



# Intimate Partner Violence & Domestic Abuse Response

**HQDA Family Advocacy Program  
Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-9 (Installations)**

# Purpose



To provide DACOWITS with Army Family Advocacy Program (FAP) responses to Intimate Partner Violence and Domestic Abuse RFI #6.

## **6b: i. How do you measure the effectiveness of current DoD and Service policies in identifying and reducing the incidence of IPV?**

1. Section 581 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008 establishes the required annual metrics for measuring the effectiveness of the Family Advocacy Program (FAP).
2. Army Community Service (ACS) Certification Team reviews each garrison FAP to ensure they meet service specific standards using the FY24 Department of Defense (DoD)/Department of the Army (DA) Certification Standard Checklist. FAP Clinical conducts the Organization Inspection Program (OIP) every two years to ensure standards are being met, with a Site Assisted Visit, which reviews the same inspection items on the off years. These standards are included in certification.
3. With the implementation of the Incident Determination Committee (IDC), Army FAP personnel are trained to apply consistent criteria when evaluating domestic abuse reports. Quarterly fidelity checks and monitoring of IDCs are performed on a continuous basis.

**6b: ii. What metrics are used to evaluate programs/policies' effectiveness? Provide findings and analysis of metrics/measures used from FY18-FY23.**

1. Section 581 Metric #1 ensures that incoming commanders receive FAP training within 90 days of assuming command in order to increase awareness and compliance with current policies.
2. Section 581 Metric #2 evaluates the New Parent Support Program (NPSP). It includes the number of families that participated in services and how many families had an incident after services were completed.
3. Section 581 Metric #4 evaluates domestic abuse reporting, as well as advocacy and services provided by the Domestic Abuse Victim Advocate (DAVA) and includes the total number of restricted and unrestricted reports to DAVAs during each fiscal year.
4. Section 581 Metric #5 evaluates domestic abuse reporting, as well as advocacy and services provided by FAP clinical staff and includes the number of restricted and unrestricted reports to FAP Clinical Staff for each fiscal year.

# Effectiveness of Army Programs



**6b: ii. (continued) What metrics are used to evaluate programs/policies' effectiveness? Provide findings and analysis of metrics/measures used from FY18-FY23.**

5. The following chart shows the number of domestic abuse victims served by DAVAs and FAP Clinical Staff for years FY18-FY23.

**Domestic Abuse Victim Advocacy by DAVAs and FAP Clinical Staff  
(Metric 4 and Metric 5)**

Fiscal Year	Victims Served by DAVAs	Victims Served by FAP Clinical Staff
FY18	3,876	5,936
FY19	2,958	4,909
FY20	4,970	4,936
FY21	6,661	5,007
FY22	6,689	5,212
FY23	2,702	4,739

**6b: ii. (continued) What metrics are used to evaluate programs/policies' effectiveness? Provide findings and analysis of metrics/measures used from FY18-FY23.**

6. Section 581 Metric #6 evaluates the success of domestic abuse offender treatment for allegedly abusive spouses/partners in any incident that met FAP criteria for domestic abuse.

7. The following chart shows the number of offenders that completed FAP clinical services for each fiscal year and the number of re-offenses the year following completion of services for years FY18-FY23.

**Success of Domestic Abuse Offender Treatment**  
(Metric 6)

Fiscal Year	Offenders who completed FAP clinical services	Re-offenses in FY following treatment
FY18	535	12
FY19	449	22
FY20	1,130	29
FY21	1,192	45
FY22	1,409	75
FY23	1,427	56

## **6b: iii. What areas/programs have been identified as needing improvement and what actions are being taken to address identified deficiencies?**

1. Improve Domestic Abuse Incident Data Collection Processes
  - Implementing policies to ensure more comprehensive and accurate recording of Army domestic violence incidents
  - Implementation of new training and reporting requirements
2. Improve Collaboration with Integrated Prevention Directorate (IPD)
  - Making efforts to align policies that address harmful behaviors
3. Increase Offender Treatment Compliance
  - To encourage offender treatment completion rates and increase awareness of victim services, FAP is developing engagement strategies at both the Regional and Clinic levels
4. Increase Collaboration and Awareness of Office of the Special Trial Counsel (OSTC) to improve offender accountability
  - Expanding relationships within the Coordinated Community Response (CCR) in efforts to foster a victim-centered approach
  - FAP has partnered with OSTC to assist in connecting commanders with the OSTC, to help meet the requirement for commanders to notify prosecutors of Known, Covered, or Related Offenses, streamlining referral protocols

# Assessment of Domestic Abuse Reports

**6c: Regarding the assessment of domestic abuse “reports” as meeting DA/IPV DoD criteria or not:**

- i. Describe the kind of monitoring, oversight, quality control and trainings that are undertaken to assure Family Advocacy Program (FAP) personnel across all Services are evaluating domestic abuse/violence reports in a standardized and consistent manner and that all domestic abuse allegations are screened in accordance with DoD policy. Describe the methods and frequency of such quality monitoring, training and/or quality control reviews.**
  
- i. Army FAP personnel undergo regular periodic audits, certification, and reviews to assess compliance and adherence to established DoD guidelines. These audits are conducted by both internal and external entities to ensure consistency and effective FAP services.



# Assessment of Domestic Abuse Reports

## 6c: Regarding the assessment of domestic abuse “reports” as meeting DA/IPV DoD criteria or not:

### ii. Specify the areas of concern/deficiencies that have been identified in the “met criteria” evaluation process.

1. Data tracking and management
  - Current restraints with capturing, sharing, and validating accurate data across the various systems
2. Inconsistent application and documentation of criteria
  - In some cases, the rationale for how a determination was made was not documented on the MEDCOM Referral and Reporting Tool (MRRT) but was instead documented on the case management log (CML).
  - Some FAP personnel may interpret the evaluation criteria differently, leading to inconsistencies in determining whether a report meets the established criteria for domestic abuse.

# Qualifications of “Met Criteria”

**6d: Identify the key reasons that domestic and intimate partner “reports” fail to qualify as “met criteria” incidents of domestic abuse/violence e.g.: was some other kind of abuse reported, do victims recant and withdraw reports, do reports not involve domestic or intimate partners, is there inconsistency across installation Incident Determination Committees (IDC) and Services in how reports are evaluated and determined to meet DoD criteria of domestic abuse, etc.**

1. All allegations of domestic abuse reported to the FAP that meet the threshold of reasonable suspicion are presented at the Incident Determination Committee (IDC). The IDC utilizes the Decision Tree Algorithm (DTA) to come to a determination of met criteria or did not meet criteria. An incident must meet criteria for both an act and impact for it to “meet criteria”.
2. Army FAP in partnership with New York University participates in a Quality Assurance Review (QAR). Findings suggest that in cases when an incident does not meet criteria at the IDC, it is due to the committee correctly applying the criteria (i.e., the available information suggested that the incident did not reach the criteria in DODM 6400.01, Vol. 3).

# Risk Assessment Tools

**6e: DoD and the Military Services developed risk assessment tools in accordance with DoD policy, but according to the Domestic Abuse: Actions Needed to Enhance DoD's Prevention, Response, and Oversight report (GAO 21-289), the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps had not, at that time, ensured their consistent implementation across installations, and may therefore have been limited in their ability to identify and convey the need for any critical safety measures for victims of domestic abuse. Describe what actions have been taken to remedy that identified concern.**

1. Per Department of Defense Instruction (DODI) 6400.06, Army uses the DoD Intimate Partner Physical Injury Risk Assessment Tool (IPPIRAT)
2. Incident Severity Scales (Penn State)
3. Victim Advocate Lethality Assessment Checklist
4. Domestic Abuse Risk Assessment (DARA) (continued pilot phase)
  - Published in Fragmentary Order (FRAGO) 1 to Headquarters, Department of the Army (HQDA) Execution Order (EXORD) 156-21



**6f: In its 2019 report, DACOWITS recommended the Services implement a means for Service members suffering from domestic abuse to access immediate and convenient access to resources and assistance, similar to the DoD Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program and the “Safe Helpline” offered to military sexual assault victims. Was this recommendation adopted? Please describe whether it has and how it was adopted or what alternative option may have been developed.**

1. All Army installations have a 24/7 Family Advocacy Program Domestic Abuse Victim Advocacy Hotline. The Army’s Victim Advocacy Program (VAP) provides victims of domestic abuse 24-hour access to services.
  - Domestic Abuse Victim Advocates (DAVA) provide wraparound services, after-hours services, and referrals to civilian agencies, as appropriate.
2. Service members and Families can find their nearest Family Advocacy Program office and domestic abuse victim advocate by using the Domestic Abuse Victim Advocate Locator on Military OneSource at <https://www.militaryonesource.mil/>.

# Domestic Abuse Hotlines

**6g: Identify the domestic abuse hotlines used by the DoD and the Services and their utilization rates for the last five years.**

- i. Are they military specific? Or are they a national non-DoD hotline (such as Military OneSource)?**
- ii. Are there translation services available?**

- i. All Army installations have a Family Advocacy Program Domestic Abuse Victim Advocacy Hotline and use a variety of marketing efforts to socialize the Hotline. Service members and Families can also find their nearest Family Advocacy Program office and domestic abuse victim advocate by using the Domestic Abuse Victim Advocate Locator on Military OneSource at <https://www.militaryonesource.mil/>.

Army does not track utilization rates for the Domestic Abuse Victim Advocacy Hotline, but is making efforts to improve data collection processes.

Victim advocates also refer victims of domestic abuse to the National Domestic Violence Hotline.

- ii. DAVAs have limited translation services available at the installation. The National Domestic Violence Hotline offers language interpretation services in over 200 languages.

# Domestic Abuse Hotlines

**6g: (continued) Identify the domestic abuse hotlines used by the DoD and the Services and their utilization rates for the last five years.**

**iii. Are they staffed 24/7?**

**iv. Are they available OCONUS/Deployed/Remote locations? If not, what alternative is available?**

iii. Both the Army FAP Domestic Abuse Victim Advocacy Hotline and the National Domestic Violence Hotline provide 24/7 victim advocacy and wraparound support services.

iv. The Family Advocacy Program Domestic Abuse Victim Advocacy Hotline is available at all Army installations, including at OCONUS locations. The Military OneSource Domestic Abuse Victim Advocate locator provides the commercial Victim Advocate phone number and calling option for each country.

Service members deployed or in remote locations can utilize DAVA services from their home installation, or nearest to their location. However, any DAVA can assist and provide a warm hand-off to the appropriate resource.

# Intimate Partner Definition

**6h: In 2021, the definition of intimate partner was updated in DoDI 6400.6, but the updated definition is not found in the regulations cited in your December 2023 briefings. Please identify the specific Service regulation, interim change, or other document that updated your Services' definition and provide a link to or copy of that publication.**

1. The expanded definition of Intimate Partner is documented in paragraph 1.A.4. of FRAGO 1 to HQDA EXORD 156-21 Implementation Instructions for the Transition from the Case Review Committee to the Incident Determination Committee – Clinical Case Staff Meeting, dated 29 July 2022. .
2. HQDA DCS, G-9 is currently in the process of revising Army Regulation (AR) 608-18. The target date for this revision and publication is August 2024.

# Victim Services MOUs



**6i: GAO 21-289 identified that installations did not all have sufficiently comprehensive Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs) for victim services with all relevant civilian agencies.**

- i. Is there a sample MOU provided by DoD/Service regulations? If so, please provide links to samples and the dates they were developed/published.**
- i. AR 608-18 Army Family Advocacy Program, Appendix E provides guidance for Memorandums of Agreement.
  - o Figure E-2 - Domestic Violence Memorandum of Agreement provides a sample format of an MOA for coordinating civilian and military response to domestic violence involving Soldiers and Family members.



# Victim Services MOUs



**6i: (continued) GAO 21-289 identified that installations did not all have sufficiently comprehensive Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs) for victim services with all relevant civilian agencies.**

- ii. What office reviews installation MOUs to assess sufficiency and whether all relevant or necessary civilian agencies have been engaged?**
- iii. How have the Services addressed/remedied the identified deficiency?**

ii. Installation Family Advocacy Program Managers (FAPMs) lead the responsibility of developing and coordinating installation MOUs/MOAs.

An installation Staff Judge Advocate (SJA) assists in negotiation and drafting of all MOAs involving spouse abuse and reviews all modifications for legal sufficiency and statutory compliance prior to implementation.

iii. MOAs are reviewed annually by FAPM for compliance.

The ACS Certification team conducts MOU reviews during certification visits to ensure compliance with ACS and FAP standards.

If a deficiency is identified during a certification visit, the ACS Center is made aware of the deficiency and given an opportunity to correct the deficit. If the deficiency is not corrected within 90 days, that ACS center must repeat the certification process.

# Law Enforcement Policies



**6j: The 2019, DoD Inspector General (2019-75) report identified that “military service law enforcement organizations did not consistently comply with DoD policies when responding to adult nonsexual incidents of domestic violence specifically in the areas of crime scene processing, interview thoroughness, FAP notification failures, and submission of criminal history data to the required databases.**

**i. What actions have been taken to improve law enforcement response to domestic violence reports and to improve the quality and sufficiency of domestic violence investigations?**

1. Office of the Provost Marshal General (OPMG) and the Department of the Army Criminal Investigation Division (DACID) are committed to reducing crime and victimization while improving readiness and quality of life for Service members and Families.
2. Both OPMG and DACID adopted victim-centric approaches to DV investigations assisting victims in coping with trauma, emphasizing safety, rights, and well-being, and maintaining continuous victim involvement in decision making.
3. The goal of aligning with industry best practices like this in Army policing is to restore a victim’s sense of security and control, ensuring safety in situations that fall below the criminal threshold, and building trust between the victim and the military justice system.

# Law Enforcement Policies

**6j: The 2019, DoD Inspector General (2019-75) report identified that “military service law enforcement organizations did not consistently comply with DoD policies when responding to adult nonsexual incidents of domestic violence specifically in the areas of crime scene processing, interview thoroughness, FAP notification failures, and submission of criminal history data to the required databases.**

**i. What actions have been taken to improve law enforcement response to domestic violence reports and to improve the quality and sufficiency of domestic violence investigations?**

4. DACID, as the lead for felony-level investigations, updated policy requiring investigation into escalating patterns of violence, established a DV campaign increasing awareness in the community of DV issues aimed toward increasing LE visibility and community education for the Services’ first priority, our People.
5. DACID and OPMG, in coordination with Family Advocacy Program (FAP), Office of Special Trail Council (OSTC), Sexual Harassment and Prevention Program (SHARP) and others, participate in the Coordinated Community Response (CCR) multi-disciplinary approach to reducing crime and harmful behaviors.
6. OPMG created the Army Crime Prevention Program supported by a new policy in AR 190-31, Military Police Crime Prevention, which is currently with Army Publishing Directorate. OPMG coordinated on the updated Army Directive 2022-13, Reforms to Counter Sexual Harassment/Sexual Assault in the Army, dated 20 September 2022.

# Law Enforcement Policies



**6j: The 2019, DoD Inspector General (2019-75) report identified that “military service law enforcement organizations did not consistently comply with DoD policies when responding to adult nonsexual incidents of domestic violence specifically in the areas of crime scene processing, interview thoroughness, FAP notification failures, and submission of criminal history data to the required databases.**

**ii. What kind of monitoring and/or quality review is undertaken, and at what Service level, to assess whether law enforcement responses to domestic violence and related investigations are sufficient and proper investigative techniques and processes employed?**

1. OPMG and DACID coordinate with HQDA, Deputy Chief of Staff (DCS) G-9, Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve Affairs (ASA, M&RA)), and SHARP developing and publishing the annual Army Crime Report (ACR) as a commander’s tool providing trend analysis, actionable recommendations, and to foster a culture of learning.
2. DACID’s headquarters provides investigative and forensic expert support to critical cases, and the Specialized Family & Sexual Violence Division reviews critical requirements for DV investigations.
3. IMCOM headquarters requires each installation’s protection leaders conduct a quarterly Computer Statistic (COMPSTAT) briefing of current crime trends, installation issues, and corrective action plans ensuring senior leader review and provide guidance for installations.

**6k: The written responses provided in March 2024 (fatality reports) provided data in differing forms that the Committee needs to reconcile to ensure accuracy and gain better understanding.**

- i. Provide the number of domestic violence fatalities, by Service, and for the whole Defense Department, from FY12-FY23.**

Per DoDI 6400.06, Secretaries of the Military Departments will submit an annual report of fatality reviews, conducted within the Military Department, through their Service headquarters FAPs, to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (DASD) for Military Community and Family Policy (MC&FP). Military Department fatality reports will include all required information and elements in the standardized format as decided by the DASD(MC&FP).

- i. The total number of Army domestic violence fatalities for FY12-21 is 354.
  - This number does not include the two undetermined and one accidental death.
  - FY22 fatality cases are still under review.

# FY12-FY22 Fatality Report Data

**6k: (continued) The written responses provided in March 2024 (fatality reports) provided data in differing forms that the Committee needs to reconcile to ensure accuracy and gain better understanding.**

**ii. From FY12-23, break out the number of fatalities by (1) homicide, suicide and undetermined/accidental, (2) gender, (3) whether the deceased was the offender or victim, (4) Service/civilian status of deceased and offender, and (5) whether it was a DA or IPV incident.**

ii. The following charts show the breakdown of fatalities by category for years FY12-FY21. FY22 fatality cases are still under review.

**Fatalities by Manner of Death**

Fiscal Year	Homicides	Suicides	Undetermined/ Accidental	Total Fatalities
FY12	15	39	0	54
FY13	12	27	1	40
FY14	11	40	1	52
FY15	9	38	1	48
FY16	11	25	0	36
FY17	4	14	0	18
FY18	6	19	0	25
FY19	7	12	0	19
FY20	8	28	0	36
FY21	9	20	0	29

**Fatalities by Gender**

Fiscal Year	Female Homicides	Male Homicides	Female Suicides	Male Suicides
FY12	13	2	4	35
FY13	8	4	3	24
FY14	6	5	5	35
FY15	7	2	4	34
FY16	4	7	4	21
FY17	4	0	1	13
FY18	3	3	1	18
FY19	5	2	2	10
FY20	7	1	6	22
FY21	8	1	1	19

# FY12-FY22 Fatality Report Data



6k: (continued) The written responses provided in March 2024 (fatality reports) provided data in differing forms that the Committee needs to reconcile to ensure accuracy and gain better understanding.

- ii. From FY12-23, break out the number of fatalities by (1) homicide, suicide and undetermined/accidental, (2) gender, (3) whether the deceased was the offender or victim, (4) Service/civilian status of deceased and offender, and (5) whether it was a DA or IPV incident.
- ii. Army is unable to provide the breakdown of homicides by victim vs. offender fatalities for FY12-FY23, as this information has not previously been a required data element for the annual fatality reports.

Army is missing suicide case data by victim vs. offender fatalities for FY12.

**Suicide Fatalities by Victim vs. Offender**

Fiscal Year	Total Suicides	Victim	Offender	Homicide/ Suicide
FY13	27	1	26	4
FY14	40	0	40	5
FY15	38	2	38	2
FY16	25	3	22	3
FY17	14	1	13	2
FY19	12	1	11	0
FY20	28	6	11	8
FY21	20	1	19	2

# FY12-FY22 Fatality Report Data



6k: (continued) The written responses provided in March 2024 (fatality reports) provided data in differing forms that the Committee needs to reconcile to ensure accuracy and gain better understanding.

- ii. From FY12-23, break out the number of fatalities by (1) homicide, suicide and undetermined/accidental, (2) gender, (3) whether the deceased was the offender or victim, (4) Service/civilian status of deceased and offender, and (5) whether it was a DA or IPV incident.

**Military Status of Deceased/Offender FY12-FY21**

Fiscal Year	Military Deceased	Civilian Deceased	Military Offender	Civilian Offender	Unknown Offender
FY12	48	6	8	7	1
FY13	30	9	9	5	
FY14	39	12	7	2	2
FY15	36	11	5	4	
FY16	28	8	6	5	
FY17	15	3	4	0	
FY18	21	4	5	1	
FY19	16	3	4	3	
FY20	26	10	5	2	1
FY21	20	9	7	2	



# FY12-FY22 Fatality Report Data



- 6k: (continued) The written responses provided in March 2024 (fatality reports) provided data in differing forms that the Committee needs to reconcile to ensure accuracy and gain better understanding.
- ii. From FY12-23, break out the number of fatalities by (1) homicide, suicide and undetermined/accidental, (2) gender, (3) whether the deceased was the offender or victim, (4) Service/civilian status of deceased and offender, and (5) whether it was a DA or IPV incident.
  - iii. What number and percentage of fatalities resulted from the use of a gun?
- ii. Army is unable to provide the breakdown the number fatalities by domestic abuse or intimate partner incident, as there has not previously been a requirement to collect and store that information. Army is working toward improving data collection processes.
- iii. The below chart shows the number of firearm fatalities from FY12-FY21.

Fiscal Year	Total Fatalities	Number of Gun Fatalities	Percentage of Gun Fatalities
FY12	54	38	70%
FY13	40	29	73%
FY14	52	42	81%
FY15	48	34	71%
FY16	36	23	64%
FY17	18	16	89%
FY18	25	20	80%
FY19	19	13	68%
FY20	36	29	81%
FY21	29	25	86%