forward to the time we have for consultation and information exchange. Problems in coordination inherent when so many people involved. (12) Things have gone well in scheduling meetings to dismiss situations and phone calls. (5) It would be even more helpful if we could always have a copy of each transcript (especially for the victims and the offenders.) This is partially useful when we get an offender who denies, we are able to read the transcripts to them and then confront the issues. (12) Problems on the legal end are not always handled in the best interest of the child (e.g. _____ is still living across the street from the victim--causing emotional stress to all members of the family). (13) Although I do not attend the Thursday meetings I receive much feedback from Jace Jamieson at our weekly Wednesday meeting. (2) Not certain of the frequency of this happening. However, I'm aware of problems with cooperation from police in investigating these cases. Think this continues to be a significant issue per program. (4) Am aware that the effort is made to be available. Think problem in work load of Assistant County Attorney creates a barrier re., his availability. (5) Observe range of differences re: quality of transcripts. (8) Not certain if this occurs regularly or not. (10) This obviously is critical position. Think coordination problems have as much to do with problems in the components as it does with the coordinators efforts and/or abilities. (11) Have made efforts to review purpose of the meetings. (12) Given the volume of cases and work load of components am often surprised that things run as well as they do. (13) Again problem areas have been noted and efforts to correct are underway. (5) I am aware of some improper questioning during interviews--I believe by the DMPD.

Group 4: (2) Depends on the allegations where the perpetrator is. A detective is always worked with, but sometimes we establish abuse first--if allegations are unclear. (4) Case load for Ass. Co. Att., is extremely high--but he is always available if needed. (5) Hope I am never completely satisfied with investigations--might get lazy with total satisfaction. (8) He knows more about being notified than I do--I inform him of referral before investigation begins at his request. (9) I inform him immediately of referral and proceeding findings as they occur. (10) Don't always understand purpose/preparation. Too busy with investigations to check on his public education efforts. Training B elementary compared to real life situations but I feel training is a good

orientation. (11) I can't always make the time because of referrals requiring immediate action. (12) I attempt to find answers to any problem--sometimes the answers aren't satisfactory to me and at these times I consult with my supervisor for assistance. (13) The purpose is not always clear but I feel that the meetings may be beneficial to others. (4) Other tasks have made asst. cty. att. occasionally unavailable. (2) Detectives are not always willing to become involved especially if the case is questionable. Frequently are not available in a timely way. (4) Is doing an excellent job but appears way overscheduled. (9) As far as I know it would be usually. (10) I have been less involved since new coordinator assigned. Have been impressed with efforts re: d,e,f, really don't know. Have been very satisfied with assistance on cases. (11) Rarely there due to work schedule. (12) Varies alot! (2) I have had problems with law enforcement--especially when small children or special children (who might not make good witnesses) are involved--getting detectives to go along. Also, frequently have problems after child and non off., spouse interview is over--getting cooperation interviewing offender and long turnaround time getting information regarding interviewing offender from County Attorney and/or law enforcement. (4) Seems a very long time bet interviews and hearing back--especially if shaky case or offender not to accessible. Seems "low Priority" cases can get put off for months--leaves CPI and family hanging. (5) I am not satisfied with myself, my abilities, my training or with the extent to which most of the detectives will go to investigate. It seems they too often will only help by interviewing or being present while interview is done at their office at their convenience. I don't feel a spirit of cooperation. (2) We have had more than our share of problems with the DMPD that appears to be improving. Paul H. does excellent job but is not available much now. Have had real good luck with other police departments and Sherriff. (4) Not to the fault of the individual--Ray is excellent. He is just spread way to thin. (5) When it works and all the components are functioning we're successful. If one part drops the ball the victim suffers. It works most of the time. (8) Should be always. (9) Should be always. CPI drops the ball--this has to be minimized. (10) Should do more out reach, public speaking, show more enthusiasm. (11) The meetings have had a tendency to become staffing--not of interest to many people. Attendance has dropped. Need key people there each time. Each component must be present along with Youth Law. Very frustrating otherwise.

Group 4: (12) Depends whether it has involved the DMPD, otherwise satisfied. (13) Missing the original concept at the meeting. Joe says it is going to improve. (10) I haven't worked with the new co-ordinator.

Group 5: (2) Again when law enforcement is not involved it causes problems. We need better trained detectives in law enforcement who are available at all times to aid in the investigation. Lacking this we are overworking Paul Houston, the County Attorney, Office. Maybe if we can't improve the police departments we will need another Co. Att., Special Investigator on these cases. (4) This is an area I'm not familiar with. (5) There is a real effort to be thorough but this is an area that needs improvement. (8) I don't know. (9) I don't know. (10) I think Joe M. is trying in these areas but there is need for improvement and not all of these things are something he can contrive. (11) If we had more notice on the agenda we could do a better job of getting the right people there. (12) Sometimes I am and sometimes not. This question is to general. (13) I think it would help if Joe M. gave a brief interpretation of each case on the agenda--shows who the victim is, perpetrator, type of abuse and when the case is. (13) Problem with dissemination of information regarding which cases are being staffed that week.

(4) Sometimes he is difficult to reach, at the time someone most needs to talk to him but is supposed to be always available and generally assists as much as he can. (4) I'm not involved at that point. (5) Again the case. Altho some cases are just plain tough. (8) Don't know (9) Again sat for two months before involved at BMC--child and mother. Also, case--but what can I say? (10) Joe does a pretty good job--there have been a couple times I've asked to have Jace prepared about a case and he has little direct knowledge and hadn't checked on the cases. (11) I only go periodically when one of my cases needs attention. (13) SEE #10 Sometimes they could be handled by a 10 or 15 minute conference call. (2) Additional Co. Atty., investigators are needed. (4) Additional Co. Atty., assistance is needed to assure that investigations are sufficient for criminal proceedings. (5) DMPD investigations are not as thorough as those done by Paul Houston. (2) Not always. (4) Time commitments restrict his availability. (9) It seems written IFSAP reports are never available at hearing. I never receive any information verbal or written unless I initiate the request. (10) In my limited contact with the program, Joe Molkebus and Julie Johnston, I have found it difficult to determine what their job responsibilities are. (11) I quit going to the meetings some time ago. It was a waste of my time, I was the one updating on the case not the other way around. (12) I could easily mark completely dissatisfied, however a long standing problem (well over one year) may be being worked on at this point. (13) I quit going and have heard nothing from anyone who attends to indicate that anything productive would be gained by my attendance.

Group 6: (5) Some of the writing in the CPI reports is deadly turgid prose with over long confusing sentences and paragraphs. Some of the writing skills are poor. (9) Seems like he is doing a good job. (10) (d) I am satisfied with his efforts. I am not sure the efforts of others match his efforts. (11) From mid-December to mid-January attendance was very poor and really held up moving cases along. (12) Depends on who is responding. Juvenile court response has been very poor of late. (13) Again some members not being there hurts. (10) Joe needs to keep the meetings moving and flow smoothly, we very often get off the subject and waste a lot of time. (11) Very often Craig Whitney, Ray Blase and Candice Bennett are not present. (2) It appears that sometimes investigators commence the investigation on their own, because a dictator is not available. (11) There are times when neither Juvenile Court or Youth Law are present. Also feel that Craig Whitney's report is rather defensive of CPI and not constructive all the time. (13) At times very satisfied other times feel like meetings are a waste of time because of small attendance, no constructive input, etc. (10) (b) On two occasions I was told by the coordinator cases would be suffed that I was involved in, attended the meeting, and found them not to be addressed. (c) Seems to have initial information, but lacks ongoing in the two cases I have had experience with. (12) In my experience, it seems as though decisions are not always individualized. This may be due to my lack of knowledge and experience in these situations. (13) It would seem that a call to Candice and Ray Blase (if they had the time, and could easily be gotten a hold of) would serve the same purpose as the meetings. (2) There are times that the police are not cooperative. (4) Not involved in the investigative process. (9) Seems to be somewhat of a coordination problem. (11) Very little experience with the meetings. (12) In the cases I've worked with I've had difficulty getting problems addressed. (13) Sometimes it feels as if the meetings are not organized at all and nobody is real sure of what is happening. (2) It appears that often times police refuse to go with CPI workers or are not available. Cooperation between CPI and police appears to be non-existent.

ISSUE D, CONT.

Group 6 Cont:

(4) It appears that due to excessive work loads that County Attorney's are not available in a timely fashion and often during the investigative phase. (5) The quality of sexual abuse investigation reports is extremely uneven with some good reporting and some extremely shoddy reporting, investigating and follow through lack of consistency happens. Follow through and treatment, I see no effort being made to remedy the situation and quality of the investigation appears to be decreasing. (9) This appears to be extremely uneven with this occurring on other occasions, and then not. There seems to be no consistency or pattern here and makes coordination difficult. (10) Coordination is usually available and quite helpful. What appears to be lacking is consistent information and cooperation by other parties involved. Often cases are left in limbo or a gray area with no one taking action or responsibility--all that is done is merely exchange of information. (11) Personnel at meetings varies from work to work. Often ~~none~~ from Juvenile Court attends leaving a major area unrepresented. Representatives from the police dept., are never there. It does not feel as if there is coordination among all personnel involved. (12) There does not appear to be real coordination of service or true problem solving so that long standing problems are remedied. (13) At times the meetings are effective--but usually it remains information--sharing rather than decision making. Often the topic wanders and is not always goal directed. (5) I have received complaints from parents regarding the amount of information revealed to children through questioning--descriptive questions regarding oral sex or penetrations. Questioning possibly needs to be tailored more to the child's consciousness. Investigations ought not to be the child's most significant or traumatic introduction to sex or most expanded infusion of information about "deviant" sex. (10) Treatment team case plans, progress reports and terminations summaries have not been evidenced in written form. (11) I believe meetings ought to start and stop as agreed. People who agree to attend ought to be there on time. (12) Receipt of requested treatment termination summaries have been extremely slow in being produced when requested. (13) As a worker dealing with only one specific client during an hour and a half meeting, I do not enjoy arriving at 3:00 p.m. to deal with a case that comes up for discussion as the last item of business. Even more distressing is having to listen to a review of what has been discussed so a late arriver can be caught up on the discussion. Commitments ought to be kept. People with difficulty keeping agreements ought to be confronted before agreement is set and re-confronted to keep future agreements when they falter.

Group 7: (2) Definitely need another person assigned to assist Paul Houston. (4) However, the Assistant County Attorney has to spend a lot of time in Court--therefore he is difficult to reach immediately. I feel it would help to have another Asst. Co. Atty. assigned to Juv. Ct. to handle delinquencies and make Ray responsible for sexual abuse cases. (5) Often I feel the police officer conducting the interview with the child could be better trained in interviewing techniques. (12) Need different times for specific case staffings. (5) The program buys too heavily into its own stereotypes and tends to be reactionary. There is little effort to provide personal attention for affected family members. Procedures are ritualized and either not scrutinized or workers are afraid to question the program. (10) The IFSAP coordinator is given too little power to achieve the results for which he is responsible. He is very adept at easing friction, however. (11) Meeting times have never been changed to coordinate with Juv. Crts. schedule. Agendas are not decision oriented. Treatment personnel do not attend or send poorly informed representatives. People get too defensive and turf oriented to participate effectively in group problem solving attempts. (12) People

ISSUE D, CONT.

are afraid to speak out, turf problems get in the way, there is no authority with the power and credibility to render binding decisions. (13) See comments above: (1) No agenda (2) Information quality is poor (3) Attendance of key persons not assured (4) Debate is stifled (5) Decisions are not always followed through on. (Comments on 5) The police department has failed as of late. (4) As far as I know. (5) Usually very well done. We have had problems, however, with officers being unwilling to accept follow-up, new or additional information. "Non-offending" spouse not always interviewed. More training on interviewing techniques would be helpful to some officers. (12) Depends on who dropped the ball. Some folks much more willing to deal with concerns than others.

Group 8: (2) I'm not sure what the criteria is anymore. At the hospital (Broadlawn) it seems that the police aren't involved as often. (4) Usually the mothers I work with know who the County Attorney is and how and when to contact him/her. There are infrequent complaints that calls weren't returned or that mothers weren't notified of court proceedings. (5) Overall the investigations have improved over the past three years greatly. I have been involved in a few cases that "slipped between the cracks". Most of the CPI appear to understand the concepts of systematic sexual abuse investigation. From the hospital perspective, however, the victim service counselors are more helpful and available for medical exams and in knowing procedures. (10) Joe has not met the needs of Parents United; there has been no facilitator found for the mens' group since 8-83, he has not with the mothers' group. Facilitators only one since 8-83, we asked for training in effective listening for the parents in 7-83 and haven't gotten that. The mothers frequently find him unresponsive to their calls, he brought a TV crew in to film a meeting with out prior permission of the clients or facilitators. I don't think Joe has taken advantage of the training needs of the community--he doesn't do enough. He also seems to have a lack of knowledge of ongoing cases when I ask him where they are in the system. In general I don't feel any support from him as a volunteer for P.U. (12) My only contact with the rest of the program is Joe. It has been my experience that he's a good listener when I go to him with a problem, and he gives me the impression something will be done, then nothing happens towards solution. (11) DMPD usually not represented. (13) Sometimes I question why I take time out of my schedule to attend the meetings. The issues discussed at the meetings sometimes are a waste of time. The meetings occasionally deteriorate into useless drivel.

ISSUE BEING EVALUATED: To increase our efforts and success in addressing the needs of the IFSAP family to decrease the likelihood that future incidents of intra-family sexual abuse of children will occur with that victim or his/her siblings.

ITEM E

| QUESTIONS INCLUDED | AVE SCORE | RESPONSES | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|--|
| | | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | ? | |
| #21a HELPFULNESS OF FAMILY CRISIS INTERV UNIT | 5.46 | 2 | 12 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | |
| #21b HELPFULNESS OF DM CHILD GUIDANCE CNTR | 5.52 | 4 | 15 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 16 | |
| #21c HELPFULNESS OF SANDS UNIT | 5.94 | 12 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | |
| #21d HELPFULNESS OF CHILD PROTECTIVE TRMT | 6.16 | 10 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | |
| #21e HELPFULNESS OF PARENTS UNITED | 5.43 | 3 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 21 | |
| #21f HELPFULNESS OF PRIVATE THERAPISTS | 4.96 | 2 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 17 | |
| #22a SANDS CENTER OFFENDER ASSESSMT/TREATMT | 4.73 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 13 | |
| #22b SANDS CENTER NON-OFFENDING SPOUSE TREATMT | 5.13 | 3 | 12 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 13 | |
| #22c SANDS CENTER VICTIM ASSESSMENT/TREATMT | 5.00 | 2 | 13 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 13 | |
| #23a SANDS REPORTS TIMELY | 3.69 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 27 | |
| #23b SANDS REPORTS COMPLETE | 4.38 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 27 | |
| #23c DMC GC REPORTS TIMELY | 4.88 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 35 | |
| #23d DMC GC REPORTS COMPLETE | 5.25 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 35 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 5.12 | | | | | | | | | |

Juvenile Court-4.49 (32% Don't Know), Law Enforcement-5.25 (77%), CPI-5.13 (39%), CPI-5.39 (51%)
Program Management-5.58 (35%), Treatment-6.24 (42%), GAL-4.91% (9%)

QUESTION #20

TREATMENT

No comments made.

CPI

No problem with CPT.

Since more staff hired, quicker response.

I hope so!

JUVENILE COURT

The information received on CPI reports is not always accurate causing problems at the field level. It is hard to start to compile information for the CINA hrg. etc., without accurate information - since there is no intake with the family, it causes a delay in the process.

Have had good luck with Ruth Ann and Mary Lee. I felt it was pointless to have Jim Gilbert on the case.

Have had very limited contact with agency on any IFSAP case at any time.

I think they do a good job considering their work loads.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Very good availability and response to any call but the CPS investigators tend to not want to stop when there is no evidence to prove an accusation or when the child says that nothing happened.

GUARDIAN AD LITEM

Since guardian ad litem are not given an opportunity to assist their clients at the stage when such treatment should be first considered, it is difficult to comment.

CPT

We try hard!

ITEM E, CONT.

PROSECUTION

No comments made.

OTHER - PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

The CPT Unit is excellent and the mothers appear to get much support, direction, and confrontation when needed.

Their involvement has been a real plus in improved quality. We now get them involved sooner and they are a major support base for the family.

QUESTION #21

TREATMENT

While private therapists are helpful, many are not trained in the dynamics of incest as are the Sands staff. Many families do need crisis intervention initially and the crises intervention unit is quite helpful. CPT also does a good job of serving the child's interest. In regard to Parents United, there are a couple of individuals who are not therapists (in the Mothers' Groups), who are attempting to theraputize new members - the result being that these new people were misinformed and confused by the time they reached us.

CPI

I have had some problems with Richard Hale and Dr. Jonclue (Conclu). I wonder (honestly) if he is professionally capable of offering healthy therapy to clients?

Barb Cavallin - excellent but overloaded. Many other local therapists don't seem to deal with problem.
DMCGC - impression they don't deal directly with the problem - mostly subjective opinion.

JUVENILE COURT

I think the Sands program is good, but get the impression they think they're overworked. They don't always put in time to explain to the families what is expected or what will happen or to coordinate services with the family. Maybe they need a competition.

ITEM E, CONT.

The cases I have had were all through Sands.

Overall we need to improve treatment. I want to say that some private therapists are good - others if they don't understand the program can be very harmful. Parents United will need to continue to grow and gain credibility. I'm concerned that Sands does not always seem victim oriented.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Sands Unit - waste of time and money.

GUARDIAN AD LITEM

Most people are working in good faith and do have necessary skills to help family.

Depends which therapist. Who knows if any of us do any good.

CPT

Depending on the family member involved, some are more useful to particular family members than others.

Not had enough experience with anyone other than Sands - the therapists I have had contact with have been very cooperative and helpful.

QUESTION #21 (continued)

CPT (continued)

The addition of Child Guidance Staff has been very helpful in the treatment of children - but I do not get the sense that a permanent plan has been developed for this crucial part of the program and coordination is still poor.

One private therapist I believe to be very helpful is Dr. Barbara Cavallin.

PROSECUTION

Parents United is not actively involved in working with offenders immediately after arrest and prior to entry into the program. They could be better utilized in this regard. Private therapists have in the past not reported abuse which has led to continued abuse of some children.

ITEM E, CONT.

OTHER - PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Parents United members speak very highly of the assistance they received at Sands - especially from Sandy Clark and Cindy Davis. Jace Jamieson is seen as a real advocate and empathetic intake person. Many of the parents mention private therapists who "gloss over" or won't deal with incest. The expertise developed at Sands over the past 3 years is a comfort to families entering the system. Of course I feel that P.U. meets a real ongoing need of the parents. There are 4 members who have been members for nearly 2 years. The help they give each other is invaluable.

We need to look at using the Family Crisis Unit, Iowa Runaway Service, and the Crisis Unit at Sands more. Also the "role" of Parents United needs to be better defined and worked on. Private therapists (with the exception of B. Cavallin) are hard to work with in terms of the "team" concept and approach.

Depends on private therapists how they respond.

QUESTION #22

TREATMENT

A.

Think we have treated some offenders on an out patient basis that should have been involved in an I.P. Program if one were available.

I believe we are currently understaffed which causes some delay in reports, intakes, etc. We also need a child therapist to work with very young children and are currently attempting to hire one.

B.

May need more support than they perceive they're getting.

Think overall we do a good job with spouses.

Treatment would be much more easily accomplished if mothers' attendance to therapy was a mandatory part of the program.

C.

Treatment very time-consuming and will be difficult to keep up with if present growth rate continues.

ITEM E, CONT.

Treatment of victims has improved remarkably. This is strong part of our program. Treatment of young children and male victims is something we're developing.

As stated above, the addition of a child psychologist would greatly enhance treatment of young victims.

CPI

A.

Don't know anything about the operation.

B.

Unsure of process in assessment/treatment.

C.

I don't "follow-up" on cases - hopefully CPI worker will contact me if treatment is ineffective.

Assessment good. I believe we all fall down on ongoing services to the kids.

Am becoming frustrated with seeing victims re-victimized.

Currently child victims go elsewhere.

JUVENILE COURT

A.

More careful screening of offenders needs to be done - sometimes other children have been abused in the past (now adults; never reported) and they are still allowed in the program.

Mostly good - see #21. Super job on evaluation on _____ once they go to it. When they get on it - they are tops.

Only had 2 that Sands worked with. Others were uncooperative or out of state.

It seems to me the offender's treatment is completed prematurely. In California, treatment takes about 2 years.

B.

Only one of my cases that he worked well with -
The others have not been good cases to utilize that.

Seem to do a good job making parent aware of child's needs.

We need to do a better job of offering support early at the time of the referral.

C.

More emphasis on support for the child in re: individuality, sexuality, insecurities that can arise out of the abuse and lead to problems later - too much emphasis pushing the family back together too quickly. Must keep the best interests of the child in mind.

We don't have a Daughters & Sons United for support. Also, Sands doesn't seem equipped to deal with the young victims. We have to send them elsewhere for treatment which hurts the continuity of the treatment program.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

A.

No comments made.

B.

No comments made.

C.

No comments made.

GUARDIAN AD LITEM

A.

Sands understaffs and could improve program by working more closely with rest of the program.

Sometimes I feel treatment is too short-term. Offenders are allowed to return home.

Satisfaction is dependent upon which therapist the offender receives.

Too short-term.

ITEM E, CONT.

QUESTION #22 (continued)

GUARDIAN AD LITEM (continued)

B.

Sands understaffs and could improve program by working more closely with rest of the program.

Satisfaction is dependent upon which therapist the offender receives.

Usually very good. Some clients need more individualized program.

C.

Sands understaff and could improve program by working more closely with rest of the program.

Satisfaction is dependent upon which therapist the offender receives.

Sometimes it seems the victim is pushed out of individual therapy and into group as soon as possible, when individual therapy would seem to be indicated for a while longer.

Not accessible to kids. Very little individual work. Families allowed to re-constitute before victim is ready. Have had a couple of disastrous experiences. Most have been O.K.

CPT

A.

Jace and her staff work hard and seem to be effective.

No experience with this component.

I find several members of treatment staff at Broadlawns appearing to make cursory assessments and state these people are "cured." Treatment process appears to be so brief as to put to question how anyone could be cured.

B.

Sometimes non-offending spouses sabotage the efforts of those involved.

The one case I had with a spouse was referred on to DMCG as was the evaluation for the offending spouse.

No experience with this component.

Seems to be the most satisfactory part of the program.

C.

It does seem that a few are slipping through the cracks.

The experience I've had has been very good.

I don't see the present focus of the program as being treatment of the victim and the child victim in particular often gets "lost in the shuffle."

PROSECUTION

A.

The Sands Center cannot be all things to all people. Psychology and psychiatry are not exact sciences. The program will not always be able to "cure" everyone accepted into the program. Success in a program such as ours is not easily quantifiable or measureable.

B.

No comments made.

C.

No comments made.

OTHER - PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

A.

It is a dynamically evolving system that really seems to address the needs of each family. The offenders really seem to grow. Some of the offenders tell their wife that they are playing "therapy games" but the program seems to be able to identify them eventually.

I feel they are doing a good job and starting to look at ways to improve and specialize their approach.

B.

The therapists for the women are very effective.

I feel they are doing a good job and starting to look at ways to improve and specialize their approach.

C.

I feel they are doing a good job and starting to look at ways to improve and specialize their approach. I believe there is more that can be done.

I'm only aware of this treatment through the mothers, but the mothers frequently feel that their daughters are allowed to drop out of counseling too soon. They also feel that more attention needs to be given to the therapeutic needs of the siblings.

TREATMENT

Typically if we know a report is due for a hearing, we are prompt and thorough. Termination reports re: timeliness need improvement.

CPI

Don't know anything about reports.

JUVENILE COURT

Reports are seldom timely and don't always follow the outline provided by Juvenile Court. It is very difficult to get information without directly talking to each therapist for each family member - communication between/within the program seems to be lacking.

I've not used CGC with IFSAP, but I threatened to once.

Usually reports are brief "memo" or verbal or non-existent. If the program wants to be aware of a real shortcoming, this is it.

The Juvenile Court needs more complete reports and we need to receive them for Juvenile Court hearings.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Never get any.

ITEM E, CONT.

GUARDIAN AD LITEM

No comments made.

CPT

Don't seem to receive any of these reports - even though as a treatment worker I should be.

Have never received a written report - quarterly; opening or closing of case.

Have never gotten any reports.

PROSECUTION

No comments made.

OTHER - PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

I don't know because at present I do not receive copies - there have been complaints from Pre-sentencing.

ISSUE BEING EVALUATED: To address the needs of the victim, including keeping the victim in the home when appropriate by having the offender move out.

ITEM F

| QUESTIONS INCLUDED | AVE SCORE | RESPONSES | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| | | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | ? |
| #3 TAPED INTERVIEWS | 6.17 | 15 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| #14 GUARDIAN AD LITEM PROVIDED | 5.79 | 9 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 10 |
| #16 Extent of Juvenile Court Monitoring to Assure necessary services are provided | 11.52 | 1 | 12 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 13 |
| #17 TIMELY JUVENILE COURT INTAKE | 3.50 | 1 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 8 |
| #19a JUV COURT EFFORTS/IMMEDIATE NEEDS | 4.72 | 2 | 15 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 13 |
| #19b JUV COURT EFFORTS/LONG TERM NEEDS | 4.55 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 12 |
| #20a AVAILABILITY OF CHILD PROTECTIVE TREATMT | 27 | 14 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| #20b TIMELINESS OF CHILD PROTECTIVE TREATMENT | 6.00 | 7 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| #21b HELPFULNESS OF DM CHILD GUIDANCE CENTER | 5.52 | 4 | 15 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 16 |
| #21a HELPFULNESS OF CHILD PROTECTIVE TRMT | 11.16 | 10 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| #22c SANDS CENTER VICTIM ASSESSMENT/TREATMT | 5.00 | 2 | 13 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 13 |
| #6a NO-CONTACT ORDER SECURED UPON ARREST | 5.90 | 8 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| #6b NO-CONTACT ORDER ENFORCED | 4.62 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 12 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 532 | | | | | | | | |

Juvenile Court-5.29 (17% Don't Know), Law Enforcement-5.57 (50%), CPT-4.82 (18%), Program Mgmt-5.76 (41%), Treatment-5.78 (24%), GAL-5.00 (9%), CPI-5.58 (22%)

COMMENTS: Group 1: (16) Too many second offenders. (3) Much time is wasted on tape recording the interviews before it is determined if there is evidence of a valid case. (17) Very slow and absolutely no feedback on cases. (20a,b) Very good availability and response to any call, but the C.P.S. investigators tend to not want to stop when there is no evidence to prove an accusation or when the child says nothing happened.

Group 2: (3) There have been cases where they will talk with the person to see if they are going to make a statement before they tape it. Also, we are trying to video tape all victims under nine which is more difficult. (6a,b) There are

exceptions--some offenders wouldn't want out, but they bond out anyway. I'd say enforcement has been good though difficult, we have taken one person in on contempt. (14) Youth Law Center handles most of the cases and they do a good job. I wish we could get them involved sooner. (16) I think for the most part they do a good job, but in some cases they could work closer with CPT. (17) It's one of the major problems right now. (19a,b) A majority of this work is done through CPT and therapists, but they are involved and provide the "support" to get the job done. (20a,b) Their involvement has been a real plus in improving the quality, we now get them involved sooner and they are a major support base for the family. (22c) I feel they are doing a good job and starting to look at ways to improve and specialize their approach. I believe there is more that can be done.

Group 3: (3) I assume always, but frequently never see transcripts. (6a,b) In cases with which I've worked, people appear quite diligent about this. (22c) Treatment very time consuming and will be difficult to keep up with if present growth rate continues. (3) They have been in all the cases with which I have worked. (6a,b) Initially they were not always issued, I understand they are supposed to be now on every case. I strongly encourage this. I believe more effort should be placed on enforcing the no-contact with consequences falling on those who break it. (16) Some Juvenile P.O.'s make little contact or are few and far between. I can think of at least one case where I felt it of utmost importance the mother attend (she had already been told by the P.O. she must attend), but failed to show. I notified the P.O. and haven't heard a word, nor has the mother shown up. (19a,b) Juvenile Court has often held the position that the child is better off in the custody of the parent(s) and often times this is not the case (not in the best interest of the child). Also the Judicial hearings in a few cases has been drug out entirely to long with detrimental effects as a result. (21d) CPT also does a good job of serving the child's interest. (22c) As stated above, the addition of a child psychologist would greatly enhance treatment of young victims. (We need a child therapist to work with very young children and are currently attempting to hire one.) (6a,b) Enforcement can be a problem but generally feel it works well. (17) Too much delay in filing CINA's (19a,b) I think efforts are good, there appear to be some barriers where results are disappointing. (22c) Treatment of victims has improved remarkably. This is a strong part of our program. Treatment of young children and male victims is something we're developing. (6a,b) It is difficult to enforce. (6a,b) We have seen the no-contact order violated. Follow-up is always available but seems quite unsuccessful. (16) Often see poor follow-up after initial reports and interview.

ITEM F, CONT.

Group 4: (3) Always taped to my knowledge. (6a,b) I am not totally aware of all involved with process during/after the arrest. I have confidence in the system to make me aware if a problem should arise with procedure. (14) As far as I know. (16) Juv. Ct., seems to attempt reasonable monitoring of family, caseload is very heavy for Juv. Ct. I feel they need more intake officers--as efficient as Jan Buck and Candice Bennett. (17) I have had no problem with Jan or Candice, but feel their caseload is unrealistic for two human beings. (19a,b) I like Juv. Ct.'s efforts and cannot foresee any dissatisfaction. (20a,b) No problem with CPT (22c) I don't "follow-up" on cases, hopefully CPT worker will contact me if the treatment is ineffective. (3) Most of the time records don't work. (6a,b) To my knowledge, it generally happens, enforcement is a problem occasionally. (14) Youth Law Center does a good job, only unsatisfied with one out of many. (16) Varies alot. (17) Sometimes too long, occasionally never. (19a,b) Immediate reaction better in recent weeks. (22c) I am becoming frustrated with seeing victims re-victimized. (14) If it ever gets to court, many of mine don't. (20a,b) Since more staff has been hired there is a much quicker response. (21b) DMCCG--impression they don't deal directly with the problem, mostly subjective opinion. (6a,b) A must. We have let a few slip through but minimal. Another crucial aspect is enforcing the order. (14) If Youth Law Center gets the case, they are outstanding. (16) This is done more by CPT. (17) Ray and Candice are excellent, work long and hard. Way overloaded. (19a,b) Nothing much seems to happen past intake. The ball gets dropped. (20a,b) I hope so! (22c) Assessment good. I believe we all fall down on ongoing services to the kids. (22c) Currently child victims go elsewhere.

Group 5: (3) Again, when they are not taped, it causes problems. Quality of the tape is a problem, sometimes you can't hear the voices well.

Group 5, Cont. (6a,b) We are doing a pretty good job of getting the no-contact order. But there is really not a good system for enforcing it. No one polices it. When there are violations it seems there is a delay in taking action. Even then, you can't automatically pick up the offender and put him in jail. You have to file contempt and have a hearing. (14) But not soon enough. There is a delay at intake in the Juv. Ct., which leaves children unrepresented at a crucial point in the case. (16) This varies from field officer to field officer, it is not consistent. (17) There is a real problem of delay in getting CINA cases filed and passed on to field. It has turned out to be a much bigger job and Candice Bennett is not keeping up with it. Her supervisor should be

ITEM F, CONT.

Contacted and asked to correct the problem. (19a,b) Again the primary problem is at intake. Once the case goes to filed it seems to improve overall. (20a,b) I think they do a good job considering their work load. (22c) We don't have a Daughters and Sons United for support. Also, Sands doesn't seem equipped to deal with the young victims. We have to send them elsewhere for treatment which hurts the continuity of the treatment program. (17) Problems occur when they are left sitting in intake for a period of time prior to being passed on to the field officer for monitoring, lots of lag on down time in the process, not enough information given usually on CPI reports, etc. (19a,b) *Not an appropriate question from my review of Juv. Ct. responsibilities as outlined in the IFSAP manual. Immediate and longterm needs of victim and family seem to be more appropriately dealt with through the therapy process, a monitoring role only becomes active when the therapy process is no longer a viable alternative. It is then Juv. Ct. should become involved in an active role to meet the needs of the child and to assure their safety. (20a,b) The information received on CPI reports is not always accurate causing problems at the field level. It is hard to start to compile information for the CINA meeting, ect, without accurate information. Since there is no intake with the family it causes a delay in the process. (22c) More emphasis on support for the child in re: individuality, sexuality, insecurity that can arise out of the abuse and lead to problems later. Too much emphasis on pushing the family back together too quickly. Must keep the best interests of the child in mind. (6a,b) First of all, the family is often collusive enough to hide the fact the perpetrator is seeing the family; secondly, if the perpetrator is arrested for violating his no-contact order, he might receive a short jail stay or evaluation at Oakdale, but goes out on the street again. (3) As far as I know, I have not received transcripts or complete transcripts on most cases. However, Ray Blase usually has whatever he needs. (6a,b) In my cases, has been appropriate. (14) Again, Baker. (16) Don't know outside of my cases. (17) Not sure that our intake person is real thorough in that department. (19a,b) We just make sure everyone gets appropriate therapy. (20a,b) Have had good luck with Ruth Ann and Mary Lee. I felt it was pointless to have Jim Gilbert on the _____ case. (14) Always has attorney when CINA petition is filed per code. (16) I have relied on victim and non-offending parent for information and verified with agency. (17) Information supplied to the field P.O. is only that available in referral reports, which do not always contain information necessary, but not concerning offense. (19a,b) Long term needs, who knows, I am not a real believer in rehabilitating the offender, label him cured and put him back with the kids. (20a,b) Have had very limited contact with the agency, on any IFSAP case at any time.

ITEM F, CONT.

Group 6: (6a,b) I understand we can't place a guard at the house of the victim 24 hours a day and that spouses often sabotage, but occasionally when the no-contact orders are violated nothing is done. I attribute this problem to time constraints on Ray Blase and Candice Bennett. (20a,b) We try hard! (22c) It does seem that a few are slipping through the cracks. (14) Only when they are represented by the Youth Law Center, but not all cases have been. (17) There is more work than Candice can possibly do herself. (14) Youth Law usually does an excellent job. (16a,b) Juv. Ct., P.O. rely on CPT for all monitoring. (17) CPT rarely involved on intake phase. I feel we should be. (19a,b) Juv. Ct., is so back logged that often it is just paper pushing one case to the next person and ongoing p.O.'s rarely see family after adjudication. They rely heavily on CPT to monitor. (6a,b) My experience has been that the no-contact order is not always secured in a timely way. (14) In my experience they have. (17) In the one case I had in court, immediate action was taken to remove the children. (19a,b) Not enough experience to assess. (21b,d) Depending on the family member involved, some are more useful to particular family members than others. (3) Don't have any knowledge of this. (6a,b) Not enough knowledge of this process. (14) In my cases I've had difficulty getting any information. (16) In the cases I've worked with I've had to harass Juv. Ct., to get anything done. (17) It has taken up to three months to get through intake. (22c) The experience I've had has been very good. (3) Although interviews are recorded, it appears that the tape is faulty, the recording is inaudible, the tape becomes lost or the transcript is lost. This potentially valuable aide appears to be worthless at the present time and no one appears to accept any responsibility for these problems. (6a,b) I am not certain how often no-contact orders are obtained, but I see no effort at enforcement and this is another area where no one accepts responsibility for follow through--again--it could be due to staffing problems and workloads. (14) The Youth Law Center does an excellent job defending victims. (16) Uneven, depending on officer assigned. (17) Intake unit is understaffed and process takes much too long. (19a,b) Long term planning is often poor. (21b,d) The addition of child guidance staff has been very helpful in the treatment of children, but I do not get the sense that a permanent plan has been developed for this crucial part of the program and coordination is still poor. (22c) I don't see the present of the program. The Dr. begins treatment of their victim and the child victim in particular often gets "lost in the shuffle". (17) It is my impression that Juv. Ct., is generally overwhelmed with intake duties. Priority ranking may dictate IFSAP cases not being filed when family cooperates with the service; however, it seems that, on occasion, treatment may near completion before Juv. Ct., has time to perform even on initial meeting of the victim. (14) Time lag e.g. two children removed on the 16th still don't have lawyer (g.a.l.) on the 26th.

Group 7: (6a,b) It's hard to get enough evidence that a no-contact order has been violated--this is also where an assistant for Paul would be useful. (14) However, Guardian Ad Litem need to be appointed as soon as a petition is filed. (16) Juv. Ct. needs to be informed immediately of any change in the offender's or family's services, ie, termination of therapy or no-contact violation. (17) Cases at intake need to be expedited and assigned to a field P.O. faster. Intake worker needs additional support staff. (22c) Sometimes it seems the victim pushed out of individual therapy and into group as soon as possible, when individual therapy would seem to be indicated for a little longer. (14) The lack of timeliness in appointment of g.a.l. does not conform with the standards of In Re Aualt counsel and CINA proceedings continue to be a last step in the process. Advice of counsel for incest victims on an ad hoc basis is available in Polk County but seldom at an early stage is it utilized.

Group 7, Cont: (16) Juv. P.O.'s should become more involved as they are very good at insuring that workers live up to their responsibilities. (17) Most petitions are being filed months after the abuse occurs. (19a,b) As Guardian Ad Litem, I employ a case by case approach and see no common trends. (20a,b) Since Guardian Ad Litem are not given an opportunity to assist their clients at the stage when such treatment should be first considered, it is difficult to comment. (22c) Sands understaffs and could improve program by working more closely with the rest of the program. (22c) Satisfaction is dependent upon which therapist the offender receives. (3) I think it may be happening, but not always getting into the Juv. Ct. file quickly enough for us to get them. (6a,b) People in program work very hard at this. Need more resources for surveillance and more cooperation from Criminal Judges. (14) We are not getting cases soon enough. (17) Staff people overwhelmed. Need additional support. (19a,b) I'm satisfied with the efforts. Sometimes the available alternatives are not terrific. (22c) Not accessible to kids. Very little individual work. Families allowed to re-constitute before victim is ready. Have had a couple of disasterous experiences, most have been ok.

Group 8: (3) I don't know. I had one case at Broadlawns last summer where the interview of an inpatient by a detective and CPI worker was not recorded. (6a,b) The mothers in the group find the concreteness of no-contact orders to be reliable tools to put some order in their chaotic family. They seem to understand the gravity of breaking the order and it is something they can rally around in protecting their kids. (14) Comments in mothers group indicate that the Guardian Ad Litem are generally actively involved in the cases. (16) I often hear comments from mothers that their children only "went to a couple

of sessions then nobody made them go anymore". (19a,b) I think sometimes the time children are in foster care without contact with their parents is too long because of lack of follow-up. It would be nice if more could be done to assure adequate counseling of the kids. (20a,b) The CPT unit is excellent and the mothers appear to get much support, direction, and confrontation when needed. (22c) I'm only aware of this treatment through the mothers, but, the mothers frequently feel that their daughters are allowed to drop out of counseling too soon. They also feel that more attention needs to be given to the therapeutic needs of the siblings. (14) I am impressed with the thoroughness and dedication of the Youth Law Center. (16) Depending on the particular P.O. assigned. (17) Delinquency charges involving IFSAP offenders are often not handled in a timely manner.

APPENDIX II

CASE ASSESSMENT FORM

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

| OFFENDER NAME/DOB | | NON-OFFENDING PARENT NAME | | | | VICTIM(S) NAME/ DOB | |
|--|---|---------------------------|-----|----|-----------|---|--|
| QUALIFIERS | CRITERIA | UNKNOWN | YES | NO | EXCEPTION | EXCEPTIONS/CONDITIONS | COMMENTS |
| Where the case is founded AND the offender is identified | AN ARREST IS MADE | 1 | 81 | 11 | 25 | The incident occurred outside of Polk County | Incident outside Polk-3 Offender is Juvenile-16 Past Statute of limitations-2 Prevention contact only/no crim act-2 No law covering-1 Passed a polygraph test-1 |
| | A CONFESSION IS OBTAINED | 5 | 59 | 54 | | The offender is a juvenile The offender lives outside of Polk County and the case is transferred there | |
| Where the case is founded AND is an INTRA-FAMILY SEXUAL ABUSE case | THE INTERVIEWS WERE TAPED | 19 | 85 | 14 | | | |
| | THE INVESTIGATION WAS A JOINT EFFORT OF CPI/LAW ENFORCEMENT | 13 | 86 | 19 | | | |
| | AN ARREST WAS MADE | 1 | 81 | 11 | 25 | See exceptions on #1 above | |
| | A CINA WAS FILED ON BEHALF OF THE VICTIM | -- | 82 | 23 | 13 | Offender will have no further contact anyway (eg babysitter) because family is protective WITHOUT needing CINA Child doesn't live in Polk County | |
| Where an arrest was made on an IFSAP case | THE CHILD REMAINED IN THE HOME WITH THE OFFENDER PROHIBITED FROM MAKING CONTACT | 2 | 50 | 3 | 26 | Remaining parent could not provide proper care for youth - 22 Child refused to remain in home or remaining parent totally rejected child | one met both exception criteria - 5 |
| Where an arrest has been made | DEFENDANT ENTERED IFSAP PROGRAM OR WAS INVOLVED IN NORMAL PROSECUTION | | 81 | 0 | | Offender was from another county and was handled by another jurisdiction Offender is a juvenile | |
| Where prosecution is over | CONVICTION WAS OBTAINED ON THE TARGET OR MORE SERIOUS CHARGE | | 56 | 14 | | Of those with no conviction: 9 were dismissed, 3 found Not Guilty, 2 found guilty simple assault. | |
| Offender entered IFSAP program | OFFENDER ENTERED TREATMT | 2 | 69 | 27 | | Of the 69 offenders known to have entered treatment, 10 are known to have dropped out, 21 are unknown status and 38 have completed or are pending. | |
| | OFFENDER COMPLETED TRTMT OR IS STILL INVOLVED | 23 | 38 | 37 | | | |
| | NON-OFFENDING PARENT ENTERED TREATMENT | 1 | 46 | 48 | 3 | No parent to work with OR parent in different jurisdiction OR parent properly protective and has no needs for assistance | |
| | COMPLETED OR IS PENDING | 21 | 22 | 52 | 3 | | |
| | VICTIM ENTERED TREATMENT | 2 | 63 | 32 | 1 | Victim not under Polk County Jurisdiction | |
| | COMPLETED OR PENDING | 33 | 23 | 41 | 1 | Can be other than Sand's Center | |

| OFFENDER NAME/DOB | | NON-OFFENDING PARENT NAME | | | | VICTIM(S) NAME/ DOB | |
|--|---|---------------------------|-----|----|-----------|---|----------|
| QUALIFIERS | CRITERIA | UNKNOWN | YES | NO | EXCEPTION | EXCEPTIONS/CONDITIONS | COMMENTS |
| Where the case is founded AND the offender is identified | AN ARREST IS MADE | | | | | The incident occurred outside of Polk County | |
| | A CONFESSION IS OBTAINED | | | | | The offender is a juvenile The offender lives outside of Polk County and the case is transferred there | |
| Where the case is founded AND is an INTRA-FAMILY SEXUAL ABUSE case | THE INTERVIEWS WERE TAPED | | | | | | |
| | THE INVESTIGATION WAS A JOINT EFFORT OF CPI/LAW ENFORCEMENT | | | | | | |
| | AN ARREST WAS MADE | | | | | See exceptions on #1 above | |
| | A CINA WAS FILED ON BEHALF OF THE VICTIM | | | | | Offender will have no further contact anyway (eg babysitter) because family is protective WITHOUT needing CINA Child doesn't live in Polk County | |
| Where an arrest was made on an IFSAP case | THE CHILD REMAINED IN THE HOME WITH THE OFFENDER PROHIBITED FROM MAKING CONTACT | | | | | Remaining parent could not provide proper care for youth Child refused to remain in home or remaining parent totally rejected child | |
| Where an arrest has been made | DEFENDANT ENTERED IFSAP PROGRAM OR WAS INVOLVED IN NORMAL PROSECUTION | | | | | Offender was from another county and was handled by another jurisdiction Offender is a juvenile | |
| Where prosecution is over | CONVICTION WAS OBTAINED ON THE TARGET OR MORE SERIOUS CHARGE | | | | | | |
| Offender entered IFSAP program | OFFENDER ENTERED TREATMT | | | | | | |
| | OFFENDER COMPLETED TRTMT OR IS STILL INVOLVED | | | | | | |
| | NON-OFFENDING PARENT ENTERED TREATMENT COMPLETED OR IS PENDING | | | | | No parent to work with OR parent in different jurisdiction OR parent properly protective and has no needs for assistance | |
| | VICTIM ENTERED TREATMENT COMPLETED OR PENDING | | | | | Victim not under Polk County Jurisdiction Can be other than Sands Center | |

| OFFENDER NAME | | Unknown | Yes | No | Exception | EXCEPTIONS/CONDITIONS | COMMENTS |
|---|--|---------|-----|----|-----------|---|----------|
| QUALIFIERS | CRITERIA | | | | | | |
| Case was founded but the offender has not entered IFSAP | NON-OFFENDING PARENT ENTERED TREATMENT PROGRAM AT SANDS | | | | | Parent(s) are found to be appropriately protective and do not feel a need for treatment/support - no CINA | |
| | VICTIM ENTERED TREATMENT VICTIM COMPLETED TREATMENT OR STILL INVOLVED | | | | | No CINA filed and parents/victim don't feel treatment is necessary | |
| A no-contact order was obtained and subsequently violated | THE OFFENDER WAS WARNED | | | | | | |
| | THE OFFENDER WAS BROUGHT IN ON CONTEMPT | | | | | No proof of violation | |
| | | | | | | | |

CURRENT STATUS:

CRIMINAL DISPOSITION: