

METHODOLOGY REPORT: 3RD NATIONAL JUVENILE ONLINE VICTIMIZATION (NJOV3) STUDY: Prosecution Study

Wendy Walsh
Janis Wolak
David Finkelhor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1: Summary

Section 2: Sample Selection

Section 3: Confidentiality

Section 4: Instrument Design

Section 5: Criteria for Eligibility

Section 6: Data Collection

Section 7: Data Cleaning and Coding

Acknowledgements

Appendices

September 2012

SECTION 1. SUMMARY

The Third National Juvenile Online Victimization Study (NJOV3) was conducted by the Crimes against Children Research Center at the University of New Hampshire and funded by Grant No 2009-SNB-90001, awarded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.

The NJOV3 Study had three related components.

- The **NJOV3 Arrest Study** used a two-phase process to collect data about technology-facilitated child sexual exploitation crimes ending in arrest in 2009 (e.g., sex offenders using the Internet to meet minors, solicitations to undercover investigators posing online as minors, downloading of child pornography). The Methodology Report for the NJOV3 Sexting Study is available online at

<http://www.unh.edu/ccrc/pdf/NJOV3%20Arrest%20Study%20Methods%20Report%20Final%20Nov%202011.pdf>

- The **NJOV3 Sexting Study** examined the prevalence and characteristics of sexting cases handled by police during 2008 and 2009. It used the same two-phase data collection process of mail surveys followed by telephone interviews. The Methodology Report for the NJOV3 Sexting Study is available online at

<http://www.unh.edu/ccrc/pdf/NJOV3%20Sexting%20Study%20Methodology%20Report%20Final%20Sept%202011%20with%20appendices.pdf>

- The **NJOV3 Prosecutor Study** involved interviews with prosecutors about strategies for handling technology-facilitated child sexual exploitation crimes, including sexting.

The NJOV3 Arrest Study is the third wave of a longitudinal study. Wave 1 (NJOV1) pertained to arrests for technology-facilitated crimes that occurred between July 1, 2000 and June 30, 2001; Wave 2 (NJOV2) pertained to arrests during 2006. The final NJOV3 longitudinal data set, weighted to account for sampling procedures and non-response, includes data from 2,962 completed interviews (NJOV1 n=612, NJOV2 n=1,051, NJOV3 n=1,299) .

For each wave of the NJOV Arrest Study, data was collected in two phases. Phase 1 was a mail survey of a national sample of law enforcement agencies that asked if agencies had made arrests for technology-facilitated child sexual exploitation crimes during a specific time frame. Phase 2 was telephone interviews with investigators to collect details about individual cases reported in the mail surveys. The goal of this methodology was to 1) utilize a representative national sample of law enforcement agencies that would give us an overall picture of these crimes in the United States, 2) understand how these cases emerged and were handled in a diverse group of agencies, 3) get detailed data about the characteristics of these crimes from well-informed, reliable sources, and 4) see how the prevalence and characteristics of such crimes may have changed over time.

An additional component of the NJOV3 Study was to conduct telephone interviews with prosecutors involved with technology-facilitated child sexual exploitation crimes. The purpose of the NJOV3 Prosecutor Study was to gather information about the experiences state prosecutors have when they prosecute technology-facilitated crimes against children – including prosecuting child pornography (CP), online undercover chat cases where an undercover agent was portraying a minor, online enticement cases involving identified victims, and when handling sexting cases.

SECTION 2. SAMPLE SELECTION

Law enforcement investigators who had made arrests for technology-facilitated child sexual exploitation crimes and participated in NJOV3 Arrest or Sexting Studies (n=818) provided the names of 545 state prosecutors who prosecuted technology facilitated crimes, and state prosecutors provided an additional 16 names. Although the law enforcement sample included federal agencies, we were unable to obtain approval to include federal prosecutors in this study. Because law enforcement investigators provided the names of prosecutors to contact for this component of the study, it is important to keep in mind that this is a convenience sample of prosecutors.

After receiving the names of prosecutors from law enforcement investigators, we sent letters to prosecutors explaining the purpose of the study. A copy of the letter is attached to this report as **Appendix 1**. This was followed by telephone calls asking if prosecutors would consent to participate in the study. Completed telephone interviews were conducted with 378 prosecutors.

The following table describes the final disposition of the sample.

	Number	Percentage
Number of prosecutor names	554	--
Screened out (i.e. did not prosecute any child sexual exploitation cases in the past 2 years)	72	
Eligible cases	482	
Unable to contact (i.e.no agency or prosecutor contact after 8 attempted calls, repeated rescheduling with prosecutor and interview never done)	46	10%
Refused to do interview	26	5%
Pending when study closed	32	7%
Completed interviews	378	78%
Subsample of prosecutors who have prosecuted child pornography cases in the past 2 years	345	
Subsample of prosecutors who have prosecuted online undercover chat cases in the past 2 years	221	
Subsample of prosecutors who have prosecuted online	202	

enticement cases in the past 2 years		
Subsample of prosecutors who have ever handled a sexting case (sexual images produced by juveniles)	236	

SECTION 3. IRB APPROVAL AND PRIVACY

All three waves of the NJOV Study were conducted with the approval of the University of New Hampshire’s Institutional Review Board and Privacy Certificates were filed in accordance with regulations mandated for research funded by the U.S. Department of Justice.

We informed respondents of the nature and purpose of the research and that participation was voluntary, they could refuse to answer any question or end the interview at any time, responses would be confidential and used for statistical purposes only, data would be kept secure and no published material would identify any agency, respondent, offender, victim or case.

SECTION 4. INSTRUMENT DESIGN

Trained telephone interviewers used a computer-assisted telephone interviewing system to interview prosecutors. The interview consisted of the following four sections, depending on the types of cases that prosecutors had prosecuted. A copy of the telephone interview is attached to this report as **Appendix 2**.

- **Child Pornography Possession or Distribution involving the internet.** This section collected information about a) decisions and issues prosecutors encounter (such as charging decisions, computer forensics examinations, discovery of images, and difficulties with defense and law enforcement); b) results of prosecution (such as the extent to which cases go to trial and issues associated with trial, the extent to which cases have reduced case outcomes, and the extent to which new information about sexual offenses against children is discovered); c) experience with other key players (such as obtaining risk assessments, judges’ rulings, and referral to federal prosecution); and d) suggestions for legislation.
- **Online Undercover Chat cases where an undercover agent was portraying a minor.** This section collected information about a) decisions and issues prosecutors encounter (such as challenging dilemmas, problems with defenses or police investigations); b) results of prosecution (such as the extent to which cases go to trial, extent to which cases have reduced case outcomes); and c) suggestions for legislation.
- **Online Enticement Cases involving identified victims (whether a meeting took place or not).** This section collected information about a) decisions and issues prosecutors encounter (such as challenging dilemmas, difficulties working with victims, and difficult defenses); b) results of prosecution (such as the extent to which cases are going to trial

and the extent to which cases have reduced case outcomes); and c) suggestions for legislation.

- **Sexting case (whether or not charges were filed).** Sexting was defined as sexual images produced by minors that constituted child pornography under applicable statutes. Cases that involved adult offenders were excluded. This section collected information about the number of sexting cases handled and how cases have been resolved, the circumstances in which charges would be filed, and whether additional legislation is needed.

SECTION 5: CRITERIA FOR ELIGIBILITY

To be included in the N-JOV3 Prosecution Study, prosecutors had to prosecute a technology-facilitated child sexual exploitation case in the past 2 years or handle a sexting case ever.

SECTION 6. DATA COLLECTION

Seven trained interviewers conducted the NJOV3 Prosecution Study telephone interviews, using a computer-assisted telephone interviewing system, WINCATI. The interview was programmed to include: 1) question and response series; 2) skip patterns; 3) interviewer probes and instructions; 4) range checks; and 5) special edit procedures. The WINCATI system provides a number of benefits over traditional telephone interviewing, including a smoother flowing interview, the ability to branch to different series of questions depending on answers to previous questions, and automated skip patterns. In addition, the use of WINCATI can help to minimize recording errors because the acceptable range of responses is programmed into the data entry program. Since the interviewer actually records each response to survey questions through the data entry program, the risk of data processing errors is reduced.

The interviewers attended a one-day training session led by the researchers that provided extensive details about the background, purpose, and instrumentation of the study, and they participated in a series of observational and practice interviews.

The telephone interviews for the NJOV3 Prosecution Study were conducted between May and August 2011. The response rate was 78%. Or approximately two-thirds of prosecutors whose names we received as part of the NJOV3 law enforcement study completed interviews.

SECTION 7. DATA CLEANING AND CODING

Data were transferred directly from the WINCATI system to a SPSS data set. A data manager cleaned the data and supervised the coding of open-ended responses or those that did not fit given categories (e.g. "Other, specify"). Research assistants monitored by the data manager compared coded responses for discrepancies, and reviewed and resolved discrepancies with one of the lead investigators. After initial cleaning and coding, the data was transferred into SPSS and excel.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project was funded by Grant No. 2009-SNB-90001 awarded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The total amount of federal funding is \$825,704. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice. We are grateful to the talents, perseverance and skills of research assistants Kristina Breton, Elisabeth Cloyd, Laura Healey, Kaitlin Lounsbury, Marisa MacDonnell, Dianne Ramey, Lynn Russ and Samantha Senechal.

We especially thank the hundreds of dedicated prosecutors who helped us develop this study and answered our many interview questions with interest, patience, and good humor.

Please address questions to: Wendy Walsh, PhD., Crimes against Children Research Center, University of New Hampshire, 10 West Edge Drive, Ste. 106, Durham, NH 03824, 603-862-1026 wendy.walsh@unh.edu

Methodology reports for previous waves of the NJOV Study can be found on the Crimes against Children Research Center web site at www.unh.edu/ccrc.

APPENDIX 1: NJOV3 PROSECUTION STUDY INTRODUCTORY LETTER

CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN RESEARCH CENTER

*Crimes against Children Research Center
University of New Hampshire*

*10 West Edge Drive, Suite 106
Durham, NH, 03824*

July 2011

The Crimes against Children Research Center, located at the University of New Hampshire, is conducting research for the US Department of Justice about technology-facilitated crimes involving child pornography and child sexual exploitation. In a recent part of our study, we interviewed investigators from across the country regarding over 1,200 of these types of cases handled by law enforcement in the past two years. Your office was identified by one or more of these investigators as being involved in the prosecution of these cases.

We are interviewing prosecutors involved with technology-facilitated child exploitation. The information from this study will be used to provide a national picture of emerging issues related to the prosecution of technology-facilitated child pornography and sexual exploitation cases. The types of cases we will be asking about include child pornography possession & distribution, online enticement, undercover operations in which an undercover officer was portraying a minor, and “sexting” cases involving youth only. Depending on which types of cases you have prosecuted in the past two years, we will be asking questions about your general experiences with these cases (nothing pertaining to a specific case) and we would like your feedback on any additional or revised legislation you believe is necessary in this area.

We would like to set up an appointment to conduct a telephone interview about issues and problems that may have come up in the cases you have prosecuted. We know how busy you are, but we hope you can find time to participate in this project. The information we gather is strictly confidential and security is maintained according to federal guidelines. Agency names, names of individuals or other identifying information will not be used in any published materials or discussions of the study results.

Information about our research center, and about this project, is posted on our website, www.unh.edu/ccrc. The interviewer assigned to your office is Kristina Breton and she can be reached at 603-862-4199 or by email at Kristina.Breton@unh.edu. If you have any questions about the overall study, please call me at our toll free number, 1-877-426-9155. Also, I can be reached by e-mail at wendy.walsh@unh.edu.

Sincerely,

Wendy Walsh
Study Director

UNIVERSITY of NEW HAMPSHIRE

APPENDIX 2: NJOV3 PROSECUTION STUDY TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

Q:TYPEPROS

T:

IS THE RESPONDENT

1 A STATE, COUNTY OR LOCAL PROSECUTOR?

2 A FEDERAL PROSECUTOR?

97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE

98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: INTRO

T:

Before we begin let me take a minute to tell you how this interview works. The interview is on a computer system so I can only see one question at a time. Participation in this study is voluntary and whether or not you participate will not affect the status of your agency in any way. If you hear a question you don't want to answer, just tell me and we'll skip that question. You may end the interview at any time.

All information you provide is confidential and our research reports will not contain any information that could identify any agencies, persons or cases. Federal law requires that all information be used for statistical purposes only.

Most of the questions require a yes or no answer, but sometimes I will ask you to elaborate. When this happens, I will be typing your answers into the interview. I will try to be as quick as I can, but there will be some times when I have to finish up one answer before we move on.

PRESS '1' TO CONTINUE

Q:PRE1

T:

In the past 2 years, have you prosecuted any cases that involved the following types of child sexual exploitation?

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. USE LIST TO PROBE.

- 1 CP Possession or Distribution involving the internet
- 2 Online Undercover Chat cases where a UC was portraying a minor
- 3 Online Enticement Cases involving identified victims(meet or no meet)
- 4 None
- 5 CLICK TO CONTINUE

Q:PRE2

T:

Have you ever handled a sexting case (whether or not charges were filed)? By 'sexting' I mean sexual images produced by juveniles (with no adult

involvement). (Sexting includes creating or distributing such images.) Sexting would also include high school students who are above the age of 17, i.e. 18 or 19 year olds.

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CKPRE1

T:

IF R HAS NOT PROSECUTED CP, UC, OR OE; SEE IF R HANDLED SEXTING

Q:CKPRE2

T:

IF R HAS NOT HANDLED ANY CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOTATION CASE, SKIP TO END

Q: PRE3

T:

How many years of experience do you have prosecuting cases of technology-related child sexual exploitation?

- 1 < 1 year
- 2 1-3 years
- 3 4-5 years
- 4 6-7 years
- 5 8-9 years
- 6 10 or more years

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: PRE4

T:

In the past 2 years, have you handled any such cases that went to trial (bench or jury)?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:PRE4A

T:

Which case types went to trial?

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. ONLY PROBE WITH TYPES THEY HAVE PROSECUTED.

- 1 Child Pornography Possession or Distribution
- 2 Online Undercover Chat cases
- 3 Online Enticement Cases
- 4 NONE
- 5 DK/REFUSED
- 6 CLICK TO CONTINUE

Q:CKCP

T:

IF R HAS NOT PROSECUTED A CP CASE, SKIP TO SEXTING SECTION

Q:CP1

T:

You said you have prosecuted a child pornography possession or distribution case in the past 2 years. How many cases in the past 2 years have you prosecuted?

ENTER NUMBER(1-95)

- 96 96 OR MORE
- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP2

T:

How many child pornography possession or distribution cases have you prosecuted in your career?

ENTER NUMBER(1-95)

- 96 96 OR MORE
- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP3

T:

Is there a clear understanding in your office regarding when child pornography (possession or distribution) cases will be accepted for prosecution?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP3A

T:

What requirements are necessary in order to prosecute?

OPENEND

Q: CP3B

T:

How are decisions to prosecute child pornography cases made? Would one or two images be enough to charge a defendant with child pornography possession?

Q: CP4

T:

When a defendant possesses a large amount of child pornography, how does your office decide how many images to charge the defendant with? (Do you charge them for every picture? Do you charge them for a maximum number? Do you charge known images only?)

Q: CP5

T:

Does your office have a policy about whether a full computer forensics exam vs. a partial forensics exam should be conducted (in child pornography cases)?

1 YES
2 NO

97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP5A

T:

What is the policy?

Q: CP5B

T:

How does your office decide whether a full computer forensics exam vs. a partial computer forensics exam should be performed?

Q: CP6

T:

In the child pornography possession (or distribution) cases you've worked on in the past 2 years, what percentage have had full computer forensics exams performed? (An estimate is fine.)

ENTER PERCENTAGE (1%-100%)

- 996 NONE
- 997 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 998 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP7

T:

In the cases you have handled, are defendants typically charged before or after you have the computer forensics examination report?

- 1 BEFORE
- 2 AFTER
- 3 SOMETHING ELSE (SPECIFY)

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP7A

T:

SPECIFY.

Q: CP8

T:

Does your office use a credentialed computer forensics laboratory?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP8A

T:

Is there debate in your office about whether to use a credentialed computer forensics laboratory?

- 1 YES (SPECIFY)
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE

98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP8B

T:

SPECIFY.

Q:CP9

T:

In the child pornography possession cases that you have handled in the past 2 years, how has discovery been handled? Is the defense given copies of the images or allowed to examine the images, but not given copies (or something else)?

- 1 GIVEN COPIES OF THE IMAGES
 - 2 ALLOWED TO EXAMINE THE IMAGES, BUT NOT GIVEN COPIES
 - 3 SOMETHING ELSE (SPECIFY)
-
- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
 - 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP9A

T:

SPECIFY.

Q: CP10

T:

Have you prosecuted any child pornography cases where there has been litigation regarding discovery of images?

- 1 YES
 - 2 NO
-
- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
 - 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP10A

T:

Did the defense ever prevail?

- 1 YES (SPECIFY SOME DETAILS)
 - 2 NO
-
- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
 - 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP10B

T:

Specify some details about a case where there was litigation and the defense prevailed.

Q: CP11

T:

In the past 2 years, have you handled any CP cases in which the defense formally raised any of the following defenses?

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. USE LIST TO PROBE.

- 1 The defendant downloaded CP unknowingly or unintentionally
- 2 Someone else with physical access to the computer downloaded CP
- 3 Images were not CP (comp. generated, artistic, not explicit enough)
- 4 The defendant downloaded them for research
- 5 OTHER (SPECIFY)
- 6 NONE OF THE ABOVE
- 7 DK/ REFUSED
- 8 CLICK TO CONTINUE

Q:CP11A

T:

Have you of these cases resulted in...

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.

- 1 SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCED PLEA
- 2 DISMISSAL OF CHARGES
- 3 LOST THE CASE
- 4 SOMETHING ELSE (SPECIFY)
- 5 NONE OF THE ABOVE
- 6 DK/REFUSED
- 7 CLICK TO CONTINUE

Q: CP11B

T:

Please describe one case where you were presented with a difficult defense.

What defense was it and what was the final outcome?

OPENEND

Q: CP11C

T:

Please describe an effective strategy you used when responding to a formally raised defense.

OPENEND

Q: CP12

T:

(In the past 2 years) have you handled any child pornography cases where addiction, mental illness or mental disability was raised as a defense?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP12A

T:

Did any of these assertions create real difficulty for the prosecution? (By real difficulty, I mean problems that were hard to overcome or the prosecution had to accept a significantly reduced plea or lost the case.)

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:CP12B

T:

Due to the difficulties created by this defense,did any of your cases have a final outcome of...

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.

- 1 SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCED PLEA
- 2 DISMISSAL OF CHARGES
- 3 LOST THE CASE
- 4 SOMETHING ELSE (SPECIFY)
- 5 NONE OF THE ABOVE
- 6 DK/REFUSED
- 7 CLICK TO CONTINUE

Q:CP13

T:

In the past 2 years, have you had a child pornography possession case where problems in a police investigation or forensic exam caused real difficulty for the prosecution? For example, were there problems with...

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. USE LIST TO PROBE.

- 1 The peer-to-peer investigation
- 2 Chain of custody issues
- 3 Search warrant issues
- 4 Lack of equipment or training of officers
- 5 Timeliness of the forensic exam
- 6 Credentials of the forensic examiner or the computer forensics lab
- 7 OTHER (SPECIFY)
- 8 NONE OF THE ABOVE
- 9 DK/REFUSED
- 10 CLICK TO CONTINUE

Q:CP13A

T:

In the past 2 years, have you had a child pornography possession (or distribution) case where charges against the defendant were dismissed because of problems with the police investigation or forensic exam?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP13B

T:

How often in the past 2 years were charges dismissed due to problems with the police investigation or forensics exam? (An estimate is fine).

ENTER NUMBER (1-100)

Q:CP14

T:

(In the past 2 years) have you handled any cases where the defense formally raised technology related issues that required you to explain technical details to a judge or jury? (By formally raised, I mean the defense brought the issue up in front of a judge or filed a motion.)

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP14A

T:

DO NOT USE LIST TO PROBE. CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.

How have you typically handled explaining technical evidence or rebutting technical defenses in child pornography cases?

- 1 Prosecutors own technical expertise
- 2 Expert testimony from law enforcement personnel
- 3 Unit in your office that responds to technical issues
- 4 OTHER (SPECIFY)
- 5 DK/REFUSED
- 6 CLICK TO CONTINUE

Q: CP14B

T:

How satisfied are you with the amount of resources your office has access to in regards to explaining technical evidence or rebutting technical defenses?

- 1 NOT AT ALL SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 MOSTLY SATISFIED
- 4 VERY SATISFIED
- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CKCPTR

T:

SEE IF PROSECUTOR WENT TO TRIAL IN CP CASES, IF NOT SKIP TO CP21

Q:CP15

T:

You said you had a child pornography (possession or distribution) case go to trial within the past 2 years. How many of your cases went to trial in the past 2 years (bench or jury trial)?

- ENTER NUMBER (1-95)
- 96 96 OR MORE
 - 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
 - 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP16

T:

How many cases were prosecuted in front of a jury?

- ENTER NUMBER (1-95)
- 96 96 OR MORE

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE
- 99 NONE

Q: CP17

T:

Do you typically introduce child pornography images into evidence when you prosecute a case in front of a jury?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP17A

T:

How are images typically displayed?

Q: CP17B

T:

Why not?

Q: CP18

T:

In the child pornography cases you have prosecuted in front of a jury, has the defense ever objected to introducing such images into evidence (claiming for example that the images were inflammatory)?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP19

T:

Have you had any cases where a defense attorney was successful in keeping the images out of evidence?

- 1 YES (SPECIFY)
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP19A

T:

Please describe a case where the defense attorney was successful in keeping the images out of evidence.

Q: CP20

T:

In cases that have gone to trial in the past 2 years, have you used any of the following methods to prove that the child pornography depicted actual children?

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. USE LIST TO PROBE.

- 1 Question for fact finder
- 2 Testimony that identities of children were known
- 3 Testimony that images were not virtual or computer generated
- 4 Something else (SPECIFY)
- 5 DK/REFUSED
- 6 CLICK TO CONTINUE

Q:CP21

T:

(Returning again to all of your child pornography cases, not just the ones that went to trial) In the past 2 years, has the defense used an expert witness in any of the child pornography possession or distribution cases you've handled (at any phase in the case, including sentencing)?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP22

T:

In the past 2 years, has an expert witness testimony created real difficulty for you? (By real difficulty, I mean problems that were hard to overcome or the prosecution had to accept a significantly reduced plea or lost the case.)

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP22A

T:

Please describe the outcome.

- 1 SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCED PLEA
- 2 DISMISSAL OF CHARGES
- 3 LOST THE CASE
- 4 SOMETHING ELSE (SPECIFY)

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP22B

T:

SPECIFY.

Q: CP23

T:

The next set of questions will discuss risk assessment and evaluation of the offender. At what stage of the proceedings does such risk assessments or psychological evaluations typically occur in your jurisdiction?

OPENEND

Q: CP24

T:

Do these assessments (or evaluations) include any of the following?

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. USE LIST TO PROBE.

- 1 Sex offender assessment
- 2 Drug or alcohol evaluation
- 3 Polygraph
- 4 Other psychological evaluation
- 5 Something else (SPECIFY)
- 6 NONE OF THE ABOVE
- 7 DK/REFUSED
- 8 CLICK TO CONTINUE

Q:CP25

T:

Do any of these assessments address the risk that a defendant may be or become a child molester?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP26

T:

How satisfied are you with the system of risk assessment that your office has access to?

- | | |
|----|---------------------------|
| 1 | NOT AT ALL SATISFIED |
| 2 | SOMEWHAT SATISFIED |
| 3 | REASONABLY SATISFIED |
| 4 | VERY SATISFIED |
| 97 | DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE |
| 98 | REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE |

Q:CP26A

T:

ENTER ADDITIONAL DETAILS, IF NECESSARY, REGARDING RISK ASSESSMENT SATISFACTION.

Q:CP27

T:

Have you had any cases in the past 2 years, where a defendant in a child pornography possession (or distribution) case was allowed to plead to a misdemeanor rather than a felony?

- | | |
|----|---------------------------|
| 1 | YES |
| 2 | NO |
| 97 | DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE |
| 98 | REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE |

Q: CP27A

T:

What were the circumstances where a defendant in a child pornography case was allowed to plead to a misdemeanor rather than a felony?

Q: CP27B

T:

Are there any circumstances where you would allow a defendant in a child pornography possession case to plead to a misdemeanor rather than a felony?

Q: CP28

T:

In the past 2 years, have you prosecuted any cases of child pornography possession or distribution in which sex offender registration was not required

when a defendant pleaded guilty?

1 YES

2 NO

97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE

98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:CP28A

T:

Please describe the circumstances in which you would agree to a plea bargain that did not require sex offender registration in child pornography possession cases.

Q:CP29

T:

When handling a child pornography case, have you ever discovered new information as part of your prosecutorial work that suggested the defendant had committed other sexual offenses against children (e.g. molestation)?

1 YES

2 NO

97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE

98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:CP29A

T:

In what percentage of cases has this happened? (An estimate is fine.)

ENTER PERCENTAGE (1%-100%)

997 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE

998 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:CP30

T:

In your opinion, what investigative procedures (at any time during a case) are most effective in identifying child pornography offenders who have committed sexual molestation crimes against minors?

OPENEND

Q: CP31

T:

(In the past 2 years) have any judges in your jurisdiction made rulings that have affected how or whether your office pursues child pornography possession

or distribution cases?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:CP32

T:

Have any of these rulings had a particularly negative impact on how or whether your office pursues child pornography possession or distribution cases?

- 1 YES (DESCRIBE UP TO 2 RULINGS)
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:CP32A

T:

Describe up to 2 rulings and their negative impacts.

ASK IF STATE OR LOCAL PROSECUTOR:

Q: CP33

T:

In the past 2 years, have you referred a child pornography possession or distribution case for federal prosecution?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:CP33A

T:

What percentage of your cases have been referred for federal prosecution?

ENTER PERCENTAGE (1-100%)

- 996 NONE
- 997 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 998 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:CPP33B

T:

Why not?

Q: CP34

T:

(In the past 2 years) what percent of your cases have been declined for federal prosecution?

ENTER PERCENTAGE (1-100%)

- 996 NONE
- 997 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 998 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:CP35

T:

Did this cause any difficulty for you?

- 1 YES (SPECIFY the difficulty created)
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP35A

T:

Specify- What difficulty was created.

Q: CP36

T:

How clear is it to you which child pornography cases will be accepted for federal prosecution in your jurisdiction?

- 1 NOT AT ALL CLEAR
- 2 SOMEWHAT CLEAR
- 3 REASONABLY CLEAR
- 4 VERY CLEAR

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP37

T:

Are there any guidelines you would like to see concerning which cases warrant

federal prosecution?

1 YES

2 NO

97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE

98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:CP37A

T:

What sort of guidelines would you like to see concerning which cases warrant federal prosecution?

Q: CP38

T:

Do any sentencing guidelines apply to child pornography cases in your jurisdiction?

1 YES

2 NO

97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE

98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP38A

T:

How often have sentencing guidelines been adhered to by judges in the cases you have handled?

1 RARELY

2 LESS THAN HALF THE TIME

3 MORE THAN HALF THE TIME

4 ALMOST ALL OF THE TIME

97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE

98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP38B

T:

Can you give an example of a specific case you handled in the past 2 years, where the sentencing guidelines were not adhered to and this caused you particular concern?

Q: CP39

T:

In the past 2 years, what percent of your child pornography possession (or

distribution) cases were referred to your office by a state, county or local prosecutor's office?

ENTER PERCENTAGE (1-100%)

- 996 NONE
- 997 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 998 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:CP40

T:

In the past 2 years, have you had any cases that were accepted for federal prosecution (from a state or local office) where the acceptance seemed inappropriate or problematic?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:CP40A

T:

Please explain why you felt the acceptance was inappropriate or problematic.

Q: CP41

T:

In your office, how clear is it which child pornography cases will be accepted for federal prosecution?

- 1 NOT AT ALL CLEAR
- 2 SOMEWHAT CLEAR
- 3 REASONABLY CLEAR
- 4 VERY CLEAR

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP42

T:

Are there guidelines that you would like to see about which cases warrant federal prosecution?

- 1 YES

- 2 NO
- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP42A

T:

What sort of guidelines would you like to see?

Q: CP43

T:

How often have federal sentencing guidelines been adhered to by judges in the cases you have handled?

- 1 RARELY
- 2 LESS THAN HALF OF THE TIME
- 3 MORE THAN HALF OF THE TIME
- 4 ALMOST ALL OF THE TIME

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP43A

T:

Can you give an example of a specific case you handled where the sentencing guidelines were not adhered to and this caused you particular concern?

Q: CP44

T:

In your opinion, how fair are sentencing guidelines for possession of child pornography in your jurisdiction? Using a scale of 1 to 3 with 1 being too light for the crime(s) committed and 3 being too heavy?

- 1 Too light for the crime committed
- 2 Just right for the crime committed
- 3 Too heavy for the crime committed

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE
- 99 DOES NOT APPLY

Q: CP45

T:

When thinking about all aspects of prosecuting child pornography cases, do you

think your jurisdiction is in need of additional or revised legislation about child pornography?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: CP45A

T:

What legislation is most needed (in your opinion)?

Q:CKSXT

T:

IF R HAS NEVER HANDLED A SEXTING CASE,SKIP NEXT SECTION

Q: SXT1

T:

The next set of questions is about sexting cases. As a reminder, sexting cases to us are cases where a minor (could be 18 or 19 if still in high school) takes sexual images of themselves or other minors (with or without distribution) How many sexting cases have you handled in your career (whether or not charges were filed)? (An estimate is fine.)

- 1 1-3
 - 2 4-6
 - 3 7-9
 - 4 10-15
 - 5 16-20
 - 6 21-40
 - 7 MORE THAN 40
-
- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
 - 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: SXT2

T:

In the cases you've handled, have you ever presented minors with an alternative to being charged, such as community service or an education program?

- 1 YES
 - 2 NO
-
- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
 - 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:SXT2A

T:

What alternatives did you present?

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. USE LIST TO PROBE.

- 1 Community service
- 2 Essay or letter
- 3 Educational class or counseling
- 4 Loss of cell phone or computer privileges
- 5 OTHER (SPECIFY)
- 6 DK/REFUSED
- 7 CLICK TO CONTINUE

Q: SXT3

T:

What percent of the sexting cases that you've handled ended with no charges filed?

ENTER PERCENTAGE (1-100%)

- 996 NONE
- 997 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 998 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: SXT4

T:

Have you or your office ever prosecuted a sexting case, meaning charges were filed against a minor for creating or distributing images?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: SXT5

T:

Have you or your office filed charges against minors in sexting cases where the images did not show sexually explicit conduct or exhibition of genitals?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:SXT5A

T:

What did the images depict?

Q:SXT6

T:

Are there circumstances in which your office might decide to prosecute sexting cases?

Q:CKSXT4

T:

IF R HAS NEVER PROSECUTED A CASE, SKIP TO ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION

Q: SXT7

T:

In the sexting cases you have prosecuted, have any minors been charged with felonies?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: SXT7A

T:

What type of felonies have minors been charged with?

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. USE LIST TO PROBE.

- 1 FELONIES RELATED TO CHILD PORNOGRAPHY PRODUCTION OR DISTRIBUTION
- 2 OTHER FELONIES (SPECIFY)
- 3 DK/REFUSED
- 4 CLICK TO CONTINUE

Q: SXT8

T:

Are there circumstances in which you would charge a minor with a felony in a sexting case?

Q:SXT9

T:

Have any of your sexting cases in the past 2 years been resolved through...

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. USE LIST TO PROBE.

- 1 Diversion?

- 2 Juvenile Court?
- 3 Plea Agreements?
- 4 Criminal Trial?
- 5 Dismissal of charges?
- 6 Something else? (SPECIFY)
- 7 NONE OF THE ABOVE
- 8 DK/REFUSED
- 9 CLICK TO CONTINUE

Q:SXT10

T:

In the sexting cases you have prosecuted, have defendants been sentenced to any of the following...

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. USE LIST TO PROBE.

- 1 Community Service
- 2 Educational activities
- 3 Probation

- 4 Jail time
- 5 Sex offender registration
- 6 Something else (SPECIFY)
- 7 NONE OF THE ABOVE
- 8 DK/REFUSED
- 9 CLICK TO CONTINUE

Q:SXT11

T:

Do you think there is a need for additional legislation about sexting cases in your jurisdiction?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: SXT11A

T:

What type of legislation would you most like to see?

Q:SXT12

T:

Do you have any other concerns regarding sexting cases?

1 YES

2 NO

97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE

98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: SXT12A

T:

What else should we know?

Q: CKUC

T:

IF R HAS NEVER PROSECUTED A UC CASE, SKIP TO NEXT SECTION

Q:UC1

T:

You said you have prosecuted an undercover chat case in the past 2 years. How many undercover chat cases have you prosecuted in the past 2 years?

(An estimate is fine.)

1 1-3

2 4-6

3 7-9

4 10-15

5 16-20

6 21-40

7 MORE THAN 40

97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE

98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: UC2

What is the most challenging dilemma you face when prosecuting undercover chat cases?

Q: UC3

T:

In the past 2 years, have you had any undercover chat cases where problems with the police investigation caused real difficulty for you? For example, issues concerning entrapment or other illegal actions by an under-cover agent? (By

real difficulty, I mean problems that were hard to overcome or the prosecution had to take a significantly reduced plea or lost the case.)

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:UC3A

T:

What was the problem with the police investigation?

Q: UC4

T:

Are there any defenses or formal challenges that we haven't already talked about that created real difficulty for the prosecution? (By real difficulty, I mean problems that were hard to overcome or the prosecution took a significantly reduced plea or lost the case).

- 1 YES (SPECIFY UP TO TWO)
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: UC4A

T:

DESCRIBE UP TO TWO TACTICS AND HOW THEY CREATED DIFFICULTIES. PROBE TO FIND OUT HOW THE PROSECUTOR DEFENDED AGAINST THE TACTIC AND WHAT THE RESOLUTION WAS.

Q: CKUCTR

T:

CHECK TO SEE IF THEY HAVE GONE TO TRIAL IN UC CASES

Q:UC5

T:

You said you had an undercover chat case go to trial within the past 2 years. How many of your undercover chat cases went to trial in the past 2 years?(An estimate is fine.)

- ENTER NUMBER(1-95)
- 96 96 OR MORE
- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE

98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:UC6

T:

How many cases were prosecuted in front of a jury?

ENTER NUMBER(1-95)

- 96 96 OR MORE
- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE
- 99 NONE

Q:UC7

T:

Have you had any cases in the past 2 years, where a defendant in an undercover chat case was allowed to plea to a misdemeanor rather than a felony?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:UC7A

T:

What were the circumstances where a defendant in an undercover chat case was allowed to plea to a misdemeanor rather than a felony?

Q:UC7B

T:

Are there circumstances where you would allow a defendant in an undercover chat case to plea to a misdemeanor rather than a felony?

LIST FIRST THREE.

Q: UC8

T:

In the past 2 years, have you prosecuted any undercover chat cases in which sex offender registration was not required when a defendant pleaded guilty?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: UC8A

T:

Please describe the circumstances in which you would agree to a plea bargain that did not require sex offender registration in an undercover chat case?

Q:UC9

T:

Do you think there is a need for additional legislation about undercover chat cases in your jurisdiction?

1	YES
2	NO
97	DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
98	REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: UC9A

T:

What type of legislation would you most like to see?

Q:UC10

T:

Is there anything we have missed that we should know concerning the undercover chat cases you have handled? (TO ENHANCE POLICY OR PRACTICE)

1	YES
2	NO
97	DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
98	REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:UC10A

T:

What else should we know?

Q:CKOE

T:

IF R HAS NEVER PROSECUTED AN ONLINE ENTICEMENT CASE, SKIP TO GENERAL Q'S

Q:OE1

T:

This next set of questions are about the online enticement cases you have prosecuted in the past 2 years. How many online enticement cases have you

prosecuted in the past 2 years? (An estimate is fine.)

- 1 1-3
- 2 4-6
- 3 7-9
- 4 10-15
- 5 16-20
- 6 21-40
- 7 MORE THAN 40

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: OE2

T:

When you handle online enticement cases, do you work with a Child Advocacy Center or multi-disciplinary team?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: OE3

T:

What is the most challenging dilemma you face when prosecuting online enticement cases?

Q:OE4

T:

Have you had any cases (in the past 2 years) where a difficult or uncooperative victim or other witness created real difficulty for the prosecution? (By real difficulty, I mean problems that were hard to overcome or the prosecution had to accept a significantly reduced plea or lost the case.)

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:OE4A

T:

Please describe the outcome.

- 1 SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCED PLEA
- 2 DISMISSAL OF CHARGES

- 3 LOST THE CASE
- 4 SOMETHING ELSE (SPECIFY)

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: OE4B

T:
SPECIFY.

Q: OE4C

T:
Do you have any suggestions for improving victim/witness cooperation?

Q:OE5

T:
Are there any defenses or formal challenges that we haven't already talked about that created real difficulty for the prosecution? (By real difficulty, I mean problems that were hard to overcome or the prosecution took a significantly reduced plea or lost the case)

- 1 YES (SPECIFY UP TO TWO)
- 2 NO
- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: OE5A

T:
DESCRIBE UP TO TWO TACTICS AND HOW THEY CREATED DIFFICULTIES. PROBE TO FIND OUT HOW THE PROSECUTOR DEFENDED AGAINST THE TACTIC AND WHAT THE RESOLUTION WAS.

Q:CKOETR

T:
CHECK TO SEE IF R HAS BEEN TO TRIAL IN OE CASES

Q: OE6

T:
In the past 2 years, how many of your online enticement cases have gone to trial?

- ENTER NUMBER (1-95)
- 96 96 OR MORE
 - 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
 - 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:OE7

T:

How many cases have been prosecuted in front of a jury?

ENTER NUMBER(1-95)

- 96 96 OR MORE
- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE
- 99 NONE

Q:OE8

T:

Have you had any cases in the past 2 years, where a defendant in an online enticement case was allowed to plea to a misdemeanor rather than a felony?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:OE8A

T:

What were the circumstances where a defendant in an online enticement case was allowed to plea to a misdemeanor rather than a felony?

Q:OE8B

T:

Are there any circumstances where you would allow a defendant in an online enticement case to plea to a misdemeanor rather than a felony?

LIST FIRST THREE.

Q: OE9

T:

In the past 2 years, have you prosecuted any online enticement cases in which sex offender registration was not required when a defendant pleaded guilty?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: OE9A

T:

Please describe the circumstances in which you would agree to a plea bargain that did not require sex offender registration in an online enticement case.

Q: OE10

T:

Do you think there is a need for additional legislation about online enticement cases in your jurisdiction?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:OE10A

T:

What type of legislation would you most like to see?

Q: OE11

T:

Is there anything else we should know concerning the online enticement cases you have handled (TO ENHANCE POLICY/PRACTICE)?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:OE11A

T:

What else should we know?

Q:GEN1

T:

I have a few more questions for you. In the past 2 years, have any defendants entered Alford pleas (no contest pleas) in any of your...

(LIST APPLICABLE CASE TYPE)? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.

- 1 Child Pornography Possession (or Distribution)
- 2 Sexting
- 3 Undercover Chat Cases
- 4 Online Enticement Cases
- 5 NONE OF THE ABOVE

- 6 DK/REFUSED
- 7 CLICK TO CONTINUE

Q:GEN2

T:

In your opinion, how much of a priority are child sexual exploitation cases (whether or not the internet is involved) in comparison to other types of cases in your office?

- 1 High priority
- 2 Medium priority
- 3 Low priority
- 4 OTHER (SPECIFY)

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:GEN2A

T:

SPECIFY HOW CASE PRIORITY IS HANDLED.

Q: GEN3

T:

Does your office prosecute cases associated with an ICAC Task Force?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:GEN4

T:

What type of unit do you work for?

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. USE LIST TO PROBE.

- 1 Computer Crimes unit
- 2 Sex Crimes unit
- 3 Juvenile Victims unit
- 4 General unit
- 5 Juvenile Court unit
- 6 OTHER (SPECIFY)
- 7 DK/REFUSED

8 CLICK TO CONTINUE

Q: GEN5

T:

Have you been able to attend any training in how to prosecute Internet-related crimes?

1 YES

2 NO

97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE

98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: GEN6

T:

Who provided that training?

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. USE LIST TO PROBE.

1 ICAC Training & Technical Assistance Program

2 National District Attorneys Association

3 National Center for Missing & Exploited Children

4 Dept. of Justice, including OJJDP

5 Other government agency (NO SPECIFY)

6 Other place (NO SPECIFY)

7 DK/REFUSED

8 CLICK TO CONTINUE

Q: GEN7

T:

Are there any other issues we should know about or suggestions that you have to improve prosecution of child pornography or other technology related crimes?

1 YES (SPECIFY)

2 NO

97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE

98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q: GEN8

T:

SPECIFY.

Q: END

T:

Thank you so much for answering our questions about prosecuting Internet-related sex crimes against children. I may need to call you back to clarify information. Do you have any questions for me about this study?

CLICK '1' TO CONTINUE

Q:END1

T:

Thank you again for talking with us. We expect the results to be available in about a year. Would you like us to notify you when the results are posted on our website?

- 1 YES (SPECIFY)
- 2 NO (THANK R AGAIN AND END INTERVIEW)

- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:END2

T:

Where should we notify you?

TYPE IN EMAIL OR MAILING ADDRESS. THANK R AGAIN. END OF INTERVIEW.

Q:RSEX

T:

RECORD SEX OF RESPONDENT

- 1 MALE
- 2 FEMALE
- 97 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 98 REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINABLE

Q:PROSNUM

T:

RECORD PROSECUTOR ID NUMBER

Q:PROSOFF

T:

RECORD PROSECUTOR OFFICE

Q:INTMO

T:

ENTER MONTH OF INTERVIEW

- 1 JAN
- 2 FEB

3	MAR
4	APR
5	MAY
6	JUN
7	JUL
8	AUG
9	SEP
10	OCT
11	NOV
12	DEC

Q:INTDAY

T:

ENTER DAY OF INTERVIEW (1-31)

Q: PRNAME

T:

ENTER PROSECUTOR NAME

Q: INTNOTES

T:

Any additional notes/comments made that were not captured in the interview.