

Phase III Report
*Assessing Domestic Violence under the Family Violence Option:
Risk Assessment Tool Creation*

Report Prepared for:
The New Jersey Division of Family Development

Project Conducted By:
**Center on Violence Against Women and Children
Rutgers University School of Social Work**

**Dr. Judy L. Postmus, Director
Dr. Andrea Hetling, VAWC Associate**

Report Prepared By:
**Laura Johnson, MSW
Jordan Steiner, MA
Judy L. Postmus, Ph.D., ACSW
Andrea Hetling, Ph.D.
Hsiu-fen Lin, MA**

August 2017

This material is based upon work supported by the Department of Human Services, Division of Family Development, State of New Jersey with Rutgers University.

Any opinions and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the State of New Jersey or the Department of Human Services.

Project Overview

The goal of the “Assessing Domestic Violence under the Family Violence” research project of the Rutgers Center on Violence Against Women and Children (VAWC), sponsored by the New Jersey Department of Family Development (DFD), was to create and validate a risk assessment tool for domestic violence victims applying for services and waivers under the Family Violence Option (FVO). To accomplish this goal, a three-phased evaluation project was designed to guide the development, implementation, and testing of a risk assessment tool.

The goal of Phase One was to examine best practices and policies on how domestic violence is identified and how other welfare departments across the U.S. assess risk. The research team reviewed academic literature and policy reports as well as examined state websites and manuals regarding domestic violence and the implementation of the FVO. Findings from this phase are described in Phase 1 Report 1A and Phase 1 Report 1B of this series.

The goal of Phase Two was to assess current practices on assessing risk of domestic violence with clients receiving TANF services in New Jersey. This was accomplished through: 1) a review of the process of identifying domestic violence among TANF clients, referring clients to domestic violence providers, assessing for domestic violence risk, and re-assessing such risk; 2) a review of all documents used during these processes; 3) focus groups with staff from the DFD, county welfare agencies, and domestic violence organizations from each county; and 4) confidential online surveys with both focus group participants and a broader group of those directly involved with the identification and assessment of domestic violence. Findings from this phase are described in the Phase 2 Report.

The goal of Phase Three was to create, implement, test, and train on a new risk assessment tool to be used with TANF clients who disclosed experiences of domestic violence to a TANF intake worker or caseworker. Findings from Phases One and Two of the study guided this process.

This report is the third and final one in the series and summarizes results from Phase Three of the project. The information that follows includes a detailed overview of the creation, piloting, validation, and revision of a risk assessment tool designed to assess the risk of future violence and the impact of abusive experiences. The Appendix includes copies of the pilot risk assessment tool and waiver granting guide, the revised risk assessment tool and waiver granting guide, and a table that outlines the changes that were made.

Creation of the Risk Assessment Tool

The initial risk assessment tool that was piloted as part of Phase Three of this project was informed by the findings from Phases One and Two of the study which included: 1) a comprehensive review of state policies and literature on best practices and policies on how domestic violence is identified and how risk is assessed by other welfare departments across the U.S.; 2) results of focus groups conducted with staff from the Division of Family Development, county welfare agencies, and domestic violence organizations; 3) results from surveys conducted with staff from the Division of Family Development, county welfare agencies, and domestic violence organizations; and 4) a comprehensive review of risk assessment literature.

State Policy and Family Violence Option Literature Review¹

Methods. First, in an effort to collect information on each state's domestic violence policies and procedures and their implementation of the FVO, our team examined state websites related to TANF, collected relevant published materials, and communicated with state agencies as needed. Our research was focused on eight key areas: whether or not the state has formally adopted the FVO, the definition of family violence, how states inform clients of waivers, how they screen clients, who handles referrals, who completes the risk assessment, who grants waivers, and the types of waivers available.

In addition, a comprehensive review of the literature was completed. The overarching goal of the literature review was to report on best practices and policies on how domestic violence is identified and how welfare departments across the U.S. assess risk. Thus, the following questions guided the literature review: 1) What is theoretically/empirically known about domestic violence survivors and TANF; 2) How is domestic violence assessed by other state welfare departments; 3) What procedures are associated with addressing domestic violence among TANF caseloads; 4) How are waivers granted; 5) What tools are utilized in the FVO process; and 6) What outcomes are associated with different approaches to the implementation of the FVO?

With these questions in mind, the research team systematically reviewed academic databases for relevant disciplines (i.e. social work, public policy, psychology, public health) using a series of predetermined keywords. Examples of key words utilized for the search include "Family Violence Option," "TANF," "domestic violence," "public assistance," and "waivers." The research team saved all articles relevant to the study and reviewed them for key information.

Findings. Findings from the state policy and literature review indicate that implementation of the FVO varies across states. We were unable to identify typical approaches or profiles of state rules because of the great diversity. Moreover, based partially on the great number of decisions and combinations of them, the literature to date does not provide a thorough evaluation or guide to best practices. Implementation decisions depend on local circumstances, including need, funding, and politics, and are not solely tied to social science findings. Further, we did not identify any

¹ A detailed description of the methods and findings from this phase are described thoroughly in Phase 1 Report 1A and Phase I Report 1B of this series.

states that utilized a quantitative rather than qualitative approach to assessing risk of domestic violence. Thus, we were unable to model our tool off a currently existing risk assessment.

Focus Groups²

Methods. Second, we conducted in-depth focus groups with various stakeholders and completed a qualitative analysis examining themes. Potential focus group participants were recruited through key contacts at the New Jersey Division of Family Development and the New Jersey Coalition to End Domestic Violence. These key contacts sent emails to eligible staff members about the research study; those interested contacted the research project coordinator at the VAWC to participate in a one-time focus group. Eight focus groups (2 with Division of Family Development representatives; 3 with county-level welfare employees; and 3 with domestic violence organization staff) were conducted with a total of 48 participants (7 Division of Family Development Representatives; 19 county-level welfare employees; and 22 domestic violence organization staff).

Findings. Focus groups served as a great source of information and largely informed the creation of the risk assessment tool. The primary focus of the themes identified centered around levels of risk and the granting of waivers.

Participants noted a lack of understanding of how each level of risk is defined, as well as how levels of risk relate to particular waivers. In response, the research team chose to develop a “score sheet” to assist risk assessors in determining whether risk is low, moderate, or high, as well as which waivers could correspond with each level of risk.

County welfare agency staff members indicated that they did not understand how risk assessors come to determine clients’ level of risk. Domestic violence organization staff members also felt that the prior risk assessment tool was too subjective. In response, the research team chose to develop a standardized tool with several open-ended questions. As such, county welfare agency staff members could also learn how the risk assessment is conducted and scored, thus giving them a better understanding of the process. The standardized approach also made the risk assessment tool much less subjective; yet, the partner risk, partner access, and perception of safety questions, along with the open-ended questions, provided risk assessors with important background information to guide them when making waiver suggestions for clients whose scores indicate a moderate level of risk.

Lastly, both county welfare agency and domestic violence organization staff members acknowledged that waivers are granted on an “all or nothing” basis, meaning that clients are typically granted either all waivers or none at all. In response, the research team provided guidelines as to which waivers should be granted based on scoring. This was designed to help risk assessors tease out which waivers would be most appropriate for a client given their current situation. Findings from the focus groups are described thoroughly in the Phase 2 report.

² A detailed description of the methods and findings from this phase are described thoroughly in Phase 2 Report.

Survey³

Methods. Third, we conducted anonymous online surveys and analyzed those with quantitative techniques. Potential survey participants were recruited through key contacts at the New Jersey Division of Family Development and the New Jersey Coalition to End Domestic Violence; staff from county welfare agencies, domestic violence organizations, and the Division of Family Development were invited to complete the survey, which was available online through the survey tool Qualtrics. Overall, 138 individuals completed the survey (79 county-level welfare employees; 52 domestic violence organization staff; 4 Division of Family Development staff; 2 who identified their place of employment as “other;” and 1 unknown).

Findings. Survey participants acknowledged that the risk assessment tool should consider multiple types of abuse. In response to this, the research team chose to make the risk assessment tool comprehensive by covering all forms of domestic violence (psychological, financial, physical, and sexual, along with stalking). Findings from the survey are described thoroughly in the Phase 2 Report.

Risk Assessment Literature Review

Methods. Finally, a comprehensive review of the risk assessment literature was completed. The overarching goal of this literature review was to report on existing risk assessments utilized by domestic violence providers across the U.S, and the world. Though no risk assessments for survivors seeking or receiving welfare were found, we included general risk assessments used with survivors or perpetrators in varied settings. Thus, the following questions guided the literature review: 1) What is theoretically/empirically known about existing risk assessments used by domestic violence organizations? 2) How is risk assessed in other similar contexts? 3) How do existing risk assessments capture multiple forms of violence? and 4) What outcomes are associated with different approaches to risk assessments?

With these questions in mind, the research team systematically reviewed academic databases of relevant disciplines (i.e. social work, public policy, psychology, public health, criminology) using a series of predetermined key words. Examples of key words utilized for the search include “risk assessment,” “welfare,” “Family Violence Option,” “TANF,” “domestic violence,” “public assistance,” and “waivers.” The research team saved all articles relevant to the study and reviewed them for key information. This included a review of over 45 academic articles ranging from the medical, judicial, and social work fields, as well as screening tools, referral forms, evaluations, actuarial and unstructured assessments in New Jersey, the United States, and internationally. The risk assessments found and reviewed were mostly perpetrator focused, including such assessments as the Domestic Violence Screening Instrument (DVSI), and B-SAFER (Brief Spousal Form for Evaluation of Risk), with minimal domestic violence survivor oriented risk assessments. However, several scales with a focus on domestic violence assessment were also reviewed.

³ A detailed description of the methods and findings from this phase are described thoroughly in Phase 2 Report.

Findings. Findings from the risk assessment review suggest that existing unstructured clinical assessments aligned with the purpose of assessments in the TANF context, but lacked validity and reliability. Additionally, while existing actuarial assessments demonstrated validity, such tools were less practical in the context of domestic violence risk assessments related to welfare and the FVO. Most existing risk assessments focused on predicting re-assault, severe violence, or lethal violence committed by perpetrators. The most common intended user population was criminal justice, assuming access to criminal records or access to medical records. There was no valid or reliable existing risk assessments developed as part of the FVO process. One of the only fully developed survivor-focused risk assessments found was the Taiwan Intimate Partner Violence Danger Assessment (TIPVDA). This tool assesses lethal danger and identifies intervention strategies (Wang, 2014). Existing scales on domestic violence capture multiple forms of violence; however, there is no existing comprehensive risk assessment from a domestic violence survivor perspective that is also related to welfare determinations. Also, because of the perpetrator focus of most of the developed risk assessment tools, assessing outcomes for survivors through existing risk assessments was challenging.

Initial Risk Assessment Tool Content

Based on the information gathered from the literature, focus groups, and surveys, we reviewed existing tools and validated measures used with domestic violence survivors and/or perpetrators. We examined each item or question in these tools or measurements to determine if suitable for use in the FVO risk assessment process. We also looked for how best to synthesize measures into consistent categories of abuse, partner risk and access, and impact of abuse. For example, we used questions from several validated scales (The Abusive Behavior Inventory and the Abusive Behavior Inventory-Revised) and a risk assessment tool to measure physical abuse. The ABI and the ABI-R asked for answers on the frequency of abuse with 0 being never, 1 being rarely, 2 being occasionally, 3 being often, and 4 as often. However, the questions on physical abuse from the risk assessment provide dichotomous or yes and no answers; however, the questions were very similar if not exactly asked the same way. Hence, when reviewing the instruments on physical abuse together, we decided to leave some with scale answers (0-4) and some with yes/no answers.

We followed this synthesis of scales and risk assessment tools for every category of abuse. In other areas of the risk assessment tool, we created new questions based on feedback from the focus groups and surveys. Finally, in the section on impact of abuse, we kept the validated measures as is. For each section, we included open-ended questions at the end to allow for further delving into topics when needed. We then determined how best to score the results based on categories of risk and impact.

In the end, we created six sections including: 1) Demographics; 2) Abuse Experiences (including psychological, financial, physical, stalking, and sexual abuse); 3) Partner Access; 4) Partner Risk; 5) Perceptions of Safety; and 6) Emotional Health. The initial risk assessment tool that was developed for piloting contained 131 questions throughout six sections and took between 45 minutes to an hour to complete. A second document, the waiver granting guide, was developed to supplement the risk assessment tool and assist with the scoring of the tool and the determination of which waivers should be recommended. In this section, we will present an

overview of the initial risk assessment tool. A copy of the pilot risk assessment tool can be found in Appendix A.

Section I. Demographics. The demographics section contained five questions. The responses to these questions did not go toward scoring, but were included as to help the risk assessor reflect on the impact these demographics may have on clients seeking waivers as part of the FVO. Questions in the demographics section asked about ethnicity, age, number of children the client is financially responsible for, and highest level of education.

Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 1. This section asked the client about their experiences with psychological abuse and is based on the validated *Danger Assessment* (Campbell, Webster, & Glass, 2009) and the *Abusive Behavior Inventory* (Shepard & Campbell, 1992; Postmus, Stylianou, & McMahon, 2016). Clients were asked to estimate how often the listed behaviors occurred in their relationship during the past six months by indicating whether the behavior occurred *never, rarely, occasionally, often, or very often*. Examples of questions in this section included “Called you a name and/or criticized you” and “Said things to scare you (i.e. told you ‘something bad’ would happen).” Overall, 11 items came from the 30-item *Abusive Behavior Inventory* and two items came from the 19-item *Danger Assessment*.

Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 2. This section asked the client about their experiences with financial abuse and is based on the validated *Scale of Economic Abuse 12 (SEA-12)* (Postmus, Plummer, & Stylianou, 2016) and the *Financial Strain Survey* (Aldana & Liljenquist, 1998; Hetling, Stylianou, & Postmus, 2016). Clients were asked to estimate how often the listed behaviors occurred in their relationship during the past six months by indicating whether the behavior occurred *never, rarely, occasionally, often, or very often*. Examples of questions in this section included “Demanded to know how money was spent” and “Spent money you needed for rent or other bills.” All 12 items from the *Scale of Economic Abuse-12* were asked, along with three items developed by the research team for the purpose of the risk assessment tool.

Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 3. This section asked the client about their experiences with physical abuse and is based on the validated *Danger Assessment* (Campbell, Webster, & Glass, 2009) and the *Abusive Behavior Inventory* (Shepard & Campbell, 1992; Postmus, Stylianou, & McMahon, 2016). Clients were asked to estimate how often the listed behaviors occurred in their relationship during the past six months by indicating whether the behavior occurred *never, rarely, occasionally, often, or very often*. Examples of questions in this section include “Threatened to hit or throw something at you” and “Choked or strangled you.” Overall, nine items were adapted from the *Abusive Behavior Inventory* and five items were adapted from the *Danger Assessment*. Two items were developed by the research team for the purpose of the risk assessment tool.

Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 4. This section asked the client about their experiences with stalking and is based on questions from the *National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey* (U.S. Department of Justice, 2014). Clients were asked to estimate how often the listed behaviors occurred in their relationship during the past six months by indicating whether the behavior occurred *never, rarely, occasionally, often, or very often*. Examples of questions in this section include “Made unwanted phone calls to your or left you messages (i.e. hang-ups, text or

voice messages” and “Left you strange or potentially threatening items for you to find.” All seven items came from the *National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey*.

Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 5. This section asked the client about their experiences with sexual abuse and is based on questions from the *Severity of Violence Against Women Scale (SVAWS)* (Marshall, 1992; Thompson, Basile, Hertz, & Sitterle, 2006) and the *Abusive Behavior Inventory* (Shepard & Campbell, 1992; Postmus, Stylianou, & McMahon, 2016). Clients were asked to estimate how often the listed behaviors occurred in their relationship during the past six months by indicating whether the behavior occurred *never, rarely, occasionally, often, or very often*. Examples of questions in this section include “Demanded sex whether you wanted it or not” and “Made you have oral sex against your will.” Overall, three items came from the *Abusive Behavior Inventory* and two items came from the *Severity of Violence Against Women Scale*.

Section II ends with an open-ended question that provided the client with the opportunity to share any additional information that was not captured by the previous scored questions about experiences of abuse. This information was intended to help in final considerations of waivers.

Section III. Partner Access. This section was designed to gauge the level of access the abuser has to the client. There were generally *yes* or *no* questions that centered on current relationship status, abusers current residence, and restraining order status. These questions were developed in response to feedback received during focus groups. The questions in this section did not go towards the clients score on the waiver granting guide, rather this information was intended to help in final considerations of waivers. Examples of questions in this section include “Is your abuser currently in jail?” and “Have you ever had a restraining order against your partner?”

Section IV. Partner Risk. This section looked at factors associated with abusers level of lethality in domestic violence situations and asked questions from the validated *Danger Assessment* (Campbell, Webster, & Glass, 2009). Clients were asked to respond *yes* or *no* to questions regarding their abusers’ behaviors during the past six months. The questions in this section did not go towards the clients score on the waiver granting guide, rather this information was intended to help in final considerations of waivers. Examples of questions in this section include “Has your partner ever threatened or tried to commit suicide?” and “Is your partner an alcoholic or problem drinker?” All three items came from the *Danger Assessment*.

Section V. Perceptions of Safety. This section looked at clients perceptions of safety within their communities, particularly in relation to fear of their abusers, and is based on questions from the *Safety Rating Scale* (Culbertson, Vik, & Kooiman, 2001) and the *Violence Against Women Survey* (Macmillan, Nierobisz, & Welsh, 2000). Clients were asked to indicate whether they felt *always safe, often safe, sometimes safe, rarely safe, or not safe at all* in a series of situations. The questions in this section did not go towards the clients score on the waiver granting guide, rather this information was intended to help in final considerations of waivers. Examples of questions in this section include “How safe do you feel in your home?” and “How safe do you feel while at a mall or shopping center?” While there was some overlap between the between the two surveys, approximately seven items came from the *Safety Rating Scale* and two came from the *Violence Against Women Survey*. The remaining six items were adapted for the risk assessment tool.

Section VI. Emotional Health Part 1. This section asked the client about feelings and behaviors associated with depression and the questions came from the validated *Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression (CESD) Scale* (Radloff, 1977). Clients were asked to indicate how often they experienced the listed feelings and behaviors during the past two weeks by indicating whether the feelings or behaviors occurred *not at all, several days, more than half of days, or nearly every day*. These questions were not intended to be used for diagnostic purposes but rather to gauge the emotional impact of the clients' abuse experiences. Examples of questions in this section include "Felt bothered by things that usually don't bother you" and "Felt that everything you did was an effort." All 20 items from the *Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression* scale were asked.

Section VI. Emotional Health Part 2. This section asked the client about feelings and behaviors associated with anxiety and the questions came from the validated *Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7* (Spitzer, Kroenke, Williams, & Lowe, 2006). Clients were asked to indicate how often they experienced the listed feelings and behaviors during the past two weeks by indicating whether the feelings or behaviors occurred *not at all, several days, more than half of days, or nearly every day*. These questions were not intended to be used for diagnostic purposes but rather to gauge the emotional impact of the clients' abuse experiences. Examples of questions in this section include "Feeling nervous, anxious, or on edge" and "Worrying too much about different things." All seven items from the *Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7* scale were asked.

Section VI. Emotional Health Part 3. This section asked the client about feelings and behaviors associated with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and the questions came from the validated *PTSD-8: A Short PTSD Inventory* (Hansen et al., 2010). Clients were asked to indicate how often they experienced the listed feelings and behaviors during the past two weeks by indicating whether the feelings or behaviors occurred *not at all, several days, more than half of days, or nearly every day*. Symptoms referenced in this scale fell into one of three categories, intrusion (four items), avoidance (two items), and hypervigilance (two items). Participants needed to experience at least one symptom from each category for *more than half of days* or greater to meet the criteria for PTSD. These questions were not intended to be used for diagnostic purposes but rather to gauge the emotional impact of the clients' abuse experiences. Examples of questions in this section include "Recurrent thoughts or memories of abuse" and "Avoiding activities that remind you of the abuse." All eight items from *PTSD-8: A Short PTSD Inventory* scale were asked.

Section VI. Emotional Health Part 4. This section asked the client about feelings and behaviors associated with substance use and the questions came from the validated scale *The CAGE Questionnaire* (Ewing, 1984). Clients were asked to respond *yes* or *no* to whether they experienced the listed feelings and behaviors during the past two weeks. These questions were not intended to be used for diagnostic purposes but rather to gauge the emotional impact of the clients' abuse experiences. Examples of questions in this section include "Have you ever felt you ought to cut down on your drinking or drug use?" and "Have you felt bad or guilty about your drinking or drug use?" All four items from the *CAGE Questionnaire* were asked.

Section VI ends with an open-ended that provided the client with the opportunity to share any additional information that was not captured by the previous scored questions about how the

clients' emotional health has affected their daily activities. This information was intended to help in final considerations of waivers.

Question 129 asked the client to share any additional information that was not captured by the previous scored questions about life generated risk factors. This information was intended to help in final considerations of waivers.

Question 130 provided the client an opportunity to indicate if they are interested in receiving any particular services if they are eligible for them. Examples of services suggested include "Emergency Assistance (e.g. Housing or Utility Assistance)" and "Mental Health Assessment and/or Services."

Question 131 provided the risk assessors an opportunity to note any comments/observations about the client and/or the risk assessment that were not recorded elsewhere.

Waiver Granting Guide Scoring and Revised Form 115

To accompany the risk assessment tool, the research team created a waiver granting guide and revised the existing DFD Form 115 to match the new waiver recommendations. The waiver granting guide utilizes the scores from each section of the Risk Assessment Tool to provide guidance in assessing levels of overall risk and impact and matching those to specific waivers. Following each section of the risk assessment tool, the risk assessors were provided space to tally the score for each section. This was completed by adding the cumulative scores in each column and documenting the cumulative score at the bottom. At the conclusion of the risk assessment, risk assessors used the waiver granting guide to determine the client's weighted score, overall level of risk, and which waivers to suggest be granted. A copy of the pilot risk assessment tool can be found in Appendix B.

Section II. Abuse Experiences Scoring. The majority of the questions in Section II – Abuse Experiences – ranged from 0 (Never) to 4 (Very often). However, when the risk assessment tool was developed, the research team felt that some items were more severe than others and thus scoring should reflect this. For example, the questions "Threatened you with a knife, gun, or other weapon" and "Physically attacked the sexual parts of your body" were modified to have binary scoring to reflect the severity of these forms of violence. For this reason, a weighted scoring system was developed. Questions that the research team wished to have weighted were made into Yes (4) or No (0) questions, so that participants who answered yes to them received all possible points. The research team determined which questions should be weighted through a combination of professional experience working in the field of domestic violence, as well as evidence from the literature regarding known risk factors associated with domestic violence lethality.

Further, the research team recognized that certain types of abuse (i.e. physical) pose a greater risk for a survivor in terms of likelihood of future injury and health-associated impacts. Therefore, on the waiver granting guide certain sections of the risk assessment tool are weighted greater than others are. As such, survivors receive a greater risk level score for having

experienced physical, stalking, and sexual abuse in comparison to psychological and financial abuse.

At the conclusion of this section, the waiver granting guide presents waiver guidelines based on risk. This allowed risk assessors to use the overall risk level score to determine their client's cumulative risk level. Each cumulative risk level was associated with a waiver granting recommendation. Thus, a low cumulative risk score was associated with no waivers and a high cumulative risk score was associated with all waivers. For moderate scoring clients, which waivers to grant was made at the discretion of the risk assessor. Section III. Partner Access, Section IV. Partner Risk, and Section V. Perceptions of Safety were used by risk assessors to consider clients level of risk and waiver needs. Lastly, it was recommended by the research team that if a client scored high for financial abuse, risk assessors waive work activities.

Section III. Partner Access Scoring. All of the questions in Section III – Partner Access – were dichotomous, meaning that participants could either answer Yes (4) or No (0). While the risk assessors scored this section using the waiver granting guide, the partner access score was not included in the determination of waivers. Rather, the score was used by risk assessors to consider which waivers to recommend for clients who fell into the moderate risk level range.

Section IV. Partner Risk Scoring. All of the questions in Section IV – Partner Risk – were dichotomous, meaning that participants could either answer Yes (4) or No (0). While the risk assessors scored this section using the waiver granting guide, the partner risk level score was not included in the determination of waivers. Rather, the score was used by risk assessors to consider which waivers to recommend for clients who fell into the moderate risk level range.

Section V. Perceptions of Safety. All of the questions in Section V – Perceptions of Safety – ranged from 0 (Always safe) to 4 (Not safe at all). While the risk assessors scored this section using the waiver granting guide, the perceptions of safety score was not included in the determination of waivers. Rather, the score was used by risk assessors to consider which waivers to recommend for clients who fell into the moderate risk level range.

Section VI. Emotional Health Scoring. The majority of the questions in Section VI – Emotional Health – ranged from 0 (Not at all) to 4 (Nearly every day). For the scale which looked at depression, an individual needed to receive a score of 15 to 21 to be categorized as having mild to moderate depression; a score greater than 21 was clinically significant and suggested the possibility of major depression.

For the scale which looked at anxiety, an individual needed to receive a score from 1 to 7 to be categorized as having mild to moderate anxiety; a score greater than 7 was clinically significant and suggested the possibility of generalized anxiety disorder.

The scale that looked at Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) had a slightly more complex scoring mechanism as part of the risk assessment. This is consistent with the original scale. In order for an individual to meet the diagnostic criteria for PTSD, an individual must experience symptoms of intrusion (four items), avoidance (two items), and hypervigilance (two items).

Participants were required to experience at least one symptom from each category for more than half of days (2) or greater to meet the criteria of PTSD.

The scale that looked at substance abuse had a binary scoring system with Yes (4) or No (0) questions, consistent with the original scale. An individual needed to answer Yes (4) on each of the four questions in order to be scored as clinically significant for possible alcohol or substance abuse.

At the conclusion of this section, the guide presents waiver guidelines based on impact. This allowed risk assessors to use the overall total impact level score to determine their client's cumulative impact level. Each cumulative impact level was associated with a waiver granting recommendation. Thus, a low cumulative impact score was associated with no recommended waivers and a high cumulative risk score was associated with a recommendation for all waivers with the exception of child support cooperation. For moderate scoring clients, which waivers to recommend was made at the discretion of the risk assessor. Section III. Partner Access, Section IV. Partner Risk, and Section V. Perceptions of Safety were used by risk assessors to consider clients level of risk and waiver needs.

Risk Assessment Piloting Process

Selection of Counties

Four counties were selected to pilot the risk assessment tool: Camden, Mercer, Union, and Ocean. These counties were selected based on the number of focus group participants representing each county, the number of risk assessments conducted during a one-quarter period, and diversity in the location and population of the county.

Risk Assessment Tool Training

Each county that agreed to participate in the pilot received a three-hour training on the risk assessment tool. Jordan Steiner, a graduate research assistant and doctoral student on the research team, and Laura Johnson, M.S.W., a doctoral candidate and the coordinator the project, conducted the training. A PowerPoint was made to accompany the presentation. In addition, each participant received a folder that included:

- a copy of the risk assessment tool,
- the waiver granting guide,
- the revised Form 115,
- a manual which provided directions on how to conduct the risk assessment tool,
- an agenda, and
- an evaluation form.

Participants were also provided with Ms. Johnson's business card so that they could reach out to her directly with any questions they had. Each county received fifty copies of the risk assessment tool, waiver granting guide, and Form 115. In addition, five laminated copies of the client version of the risk assessment tool were provided to each county. This enabled clients to follow

along with the risk assessors throughout the assessment. Lastly, each county was provided two reams of computer paper to support their participation in the pilot.

The training began with an introduction of the members of the research team. Ms. Steiner and Ms. Johnson then explained the objectives of the “Assessing Domestic Violence under the Family Violence Option” project with a focus on the role that domestic violence risk assessors would be playing in the piloting process.

An overview of the risk assessment tool was presented, beginning with the materials that informed the creation of the risk assessment tool. This information provided individuals with an opportunity to see how their participation in the focus groups and survey informed the first draft of the risk assessment tool. Ms. Steiner and Ms. Johnson then presented each section of the risk assessment tool in detail, reviewing each question, the response options, and the validated scale that informed the inclusion of the question, scoring, and clarifying any ambiguities within the section.

After the risk assessment tool was reviewed, Ms. Steiner and Ms. Johnson reviewed the waiver granting guide. This included the process of converting the client’s total score to a weighted risk level score. The waiver guidelines were also discussed. At the conclusion of the training, participants were provided with a practice scenario and asked to role play the risk assessment process with a partner. After the role play, which lasted approximately one hour, the audience had an opportunity to ask questions related to the risk assessment process.

Overall, feedback received from the domestic violence risk assessors and county welfare agency staff members regarding the training was positive. Risk assessors noted that the training was comprehensive and prepared them well for conducting the risk assessments. Further, the role play activity was useful for practicing the risk assessment process. Both the risk assessors and the county welfare agency staff also appreciated the opportunity they had to come together to discuss the FVO process, as well as receive clarification on aspects of the FVO process that were more ambiguous.

Data Collection

The new risk assessment tools were piloted in the four counties between June and December 2016. All human subjects-related elements of this research project were approved by the Rutgers University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects.

Risk Assessment Tools and Waiver Granting Guides. Risk assessors were asked to make a photocopy of each completed risk assessment tool and waiver granting guide. The photocopies were placed in envelopes provided by the research team. Approximately, once per month a member of the research team picked up the photocopies in person. For confidentiality purposes, no names were associated with the risk assessments. The overall goal was to collect 40 risk assessments from each county so that the research team had a minimum of 150 risk assessment tools for analysis. Overall, 237 risk assessments were collected, ranging from a minimum of 19 to a maximum of 91 in each county.

Informal Risk Assessor Feedback. Feedback from the risk assessors was ongoing throughout the piloting process. Risk assessors provided feedback on the actual risk assessments, particularly when the feedback was question specific. They also had the opportunity to provide feedback verbally during monthly in-person meetings when a member of the research team came to pick up the risk assessment copies, as well by phone. Risk assessors were also able to provide feedback via email. An area of concern that came up almost immediately was that there was no Spanish-translated risk assessment tool available. In response to this feedback, DFD contracted with a translator to have the risk assessment tool translated into Spanish.

For more comprehensive risk assessor feedback, a meeting was scheduled with risk assessors from each county to hear about what elements of the risk assessment tool and waiver granting guide were working for them, as well as any suggested improvements they had. The majority of the risk assessors had worked in the field of domestic violence for a minimum of three years and had an advanced degree related to social services (e.g. Master of Social Work). Because of their strong professional experience with this population, the feedback provided was invaluable. Feedback included suggestions on how to reword sentences, ways to improve the ordering of questions, and how to clarify scoring on the waiver granting guide.

Formal Client Feedback. To recruit clients to participate in a one hour interview regarding their opinion of the risk assessment tool, flyers were developed and forwarded to each county. The risk assessors were asked to provide flyers to their clients at the conclusion of their risk assessments. Clients were instructed to call the project's coordinator to schedule an interview if they were interested. A \$40 incentive was made available for those clients interested in participating. Because this method was unsuccessful in recruiting clients to participate, an alternate method of recruitment was developed. The project coordinator spoke with a representative from each domestic violence organization and scheduled one specific day in which clients would be invited to participate in an interview. The purpose of scheduling one specific day per county was that it enabled the organizations to arrange for child care to be available during that time. Because of this recruitment method, two clients were interviewed.

Results

Analysis Conducted to Inform the Revision and Finalization of the Tools

Risk Assessor Feedback. Risk assessor feedback was not formally analyzed. However, feedback from the risk assessors was documented and then reviewed for common themes and specific recommendations. In instances where a particular recommendation was heard multiple times, or when a specific and meaningful change was suggested, these modifications were made directly to the risk assessment tool.

Client Feedback. Similar to risk assessor feedback, client feedback was not formally analyzed. However, feedback from clients was documented and then reviewed for common themes and specific recommendations. In instances where a particular recommendation was heard more than once, or when a specific and meaningful change was suggested, these modifications were made directly to the risk assessment tool.

Risk Assessment Tools and Waiver Granting Guides. The risk assessment tool and waiver granting guide were analyzed using multiple methods, including descriptive analyses and principal component analysis. Principal component analysis is a type of statistical technique that identifies patterns within a dataset with the goal of finding the variables with the most explanatory power. The results can be used to understand whether any items within a particular scale can be removed, thus reducing the size of the scale without significantly decreasing the amount of variance it can explain. In the next section, descriptive results will be presented, followed by the results of the principal component analyses. Incorporated in these findings will be a summary of the results influenced revisions made to the pilot risk assessment tool.

Appendix C presents an overview of all changes made to the piloted risk assessment tool, as well as the source of information that inspired the revision. In this section, results from the risk assessment tool data analysis will be presented.

Descriptive Results

Descriptive analyses were conducted on all items included in the risk assessment tool. Depending on the nature of the question frequencies, means, or both were included. The most frequent response on each item is bolded.

Participant Characteristics. Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of participants from the pilot study. Overall, almost three quarters of the risk assessments completed during the pilot study were new risk assessments. Similarly, three quarters of participants identified their abuser as a former partner; almost twenty percent (16.5%) identified their abuser as a current partner. The majority of participants identified as either Black or African American (40.3%) or White, non-Hispanic (30.5%). Half of participants were between the ages of 26 and 35 and 87 percent were responsible for at least one child if not more. Almost 40 percent of participants had earned their high school diploma or GED while another 40 percent attended some college or graduated with a college degree.

Table 1. Demographics

	Item	Total #	Percentage
1	Is this a:		
	New risk assessment	171	73.1
	Re-assessment	63	26.9
2	What is your current relationship to your abuser?		
	Current partner	39	16.5
	Former partner	179	75.5
	Family member	10	4.2
	Other	9	3.8
3	Which of the following ethnic groups best describes you?		
	White, non-Hispanic	72	30.5
	Black or African American, non-Hispanic	95	40.1
	Hispanic or Latina	8	3.4
	Asian	39	16.5
	Multi-ethnic	1	.4
	Other	21	8.9
4	Which age group do you belong to?		
	Less than 25	54	23.1
	26 – 35	116	49.6
	36 – 45	46	19.7
	46 or older	18	7.7
5	How many children are you financially responsible for?		
	None	32	13.5
	1 or 2	144	60.8
	3 or 4	49	20.7
	5 or more	11	4.6
6	What your highest level of education?		
	Less than high school	52	22.3
	High school graduate or GED	89	38.2
	Some college or college graduate	92	39.5

Emotional Abuse Scale. Table 2 presents participants experiences with emotional abuse. The scale ranged from 0 (Never or N/A) to 4 (Very Often). Two items (questions 12 and 13) were binary (Yes/No). Overall, the majority of participants indicated that their abusers were “violently and constantly jealous” of them (85 percent) and that their abusers “controlled most or all of [their] daily activities” (61 percent). Further, almost half of participants responded “Very Often” to the items “called you a name and/or criticized you” (49 percent), “put down your friends and family” (46 percent) and “said things to scare you” (48 percent).

Table 2. Emotional Abuse Scale Descriptives

Item	Percentage					Total Mean
	0 %	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	
1. Called you a name and/or criticized you.	11.54	1.71	8.97	29.06	48.72	3.02
2. Gave you angry stares or looks.	14.16	4.29	15.45	28.76	37.34	2.71
3. Ended the discussion with you and made the decision themselves.	20.69	4.31	10.34	29.74	34.91	2.54
4. Put down your family and friends.	15.45	4.29	7.30	26.61	46.35	2.84
5. Became very upset with you because dinner, housework, or laundry was not ready when your partner wanted it or done the way it should be.	42.98	11.40	9.65	14.04	21.93	1.61
6. Said things to scare you (i.e. told you something bad would happen).	10.78	4.74	7.76	29.74	46.98	2.97
7. Made you do something humiliating or degrading (i.e. begged for forgiveness, had to ask for permission to use the car or do something).	42.92	7.73	12.45	13.30	23.61	1.67
8. Refused to do housework or childcare.	37.39	3.91	13.48	13.04	32.17	1.99
9. Checked up on you (i.e. listened to your phone calls, checked the mileage on your car, called you repeatedly).	19.74	4.72	9.44	22.32	43.78	2.65
10. Told you that you were a bad parent.	25.76	6.11	13.10	19.65	35.37	2.33
11. Accused you of paying attention to someone or something else.	25.43	2.16	11.21	20.69	40.52	1.62
12. Been violently and constantly jealous of you.	(No) 15.48			(Yes) 84.52		.85
13. Controlled most or all of your daily activities (i.e. told you who you could be friends with, when you could see your family, or when you could take the car).	(No) 38.53			(Yes) 61.47		.61

Financial Abuse Scale. Table 2 presents participants experiences with financial abuse. The scale ranged from 0 (Never or N/A) to 4 (Very Often). Three items (questions 26 through 28) were binary (Yes/No). Overall, participants were least likely to be “beat up” if they needed to go to work ($M=.53$). While the majority of participants had not “gotten in trouble at a job because of the abuse” (68 percent responded “no”) nor “gotten fired from a job because of the abuse” (72 percent responded “no”), half of respondents “missed a day of work because of the abuse.” Over half of participants reported that their abusers “demanded to know how money was spent” (62%) and “kept financial information from [them].”

Table 3. Financial Abuse Scale Descriptives

Item	Percentage					
	0 %	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	Total Mean
14. Done things to keep you from going to your job.	48.21	3.59	9.23	12.82	26.15	1.65
15. Beat you up if you said you needed to go to work.	78.97	4.62	5.64	5.64	5.13	.53
16. Threatened to make you leave work.	65.98	4.64	8.76	8.76	11.86	.96
17. Demanded that you quit your job.	68.39	2.59	5.70	8.29	15.03	.99
18. Made you ask them for money.	45.81	5.29	9.25	13.66	25.99	1.69
19. Demanded to know how money was spent.	32.89	5.26	9.21	14.04	38.60	2.20
20. Demanded that you give them receipts and/or change when you spent money.	54.39	3.95	5.26	14.91	21.49	1.45
21. Kept financial information from you.	34.65	2.63	7.46	18.42	36.84	2.20
22. Made important financial decisions without talking with you.	40.71	3.98	5.75	15.93	33.63	1.98
23. Spent the money you needed for rent or other bills.	40.97	5.29	4.41	15.86	33.48	1.96
24. Build up debt under your name by doing things like using your credit card or running up the phone bill.	62.28	3.51	2.63	11.84	19.74	1.23
25. Paid bills late or not paid bills that were in your name or in both of your names.	51.33	3.10	7.08	12.39	26.11	1.59
26. Gotten in trouble at a job because of the abuse.	(No) 68.06			(Yes) 31.94		
27. Missed a day of work because of the abuse	(No) 50.26			(Yes) 49.74		
28. Gotten fired from a job because of the abuse.	(No) 72.25			(Yes) 27.75		

Physical Abuse Scale. Table 3 presents participants experiences with physical abuse. The scale ranged from 0 (Never or N/A) to 4 (Very Often). Twelve items (questions 33 through 44) were binary (Yes/No). Overall, the majority (67 percent) of participants indicated that their abuser had threatened to kill them. Further, the majority (78 percent) of participants believed that their abuser is capable of killing them. For 65 percent of participants, the severity or frequency of the physical violence they experienced also increased over the past year. Participants indicated that their abuser was least likely to threaten to harm their children (76 percent responded “no”).

Table 3. Physical Abuse Scale Descriptives

Item	Percentage					
	0 %	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	Total Mean
29. Threatened to hit or throw something at you.	29.00	3.46	10.82	23.38	33.33	2.29
30. Threatened to harm your children.	75.66	4.87	7.96	4.87	6.64	.62
31. Threw, hit, kicked or smashed something.	26.20	3.93	12.23	24.02	33.62	2.35
32. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved you.	27.83	8.70	12.78	20.43	28.26	2.13
33. Hit or punched you.	(No) 44.16			(Yes) 55.84		
34. Threatened you with a knife, gun or other weapon.	(No) 67.53			(Yes) 32.47		
35. If yes, was the weapon a gun?	(No) 51.95			(Yes) 48.05		
36. Does your partner have access to a gun?	(No) 65.32			(Yes) 34.68		
37. Used a knife, gun or other weapon against you	(No) 80.09			(Yes) 19.91		
38. If yes, was the weapon a gun?	(No) 69.77			(Yes) 30.23		
39. Has your partner ever threatened to kill you?	(No) 33.04			(Yes) 66.96		
40. Do you believe your partner is capable of killing you?	(No) 21.93			(Yes) 78.07		
41. Kicked you.	(No) 64.50			(Yes) 35.50		
42. Threw you around.	(No) 48.05			(Yes) 51.95		
43. Choked or strangled you.	(No) 59.31			(Yes) 40.69		
44. If you experienced physical violence, has the severity or frequency of the violence increased over the past year?	(No) 34.70			(Yes) 65.30		

Stalking Scale. Table 4 presents participants experiences with physical abuse. The scale ranged from 0 (Never or N/A) to 4 (Very Often). Overall, a third of participants reported that their abuser made unwanted phone calls or left messages very often. Half of participants had their abusers approach them or show up in places when they didn't want their abuser to be there. Abusers were least likely to send unwanted emails, instant messages, or messages through websites like Facebook, Snapchat, or Instagram (43 percent answered "Never"). Abusers were also least likely to leave strange or potentially threatening items for the participants to find (85 percent answered "Never").

Table 4. Stalking Scale Descriptives

Items	Percentage					
	0 %	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	Total Mean
45. Made unwanted phone calls to you or left you messages (i.e. hang ups, text or voice messages)	18.38	4.27	18.80	23.93	34.62	2.52
46. Sent you unwanted emails, instant messages, or sent messages through websites like Facebook, Snapchat or Instagram	42.92	5.15	9.44	18.03	24.46	1.76
47. Let you cards, letters, flowers or presents when your partner knew you didn't want them to.	75.00	5.60	6.90	4.31	8.19	.65
48. Watched or followed you from a distance, or spied on you with a listening device, camera, or GPS.	43.42	6.14	12.28	14.47	23.68	1.69
49. Approached you or showed up in places, such as your home, workplace, or school when you didn't want your partner to be there.	36.05	9.01	15.45	16.31	23.18	1.82
50. Left you strange or potentially threatening items for you to find	84.98	3.43	4.29	2.58	4.72	.39
51. Snuck in your home or car and did things to scare you (i.e. by letting you know they had been there)	63.36	9.05	12.50	6.90	8.19	.88

Sexual Abuse Scale. Table 6 presents participants experiences with physical abuse. The scale ranged from 0 (Never or N/A) to 4 (Very Often). Three items (questions 54 through 56) were binary (Yes/No). Almost half of participants (46 percent) indicated their partner demanded sex whether they wanted it or not at least occasionally. Twenty-eight percent of participants indicated that they were physically forced to have sex. Approximately one-fourth of participants were made to have oral sex against their will. Similarly, one-fourth had the sexual parts of their body physically attacked.

Table 6. Sexual Abuse Descriptives

Items	Percentage					
	0 %	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	Total Mean
52. Demanded sex whether you wanted it or not.	46.49	7.89	14.04	12.72	18.86	1.50
53. Pressured you to have sex in a way that you didn't like or want.	57.46	7.02	11.84	10.96	12.72	1.14
54. Made you have oral sex against your will.	(No) 75.44			(Yes) 24.56		
55. Physically forced you to have sex.	(No) 71.93			(Yes) 28.07		
56. Physically attacked the sexual parts of your body.	(No) 76.32			(Yes) 23.68		

Partner Access. Table 7 presents information about the abusers, with a focus on the abusers' access to the participant. Overall, 98 percent of the abusers were alive and only 15 percent were currently in jail. Of those abusers in jail, almost half were going to be in jail for longer than 12 months. Only five percent identified as currently being in a relationship with their abuser. Almost all participants (95 percent) were not currently living with their abuser; 60 percent of the abusers were familiar with where the participants currently lived. Over three-quarters of participants (82 percent) said their abuser could get to them within two hours. Lastly, a little over half (58 percent) of participants had a restraining order against their abuser; however, for those who had a restraining order, three-fifths reported that it had been violated at least once.

Table 7. Partner Access Means and Frequencies

#	Item	% Yes	N
58	Is your partner deceased?	2.1	(n=5)
59	Is your partner currently in jail?	15.3	(n=36)
60	<i>If yes, is your partner going to be in jail for longer than 12 months?</i>	51.9	(n=14)
61	Are you currently in a relationship with the person who did any of the previously discussed behaviors to you?	5.1	(n=12)
62	<i>If no, how long ago did the relationship end?</i>	N/A ¹	
63	Are you currently living with your partner?	4.3	(n=10)
64	<i>If no, does your partner know where you live?</i>	59.0	(n=121)
65	Can your partner get to you within two hours?	82.4	(n=192)
66	Have you ever had a restraining order against your partner?	57.6	(n=136)
67	<i>If yes, did your partner ever violate the restraining order?</i>	61.8	(n=84)

¹Descriptive information on this question is unavailable because participants' responses varied too widely. In response to how long ago the individuals' relationship ended, answers ranged from "this morning" to "228 months [19 years]."

Partner Risk. Table 8 presents additional information about the abusers with a focus on partner risk. About one-third of the abusers threatened to commit suicide at some point in their relationship with the participants. Half of the abusers were identified as an alcoholic or problem drinker and half were reported to use illegal drugs.

Table 8. Partner Risk Means and Frequencies

#	Item	% Yes	N
68	Has your partner ever threatened or tried to commit suicide?	32.6	(n=76)
69	Is your partner an alcoholic or a problem drinker?	50.9	(n=117)
70	Does your partner use illegal drugs? (i.e. "uppers" or amphetamines, "meth", speed, angel dust, cocaine, "crack", street drugs or mixtures)	49.6	(n=114)

Perceptions of Safety. Lastly, Table 9 presents participants reported feelings of safety as a result of their experiences with domestic violence as they travel about their communities. The Perceptions of Safety scale ranged from 0 (Always safe or N/A) to 4 (Not safe at all). Overall, when asked "How physically safe do you feel from your partner today?" participants reported a mean response of 2.17, meaning sometimes safe. Participants generally felt least safe taking

public safety at night (M=2.36) and walking at night (M=2.61). Participants generally reported feeling most safe at their houses of worship (M=.95).

Table 9. Perceptions of Safety – How safe do you feel...(N=237)

#	Item	Mean
71	In your home?	1.92
72	At the grocery store?	1.60
73	While at a mall or shopping center?	1.68
74	While out to eat?	1.64
75	At your job or school?	1.30
76	Taking your child to school or daycare?	1.39
77	Bringing your child to activities outside of their school (i.e. park, athletic games)?	1.54
78	At your places of worship?	.95
79	At social gatherings?	1.73
80	At service providers (i.e. doctors office, clinic, county welfare office)?	1.46
81	Driving or riding in a care during the day?	1.48
82	Driving or riding in a care at night?	1.74
83	Taking public transportation during the day?	2.01
84	Taking public transportation at night?	2.36
85	Walking during the day?	2.02
86	Walking at night?	2.61
67	How physically safe do you feel from your partner today?	2.17

Depression Scale. Table 10 presents participants experiences with depression. The scale ranged from 0 (Not at all) to 3 (Nearly every day). Overall, the depressive symptoms most frequently reported restless sleep (54 percent) and feeling sad (45 percent). The depressive symptoms least often experienced were feeling disliked by others (49 percent responded “Never”) and feeling that people are unfriendly (46 percent responded “Never”).

Table 10. Depression Scale Descriptives

Item	Percentage				
	0 %	1 %	2 %	3 %	Total Mean
89. Felt bothered by things that usually don't bother you,	21.52	21.52	18.14	38.82	1.74
90. Felt like not eating; your appetite was poor.	27.12	19.07	16.10	37.71	1.64
91. Felt that you could not shake off the blues even with the help from your family or friends.	24.26	22.55	19.15	34.04	1.63
92. Felt that you were just as good as other people (reverse coded).	25.64	13.25	23.93	37.18	1.73
93. Had trouble keeping your mind on what you were doing.	16.88	27.00	15.61	40.51	1.80
94. Felt depressed.	18.14	21.10	13.50	47.26	1.90
95. Felt that everything you did was an effort.	20.25	23.63	17.72	38.40	1.74
96. Felt hopeful about the future (reverse coded).	28.69	18.57	27.43	25.32	1.49
97. That your life was a failure.	34.32	22.46	11.86	31.36	1.40
98. Felt fearful.	17.72	21.10	18.14	43.04	1.86
99. Felt your sleep was restless.	10.97	19.41	16.03	53.59	2.12
100. Felt happy (reverse coded).	15.19	21.10	39.24	24.47	1.73
101. Talked less than usual.	30.80	27.85	15.61	25.74	1.36
102. Felt lonely.	25.74	13.08	16.46	44.73	1.80
103. Felt people were unfriendly.	45.76	22.88	11.44	19.92	1.06
104. Enjoyed life (reverse coded).	25.42	16.53	30.51	27.54	1.60
105. Had crying spells.	15.19	23.63	23.63	37.55	1.84
106. Felt sad.	9.28	26.16	19.83	44.73	2.00
107. Felt that people disliked you.	48.95	17.72	13.50	19.83	1.04
108. Felt you could not get "going."	24.89	28.27	14.77	32.07	1.54

Anxiety Scale. Table 11 presents participants experiences with anxiety. The scale ranged from 0 (Not at all) to 3 (Nearly every day). Overall, means on each of the seven anxiety symptoms suggest that participants experienced these symptoms between several days to more than half of days in a two week period. More than half of participants reported not being able to stop or control worrying (56 percent), worrying too much about different things (60 percent), and having trouble relaxing (51 percent) nearly every day in a two week period.

Table 11. Anxiety Scale Descriptives

Item	Percentage				
	0 %	1 %	2 %	3 %	Total Mean
109. Feeling nervous, anxious, or on edge.	11.39	25.74	14.77	48.10	2.00
110. Not being able to stop or control worrying.	10.59	19.49	14.41	55.51	2.15
111. Worrying too much about different things.	8.02	19.83	11.81	60.34	2.24
112. Trouble relaxing.	11.81	19.83	17.72	50.63	2.07
113. Being so restless that it is hard to sit still.	27.43	23.21	13.92	35.44	1.57
114. Becoming easily annoyed or irritable.	21.52	21.10	16.88	40.51	1.76
115. Feeling afraid as if something awful might happen.	14.77	24.89	18.99	41.35	1.87

Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) Scale. Table 12 presents participants experiences with PTSD. The scale ranged from 0 (Not at all) to 3 (Nearly every day). Overall, means on each of the eight PTSD symptoms suggest that participants experienced these symptoms between several days to more than half of days in a two week period. More than half of participants reported feeling on guard (62 percent) nearly every day in a two week period. Almost forty percent of participants reported recurrent thoughts or memories of the abuse (46 percent), sudden emotional or physical reactions when reminded of the abuse (40 percent), avoiding thoughts or feelings associated with the abuse (41 percent) and feeling jumpy, easily started (37 percent) nearly every day in a two week period.

Table 12. Post Traumatic Stress Disorder Scale Descriptives

Item	Percentage				
	0 %	1 %	2 %	3 %	Total Mean
116. Recurrent thoughts or memories of the abuse	9.28	20.68	24.47	45.57	2.06
117. Feeling as though the abuse is happening again	32.63	19.49	17.37	30.51	1.46
118. Recurrent nightmares about the abuse.	35.86	21.94	13.50	28.69	1.35
119. Sudden emotional or physical reactions when reminded of the abuse	16.53	26.27	17.37	39.83	1.81
120. Avoiding activities that remind you of the abuse	30.38	18.57	15.19	35.86	1.57
121. Avoiding thoughts or feelings associated with the abuse.	18.64	19.49	21.19	40.68	1.84
122. Feeling jumpy, easily startled.	27.85	18.99	16.03	37.13	1.62
123. Feeling on guard.	12.66	12.24	13.08	62.03	2.24

Substance Use Scale. Table 13 presents participants experiences with depression. The scale was binary (Yes/No). Overall, only a small percentage of participants responded yes to the four substance abuse questions. Overall, eight percent of participants responded yes to feeling that they out to cut down on their drinking or drug use. Seven percent of participants responded yes to feeling bad or guilty about their drinking or drug use.

Table 13. Substance Use Scale Descriptives

Item		
	% Yes	N
124. Have you felt you ought to cut down on your drinking or drug use?	8.29	17
125. Have people annoyed you by criticizing your drinking or drug use?	3.43	7
126. Have you felt bad or guilty about your drinking or drug use?	6.90	14
127. Have you ever had a drink or used drugs first thing in the morning to steady your nerves or get rid of a hangover?	4.90	10

Principal Component Analysis Results

SPSS was used for the Principal Component Analysis (PCA), which is a multivariate statistical technique used for data reduction. The aim is to identify the most important variables or questions in relationship to an issue and thus enabling the researcher to drop those deemed less important. For example, in order to assess for depression, a complex construct or experience, a scale would need to include many related questions. Each question included in the scale is assumed to make up a component or aspect of depression. Taken together, all 20 items make up 100 percent of the observed variance of the construct of depression in our sample. However, the stronger an item the greater percentage of the variance the item will make up or explain. Conversely, a weak item will make up only a small percentage of variance. *Total variance explained* is one of the outputs reviewed as part of PCA to determine whether items can be reduced without decreasing our explanation of variance on a particular component. From a research standpoint, the components that explain between 60 to 70 percent of the total variance should be retained. Given the practical use of the proposed tool, the research team felt a higher cutoff was needed. Since the tool is designed to correctly identify individual experiences and not be correct on average, the team made sure that the variables retained explained at least 90 percent of the total variance.

The second output reviewed as part of the PCA was a *correlation matrix*. A correlation matrix measures the direction and strength of two items. For purposes of our analysis, the research team was looking to identify variables that were very highly correlated. Two variables are highly correlated when they are measuring the same idea and thus the inclusion of both variables or questions are deemed redundant. When interpreting the correlation coefficients, the research team used the following guidelines: $\pm .90$ to ± 1.0 indicated a very high correlation, $\pm .7$ to $\pm .9$ indicated a high correlation, and $\pm .5$ to $\pm .7$ indicated a moderate correlation. A general rule is that correlation coefficients around $\pm .8$ or higher may suggest multicollinearity (too much similarity between two items).

Lastly, the output of *rotated component matrix* demonstrates the loadings, or correlations between the variables and each of the components. The component matrix illustrates which of the individual variables are most related to the components underlying the concept being measured. Commonly correlations of less than 0.3 or 0.4 are seen as insignificant. The results of the rotated component matrix assist the researcher in knowing which variables are the least important or most unrelated to the concept of interest.

To determine whether items can be reduced from a scale, it is necessary to look collectively at the total variance explained, the correlations, and the strength of individual loadings on each component. In this section, we present component matrices for each scale analyzed.

Emotional Abuse Scale. For the Emotional Abuse Scale (see table 14), examining the total variance explained showed Component 1 made up the largest percent of variance. The cumulative percentage of the first and second component was 56 percent, indicating the importance of retaining variables in order to maintain the explanatory power of the scale. Examining the correlation matrix, no questions were highly correlated. In the component matrix, questions 8 and 10 had the lowest positive component loadings, out of those two components extracted. Taken together, these findings suggested that the items in the scale were strong and thus none were removed.

Table 14. Emotional Abuse Scale Component Matrix

Item	Component	
	1	2
1. Called you a name, and or criticized you.	.764	.310
2. Gave you angry stares or looks.	.711	.246
3. Ended the discussion with you and made the decision themselves.	.784	.073
4. Put down your family and friends.	.694	.305
5. Became very upset with you because dinner, housework, or laundry was not ready when your partner wanted it or done the way it should be.	.713	-.144
6. Said things to scare you (i.e. told you something bad would happen)	.764	.286
7. Made you do something humiliating or degrading (i.e. begged for forgiveness, had to ask for permission to use the car or do something)	.674	-.091
8. Refused to do housework or childcare.	.636	-.065
9. Checked up on you (i.e. listened to your phone calls, checked the mileage on your car, called you repeatedly).	.699	-.079
10. Told you that you were a bad parent.	.467	.455
11. Accused you of paying attention to someone or something else.	.734	-.350
12. Been violently and constantly jealous of you.	.617	-.525

13. Controlled most or all of your daily activities (i.e. told you who you could be friends with, when you could see your family, or when you could take the car).	.658	-.411
--	------	-------

Financial Abuse Scale. For the Financial Abuse Scale (see table 15), examining the total variance explained demonstrated Component 1 made up the largest percent of variance. The cumulative percentage of the first, second, and third components together was 66 percent. Examining the correlation matrix, questions 19 and 20 had a high positive correlation at .745. As a result, these two questions were merged: “Demanded to know how money was spent” and “Demanded that you give them receipts and/or change when you spent money.” The question was changed to “Demanded to know how money was spent (for example, demanded that you give them receipts.)” The component matrix illustrated that there were no items of concern.

Table 15. Financial Abuse Scale Component Matrix

Item	Component		
	1	2	3
14. Done things to keep you from going to your job.	.728	.357	-.126
15. Beat you up if you said you needed to go to work	.545	.386	.20
16. Threatened to make you leave work	.682	.425	.129
17. Demanded that you quit your job.	.686	.379	-.049
18. Made you ask them for money.	.698	-.201	-.318
19. Demanded to know how money was spent	.773	-.248	-.302
20. Demanded that you give them receipts and/or change when you spent money.	.725	-.246	-.399
21. Kept financial information from you	.781	-.375	-.092
22. Made important financial decisions without talking with you.	.774	-.366	-.055
23. Spent the money you needed for rent or other bills	.746	-.352	.050
24. Build up debt under your name by doing things like using your credit card or running up the phone bill.	.549	-.287	.61
25. Paid bills late or not paid bills that were in your name or in both of your names.	.570	-.464	.509
26. Gotten in trouble at a job because of the abuse	.622	.364	.007
27. Missed a day of work because of the abuse	.668	.422	.047
28. Gotten fired from a job because of the abuse.	.647	.375	.126

Physical Abuse Scale. For the Physical Abuse Scale (see table 16), examining the total variance explained showed Component 1 made up the largest percent of variance. The cumulative percentage of the first, second and third components was 59 percent. On the correlation matrix,

questions 42 and 43 had a high positive correlation at .750. As a result, question 42, "Threw you around" was removed. The component matrix illustrated that there were no items of concern.

Table 16. Physical Abuse Scale Component Matrix

Item	Component	
	1	2
29. Threatened to hit or throw something at you.	.750	-.152
30. Threatened to harm your children.	.319	.331
31. Threw, hit, kicked or smashed something.	.701	-.237
32. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved you.	.821	-.336
33. Hit or punched you.	.758	-.419
34. Threatened you with a knife, gun or other weapon.	.589	.588
35. If yes, was the weapon a gun?	.441	.641
36. Does your partner have access to a gun?	.392	.593
37. Used a knife, gun or other weapon against you	.599	.272
38. If yes, was the weapon a gun?	.487	.378
39. Has your partner ever threatened to kill you?	.428	.317
40. Do you believe your partner is capable of killing you?	.356	.323
41. Kicked you.	.721	-.183
42. Threw you around.	.753	-.417
43. Chocked or strangled you.	.728	-.334
44. If you experienced physical violence, has the severity or frequency of the violence increased over the past year?	-.349	.007

Stalking Scale. For the Stalking Scale (see table 17), examining the total variance explained showed Component 1 made up the largest percent of variance. The cumulative percentage of the first and second components was 56 percent. Examining the correlation matrix, no questions were highly correlated. They are all at the moderate level or below. However, on the component matrix, question 47 had the lowest positive loading on Component 1, meaning that the question did not contribute to the scale. As a result, this question, "Left you cards, letters, flowers, or presents when you abuser knew you didn't want them" was removed.

Table 17. Stalking Scale Component Matrix

Items	Component	
	1	2
45. Made unwanted phone calls to you or left you messages (i.e. hang ups, text or voice messages)	.710	-.457
46. Sent you unwanted emails, instant messages, or sent messages through websites like Facebook, Snapchat or Instagram	.602	-.564
47. Let you cards, letters, flowers or presents when your partner knew you didn't want them to.	.418	-.241
48. Watched or followed you from a distance, or spied on you with a listening device, camera, or GPS.	.768	.228
49. Approached you or showed up in places, such as your home, workplace, or school when you didn't want your partner to be there.	.808	.155
50. Left you strange or potentially threatening items for you to find	.446	.500
51. Snuck in your home or car and did things to scare you (i.e. by letting you know they had been there)	.629	.384

Sexual Abuse Scale. For the Sexual Abuse Scale (see table 18), examining the total variance explained showed Component 1 made up the largest percent of variance, with a cumulative percentage of at 69 percent. On the correlation matrix, questions 52 and 53 have high positive correlation at .767. Additionally, on the component matrix, question 53 had very high positive loading on Component 1, thus capturing a significant amount of this component. Therefore, question 52, "Demanded sex whether you wanted it or not" and question 53, "Pressured you to have sex in a way that you didn't like or want" was changed to, "Pressured you to have sex when you didn't want to or in a way that you didn't like or want."

Table 18. Sexual Abuse Scale Component Matrix

Items	Component
	1
52. Demanded sex whether you wanted it or not.	.819
53. Pressured you to have sex in a way that you didn't like or want.	.915
54. Made you have oral sex against your will.	.817
55. Physically forced you to have sex.	.850
56. Physically attacked the sexual parts of your body.	.729

Access and Risk Questions. The Access and Risk questions were not full scales; therefore, PCA was not an appropriate method of analysis.

Perceptions of Safety Scale. For the Perceptions of Safety Scale, a PCA was run, but only half the sample size was retained due to missing values. In addition, it was not a full valid or reliable scale. Therefore, the results of the PCA were reviewed with caution.

Depression Scale. The original Depression Scale included 20 questions (Radloff 1977) and is a reliable and valid scale used with a number of populations including domestic violence survivors. However, the risk assessors requested a different scale with fewer questions; hence we replaced the original depression scale with a ten-item validated and reliable scale (Van Dam & Earleywine, 2011) based on qualitative feedback from the risk assessors. Therefore, a PCA was not run on this scale.

Anxiety Scale. For the Anxiety Scale (see table 19), examining the total variance explained showed Component 1 made up the largest percent of variance, with a cumulative percentage of 63 percent. Examining the correlation matrix, Question 110 and 111 had high positive correlation at .764. Therefore, Question 110, "Not being able to stop or control worrying" was removed, as it was too highly correlated with Question 111, "Worrying too much about different things. On the component matrix, all of the questions held together well; all load well on primary Component 1.

Table 19. Anxiety Scale Component Matrix

Item	Component
	1
109. Feeling nervous, anxious, or on edge.	.827
110. Not being able to stop or control worrying.	.841
111. Worrying too much about different things.	.812
112. Trouble relaxing.	.864
113. Being so restless that it is hard to sit still.	.746
114. Becoming easily annoyed or irritable.	.695
115. Feeling afraid as if something awful might happen.	.749

Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) Scale. For the PTSD Scale (table 20), examining the total variance explained showed Component 1 made up the largest percent of variance, with a cumulative percentage at 57 percent. Investigating the correlation matrix, no questions are highly correlated. They were all at the moderate level or below. Moreover, on the component matrix, all of the questions held together well and loaded on to Component 1.

Table 20. PTSD Scale Component Matrix

Item	Component
	1
116. Recurrent thoughts or memories of the abuse	.791
117. Feeling as though the abuse is happening again	.764
118. Recurrent nightmares about the abuse.	.759
119. Sudden emotional or physical reactions when reminded of the abuse	.792
120. Avoiding activities that remind you of the abuse	.788
121. Avoiding thoughts or feelings associated with the abuse.	.732
122. Feeling jumpy, easily startled.	.762
123. Feeling on guard.	.669

Substance Abuse Questions. Finally, the Substance Abuse section were not a full scale, so a PCA was not appropriate for the analysis.

Final Tool Development

Taking all of the results including the quantitative analyses and the qualitative feedback from risk assessors and survivors, we modified the final risk assessment tool. A copy of the final risk assessment tool can be found in Appendix D and a copy of the final waiver granting guide can be found in Appendix E. An overview of all of the changes made to the pilot risk assessment tool can be found in Appendix C. This table includes specific information on what and why sections were modified.

In addition to shortening some sections, we also changed the full 20-item depression scale with a 10-item scale. We also added a Technology Abuse scale, a new instrument that captures how a perpetrator can use technology to further abuse the partner. Thus far, few validated technology abuse scales for use with survivors of domestic violence exist. The items utilized for the Technology Abuse scale in this risk assessment were adapted from the Cyber Dating Abuse scale utilized by Urban Institute (Zweig, Dank, Lachman, & Yahner, 2014) in a study on teen dating violence. Six of the items utilized by Urban Institute came from Picard (2007). Zweig and colleagues (2014) found the overall scale to have high internal validity ($\alpha=.907$) suggesting that collectively these items are measuring the construct of interest. The Cyber Dating Abuse scale was found to consist of two subscales – one measuring sexual cyber abuse ($\alpha=.907$) and the other measuring other forms of cyber abuse ($\alpha=.891$). The seven items used on the risk assessment tool were adapted from the 16 items on the Cyber Data Abuse scale. Since some of these questions overlapped with the stalking section, we ensured that there was no duplication and removed additional items from the stalking section.

It is important to note that during the analysis of this data it came to the attention of the research team that the risk assessors sometimes miscalculated participants' risk assessment scores. Miscalculations were found on the risk assessment tool, where the risk assessors added up participants' total score incorrectly. Although not necessarily a miscalculation, on the waiver granting guide risk assessors sometimes got mixed up and put the level of risk score of their client under "Client's Total Score" rather than the actual total score. In some cases, this mix up may have deflated or inflated the participants' "Risk Level Score." While these errors generally did not affect the clients' overall outcome significantly, it is worth highlighting. Perhaps one remedy for this challenge would be a computer-based scoring system.

Recommendations

Training

Cross-training on domestic violence and welfare policies and practices. Throughout this project, findings from the literature, focus groups, surveys, and informal conversations with risk assessors illuminated the need for continued training on both domestic violence and welfare policies and practices for all involved with the screening, referring, and assessing processes. Findings also indicate that the trainings should focus on cross-training the staff on both topics in a collaborative environment. There was an overall lack of clarity on how the FVO should function and the roles and responsibilities of case workers and risk assessors. Domestic violence organization staff recognized a gap in their understanding of the welfare system while county welfare agency staff felt greater training on domestic violence would be beneficial. Through cross-training, staff at both entities would have a better understanding of each other's roles.

Training on revised risk assessment tool. Prior to piloting the risk assessment tool, each of the four counties received a comprehensive three-hour training on the risk assessment tool and waiver granting guide. Feedback from risk assessors on this training was positive and they expressed that the role play activity provided an opportunity to practice what they had been taught. All staff conducting the risk assessment must be thoroughly trained on this process using the training materials provided. This includes ensuring that the risk assessors be comfortable discussing all forms of abuse. A manual was developed on the risk assessment tool and waiver granting guide to provide support to risk assessors once they are out in the field conducting assessments. A copy of this manual should be made available to all risk assessors.

Practice

Improve relationships between county welfare agencies and domestic violence organizations. Findings from focus groups, informal conversations with risk assessors, and excited utterances during trainings suggest that there is a need to facilitate greater interagency collaboration. This collaboration may help to reduce divergent attitudes and beliefs toward survivors and the FVO process, as well as clarify how both entities' roles and responsibilities fit in to the larger FVO system. Further, over time this shared understanding will also help to facilitate trust between agencies. To further facilitate open

communication, ongoing opportunities to meet and discuss cases and questions should also be arranged.

Utilize risk assessors who have a strong level of understanding of domestic violence.

On average, the risk assessors working in the domestic violence organizations that piloted the risk assessment tool had a master's level degree in either social work, counseling, or a similar field and approximately five years of experience working within the field of domestic violence. This experience ensured that the risk assessors had the mandated 40-hour training necessary to provide services to survivors of domestic violence as well as training beyond this requirement. The risk assessors felt that this level of knowledge on domestic violence was needed to effectively conduct the risk assessment tool. Of particular importance was an understanding of the diverse forms domestic violence can take (i.e. physical, sexual, emotional, financial, stalking) and the impact that these forms of abuse can have on survivors. Further, through their training as counselors, these risk assessors understood the varying ways in which trauma can impact an individual; thus despite commonalities or differences across cases, no two victims should be expected to respond similarly. Lastly, because domestic violence practice has its origins in the empowerment movement, risk assessors had a strong understanding of intersectionality and the ways that other forms of oppression (e.g. poverty, race, sexual orientation, and disability) may affect how survivors prioritize their needs.

Research and Evaluation

Further validate the risk assessment tool through research with a general welfare sample. A large percentage of survivors who were assessed for risk were categorized as high risk. This is not surprising, since they are the survivors coming forward and identifying themselves as victims, most likely because they are in need of the most help. As such, this risk assessment tool should be validated with a general welfare sample, as they would presumably range in risk level and would thus allow researchers to better assess for accuracy.

Further explore the scoring process for the revised risk assessment tool. After piloting the risk assessment tool a series of modifications were made, including the inclusion of a new technology abuse scale and a shortened depression scale. However, this revised risk assessment tool was not piloted. As a next step, researchers should conduct a similar study by collecting completed revised risk assessments from risk assessors and evaluating the scoring process.

Additionally, as noted previously, risk assessors sometimes had difficulty with the scoring process itself, which resulted in mathematical miscalculations. To reduce the likelihood of miscalculations, several methods could be employed. First, risk assessors could have a calculator available to ensure they are not calculating scores by hand. Second, a computer-based scoring system could be utilized in which the risk assessors input their client's scores, which are then computed automatically. Lastly, to ensure scoring accuracy random checks could be completed by a third party (i.e. a supervisor; someone from another unit).

Examine the reassessment process through longitudinal research. This project did not focus on the reassessment process nor the outcome of the risk assessment (i.e. whether waivers were granted and whether the survivor received services). As a next step, a longitudinal study should be conducted to better understand the survivors experience from screening through reassessment or longer to determine factors that promote or prohibit survivors' economic empowerment.

Evaluate the screening process. This research project also did not look at the screening process for survivors applying for benefits under WFNJ. The screening process is particularly important because victim identification serves as the gateway to FVO services. While victims have the opportunity to disclose at any point in the WFNJ process, a sensitive and informative screening process increases survivors' likelihood of disclosure. As such, future research should look at the screening process, with a focus on the background and training of the individuals who conduct the screening, how many survivors come forward during the screening process, and what information is being provided to survivors at the time of screening about the FVO.

Policy

Take a strong look at confidentiality policies and practices. For survivors of domestic violence, issues related to violations of confidentiality are particularly concerning. This information could be damaging to a survivor's reputation as well as increase their risk for harm. Considerations that should be made when reflecting on confidentiality should include verbal communication (both during the risk assessment process with the client and in conveying information back and forth with the risk assessors themselves), electronic communication, and privilege. When a licensed clinician or a trained advocate conducts a risk assessment, the communication is privileged and thus protected in the event there is a court subpoena. If the model for risk assessment changes, it is particularly important to protect the risk assessment results by ensuring confidentiality. Information on recipients of WFNJ benefits is confidential and protected in accordance with N.J.S.A. 10:90-7.7.

Revisit the revised risk assessment tool periodically to determine if the questions are still appropriate. This risk assessment was developed with consideration of the current technological and social climate. The risk assessment tool should be reviewed from time to time to determine whether the questions are still appropriate. For example, consider if people are still using the same forms of technology.

References

- Aldana, S. G., & Liljenquist, W. (1998). Validity and reliability of a financial strain survey. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning*, 9(2), 11.
- Campbell, J. C., Webster, D. W., & Glass, N. (2009). The danger assessment; Validation of a lethality risk assessment instrument for intimate partner femicide. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(4), 653-674.
- Culbertson, K. A., Vik, P. W., & Kooiman, B. J. (2001). The impact of sexual assault, sexual assault perpetrator type, and location of sexual assault on ratings of perceived safety. *Violence Against Women*, 7(8), 858-875.
- Ewing, J. (1984). Detecting alcoholism: The CAGE Questionnaire. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 252(14), 1905-1907.
- Hansen, M., Andersen, T. E., Armour, C., Elklit, A., Palic, S., & Mackrill, T. (2010). PTSD-8: A Short PTSD Inventory. *Clinical Practice and Epidemiology in Mental Health*, 6, 101-108.
- Hetling, A., Stylianou, A. M., & Postmus, J. L. (2015). Measuring financial strain in the lives of survivors of intimate partner violence. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 30(6), 1046-1064.
- Marshall, L. L. (1992). Development of the Severity of Violence Against Women Scale. *Journal of Family Violence*, 7, 103-121.
- Macmillan, R., Nierobisz, A., & Welsh, S. (2000). Experiencing the streets: Harassment and perceptions of safety amount women. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 37(3), 306-322.
- Postmus, J. L., Plummer, S., & Stylianou, A. M. (2016). Measuring economic abuse in the lives of survivors: Revising the Scale of Economic Abuse. *Violence Against Women*, 22(6), 692-703.
- Postmus, J. L., Stylianou, A. M., & McMahon, S. (2016). The Abusive Behavior Inventory – Revised. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 31(17), 2867-2888.
- Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D Scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 1, 385-401.
- Shepard, M. F. & Campbell, J. A. (1992). The Abusive Behavior Inventory: A measure of psychological and physical abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 7, 291-305.
- Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B., & Lowe, B. (2006). A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 166(10), 1092-1097.

Thompson, M., Basile, K., Hertz, M., & Sitterle, D. (2006). Measuring intimate partner violence victimization and perpetration: A compendium of assessment Tools. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.

U.S. Department of Justice (2014). The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey: 2010 survey instrument. Ann Arbor,

Van Dam, N. T., & Earleywine, M. (2011). Validation of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale—Revised (CESD-R): Pragmatic depression assessment in the general population. *Psychiatry research*, *186*(1), 128-132.

Wang, P. (2015) Assessing the danger: Validation of Taiwan Intimate Partner Violence Danger Assessment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *30*(14), 2428-2446.

Zweig, J. M., Dank, M., Lachman, P., & Yahner, J. (2014). Technology, teen dating violence and abuse, and bullying: Final Report July 2013. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

**Appendix A:
Family Violence Option Pilot Risk Assessment Tool – Risk Assessor Version⁴**

Read to client: Thank you for meeting with me today. You are here because you identified as someone who has experienced domestic violence. I am going to go through this assessment with you to determine your level of risk for further abuse and the impact of any previous abuse. The details of our conversation will be confidential, and only your score will be sent to your welfare case worker.

Is this a:

New risk assessment

Re-assessment

Section I. Demographics

Instructions: The following demographics are for your reference. The information provided by the client in this section will not go toward the scoring of the risk assessment, but will give you the opportunity to reflect on the impact that these demographics may have on your client’s ability to participate in Work First New Jersey requirements at the end of the risk assessment tool.

Please read each of the following statements to your client followed by the answer choices and ask them to provide an answer. Below are instructions for you to read to your client prior to beginning. Based on what the client says regarding “relationship to the abuser” in the below demographics, be sure to change your language throughout the risk assessment accordingly (For example, replace *partner* with *family member*).

Read to client: I am now going to read you a series of questions followed by several possible answers. For each question, please tell me which response is most accurate for you.

What is your relationship to your abuser?

Current Partner

Former Partner

Family Member (please specify): _____

Other (please specify): _____

Which of the following ethnic groups best describes you?

White, non-Hispanic

Black or African American, non-Hispanic

American Indian or Alaska Native

Hispanic or Latina

Asian

Multi-ethnic

Other (please specify): _____

Which age group do you belong to?

Less than 25

26 - 35

36 - 45

46 or older

How many children are you financially responsible for?

None

1 or 2

3 or 4

5 or more

What is your highest level of education?

Less than high school

High school graduate or GED

Some college or college graduate

⁴ Please note, the formatting of the risk assessment tool in this appendix varies slightly from the actual paper version due to the page layout of this report.

Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 1

Instructions: Please read each of the following statements to your client and ask them to estimate how often these behaviors occurred in their relationship during the past six months by indicating whether the behavior occurred never, rarely, occasionally, often, or very often. Once your client has selected their response, please circle the number next to the item that corresponds with the frequency your client indicated. Below are instructions for you to read to your client prior to beginning.

Read to client: I am going to read you a list of behaviors that many individuals report having been used by their partners or former partners. Please estimate how often these behaviors occurred during the past 6 months by indicating whether the behavior occurred **never, rarely, occasionally, often, or very often**. Please note number 12 and 13 asks for responses of **yes** or **no**.

How often in the past six months has your partner...

		Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	Very Often
1	Called you a name and/or criticized you.	0	1	2	3	4
2	Gave you angry stares or looks.	0	1	2	3	4
3	Ended a discussion with you and made the decision themselves.	0	1	2	3	4
4	Put down your family and friends.	0	1	2	3	4
5	Became very upset with you because dinner, housework or laundry was not ready when your partner wanted it or done the way they thought it should be.	0	1	2	3	4
6	Said things to scare you (i.e. told you "something bad" would happen).	0	1	2	3	4
7	Made you do something humiliating or degrading (i.e. begged for forgiveness, had to ask their permission to use the car or do something).	0	1	2	3	4
8	Refused to do housework or childcare.	0	1	2	3	4
9	Checked up on you (i.e. listened to your phone calls, checked the mileage on your car, called you repeatedly).	0	1	2	3	4
10	Told you that you were a bad parent.	0	1	2	3	4
11	Accused you of paying too much attention to someone or something else.	0	1	2	3	4
12	<i>If the individual answered 2-4 to question 11: Been violently and constantly jealous of you (i.e. did they say "If I can't have you, no one can").</i>	No (0)				Yes (4)
13	Controlled most or all of your daily activities. (i.e. told you who you could be friends with, when you could see your family, or when you could take the car).	No (0)				Yes (4)
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:						

_____ + _____ + _____ + _____ + _____ = _____
Total Score

Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 2

Read to client: I am going to read you a list of behaviors that many individuals report having been used by their partners or former partners. Please estimate how often these behaviors occurred during the past 6 months by indicating whether the behavior occurred **never, rarely, occasionally, often, or very often**.

How often in the past six months has your partner...

		Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	Very Often
14	Done things to keep you from going to your job.	0	1	2	3	4
15	Beat you up if you said you needed to go to work.	0	1	2	3	4
16	Threatened to make you leave work.	0	1	2	3	4
17	Demanded that you quit your job.	0	1	2	3	4
18	Made you ask them for money.	0	1	2	3	4
19	Demanded to know how money was spent.	0	1	2	3	4
20	Demanded that you give them receipts and/or change when you spent money.	0	1	2	3	4
21	Kept financial information from you.	0	1	2	3	4
22	Made important financial decisions without talking with you about it first.	0	1	2	3	4
23	Spent the money you needed for rent or other bills.	0	1	2	3	4
24	Build up debt under your name by doing things like using your credit card or running up the phone bill.	0	1	2	3	4
25	Paid bills late or not paid bills that were in your name or in both of your names.	0	1	2	3	4
Sometimes individuals experience difficulties at work because of their partner. Please indicate whether you have experienced the following during the past 6 months by answering yes or no.						
26	Gotten in trouble at a job because of the abuse.	No (0)				Yes (4)
27	Missed a day of work because of the abuse.	No (0)				Yes (4)
28	Gotten fired from a job because of the abuse.	No (0)				Yes (4)
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:						

_____ + _____ + _____ + _____ + _____ = _____
Total Score

Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 3

Read to client: I am going to read you a list of behaviors that many individuals report having been used by their partners or former partners. Please estimate how often these behaviors occurred during the past 6 months by indicating whether the behavior occurred **never, rarely, occasionally, often, or very often**.

How often in the past six months has your partner...

		Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	Very Often
29	Threatened to hit or throw something at you.	0	1	2	3	4
30	Threatened to harm your children.	0	1	2	3	4
31	Threw, hit, kicked, or smashed something.	0	1	2	3	4
32	Pushed, grabbed, or shoved you.	0	1	2	3	4
Please answer the following questions by answering yes or no. In the <u>past 6 months</u> has your partner:						
33	Hit or punched you.	No (0)				Yes (4)
34	Threatened you with a knife, gun, or other weapon.	No (0)				Yes (4)
35	<i>If yes, was the weapon a gun?</i>	No (0)				Yes (4)
36	Does your partner have access to a gun?	No (0)				Yes (4)
In the <u>past 6 months</u> has your partner:						
37	Used a knife, gun, or other weapon against you.	No (0)				Yes (4)
38	<i>If yes, was the weapon a gun?</i>	No (0)				Yes (4)
39	Has your partner ever threatened to kill you?	No (0)				Yes (4)
40	Do you believe your partner is capable of killing you?	No (0)				Yes (4)
In the <u>past 6 months</u> has your partner:						
41	Kicked you.	No (0)				Yes (4)
42	Threw you around.	No (0)				Yes (4)
43	Choked or strangled you.	No (0)				Yes (4)
<i>If the individual answered a 1-4 or yes on any of the questions above (29-43), then ask:</i>						
44	If you experienced physical violence, has the severity or frequency of the violence increased over the past year?	No (0)				Yes (4)
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:						

_____ + _____ + _____ + _____ + _____ = _____
Total Score

Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 4

Read to client: I am going to read you a list of behaviors that many individuals report having been used by their partners or former partners. Please estimate how often these behaviors occurred during the past 6 months by indicating whether the behavior occurred **never, rarely, occasionally, often, or very often**.

How often in the past six months has your partner...

		Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	Very Often
45	Made unwanted phone calls to you or left you messages (i.e. hang-ups, text or voice messages).	0	1	2	3	4
46	Sent you unwanted emails, instant messages, or sent messages through websites like Facebook, Snapchat, or Instagram.	0	1	2	3	4
47	Left you cards, letters, flowers, or presents when your partner knew you didn't want them to.	0	1	2	3	4
48	Watched or followed you from a distance, or spied on you with a listening device, camera, or GPS.	0	1	2	3	4
49	Approached you or showed up in places, such as your home, workplace, or school when you didn't want your partner to be there.	0	1	2	3	4
50	Left you strange or potentially threatening items for you to find.	0	1	2	3	4
51	Snuck into your home or car and did things to scare you (i.e. by letting you know they had been there).	0	1	2	3	4
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:						

_____ + _____ + _____ + _____ + _____ = _____
Total Score

Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 5

Read to client: I am going to read you a list of behaviors that many individuals report having been used by their partners or former partners. Please estimate how often these behaviors occurred during the past 6 months by indicating whether the behavior occurred **never, rarely, occasionally, often, or very often.**

How often in the past six months has your partner...

		Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	Very Often
52	Demanded sex whether you wanted it or not.	0	1	2	3	4
53	Pressured you to have sex in a way that you didn't like or want.	0	1	2	3	4
Please answer the following questions by answering yes or no. In the <u>past 6 months</u> has your partner:						
54	Made you have oral sex against your will.	No (0)				Yes (4)
55	Physically forced you to have sex.	No (0)				Yes (4)
56	Physically attacked the sexual parts of your body.	No (0)				Yes (4)
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:						

_____ + _____ + _____ + _____ + _____ = _____
Total Score

57. We just finished the section of the assessment that asks about experiences with abuse. Are there any other abuse experiences that you feel were not covered in this section that you would like to discuss? If yes, please describe.

Section III. Partner Access

58	Is your partner deceased?	No (4)	Yes (0)
----	---------------------------	--------	---------

If the individual answered yes to question 58, please move on to Section VI- Emotional Health Part 1

Read to client: Please answer the following questions by answering yes or no.

		No	Yes
59	Is your partner currently in jail?	No (4)	Yes (0)
60	<i>If yes</i> , is your partner going to be in jail for longer than 12 months?	No (4)	Yes (0)
61	Are you currently in a relationship with the person who did any of the previously discussed behaviors to you?	No (0)	Yes (4)
62	<i>If no</i> , how long ago did the relationship end?	_____ months	
63	Are you currently living with your partner?	No (0)	Yes (4)
64	<i>If no</i> , does your partner know where you live?	No (0)	Yes (4)
65	Can your partner get to you within two hours?	No (0)	Yes (4)
66	Have you ever had a restraining order against your partner?	No (0)	Yes (4)
67	<i>If yes</i> , did your partner ever violate the restraining order?	No (0)	Yes (4)
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:			

_____ + _____ = _____
Total Score

Section IV. Partner Risk

Read to client: Please answer the following questions by answering yes or no. In the past 6 months:

		No	Yes
68	Has your partner ever threatened or tried to commit suicide?	No (0)	Yes (4)
69	Is your partner an alcoholic or a problem drinker?	No (0)	Yes (4)
70	Does your partner use illegal drugs? (i.e. "uppers" or amphetamines, "meth", speed, angel dust, cocaine, "crack", street drugs or mixtures)	No (0)	Yes (4)
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:			

_____ + _____ = _____
Total Score

Section V. Perceptions of Safety

Read to client: I am going to read you a series of questions on your perception of safety. Please indicate whether you feel **always safe, often safe, sometimes safe, rarely safe, or not safe at all** in the following situations.

How safe do you feel...

		Always Safe	Often Safe	Sometimes Safe	Rarely Safe	Not Safe At All
71	In your home?	0	1	2	3	4
72	At the grocery store?	0	1	2	3	4
73	While at a mall or shopping center?	0	1	2	3	4
74	While out to eat?	0	1	2	3	4
75	At your job or school?	0	1	2	3	4
76	Taking your child to school or daycare?	0	1	2	3	4
77	Bringing your child to activities outside of their school (i.e. park, athletic games)?	0	1	2	3	4
78	At your place of worship?	0	1	2	3	4
79	At social gatherings?	0	1	2	3	4
80	At service providers (i.e. doctors office, clinic, county welfare office)?	0	1	2	3	4
81	Driving or riding in a car during the day?	0	1	2	3	4
82	Driving or riding in a car at night?	0	1	2	3	4
83	Taking public transportation during the day?	0	1	2	3	4
84	Taking public transportation at night?	0	1	2	3	4
85	Walking during the day?	0	1	2	3	4
86	Walking at night?	0	1	2	3	4
87	How physically safe do you feel from your partner today?	0	1	2	3	4
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:						

_____ + _____ + _____ + _____ + _____ = _____
Total Score

88. What additional concerns do you have regarding your partner's access, risk to you, and other safety concerns?

Section VI. Emotional Health Part 1

Read to client: I am going to read you a list of feelings and behaviors. Please indicate how often you have felt or behaved this way during the past 2 weeks by indicating whether the feelings or behaviors occurred **not at all, several days, more than half the days, or nearly every day.**

In the last two weeks, how often have you...

		Not at all	Several days	More than half of days	Nearly every day
89	Felt bothered by things that usually don't bother you.	0	1	2	3
90	Felt like not eating; your appetite was poor.	0	1	2	3
91	Felt that you could not shake off the blues even with the help from your family or friends.	0	1	2	3
92	Felt that you were just as good as other people.	3	2	1	0
93	Had trouble keeping your mind on what you were doing.	0	1	2	3
94	Felt depressed.	0	1	2	3
95	Felt that everything you did was an effort.	0	1	2	3
96	Felt hopeful about the future.	3	2	1	0
97	Thought your life was a failure	0	1	2	3
98	Felt fearful.	0	1	2	3
99	Felt your sleep was restless.	0	1	2	3
100	Felt happy.	3	2	1	0
101	Talked less than usual.	0	1	2	3
102	Felt lonely.	0	1	2	3
103	Felt people were unfriendly.	0	1	2	3
104	Enjoyed life.	3	2	1	0
105	Had crying spells.	0	1	2	3
106	Felt sad.	0	1	2	3
107	Felt that people disliked you.	0	1	2	3
108	Felt you could not get "going."	0	1	2	3
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:					

_____ + _____ + _____ + _____ = _____
Total Score

Section VI. Emotional Health Part 2

Instructions for client: I am going to read you a list of feelings and behaviors. Please indicate how often you have felt or behaved this way during the past 2 weeks by indicating whether the feelings or behaviors occurred **not at all, several days, more than half the days, or nearly every day.**

In the last two weeks, how often did you experience...

		Not at all	Several days	More than half the days	Nearly every day
109	Feeling nervous, anxious, or on edge.	0	1	2	3
110	Not being able to stop or control worrying.	0	1	2	3
111	Worrying too much about different things.	0	1	2	3
112	Trouble relaxing.	0	1	2	3
113	Being so restless that it is hard to sit still.	0	1	2	3
114	Becoming easily annoyed or irritable.	0	1	2	3
115	Feeling afraid as if something awful might happen.	0	1	2	3
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:					

_____ + _____ + _____ + _____ = _____
Total Score

Section VI. Emotional Health Part 3

Instructions for client: I am going to read you a list of feelings and behaviors. Please indicate how often you have felt or behaved this way during the past 2 weeks by indicating whether the feelings or behaviors occurred **not at all, several days, more than half the days, or nearly every day.**

In the last two weeks, how often did you experience...

		Not at all	Several days	More than half the days	Nearly every day	Scoring Guide	
116	Recurrent thoughts or memories of the abuse.	0	1	2	3	Does at least one question have a score \geq 2?	Yes _____ No _____
117	Feeling as though the abuse is happening again.	0	1	2	3		
118	Recurrent nightmares about the abuse.	0	1	2	3		
119	Sudden emotional or physical reactions when reminded of the abuse.	0	1	2	3		
120	Avoiding activities that remind you of the abuse.	0	1	2	3	Does at least one question have a score \geq 2?	Yes _____ No _____
121	Avoiding thoughts or feelings associated with the abuse.	0	1	2	3		
122	Feeling jumpy, easily startled.	0	1	2	3	Does at least one question have a score \geq 2?	Yes _____ No _____
123	Feeling on guard.	0	1	2	3		

Scoring instructions: After client responds to questions 116 through 123 use the scoring guide to calculate the client's score. In the first section (questions 116-119) check yes in the box to the right if the client answered at least one question with a score greater than or equal to 2. Please do the same for the next two sections (questions 120 and 121 and questions 122 and 123).

Section VI. Emotional Health Part 4

Instructions for client: I am going to read you a list of feelings and behaviors. Please indicate if you have felt or behaved this way during the past 2 weeks by answering yes or no.

		No	Yes
124	Have you ever felt you ought to cut down on your drinking or drug use?	No (0)	Yes (4)
125	Have people annoyed you by criticizing your drinking or drug use?	No (0)	Yes (4)
126	Have you felt bad or guilty about your drinking or drug use?	No (0)	Yes (4)
127	Have you ever had a drink or used drugs first thing in the morning to steady your nerves or to get rid of a hangover?	No (0)	Yes (4)
Add up total number of yes responses for total score:			

_____ + _____ = _____
Total Score

128. We just finished the section of the assessment that asks about your emotional health. Is there any additional information you would like to share related to how your emotional health has impacted your daily activities? If yes, please describe.

129. Are there any other risk factors you would like to mention related to race, gender, sexual orientation, age, disability, employment, income assets limitations, immigration issues, community support systems, child custody issues, pregnancy, or physical health? If yes, please describe.

130. Are you interested in receiving help with any of the following services from your County Welfare Agency?

- Emergency Assistance (e.g. Housing or Utility Assistance)
- Substance Abuse Assessment and/or Services
- Mental Health Assessment and/or Services
- Court Legal Intervention (e.g. Restraining Order, Child Custody, Divorce)
- Domestic Violence Counseling (e.g. Shelter, Support Group, Individual Counseling)
- Child Support
- Work Readiness Activities
- Other

Additional comments/observations by the risk assessor:

Appendix B: Family Violence Option Pilot Waiver Granting Guide⁵

Abuse Experiences Overall Total Risk Score

Section	Client's Total Score	Level of Risk	Risk Level Score
Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 1- Psychological Abuse		Less than 13 - Low psychological abuse	= 0
		Between 13-25 - Moderate psychological abuse	= 1
		Greater than or equal to 26 - High psychological abuse	= 2
Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 2- Financial Abuse		Less than 15 - Low financial abuse	= 0
		Between 15-33 - Moderate financial abuse	= 2
		Greater than or equal to 34 - High financial abuse	= 4
Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 3- Physical Abuse		0 - No physical abuse indicated	= 0
		1-4 - Moderate physical abuse	= 4
		Greater than or equal to 5 - High physical abuse	= 8
Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 4- Stalking		0 - No stalking indicated	= 0
		1-7 - Low stalking	= 0
		8-14 - Moderate stalking	= 4
		Greater than or equal to 15 - High stalking	= 8
Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 5- Sexual Abuse		0 - No sexual abuse indicated	= 0
		1-3 - Moderate sexual abuse	= 4
		Greater than or equal to 4 - High sexual abuse	= 8
Add up risk level score column to get client's overall risk level score for Abuse Experiences:			
			Overall Risk Level Score

Waiver Guidelines Based on Risk

Overall Risk Level Score	Cumulative Risk Level	Waivers to Grant
0 to 2	Low	No waivers
3 to 7	Moderate	Discretion of risk assessor
8 or higher	High	All waivers

Note: If client is at high risk for financial abuse, waive work activities.

⁵ Please note, the formatting of waiver granting guide in this appendix varies slightly from the actual paper version due to the page layout of this report.

Partner Risk and Access Overall Total Risk Score

Section	Client's Total Score	Level of Risk	Risk Level Score
Section III. Partner Access		Less than or equal to 7- Partner has a low level of access to client = 0	
		8-11- Partner has a moderate level of access to client = 1	
		Greater than or equal to 12 - Partner has a high level of access to client = 2	
Section IV. Partner Risk		0 - Partner risk is low = 0	
		Greater than or equal to 1 - Partners risk is high = 1	

Perception of Safety Overall Total Score

Section	Client's Total Score	Level of Risk	Risk Level Score
Section V. Perceived Safety		Less than or equal to 17- High perception of safety = 0	
		18-34- Moderate perception of safety = 1	
		Greater than or equal to 35- Low perception of safety = 2	

Note: If partner has a low risk, access, or perceived safety scores, consider less waivers for client. If partner has moderate or high risk, access, or safety scores, consider waivers as needed.

Emotional Health Overall Total Impact Score

Section	Client's Total Score	Level of Impact	Impact Level Score
Section VI. Emotional Health Part 1- Depression		0-14 - No depression indicated = 0	
		15-21 - Mild to moderate depression = 1	
		Greater than 21 - Possibility of major depression = 2	
Section VI. Emotional Health Part 2- Anxiety		0 - No anxiety indicated = 0	
		1-7 - Mild to moderate anxiety = 1	
		Greater than or equal to 8 - Possibility of generalized anxiety disorder = 2	
Section VI. Emotional Health Part 3- PTSD		0 Yes - No PTSD indicated = 0	
		1-2 Yes - Mild to moderate PTSD = 1	
		3 Yes - Possibility of PTSD = 2	
Section VI. Emotional Health Part 4- Substance Use		Less than 8- Alcohol or substance use not clinically significant = 0	
		8 or greater - Clinically significant for alcohol or substance abuse = 2	
Add up impact level score column to get client's overall impact level score for Emotional Health:			

Overall
Impact Level
Score

Waiver Guidelines Based on Impact

Overall Impact Level Score	Cumulative Impact Level	Waivers to Grant
0	Low	No waivers
1	Moderate	Discretion of risk assessor
2 or higher	High	All waivers with the exception of child support cooperation

Waiver Recommendation

Please use section totals and any additional relevant information to determine and explain your recommended decision below.

Waiver Type	Recommended (Yes/No)	Rationale
60 Month Time Limit		
Work Requirements		
Emergency Assistance		
Child Support Requirements		

Services Recommendation

Please use question 128 of the assessment to inform your completion of this section.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Assistance | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Substance Abuse Assessment/Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Court Legal Intervention | <input type="checkbox"/> Work Readiness Activities | <input type="checkbox"/> Mental Health Assessment/Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Domestic Violence Counseling | | |

**Appendix C:
Changes Made to Risk Assessment Tool after Piloting**

Section	Change to Risk Assessment	Rationale
Entire risk assessment	The risk assessment used the word “partner” throughout the tool. This was changed so that the word “partner” is only used when asking about the client’s relationship with the abuser. Otherwise, the word “abuser” is used throughout the tool instead.	Recommendation made by risk assessors.
Entire risk assessment	Scoring numbers were removed from all binary filter questions.	Decision made during the meeting with the Division of Family Development administrators held on March 6 th .
Risk assessment directions	Changed the word “determine” to “understand” in the second sentence of the directions, so they now read “I am going to go through this assessment with you to understand your level of risk for further abuse and the impact of any previous abuse.”	Decision made during the meeting with the Division of Family Development administrators held on March 6 th .
Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 1	Added filters to this section. Specifically the questions added are “Have you had any contact with your abuser over the past six months?” and “Is your abuser deceased?” Thus if the client answers “yes” to any of these questions the risk assessor can move on to Section VI.	Recommendation made by risk assessors.
	The question “When was the most recent abusive incident?” was added.	Recommendation made by risk assessors.
	Reworded question “Ended a discussion with you and made the decision themselves” to “Made a decision without discussing it with you.”	Recommendation made by risk assessors.
Section II	Changed “Never” response option to “Never or N/A”	Decision made based on frequent notations of “N/A” on risk assessments, particularly in this section.
Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 2	Reorganized questions so that the section begins with a filter question that asks “Did you	Recommendation made by risk assessors.

	have a job at any point over the past six months?”	
	Reorganized questions so that all questions related to work are asked first following the filter question. Participants who respond “no” to the filter question will be redirected to the next applicable question.	Recommendation made by risk assessors.
	Merged the questions “Demanded to know how money was spent” and “Demanded that you give them receipts and/or change when you spent money” to “Demanded to know how money was spent (for example, demanded that you give them receipts).	Results from Principal Factor Analysis suggested that these two questions were highly correlated.
	Added the question “Has your partner ever made you lose a job?”	Recommendation made by risk assessors.
	Revised directions to this section so that they are clearer. The directions now read “If the client answers yes to the question [17], please begin with question 18.”	Decision made based on the meeting with the Division of Family Development administrators held on March 6 th .
Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 3	Removed the question “Threw you around.”	Results from Principal Factor Analysis suggested that this question was highly correlated with “Choked or strangled you.”
	Removed the follow up question “If yes, was the weapon a gun?” from two questions.	Decision made based on examination of completed risk assessments, which showed that the question was often skipped or answered inconsistently.
	Questions were reorganized to improve the flow.	Observation made by project coordinator.
Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 4	Added a section on Technology Abuse based on scale utilized by Urban Institute.	Recommendation made by risk assessors.
Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 5	Removed the question “Sent you unwanted emails, instant messages, or sent messages through websites like Facebook, Snapchat, or Instagram” because the question was very	Observation made by research team.

	similar to those on the new Technology Abuse Scale.	
	Removed the question “Left you cards, letters, flowers, or presents when your abuser knew you didn’t want them.”	Results from Principal Component Analysis found that this question had a low positive loading on Component 1, meaning that the question did not contribute to the scale.
Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 6	Merged the questions “Demanded sex whether you wanted it or not” and “Pressured you to have sex in a way that you didn’t like or want” to “Pressured you to have sex when you didn’t want to or in a way that you didn’t like or want?” Changed the question response format from a Likert scale to a binary response (yes/no).	Recommendation made by risk assessors. Results from Principal Factor Analysis suggested that these two questions were highly correlated.
Section III. Partner Access	For the question “If no, how long ago did the relationship end?” response options were changed to weeks, months, or years. Risk assessors are instructed to circle the appropriate response.	Decision made based on examination of completed risk assessments, which showed that assessors often needed to write in time frames other than weeks in response to the question.
	The question “Can your partner get to you within two hours?” was reworded to an open-ended question and moved to the end of the section. Question was reworded to “Is it easy for your partner to physically get to where you live or work?”	Recommendation made by risk assessors who felt a more concrete answer (i.e. down the block; in another state) would be more useful.
Section IV. Partner Risk	The question “Is your abuser gang affiliated?” was added.	Recommendation made by risk assessors.
Section V. Perceptions of Safety	Directions were modified as to clarify that the perception of safety is specific to their experiences with abuse. Directions now read “I am going to read you a series of questions on your perception of safety within your community as a result of the abuse. Please indicate whether you feel always safe, often	Recommendation made by risk assessors.

	<p>safe, sometimes safe, rarely safe, or not safe at all in the following situations.”</p>	
	<p>Changed “Always Safe” response option to “Always Safe or N/A”</p>	<p>Decision made based on frequent notations of “N/A” on risk assessments, particularly in this section.</p>
	<p>Several questions were merged to minimize repetition:</p> <p>The question “At the grocery store?” was deleted. Grocery store was added to an alternate question, which now reads “While at the mall, grocery store, or other shopping locations?”</p> <p>Deleted the question “While out to eat” because it did not seem appropriate for this population.</p> <p>The question “Bringing your child to activities outside of their school (i.e. park, athletic games?” was deleted. Activities (for example, parks, athletic games) was added to the question “Taking your child to school or daycare?” so it now reads “Taking your child to school, daycare, or other activities (i.e. parks, athletic games).”</p> <p>The question “At your place of worship?” was deleted. Place of worship was added to an alternate question, which now reads, “At social gatherings (i.e. with friends, at the gym, at your place of worship?)”</p> <p>The questions “Driving or riding in a car during the day?” “Driving or riding</p>	<p>Recommendation made by risk assessors.</p> <p>Results from Principal Factor Analysis suggested that many of these questions were highly correlated.</p> <p>Observations from research team.</p>

	<p>in a car at night?” “Taking public transportation during the day?” “Taking public transportation at night?” “Walking during the day?” and “Walking at night?” were merged by removing the reference to the time of day. These questions were also combined and now read, “Going between places (i.e. by driving, public transportation or walking?)”</p>	
Section VI. Emotional Health Part 1	<p>Changed the depression scale from the full 20-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) to the shortened 10-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies CES-D10.</p>	<p>Recommendation made by risk assessors.</p>
Section VI. Emotional Health Part 2	<p>Removed the question “Not being able to stop or control worrying.”</p>	<p>Results from Principal Factor Analysis suggested that this question was highly correlated with the question “Worrying too much about different things.”</p>
Section VI. Emotional Health Part 3	<p>Removed the scoring guide so scoring is consistent with other sections.</p>	<p>Observation by research team that the scoring on the PTSD section was done incorrectly (i.e. there were addition errors) by a number of risk assessors.</p>
Section VI. Emotional Health Part 4	<p>Added the filter question, “In the last two weeks, how often did you drink alcohol or use drugs?”</p>	<p>Recommendation made by risk assessors and observation of frequent notations of “N/A” on risk assessments, particularly in this section.</p>
Open-Ended Question – Economic Self-Sufficiency	<p>Reworded the question “We just finished the section of the assessment that asks about your emotional health. Is there any additional information you would like to share related to how your emotional health has impacted your daily activities? If yes, please describe” to “What makes it difficult for you to become financially self-sufficient (for example,</p>	<p>Recommendation made by risk assessors.</p>

	disability, immigration issues, race, gender, sexual orientation, age)?”	
Closed-Ended Question – Services	Reworded the question “Are you interested in receiving help with any of the following services from your County Welfare Agency?” to “Are you interested in learning more about any of the following services?”	Recommendation made by risk assessors.
Open-Ended Question – Safety Planning	Added a question at the end of the risk assessment tool which asks, Safety planning notes.”	Recommendation made by risk assessors.

**Appendix D:
Family Violence Option Final Risk Assessment Tool – Risk Assessor Version⁶**

Read to client: Thank you for meeting with me today. You are here because you identified as someone who has experienced domestic violence. I am going to go through this assessment with you to understand your level of risk for further abuse and the impact of any previous abuse.

Section I. Demographics

Instructions for risk assessor: The following demographics are for your reference. The information provided by the client in this section will not go toward the scoring of the risk assessment, but will give you the opportunity to reflect on the impact that these demographics may have on your client’s ability to participate in Work First New Jersey requirements at the end of the risk assessment tool.

Please read each of the following statements to your client followed by the answer choices and ask them to provide an answer. Below are instructions for you to read to your client prior to beginning.

Read to client: I am now going to read you a series of questions followed by several possible answers. For each question, please tell me which response is most accurate for you.

Is this a:

- New risk assessment Re-assessment

What is your relationship to your abuser?

- Current partner
 Former partner
 Family member (please specify): _____
 Other (please specify): _____

Which of the following ethnic groups best describes you?

- White, non-Hispanic
 Black or African American, non-Hispanic
 American Indian or Alaska Native
 Hispanic or Latina
 Asian
 Multi-ethnic
 Other (please specify): _____

Which age group do you belong to?

- Less than 25
 26 – 35
 36 – 45
 46 or older

How many children are you financially responsible for?

- None
 1 or 2
 3 or 4
 5 or more

What is your highest level of education?

- Less than high school
 High school graduate or GED
 Some college or college graduate

⁶ Please note, the formatting of the risk assessment tool in this appendix varies slightly from the actual paper version due to the page layout of this report.

Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 1

Instructions for risk assessor: Please begin this section by asking the client filter questions 1 and 2 and follow the instructions after question 2 about how to proceed.

Read to client: I am going to ask you two questions about your abuser. Please respond by answering **yes** or **no**.

1	Have you had <u>any</u> contact with your abuser over the past six months?	No	Yes
2	Is your abuser alive (not deceased)?	No	Yes

*If the individual answered **yes** to questions 1 and 2, please move on to question 3. If the individual answered **no** to questions 1 or 2, please move on to Section VI – Emotional Health Part 1.*

3. When was your most recent incident of abuse (can include physical, sexual, psychological, financial, or stalking):

Read to client: I am going to read you a list of behaviors that many individuals report having been used by their current or former abusers. Please estimate how often these behaviors occurred during the past 6 months by indicating whether the behavior occurred **never, rarely, occasionally, often, or very often**. Please note that questions 15 and 16 ask for responses of **yes** or **no**.

How often in the past six months has your abuser...

		Never or N/A	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	Very Often
4	Called you a name and/or criticized you.	0	1	2	3	4
5	Gave you angry stares or looks.	0	1	2	3	4
6	Made a decision without discussing it with you.	0	1	2	3	4
7	Put down your family and friends.	0	1	2	3	4
8	Became very upset with you because dinner, housework, or laundry was not ready when your abuser wanted it or done the way they thought it should be.	0	1	2	3	4
9	Said things to scare you (i.e. told you “something bad” would happen).	0	1	2	3	4
10	Made you do something humiliating or degrading (i.e. begged for forgiveness, had to ask their permission to use the car or do something).	0	1	2	3	4
11	Refused to do housework or childcare.	0	1	2	3	4
12	Checked up on you (i.e. listened to your phone calls, checked the mileage on your car, called you repeatedly).	0	1	2	3	4
13	Told you that you were a bad parent.	0	1	2	3	4
14	Accused you of paying too much attention to someone or something else.	0	1	2	3	4

<i>If the individual answered 2-4 on question 14:</i>						
15	Been violently and constantly jealous of you (i.e. did they say "If I can't have you, no one can").	No (0)				Yes (4)
16	Controlled most or all of your daily activities (i.e. told you who you could be friends with, when you could see your family, or when you could take the car).	No (0)				Yes (4)
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:						

Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 2

Instructions for risk assessor: Please begin this section by asking the client filter question 17. If the client answers **no** to the question, please move on to question 25 of this section. If the individual answers **yes** to the question, please begin with question 18 and ask **all** the questions in this section. All individuals should receive questions 25-31.

17	Did you have a job at any point over the past six months?	No	Yes
----	--	----	-----

If the individual answered no to question 17, please move on to question 25 of this section. If the client answers yes to the question, please begin with question 18. All clients should receive questions 25-31.

Read to client: Sometimes individuals experience difficulties at work because of their abuser. Please indicate whether you have experienced the following during the past 6 months by answering **yes** or **no**.

		No			Yes
18	Gotten in trouble at a job because of the abuse.	No (0)			Yes (4)
19	Missed a day of work because of the abuse.	No (0)			Yes (4)
20	Gotten fired from a job because of the abuse.	No (0)			Yes (4)

Read to client: I am going to read you a list of behaviors that many individuals report having been used by their current or former abusers. Please estimate how often these behaviors occurred during the past 6 months by indicating whether the behavior occurred **never, rarely, occasionally, often, or very often**.

How often in the past six months has your abuser...		Never or N/A	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	Very Often
21	Demanded that you quit your job.	0	1	2	3	4
22	Done things to keep you from going to your job.	0	1	2	3	4
23	Beat you up if you said you needed to go to work.	0	1	2	3	4
24	Threatened to make you leave work.	0	1	2	3	4

<i>Please ask the questions below to all individuals.</i>						
25	Made you ask them for money.	0	1	2	3	4
26	Demanded to know how money was spent (for example, demanded that you give them receipts).	0	1	2	3	4
27	Kept financial information from you.	0	1	2	3	4
28	Made important financial decisions without talking with you about it first.	0	1	2	3	4
29	Spent the money you needed for rent or other bills.	0	1	2	3	4
30	Build up debt under your name by doing things like using your credit card or running up the phone bill.	0	1	2	3	4
31	Paid bills late or not paid bills that were in your name or in both of your names.	0	1	2	3	4
Please answer the following question by answering yes or no:						
32	Has your abuser <u>ever</u> made you lose a job?	No (0)				Yes (4)
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:						

Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 3

Read to client: I am going to read you a list of behaviors that many individuals report having been used by their current or former abusers. Please estimate how often these behaviors occurred during the past 6 months by indicating whether the behavior occurred **never, rarely, occasionally, often, or very often.**

How often in the past six months has your abuser...

		Never or N/A	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	Very Often
33	Threatened to hit or throw something at you.	0	1	2	3	4
34	Threatened to harm your children.	0	1	2	3	4
35	Threw, hit, kicked, or smashed something.	0	1	2	3	4
36	Pushed, grabbed, or shoved you.	0	1	2	3	4
Please answer the following questions by answering yes or no. In the past six months has your abuser:						
37	Hit or punched you.	No (0)				Yes (4)
38	Kicked you.	No (0)				Yes (4)
39	Choked or strangled you.	No (0)				Yes (4)
40	Threatened you with a knife, gun, or other weapon.	No (0)				Yes (4)
41	Used a knife, gun, or other weapon against you.	No (0)				Yes (4)
42	Does your abuser have access to a gun?	No (0)				Yes (4)
43	Has your abuser ever threatened to kill you?	No (0)				Yes (4)
44	Do you believe your abuser is capable of killing you?	No (0)				Yes (4)
<i>If the individual answered a 1-4 or yes on any of the questions above (33-44), then ask:</i>						
45	If you experienced physical violence, has the severity or frequency of the violence increased over the past year?	No (0)				Yes (4)
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:						

Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 4

Read to client: I am going to read you a list of behaviors that many individuals report having been used by their current or former abusers. Please estimate how often these behaviors occurred during the past 6 months by indicating whether the behavior occurred **never, rarely, occasionally, often, or very often.**

How often in the past six months has your abuser...

		Never or N/A	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	Very Often
46	Used your social networking account without permission.	0	1	2	3	4
47	Wrote nasty things about you on their social media accounts (i.e. Facebook, Twitter).	0	1	2	3	4
48	Sent you so many messages (like texts, emails) that it made you feel unsafe.	0	1	2	3	4
49	Made you feel pressured to respond to messages like texts, emails, or through social media.	0	1	2	3	4
50	Threatened to harm you physically through cell phone, text message, or social media page.	0	1	2	3	4
51	Sent you sexual or naked photos they knew you did not want.	0	1	2	3	4
52	Pressured you into sending a sexual or naked photo of yourself.	0	1	2	3	4
53	Posted embarrassing photos or other images of you online.	0	1	2	3	4
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:						

Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 5

Read to client: I am going to read you a list of behaviors that many individuals report having been used by their current or former abusers. Please estimate how often these behaviors occurred during the past 6 months by indicating whether the behavior occurred **never, rarely, occasionally, often, or very often.**

How often in the past six months has your abuser...

		Never or N/A	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	Very Often
54	Made unwanted phone calls to you or left you messages (i.e. hang-ups, text or voice messages).	0	1	2	3	4
55	Watched or followed you from a distance, or spied on you with a listening device, camera, or GPS.	0	1	2	3	4
56	Approached you or showed up in places, such as your home, workplace, or school when you didn't want your abuser to be there.	0	1	2	3	4
57	Left you strange or potentially threatening items for you to find.	0	1	2	3	4
58	Snuck into your home or car and did things to scare you (i.e. by letting you know they had been there).	0	1	2	3	4
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:						

Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 6

Read to client: I am going to read you a list of behaviors that many individuals report having been used by their current or former abusers. Please estimate how often these behaviors occurred during the past 6 months by indicating whether the behavior occurred **never, rarely, occasionally, often, or very often.**

How often in the past six months has your abuser...

		No				Yes
59	Pressured you to have sex when you didn't want to or in a way that you didn't like or want.	No (0)				Yes (4)
60	Made you have oral sex against your will.	No (0)				Yes (4)
61	Physically forced you to have sex.	No (0)				Yes (4)
62	Physically attacked the sexual parts of your body.	No (0)				Yes (4)
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:						

63. We just finished the section of the assessment that asks about experiences with abuse. Are there any other abuse experiences that you feel were not covered in this section that you would like to discuss? If yes, please describe.

Section III. Abuser Access

Read to client: Please answer the following questions by answering **yes** or **no**.

		No	Yes
64	Is your abuser currently in jail?	No (0)	Yes (4)
65	<i>If yes</i> , is your abuser going to be in jail for longer than 12 months?	No (0)	Yes (4)
66	Are you currently in a relationship with the person who did any of the previously discussed behaviors to you?	No (0)	Yes (4)
67	<i>If no</i> , how long ago did the relationship end?	_____	Circle: Weeks Months Years
68	Are you currently living with your abuser?	No (0)	Yes (4)
69	<i>If no</i> , does your abuser know where you live?	No (0)	Yes (4)
70	Have you ever had a restraining order against your abuser?	No (0)	Yes (4)
71	<i>If yes</i> , did your abuser ever violate the restraining order?	No (0)	Yes (4)
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:			

72. Is it easy for your abuser to physically get to where you live or work?

Section IV. Abuser Risk

Read to client: Please answer the following questions by answering **yes** or **no**.

		No	Yes
73	Has your abuser ever threatened to or tried to commit suicide?	No (0)	Yes (4)
74	Is your abuser an alcoholic or problem drinker?	No (0)	Yes (4)
75	Does your abuser use illegal drugs (i.e. "uppers" or amphetamines, "meth", speed, angel dust, cocaine, "crack", street drugs or mixtures)?	No (0)	Yes (4)
76	Is your abuser gang affiliated?	No (0)	Yes (4)
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:			

Section V. Perceptions of Safety

Read to client: I am going to read you a series of questions on your perception of safety within your community as a result of the abuse. Please indicate whether you feel **always safe, often safe, sometimes safe, rarely safe, or not safe at all** in the following situations.

How safe do you feel...

		Always Safe or N/A	Often Safe	Sometimes Safe	Rarely Safe	Not Safe At All
77	In your home?	0	1	2	3	4
78	While at the mall, grocery store, or other shopping locations?	0	1	2	3	4
79	At your job or school?	0	1	2	3	4
80	Bringing your child to school, daycare, or activities outside of their school (i.e. park, athletic games)?	0	1	2	3	4
81	At social gatherings (i.e. with friends, at the gym, at your place of worship)?	0	1	2	3	4
82	At service providers (i.e. doctors office, clinic, county welfare office)?	0	1	2	3	4
83	How physically safe do you feel from your abuser today?	0	1	2	3	4
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:						

84. What additional concerns do you have regarding your abuser’s access, risk to you, or other safety concerns?

Section VI. Emotional Health Part 1

Read to client: I am going to read you a list of feelings and behaviors. Please indicate how often you have felt or behaved this way during the past 2 weeks by indicating whether the feelings or behaviors occurred **not at all, several days, more than half the days, or nearly every day.**

In the last two weeks, how often have you...

		Not at all	Several days (1-6)	More than half of days (7+ days)	Nearly everyday
85	Felt bothered by things that usually don't bother you.	0	1	2	3
86	Had trouble keeping your mind on what you were doing.	0	1	2	3
87	Felt depressed.	0	1	2	3
88	Felt that everything you did was an effort.	0	1	2	3
89	Felt hopeful about the future.	3	2	1	0
90	Felt fearful.	0	1	2	3
91	Felt your sleep was restless.	0	1	2	3
92	Felt happy.	3	2	1	0
93	Felt lonely.	0	1	2	3
94	Felt you could not get "going."	0	1	2	3
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:					

Section VI. Emotional Health Part 2

Read to client: I am going to read you a list of feelings and behaviors. Please indicate how often you have felt or behaved this way during the past 2 weeks by indicating whether the feelings or behaviors occurred **not at all, several days, more than half the days, or nearly every day.**

In the last two weeks, how often did you experience...

		Not at all	Several days (1-6)	More than half of days (7+)	Nearly everyday
95	Feeling nervous, anxious, or on edge.	0	1	2	3
96	Worrying too much about different things.	0	1	2	3
97	Trouble relaxing.	0	1	2	3
98	Being so restless that it is hard to sit still.	0	1	2	3
99	Becoming easily annoyed or irritable.	0	1	2	3
100	Feeling afraid as if something awful might happen.	0	1	2	3
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:					

Section VI. Emotional Health Part 3

Read to client: I am going to read you a list of feelings and behaviors. Please indicate how often you have felt or behaved this way during the past 2 weeks by indicating whether the feelings or behaviors occurred **not at all, several days, more than half the days, or nearly every day.**

In the last two weeks, how often did you experience...

		Not at all	Several days (1-6)	More than half of days (7+)	Nearly everyday
101	Recurrent thoughts or memories of the abuse.	0	1	2	3
102	Feeling as though the abuse is happening again.	0	1	2	3
103	Recurrent nightmares about the abuse.	0	1	2	3
104	Sudden emotional or physical reactions when reminded of the abuse.	0	1	2	3
105	Avoiding activities that remind you of the abuse.	0	1	2	3
106	Avoiding thoughts or feelings associated with the abuse.	0	1	2	3
107	Feeling jumpy, easily startled.	0	1	2	3
108	Feeling on guard.	0	1	2	3
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:					

Section VI. Emotional Health Part 4

Instructions for risk assessor: Please begin this section by asking the client filter question 109. If the client answers not at all to the question, please move on to question 114. If the client answers **several days, more than half of days, or nearly everyday** to the question, please begin with question 110.

		Not at all	Several days (1-6)	More than half of days (7+)	Nearly everyday
109	In the last two weeks, how often did you drink alcohol or use drugs?	0	1	2	3

If the client answers not at all to the question, please move on to question 114. If the client answers several days, more than half of days, or nearly every day to the question, please begin with question 110.

Read to client: I am going to read you a list of feelings and behaviors. Please indicate if you have felt or behaved this way during the past 2 weeks by answering **yes** or **no**.

		No or N/A	Yes
110	Have you ever felt you ought to cut down on your drinking or drug use?	No (0)	Yes (4)
111	Have people annoyed you by criticizing your drinking or drug use?	No (0)	Yes (4)
112	Have you felt bad or guilty about your drinking or drug use?	No (0)	Yes (4)
113	Have you ever had a drink or used drugs first thing in the morning to steady your nerves or to get rid of a hangover?	No (0)	Yes (4)
Add up the totals for each column in the boxes to the right:			

114. We just finished the section of the assessment that asks about your emotional health. Is there any additional information you would like to share related to how your emotional health has impacted your daily activities? If yes, please describe.

115. What makes it difficult for you to become financially self-sufficient (for example, education, disability, immigration issues, race, gender, sexual orientation, age)?

116. Are you interested in learning more about any of the following services?

- Emergency assistance (e.g. Housing or Utility Assistance)
- Substance Abuse Assessment and/or Services
- Mental Health Assessment and/or Services
- Court Legal Intervention (e.g. Restraining Order, Child Custody, Divorce)
- Domestic Violence Counseling (e.g. Shelter, Support Group, Individual Counseling)
- Child Support
- Work Readiness Activities
- Other (please specify): _____

117. Additional comments/observations by the risk assessor:

118. Safety planning notes:

Appendix E: Family Violence Option Final Waiver Granting Guide⁷

Abuse Experiences Overall Total Risk Score

Section	Client's Total Score	Level of Risk	Risk Level Score
Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 1- Emotional Abuse		Less than 13 - Low emotional abuse	= 0
		Between 13-29 - Moderate emotional abuse	= 1
		30 or greater - High emotional abuse	= 2
Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 2- Financial Abuse		Less than 15 - Low financial abuse	= 0
		Between 15-24 - Moderate financial abuse	= 2
		25 or greater - High financial abuse	= 4
Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 3- Physical Abuse		0 - No physical abuse indicated	= 0
		Between 1-8 - Moderate physical abuse	= 4
		9 or greater - High physical abuse	= 8
Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 4- Technology Abuse		Less than 8 - Low technology abuse	= 0
		Between 9-16 - Moderate technology abuse	= 4
		17 or greater - High technology abuse	= 8
Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 5- Stalking		Less than 5 - Low stalking	= 0
		Between 6-10 - Moderate stalking	= 4
		11 or greater - High stalking	= 8
Section II. Abuse Experiences Part 6- Sexual Abuse		0 - No sexual abuse indicated	= 0
		Between 1-3 - Moderate sexual abuse	= 4
		4 or greater - High sexual abuse	= 8
Add up risk level score column to get client's overall risk level score for Abuse Experiences:			

Waiver Guidelines Based on Risk

Overall Risk Level Score	Cumulative Risk Level	Waivers to Grant
0 to 2	Low	No waivers
3 to 7	Moderate	Discretion of risk assessor
8 or higher	High	All waivers

Note: If client is at high risk for financial abuse, waive work activities.

⁷ Please note, the formatting of the waiver granting guide in this appendix varies slightly from the actual paper version due to the page layout of this report.

Abuser Risk and Access Overall Total Risk Score

Section	Client's Total Score	Level of Risk	Risk Level Score
Section III. Abuser Access		Less than 8 - No partner access indicated = 0	
		Between 8-11 - Partner has a moderate level of access = 1	
		Greater than 12 - Partner has a high level of access = 2	
Section IV. Abuser Risk		0 - No risk indicated = 0	
		4 or greater - Partner has a high level of risk = 2	

Perception of Safety Overall Total Score

Section	Client's Total Score	Level of Risk	Risk Level Score
Section V. Perceived Safety		Less than 8 - High perception of safety = 0	
		Between 8-14 - Moderate perception of safety = 1	
		Greater than 15 - Low perception of safety = 2	

Note: If partner has a low risk, access, or perceived safety scores, consider less waivers for client. If partner has moderate or high risk, access, or safety scores, consider waivers as needed.

Emotional Health Overall Total Impact Score

Section	Client's Total Score	Level of Impact	Impact Level Score
Section VI. Emotional Health Part 1- Depression		0-14 - No depression indicated = 0	
		15-21 - Mild to moderate depression = 1	
		Greater than 21 - Possibility of major depression = 2	
Section VI. Emotional Health Part 2- Anxiety		0 - No anxiety indicated = 0	
		1-7 - Mild to moderate anxiety = 1	
		Greater than or equal to 8 - Possibility of generalized anxiety disorder = 2	
Section VI. Emotional Health Part 3- PTSD		0 Yes - No PTSD indicated = 0	
		1-2 Yes - Mild to moderate PTSD = 1	
		3 Yes - Possibility of PTSD = 2	
Section VI. Emotional Health Part 4- Substance Use		Less than 8 - Alcohol or substance use not clinically significant = 0	
		8 or greater - Clinically significant for alcohol or substance abuse = 2	
Add up impact level score column to get client's overall impact level score for Emotional Health:			

**Overall
Impact Level
Score**

Waiver Guidelines Based on Impact

Overall Risk Level Score	Cumulative Risk Level	Waivers to Grant
0	Low	No waivers
1	Moderate	Discretion of risk assessor
2 or higher	High	All waivers with the exception of child support cooperation

Waiver Recommendation

Please use section totals and any additional relevant information to determine and explain your recommended decision below.

Waiver Type	Recommended (Yes/No)	Rationale
60 Month Time Limit		
Work Requirements		
Emergency Assistance		
Child Support Requirements		

Services Recommendation

Please use question 116 of the assessment to inform your completion of this section.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Assistance | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Substance Abuse Assessment/Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Court Legal Intervention | <input type="checkbox"/> Work Readiness Activities | <input type="checkbox"/> Mental Health Assessment/Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Domestic Violence Counseling | | |

RUTGERS

School of Social Work

Center on Violence Against Women and Children



For more information, please visit:

vawc.rutgers.edu