

# Virginia's Lethality Assessment Program (LAP) January 2017–June 2020



[www.dcjs.virginia.gov](http://www.dcjs.virginia.gov)

# Virginia's Lethality Assessment Program (LAP)

## January 2017–June 2020

### Background

The Lethality Assessment Program (LAP) is an innovative approach being used to help identify victims of domestic violence who are at the highest risk (high danger) of being seriously injured or killed by their intimate partners.

Based on evidence that victims who access domestic violence services reduce their risk for serious injury/homicide, LAP provides an “immediate, consistent, and proportional response” through use of a two-stage protocol: (1) a standardized, evidence-based lethality assessment tool is used by trained law enforcement officers in response to an intimate partner domestic violence call to identify victims in high danger of serious injury or homicide, and (2) identified victims are immediately connected to a local domestic violence service program through a local domestic violence hotline. This protocol can also be expanded for use by other first responders such as health care professionals.

### Steps in the LAP protocol

- A law enforcement officer responding to an intimate partner domestic violence call believes the victim may be in danger.
- The officer asks the victim to answer eleven questions that make up the Lethality Screen for First Responders. The victim may decline, but if they agree, the officer proceeds with the questions.
- If the victim's responses to the questions indicate they are at high risk for homicide/serious injury (or if the officer believes the victim is at high risk), the officer continues to the referral stage.
- The officer “states he/she is going to place a phone call to the local 24-hour domestic violence hotline to seek advice” and encourages the victim to speak with the counselor/advocate. The victim may decline, but if they agree, the domestic violence hotline advocate will encourage the victim to seek services to increase their safety.

### LAP in Virginia

The nationally recognized LAP model was developed by the Maryland Network to End Domestic Violence in 2005 and has been used in Virginia since 2012 through collaboration between the Office of the Attorney General, the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS), and the Virginia Sexual and Domestic Violence Action Alliance.

To date, 48 law enforcement agencies (LEAs) have partnered with 23 domestic violence (DV) agencies across the state to implement LAP in Virginia. DCJS is collecting data from participating localities in an effort to assess the effectiveness of LAP, with the hope to see a decrease in intimate partner homicides and in law enforcement injuries and fatalities, and an increase in victim safety. While reporting LAP data biannually to DCJS is not mandated, most LAP programs regularly report. Currently, there are four LEAs from two DV agencies that have not yet reported their LAP data to DCJS.

Since data collection began in early 2017, the number of participating LAPs in Virginia increased substantially. In the first reporting period (January–June 2017), there were nine participating DV agencies and 13 participating law enforcement agencies. New lethality assessment programs were implemented in some areas, and additional LEAs signed onto existing LAPs in others.

The variance in the numbers of programs and participating agencies makes comparing raw numbers reported by the programs difficult. To make the data comparable for this report, statewide averages were calculated based on the number of responses received to each question for each month.

### **Methodology Used**

This analysis report provides aggregated monthly data on LAP screenings, select lethality assessment questions, victims' responses to seeking services, and law enforcement and victim homicide data for the 42-month period beginning January 1, 2017 through June 30, 2020.

For each LAP data collection question asked, the numbers reported by the programs for each month were summed, the number of reporting law enforcement agencies (LEAs) or domestic violence (DV) agencies was noted, and an average rate per LEA or DV agency was calculated. The average was calculated by dividing the sum of the reported numbers by the number of LEAs/DV programs that reported in a given month. This average allows the reader of this report to compare statewide rates across the 42-month period.

# Lethality Assessment Screening

Law enforcement officers ask victims of intimate partner domestic violence (IPDV) whether they are willing to respond to a set of questions (lethality assessment screening questions) to assess their level of danger. Victims may decline, or agree to answer the questions.

Note: Total = Total number reported based on the question; N LEAs = Number of law enforcement agencies who reported data; Average = Total / N LEAs, showing the average number per agency and allowing the reader to compare statewide rates across the 42-month period.

## How many victims declined to participate in the LAP questionnaire?


Number of victims that declined to respond to lethality assessment screening questions during each month of the reporting period.

2017												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	19	9	20	13	14	19	31	36	34	38	37	21
N LEAs	12	12	12	14	14	14	22	22	23	26	26	25
Average	1.6	0.8	1.7	0.9	1.0	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.4	0.8

2018												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	22	20	31	35	33	32	74	82	53	73	73	64
N LEAs	20	21	21	22	22	22	32	32	32	33	33	33
Average	1.1	1.0	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.5	2.3	2.6	1.7	2.2	2.2	1.9

2019												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	79	86	75	90	86	92	85	114	67	81	82	76
N LEAs	29	30	30	31	30	32	33	33	33	33	33	33
Average	2.7	2.9	2.5	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.6	3.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.3

2020												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	45	50	54	49	65	63						
N LEAs	38	39	39	39	39	39						
Average	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.7	1.6						



When victims agree to respond to the screening questions, a LAP screen protocol is initiated.

**How many LAP screens were initiated?**


Number of lethality assessment screenings that occurred each month during the reporting period.

2017												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	187	168	202	252	225	248	477	464	376	394	406	427
N LEAs	12	12	12	14	14	14	24	24	24	27	27	27
Average	15.6	14.0	16.8	18.0	16.1	17.7	19.9	19.3	15.7	14.6	15.0	15.8


2018												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	301	288	313	331	361	344	474	485	447	405	385	473
N LEAs	20	21	21	21	21	21	31	31	31	32	32	32
Average	15.1	13.7	14.9	15.8	17.2	16.4	15.3	15.7	14.4	12.7	12.0	14.8

2019												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	411	408	470	463	539	521	647	607	612	581	539	570
N LEAs	31	33	33	33	32	34	32	32	32	32	32	32
Average	13.3	12.4	14.2	14.0	16.8	15.3	20.2	19.0	19.1	18.2	16.8	17.8

2020												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	588	508	609	488	541	578						
N LEAs	39	39	39	39	39	39						
Average	15.1	13.0	15.6	12.5	13.9	14.8						



Based on data reported by participating LAP programs, the percent of all IPDV calls where the victim declined to respond to screening questions was calculated. The 42-month average of victims that declined to participate was 12%. The range was a low of 5% and a high of 21%



After the questionnaire is completed, a victim’s level of danger is assessed based on their responses to the set of questions.

**How many victims screened in as “high danger” based on the LAP?**


Of all of the lethality assessment screenings conducted, what was the number of victims that screened as in high danger based on their lethality assessment screening during each month of the reporting period.

	2017											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	101	104	114	158	123	145	253	221	219	232	257	247
N LEAs	12	12	12	14	14	14	22	22	23	26	26	26
Average	8.4	8.7	9.5	11.3	8.8	10.4	11.5	10.0	9.5	8.9	9.9	9.5

	2018											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	184	176	187	214	270	264	314	325	306	276	240	317
N LEAs	20	21	21	22	22	22	32	32	32	33	33	33
Average	9.2	8.4	8.9	9.7	12.3	12.0	9.8	10.2	9.6	8.4	7.3	9.6

	2019											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	233	221	274	278	317	290	350	298	328	334	280	301
N LEAs	30	33	33	33	32	34	32	32	32	32	32	32
Average	7.8	6.7	8.3	8.4	9.9	8.5	10.9	9.3	10.3	10.4	8.8	9.4

	2020											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	350	289	380	309	329	352						
N LEAs	39	39	39	39	39	39						
Average	9.0	7.4	9.7	7.9	8.4	9.0						



Law enforcement officers can also decide that a victim is high danger based on what they observe.

### How many victims screened in as high danger based on officer's belief?


Number of victims screened as in high danger *based on the responding officer's belief* during each month of the reporting period.

2017												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	4	15	6	6	9	4	11	17	22	14	19	13
N LEAs	11	11	11	12	12	12	20	20	20	23	23	23
Average	<b>0.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.6</b>

2018												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	10	15	18	8	10	17	15	12	19	9	13	17
N LEAs	20	21	21	22	22	22	31	30	31	32	32	32
Average	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.5</b>

2019												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	9	14	18	14	31	20	22	20	29	29	24	25
N LEAs	32	34	35	35	33	35	32	32	32	32	31	32
Average	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.8</b>


2020												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	24	22	27	18	22	20						
N LEAs	39	39	39	39	37	37						
Average	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.5</b>						





**A closer examination of how victims are screened in as high danger**

The following chart shows the number of all LAPs initiated each month, victims that screened in high danger based on the LAP assessment, and those that screened in high danger based on officer belief. Victims screened in high danger based on an officer’s belief happened relatively infrequently, while the number of LAPs initiated and the high-danger LAP screens trended very similarly over the 42-month period.



The tables below show the total number of all high-danger screens, along with the percentage of which were determined by a LAP screen versus based on officer belief.

	2017											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
All high danger	105	119	120	164	132	149	264	238	241	246	276	260
% LAP screen	96%	87%	95%	96%	93%	97%	96%	93%	91%	94%	93%	95%
% officer belief	4%	13%	5%	4%	7%	3%	4%	7%	9%	6%	7%	5%

	2018											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
All high danger	194	191	205	222	280	281	329	337	325	285	253	334
% LAP screen	95%	92%	91%	96%	96%	94%	95%	96%	94%	97%	95%	95%
% officer belief	5%	8%	9%	4%	4%	6%	5%	4%	6%	3%	5%	5%

	2019											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
All high danger	242	235	292	292	348	310	372	318	357	363	304	326
% LAP screen	96%	94%	94%	95%	91%	94%	94%	94%	92%	92%	92%	92%
% officer belief	4%	6%	6%	5%	9%	6%	6%	6%	8%	8%	8%	8%

	2020											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
All high danger	374	311	407	327	351	372						
% LAP screen	94%	93%	93%	94%	94%	95%						
% officer belief	6%	7%	7%	6%	6%	5%						

*Based on LAP assessment tool*


- Over the 42-month period, an average of 94% of all high-danger screens were based on the outcome of the LAP assessment.
- The range over the same period was a low of 87% and a high of 95%.

*Based on officer belief*

- Over the 42-month period, an average of 6% of all high-danger screens were based on the officers' belief.
- The range over the same period was a low of 3% and a high of 13%.

The following table and chart show the percent of all LAP screens that resulted in a high-danger screening (includes both LAP HD screens and HD by officer belief).

	Percent of All LAP Screens Initiated that Were High Danger											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
<b>2017</b>	56%	71%	59%	65%	59%	60%	55%	51%	64%	62%	68%	61%
<b>2018</b>	64%	66%	65%	67%	78%	82%	69%	69%	73%	70%	66%	71%
<b>2019</b>	59%	58%	62%	63%	65%	60%	57%	52%	58%	62%	56%	57%
<b>2020</b>	64%	61%	67%	67%	65%	64%						



Over the 42-month period, the average of all LAP screens initiated that screened in high danger was 63%. The range over the same period was a low of 51% and a high of 82%.

# DV Hotline Calls and Victim Response to DV Services

The LAP protocol states that a law enforcement officer should place a call to the partnering DV agency's hotline when a victim is identified as high danger.

## How many LAP hotline calls did the DV agency receive from partnering LEAs?


Number of hotline calls received by domestic violence agencies from the law enforcement agencies.

	2017											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	67	78	76	97	82	80	150	132	127	153	142	158
N LEAs	9	9	9	11	11	10	19	19	19	22	22	22
Average	7.4	8.7	8.4	8.8	7.5	8.0	7.9	7.0	6.7	7.0	6.5	7.2

	2018											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	124	112	137	177	206	211	200	193	181	206	183	240
N LEAs	20	21	21	22	22	22	31	31	31	32	32	32
Average	6.2	5.3	6.5	8.0	9.4	9.6	6.5	6.2	5.8	6.4	5.7	7.5

	2019											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	181	169	193	217	250	215	226	190	228	197	187	196
N LEAs	30	31	32	31	31	33	27	27	27	27	27	27
Average	6.0	5.5	6.0	7.0	8.1	6.5	8.4	7.0	8.4	7.3	6.9	7.3

	2020											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	249	209	242	219	243	265						
N LEAs	36	36	36	36	36	36						
Average	6.9	5.8	6.7	6.1	6.8	7.4						



After the officer places the call to the DV hotline, the victim is given the opportunity to speak with the hotline counselor. The victim may agree or decline.

### How many victims spoke to a hotline worker?

Number of victims that agreed to speak with a domestic violence hotline worker as part of the lethality assessment process during each month of the reporting period.

2017												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	62	69	66	93	72	89	144	121	116	126	130	142
N LEAs	12	12	12	14	14	14	24	24	24	27	27	27
Average	5.2	5.8	5.5	6.6	5.1	6.4	6.0	5.0	4.8	4.7	4.8	5.3

2018												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	95	100	113	151	187	177	160	178	166	138	132	165
N LEAs	20	21	21	22	22	22	31	31	31	32	32	32
Average	4.8	4.8	5.4	6.9	8.5	8.0	5.2	5.7	5.4	4.3	4.1	5.2

2019												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	154	175	177	210	230	223	192	163	205	163	146	145
N LEAs	32	35	35	34	34	36	33	33	33	33	33	33
Average	4.8	5.0	5.1	6.2	6.8	6.2	5.8	4.9	6.2	4.9	4.4	4.4


2020												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	180	159	196	168	173	185						
N LEAs	39	39	39	39	39	39						
Average	4.6	4.1	5.0	4.3	4.4	4.7						



***A closer examination of calls to the domestic violence hotline***

As stated above, when a law enforcement officer (LEO) conducts the lethality assessment protocol and the victim screens in high danger, the protocol states the officer should call the partnering domestic violence hotline. The victim is not under any obligation to talk to the hotline counselor, but is given the opportunity to do so.

The data in the following chart show the percent of calls made by an officer that result in the victim speaking with a hotline counselor. Over the 39-month\* period, the average was 87%.



(\*data from June 2017, February 2019, and June 2019 is missing due to reporting errors)

The victims that agreed to speak with a DV hotline counselor were informed of services available for victims of IPDV. Some victims decide to receive services; some do not. DV services increase victims' safety and decrease their risk of being killed by their abuser.

### How many victims received DV services after the hotline call?


Number of victims that agreed to receive services from the partnering domestic violence agency after the hotline call during each month of the reporting period.

	2017											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	34	45	24	47	36	44	86	58	56	71	73	78
N DVAs	7	7	7	8	8	8	11	11	11	12	12	12
Average	4.9	6.4	3.4	5.9	4.5	5.5	7.8	5.3	5.1	5.9	6.1	6.5

	2018											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	51	59	75	87	106	85	109	99	93	111	95	134
N DVAs	13	13	13	14	14	14	15	15	15	16	16	16
Average	3.9	4.5	5.8	6.2	7.6	6.1	7.3	6.6	6.2	6.9	5.9	8.4

	2019											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	78	62	101	102	142	93	76	63	64	68	57	72
N DVAs	18	19	19	19	18	20	18	18	18	18	18	18
Average	4.3	3.3	5.3	5.4	7.9	4.7	4.2	3.5	3.6	3.8	3.2	4.0

	2020											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	120	85	107	89	80	105						
N DVAs	20	20	20	20	20	19						
Average	6.0	4.3	5.4	4.5	4.0	5.5						



For some victims, this was the first time they received services from a DV agency.

**How many victims received DV services for the first time after the hotline call?**


Number of victims that agreed to receive services for the first time from the partnering domestic violence agency after the hotline call during each month of the reporting period.

	2017											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	8	14	12	37	25	28	55	42	39	52	42	45
N LEAs	7	7	7	8	8	8	10	10	10	11	11	11
Average	1.1	2.0	1.7	4.6	3.1	3.5	5.5	4.2	3.9	4.7	3.8	4.1

	2018											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	50	31	45	59	77	70	82	65	71	85	66	113
N LEAs	12	12	12	13	13	13	16	16	16	17	17	17
Average	4.2	2.6	3.8	4.5	5.9	5.4	5.1	4.1	4.4	5.0	3.9	6.6


	2019											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	63	50	89	82	105	76	44	60	52	67	67	60
N LEAs	18	19	18	18	18	20	18	18	18	18	18	18
Average	3.5	2.6	4.9	4.6	5.8	3.8	2.4	3.3	2.9	3.7	3.7	3.3

	2020											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	94	67	82	64	63	78						
N LEAs	20	20	20	20	20	19						
Average	4.7	3.4	4.1	3.2	3.2	4.1						




**A closer examination of how victims enter services**

The following chart shows the number of high-danger screens (LAP screens and officer belief) each month, the number of HD screens where the victim spoke to a hotline worker, the number of victims that agreed to receive DV services, and the number of victims that agreed to receive DV services for the first time. Generally, these trend along a similar path.



Over the 42-month data collection period, of the victims that screened in high danger, an average of 58% spoke to the hotline worker, 31% agreed to receive DV services, and for 23%, this was the first time they had agreed to receive DV services. (See table below.) Averages don't tell the whole story; there was wide variability in the monthly percentages over the data collection period:

Victim spoke to hotline worker	48%	to	79%
Received DV services	20%	to	45%
Received DV service for the first time	8%	to	34%






The trends suggest that, while the percent of victims that speak to the hotline has recently decreased, the percent that agreed to receive services (veterans and first-timers) was somewhat flat. However, over time, the trends hold somewhat steady with short-term fluctuations.

There was a slight decrease in the percentage of victims that spoke to the hotline in the summer of 2019 and recent percentages have held steady. Victims that agreed to receive services had a very slight increase in winter 2020 and held steady into summer.

Of the victims that spoke with a DV hotline counselor, an average of 53% agreed to receive DV services and for 40%, this was the first time they received DV services. Again, there was wide variability among the monthly percentages over the 42-month data collection period.

Victim received DV services	31%	to	81%
Received DV service for the first time	13%	to	68%



# Lethality Assessment Questions

Among the LAP screening questions asked of victims, data were collected on three that ask about the offender’s abuse history and access to firearms.

## How many victims reported that the offender had access to firearms?


Based on the victim’s response to LAP question, “Does s/he have a gun or can s/he get one easily?”

	2017											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	34	44	45	76	54	58	100	102	105	113	105	123
N LEAs	12	12	12	14	14	14	20	20	21	24	24	24
Average	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>5.1</b>

	2018											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	92	73	74	95	109	95	107	136	108	86	89	116
N LEAs	20	21	21	22	22	22	31	31	31	32	32	32
Average	<b>4.6</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>

	2019											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	101	118	119	125	151	127	185	145	153	160	136	152
N LEAs	32	35	33	34	34	36	33	33	33	33	33	33
Average	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.6</b>

	2020											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	163	138	186	153	153	183						
N LEAs	40	40	40	40	40	40						
Average	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.6</b>						



**How many victims reported a history of strangulation by the offender?**

Based on the victim’s response to LAP question, “Has s/he ever tried to choke you?”

2017												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	72	74	60	61	69	66	192	184	184	183	181	163
N LEAs	11	11	11	13	13	13	20	20	21	24	24	24
Average	<b>6.6</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>6.8</b>

2018												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	159	132	126	148	182	162	207	207	181	168	156	189
N LEAs	20	21	21	22	22	22	30	31	31	32	32	32
Average	<b>8.0</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>5.9</b>

2019												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	140	152	188	178	221	183	309	251	284	276	248	267
N LEAs	30	33	33	32	32	34	32	32	32	32	32	32
Average	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>8.3</b>

2020												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	281	234	308	269	275	295						
N LEAs	39	39	39	39	39	39						
Average	<b>7.2</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>7.6</b>						



### How many victims reported a history of stalking by the offender?


Based on the victim's response to LAP question, "Does s/he follow or spy on you or leave threatening messages?"

2017												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	45	52	48	55	54	54	131	125	136	142	125	120
N LEAs	11	11	11	13	13	13	20	20	21	24	24	24
Average	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>5.0</b>

2018												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	117	98	107	115	129	122	134	157	139	131	119	141
N LEAs	20	21	21	22	22	22	31	31	31	32	32	32
Average	<b>5.9</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.4</b>


2019												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	118	145	155	168	196	164	223	196	209	205	187	206
N LEAs	32	35	35	34	34	36	33	33	33	33	33	33
Average	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>6.2</b>

2020												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	217	163	212	212	186	210						
N LEAs	40	40	40	40	40	40						
Average	<b>5.4</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>5.3</b>						



***A closer examination of offenders' access to firearms, history of strangulation, and history of stalking***

Based on victims' responses to the three offender-related conditions, the number of offenders with a history of strangulation trends highest, followed by offenders with a history of stalking, and closely followed by offenders with access to firearms.



# DV-Related Homicide/Law Enforcement Injury Data

Data are collected on IPDV-related homicides and law enforcement DV-related injuries in the programs' localities.

## How many DV-related homicides occurred in your locality during the reporting period?

Number of DV-related homicides, *not including* responding law enforcement officers, during each month the reporting period.

2017												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	1	2	0	2
N LEAs	10	10	10	11	11	11	20	20	20	23	23	23

2018												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	2	2	1	3	0	1	1	2	3	1	1	0
N LEAs	20	21	21	22	22	22	26	25	26	26	26	26

2019												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	3	1	2	0	0
N LEAs	32	35	34	34	34	35	30	30	30	30	30	30

2020												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	0	3	3	5	1	0						
N LEAs	38	38	38	38	38	38						

A total of 56 domestic violence-related homicides were reported in the LAP localities over the 42-month period.

## How many law enforcement officer deaths occurred in your locality in response to a DV incident during the reporting period?

Number of DV-related deaths of responding law enforcement officers, during each month of the reporting period.

2017												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
N LEAs	11	11	11	11	11	11	15	15	15	16	16	16

2018												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
N LEAs	20	21	21	22	22	22	24	25	25	26	26	26

2019												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
N LEAs	32	34	34	34	34	35	31	31	31	31	31	31

2020												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0						
N LEAs	38	38	38	38	38	37						

No law enforcement deaths in response to a DV incident were reported in the program localities during the 42-month reporting period.

**How many law enforcement officers were injured in your locality in response to a DV incident during the reporting period?**

Number of DV-related injuries of responding law enforcement officers, during each month of the reporting period.

2017												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	5
N LEAs	7	7	7	7	7	7	15	16	16	19	19	19

2018												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	3	1	0	2	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0
N LEAs	17	18	18	19	19	19	20	20	20	21	21	21

2019												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
N LEAs	27	29	29	29	29	30	31	31	31	31	31	31

2020												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Total	2	0	2	2	2	0						
N LEAs	37	37	37	37	37	36						

LAP localities reported that a total of 34 law enforcement officers were injured responding to DV calls over the 42-month reporting period.