

**THE OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST  
WOMEN'S GRANT FUNDS USED TO ADDRESS  
STALKING: 2010 REPORT TO CONGRESS**

## **Contents**

Office on Violence Against Women Background	<b>3</b>
Introduction	<b>5</b>
OVW Discretionary Grantees Address the Crime of Stalking	<b>7</b>
Criminal Justice Activities: Snapshot of the Arrest Program (January to June 2009)	<b>14</b>
STOP Program Subgrantees Activities (January to December 2009)	<b>16</b>
Technical Assistance to OVW Grantees	<b>20</b>
Reported Areas of Remaining Need	<b>22</b>

## **Office on Violence Against Women Background**

The Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), a component of the U.S. Department of Justice, provides national leadership in developing the nation's capacity to reduce violence against women through the implementation of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) of 1994. Created in 1995, OVW administers financial and technical assistance to communities across the country that are developing programs, policies, and practices aimed at ending domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Since its inception, OVW has awarded nearly \$4 billion in grants and cooperative agreements and launched a multifaceted approach to implementing VAWA. By forging state, local, and tribal partnerships among police, prosecutors, victim advocates, health care providers, and others, OVW grant programs help provide victims<sup>1</sup> with the protection and services they need to pursue safe and healthy lives, while simultaneously enabling communities to hold offenders accountable for their crimes.

Currently, OVW administers 2 formula grant programs and 19 discretionary grant programs, which were established under VAWA and subsequent legislation. OVW grant funds are awarded to a variety of recipients. Each discretionary program explicitly defines eligible recipients, which vary based on the program (e.g., states, tribal governments, city and county governments, universities, and private nonprofit organizations, including those serving victims/survivors). Grants are typically awarded for a period of 2 or 3 years, though grantees may apply for continuation funding. Formula grants are awarded annually to each state, the District of

---

<sup>1</sup> In most instances, this report's use of the term "victim" is also intended to include "survivor," as in "victim/survivor." Certain statutory wording, names of grant programs, and other terms of art refer only to "victim," and in those instances the original wording has not been changed. The word "victim" may also sometimes appear without "survivor" to avoid awkward wording or facilitate displays of data.

Columbia, and the U.S. territories through the Services, Training, Officers, and Prosecutors (STOP) Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program (STOP Program) and the Sexual Assault Services Program (SASP), with award amounts determined by population. The monies awarded to STOP Program and SASP Program grantees are then allocated to subgrantees in their respective jurisdictions.

The Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (VAWA 2000) requires grantees and subgrantees to report on the effectiveness of activities carried out with grant funds, including the number of people served and the number of people seeking services who could not be served. To meet these congressional reporting requirements and those of the Government Performance and Results Act, OVW requires all discretionary program grantees to complete semi-annual progress reports (January 1 to June 30 and July 1 to December 31) and all formula grantees and subgrantees to complete annual progress reports (January 1 to December 31). Note that data presented in this report come from grantee progress reports for 2009.

## **Introduction**

Since 1995, OVW has provided funding to address the crime of stalking, which is defined as a course of conduct directed at a specific person that would cause a reasonable person to fear for his or her safety or the safety of others or to suffer substantial emotional distress. Almost 3.5 million people over the age of 18 are stalked each year in the United States, mostly by someone they know (nearly three in four cases).<sup>2</sup> Persons 18–24 years of age experience the highest rate of stalking. Thirty percent of stalking victims are stalked by a current or former intimate partner, and 10 percent of stalking victims are stalked by a stranger.

One in four victims report being stalked through the use of some form of technology, such as email or instant messaging.<sup>3</sup> As part of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2005 Congress extended the federal interstate stalking statute to include cyberstalking<sup>4</sup>, which is defined as threatening behavior or unwanted advances directed at another person using the Internet or other forms of online and computer communication.<sup>5</sup>

The snapshot of stalking data that follows is generated from the STOP Program (January to December 2009 reporting period), the National Center for Victims of Crime’s Stalking Resource Center (January to June 2009 and July to December 2009 reporting periods), and the following discretionary grant programs (January to June 2009 and July to December 2009 reporting periods):

---

<sup>2</sup> Katrina Baum et al., “Stalking Victimization in the United States,” (Washington, DC: BJS, 2009).

<sup>3</sup> Katrina Baum et al., “Stalking Victimization in the United States,” (Washington, DC: BJS, 2009).

<sup>4</sup> (18 U.S.C. §2261 A)

<sup>5</sup> This definition comes from the National Center for Victims of Crime, <http://www.ncvc.org/ncvc/main.aspx?dbName=DocumentViewer&DocumentID=32458>

- Education, Training, and Enhanced Services to End Violence Against and Abuse of Women with Disabilities Grant Program (Disabilities Program)
- Enhanced Training and Services to End Violence Against and Abuse of Women Later in Life Program (Abuse in Later Life Program)
- Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies and Enforcement of Protection Orders Program (Arrest Program)
- Grants to Reduce Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, and Stalking on Campus Program (Campus Program)
- Legal Assistance for Victims Grant Program (LAV Program)
- Rural Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, and Stalking Assistance Program (Rural Program)
- State Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence Coalitions Program (State Coalitions Program)
- Supervised Visitation and Safe Exchange Grant Program (Supervised Visitation Program)
- Transitional Housing Assistance Grants for Victims of Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Stalking, or Sexual Assault Program (Transitional Housing Program)
- Tribal Governments Program (Tribal Governments Program)
- Tribal Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Coalitions Grant Program (Tribal Coalitions Program)
- Technical Assistance Program (TA Program)

For more information on these and other OVW grant programs, please visit

<http://www.ovw.usdoj.gov/ovwgrantprograms.htm>.

## OVW Discretionary Grantees Address the Crime of Stalking

During the January to June 2009 and July to December 2009 reporting periods,<sup>6</sup> nine OVW discretionary grant programs reported directing some percentage of grant funds to address the crime of stalking (see table 1).

*Table 1. Number of Discretionary Grantees Directing Some Percentage of Grant Funds to Address Stalking*

Grant Program	January to June 2009	July to December 2009
Arrest Program	<b>99 (50%)</b> (n=198)	<b>108 (49%)</b> (n=222)
Campus Program	<b>58 (98%)</b> (n= 59)	<b>63 (94%)</b> (n=67)
Disabilities Program	<b>14 (41%)</b> (n=34)	<b>14 (35%)</b> (n=40)
Abuse in Later Life Program	<b>8 (26%)</b> (n=31)	<b>15 (48%)</b> (n=31)
LAV Program	<b>71 (55%)</b> (n=129)	<b>88 (56%)</b> (n=158)
Rural Program	<b>82 (58%)</b> (n=142)	<b>90 (56%)</b> (n=162)
Supervised Visitation Program	<b>38 (58%)</b> (n=65)	<b>44 (59%)</b> (n=75)
Transitional Housing Program	<b>27 (18%)</b> (n=147)	<b>35 (19%)</b> (n=182)
Tribal Governments Program	<b>64 (52%)</b> (n=123)	<b>100 (54%)</b> (n=186)

Note: “n” is the number of discretionary grantees that submitted their semi-annual progress reports during the particular reporting period. The percentages shown are the percentages of grantees that directed at least 1 percent of their grant funds to address the crime of stalking.

<sup>6</sup>To avoid duplication, data is presented as two reporting periods as opposed to 1 full year.

## Victims/Survivors of Stalking

Many victims/survivors of stalking were provided services by discretionary grant programs during the 2009 reporting periods (see table 2).

*Table 2. Number of Stalking Victims/Survivors Served<sup>7</sup>*

<b>Grant Program</b>	<b>January to June 2009</b>	<b>July to December 2009</b>
Arrest Program	<b>1,446</b> (n=150)	<b>1,297</b> (n=152)
Campus Program	<b>155</b> (n=40)	<b>113</b> (n=30)
LAV Program	<b>365</b> (n=127)	<b>529</b> (n=149)
Rural Program	<b>630</b> (n=122)	<b>770</b> (n=130)
Tribal Governments Program	<b>170</b> (n=100)	<b>121</b> n=110)

Note: “n” is the number of grantees that reported using funds to provide victim services during that particular reporting period. These numbers do not reflect all victims/survivors of stalking served or partially served, because programs count victims/survivors by their *primary victimization*. For example, a victim who requests assistance with a protection order after being sexually assaulted by an estranged intimate partner who has a history of stalking and controlling behavior will most likely be reported as a victim of sexual assault instead of a victim of stalking because the sexual assault prompted the victim to seek services.

For the discretionary grant programs that reported serving victims/survivors of stalking, the victims served were most often a current or former spouse or intimate partner of the offender (58 percent and 55 percent, respectively). Thirty percent or more of the victims/survivors served were either an acquaintance or a current or former dating partner of the offender (see tables 3 and 4).

---

<sup>7</sup> The number of victims served reported here includes those victims counted on the progress reports as “served” and “partially served.” The OVW progress reports define “victims/survivors served” as those who received the service(s) they requested, if those services were provided under the grant or subgrant; and “victims/survivors partially served” as those who received some, but not all, of the services they requested, if those services were provided under the grant or subgrant.



**Table 3. January to June 2009: Number and Percent of Stalking Victims/Survivors' Relationship to Offenders, by Grant Program**

Type of Relationship	Arrest Program (n=150)	Campus Program (n=40)	LAV Program (n=127)	Rural Program (n=122)	Tribal Governments Program (n=100)	Total Percent
Current or former spouse or intimate partner	824 (52%)	54 (30%)	674 (80%)	441 (53%)	133 (71%)	58%
Acquaintance	315 (20%)	49 (27%)	51 (6%)	168 (20%)	25 (13%)	17%
Current or former dating relationship	230 (14%)	49 (27%)	71 (8%)	118 (14%)	11 (6%)	13%
Other family or household member	92 (6%)	5 (3%)	20 (2%)	59 (7%)	10 (5%)	5%
Relationship unknown	70 (4%)	7 (4%)	14 (2%)	24 (3%)	5 (3%)	3%
Stranger	64 (4%)	18 (10%)	11 (1%)	21 (3%)	4 (2%)	3%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1595</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>841</b>	<b>831</b>	<b>188</b>	

Note: "n" is the number of grantees that reported using funds to provide victim services. Percentages were rounded to the closest whole number and may not equal 100. A victim may have multiple stalking victimizations and/or offenders, so the number of relationships can be higher than the number of victims served.

**Table 4. July to December 2009: Number and Percent of Stalking Victims/Survivors' Relationship to Offenders, by Grant Program**

Type of Relationship	Arrest Program (n=152)	Campus Program (n=30)	LAV Program (n=149)	Rural Program (n=130)	Tribal Governments Program (n=110)	Total Percent
Current or former spouse or intimate partner	627 (44%)	59 (42%)	925 (75%)	419 (49%)	75 (56%)	55%
Acquaintance	255 (18%)	36 (25%)	104 (8%)	203 (24%)	38 (28%)	17%
Current or former dating partner	281 (20%)	23 (16%)	109 (9%)	137 (16%)	6 (4%)	15%
Other family or household member	74 (5%)	5 (4%)	47 (4%)	64 (7%)	3 (2%)	5%
Relationship unknown	98 (7%)	9 (6%)	31 (3%)	19 (2%)	6 (4%)	4%
Stranger	95 (7%)	10 (7%)	17 (1%)	19 (2%)	6 (4%)	4%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1,430</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>1,233</b>	<b>861</b>	<b>134</b>	

Note: "n" is the number of grantees that reported using funds to provide victim services. Percentages were rounded to the closest whole number and may not equal 100 percent. A victim/survivor may have multiple stalking victimizations and/or offenders, so the number of relationships can be higher than the number of victims/survivors served.

The Supervised Visitation Program's semi-annual progress report identifies the number of families seeking and receiving services (as opposed to the number of victims/survivors seeking and receiving services). Of the 2,695 families reported to have been served during the January to June 2009 reporting period, 522 families reported stalking issues (almost 20 percent). For 62 of those families, stalking was the primary reason for the referral to supervised visitation services. Similarly, during the July to December 2009 reporting period, of the 2,572 families reported to have been served by the grantee, 443 reported stalking issues; stalking was the primary reason for the referral to supervised visitation services for 89 of those families.

## **Training on Stalking**

Many OVW grantees provide training to professionals on sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking that enables them to improve their response to victims/survivors. In 2009, many discretionary grantees reported training professionals (e.g., attorneys, court personnel, advocacy organization personnel, law enforcement, mental health professionals, prosecutors) on stalking issues, focusing on stalking statutes and codes, dynamics, and services (see table 5).

**Table 5. Number and Percentage of Discretionary Grantees Training on Stalking Topics, by Grant Program**

Grant Program	January to June 2009		July to December 2009	
	Stalking overview, dynamics, and services	Stalking statutes/codes or laws	Stalking overview, dynamics, and services	Stalking statutes/codes or laws
Arrest Program	<b>80 (57%)</b> (n=141)	<b>55 (39%)</b> (n=141)	<b>73 (56%)</b> (n=130)	<b>49 (38%)</b> (n=130)
Campus Program	<b>35 (74%)</b> (n=47)	<b>16 (34%)</b> (n=47)	<b>33 (87%)</b> (n=38)	<b>21 (55%)</b> (n=38)
LAV Program	<b>37 (39%)</b> (n=95)	<b>37 (39%)</b> (n=95)	<b>38 (37%)</b> (n=103)	<b>44 (43%)</b> (n=103)
Rural Program	<b>59 (51%)</b> (n=115)	<b>28(24%)</b> (n=115)	<b>47 (44%)</b> (n=107)	<b>22 (21%)</b> (n=107)
State Coalitions Program	<b>39 (54%)</b> (n=72)	<b>32 (44%)</b> (n=72)	<b>30 (40%)</b> (n=75)	<b>27 (36%)</b> (n=75)
Supervised Visitation Program	<b>13 (27%)</b> (n=49)	<b>6 (12%)</b> (n=49)	<b>16 (31%)</b> (n=52)	<b>9 (17%)</b> (n=52)
Tribal Coalitions Program	<b>4 (44%)</b> (n=9)	<b>2 (22%)</b> (n=9)	<b>6 (40%)</b> (n=15)	<b>0</b> (n=15)
Tribal Governments Program	<b>9 (25%)</b> (n=36)	<b>3 (8%)</b> (n=36)	<b>22 (40%)</b> (n=55)	<b>13 (24%)</b> (n=55)
TA Program	<b>20 (22%)</b> (n=89)	<b>20 (22%)</b> (n=89)	<b>25 (24%)</b> (n=104)	<b>19 (18%)</b> (n=104)

Note: “n” is the number of discretionary grantees that reported using their funds to provide training during that particular reporting period.

## **Stalking Education**

Many OVW grantees<sup>8</sup> engage in educational activities that provide general information to increase public awareness of sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, or stalking. Of the 50 Campus Program grantees that provided education during the January to June 2009 reporting period, three-quarters addressed stalking prevention (76 percent), and more than four-fifths provided an overview of stalking dynamics and services (84 percent). During the same reporting period, more than half of the 116 Rural Program grantees reported providing education on stalking, which included an overview of stalking dynamics and services (57 percent).

---

<sup>8</sup> The Campus, Rural, Tribal Coalitions, and Disabilities Programs reported using funds for educational activities during this reporting period.

## **Criminal Justice Activities: Snapshot of the Arrest Program (January to June 2009)**

### **Law Enforcement**

Of the 198 Arrest Program grantees, 71 reported using grant funding for law enforcement activities (36 percent).<sup>9</sup> Of those, 40 grantees reported using funds for law enforcement activities related to stalking (56 percent). Arrest Program grantees reported responding to 854 calls for assistance,<sup>10</sup> of which 839 resulted in completed incident reports (94 percent) and 814 were investigated (80 percent of the incident reports). Arrests were made in 333 of the cases/incidents investigated (39 percent).<sup>11</sup>

### **Prosecution**

Twenty-seven percent of Arrest Program grantees reported using grant funding for prosecution activities (54 out of 198 grantees). Of those grantees, 56 percent reported stalking-related cases (30 grantees). For all stalking ordinance cases, misdemeanor stalking cases, and felony stalking cases reported by Arrest Program grantees during this reporting period, more than half resulted in convictions (50 percent, 52 percent, and 88 percent, respectively).<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> The Arrest Program collects and reports agency-wide data for all criminal justice activities.

<sup>10</sup> All 911 and other calls made to law enforcement reporting on or requesting assistance in sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking incidents

<sup>11</sup> The percentages in this paragraph include only grantees that provided data for all of the listed activities. The assumption is that, in most instances, reported activities occurred in the same reporting period. This report does not include activities that occurred outside of the reporting period. For example, if a phone call for assistance was made at the end of a reporting period and the subsequent arrest was made in the beginning of the next reporting period, only one of those activities was included in this report.

<sup>12</sup> Figures comprise all cases disposed during this reporting period, including deferred adjudications. Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

## Protection Orders

Protection orders are court orders designed to protect victims/survivors from contact with their offender(s) during the term of the order.<sup>13</sup> OVW grantees demonstrate a commitment to the enforcement of protection orders from other states and jurisdictions (including tribal jurisdictions). Arrest Program grantees reported the number of law enforcement officers, victim service providers, court officials, and prosecutors that assisted victims/survivors with obtaining temporary and final protection orders (see table 6).

*Table 6. Arrest Program Assistance with Protection Orders (January to June 2009)*

<b>Arrest Program-Funded Assistance Provider</b>	<b>Temporary Protection Orders Granted</b>	<b>Final Protection Orders Granted</b>
<b>Law enforcement</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>138</b>
<b>Victim services</b>	<b>635</b>	<b>547</b>
<b>Prosecution</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Court</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>29</b>

---

<sup>13</sup> Protection orders may also be referred to as protection from abuse orders, protection from harassment orders, anti-harassment orders, restraining orders, no-contact orders, or stay-away orders in a given jurisdiction; and may be criminal or civil. Temporary orders are generally issued *ex parte*, meaning without a court hearing, for a short period of time (e.g., 30 days), and final orders are issued for a longer period of time (e.g., 2 years) after a court hearing.

## **STOP Program Subgrantees Activities (January to December 2009)**

In 2009, a total of 2,305 STOP Program subgrantees submitted annual progress reports. Of those, 979 subgrantees used some percentage of STOP Program funds to address stalking (42 percent),<sup>14</sup> and 286 subgrantees addressed stalking as a STOP Program statutory purpose area (12 percent).<sup>15</sup>

### **Victims/Survivors of Stalking**

STOP Program subgrantees served 10,674 victims/survivors of stalking during the reporting period<sup>16</sup>. Forty-seven percent were a current or former spouse or intimate partner of the offender, and 32 percent were either an acquaintance or a current or former dating partner of the offender (see table 7).

---

<sup>14</sup> At least 1 percent was directed to address the crime of stalking

<sup>15</sup> These subgrantees may have also addressed domestic violence, dating violence, and sexual assault.

<sup>16</sup> The total number of victims served reported here includes those victims counted on the progress reports as “served” and “partially served.” The OVW progress reports define “victims/survivors served” as those who received the service(s) they requested, if those services were provided under the grant or subgrant; and “victims/survivors partially served” as those who received some, but not all, of the services they requested, if those services were provided under the grant or subgrant. These numbers do not reflect all victims/survivors of stalking served or partially served, because programs count victims/survivors by their *primary victimization*. For example, a victim who requests assistance with a protection order after being sexually assaulted by an estranged intimate partner who has a history of stalking and controlling behavior will most likely be reported as a victim of sexual assault instead of a victim of stalking because the sexual assault prompted the victim to seek services.



**Table 7. STOP Program: Number and Percent of Stalking Victims/Survivors' Relationship to Offenders<sup>17</sup>**

<b>Type of Relationship</b>	<b>Number of Relationships Reported</b>
Current or former spouse or intimate partner	<b>6,118 (47%)</b>
Current or former dating relationship	<b>2,287 (18%)</b>
Acquaintance	<b>1,797 (14%)</b>
Relationship unknown	<b>1,668 (13%)</b>
Other family or household member	<b>669 (5%)</b>
Stranger	<b>525 (4%)</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,064</b>

### **Training**

More than a third of the STOP Program subgrantees that reported using funds for training professionals in 2009 offered training on stalking.<sup>18</sup> Of those subgrantees, 367 trained professionals on stalking statutes and codes and 490 trained professionals on stalking overview, dynamics, and services.

<sup>17</sup> A victim may have multiple stalking victimizations and/or offenders, so the number of relationships can be higher than the number of victims served. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number and may not equal 100 percent.

<sup>18</sup> A total of 1,000 STOP Program subgrantees used funds for training professionals in 2009.

## **Criminal Justice Activities**

In 2009, 516 STOP Program subgrantees reported using funds for specialized units<sup>19</sup> in law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and probation or parole. More than a third of those subgrantees reported specialized prosecution units or law enforcement units that addressed stalking (38 percent and 35 percent, respectively).<sup>20, 21</sup>

## **Law Enforcement**

During the reporting period, 13 percent of the STOP Program subgrantees used grant funding for law enforcement activities (291 subgrantees). Law enforcement reported responding to 1,855 stalking calls for assistance, recording 1,404 incidents of stalking, and investigating 1,636 cases/incidents. STOP Program subgrantees reported making 439 arrests related to stalking.<sup>22</sup>

## **Prosecution**

During the reporting period, 305 STOP Program subgrantees reported using grant funding for prosecution. Of the 3,800 stalking case referrals received, 56 percent were accepted for prosecution (2,128 cases).<sup>23</sup> For all stalking ordinance cases, misdemeanor stalking cases, and

---

<sup>19</sup> A *specialized unit* is defined as a centralized or coordinated group, unit, or dedicated staff of police officers, prosecutors, probation officers, judges, or other court staff responsible for handling sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and/or stalking cases.

<sup>20</sup> Often, stalking is combined with domestic violence or dating violence in cases handled by specialized units.

<sup>21</sup> Four percent of STOP Program subgrantees reported specialized courts that addressed stalking, and 4 percent reported probation or parole units that addressed stalking.

<sup>22</sup> STOP Program subgrantees only report activities funded by STOP Program funds. For example, if STOP Program funding was used to support a 911 dispatcher, detective, or patrol officer, only the activities engaged in by those personnel would be reported.

<sup>23</sup> Cases accepted, declined, or transferred in the current reporting period may have been received by prosecution in a previous reporting period.

felony stalking cases reported by STOP Program subgrantees in 2009, roughly two-thirds or more resulted in convictions (81 percent, 66 percent, and 82 percent, respectively).<sup>24</sup>

### **Protection Orders**

STOP Program subgrantees reported assisting victims/survivors with obtaining temporary and final protection orders with the assistance of STOP Program-funded law enforcement, victim services, prosecution, and court staff.

*Table 8. STOP Program: Assistance with Protection Orders*

<b>Assistance by Type of STOP Program-funded Staff</b>	<b>Temporary Protection Orders Granted</b>	<b>Final Protection Orders Granted</b>
<b>Law enforcement</b>	<b>1,531</b>	<b>779</b>
<b>Victim services</b>	<b>4,349</b>	<b>2,489</b>
<b>Prosecution</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>184</b>
<b>Court</b>	<b>1,494</b>	<b>350</b>

---

<sup>24</sup> Numbers reflect all cases disclosed during the reporting period, including deferred adjudications. Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

## **Technical Assistance to OVW Grantees**

The National Center for Victims of Crime (NCVC) is the only OVW technical assistance provider that focuses exclusively on stalking issues. Since 1998, NCVC has used OVW grant funds to maintain the Stalking Resource Center (SRC), which works to raise national awareness of stalking and encourage the development and implementation of multidisciplinary responses to stalking in local communities across the country. As the only national training and technical assistance center focused solely on stalking, SRC has provided training to tens of thousands of victim service providers and criminal justice professionals throughout the United States and has fostered innovations in programs for stalking. SRC provides training on stalking dynamics, legal remedies, multidisciplinary efforts, practitioner-specific practices (e.g., safety planning, investigation, prosecution), and the use of technology to stalk. SRC also collects and distributes materials for practitioners such as case law digests and model protocols from jurisdictions throughout the country.

SRC provides a wide range of valuable information to OVW grantees, subgrantees, and the public through their website: [www.ncvc.org/src](http://www.ncvc.org/src). The website is continuously updated with information, including weekly postings of news articles involving stalking, periodic legislative and case law updates, and timely postings of new materials developed by SRC. The SRC website also includes a compilation of federal, state, territory, and tribal stalking laws; stalking-related articles, research, guides, and awareness materials for download and distribution; and highlights of stalking-related news stories from across the country.

Between January and December 2009, SRC responded to 207 technical assistance and information requests on a variety of topics, including developing a model policy to address stalking on college and university campuses; developing a profession-specific guide on stalking for parole, probation, and corrections personnel; and National Stalking Awareness Month. SRC also provided 48 consultations and 10 referrals and responded to 149 requests for information.

During this same period, SRC provided 356 hours of training to 9,215 professionals. Training was provided through national conferences hosted by SRC and at events sponsored or hosted by grantees and other technical assistance providers, including the National Network to End Domestic Violence, the Battered Women's Justice Project, and the Iowa Coalition Against Sexual Assault. By conducting workshops at conferences throughout the country,<sup>25</sup> SRC increased opportunities to raise grantee and public awareness about stalking issues.

---

<sup>25</sup> These training opportunities included conferences and institutes sponsored by the Arizona Sexual Assault Network; Fairfax County Government Department of Systems Management for Human Services (VA); Legal Services of Northern Virginia; Esperanza Shelter and the Santa Fe Coordinated Community Response Council (NM); Custer Network Against Domestic Abuse and Sexual Assault, and the Dawson County Domestic Violence Program (MT); National Sheriff's Association Domestic Violence Committee; EMERGE (MA); Mississippi Attorney General's Office; Philadelphia Police Department and Women's Law Project (PA); Texas Association Against Sexual Assault; Arizona Governor's Office for Children, Youth, and Families; Catholic Charities (NY); Suffolk County Executive's Task Force to Prevent Family Violence (NY); New Jersey Administrative Office of the Courts Criminal Practice Division; West Virginia Foundation for Rape and Information Services; University of Vermont Women's Center; New Jersey Courts Judicial Performance and Education Program; Women's Resource Center (MN); Tennessee Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence; Florida Coalition Against Domestic Violence; Susquehanna Valley Women in Transition (PA); End Violence Against Women International; Federal Law Enforcement Training Center; Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center; Texas Association Against Sexual Assault; Southwest Center for Law and Policy (AZ); Henrico County Division of Police, and Chesterfield Police Department (VA); National Network to End Domestic Violence; Women in Need (PA); Arkansas Coalition to End Sexual Assault; York/Poquoson Victim-Witness Assistance Program (VA); Family Support Center (WA); Tohono O'odhnam Nation; Nebraska State Patrol; Minnesota Coalition for Battered Women; Pikes Peak Domestic Violence Summit (CO); EMERGE, SOS, Inc. (KS); South Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault; Kitsap County Domestic Violence Task Force (WA); California Coalition Against Sexual Assault; 22nd Judicial District Council on Domestic Violence (IL); National District Attorneys Association; Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence; VERA Institute; 7th Judicial District Gender Fairness Committee (NY); Mary Bryon Foundation; Louisiana Foundation Against Sexual Assault; Iowa Legal Aid; and Ocean County Prosecutor's Office (NJ).

## Reported Areas of Remaining Need

In 2009, STOP Program subgrantees reported a need for expanded community education and awareness, enhanced coordinated community response to stalking crimes, and training for more professionals on how best to respond to stalking issues.

The subgrantees stressed the need for increased community education and an overall awareness and understanding of stalking-related issues by the public as a priority and continued focus in the field. Cyberstalking was mentioned as a particular area where more education and awareness is needed. Awareness of stalking laws and resources, especially among victims, was also mentioned as a need by subgrantees. STOP Program subgrantees provided the following feedback:

*One of the most significant areas of remaining need is working with teenagers in terms of dating violence, and stalking, including cyberstalking. We are just beginning to discover the depth of this problem in our community, and also discovering the lack of knowledge about these issues among the teenagers themselves, let alone their parents, teachers, and the community as a whole...*

Siuslaw Outreach Services, Oregon

*The rising popularity of cell phone texting, Facebook, and MySpace has created a steady flow of offenses that occur in an absolute electronic environment. It is most difficult, if not impossible, to prove the offender was the person who made the electronic footprint that forms the basis of the crime. State criminal law has not kept in time with electronic socialization. Aside from amendments to current law or new criminal laws, it remains*

*problematic to hold offenders accountable for such online crimes. Fortunately, there are precautions victims can be counseled on to prevent further "electronic abuse."*

Hillsborough County Attorney Office, New Hampshire

*The statutes providing protection for victims of stalking are somewhat cumbersome and in need of clarification and revision. For example, the court that a victim can seek protection from and the rules surrounding what kind of protection they can request vary depending on the victim's relationship to the stalker. Especially when the victim is unrelated to the stalker, only weak forms of protection orders are available. There is a need to reform stalking statutes to provide clarity and greater protection for victims.*

Women Helping Battered Women, Vermont

Enhancing the coordinated community response to stalking was reported by STOP Program subgrantees as an area of need. A coordinated community response (CCR) brings together criminal and civil justice personnel, victim advocates, social services staff, and other entities and professionals to create a multidisciplinary, integrated response that holds offenders accountable for violent crimes against women and develops and strengthens services to victims of these crimes. One STOP subgrantee reported:

*There is a need to improve services to victims of stalking cases that occur within the context of domestic violence. The Orange County District Attorney's Office filed 26 stalking cases involving domestic violence in 2008, up from 23 cases in 2007. Stalking cases are unique in their complexity, duration, and level of threat. It is critical to have specialized staff to handle these cases. Specifically, the Orange County District Attorney's Office sees a need to 1) develop a stalker tracking database; 2) develop policies and procedures to coordinate parallel stalking investigations involving multiple jurisdictions; 3) provide training to prosecutors, law enforcement, the judiciary, and victims' organizations to ensure that stalkers are prosecuted appropriately and that the dignity and safety of victims is always maintained; and 4) conduct outreach to Orange County's diverse populations to raise*

*awareness of stalking among the general public and to inform victims about available resources. In addition, recent changes in both case and statutory law have made the need for victim advocates even more essential... The efforts of the victim advocates greatly increase the likelihood that a victim will participate in the prosecution.*

Orange County District Attorney's Office, California

Training professionals in each component of CCR was mentioned as an area of critical need in the field. For example, subgrantees reported that law enforcement officers and prosecutors need to be trained in recognizing stalking cases and assessing risk, with the goal of prosecuting more stalking crimes. STOP Program subgrantees reported the following:

*In Franklin County, stalking is a crime that is rarely investigated by law enforcement officials. Without proper documentation of a series of acts, this crime can be difficult to prove. There is a need in our county to teach police officers to engage stalking victims in the collection of this evidence. For example, victims can learn to log every encounter with the offender, whether that is through emails, phone calls, letters, in-person visits, etc.*

Franklin County, Pennsylvania

*In 2009, the team observed many domestic violence cases that had elements of stalking behavior perpetrated by the batterer. However, stalking is rarely charged by law enforcement agencies in Albany County. Officers seemed to be intimidated by the stalking laws and are more at ease with charging other domestic violence crimes. In the past, the prosecutors have also been reluctant to add stalking offenses and rely on charges for violations of orders of protections instead. It is also very unlikely that when a defendant pleads guilty a stalking offense will be included in the plea agreement. There definitely needs to be a great[er] focus on the prosecution of stalking related offenses. Usually, when a perpetrator uses stalking behavior in the past, he will also rely on it as a battering technique in the future. If the offender has stalking on his permanent record, it will allow officers to charge repeat offenders with more serious crimes and therefore deter perpetrators from such behaviors in the future.*



Albany County, New York