



United States Department of Justice

Office on Violence Against Women

---

*Working Together to End the Violence*

# S•T•O•P Program

Services • Training • Officers  
• Prosecutors

2010 Report



# Contents

<b>Acknowledgments.....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Background.....</b>	<b>3</b>
Statutory Purpose Areas of STOP Program .....	3
Allocation and Distribution of STOP Program Funds .....	6
Eligibility Requirements.....	6
Reporting Requirements.....	8
Reporting Methods .....	9
<b>STOP Program 2007: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds.....</b>	<b>11</b>
Sources of Data .....	11
How STOP Program Funds Were Distributed: STOP Administrators.....	11
How STOP Program Funds Were Used: Subgrantees .....	12
Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed .....	13
Types of Agencies Receiving STOP Program Funds.....	14
Types of Victimization Addressed by Funded Projects .....	15
<b>Effectiveness of the STOP Program .....</b>	<b>17</b>
Coordinated Community Response.....	17
Training .....	23
Victim Services .....	28
Underserved Populations.....	31
American Indians and Alaska Natives .....	33
Victims/Survivors with Disabilities and Victims/Survivors Who Are Older.....	35
Victims/Survivors Who Are Immigrants or Refugees .....	38
Victims/Survivors Who Live in Rural Areas .....	40
The Criminal Justice Response: Specialized Units, Policies and Protocols, Data Collection and Communication Systems.....	42
Law Enforcement .....	43
Prosecution .....	47
Courts .....	52
Probation Supervision .....	55
Data Collection and Communication Systems .....	59
Sexual Assault .....	61
Stalking.....	65
Remaining Areas of Need .....	68
<b>STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments.....</b>	<b>71</b>
Training .....	72
Coordinated Community Response.....	73
Policies .....	74
Products.....	75
Data Collection and Communication Systems .....	75
Specialized Units.....	76
System Improvement.....	77

Victim Services.....	77
Protection Orders .....	81
Criminal Justice .....	82
<b>References.....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>Appendix A.....</b>	<b>95</b>
Table A1: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2007 .....	97
Table A2. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2007 .....	99
<b>Appendix B.....</b>	<b>101</b>
Table B1. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2007 .....	103
Table B2. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2007.....	105
Table B3. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2007 .....	107
Table B4. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2007 .....	111
Table B5. Victim's relationship to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2007 .....	113

**List of Tables**

Table 1. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2007 .....	12
Table 2. Statutory purpose areas addressed with STOP Program funds in 2007.....	14
Table 3. Types of agencies receiving STOP Program funds in 2007 .....	15
Table 4. Types of victimization(s) addressed by STOP Program-funded projects in 2007.....	16
Table 5. Community agencies/organizations with which subgrantees reported having weekly or monthly meetings in 2007 .....	22
Table 6. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2007—selected professional positions.....	28
Table 7. Individuals receiving STOP Program-funded services in 2007 .....	29
Table 8. Disposition of selected violations of probation and other court orders in STOP Program-funded courts in 2007.....	55
Table 9. Disposition of selected probation violations by STOP Program-funded probation departments in 2007.....	58
Table 10. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Program in 2007 .....	71
Table 11. People trained using STOP Program funds in 2007 .....	72
Table 12. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to community agencies in 2007.....	73
Table 13. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols in 2007.....	74
Table 14. Use of STOP Program funds to develop or revise products for distribution in 2007 .....	75

Table 15. Use of STOP Program funds for data collection activities and/or communication systems in 2007.....	76
Table 16. Most frequently reported purposes of data collection and/or communication systems in 2007.....	76
Table 17. Use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities in 2007.....	77
Table 18. Use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities in 2007.....	77
Table 19. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees in 2007, by level of service and type of victimization.....	78
Table 20. Victims/survivors receiving services from STOP Program subgrantees in 2007, by type of victimization.....	78
Table 21. Demographic characteristics of victims/survivors served by STOP Program subgrantees in 2007.....	79
Table 22. Relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds in 2007.....	80
Table 23. Victim services provided by STOP Program subgrantees in 2007.....	80
Table 24. Protection orders granted with assistance of STOP Program-funded staff in 2007.....	81
Table 25. Law enforcement activities funded by STOP Program in 2007.....	82
Table 26. Prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence, and related charges by STOP Program-funded prosecutors in 2007.....	83
Table 27. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders by STOP Program-funded courts in 2007.....	84
Table 28. Offender monitoring by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2007, by type and number of contacts.....	85
Table 29. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2007.....	85



# Acknowledgments

The Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) gratefully acknowledges the work of the staff of the Violence Against Women Act's Measuring Effectiveness Initiative at the Muskie School of Public Service, University of Southern Maine (Muskie School); the staff played a central role in the development of this report to Congress.

In addition, we wish to express our appreciation to the STOP (Services • Training • Officers • Prosecutors) Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program (STOP Program) administrators and subgrantees who collected and reported the data on which this report is based, and who worked with the Muskie School to ensure the accuracy of the data. OVW also thanks the administrators and subgrantees who provided detailed narrative data about their STOP-funded activities and about the impact of STOP Program funding on their states and communities. This information has added significant depth and detail to this report, providing specific examples of the STOP Program's accomplishments on behalf of women who are victims/survivors of violence.

Susan B. Carbon  
Director  
Office on Violence Against Women  
U.S. Department of Justice





# Introduction

The STOP (Services • Training • Officers • Prosecutors) Program 2010 Report<sup>1</sup> is submitted in fulfillment of the statutory requirement that the U.S. Attorney General provide a biennial report to Congress on the STOP Program, including how funds were used and an evaluation of the effectiveness of funded programs. The overall structure of the report is designed to move from the general to the specific. “Background” (page 3) sets out the statutory origins and outlines of the STOP Program – the Program’s goals, the allocation and distribution of STOP Program funds, and states’ eligibility, reporting requirements, and reporting methods.<sup>2</sup> “STOP Program 2007: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds” (page 11) describes the sources of the data and how funds were used during calendar year 2007 – what types of agencies and organizations received funding and the types of activities they engaged in. “Effectiveness of the STOP Programs” (page 17) describes key activities carried out with STOP Program funds, discusses why they are important, and provides examples of specific STOP-funded programs and initiatives engaging in those activities. “STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments” (page 71) presents the data reported by subgrantees in greater detail with regard to activities engaged in with STOP Program funds. Finally, Appendix A and Appendix B present data on the numbers and amounts of awards in the mandated allocation categories (i.e., victim services, law enforcement, prosecution, and courts) and the number and characteristics of victims/survivors served on a state-by-state basis. More extensive discussion of the prevalence of violence against women and what research and practice have shown to be effective strategies for responding to the violence can be found in the 2008 Biennial Report to Congress on the Effectiveness of Grant Programs Under the Violence Against Women Act (2008 Biennial Report).

---

<sup>1</sup> The STOP Report previous to this one, called the *STOP Program 2008 Report*, was based on 2006 STOP Program data and was submitted in fulfillment of the biennial reporting requirement for 2008; this 2010 report is based on 2007 data and is submitted in fulfillment of the biennial reporting requirement for 2010. It is expected that a STOP report based on data from 2008, 2009, and 2010 will be submitted to fulfill the reporting requirement for 2012. At that point, reporting of STOP data will be timely and in compliance with reporting requirements as amended in the Violence Against Women Act of 2005 (VAWA 2005). Prior to VAWA 2005, STOP data was reported on an annual basis and STOP reports were named for the year following the year of the data upon which the report was based.

<sup>2</sup> Throughout this report, the word “state” is intended to refer to *all* recipients of STOP awards—i.e., the 50 states, the five U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia.



# Background

## Statutory Purpose Areas of STOP Program

The STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program, also known as the STOP Program, was authorized by the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), Title IV of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law No. 103–322), and reauthorized and amended by VAWA 2000 (Public Law No. 106–386) and VAWA 2005 (Public Law No. 109–162). The STOP Program, which funds states and territories, promotes a coordinated, multidisciplinary approach to improving the criminal justice system’s response to violent crimes against women and increasing the availability of victim services. The Program encourages the development and strengthening of effective law enforcement, prosecution, and judicial strategies and victim services.

By statute, STOP Program funds may be used for the following purposes:<sup>3</sup>

- Training law enforcement officers, judges, other court personnel, and prosecutors to more effectively identify and respond to violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence;
- Developing, training, or expanding units of law enforcement officers, judges, other court personnel, and prosecutors specifically targeting violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault and domestic violence;
- Developing and implementing more effective police, court, and prosecution policies, protocols, orders, and services specifically devoted to preventing, identifying, and responding to violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault and domestic violence;
- Developing, installing, or expanding data collection and communication systems, including computerized systems, linking police, prosecutors, and courts or for the purpose of identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions for violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault and domestic violence;

---

<sup>3</sup> VAWA 2005 added three new purpose areas to the STOP Program, which are included as the last three bullets in this list. However, STOP subgrantees were not able to specifically report that their activities addressed these new purpose areas during calendar year 2007; they began reporting this on the revised annual progress reporting form, which reflected activities in calendar year 2008.

- Developing, enlarging, or strengthening victim services programs, including sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence programs, developing or improving delivery of victim services to underserved populations, providing specialized domestic violence court advocates in courts where a significant number of protection orders are granted, and increasing reporting and reducing attrition rates for cases involving violent crimes against women, including crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence;
- Developing, enlarging, or strengthening programs addressing stalking;
- Developing, enlarging, or strengthening programs addressing the needs and circumstances of Indian tribes in dealing with violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault and domestic violence;
- Supporting formal and informal statewide, multidisciplinary efforts, to the extent not supported by state funds, to coordinate the response of state law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, courts, victim services agencies, and other state agencies and departments, to violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence;
- Training of sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners in the collection and preservation of evidence, analysis, prevention, and providing expert testimony and treatment of trauma related to sexual assault;
- Developing, enlarging, or strengthening programs to assist law enforcement, prosecutors, courts, and others to address the needs and circumstances of older and disabled women who are victims of domestic violence or sexual assault, including recognizing, investigating, and prosecuting instances of such violence or assault and targeting outreach and support, counseling, and other victim services to such older and disabled individuals;
- Providing assistance to victims of domestic violence and sexual assault in immigration matters;
- Maintaining core victim services and criminal justice initiatives, while supporting complementary new initiatives and emergency services for victims and their families;
- Supporting the placement of special victim assistants (to be known as “Jessica Gonzales Victim Assistants”) in local law enforcement agencies to serve as liaisons between victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and personnel in local law enforcement agencies in order to improve the enforcement of protection orders. Jessica Gonzales Victim Assistants shall have expertise in domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and may undertake the following activities—
  - Notifying persons seeking enforcement of protection orders as to what responses will be provided by the relevant law enforcement agency;
  - Referring persons seeking enforcement of protection orders to supplementary services (such as emergency shelter programs, hotlines, or legal assistance services); and

- Taking other appropriate action to assist or secure the safety of the person seeking enforcement of a protection order.
- To provide funding to law enforcement agencies, nonprofit nongovernmental victim services providers, and State, tribal, territorial, and local governments, (which funding stream shall be known as the Crystal Judson Domestic Violence Protocol Program) to promote—
  - The development and implementation of training for local victim domestic violence service providers, and to fund victim services personnel, to be known as “Crystal Judson Victim Advocates,” to provide supportive services and advocacy for victims of domestic violence committed by law enforcement personnel;
  - The implementation of protocols within law enforcement agencies to ensure consistent and effective responses to the commission of domestic violence by personnel within such agencies (such as the model policy promulgated by the International Association of Chiefs of Police [‘Domestic Violence by Police Officers: A Policy of the IACP, Police Response to Violence Against Women Project’ July 2003]);
  - The development of such protocols in collaboration with State, tribal, territorial and local victim service providers and domestic violence coalitions.

The emphasis of the STOP Program continues to be on the implementation of comprehensive strategies addressing violence against women that are sensitive to the needs and safety of victims<sup>4</sup> and that hold offenders accountable for their crimes. States carry out these strategies by forging lasting partnerships between the criminal justice system and victim advocacy organizations and by encouraging communities to look beyond traditional resources and to look to new partners, such as faith-based and community organizations, to respond more vigorously to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking crimes.

For fiscal year 2007, states were encouraged to develop and support projects to:

- 1) Implement community-driven initiatives, utilizing faith-based and community organizations to address the needs of underserved populations as defined by VAWA, including people with disabilities and elder victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and
- 2) Address sexual assault and stalking through service expansion; development and implementation of protocols; training for judges, other court personnel, prosecutors, and law enforcement; and development of coordinated community responses to violence against women.

---

<sup>4</sup> In most instances this report’s use of the term “victim” is also intended to include “survivor,” as in “victim/survivor.” Exceptions include certain statutory wording and other terms of art that refer only to “victim”; in those instances the original wording has not been changed. The word “victim” may also sometimes appear without “survivor” to avoid awkward wording or to simplify displays of data.

## Allocation and Distribution of STOP Program Funds

The Department of Justice’s Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) administers the STOP Program according to a statutory formula. All states, including the U.S. territories and the District of Columbia, are eligible to apply for STOP Program grants to address the crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. Funds are distributed to the states according to the following formula: a base award of \$600,000 is made to each state, and

remaining funds [are awarded] to each state in an amount that bears the same ratio to the amount of remaining funds as the population of the state bears to the population of all of the states that results from a distribution among the states on the basis of each state’s population in relation to the population of all states (not including populations of Indian tribes (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg–1(b)(5) and (6)).

Funds granted to the states are then subgranted to agencies and programs, including state offices and agencies, state and local courts, units of local government, tribal governments, and nonprofit, nongovernmental victim services programs. Each state determines the process by which it awards subgrants.<sup>5</sup> STOP Program awards may support up to 75 percent of the costs of all projects receiving subgrants, including the cost of administering those subgrants; the remaining 25 percent of costs must be covered by nonfederal match sources.<sup>6</sup>

The statute requires each state to distribute STOP Program funds as follows: 25 percent for law enforcement; 25 percent for prosecution; 30 percent for victim services, of which at least 10 percent shall be distributed to culturally specific community-based organizations; and 5 percent for state and local courts, including juvenile courts. The use of the remaining 15 percent is discretionary, within parameters defined by the statute (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg–1(c)(3)).

## Eligibility Requirements

To be eligible to receive STOP Program funds, states must meet all application requirements and certify that they are in compliance with certain statutory requirements of VAWA. First, the states’ laws, policies, and practices must not require victims of domestic violence to incur costs related to prosecution, or victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking to incur costs related to obtaining protection orders; and, second, states must certify that a government entity incurs the

---

<sup>5</sup> The state official(s) designated to administer STOP Program formula funds will be referred to in this report as the “STOP administrator(s).”

<sup>6</sup> VAWA 2005, as amended, contains a new provision eliminating match in certain circumstances and providing for waivers of match in other circumstances (42 U.S.C. section 13925(b)(1)). Data reported by STOP subgrantees and presented in this report reflect activities supported by the required nonfederal match sources.

full out-of-pocket costs of forensic medical exams for sexual assault victims (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg–(5)(a); 3796gg–(4)(a)).

A state application for STOP Program funding must include documentation from prosecution, law enforcement, court, and victim services programs that demonstrate the need for grant funds, how they intend to use the funds, the expected results, and the demographic characteristics of the populations to be served (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(d)).

Within 120 days of receiving a STOP Program grant, states are required to submit implementation plans describing their identified goals and how funds will be used to accomplish these goals.<sup>7</sup> States that have previously submitted a three-year plan must certify how, or whether, the previous plan has changed. States are required to consult with nonprofit, nongovernmental victim services programs, including domestic violence and sexual assault service programs, when developing their implementation plans. States are strongly encouraged to include Indian tribal governments in their planning processes.

The implementation plans describe how states will:

- 1) give priority to areas of varying geographic size with the greatest showing of need, based on the current availability of existing domestic violence and sexual assault programs in the population, and geographic area to be served in relation to the availability of such programs in other such populations and geographic areas;
- 2) determine the amount of subgrants based on the population and geographic area to be served;
- 3) distribute monies equitably on a geographic basis, including nonurban and rural areas of varying geographic sizes; and
- 4) recognize and address the needs of underserved populations and ensure that monies set aside to fund linguistically and culturally specific services and activities for underserved populations are distributed equitably among those populations.

State implementation plans also describe the involvement of victim services providers and advocates; major shifts in direction, how the states' approach to violence against women will build on earlier efforts; how funds will be distributed to law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and victim services categories; the types of programs the grantee intends to support; whether funds will be directed to the Crystal Judson Domestic Violence Protocol Program; and how the success of grant-funded activities will be evaluated.

---

<sup>7</sup> Beginning in fiscal year 2003, OVW permitted states to satisfy the implementation plan requirement by submitting three-year implementation plans and annual updates.

## Reporting Requirements

VAWA 1994 required that the Attorney General provide an annual report to Congress on the STOP Program no later than 180 days after the end of each fiscal year for which grants are made. Amendments made by VAWA 2005 require that future reports be submitted no later than one month after the end of each even-numbered fiscal year (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-3(b)). The statute requires that the annual report include the following information for each state receiving funds:

- 1) the number of grants made and funds distributed;
- 2) a summary of the purposes for which those grants were provided and an evaluation of their progress;
- 3) a statistical summary of persons served, detailing the nature of victimization and providing data on age, sex, relationship to the offender, geographic distribution, race, ethnicity, language, disability, and the membership of persons served in any underserved population; and
- 4) an evaluation of the effectiveness of programs funded with STOP Program monies (42 U.S.C. 3796gg-3(b)).

In VAWA 2000 Congress broadened existing reporting provisions to require the Attorney General to submit a biennial report to Congress on the effectiveness of activities of VAWA-funded grant programs (Public Law No. 106-386, section 1003 (codified at 42 U.S.C. 3789p)). In response to this statutory mandate, and as part of a broader effort to improve measurements of program performance, OVW worked with the VAWA Measuring Effectiveness Initiative at the Muskie School of Public Service, University of Southern Maine (Muskie School), to develop meaningful measures of program effectiveness and new progress report forms for all VAWA grant programs administered by OVW, including the STOP Program.

Measuring the effectiveness of the STOP Program and other VAWA-funded grant programs is a uniquely challenging task. Between 1998 and 2003, states receiving STOP Program funds were required to submit data in the Subgrant Award and Performance Report reflecting how they and their subgrantees were using these funds. However, OVW was interested in gathering information about all grant-funded activities in a more uniform and comprehensive manner.

In late 2001 the Muskie School and OVW began developing progress report forms for grantees to use to collect data and report on their activities and effectiveness. This process was informed by extensive consultation with OVW grantees, experts in the field, and OVW staff concerning the kinds of measures that would best reflect the goals of the VAWA grant programs and whether those goals were being achieved. The report forms included measures identified in the collaborative process and outcome measures identified by OVW as indicators of the effectiveness of the funded programs for purposes of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993.

The progress report forms were designed to satisfy OVW grantees' semiannual (discretionary grant programs) and annual (STOP Program) reporting requirements.



To the extent possible, given the goals and activities authorized under each of the grant programs, uniform measures were chosen to permit the aggregation of data and reporting across grant programs. In addition to generating data for the monitoring of individual grantees' activities, the report forms enabled OVW to review the activities and achievements of entire grant programs, as well as the aggregate achievements of numerous grant programs engaged in similar activities. This new grantee reporting system contributes to better long-term trend analysis, planning, and policy development. It also enhances OVW's ability to report to Congress in greater detail and depth about the programs funded by VAWA and related legislation.

## Reporting Methods

OVW finalized the STOP administrator and subgrantee report forms for the STOP Program in early 2005. Since that time, the Muskie School has provided ongoing, extensive training and technical assistance to state STOP administrators in completing the forms.<sup>8</sup> Administrators submit annual STOP Administrators reports online through the Office of Justice Programs' Grants Management System; STOP Program subgrantees submit electronic versions of the annual progress report to their state STOP administrators. Currently, states are required to submit both reports to OVW by March 30 of each year.

---

<sup>8</sup> Because of the large number of subgrantees (approximately 2,400), Muskie School staff provide the STOP administrators with training and technical assistance with the understanding that the STOP administrators will train their states' subgrantees in how to complete the subgrantee progress reporting form.



# STOP Program 2007: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds

## Sources of Data

This report is based on data submitted by 2,387 subgrantees from all 50 states, four of the five territories,<sup>9</sup> and the District of Columbia, as well as data submitted by the 56 STOP administrators about the distribution and use of program funds during calendar year 2007. Under a cooperative agreement with OVW, the Muskie School has analyzed quantitative and qualitative data from two sources: subgrantees completing the Annual Progress Report and grant administrators completing the Annual STOP Administrators Report.<sup>10</sup>

## How STOP Program Funds Were Distributed: STOP Administrators

The statute authorizing the STOP Program requires that each state distribute its funds according to a specific formula: at least 25 percent each for law enforcement and prosecution, 30 percent for victim services, and 5 percent for state and local courts (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(c)(3)).<sup>11</sup> Table 1 shows the number and distribution of subgrant awards for each of the allocation categories.

---

<sup>9</sup> Data from STOP subgrantees in Guam were received too late to be included in the aggregated database used for analysis for this report.

<sup>10</sup> These two report forms replaced the Subgrant Award Performance Report forms (SAPRs) originally designed by the Urban Institute in cooperation with the National Institute of Justice. State administrators and subgrantees reported on their activities on the SAPRs from 1998 through 2003. The data derived from the SAPRs formed the basis of the 2000, 2002, and 2004 STOP Program Reports. This 2010 STOP Program Report is the fourth report to contain data generated from the Annual STOP Administrators' Report and the STOP subgrantee Annual Progress Report. The two forms can be found at <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/vawamei/stopformulaform.htm>.

<sup>11</sup> STOP Program funds awarded for law enforcement and prosecution may be used to support victim advocates and victim witness specialists in those agencies.

**Table 1. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2007**

Allocation category	Number of awards to subgrantees	Total funding in category (\$)	Percentage of total dollars awarded
Courts	227	\$6,131,358	5
Law enforcement	922	\$28,581,574	23
Prosecution	809	\$29,124,093	23
Victim services	1,451	\$44,920,802	36
Administration	na	\$9,013,632	7
Other <sup>12</sup>	223	\$8,111,76	6
Total	3,632	\$125,883,220	100

na = not applicable

NOTE: Data derived from the Annual STOP Administrators Reports. Information by award category on a state-by-state basis is available in Appendix A. More specific information regarding types of activities engaged with STOP Program funds, based on data from subgrantee Annual Progress Reports, is available on a state-by-state basis in Appendix B.

## How STOP Program Funds Were Used: Subgrantees

The overwhelming majority (94 percent) of the subgrantee agencies and organizations used STOP Program monies to fund staff positions, most often professional positions providing direct services to victims/survivors. When staff allocations are translated to full-time equivalents (FTEs), staff providing direct services to victims/survivors represent 50 percent of the total STOP Program-funded FTEs.<sup>13</sup> By comparison, law enforcement officers represent 11 percent of FTEs and prosecutors 10 percent.

Another way of looking at the distribution of STOP Program funds is to consider the percentage of subgrantees reporting that funds were used for specific categories of activities.<sup>14</sup> Sixty-seven percent of subgrantees reported using funds to provide services to victims/survivors, 46 percent used funds to provide training, 36 percent to develop or implement policies and/or to develop products, 15 percent for law

<sup>12</sup> Examples of awards reported in this category include fatality review, medical training, CCR (coordinated community response), and BIP (batterer intervention programs).

<sup>13</sup> These staff categories include victim advocates, victim witness specialists, counselors, legal advocates, and civil attorneys.

<sup>14</sup> Some subgrantees receive funds to pay for a portion of a shelter advocate's salary; others may receive funding for a number of full-time advocates. This analysis considers only the number of subgrantees that used their funds in these ways, regardless of the amount of STOP Program funding they received. Because subgrantees often fund more than one category of activity, these percentages will total more than 100 percent.

enforcement activities, 13 percent for prosecution activities, and 1 percent each for court and probation activities.

In 2007, STOP Program funds were used to carry out the program's fundamental activities of offering victim services, providing training, and supporting law enforcement and prosecutors.

**Services.** Approximately 505,000 victims/survivors received services supported by STOP Program funds (of about 516,000 victims/survivors who sought services). Although the majority were white (58 percent), female (90 percent), and between the ages of 25 and 59 (64 percent), subgrantees reported that 21 percent of the victims/survivors they served were black or African American, and 17 percent were Hispanic or Latino.<sup>15</sup> Twenty-seven percent of the victims/survivors served were reported as living in rural areas. Victims/survivors used victim advocacy (238,000), hotline calls (210,000), and crisis intervention (182,000) in greater numbers than any other services.<sup>16</sup>

**Training.** From the inception of the STOP Program, states and their subgrantees have recognized the critical need to educate first responders about violence against women. The fact that well over one-quarter of all people trained with STOP Program funds (more than 75,000 individuals) were law enforcement officers reflects the fact that the grant program is fulfilling one of its primary and original purposes. Health and mental health professionals made up the next largest category, with more than 29,500 trained. A total of more than 267,000 people were trained with STOP Program funds in 2007.

**Officers.** Law enforcement agencies used STOP Program funds to respond to nearly 114,000 calls for assistance, to investigate more than 108,000 incidents of violence, and to serve more than 24,500 protection orders. STOP-funded officers arrested more than 40,300 predominant aggressors and made only 2,100 dual arrests.

**Prosecutors.** STOP Program-funded prosecutors filed nearly 163,000 new charges during calendar year 2007, 58 percent of which were domestic violence misdemeanors. During the same period, prosecutors disposed of 130,000 charges, about 80,000 (62 percent) of which resulted in convictions.

## Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed

Subgrantees reported using STOP Program funds for 11 statutory purposes. Table 2 lists these purpose areas and reports the number of projects addressing each area

<sup>15</sup> These percentages are based on the number of victims/survivors for whom race/ethnicity was known. This may represent an undercounting of the true number of underserved because race/ethnicity for nearly 13 percent of victims/survivors was reported as unknown for this reporting period. Hotline services, for example, generally do not collect this information, as it could prevent victims/survivors from seeking help. Whenever collecting demographic information on victims/survivors presents a barrier to service, or could violate confidentiality or jeopardize a victim's safety, service providers are advised not to collect it.

<sup>16</sup> Victims/survivors were reported only once for each type of service received during the calendar year.

during calendar year 2007. Consistent with other reported data, the purpose area most frequently addressed by subgrantees was victim services projects.

**Table 2. Statutory purpose areas addressed with STOP Program funds in 2007<sup>17</sup>**

Purpose area	Subgrantees (N =2,387)	
	Number	Percent
Victim services projects	1,685	71
Training of law enforcement, judges, court personnel, and prosecutors	855	36
Specialized units	623	26
Policies, protocols, orders, and services	610	26
Support of statewide, coordinated community responses	407	17
Assistance to victims in immigration matters	325	14
Stalking initiatives	307	13
Development of data collection and communication systems	306	13
Programs to assist older and disabled victims	254	11
Training of sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners	161	7
Tribal populations projects	83	3

NOTE: Detail does not add to total number of subgrantees because each subgrantee was able to select all purpose areas addressed by their STOP Program-funded activities during calendar year 2007.

## Types of Agencies Receiving STOP Program Funds

Not surprisingly, the number of domestic violence programs reported as receiving STOP Program funds was greater than that of any other type of agency or organization. Dual programs (e.g., programs that address both domestic violence and sexual assault) were the next most frequently reported as having received STOP Program funding, followed by law enforcement and prosecution agencies. Table 3 presents a complete list of the types of organizations receiving funding, as reported by subgrantees.

<sup>17</sup> While STOP funds were allowed to be used for three additional purposes (see page 3 for a complete listing of the statutory purpose areas) beginning in 2007, the reporting form did not include those three purposes. The form was revised and used for reporting data for calendar year 2008; future STOP reports will include the number of subgrantees who addressed these additional purpose areas.

**Table 3. Types of agencies receiving STOP Program funds in 2007**

Type of agency	Subgrantees (N=2,387)	
	Number	Percent
Domestic violence program	736	30.8
Dual program	489	20.5
Law enforcement	480	20.1
Prosecution	423	17.7
Sexual assault program	276	11.6
Unit of local government	118	4.9
Court	70	2.9
Government agency	68	2.8
Dual state coalition	41	1.7
Probation, parole, or other correctional agency	39	1.6
Faith-based organization	39	1.6
Sexual assault state coalition	38	1.6
Domestic violence state coalition	35	1.5
University/school	31	1.3
Tribal domestic violence and/or sexual assault program	12	0.5
Tribal government	5	0.2
Tribal coalition	2	0.1
Other	170	7.1

NOTE: Detail does not add to total number of subgrantees because each subgrantee could choose more than one option.

## Types of Victimization Addressed by Funded Projects

As of 2007, the percentage of projects focused solely on domestic violence had decreased from 47 percent (the average for the first four years of the STOP Program)<sup>18</sup> to 34 percent, and the percentage addressing domestic violence and/or sexual assault or stalking had risen from 15 percent to 50.5 percent (Table 4). The combined percentage of projects focusing on sexual assault alone, stalking alone, or both sexual assault and stalking was 12 percent.

<sup>18</sup> STOP Annual Report 2002

**Table 4. Types of victimization(s) addressed by STOP Program-funded projects in 2007**

Type of victimization	Subgrantees (N =2,387)	
	Number	Percent
Domestic violence only	817	34.2
Sexual assault only	266	11.1
Stalking only	11	0.5
Domestic violence and sexual assault	358	15.0
Domestic violence and stalking	91	3.8
Sexual assault and stalking	12	0.5
Domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking	832	34.9



## Effectiveness of the STOP Program

This section describes key areas of activity carried out with STOP Program funds, with a focus on the specific areas set out in the statute. It discusses why they are important and how they contribute to the goals of VAWA – improving victim safety and increasing offender accountability. Program-wide accomplishments in these areas are highlighted, as well as specific STOP-funded projects engaging in effective practices. (For a more detailed presentation of data reflecting the aggregate activities of all STOP Program-funded projects, see “STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments” on page 71.)

### Coordinated Community Response

Developing and/or participating in a coordinated community response (CCR) to address violence against women is an essential and fundamental component of the STOP Program and all other OVW-funded programs. A CCR brings together criminal and civil justice personnel, victim advocates, social services program 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/survivors of these crimes. Research has shown that efforts to respond to violence against women are most effective when combined and integrated as part of a CCR (Pence & Shepard, 1999; Shepard, 1999). Research on the impact of batterer intervention programs (BIPs) and systems has suggested that a coordinated community response involving BIPs and mandatory court reviews, as well as strong community support for victims/survivors, may improve victim safety (Gondolf, 2000). A Duluth, Minnesota, study on the effectiveness of a project designed to enhance CCR through danger assessment and information-sharing among criminal justice partners and advocates found lower recidivism rates among offenders after the implementation of the project, when compared to a baseline period (Shepard, Falk, & Elliott, 2002).

A Georgia study examined the impact of a CCR on the criminal justice system response in two counties, particularly the effect of the CCR intervention on legal sanctions administered to batterers. The CCR activities included the following: participation on a Community Task Force on Family Violence, training of task force members on implementing the CCR, implementation of a BIP, extensive training of law enforcement agencies in each county, and a public awareness campaign. Researchers found statistically significant changes in systemic responses post-CCR, e.g., increases in the number of male arrests (as well as arrests of women) in both counties and a higher prosecution rate in one county. Researchers observed that more men were sentenced to probation and BIP, and fewer received a fine, in the county that had increased its prosecution rate of domestic violence defendants, though the amount of fines did increase. However, there were no differences in the

numbers of convicted offenders who received jail time or in the amount of jail time (Salazar, Emshoff, Baker, & Crowley, 2007).

A re-examination of data from ten CCR projects funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention identified several factors at individual sites that were associated with higher rates of victim/survivor contact with intimate partner violence (IPV)<sup>19</sup> services. Those factors included developing goals and selecting priorities based on community needs, engaging in efforts to coordinate services, and disseminating information on the prevalence of IPV in the community (Klevens, Baker, Shelley, & Ingram, 2008).

While traditionally CCR has referred to the criminal justice system and organizations serving victims/survivors, the concept of “community” may be expanded to include employers, churches, community groups, families, social groups, and neighbors. STOP subgrantee Family Services of Northeast Wisconsin Inc., for example, established strong relationships with the Catholic Church and with the two largest employers of the Hispanic community in their area. This in turn led to the program building more trust within the Hispanic population and more referrals coming into the Sexual Assault Center. Other subgrantees reported similar interactions with churches and community groups as part of their CCR efforts:

STOP funding supports continued operation of the Policy Board. The board has allowed us to engage all segments of the community – non-profits, churches, drug and alcohol/mental health, law enforcement – with the court system in ways that we would never have interacted before. The problem-solving and identification of need that takes place through the Policy Board has been essential to improving victim safety and ensuring perpetrator accountability.

*-Butler County's STOP Violence Against Women Initiative,  
Pennsylvania*

The Council on Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence has created strong, collaborative working relationships with other local entities that also assist the Hispanic community, such as La Casa Latina, Catholic Charities, the New Iowan Center, and area churches. Battered immigrant women who may have not otherwise learned about our program have become aware of the agency and our services through our outreach efforts.

*-Council on Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence, Iowa*

In the years since its inception, Project Outreach has become strongly ingrained in the community by partnering with Black churches and other service organizations that are known to serve the African-American community. Staff is aware that racism in the general culture affects how African-American victims perceive and receive domestic abuse services, and approach the provision of

---

<sup>19</sup> “Intimate partner violence” and “domestic violence” are used interchangeably to mean violence that is committed by intimate partners.

these services with an awareness of cultural appropriateness in order to continue to break down the barriers that perpetuate the cycle of violence.

*-Catholic Charities, Diocese of Trenton, Providence House  
Domestic Violence Services in Burlington County, New Jersey*

The statute authorizing the STOP Program specifically authorizes support for state-level multidisciplinary efforts to coordinate the responses of justice and victim services systems, as well as other state agencies, to violent crimes against women. This level of multidisciplinary effort is exemplified in the implementation planning process that takes place in every state. VAWA requires the state administering agencies to involve nonprofit, nongovernmental victim services programs, including domestic violence and sexual assault service programs, when developing their implementation plans. Those agencies are also strongly encouraged to involve Indian tribal governments in the planning process. The creation of the STOP Program in the original Violence Against Women Act ensured a broad distribution of funds among criminal justice agencies (law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and probation) and victim services organizations.

Two STOP administrators described the impact of the formula for distribution of STOP Program funds in this way:

Funding has allowed for the coordination of law enforcement, prosecution, courts and victim services in addressing crimes against women. . . . The STOP VAWA funds have assisted local communities in maintaining coordinated community response teams, including three communities that incorporated specialized units in which domestic violence advocates assist law enforcement officers on domestic violence calls by responding immediately after it is safe and secure to go to the victim's home. The following quote is from the Riley County Domestic Violence Task Force: "Now in the 12th year of existence, the task force – a purely voluntary association – remains a vital group, with active participation from a variety of agencies, including law enforcement, prosecution, child protective services, legal services, court services, probation and parole. STOP VAWA funding has made possible this unique collaboration that puts victim advocates on scene with law enforcement officers and inside the department's investigations division."

*-STOP administrator, Kansas*

Another vital component of Pennsylvania's STOP Program is the longstanding requirement of county "STOP Coordinating Teams" in order to participate in the STOP Program. The STOP Coordinating Teams are comprised of representatives from victim services, law enforcement and prosecution as well as allied professionals from the community who meet four times per year to discuss how to more effectively serve victims of violence against women and ensure that the county STOP grant activities are on target. All coordinating teams have created and adopted protocols for response to domestic violence and sexual assault. Many are working on or nearing completion of protocols to address stalking. The teams have also fostered awareness of the dynamics of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking among team

members, cross referrals for services, and collective problem solving and decision making at the local level.

*-STOP administrator, Pennsylvania*

CCR efforts on the community level often include sexual assault response teams (SARTs) and domestic abuse or domestic violence response teams (DARTs or DVRTs). SARTs, often organized around sexual assault nurse examiner (SANE) programs, coordinate the efforts of medical providers, counselors, advocates, and criminal justice agencies to improve the response to sexual assault victims/survivors. Some SARTs have case-specific discussions, while others focus more on systemic responses. SART programs have been found to greatly enhance the quality of health care for women who have been sexually assaulted, improve the quality of forensic evidence, improve law enforcement's ability to collect information and to file charges, and increase the likelihood of successful prosecution (Campbell, Patterson, & Lichty, 2005; Crandall & Helitzer, 2003).

The collaborative nature and broad-ranging impact of STOP Program-funded SARTs and DARTs are illustrated in the following examples:

This funding has also allowed us to continue working closely with the court systems not only as support for our clients but to help educate law enforcement and court personnel on the dynamics of domestic violence and sexual assault. As a result of the STOP funding we have an established protocol and are part of the Sexual Assault Response Team. This has been a great accomplishment, and rape victims are receiving quality care due to a much greater support system. This team is a great help to prosecution, as we are seeing an increased number of clients who are following through on criminal prosecution.

*-Women's Crisis Center, Inc., Kentucky*

STOP Program funding has provided Dutchess County with the ability to establish a structured system of intervention, communication, and case management for all intimate partner violence cases in three jurisdictions: the City of Poughkeepsie, Town of Poughkeepsie, and City of Beacon. Due to ongoing and consistent interaction and cross training over the past ten years, the police, advocates, prosecution, probation, and domestic abuse awareness classes for men have built strong relationships from the administrative level on down to the employees in the field. These relationships have established an environment of shared trust that is rare and extremely valuable when working with the complexities of domestic violence. One of the most important aspects of the DART project is the policy that police officers in the designated jurisdiction place a call to the Family Services' Battered Women's Services 24-hour hotline at the time of police response to give the victim immediate access to services and safety planning. Several other police agencies in Dutchess County have expressed their desire to institute this policy in their own departments, even though their jurisdictions do not have a DART at this time. Many county legislators have expressed interest in expanding DART to additional jurisdictions in the county due to its success in the currently served areas. As STOP Program funding has decreased over the years since the original three-year grant, the county has

picked up additional funding responsibilities and actually expanded the program significantly. It is highly unlikely that this county's support and enthusiasm would have been possible or nearly as successful without the initial and continuing support of STOP Program funding.

*-Dutchess County, New York*

The STOP funding allowed Seeds of Hope to create my position as the victim advocate for the Domestic Abuse Response Team (DART). This has allowed me to work closely with the police department and the county attorney's office. I am able to meet with the prosecutors and police officers who work on the domestic violence cases on a weekly basis. This provides me with the information I need to update victims about their cases. I am also able to read the police reports, which allows me to provide better services to the victim. By reading the police reports and obtaining the court information I am able to identify the successes and struggles in the criminal justice system. I believe this funding has enabled us to reach victims quicker and provide more comprehensive services. We have also been able to reach out and build relationships with police officers, prosecutors, probation officers, and batter-education programs. This has given us the opportunity to start to make changes at many different levels in the criminal justice process. Without this funding I would not be able to reach out to as many victims as I did this year. I would also not have access to the information that I have now and would not have had the opportunity to establish a relationship with the police and county attorney's office. This funding helps us provide quality services to victims and supports DART, which provides us with the opportunity to improve services for victims and hold offenders accountable.

*-Seeds of Hope, Iowa*

All STOP subgrantees are required to report on the frequency of their contact with community partners, on both a case and victim-level as well as on a systems level. Significant numbers of subgrantees reported daily contact having to do with specific victims/survivors and/or cases with the following organizations: law enforcement agencies (970, or 41 percent of all subgrantees reported this), domestic violence organizations (927, or 39 percent), courts (805, or 34 percent), and prosecutors (631, or 26 percent).<sup>20</sup> These interactions may have involved referrals (e.g., law enforcement referring a victim to a shelter or a victim services agency, or to the court so that victim may obtain a protection order) or consultations between victim services and law enforcement (e.g., the sharing of information on behalf of a victim about an offender's actions or whereabouts). Significant numbers of subgrantees also reported having daily or weekly interactions with social services, health and mental health, legal services, and sexual assault organizations. Following is an example of this type of collaboration:

Forming and maintaining close working relationships with a wide variety of community partners are essential functions for which the STOP Program provides funding. Project staff communicate with many state government offices and other non-profits on a daily

<sup>20</sup> More complete data on CCR activities can be found in Table 12.

basis, sharing ideas and resources and working together to aid individual victims as well as solve systemic problems in the state systems which deal with victims. Staff participate in many councils, committees, and task forces which strive to improve the delivery of services to victims, including battered immigrant victims.

- *Kentucky Domestic Violence Association*

In addition to collaborating with other organizations in their responses to specific victims/survivors and specific crimes, subgrantees also work with their community partners on task forces and work groups and in other regularly scheduled forums on the local, regional, and state levels. These groups often engage in the development of protocols that set out how participants' organizations or agencies will respond in a coordinated fashion to ensure victim safety and offender accountability and to remove barriers to these outcomes in the justice, victim services, and other systems. Ideally, participants are decision-makers, able to direct the implementation of agreed-upon protocols and to promote coordination and collaboration among their agencies and other participants. The data in Table 5 reflect the number of specific community agencies and organizations STOP Program subgrantees met with on a weekly or monthly basis to address systems-level issues in 2007.

**Table 5. Community agencies/organizations with which subgrantees reported having weekly or monthly meetings in 2007**

Agency/organization	Subgrantees
Domestic violence organization	1,165
Law enforcement	1,114
Prosecutor's office	965
Social service organization	829
Court	801
Sexual assault organization	789

NOTE: Table reflects only the most frequently reported types of organizations with which STOP subgrantees had weekly or monthly contact.

These collaborative efforts can change attitudes, promote learning and communication, and lead to a better response to victims/survivors, as illustrated below.

Most importantly though, STOP funding has brought decision makers together, allowed each stakeholder to learn from others and the challenges they face, and work together to make sure the system as a whole is safe and friendly for victims and holds perpetrators accountable. Funding has forced agencies/departments to think beyond their own needs and recognize that in order to be most effective and service victims in the way they deserve, all pieces of the puzzle must fit together. It cannot be one agency alone doing all of the work; we must work together and support one another's efforts.

-*STOP administrator, Rhode Island*

Many smaller successful collaborative projects have created impact all across the state, resulting in an improved criminal justice system response to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking and dating violence. We've seen significant systems change that also affects counties next door, when they see and hear of improved relationships and greater success in addressing domestic violence and sexual assault by their criminal justice counterparts. VAWA funding has made collaboration easier to undertake with each funding year. At this point criminal justice agencies are more willing and eager to partner with advocacy agencies, and we see more creative proposals in response to the special project request for proposals each time it is issued.

*-STOP administrator, Minnesota*

## Training

As communities have developed coordinated response initiatives, the need for quality training and cross-training has become evident. The STOP Program, like every other OVW grant program, supports the training of professionals to improve their response to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. The statutory purpose areas for the STOP Program specifically set out the following: training for criminal justice personnel (i.e., law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges, and other court personnel), including those in specialized units, and training of sexual assault forensic examiners. Funds for training may be distributed to organizations on the state or local level. In the following example, STOP Program funds were used to expand the scope and broaden the reach of training and to respond to the specific needs expressed by criminal justice and victim services professionals.

The STOP funds continue to allow us to expand training activities both across disciplines and to a much wider geographic area than ever before. The funds allow us to identify and institutionalize best practices and offer trainings clearly focused on the issue of domestic violence and sexual assault. The funds allowed us to respond to individual community needs with more training focused on that communities needs. . . . In response to needs expressed by prosecutors, law enforcement, service providers and other partners, the program, always through collaboration with many partners and stakeholders, has presented trainings to sexual assault nurse examiners and to service providers who wish to serve as expert witnesses in DV or SA cases. Additionally, the program continues to address the changing issue of sexual assault sentencing. The program has expanded its audience to include probation/parole agents who were not aware of the high quality training available to them. Many of the training materials developed now function as "stand alone" products (for example the materials developed on "Identifying the Batterer," "Understanding Sexual Assault," "Cyberstalking," "Appropriate Report-Writing" and others) that are presented several times a year at the request of law enforcement agencies, community based advocates, prosecutor offices and other groups.

*-STOP administrator, Michigan*

After victim services, training is the most frequent activity engaged in by STOP Program subgrantees: 1,094 subgrantees (46 percent of subgrantees) used their STOP Program funds to provide training. An impressive 267,023 professionals were trained with STOP Program funds. Significantly, more than a quarter (28 percent) of those trained with STOP Program funds were law enforcement officers. As first responders, law enforcement officers play a critical role in keeping the victim/survivor safe and ensuring offender accountability. As a result of CCR efforts, training, and the development of pro-arrest or mandatory arrest policies, there has been profound and widespread change in the law enforcement response to violence against women. Ongoing training for law enforcement is essential, as officers retire and are replaced with new officers, and as best practices develop and change over time.

For example, mandatory arrest policies in some jurisdictions resulted in dual arrests – i.e., the arrests of both victims and batterers – and an increase in the number of women who were arrested. A New York City-based study looked at these and other unintended consequences of a mandatory arrest statute, as applied in 2000, and found that “further training and better supervision is required for responding officers to better implement the requirement of the [mandatory arrest] law” (Frye, Haviland, & Rajah, 2007). To avoid inappropriate arrests of victims/survivors who have inflicted wounds on their violent partners in an attempt to avoid further harm to themselves, a former police officer, now a leading trainer on law enforcement response to domestic violence, recommends that police officers receive training on defensive wounds. Training to identify these types of wounds (e.g., bite wounds to the chest or arms) may result in a decrease in the number of victims/survivors who are arrested. (O’Dell, 2008).

During the current reporting period, the VAWA STOP funding was able to provide much needed domestic violence training to veteran police officers across the state. During the last four fiscal years, the state agency responsible for police training could not allocate funds to conduct training to veteran officers in the area of domestic violence or sexual assault. As a result of the STOP funding, veteran officers received current training on various domestics in improving their response to domestic violence incidents. This has resulted in increased visibility and priority setting within the Massachusetts Municipal Police Training Council to integrate advanced domestic violence and sexual assault training into the regional police training academies across the state.

*-STOP administrator, Massachusetts*

The Domestic Violence Enforcement Unit as a whole is able to provide annual domestic violence training for local law enforcement officers where we instruct officers on their role in evidence based prosecution for domestic violence. As a result of the training provided in the past several years, our local law enforcement officers now routinely collect evidence beyond the statements of domestic violence victims.

*-Boone County Prosecuting Attorney, Montana*



Arte Sana Latina Victim Outreach has established cooperative working agreements with the Texas Association Against Sexual Assault which provides multicultural awareness training to law enforcement and allied professionals to increase successful investigation and prosecutions of violent crime, promote public awareness and understanding of sexual assault issues within underserved diverse communities, and encourage reporting of sexual assaults. This focused training also illustrated the utility of services that are tailored to meet the needs of a given community and the merits of sensitively meeting the needs of survivors from underserved populations.

*-STOP administrator, Texas*

STOP Program funds also supported the training of health and mental health professionals. These professionals become involved in the lives of victims/survivors at critical times; therefore, it is important that they understand the dynamics of domestic violence and sexual assault to enable them to provide appropriate support and referral to other services. Training also demonstrates to these professionals how certain actions can be harmful to victims/survivors (e.g., engaging in marriage counseling with a controlling batterer and a victim, blaming the victim/survivor for her injuries, or recommending that the victim/survivor leave the batterer without understanding the dangers that presents). These professionals may not be aware of or recognize the tactics of intimidation and manipulation employed by batterers or the increased danger victims/survivors may face when attempting to leave or when newly separated from their abusive partners (Fleury, Sullivan, & Bybee, 2000). Medical personnel who have not received specialized training may inadvertently retraumatize rape victims.

Training health care providers in screening for and identifying domestic violence among their patients is a critical step in improving safety for victims/survivors. One study found that only 6 percent of physicians ask their patients about possible domestic violence, even though 88 percent of them knew that they had female patients who had experienced abuse (Elliott, Nerney, Jones, & Friedmann, 2002). Another study measuring the attitudes and values of 752 health providers before and after a three-hour domestic violence training program found the following: after the training (including at the six-month point), the providers reported feeling that they were better able to identify and assist victims/survivors, they were more comfortable making referrals, and they saw a greater role for themselves and the health care system in stopping domestic violence (Hamberger et al., 2004). STOP Program subgrantees trained 29,515 health and mental health professionals; this was the second highest specific category of professionals trained in 2007.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>21</sup> The non-specific category “multidisciplinary” technically had the second highest number of people reported as trained; this category is chosen when subgrantees do not know the specific professions of people who received training. Table 6 presents a number of categories that combine related categories from the reporting form: health/mental health professionals combines the two reported categories of health and mental health professionals; domestic violence staff combines program and coalition staff and includes victim witness specialists; sexual assault staff combines program and coalition staff and includes sexual assault forensic examiners; nongovernmental advocacy staff combines staff from community, disability, elder, and immigrant advocacy organizations; and attorneys/law students and legal services staff have been combined.

Two subgrantees describe below how they used funds to train personnel who respond to sexual assault victims/survivors:

For another year VAWA has enabled 180 Turning Lives Around Rape Care Program to realize our project's mission which is to further educate law enforcement, para law enforcement and professionals in need of this socially vital information. Working in partnership with community organization such as the Monmouth County Crime Prevention Officers Association, the project is committed to providing quality of service to law enforcement and their communities by maintaining a comprehensive educational program for all that request it. . . . Medical groups affiliated with the hospitals that do anonymous HIV testing and counseling have reached out to the project director for information and staff training admitting that they have seen a spike in drug-facilitated rapes. These medical persons work to prevent HIV infection and care for individuals and families affected by HIV/AIDS in Monmouth County. The programs provide comprehensive, community-based prevention and testing services, HIV related health care, social services, advocacy, and referrals to community agencies such as 180 Turning Lives Around Rape Care Program.

*-180 Turning Lives Around, New Jersey*

The funding has provided training opportunities for interested nurses to develop the skills to provide a sensitive, victim-centered response to sexual assault victims; these skills are transferable to providing services to any crime victims who seek services in the emergency department. Thus our hospital's emergency department personnel improve their patient skills and quality of services to all patients. During the past year these funds were used to train new SANEs, to provide 'refresher' trainings with surrogate 'patients' to help SANEs who may not have had an opportunity to complete an exam recently maintain their confidence and competency. The on-going training opportunities provided by the STOP funding, help to reinforce the connection with the victim service providers, law enforcement, DA's office and the hospital.

*-Domestic Violence and Rape Crisis Services of Saratoga County,  
New York*

A study involving 134 victims/survivors who participated in 21 separate focus groups found that because older victims/survivors of domestic violence are often socialized to have unique generational and religious beliefs regarding marriage and its dissolution, they are most inclined to discuss domestic abuse with clergy, if they choose to discuss it at all (Beaulaurier, Seff, Newman, & Dunlop, 2007). Thus, clergy members are also in a critical position in terms of responding to the needs of domestic violence victims/survivors and referring them for appropriate support and services. While the participants reported that their religious faith played an important role in their decisions to stay in or leave abusive relationships, none of the participants reported that they were referred by their clergy for social services related to the abuse or violence. This study illustrates the importance of training clergy, pastoral counselors, and other faith-based organization staff on the dynamics of

domestic violence in particular, and on services and resources available to victims/survivors who are older.

Following are examples of two subgrantees that used STOP funding to provide training to clergy:

Through STOP funding the DVCCC was able to continue its innovative Clergy Workgroup on Domestic Violence Prevention, which focuses on building partnerships between faith communities, advocates and the DVCCC, training faith leaders in domestic violence response and prevention, and encouraging clergy to take a visible stand on this issue. With co-leadership and consultation by the DVCCC coordinator, this workgroup continues to succeed through ownership and leadership by faith leaders, in partnership with advocates. The workgroup's clergy training series continued with "Preaching & Teaching with Domestic Violence in Mind," a seminar that was very well-received by area faith leaders, who felt it gave them concrete tools and resources for their work in the community. In addition, in 2007 the workgroup published for the third time its "Clergy Response to Domestic Violence" statement of intent and commitment, signed by a range of faith leaders, and publicly published in the newspaper during Domestic Violence Awareness Month (DVAM). The Clergy Workgroup also created a new, innovative project for DVAM this year – a set of four worship bulletin inserts for each of the four weeks in October.

*-Domestic Violence Project of Warren & Washington Counties, a program of Catholic Charities of Saratoga, Warren & Washington Counties, New York*

Training and education has been provided with STOP grant funding. Amberly's Place continues to educate the community of services available to reach more victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. Local clergy have had trainings on the dynamics of domestic violence and family abuse. This allows clergy to provide victims information and refer victims for services at Amberly's Place.

*-Yuma Family Advocacy Coalition d/b/a Amberly's Place, Arizona*

**Table 6. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2007—selected professional positions**

Position	People trained (N=267,023)	
	Number	Percent
Law enforcement officers	75,281	28.2
Health/mental health professionals	29,515	11.0
Domestic violence organization staff	16,803	6.3
Social service organization staff	16,415	6.1
Volunteers	15,453	5.8
Nongovernmental advocacy staff	10,720	4.0
Court personnel	9,725	3.6
Attorneys/law students/legal services staff	8,770	3.3
Prosecutors	7,723	2.9
Faith-based organization staff	7,232	2.7
Corrections personnel	7,077	2.7
Sexual assault program staff	6,144	2.3

NOTE: A number of categories above combine professionals, as explained in footnote 24. For a complete listing of all individual categories of people trained, see Table 11.

## Victim Services

The authorizing statute for the STOP Program allows for the following victim services activities to be conducted with STOP Program funds: developing, enlarging, or strengthening victim services programs, including those that address the needs and circumstances of older and disabled women who are victims/survivors of domestic violence or sexual assault; developing or improving delivery of victim services to underserved populations; providing assistance to victims/survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault in immigration matters; maintaining core victim services while supporting emergency services for victims/survivors and their families; and funding victim services personnel to provide supportive services and advocacy for victims/survivors of domestic violence committed by law enforcement personnel.<sup>22</sup> The provision of services to victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking represents the most frequently funded activity under the STOP Program.

Early studies of shelters for battered women found that the majority of victims, upon leaving the shelters, returned to their abusers (Gondolf, Fisher, & McFerron, 1990); subsequent studies of shelter residents indicated that if they were connected to supportive services and assistance, most did not return to their abusers and, as a result, experienced less re-victimization (Klein, 2005).

Research indicates that women who work with advocates are more effective overall at accessing community resources and that they often require a variety of services

<sup>22</sup> See footnotes 3 and 17. The last two areas of victim services activities are included in the new purpose areas authorized by VAWA 2005.

that must be accessed through several community agencies (Allen, Bybee, & Sullivan, 2004). The same study found that victims/survivors who receive comprehensive advocacy and services are more effective in meeting their needs and achieving safety, autonomy, healing, and economic security than women who do not receive such support and services. The study's authors conclude that it is essential that advocacy and other human service programs recognize the need for a comprehensive response to the needs of victims/survivors.

STOP Program subgrantees provided services to 505,171 victims/survivors in 2007. Of those receiving services, 84.4 percent were victims of domestic violence, 13.0 percent were victims of sexual assault, and 2.6 percent were victims of stalking.<sup>23</sup> These victims/survivors received a wide range of services, including victim/survivor advocacy (assistance with obtaining needed services or resources, including material goods and services, health care, education, finances, transportation, child care, employment, and housing), hotline calls, crisis intervention, legal advocacy (assistance in navigating the criminal and/or civil legal systems), counseling and support, and victim-witness notification. Subgrantees providing these services also routinely provided safety planning, referrals, and information to victims/survivors as needed.

**Table 7. Individuals receiving STOP Program-funded services in 2007**

Type of service	Individuals served
Victim advocacy	237,920
Hotline calls	209,850
Crisis intervention	182,397
Criminal justice advocacy	146,828
Counseling/support group	128,228
Victim witness notification <sup>24</sup>	126,708
Civil legal advocacy	122,303

NOTES: Each victim/survivor is reported only once in each category of service, regardless of the number of times that service was provided to the victim/survivor during the reporting period. Only the most frequently reported categories are presented; for a complete listing of categories of services provided to victims/survivors, see Table 23.

<sup>23</sup> The overall number of victims/survivors served represents an unduplicated count; this means that each victim/survivor is counted only once by each subgrantee, regardless of the number of times that victim/survivor received services during calendar year 2007. Because victims/survivors can only be counted once, they must be reported under only one primary victimization. It is not uncommon for victims/survivors to experience more than one type of victimization (e.g., domestic violence and stalking, or domestic violence and sexual assault), but that fact is not reflected in the reported percentages of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking victims/survivors served.

<sup>24</sup> For the purposes of reporting victim services activities engaged in by STOP subgrantees, victim witness notification and other advocacy provided by victim assistants or advocates located in governmental agencies are considered victim services; however, these victim services activities may also be considered to fulfill the statutorily mandated percentage allocations for law enforcement, prosecution, and state and local courts as reported by STOP administrators, and are not considered to fulfill the statutorily mandated percentage allocations for victim services, which refers to nonprofit victim services only. See page 6.

Victim advocates and others providing STOP Program-funded services to victims/survivors may be located in a nongovernmental community-based agency, law enforcement agency, prosecutor's office, court, or medical or treatment facility. Below are some examples:

STOP funding has allowed us to have an advocate housed at the police department so victims can receive help immediately after reporting the crime. The victim advocate is on call 24 hours a day to assist both the patrol and investigation divisions on cases involving violent crimes against women. . . . Prior to receiving STOP funding, this project did not exist and victims in Huntington Beach were not offered specialized services. STOP funding has allowed us to pursue our goal of ensuring victims of domestic violence, stalking, and sexual assault are provided immediate services, support, and resources to help them cope with the victimization.

*-City of Huntington Beach, California*

STOP funding provided one full-time and one part-time victim witness advocate to dedicate their time to Domestic Violence (DV) Court. These advocates provided courtroom support for every victim who attended DV Court, informed victims of the judicial process and their rights so victims could decide whether they wanted to participate in the process, made outreach contacts with victims from law enforcement referrals, provided safety planning information and referrals for ongoing advocacy and support services, and made follow-up contacts with victims. During the 9.5 months of DV Court's operation, 429 victims received direct courtroom support from advocates. Victim witness advocates also provided face-to-face crisis intervention in response to law enforcement calls to 299 victims, telephonic outreach to 306 victims within 48 hours of a DV incident, and notification of case status and victim/survivor advocacy to 700 or more victims.

*-Pima County Consolidated Justice Court Domestic Violence Court Project, Arizona*

Since receiving STOP funding, the Department of Correction/Probation & Parole has been able to hire a victim services agent (VSA) in each county. The VSA works with the victims whose perpetrator is under community supervision for charges relating to domestic violence and/or sexual assault. Prior to the funding, the only resource for these victims was the probation officer, who sometimes is not trained in the areas of domestic violence/sexual assault. Victims were reluctant to call on the probation/parole officer, feeling that they would be unable to meet their needs or had concerns that the officer was only available to help the perpetrator. This left a gap in services to these victims. Since the program began, this gap has been slowly diminishing and the communication between the two has greatly increased. The response has been great, and more and more victims are requesting additional services. In Kent County alone,

we have made contact with 1330 victims and 910 have received additional services.

*-Department of Correction, Bureau of Community Corrections,  
Delaware*

Some victim services agencies focus on providing culturally appropriate, community-based and shelter-based services to victims/survivors of specific ethnicities, as in the following examples:

STOP funds have allowed PACT (Parents and Children Together) Family Peace Center (FPC) to address critical gaps in service for victims of domestic violence. As a result of these funds, we have been able to provide much-needed individual counseling to victims with complex needs such as mental illness, language barriers, living in a rural area and/or immigrants. This funding has also allowed FPC to increase counseling services to victims of domestic violence at Ohia Shelter for Women and Children. Although Ohia provides intervention and support for its residents, the varied needs of victims at a domestic violence shelter necessitate intensive services that employ diverse methods. FPC's weekly intervention/support group at the shelter has been of tremendous benefit to shelter residents healing from the trauma of domestic violence while working to find safety. Finally, these funds have allowed FPC to begin developing a culturally-based intervention curriculum specifically tailored for the needs of Native Hawaiian victims of domestic violence. Such a curriculum will provide a unique venue for Native Hawaiian women to heal from the trauma of the abuse while strengthening and expanding their connection to their cultural heritage.

*-Parents and Children Together Peace Center, Hawaii*

## Underserved Populations

Violence against women affects all populations in all areas of the United States, but some groups are reported to be more vulnerable and to experience higher rates of violence than others (Field & Caetano, 2004). These population groups include American Indians/Alaska Natives, women living in rural areas, older adults, women who are disabled, people of color and other racial minorities, immigrants, and refugees. Victims/survivors from these populations often face unique challenges and barriers to receiving assistance and support, and how they perceive and manage their experiences with violence may often reflect cultural and social norms, opportunities, and restrictions (Campbell, Sharps, Gary, Campbell, & Lopez, 2002).

VAWA and OVW require states to specify in their implementation planning process how they will use STOP funds to address the needs of underserved victims/survivors. The statutory purpose areas of the STOP Program include specific references to the delivery of services to underserved populations,<sup>25</sup> addressing the needs of American

<sup>25</sup> VAWA 2000 at Sec. 1103 (3) defines "underserved populations" as including "populations underserved because of geographic location (such as rural isolation), underserved racial and ethnic populations, populations underserved because of special needs (such as language barriers, disabilities, alienage status, or age), and any other population determined to be underserved by the State planning process in consultation with the Attorney General."

Indian tribes, addressing the needs of older and disabled victims/survivors, and assisting victims/survivors in immigration matters.

The Oklahoma STOP administrator summarizes that state's efforts to address the needs of underserved victims/survivors in this way:

One project is providing domestic violence education and training, sexual assault education, safety planning, counseling, and advocacy to incarcerated victims to assist in attaining healthy and violence-free relationships. Another project funds a part-time bilingual advocate to assist Spanish-speaking only and immigrant victims of domestic violence and sexual assault in obtaining interpreters and translation assistance to access services and comprehend safety and legal immigration options. Finally, one project focuses on the victims of domestic violence that are deaf and hard of hearing by promoting awareness, intervention, and prevention for the deaf and hard of hearing community.

– *STOP administrator, Oklahoma*

The Texas administrator discusses below the considerations taken into account in planning how STOP funds will be allocated to provide services to, and respond to crimes against, underserved populations in that state:

Texas outreach to underserved populations for STOP VAWA subgrant funding is based on individual restoration, the recognition of formal and informal systems of delivery, and a formulaic distribution of funds that considers the rates of crimes against women in each community within the state, including historically underserved populations. Because of the diversity and size of Texas it is important that comprehensive culturally-specific assistance is provided to victims from underserved communities. Culturally-specific assistance may include the immediate assessment of the victim's safety, understanding the cultural history that may affect the victim's reaction to the crime, supporting the victim from the moment of the crime through final case disposition, helping the victim understand the criminal justice process, translating information for victims, and interpreter services for the hearing impaired.

– *STOP administrator, Texas*

Of all subgrantees providing services in calendar year 2007, 99 percent provided services to victims/survivors in at least one of the underserved categories.<sup>26</sup> Subgrantees used STOP Program funds to provide services to 11,800 victims/survivors who were reported in the category American Indian and Alaska Native; 93,050 victims/survivors who were black or African American; 72,251 victims/survivors who were Hispanic or Latino; 7,488 victims/survivors who were

---

<sup>26</sup> It is not possible to report the overall percentage of victims/survivors receiving services who were from one or more of the underserved populations because victim data were reported in the aggregate and individual victims/survivors may be reported in a number of the underserved categories. "Underserved" categories referred to here include the following: people of races and ethnicities other than white (in categories established by the Office on Management and Budget), individuals more than 60 years old, people with disabilities, people with limited English proficiency, immigrants or refugees, and those living in rural areas.



Asian; 13,447 victims/survivors who were 60 years of age or older; 24,527 victims/survivors with disabilities; 36,916 victims/survivors with limited English proficiency; 22,820 victims/survivors who were immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers; and 134,898 victims/survivors who were living in rural areas.<sup>27</sup>

In addition to providing direct services, subgrantees used STOP Program funds for training, products (e.g., brochures, manuals, training curricula, and training materials), and the development and implementation of policies addressing issues specific to the needs of underserved victims/survivors. Training was provided to 6,100 staff of advocacy organizations for older, disabled, and immigrant populations. These nongovernmental, community-based groups are often in the best position to reach specific underserved populations and to assist them with referrals to appropriate services and agencies.

Training on issues specific to underserved populations was provided by 784 subgrantees – 72 percent of all subgrantees that reported using STOP funds for training. Similarly, 293 subgrantees – 56 percent of subgrantees using STOP funds for policy development – established and/or implemented policies regarding appropriate responses to underserved populations in victim services, the criminal justice system, and health care. Taken together, the use of STOP Program funds in these areas demonstrates the commitment of states and their subgrantees to better understand the particular challenges faced by victims/survivors in underserved populations and to improve their responses to the needs of these victims.

## American Indians and Alaska Natives

American Indian and Alaska Native women report higher rates of victimization than women from any other ethnic or racial background (Luna-Firebaugh et al., 2002; Rennison, 2001; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). The National Crime Victimization Survey, as reported by (Rennison, 2001), revealed that the rate of domestic violence among American Indian women is much higher (23.2 per 1,000) than rates among black (11.2), white (8.1), and Asian women (1.9).

As startling as the rate of domestic violence is, the rate of rape and sexual assault is even more dramatic: The average annual rate is 3.5 times higher for Indians than for non-Indians (Greenfield & Smith, 1999). American Indian and Alaska Native women are also more likely to suffer physical injuries in addition to the sexual assault (50 percent) when compared to non-Native women (30 percent) (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2006).

The National Violence Against Women (NVAW) Survey found that 17 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native women are stalked during their lifetimes, compared with 8.2 percent of white women, 6.5 percent of African American women, and 4.5 percent of Asian/Pacific Islander women (Lee, Sanders Thompson, & Mechanic, 2002). Complicating efforts to protect these victims/survivors is the fact that many live in isolated communities and may not have access to telephones,

<sup>27</sup> For more detailed demographic information on victims/survivors served by all states, see Table 21; for demographic information on victims/survivors served by individual states see Tables B3 and B4 in Appendix B.

transportation, or emergency services. Also, criminal justice resources and legal assistance often are limited in those communities.

The STOP grant pays for a part-time (ten hours a week) SISTR (Safety in Sobriety Through Recovery) counselor focused on women who are battered and chemically dependent. Our SISTR program provides safe shelter, advocacy and child care for women who are accessing treatment and/or counseling for substance abuse. . . . women with addictions and/or FASD (fetal alcohol spectrum disorder) are at extremely high risk for abuse and their batterers are rarely held accountable since the violence is often seen as a 'natural' result of her addictions rather than his choice. Without the STOP funding, we would not be able to provide this assistance to women who are battered and also challenged by disabilities or addiction.

– *Safe & Free Environment, Inc., Alaska*

The STOP funding has enabled Native Pathways to Healing Program to facilitate many services to the American Indian Community which we were unable to do prior to receiving these funds. We have been able to educate and empower not only the women we serve in the program but also their families. STOP funding has made it possible for many American Indian women to start their life all over again, and to overcome many of the obstacles they previously were not able to overcome. With STOP funding American Indian women participating in our program have been able to attend therapy, support groups, and psycho-educational classes which ultimately enabled them to overcome the fear and insecurities that kept them bonded to destructive, violent relationships that they were not able to leave previously.

– *American Indian Involvement, Inc., California*

The grant has allowed us to provide training specific to the needs of Native communities and the victims and address issues that they face. Some of these issues have to do with jurisdiction, cultural sensitivity, and high rates of violence against Native women. We have been able to effectively motivate community members to want to create coordinated community response teams. We've made this training convenient for our local victim services providers and others to attend. We also opened the training up to other parts of the state and country, including tribal communities. Basically, we've been able to provide training that was previously unavailable in our rural location.

– *Women's Rural Advocacy Programs, Inc., Minnesota*

As a recipient of VAWA STOP Grant funds, New Day Shelter has been able to offer the services of two master's level therapists and a Native American counselor to victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. The therapists provide expanded and extended individual and group therapy and supportive therapeutic services to victims of sexual assault and childhood sexual abuse who are uninsured or underinsured, and, therefore, unable to receive these services elsewhere. As New Day Shelter has received funding for the two therapists for several years, this continuity has benefited the clients who need long-term individual therapy and involvement

in a group to continue or, at least, maintain their healing. Some sexual assault victims, especially adults with childhood sexual abuse issues, never completely heal and will need therapy throughout their lifetime. Attendance at a sexual assault therapy support group can help a sexual assault/abuse victim learn and practice self-help skills, provides the opportunity to be with other women who have sexual assault issues to deal with, which thereby decreases isolation and shame, and gives valuable and healing validation to victims about their own sexual assault/abuse experiences. Day Shelter offers a support group to victims focused on sexual assault issues that include women with severe and persistent mental health issues. To our knowledge, there is no other service in the area that offers a group experience to clients with these issues and with severe and persistent mental health problems. The two therapists also provide individual therapy for domestic violence victims, and case management and coordination of services to victims of domestic violence and sexual assault.

– *New Day Shelter, Wisconsin*

Seven subgrantees receiving STOP Program funding identified themselves as tribal coalitions or tribal governments.<sup>28</sup> Seventy-seven subgrantees reported that their projects specifically addressed tribal populations and cited nearly 200 unique nations, tribes, and bands they served or intended to serve. American Indian or Alaska Native individuals made up 3 percent of those served with STOP Program funds in 2007, with 11,800 victims/survivors receiving services. Training on issues specific to victims/survivors who are American Indian or Alaska Native was provided by 124 subgrantees, and approximately 1,061 tribal coalition and tribal government staff were trained with STOP funds.

### Victims/Survivors with Disabilities and Victims/Survivors Who Are Older

Approximately 54 million Americans live with a wide array of physical, cognitive, and emotional disabilities (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003). Victimization rates for women with disabilities are far greater than for those who are currently not disabled, suggesting that offenders specifically target the most vulnerable. According to the Committee on Law and Justice (2001), studies show that 39 percent to 85 percent of women with disabilities experience some type of physical or emotional abuse at the hands of an intimate partner or caregiver. A study of 5,326 women revealed that the 26 percent of women who reported having some type of disability were more than four times as likely to have been sexually assaulted within the past year as were women without disabilities (Martin et al., 2006). Examination of data from the 2005 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) Survey, which included 356,112 male and female subjects, revealed that disabled females were nearly three times more likely to be threatened by violence, two and a half times more likely to be physically abused, and over 12 times more likely to experience unwanted sex when compared to all other populations (Smith, 2008).

<sup>28</sup> The STOP Violence Against Indian Women grant program provides funding to tribal governments and agencies and is separate from the STOP Program. Activities supported by that grant program are reported on in the 2008 Biennial Report.

A relatively small number of studies have been conducted examining the prevalence of violence against women with disabilities. Violence and abuse of women with disabilities and deaf women may be more severe, of longer duration, and inflicted by multiple perpetrators, and may occur in settings atypical for other victims/survivors (e.g., group homes, hospitals, and institutions). Women with disabilities and deaf women frequently have greater challenges accessing the legal system, advocacy, services, and community support, than other victims/survivors (Nosek & Hughes, 2006).

When caretakers responsible for the abuse against women with disabilities are intimate partners, parents or other family members, separation from these caretakers may seriously endanger a woman's health and well-being. Women with disabilities face additional barriers that may seriously interfere with, or take away, their ability to leave a violent relationship.

Disability service providers and advocates often fail to address violence against women with disabilities (Elman, 2005). Historically, advocates lack the experience and training necessary to understand and effectively deal with the unique vulnerabilities to abuse in disability-specific contexts (Nosek, Foley, Hughes, & Howland, 2001).

Funds enabled project staff to complete a physical and programmatic assessment of the First Judicial District Courts primary facilities in Santa Fe, New Mexico and Tierra Amarilla, New Mexico to ensure that individuals with mobility limitations who are victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking are able to gain access to needed services. Funds also enabled project staff to conduct focus groups with the First Judicial District Attorney's Office and local police and sheriff's departments. Based on conversations with court administrators, project staff developed and conducted onsite training and technical assistance for First Judicial District Court staff who interact with the public. The training focused on issues specific to individuals with mobility limitations who are victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. As a result of STOP funding, the First Judicial District Court and local law enforcement and District Attorney's Office are now talking about how they can work together to effectively serve individuals with disabilities. Without this funding opportunity, these efforts would not have occurred.

*–New Mexico Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs, Inc.*

STOP funding has created, for the first time, a formal mechanism for communication and leadership related to addressing sexual assault toward Deaf women that has begun to open the doors to new opportunities. The core goal of this funding has been the training of Deaf women who are fluent in American Sign Language to become Massachusetts certified sexual assault counselors. These women are now able to work as counselors, advocates, outreach education presenters and trainers for sexual assault training throughout the state and/or the other Rape Crisis Center.

*–Rape Crisis Center of Central Massachusetts*

Approximately 25 percent of persons over the age of 65 have been victims of physical, sexual, or psychological violence, and over half of those have experienced more than one type of violence (Bonomi et al., 2007). Studies of elder sexual abuse suggest that most victimizers are family members (Ramsey-Klawnsnik, 1991; Teaster, Roberto, Duke, & Kim, 2001). These studies agree that nearly all reported perpetrators were male and most victims were female. Only a handful of studies have been conducted examining the relationship between older women and intimate partner violence. It is evident from studies that do exist that violence against older women by intimate partners is a significant issue, and one that is often overlooked. In one study, only 3 percent of respondent older women indicated having ever been asked about physical or sexual violence by their health care provider (Bonomi et al., 2007). According to the National Center on Elder Abuse (2005), data suggest that only one in 14 incidents comes to the attention of authorities; victims of these incidents are also less likely to be receiving services.

Often, women in later life who are victims of violence are encouraged to seek and/or are referred to adult protective services (APS) (Paranjape, Tucker, Mckenzie-Mack, Thompson, & Kaslow, 2007). Once a woman is within the APS system, it is highly unlikely that she will be referred to a domestic-violence program for appropriate services or that the incident will be reported to law enforcement (Otto & Quinn, 2007).

Historically, domestic violence and sexual assault agencies have overlooked older women, who often have very distinct and special needs. They may not be employed, they may be receiving public assistance and/or Social Security benefits, and may be dependent upon family members for their care. Other social service and criminal justice agencies have also failed to develop responses tailored to the needs of elder victims/survivors. Battered women's shelters may not even be able to accommodate older victims/survivors. These limitations require that STOP-funded programs engage in creative approaches to increase awareness about abuse of elders, identify and provide services to victims/survivors who are older, and develop effective collaborations with criminal justice and social services agencies to improve their communities' response to older victims/survivors.

Since the creation of Project REACH, which took place due to funding from the Violence Against Women Act, Providence House has been able to reach a significantly higher number of older victims of domestic abuse. The program started small, focusing on educating the community about the pervasive problem of domestic abuse among the aging and elderly and serving those victims who came forward for services. Today, the program still offers victims individual and group counseling that focuses on the issues that are not normally addressed in traditional domestic violence counseling such as: leaving a long-term or even life-long relationship, creating physical and emotional boundaries when your adult child is being abusive, and becoming financially self-sufficient when most others your age are preparing for retirement. It offers case management services, information and referral, and advocacy. Project REACH continues to expand since its creation. The program sees more clients than ever before. In fact, after moving the program to the heart of a large retirement community, the number of victims served age 60 and over increased by 15 percent. As a primary provider of domestic violence services to

victims aged 50 and older, Project REACH is a crucial component in protecting the well-being of older victims.

– *Catholic Charities, Diocese of Trenton, Providence House of Ocean County, New Jersey*

Thanks to this funding we have started support groups for older women. We offer outreach, educational and direct services in our community, i.e., hospitals, councils on aging and nursing homes. We offer elderly victims of domestic abuse support, advocacy, 24-hour hotline and referrals to help them live their lives free from abuse. Our STOP funding has allowed us to focus on domestic violence/abuse in the elder community. This has been an underserved population and requires very specific expertise and resources to bring victims from abusive to safety.

– *High Point Treatment Center, Massachusetts*

Because of the unique challenges and barriers faced by victims/survivors with disabilities and victims/survivors who are older, it is critical to direct funding to programs that will focus their efforts on responding to their needs, as the STOP Program does. Eleven percent (254) of all subgrantees reported that their programs assisted criminal justice agencies and others in addressing the needs of older and disabled victims/survivors of domestic violence or sexual assault. Overall, STOP subgrantees reported providing victim services to 24,527 victims/survivors with disabilities and 13,447 victims/survivors over the age of 60 – 4.9 percent and 3.1 percent, respectively, of all victims served.<sup>29</sup> STOP Program subgrantees provided training and developed or implemented policies designed to improve the appropriateness and effectiveness of the criminal justice response and the provision of services to older and disabled victims/survivors. Training that addressed issues specific to these victims/survivors was provided by 417 subgrantees to other professionals; those professionals included 4,575 staff members of disability and elder advocacy organizations. Policies addressing the needs of victims/survivors who are elderly or who have disabilities were developed or implemented by 207 subgrantees.

## Victims/Survivors Who Are Immigrants or Refugees

Language barriers, isolation, immigration status, and traditional values increase the vulnerability of immigrant women and intensify their need to rely significantly on their abusers (Bhuyan, Mell, Senturia, Sullivan, & Shiu-Thornton, 2005). Lack of education and of job skills necessary for working in the United States may deepen that isolation and dependency. Immigrant women, especially those who are undocumented, may be afraid to seek help following victimization. They may not know what their rights are or that services exist. Domestic violence is thought to be even more prevalent and severe among immigrant women than among U.S. citizens (Anderson, 1993; Raj & Silverman, 2002); homicide data from New York City revealed that immigrant women were disproportionately represented among female

---

<sup>29</sup> Because data are collected at the program level and not at the victim level, it is not known how many of these victims/survivors were both disabled and over the age of 60. Also, the reporting form that was used to collect data for this report used the category 60+. The next category was ages 25–59.

victims of intimate partner homicides (Frye, Hoselin, Waltermaurer, Blaney, & Wilt, 2005).

The subgrantee cited below not only provided direct services to victims/survivors who were immigrants, but also developed culturally appropriate materials for victims/survivors, as described below:

The STOP Program funding also served to develop culturally competent educational materials with a high standard of quality, showing immigrants that the CFVC [Cherokee Family Violence Center] has a firm commitment to serve immigrant Latino survivors of domestic violence and not that it is only an afterthought. These brochures are not translations of English but developed with the Latino immigrant community in mind.

– *Cherokee Family Violence Center, Georgia*

The following subgrantee provided legal services to immigrant victims/survivors but also used funds to collaborate with other agencies in the recruiting and training of pro bono attorneys, thus building capacity and enabling more immigrant victims/survivors to receive assistance with immigration cases:

Before the initiation of Catholic Charities of Idaho's Domestic Violence Immigration Program, VAWA eligible immigrants in our region had no options except to seek a private attorney, which was usually cost-prohibitive. Also, the VAWA laws were relatively unknown around here, so many women didn't even know that they had options. Since receiving funding to start this program, we have done educational sessions with most of the area shelters, police stations, hospitals, and other agencies which may have first contact with victims, and now they are able to offer referrals to us. However, we have also come to realize that VAWA cases are complicated and time-consuming. Seeing that there is a great need for this service in our community, but also seeing that we are limited by resources, we collaborated with the Idaho Network to End Domestic Violence and Trafficking Against Immigrants and the Idaho Volunteer Lawyer's Program to launch a project aimed at recruiting and training pro bono attorneys to handle VAWA cases. The pro bono project began in 2006 and we increased the numbers of attorneys trained in 2007.

– *Catholic Charities of Idaho*

Following is one subgrantee's description of the many challenges faced by victims/survivors who are immigrants and how STOP funds were used to respond to their particular needs:

Prior to the implementation of the STOP grant, indigent and low-income immigrant domestic violence victims received no immigration legal services within the state of Alaska. The STOP grant allows the AIJP to provide immigration legal services to these victims/survivors of domestic violence throughout Alaska. STOP funding allows AIJP staff to travel to remote communities, which are only accessible by plane, to provide free consultations to immigrant domestic violence victims/survivors and sexual assault victims/survivors. Due to the complexity of issues that often

prevent immigrant domestic violence and sexual assault victims from seeking safety and protection, these face-to-face meetings are often instrumental to ensuring immigrant crime victims have accurate immigration information so that they can make informed choices.

– *Alaska Immigration Justice Project*

STOP funds were awarded to Na Loio . . . to: expand knowledge about domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking within the ethnic Chinese immigrant community; expand the capacity of agencies within Honolulu County to serve this population; and provide immigration and civil legal services to an increased number of Chinese immigrant victims. Prior to receipt of funding, immigrant Chinese victims underreported domestic violence and sexual assault and also underutilized domestic violence and sexual assault social service providers, shelters, and legal services. With funding, Na Loio was able to provide direct information about domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking to ethnic immigrant Chinese community members, leaders, and faith-based groups. As a direct result of these services, Na Loio experienced a 500 percent increase in full legal representation cases and hotline calls related to domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking over the course of the year.

– *STOP administrator, Hawaii*

VAWA 2000 attempted to remove barriers for victims/survivors seeking help by including the provision of assistance in immigration matters among the purpose areas authorized by the STOP Program. Subgrantees reported serving more than 22,820 victims/survivors who were immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers; these victims represent 4.5 percent of all victims served. Training on issues specific to these victims/survivors was provided by 310 subgrantees. This training is critical because the social, cultural, and legal issues these victims/survivors face are complex, and the consequences of reporting domestic violence incidents are often more serious for them than for other victims/survivors. Subgrantees also used STOP Program funds to provide language services specifically designed to remove barriers to accessing critical services and effectively dealing with the criminal justice system. These services were provided by 153 STOP Program subgrantees and included interpreters; language lines; and the translation of forms, documents, and informational materials into languages other than English. Subgrantees used STOP Program funds to develop, translate, and/or distribute at least 1,906 unique products in 24 different languages.<sup>30</sup>

## Victims/Survivors Who Live in Rural Areas

While national data suggest that women in urban areas are victimized at higher rates than women in rural areas (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2006) two studies of adult sexual victimization found that sexual assault rates were higher in certain rural counties (Lewis, 2003; Ruback & Ménard, 2001); rates of *reporting* victimization, however, were higher in urban counties (Ruback & Ménard, 2001). Further research

---

<sup>30</sup> For a listing of the specific languages in which these materials were developed or translated, see page 75, the Products section of “STOP Aggregate Accomplishments.”



indicates that women in rural areas report higher levels of stalking and violence and are more likely to experience a partner isolating them from family or friends and limiting their access to money (Logan, Shannon, & Walker, 2005).

Culturally predisposing factors such as patriarchal attitudes, lack of anonymity, fear of familial disapproval, and an ethic of self-reliance may prevent women living in rural areas from seeking safety (Eastman, Bunch, Williams, & Carawan, 2007; Grama, 2000; Hunnicutt, 2007; Lee & Stevenson, 2006; Lewis, 2003). Geographic isolation combined with inadequate transportation and lack of telephone service make leaving a batterer, particularly in the midst of a crisis, nearly impossible (Grama, 2000; Krishnan, Hilbert, & VanLeeuwen, 2001). Victims/survivors seeking services in rural communities may find that medical, legal, and social services are very limited or even nonexistent (Eastman et al., 2007; Grama, 2000; Logan, Walker, Cole, Ratliff, & Leukefeld, 2003).

The use of firearms against women seems to be more prevalent in rural communities than in urban communities (Grama, 2000), with the not-surprising consequence that the percentage of all homicides involving intimate partners is higher in rural than in urban areas (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2006; Gallup-Black, 2005).

Programs seeking to reach and to serve rural victims/survivors must work harder to inform them about services and to deliver those services. Developing effective community partnerships is critical to accomplishing these goals. Providing multidisciplinary training opportunities is one strategy for promoting these partnerships in rural areas, as demonstrated below:

STOP funding has allowed many rural programs to expand services, and coordination with VOCA funding has enabled the Montana Board of Crime Control to leverage all of the resources. The Montana Law Enforcement Academy provides training to rural communities through STOP funding, and funding is also provided for an annual multidisciplinary training in eastern Montana. Rural programs rely heavily on trained volunteers to provide services where a part- or full-time paid advocate would not be feasible. STOP funding provides a victim advocacy academy at a very affordable rate for all Montana programs. All rural programs are accessible 24/7 and have developed a network of safe homes and hotels that can be used if a victim cannot relocate to a larger community for shelter. This allows time to do emergency advocacy and safety planning as well as link the victim up with other needed services.

– *STOP administrator, Montana*

Serving victims/survivors in rural areas may also involve responding to victims/survivors who are underserved because of ethnicity and/or limited English proficiency, as illustrated by the Kansas STOP administrator:

Highlighting one of the rural projects funded with STOP VAWA funds, the Crisis Center of Dodge City is located in southwest Kansas in a very rural part of the state. It serves a seven-county region. In addition to serving a rural locale, there is a large and growing immigrant and Spanish-speaking population. The Crisis Center of Dodge City utilized these funds for a Bilingual Court

Advocate to assist domestic violence and sexual assault victims through the criminal justice process. In 2007, the Crisis Center of Dodge City provided services to 203 victims of domestic violence, 36 victims of sexual assault and three victims of stalking (according to the primary victimization). More than 70 percent of the victims served with STOP VAWA funds in 2007 were of Hispanic ethnicity. All of the victims served live in rural areas, and 138 victims had limited English proficiency.

– *STOP administrator, Kansas*

The White Mountain SAFE House is a residential domestic violence shelter providing services to Navajo and Apache counties located in the rural area of eastern Arizona. Within this catchment area there are three Native American communities (the White Mountain Apache Tribe, Navajo Nation and the Hopi Tribe). It was identified in 2004 that because of the lack of capacity by on-reservation law enforcement, courts and the health/behavioral systems, that on- and off-reservation services could not effectively respond to Native American domestic violence issues, and lacked a coordinated system to work effectively with off-reservation DV advocates and bridge off-reservation services. With the funding of the STOP program, the White Mountain SAFE House as a sub-grantee has been able to provide trainings to both on and off-reservation service providers. Previously, we were unable to provide for culturally appropriate trainings.

– *White Mountain Association for Victims of Domestic Violence, Arizona*

STOP Program funds were used to provide services to 134,898 victims/survivors who were reported as residing in rural areas (including reservations and Indian country) during 2007; this represents more than a quarter of all victims/survivors served. Training in issues specific to victims/survivors who live in rural areas was provided by 485 subgrantees (44 percent of those using funds for training).

## **The Criminal Justice Response: Specialized Units, Policies and Protocols, Data Collection and Communication Systems**

The authorizing statute for the STOP program states that STOP funds may be used to develop, train, or expand units of law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges and other court personnel that focus their efforts on violent crimes against women, including the crimes of domestic violence and sexual assault. These are usually referred to as specialized units in law enforcement and prosecution, and specialized domestic violence courts or dockets in the judicial system. A total of 624 STOP subgrantees (26 percent of all subgrantees reporting) reported using funds to support specialized units in law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and probation or parole. The statute further authorizes funds to be used to develop and implement more effective police, court, and prosecution policies specifically addressing violent crimes against women, including domestic violence and sexual assault. A total of 610 STOP subgrantees (26 percent) reported using funds for this purpose. Finally, these funds may be used for data and communication systems that link police, prosecutors, and

courts to assist them with identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions for violent crimes against women. STOP funds were used for that purpose by 306 subgrantees (13 percent).

## Law Enforcement

Law enforcement agencies are charged with identifying and arresting the perpetrators of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. VAWA also anticipates that law enforcement professionals will act to safeguard victims. The manner in which officers and agencies carry out these duties profoundly influences their success or failure in responding to violence against women. Success can be measured both by reduction in recidivism rates and by victim/survivor satisfaction with the assistance provided. One study found that for women experiencing intimate-partner sexual assault, contact with the justice system, whether from police or a protection order, was associated with a reduction in the risk of re-assault of up to 70 percent (McFarlane & Malecha, 2005). Victims who find police contact to be positive are more likely to call police again should violence recur (Buzawa, Hotaling, Klein, & Byrne, 1999; Davis & Maxwell, 2002; Davis & Taylor, 1997; Friday, Lord, Exum, & Hartman, 2006).

### Specialized Units

The availability of physical evidence is often crucial to the successful disposition of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking cases. Specialized police domestic violence units have been shown to collect evidence in a much higher percentage of cases than traditional patrol units (Friday et al., 2006). The evidence collected by specialized units is also more likely to be useful for prosecution (Townsend, Hunt, Kuck, & Baxter, 2006), leading to higher rates of prosecution, conviction, and sentencing (Jolin, Feyerherm, Fountain, & Friedman, 1998).

Specialized law enforcement units may consist of just one staff person, but can nonetheless have a significant impact on victim safety and offender accountability. STOP funds provided to the Putnam County Sheriff's Office in Florida have improved investigation of domestic violence cases by funding the first full-time detective dedicated to these issues:

Putnam County is a very rural and financially challenged county which has been designated as an "area of economic concern" by the state of Florida. The lack of major business and industry, along with a small population, makes for a very limited tax base. These factors contribute to a severe lack of financial resources, allowing for the provision of only the most basic and necessary of public services by the county government. Before receiving STOP program funding, the Putnam County Sheriff's Office was unable to dedicate a full-time detective to the investigation and follow up of domestic violence-related incidents in Putnam County. Previously, only felony DV cases that did not involve an initial arrest were forwarded to a persons crimes detective for further investigation. STOP program funding has allowed the dedication of a full-time

detective to concentrate all of their efforts on these cases and these victims.

*-Putnam County Sheriff's Office, Florida*

The following subgrantees discuss the importance of STOP funding in ensuring that officers have specific training in responding to domestic violence incidents and in evidence collection:

The members of the Domestic Violence Task Force have received extensive training, from interviews and interrogations to photography, so that they can be placed at the scene of an extremely violent incident. These deputies have received additional training in evidence collection and all of the other areas to assist them in making solid cases with the correct criminal charges. This has cut down on the number of incidents that investigators are called to. . . . The funding has allowed us to place a Domestic Violence Task Force member on every shift. The time it takes to adjudicate a family-violence case has been decreased by the effective investigating on the part of both the sheriff's office and the DA's office.

*-Barrow County Board of Commissioners, Georgia*

STOP funding has allowed our agency to develop a specialized unit highly trained in addressing the issues of domestic violence in Alamance County. We have seen a dramatic decrease in calls for service and the rate of recidivism for offenders and a dramatic decrease in homicides. Domestic violence cases enjoy a 100 percent follow up rate, which puts these cases in a unique category as compared to other criminal offenses.

*-Alamance County Sheriff's Office DV Unit II, North Carolina*

### Police/Advocate Response

Law enforcement responses that involve officers and victim advocates often provide the best outcomes for victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking. These teams respond to incidents together, providing support to victims at the scene and follow-up in the days following an incident. A study in New Haven, Connecticut compared the outcomes of a police/advocate team response to the standard law enforcement response to domestic violence (a single visit from police officers at the time of the incident). Researchers found that in the 12 months following an initial domestic violence call, only 20 percent of the victims who received a follow-up visit from a police officer and an advocate needed repeat police intervention for further domestic violence, compared to over 40 percent of the victims who received the standard law enforcement response (Casey et al., 2007). STOP subgrantees are also engaging in this practice with success:

STOP funding has allowed crisis response advocates to provide on-scene services with law enforcement to sexual assault and domestic violence victims. Prior to the STOP grant funding, Amberly's Place was not opened, and crisis response services did not exist in Yuma County. . . . As a result of the STOP grant,

victims have access to a crisis response advocate on-scene 24/7. Due to the large turnover rate in law enforcement, new officers are responding to domestic violence calls with limited training and experience on the dynamics of domestic violence and the cycle of abuse. The on-scene crisis response advocate is available to guide the officer through the cycle of abuse as well as identifying the primary aggressor.

*-Yuma Family Advocacy Coalition d/b/a Amberly's Place, Arizona*

The funds have allowed the Los Angeles Police Department's (LAPD) Newton Area to operate a Specialized Domestic Abuse Response Team. The team is comprised of detectives and a community-based advocate who respond to the scene of incidents. The detectives are able to conduct more comprehensive investigations (evidence collection, report writing, etc.). In addition, the funds allow the LAPD to contract with a community-based organization that provides an array of critical services, including crisis intervention, counseling, emergency assistance and referrals. The community-based organization helps relieve the apprehension of victims and encourages victims to cooperate with law enforcement.

*-City of Los Angeles, California*

Since receiving funding, there has been a significant expansion of coordination between law enforcement and victim/survivor services. The inclusion of a full time victim advocate at the police department, in combination with a detective's focus on DV/SA related crimes, has allowed for a direct delivery of services. This also strengthened the working relationship between law enforcement and the local rape crisis center, United Against Sexual Assault of Sonoma County. Victims now can, for example, come to the police department to report a domestic violence incident and receive crisis intervention counseling on the spot.

*-City of Petaluma, California*

### Spectrum of Law Enforcement Responsibilities

A law enforcement officer's responsibilities begin with the initial response to the sexual assault, domestic violence, or stalking call. The officer engages in a continuum of activities to ensure victim safety: making arrests of the predominant aggressor at incident scenes, referring the victim to services, fully investigating cases to enhance effective prosecution, serving protection orders on offenders, doing periodic safety checks on the victim, and making arrests for violations of bail conditions and protection orders. States are providing STOP Program funding to law enforcement agencies that are collectively engaging in a broad range of these activities.

We do not have the manpower to conduct follow-up checks on petitioners of our protective orders. This grant provided funding to pay deputies overtime to make these checks. If a respondent was found at the residence in violation of the order, an arrest was made.

*-Washington County Sheriff's Office, Maryland*

Prior to grant funding, the philosophy of the police department was to encourage victims to take their cases directly to the District Attorney's Office and for them to pursue their own individual prosecution. As a result of this grant, we now have a mechanism in place to provide support for victims, follow up investigations and aggressive prosecution. The grant funding also has allowed us to better track our success/failures in domestic violence investigations of all types and to see where we need to increase focus and efficiency. The purchase of the computer and the development of tracking software allow us to track cases from the original call thru the entire process. Finally, we have increased the quality of DV, sexual assault, and violation of protection order cases through aggressive reporting, follow up investigation and victim support. The results have been a reduction of these types of cases, increased convictions and a public commitment to the victims of these offenses.

*-Durant Police Department, Oklahoma*

This funding has allowed us to focus on domestic abuse with quality follow up investigation, and coordination with several agencies in order to ensure victim safety and offender accountability. Due to that increased focus, the rank and file line officers have accepted the idea that domestic violence cases are to be taken seriously. We have seen a dramatic increase in the quality of work done by first-responding officers as a result. We have virtually eliminated dual arrests.

*-Columbia Police Department, Missouri*

The Office of the Fayette County Sheriff in Kentucky served 1,789 protection orders and assisted victims/survivors who were granted 1,053 final protection orders in 2007. They credit STOP funding with making their work possible:

The STOP funding allows our office to have deputies focused on service of protection orders, arrest of violators of protection orders, safety planning with victims, escorts of victims, and court monitoring of offenders ordered to counseling. This funding also supports the countywide collaboration with multi-disciplinary teams and judicial staff that our specialized deputies participate.

*-The Office of the Fayette County Sheriff, Kentucky*

The Lewiston, Maine Police Department uses STOP funds for safety checks on victims; this subgrantee made 134 arrests for violations of bail conditions in 2007. The Dubuque, Iowa Sheriff's Office reported more arrests for violations of protection orders than any other subgrantee in 2007 – 250. Following are their descriptions of the importance of STOP funding:

The STOP grant has enabled the Lewiston Police Department to create a Proactive Response Team (PRT) that does domestic violence safety checks. These safety checks are done on victims of domestic violence assaults, sexual assaults and plaintiffs in protection orders . . . While doing the safety checks, the officers check with the victims to make sure they are not being harassed or stalked by the suspect and to make sure the victim is aware of

additional services that are available if needed. The officers also check with neighbors to see if the suspect has been seen in the area. The domestic violence coordinator provides the PRT with a photo of the suspect, the arrest report and any additional information needed to perform the safety checks thoroughly. These safety checks are done twice a week by a team of two uniformed officers.

*-Lewiston Police Department, Maine*

STOP funding has allowed our police department to provide more thorough investigation in regard to domestic violence, stalking and harassment cases. In our area, funds from the city and state are severely limited. Our overtime budget is slim, and without the STOP grant funding, most if not all domestic follow-up investigations would not be able to be performed. If that were to happen it would be a snowball effect in that less investigation would result in fewer convictions, more recidivism, and an increase in domestic violence in our community.

*-Dubuque County Sheriff's Office, Iowa*

During the calendar year 2007, 356 subgrantees (15 percent of all subgrantees reporting) used STOP Program funds for law enforcement activities that were carried out by law enforcement personnel with a total of 363 FTEs.<sup>31</sup> Law enforcement officers funded under the STOP Program in 2007 received 113,431 calls for assistance from sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking victims/survivors. They responded and prepared incident reports in 108,120 cases, investigated 126,450 cases, made 40,321 arrests of predominant aggressors and 2,152 dual arrests, and referred 52,497 cases to prosecutors. Officers funded by the STOP Program served more than 24,953 protection/restraining orders, arrested offenders for 5,807 violations of court orders, and enforced 10,442 warrants.<sup>32</sup>

In addition to traditional law enforcement activities, subgrantees also engaged in the following activities designed to improve law enforcement response and arrests of offenders: 351 used funds to develop, expand, or train specialized law enforcement units; 698 provided training on law enforcement response and 348 specifically addressed identifying and arresting the predominant aggressor in training; 134 developed and/or implemented policies that addressed identification of the primary aggressor and 99 developed or implemented pro-arrest policies.

## Prosecution

Prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking presents numerous challenges. Funding from OVW over the past 15 years has been

<sup>31</sup> For more detailed information on the types and numbers of law enforcement activities reported, see page 82, section on Law Enforcement.

<sup>32</sup> Subgrantees may receive funds for specifically designated law enforcement activities and might not engage in the other activities referred to here. For example, a subgrantee may have received STOP Program funding to support a dedicated domestic violence detective whose only activity was to investigate cases; that subgrantee would not report on calls received, or incidents responded to, unless those activities were also supported by the STOP Program.

instrumental in addressing these challenges, by improving knowledge and providing badly-needed resources to prosecution offices across the country. Without thorough police investigation and detailed reports, expertise on violence against women, staff to supplement information from law enforcement, reasonable caseloads, technology to enhance investigation and presentation of evidence, resources to employ experts for evidence analysis, and expert testimony, prosecution of crimes of violence against women too often fails. Prosecutors without knowledge may fail to identify stalking and intimate partner sexual assault and may not devise specialized policies to guide prosecution of violence against women (Miller & Nugent, 2002). Without the necessary resources, prosecutors often charge offenders with misdemeanors, as felony trials are both labor- and cost- intensive (Miller & Nugent, 2002). Without adequate staff to prosecute violations of conditions on sentences, in either judicial monitoring or probation revocation proceedings, prosecutors do not vigorously prepare nor do they seek serious sanctions (Friday et al., 2006).

### Specialized Prosecution

Jurisdictions with specialized domestic violence prosecution programs generally have the highest rates of successful prosecution (Smith, Davis, Nickles, & Davies, 2001), largely because of prosecutors' commitment to proceed. A large Ohio court study found that the amount of time prosecutors spent with victims/survivors preparing the case was positively associated with successful prosecution. The same study also found that high prosecution caseloads were negatively associated with successful outcomes (Belknap et al., 2000).

Studies that looked at specialized prosecution units in Cook County (Chicago) and in Milwaukee found dramatic differences in conviction rates between specialized and non-specialized prosecution: Cook County's specialized unit obtained a conviction rate of 71 percent compared to 50 percent obtained by the rest of the office for domestic violence cases (Hartley & Frohmann, 2003); in Milwaukee, the specialized unit increased felony convictions five times over (Harrell, Schaffer, DeStefano, & Castro, 2006).

While victims/survivors most commonly reported fear of retaliation as a barrier to their participation in prosecution, a three-state study found that the fear was reduced in sites with specialized prosecution, increased victim advocacy, and specialized domestic violence courts (Harrell, Castro, Newmark, & Visher, 2007). Prosecutors' offices that adopt specialized policies and practices to deal with intimate partner abusers are more sensitive to victims/survivors' needs; as a result, fewer homes in the jurisdiction suffer from family or intimate violence (Dugan, Nagin, & Rosenfeld, 2003).

In the eight years preceding its receipt of STOP Program funding, the Schuyler County District Attorney's Office in New York did not take a single domestic violence case to trial, though the number of DV cases in their small rural county was significant. These cases were rarely investigated, and often victims/survivors were not even contacted before the case was disposed. STOP funds have been used for a probation officer, designated prosecutor, investigator, and part-time support person. For the past five years (2002-2007), since receiving STOP funding, every DV or sexual assault victim/survivor has been contacted by the prosecutors' office and hundreds of services referrals have been made.



This office now does its own investigations based on complaints of DV made here, and it handles all of the follow-up investigations on such cases. Dismissals are no longer the norm on DV cases. In fact, almost every defendant charged with DV or sexual assault is convicted of an offense or is mandated to get some sort of counseling.

*- Schuyler County District Attorney's Office, New York*

In Ohio, a STOP-funded specialized prosecution unit organized a county-wide task force, the Marion County Violence Against Women Initiative and the Marion County Sexual Assault Resource Team. Countywide protocols were implemented to address both domestic violence and sexual assault. The county's conviction rate for domestic violence rose from 35 percent in 1998 to 73 percent in 2007, and for protection order violations the conviction rate increased to 88 percent.

This funding also was utilized to implement a tracking program for these cases which has led to higher offender accountability in these cases. The STOP funding has allowed for this program to continue in this age of budget cuts and diminishing grant funds. This program would have ceased to exist without the funding we have been fortunate enough to procure.

*- Violence Against Women Initiative, Ohio*

For the first time in its history, as a result of STOP funding, the Cabarrus County District Attorney's Office in North Carolina has an assistant district attorney, a victim witness advocate, and an investigator who all specialize in sexual assault and higher-level domestic violence cases involving physical assault. Before STOP funding allowed for the formation of the Safe Haven Team, a victim/survivor waited three months before meeting with anyone in the prosecutor's office.

Now, victims meet with a team member within 14 days of filed charges. The investigator proved invaluable to the project and has collected supplemental evidence in 93 percent of our cases. These statistics are unable to fully show the impact that this grant has had on our community. Because we now have the resources to fully prepare these cases for trial, the victims feel more confident when it is time to testify. Cases that were barely marginal before became very strong after the collateral evidence was collected and the investigator gathered additional evidence.

*- Cabarrus County District Attorney's Office, North Carolina*

The Iowa Department of Justice has used STOP funding for a special prosecutor who works primarily in rural areas in which the part-time elected county attorneys lack the time and expertise to prosecute domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking cases. This person prosecutes felony-level offenses in these areas and also provides training to multi-disciplinary groups, often in community-based settings, on stalking, sexual assault and domestic violence with a special emphasis on safety concerns, coordinated response, and firearms safety.

The special prosecutor is an integral part of a statewide network of corrections officers, judiciary staff, prosecutors, law enforcement,

forensic examiners and state and local victim coalitions and advocates. This reporting period, the special prosecutor was appointed to the Iowa Supreme Court's Domestic Violence Task Force which is developing best practices and domestic violence-related system improvements for the Iowa judiciary.

*-Iowa Department of Justice*

Similarly, the Iowa Attorney General's office uses STOP funds for a statewide prosecutor who prosecutes, provides technical assistance to local prosecutors, and provides training to criminal justice and other professionals who respond to violent crimes against women.

This prosecutor will often prosecute felony level domestic abuse, sexual abuse, and stalking cases in our rural counties if there is a conflict of interest, high profile case, or if it is an exceptionally challenging case for other reasons. She also provides technical assistance to local prosecutors on violence against women cases. The VAWA prosecutor also provides training about violence against women issues around the state for prosecutors, law enforcement, advocates and medical personnel.

*-Iowa Attorney General's Crime Victim Assistance Division*

STOP funding has helped the Queens County District Attorney's Office in New York to institutionalize a bureau dedicated to prosecuting domestic violence cases. The staff of 15 assistant district attorneys (ADAs) and three paralegals includes three ADAs who focus solely on felony domestic violence cases (two domestic violence prosecutors were funded under STOP in 2007):

By reducing the need for multiple interviews and eliminating the loss of information that can accompany the reassignment of cases from one attorney to another, we have increased conviction rates. Dedicated staffing also allows responding ADAs early contact with victims, affording them the opportunity to determine whether there is a history of violence in the relationship and to assess the potential threat of further injury to the complainant or the family involved, and to obtain thorough contact information for the victim. All of this helps the attorney not only to establish a rapport with the victim, but allows them to more accurately evaluate the case and make appropriate bail, order of protection, charging, and plea offer decisions.

*-Office of the Queens County District Attorney, New York*

### Vertical prosecution

Vertical prosecution provides the victim/survivor and the prosecutor the opportunity to work together throughout the life of the case. Cook County (Chicago) victims/survivors reported higher satisfaction with the specialized domestic violence prosecution unit, which featured specially trained prosecutors, vertical prosecution, and its own victim advocates, than with the prosecutors who handled domestic violence outside the unit. Domestic violence unit victims/survivors were also more likely to appear in court: 75 percent of victims appeared, compared to just 25 percent

in non-unit domestic violence cases. This unit also obtained a higher domestic violence conviction rate – 71 percent – compared to 50 percent for the rest of the office (Hartley & Frohmann, 2003).

Vertical prosecution has been instituted in numerous STOP Program-funded prosecution offices: Twenty-seven STOP subgrantees from 15 different states specifically mentioned utilizing their STOP funds for vertical prosecution in 2007. Following are descriptions of how critical this funding has been and what it means for victims/survivors:

There would be no domestic violence prosecutor in our office without the STOP funds. The other component that would not exist is vertical prosecution. This prevents the defense bar from prosecutor-shopping for a better deal. It also ensures that victims have a stable contact throughout her case. The domestic violence prosecutor also compiles all of the relevant statistics of the cases prosecuted. That was not done prior to receiving STOP funds. Simply put, the little progress that we have made would not have occurred without these funds.

*-City of Marietta, Ohio*

It is not uncommon for the STOP-funded prosecutors to recognize that multiple individual misdemeanor cases merit stalking prosecutions as they are handled vertically in the criminal justice system. . . . Vertical prosecutions are those that only one prosecutor handles from charging through to sentencing and has the best ability for legal accountability, especially in complex criminal domestic violence prosecutions. Independent of the STOP grant funding, misdemeanor cases would not have a vertical approach to the most aggravated and therefore potentially hinder the prosecution by different prosecutors having to spend significant time just familiarizing themselves with the facts of the case and dynamics of the abuse.

*-Milwaukee County District Attorney's Office, Wisconsin*

Prosecutors funded under the STOP Program received 170,744 cases of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking for charging consideration and filed charges, on average, in 131,810 (77 percent) of those cases. STOP Program-funded prosecution offices showed a dismissal rate of 39 percent for domestic violence misdemeanors.<sup>33</sup> This rate is in stark contrast to what studies have revealed in some other localities. For example, 80 percent of domestic assault cases were dismissed in the Albuquerque (New Mexico) Metropolitan Court in 2004, compared with 34 percent of drunk-driving cases (Gallagher, 2005); in Bernalillo County, New Mexico, the dismissal rate was reported to be almost 90 percent (“Officials push domestic

<sup>33</sup> This percentage is based on the number of dismissals compared to all other dispositions. Included as reasons for dismissal on the report form were the following subcategories: request of victim, lack of evidence, plea bargain, other. (Subgrantees were instructed to report only on the disposition of the original charges, not on the disposition of lesser charges pled to by the offender.) For more information on the dispositions of charges, see Table 27.

violence initiatives,” 2004); dismissal rates of domestic violence cases in Florida were reported at 72 percent in the Orange and Osceola County Judicial Circuit, and 69 percent in the Polk, Highlands, and Hardee County Judicial Circuit in 2003(Owens, 2004); and only 20 percent of criminal stalking cases in Utah resulted in convictions in 2002 (Bryson, 2004).

During the calendar year 2007, 307 subgrantees used STOP Program funds for prosecution activities carried out by prosecutors with a total of 308 FTEs. STOP funds were used to develop, expand, or train specialized prosecution units by 332 subgrantees. Overall, subgrantees engaged in the following activities designed to improve the prosecution response: 414 provided training on prosecution response; 121 developed and/or implemented policies that addressed victim witness notification; and 117 addressed policy development/implementation regarding protection order violations. The low dismissal rate in STOP Program-funded prosecution agencies may well reflect the impact of specialized prosecutors engaging in training and the development and implementation of strategic policies that result in increased offender accountability.

## Courts

Successful and effective prosecution of domestic violence is augmented in jurisdictions where courts have consolidated domestic violence calendars and more intensive supervision of defendants pre- and post-conviction. A study of 106 jurisdictions with specialized domestic violence courts found that 70 percent shared the following key practices and processes essential to effective management of specialized courts: 1) effective management of domestic violence cases, coordinating all of the cases involving the relevant parties, and integrating requisite information for the court; 2) specialized intake and court staffing for domestic violence cases; 3) improved victim access, expedited hearings, and assistance for victims/survivors by court staff, often assisted by related, specialized, vertical domestic violence prosecution units; 4) court processes to ensure victims/survivors’ safety, from court metal detectors and separate waiting rooms to specialized orders and victim referrals; 5) increased court monitoring and enforcement of batterer compliance with court orders, often exercised by related specialized probation supervision units; 6) consideration of children involved in domestic violence; and 7) enhanced domestic violence training for judges (Keilitz, 2004).

In some jurisdictions, judges have been at the forefront in establishing special coordinating councils for sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking cases. In an increasing number of jurisdictions, judges have used their administrative role to create specialized domestic violence courts with the goal of enhanced coordination, more consistent intervention to protect victims/survivors, and increased offender accountability. These courts seek to link different cases involving the same offender and victim/survivor (e.g., custody cases, protection orders, and criminal charges often can be linked to the same offender and victim), so that the same judge is reviewing the cases. These courts typically have specialized intake units, victim-witness advocates, specialized calendars, and intense judicial monitoring of offenders (Klein, 2004).

The following STOP-funded domestic violence court exemplifies improved case coordination and communication, with greater offender accountability and enhanced victim safety:

Prior to DV Court, misdemeanor domestic violence crimes committed in Pima County were handled by eight different elected judges who represented the precincts of the Pima County Consolidated Justice Court, with little communication or shared information within the system. This resulted in defendants having two or more domestic violence cases pending in front of different judges, defendants with prior or active DV cases being inappropriately placed on diversion or unsupervised probation for new DV charges, and probation sentences and violation dispositions which did not always hold defendants accountable. STOP funding has allowed Pima County to implement a Domestic Violence Court, which has brought consistent handling of domestic violence cases by a specialized judge, who has special training and sensitivity to domestic violence issues. . . . The DV Court judge hears all misdemeanor DV arraignments two mornings per week, and the prosecutor is prepared to provide the judge with criminal histories and inform the judge if the case will remain assigned to DV Court (per prior conviction history or seriousness of the offense). . . . Offender accountability was increased in DV Court through sentencing of repeat DV offenders to 12-24 months of enhanced, supervised probation by a specially trained DV probation team and regular judicial review hearings. . . . The court held 105 review hearings on 75 probationers throughout the year. The DV Court created an environment of safety and comfort for victim/survivors. The judge patiently and compassionately listened to every victim who wished to speak during every hearing. Security was established to escort victim/survivors to their vehicles, and safe areas were located for victims to wait with the victim witness advocate if they did not want to encounter their abuser before a hearing.

*-Pima County Consolidated Justice Court Domestic Violence Court Project, Arizona*

In order to help courts effectively manage their domestic violence docket, STOP funds may be used for clerks, coordinators, or case managers, as in the following example:

STOP enabled the second Brooklyn Integrated Domestic Violence Court to open in February 2007 with the enhanced staffing of a resource coordinator to ensure information flow, coordination of services and offender monitoring. During the reporting period, the resource coordinator assisted the Judge in monitoring 220 defendants.

*-New York State Unified Court System*

STOP funds have been used for domestic violence court liaisons, court-based advocates, and resource coordinators<sup>34</sup> whose roles are multi-faceted and can be

---

<sup>34</sup> These staff may be employed directly by the court or by coalitions or victim services agencies, or may be working under a contract between the court and another agency.

critical to the success of the specialized court, the coordinated community response, and ultimately to victim safety and offender accountability. Following are examples:

Our grant has allowed us to work toward a more coordinated community response. Our victim liaisons (VLs) are charged with advocating in the court systems for more batterer accountability through compliance hearings and other strategies. They collect court and family violence intervention program (FVIP) statistics and report on the statistics to local task forces. They enlist the task forces to implement better accountability measures to ensure that batterers face consequences for their behavior, particularly if they do not comply with court orders. VLs have been able to show a clear increase in batterers being ordered into FVIPs. Our grant allows VLs to reach out to victims who traditionally have not sought DV services, linking them to services that can assist with safety planning and other needs. As our VLs' statistics show, this project has allowed a significant increase in the number of victims the VLs are able to reach out to, thereby increasing victim safety. We've used the funding to begin addressing the specific impact of DV in the African-American community. This is particularly important as African-American women are 34 percent more likely to be victims of DV and face a higher risk of lethality. The funding also allows us to bring FVIPs and VLs together to deal with issues around problems with compliance within the court systems, to share accurate information about cases and helps the groups develop stronger collaborations, allowing them to support each other's work at task forces and in the court systems.

*-Georgia Coalition Against Domestic Violence*

Since receiving funding for the domestic violence docket, offender accountability is at a higher rate. The domestic violence coordinator maintains the domestic violence docket and keeps a weekly monitoring of the perpetrators. The funding has also allowed the coordinator to work closely with the other agencies within the surrounding areas. Recidivism rates are extremely low in our county. This is due in part to the close monitoring of the perpetrators and their sentencing.

*-Family Resource Center, Oklahoma*

When meeting the victim at the court, this domestic violence court liaison (DVCL) triages the victim, makes referrals for appropriate services, and counsels them regarding domestic violence issues. This funding provides a court liaison to notify victims of all hearings and the status of their case, prepare victims for what to expect at hearings (including questions the court is likely to ask), and to attend all hearings with victims. The DVCL also makes sure that victims are cognizant of their rights and advocates on their behalf. In addition the DVCL then explains the impact of each hearing to the victim. Many victims are overwhelmed with the court process, are still suffering from the emotional trauma of the abuse (as well as having to come face to face with their offender in the courtroom), and need a recap of what actually occurred during the proceeding and what it all means. The court liaison is also available to coordinate the criminal justice process with frequently on-going domestic relations proceedings.

*-City of Bedford, Ohio*

Funds were used for specialized courts or court activities addressing sexual assault, domestic violence, and/or stalking by 18 STOP subgrantees; 12 of these subgrantees used funds for judicial monitoring activities of convicted offenders, holding an average of 1.5 hearings per offender for 2,378 offenders during calendar year 2007. These courts held offenders accountable by imposing sanctions for violations of probation conditions and other court orders, as shown in Table 8. It is worth noting the following: revocation (partial or full) of probation represented 50 percent of the dispositions for offenders who violated protection orders and 61 percent for those who failed to attend a batterer intervention program (BIP); verbal or written warnings represented only 14 percent of the dispositions for offenders who engaged in new criminal behavior and 15 percent for those who failed to attend BIP; and finally, no action taken was not reported as a disposition for any of the listed violations.

**Table 8. Disposition of selected violations of probation and other court orders in STOP Program-funded courts in 2007**

Violation	Verbal/ written warning (%)	Partial/full revocation of probation (%)	Conditions added (%)	Fine (%)	No action taken (%)
Protection order ( <i>N</i> =100)	28 (28%)	50 (50%)	7 (7%)	15 (15%)	0
New criminal behavior ( <i>N</i> =165)	23 (14%)	63 (38%)	76 (46%)	3 (2%)	0
Failure to attend batterer intervention program ( <i>N</i> =289)	44 (15%)	175 (61%)	55 (19%)	15 (5%)	0

NOTE: *N* is the number of dispositions reported for each category of violation. One offender may have received more than one disposition per violation and may have had multiple violations in the same 12-month period.

## Probation Supervision

Probation supervision offers the criminal justice system alternatives to incarceration of offenders. The primary role of the probation officer is to monitor offenders' compliance with specific court-ordered conditions. Following the example of police, prosecutors, and courts, probation departments funded under the STOP Program have adopted specialized caseloads for monitoring sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking offenders. Many of these specialized probation officers engage in more intensive supervision of their probationers, and many require attendance at batterer intervention programs (BIPs) or sex offender treatment programs.

Specialized supervision of domestic violence offenders has been shown to be effective. A National Institute of Justice-sponsored study of Rhode Island's Department of Corrections/Probation and Parole found that a specialized probation supervision unit for individuals convicted of domestic violence significantly reduced the risk of re-abuse and re-arrest among low-risk offenders, and increased victim satisfaction, when compared with non-specialized supervision (Klein, Wilson, Crowe, & DeMichele, 2005).

Probation and parole departments have devised policies and practices to respond to the heightened scrutiny and more nuanced sentencing by courts in responding to sexual assault, domestic violence, stalking, and dating violence. Increasingly, probation departments have adopted specialized caseloads that utilize intensive supervision with these offenders. Many of these specialized units provide outreach and support to victims/survivors.

Research on the effectiveness of probation supervision in domestic violence cases suggests there are several essential ingredients for effective probation supervision of perpetrators. One is victim-focused supervision. A primary goal of the supervision must be victim/survivor protection, and a secondary, but significant goal, is victim restitution. To achieve both, periodic probation officer contact and communication with victims/survivors is essential; this ongoing outreach to victims requires a paradigm shift away from traditional approaches to probation, which tend to focus on the offender, not the victim/survivor (Klein & Crowe, 2008; Klein et al., 2005).

Another critical practice is strict monitoring of all probationary conditions, particularly attendance at and satisfactory compliance with assigned BIPs. BIPs, especially those embedded in a criminal justice response system that mandates participation and imposes swift sanctions for noncompliance, appear to de-escalate re-assault and other abuse (Gondolf, 2004). Abusers who are unwilling or unable to complete these programs are significantly more likely to re-abuse than those who complete them (Gordon & Moriarty, 2003; Puffett & Gavin, 2004). By tightly monitoring offenders' participation in BIPs, probation officers can bring noncompliant abusers back to court for probation modification or revocation before they re-offend.

A third element is intensive supervision of offenders provided by specially trained probation officers. This can take the form of periodic office, home, or work visits and drug/alcohol testing, scheduled or unscheduled. Officers should monitor compliance with state and federal firearms prohibitions (Crowe et al., 2009; Klein, 2006).

A number of California subgrantees have incorporated these elements of effective probation practice, including the following:

The STOP grant has allowed Contra Costa County to develop a specialized unit to provide intensive supervision of domestic violence offenders who live in the central, east and west areas of Contra Costa County. The majority of our domestic violence cases continue to come from the east and west areas of the county, where economic deprivation, cultural norms, re-location stress and substance abuse are contributing factors to the incidents of domestic violence. . . . This grant has allowed officers to conduct intensive supervision of domestic violence offenders and establish collaborative efforts with local law enforcement agencies. Officers conduct face-to-face interviews with the offenders, maintain telephone contact and conduct home visits. Officers ensure that the standard of supervision will not be reduced until the offender completes 52 weeks of batterers intervention program, complete mandated terms and comply with other conditions of probations such as no weapons, attending alcohol and drug abuse programs, AA meetings, and payment of victim restitutions. If the offender



violates probation, probation is revoked expeditiously, and sanctions imposed. Additionally, this grant has allowed officers to have more contact with a great number of victims of crime, to continue to connect victims to community based organizations and to inform victims that safety is a goal.

*-Contra Costa County Probation Department, California*

VAWA funding has allowed the department to assign one senior probation officer and one deputy probation officer to intensively supervised caseloads of no more than 40 probationers convicted of domestic violence offenses. These small caseloads allow the probation officer the opportunity to make frequent home and victim contacts, as well as to immediately arrest a probationer who violates his conditions of probation. The funding further allows the caseloads to remain continuously covered and provides a continuity of staffing. Additionally, staff assigned have received extensive domestic violence training and have been able to develop an excellent working relationship with other law enforcement agencies, the district attorney and the judge.

*-County of Riverside, California*

STOP funding has allowed the assigned officers to have manageable caseloads. Non-STOP funded probation officers have caseloads of up to 360 probationers. These numbers make it extremely difficult to closely supervise individuals on probation. The STOP officer's caseloads are approximately fifty. They are able to have weekly contact with probationers, and the extra attention allows for immediate sanctions for violations. Because of the level of contact, officers are able to verify the defendant's compliance with their probation terms, counseling, and court requirements, and also maintain contact with victims to monitor their safety.

*-Kern County Probation Department, California*

A multi-disciplinary team in Illinois, which received STOP funding for staff in victim services, law enforcement, prosecution, and probation, described the impact of this funding in their jurisdiction in this way:

STOP funding has allowed the detective and prosecutors assigned to domestic violence incidents to sit down with victim advocates and probation officers to actively discuss open cases and advise each entity on how to proceed, focusing on victim safety first and foremost, as well as holding offenders accountable for their actions. STOP funding has allowed prosecutors, probation officers, and victim advocates to communicate with the Family Violence Intervention Project (FVIP) liaison to better track offenders' compliance with attending domestic violence counseling. The STOP funding has allowed probation officers, via the FVIP liaison, to file petitions to revoke more efficiently and within a shorter timeframe when an offender has become noncompliant with the domestic violence counseling.

*-The Peoria County Family Justice Center, Illinois*

The following subgrantee used STOP funds for intensive supervision of offenders by a court officer who also provided case management services to misdemeanor level offenders:

The STOP VAWA court grant monies provide for a dedicated court services officer (CSO) who supervises all domestic violence offenders placed on a period of supervised probation by the Domestic Violence Court. As a result, there is one central person (the CSO) who provides case management to all supervised offenders, appears at all sentencing, compliance and revocation dockets, provides testimony as to offender status, acts as a liaison between the courts, the district attorney and service agencies and provides outcome data regarding the success of the program. Our goal is to eliminate re-offending by ensuring that each offender is given the tools necessary to be a productive citizen and remain out of the criminal justice system in the future. The intensive supervision provided by the CSO is a service that is not offered at the misdemeanor level by the Oklahoma Department of Corrections and would be unavailable without the STOP VAWA grant funds.

*-Cleveland County, Oklahoma*

As illustrated in Table 9 below, when offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation officers in 2007 failed to comply with court-ordered conditions, probation revocation rates ranged from 53 percent for failure to attend a BIP, to 54 percent for protection order violations, to 47 percent for new criminal behavior.

**Table 9. Disposition of selected probation violations by STOP Program-funded probation departments in 2007**

Violation	Verbal/ written warning (%)	Partial/full revocation of probation (%)	Conditions added (%)	Fine (%)	No action taken (%)
Protection order (N = 301 )	16 (5%)	163 (54%)	25 (8%)	1 (1%)	96 (32%)
New criminal behavior (N = 717 )	27 (4%)	340 (47%)	155 (22%)	37 (5%)	158 (22%)
Failure to attend batterer intervention program (N = 831)	130 (16%)	444 (53%)	117 (14%)	48 (6%)	92 (11%)

NOTE: N is the number of dispositions reported for each category of violation. One offender may have received more than one disposition per violation and may have had multiple violations in the same 12-month period.

Probation officers funded under the STOP Program supervised 13,383 offenders and made a total of 48,665 contacts with those offenders, for an average of 3.6 contacts per offender. The majority of these contacts (56 percent) were face-to-face, 29 percent were by telephone, and 14 percent were unscheduled surveillance. Some probation officers have also begun to reach out to victims/survivors; officers made 5,776 contacts with 3,384 victims/survivors during 2007. Regular contact provides an opportunity to inform victims/survivors about services available in the community

and lets them know that the criminal justice system is continuing to hold the offender accountable.

## Data Collection and Communication Systems

The ability of police, prosecutors, and courts to share information with one another is critical and may save lives. A police officer needs to know about bail, probation, or protection order conditions to make an informed decision about whether to apprehend a defendant who may be violating those conditions. A judge issuing a protection order may not be aware that there is a pending bail order, or vice versa, and may include conflicting conditions in the order. A prosecutor engaged in fast-paced plea negotiations should have ease of access to prior criminal history, as well as information on pending and prior protection orders. To ensure the highest level of victim safety and offender accountability, the sharing of information may need to happen on several different levels, from within a local prosecutor's office to a statewide court or public safety system.

STOP funds were used to develop, install, or expand data collection and communication systems by 358 subgrantees;<sup>35</sup> 188 of those subgrantees reported using STOP funds to link systems and share information. These systems were most often used for case management and to track protection orders, violations of protection orders, arrests, incident reports, evaluation/outcome measures, and prosecutions.

Following are two examples of STOP Program funds used for these purposes in a health education center and in a police department in Maryland:

The current funding year has provided us with the ability to purchase the Thorough Assault Case Tracking system, a comprehensive data collection system that will allow us to link our local law enforcement, victim service, hospital, state's attorney, and state police agencies together through software to get an accurate, in-depth picture of the situation of family violence and sexual assault in our county. Despite years of trying, this groundbreaking system was unattainable without STOP program funds.

*-Western Maryland Area Health Education Center*

Another major accomplishment with STOP funds was the development and enhancement of the data-collection system relating to domestic violence in Washington County. This system is a county-wide data base relating to law enforcement, the judicial system, prosecution, and victim services. The data are being used by all agencies involved and as a community training and education tool. The victim resource counselor not only works with the database by entering all data, but uses the information in the

<sup>35</sup> Subgrantees have two opportunities to respond to this question on the reporting form—one in a question about which *statutory purpose areas* they addressed during the reporting period and another asking if they used STOP funds to *develop, install, and expand data collection systems*. The first question received an affirmative response from 306 subgrantees; the second question received affirmative responses from 358.

incident reports to contact both the victim and abuser. She sends a letter to both outlining their options and identifies community resources for them.

*-Hagerstown Police Department, Maryland*

The Maine District Court used STOP Program funds to upgrade its information system:

The court's Information and Technology Department has been able to work on the protection from abuse module in MEJIS [Maine Justice Information System] and do the necessary research and rebuild work for MEJIS II. The DV indicator was scheduled to go into beta testing in January 2008. This means that the Office of Information and Technology will do the first round of testing, then the program will be released to pilot sites for quality assurance testing. Work on the refinement stage continues and this includes the Brady warning. Without these STOP grant funds this progress would never have been made and we now have a tool to track all domestic violence cases through the life of the case.

*-Maine District Court*

STOP funds were also used to buy equipment that enhanced the ability of police officers to communicate critical information and to collect evidence at the incident scene.

Laptops have provided the officers responding to violence against women quicker access to information relating to the number of violence calls to the location they are responding to, information on weapons, sex offenders, etc. This has been great for pertinent information for the victim's safety and the officer's safety. Ear mike sets have been a great way to communicate with the officer from dispatch when officer is on the scene and talking to the offender. Dispatch can advise of victim's information, safety, any weapons, etc., without the offender hearing the conversation. Also, [these ear mikes] free the officers' hands. . . . All officers now have a good walkie-talkie that they can use when out of their patrol cars for the safety of the victim and victims' families. These keep communications up with other officers and dispatch for the safety of the victim. Now all officers have their own camera in their patrol car for use at all times for the victim's safety, information on the case and also information of the scene for the victim advocate.

*-Pickens City Police Department, South Carolina*

The STOP funding has given forensic investigators of the Anderson Police Department tools that have enabled our agency to drastically increase the amount of evidence collected at crime scenes involving violence against women. STOP funding has equipped our officers with photography, video, and other evidence collection equipment to be used in crimes involving violence against women. These tools have been used to identify, apprehend, and convict perpetrators of these crimes. While

obtaining this equipment, officers have become more proficient in evidence collection through learning how to operate it.

*-Anderson Police Department, Indiana*

## **Sexual Assault**

According to the National Violence Against Women (NVAW) Survey, more than 300,000 women and 90,000 men are raped annually, and these rates have shown little variation over the past few decades. The survey reported that nearly 18 million women and 3 million men had experienced a sexual assault during their lifetime. Epidemiological data suggest that at least 17 percent of women will be sexually assaulted in their adult lifetimes. According to the survey, only one in five women reported their victimization to the police; of those assaults reported to law enforcement, only 37 percent were prosecuted (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2006).

STOP-funded programs are permitted by VAWA to fund the training of sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners in the following areas: the treatment of trauma related to sexual assault; in the collection, preservation, and analysis of evidence; and in providing expert testimony. In addition, STOP Program subgrantees have provided training to increase understanding of the intersection of domestic violence, sexual violence, and stalking. They have also developed and implemented policies and protocols that have led to better responses and improved services to victims/survivors of sexual assault and stalking.

The specialized training of medical personnel is designed not only to improve the quality of the examination and of the evidence collected, but also to provide victims/survivors of sexual trauma with compassionate treatment during the examination process. This training is vital because a victim/survivor's decision to appear at a medical facility to be examined is a critically important step in the process of holding offenders accountable. Historically, victims/survivors of sexual assault were often re-traumatized by their experiences in hospitals. Triage usually left them waiting hours for forensic exams. Physicians were often untrained in forensic evidence collection and disinclined to become involved in a procedure that could require them to appear in court. Lack of training compromised the ability of the criminal justice system to prosecute perpetrators successfully. In sexual assault nurse examiner (SANE) programs, trained nurse examiners provide prompt, sensitive, supportive, and compassionate care; the nurses also follow forensic protocols, ensuring the highest quality evidence.

Programs that include SANEs and sexual assault response teams (SARTs) have been found to greatly enhance the quality of health care provided to women who have been sexually assaulted and to improve the quality of forensic evidence. They also enhance law enforcement's ability to collect information and to file charges, thus increasing the likelihood of successful prosecution (Campbell, Bybee, Ford, & Patterson, 2008; Campbell et al., 2005; Crandall & Helitzer, 2003).

The following subgrantees used funds for SANE coordinators and reported as follows about the impact of STOP funding in their communities:

Prior to receiving STOP funding, the response from the medical community regarding sexual assault was minimal to none. As the Rape Crisis Program we founded a Rape Crisis Advisory Committee that began an assessment of forensic exams and the quality of care in our community. . . . Having our coordinator position has been amazing. As a result of her hard work, we have a SANE program in our county hospital (Erie County Medical Center) which is also a New York State Department of Health Designated Center of Excellence for Sexual Assault. . . . We are thrilled to be supported by these funds and have seen the results when cases go to court. Convictions are strong because the evidence, investigation and victim are supported by this multidisciplinary approach. We are proud to have a 90 percent conviction rate on sexual assault cases in Erie County. We know that the result of this is the collaborative efforts of the Rape Crisis Center, law enforcement, the medical community and the District Attorney's Office. We support each other's role in the process of helping victims of rape and sexual assault, and as a result we see victims become survivors, we see perpetrators held accountable and our community safety improve when convictions are placed on these offenders. We still have work to do, as do all communities, but feel we have seen extensive improvement in the few years we have been funded by the STOP funds.

*-Suicide Prevention and Crisis Service, Inc., New York*

The Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) / Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) team of Montgomery was created to provide a professional, compassionate and dignified approach to the sexual assault victims. . . . Prior to the start of the SART/SANE program there was lack of communication and trust between the various organizations that were involved in sexual assault cases. This includes the law enforcement agencies, the medical professionals, the forensic scientists, the Alabama Crime Victims Compensation Commission, the district attorneys, and the advocates. By establishing the program, these parties have one central location in which to turn for answers. This has created relationships that have resulted in the sharing of knowledge on how to pursue these cases, how to work with sexual assault victims, and how to improve the prosecution of rapists. . . . The SANE program provides 24-hour, seven-day-a-week on-call availability to provide the forensics medical exams to victims of sexual assault. SANEs also provide expert testimony in all legal proceedings as deemed necessary by the District Attorney's Office. It has been shown that the quality of evidence collected has been a determining factor in numerous defendants pleading guilty to sexual assault charges. . . . STOP funding has allowed us to have this unique opportunity to provide trained and qualified staff to serve the victims from the moment of our first encounter throughout the entire legal process. The SART/SANE coordinator spends a great amount of time working with other members of the SART coordinating information relating to cases currently being pursued.

*-Lighthouse Counseling Center, Alabama*

Prior to receiving this funding, Isanti County had no sexual assault protocol. There was no formal collaboration between law enforcement, medical, prosecution, advocacy, or any other key members involved in addressing sexual assaults. With funding we

were able to get a formal collaboration of law enforcement, medical, advocacy, prosecution, corrections, treatment facilities and many others to work together to make the entire process of reporting a sexual assault and holding the offender accountable better. We now have formal policies and procedures in place for victims of sexual assault to make the entire process more efficient for victims so as not to re-victimize them. We have developed the protocol as well as continue to train all interested parties.

*-Isanti County Sexual Assault Multidisciplinary Action Response Team, Minnesota*

The following subgrantee used STOP funds to provide essential training on sexual assault:

Before receiving STOP funds, training for hundreds of law enforcement officers and prosecutors across the state on sexual assault issues was almost non-existent. Under STOP, ACAR has been able to provide specialized training on how to be "first responders" on cases, as well as the follow-up investigation that is needed by detectives that is given during the advanced level training. Prosecutors are also trained on the special issues of sexual assault each year. Through this contractual arrangement with its trainers, the Institute for Criminal Justice Education (ICJE), ACAR has been able to provide two hours of the first responder presentation material to minimum-standards classes at the Montgomery Police Academy (MPA) in Montgomery, as one of its contracted trainers is an adjunct member and certified police trainer with the MPA. This trainer also presented a block of instruction entitled "Sex Crimes" to officers during their initial training program. All of the officers were provided with ACAR handout materials during the presentations.

*-Alabama Coalition Against Rape*

A subgrantee in New Jersey used funds to expand access to critical counseling services for sexual assault victims/survivors:

The Hudson County Rape Crisis Center at Christ Hospital is located in Jersey City, where about half the county's 601,000 residents reside. We are one of many community-based programs at the counseling center, however we are the only rape crisis center in the county and as such the demand for counseling services for sexual assault victims was very overwhelming. With only one counselor on staff to provide counseling to all sexual assault victims and their families, it was extremely difficult to meet the needs of victims seeking help. Unfortunately victims were often put on long waiting lists or referred to other programs that really did not have the specialized training to work with sexual assault victims. Since receiving STOP funding in 2007, things have changed immensely. We were able to hire a counselor who works solely with sexual assault victims and their families. As a result, we have managed to decrease the waiting time for clients seeking counseling from about four weeks to about two weeks. This is very important, as countless studies have shown that sexual assault victims who are able to receive specialized counseling services shortly after the assault have a higher recovery rate than

those seeking counseling much later. Another thing that we are able to do now that we weren't able to do before receiving STOP funding is that our program now has evening (after 5 p.m.) counseling hours to accommodate those clients who are in school or who work during the day. The VAWA counselor works two evenings a week. In the past, clients had to take time off from work or school to make it to their counseling appointments. Now they don't.

*-Enhanced Hudson County Rape Crisis Program, New Jersey*

The following subgrantee used STOP funds for prosecutors devoted exclusively to the prosecution of sex crimes against adults:

STOP Program funding has allowed us to acquire three additional prosecutors dedicated solely to the review and prosecution of adult sex crimes cases. This shift has actualized a monumental change in this unit. First of all, STOP Program funding has allowed the three grant prosecutors to effectively review cases faster than they were able to before STOP Program funding despite the fact that the unit received twice as many adult sex crimes cases that year than it did the year before receiving STOP Program funding. STOP funds have allowed adult sex crimes attorneys to better prepare for trial because of their manageable caseloads. It has allowed adult sex crimes attorneys to plea more cases with better results because of their early case preparation. Further, the funds enable the three grant attorneys to effectively prosecute the deluge of "cold hit" adult sexual assault cases that we will receive this year as a result of Missouri's all felons DNA statute and the formation of a new Cold Case Unit at the Kansas City Police Department devoted to sex crimes. . . . STOP Program funding has allowed us to more effectively prosecute perpetrators of adult sex crimes cases in Jackson County.

*-Jackson County Prosecutor's Office, Missouri*

Seven percent (165) of all subgrantees reported that they used funds for SANE training. STOP Program funds were used by 25 STOP subgrantees to support 21 FTE SANE staff positions.<sup>36</sup> More significantly, in terms of the program's broader impact, funds supported training for 4,058 SANEs.

More than 314 sexual assault organizations – 276 local programs and 38 state sexual assault coalitions<sup>37</sup> – received STOP Program funds, and sexual assault victims/survivors made up 13 percent of all victims/survivors served with program funds in 2007. Although it is not possible to know exactly what services were provided to sexual assault survivors, subgrantees did report that 18,921 victims/survivors were accompanied to the hospital; those hospital visits are often for forensic exams for sexual assault victims/survivors. In addition to providing services

---

<sup>36</sup> These include the following, as reported by the subgrantees in the staff "other" category: SANE, sexual assault forensic examiner (SAFE), forensic medical personnel, forensic nurse examiner (FNE), nurse examiner, SANE coordinator, SANE director, SANE supervisor, etc.

<sup>37</sup> Subgrantees also reported that 489 dual (meaning that they address both domestic violence and sexual assault) programs and 41 dual state coalitions received STOP Program funds in 2007.



to sexual assault victims, 686 subgrantees – an impressive 63 percent of those using funds for training – provided training on topics related specifically to sexual assault: sexual assault dynamics, services, statutes and codes, and forensic examination. Felony sexual assault charges made up two percent of all new charges filed during 2007 by STOP Program-funded prosecutors. Of those felony sexual assault charges disposed of during 2007, an overall average of 59 percent resulted in convictions.<sup>38</sup>

## Stalking

Although the general public may be most familiar with stalking by strangers, the majority of stalking is actually perpetrated by partners or former partners of the stalking victims, or people known to the victim: More than half of all stalking cases emerge from romantic relationships, and over 80 percent of stalkers are reportedly known to their victims (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007). A meta-analysis of 175 studies on stalking revealed that approximately one-fourth of women have experienced stalking in their lifetime and that the average time a person is stalked is two years (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007). The NVAW Survey found that 59 percent of women who reported being stalked were stalked by their current or former intimate partners. Of those, 81 percent were also physically assaulted by that partner, and 31 percent were sexually assaulted by that partner (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998).<sup>39</sup> The NVAW Survey also found that half of all stalking victims report the stalking to the police, and a quarter of those reported cases result in arrests.

The danger of stalking has often been underestimated. Stalking has been associated with a range of serious consequences for victims/survivors, including increased risk of violence, injury, and homicide (Logan, Shannon, Cole, & Swanberg, 2007; Roberts, 2005). A ten-city study of female abuse victims and female victims of attempted or actual homicide committed by their intimate partners found a strong association between stalking and subsequent lethality or near-lethality. It found that stalking, when combined with a history of physical assault and a former or estranged relationship status, places women at greater danger of becoming victims of attempted or actual homicide by intimate partners. It also found that women who reported that they were being followed or spied on by a partner had a more than a twofold increase in the risk of becoming a homicide victim (McFarlane, Campbell, & Watson, 2002).

The dynamics of stalking and strategies employed by offenders who engage in stalking call for specialized training in how best to identify the crime, how to involve the victim/survivor and others in collecting evidence necessary to prosecute the crime, and how to keep the stalking victim/survivor safe, as well as a coordinated response among criminal justice agencies and community partners.

---

<sup>38</sup> This rate includes deferred adjudications. For purposes of comparison, the average conviction rate for domestic violence misdemeanors was also 59 percent and for domestic violence felonies it was 66 percent.

<sup>39</sup> The co-incidence of physical assault, sexual assault, and stalking may explain in part the low percentage of stalking victims (2.6 percent) reported as being served with STOP Program funds. Subgrantees are instructed to report an *unduplicated* count of victims/survivors and to select only *one primary victimization* for each victim/survivor served during each calendar year. It is safe to assume that a significant number of domestic violence and sexual assault victims/survivors were also victims of stalking, even though they were not reported as stalking victims on the STOP Annual Progress Report form.

Community collaboration is evident in the following subgrantee's multi-faceted use of STOP funds to respond to stalking:

The STOP funding has allowed us to pay specially trained officers overtime money to do surveillance and collect evidence for prosecution of stalking cases. Time is able to be spent on tracking offenders that are on GPS monitoring and communicating with the Justice Sanctions Program to keep them updated on new information regarding the offender. We are able to pay for a part time victim services stalking coordinator to maintain the case history, keep weekly contact with the victim/survivor to update and receive information regarding concerns or reoccurring incidents. The coordinator also maintains regular contact with the DA regarding charges that have been filed and court issues. Schedules and training of the night time on-call volunteer advocates (NOVA) are also a part of the victim services stalking coordinator duties. Funding has also been provided to obtain bus passes, and devices that can be used to record conversations and incidents in order to assist law enforcement in evidence collection.

*-City of La Crosse, Wisconsin*

The following subgrantees used STOP funds to educate and empower actual and potential victims/survivors of stalking, as well as to provide them with services, and to strengthen the system's response to stalking:

We are grateful for the VAWA-STOP (V-STOP) funding and the ability to have someone work exclusively in the criminal justice system who can identify gaps and help close those gaps. This year V-STOP has helped make it possible to increase our assistance to stalking victims and to potential stalking victims. Many more victims who leave shelter know what to do if their abusers start stalking them. They know how to report the incidents, document, and safety plan. They know the importance of working with the police and insisting that the police take them seriously, do a report and tell the stalker to stay away from them. The number of requests for presentations on stalking has increased this year. The Virginia Sexual & Domestic Violence Action Alliance has made it mandatory that all new volunteers and new staff members receive information on stalking before they start working with victims or start their jobs.

*-The Shelter for Abused Women, Virginia*

The funds that we have received this year have given us an opportunity to provide services we have not been able to in the past. We started a Stalking Support Group in a psycho-educational format. The participants were very grateful and have all moved on to more productive, less fearful lives. A victim of stalking requires more time with an advocate to explain what has been going on so that someone gets the "context" in which this client feels fear. We have developed a new and innovative way to do a safety plan, created a time-line worksheet, and crafted a new incident and behavior log that fits within the stalking law in Minnesota. We have also created victim/offender folders that clients can use to assist them in relieving a bit of their fear--

someone has the information that can be released to law enforcement in the event of the client's death. In addition to direct service, city leaders have met with us to create a protocol for law enforcement, prosecution, and victim service providers in how they would handle stalking cases. This protocol is finished and will be presented in February to any Minnesota stakeholder who would like to adapt the protocol to their jurisdiction.

*-Cornerstone Advocacy Service, Minnesota*

Following are two examples of STOP Program-funded strategies to address stalking through a coordinated community response:

We have been able to create and maintain a Stalking Task Force, which is a coalition between law enforcement entities, and non-law enforcement entities, whose goal it is to discuss the judicial procedure and case management, in an effort to determine best practices, and seek out those areas of response that need to be improved. The task force is also a forum for interdepartmental training. . . . We have had success in helping departments become more alert to the nature of stalking. For example, with training it is easy to see that discrete contacts may be part of a larger stalking picture, that a trespasser may be a stalker. Out of this and under development are techniques to spot stalking from the first call to 911, through police investigation, to the subsequent charging and prosecution of the case. We have in place a team approach to stalking. The assigned district attorney has a specific victim services advocate to whom he can, and does, turn. One specific district attorney investigator is assigned to stalking cases. The victim support that is so necessary in these cases is provided by a specific person. Stalking victims have one person to whom they can turn at all times. This makes it much less likely that a victim is going to be lost in the system, discouraged and afraid, with needs unmet. The close collaboration which exists through the team approach translates into effective service delivery to the victim

*-San Francisco, City & County, California*

STOP funding has allowed us to focus on implementing a stalking program which focuses on providing education and raising awareness of stalking within the community, coordinating efforts with other law enforcement agencies on responding to the needs of stalking victims, and providing direct services to victims of stalking. This training has been instrumental in encouraging the law enforcement community to identify needs associated with stalking victims and holding perpetrators accountable. STOP funding has been instrumental in our ability to provide both group and individual therapy to victims/survivors. Therapy is provided weekly by a trained therapist from our Community Mental Health Center. Victims can access therapy that is free of charge (to the consumer), and offered in a safe, confidential location.

*-Lewis County Opportunities, Inc., New York*

STOP Program funds were used to develop, enlarge, or strengthen programs that address stalking by 307, or 13 percent, of subgrantees. Prosecution offices funded

under the STOP Program reported filing a total of 2,665 new stalking charges in 2007, which constituted 1.7 percent of all new charges; 31 percent of the new stalking charges were for felony stalking. The conviction rates for ordinance, misdemeanor, and felony-level stalking charges disposed of during 2007 were 82 percent, 60 percent, and 68 percent, respectively. Training on stalking issues was provided by 549 subgrantees (half of those using funds for training); training topics included an overview of stalking and information about the dynamics of stalking, available services, and relevant statutes and codes.

## Remaining Areas of Need

STOP administrators are asked to report on the most significant areas of unmet need in their states, with regard to the needs of victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking, and with regard to offender accountability. In their reports for calendar year 2007, the administrators regularly cited the following as remaining unmet needs:

- training within the judicial system;
- legal representation for victims/survivors;
- transportation and services for geographically isolated victims/survivors;
- culturally and linguistically appropriate services;
- services for victims/survivors with disabilities, mental health issues, and who are older; and
- community education and public awareness.

With regard to the judicial system, specific areas cited by STOP administrators included the need for increased training of court and related justice system personnel on the issues of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. Particular topics for training included an understanding of the unique prosecutorial issues for victim/survivors, enhancing offender accountability, and insight into the particular challenges surrounding protection orders in cases of domestic violence. They also reported the need for coordination and more efficient and accurate communication of information among probate, criminal, and civil courts. Improved access to accurate information from other courts would, in turn, ensure more effective monitoring of offenders, resulting in increased offender accountability and enhanced victim safety.

Administrators reported a serious lack of access to legal services for victims/survivors. They discussed the needs of victims/survivors for a wide range of legal services, including representation in divorce, child custody, protection order, and immigration proceedings. More information about available legal resources and access to free or reduced-fee advocacy throughout the court process is also necessary. It was also reported that there remains an additional need for greater access to legal services that are culturally and linguistically appropriate for underserved populations, including victims/survivors who are immigrants or refugees.

The need for culturally and linguistically appropriate responses is lacking not only with regard to legal representation, but across the spectrum of victim/survivor's needs and experiences. Commonly cited was the need for increased access to interpreters and language lines, as well as for more multilingual advocates, police

officers, and court personnel, particularly in areas with significant immigrant and refugee populations. Some STOP administrators cited the need for mental health professionals who are able to speak with victims/survivors in their own language so they can receive confidential counseling.

Victims/survivors with disabilities and victims/survivors who are older were frequently mentioned as having unmet needs. Administrators noted the need for increased services to both of these populations, most specifically the need for appropriate and accessible emergency, short term, and transitional housing. Additionally, STOP administrators reported a need for informed service providers who are able to respond to the unique needs of victims/survivors with mental or physical disabilities and those who are older.

STOP administrators frequently indicated a need for the public to have a greater understanding of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. They discussed the need for prevention programming, public awareness activities, and general education of community members. They discussed the fact that increased knowledge and awareness could lead to greater access to services for victims/survivors, an increase in the number of professionals who are aware of the varied needs of victims/survivors, and an increase in offender accountability.



# STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments

This section presents aggregate data reflecting the activities and accomplishments funded by the STOP Program in all states, four of the five U.S. territories,<sup>40</sup> and the District of Columbia.

STOP Program staff provide training and victim services and engage in law enforcement, prosecution, court, and probation activities to increase victim safety and offender accountability.

- Number of subgrantees using funds for staff: 2,235 (94 percent of all subgrantees)

**Table 10. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Program in 2007**

Staff	Number	Percent
All staff	3,174	100.0
Victim advocate	1,023	32.2
Program coordinator	381	12.0
Law enforcement officer	363	11.4
Prosecutor	308	9.7
Counselor	226	7.1
Legal advocate	171	5.4
Support staff	156	4.9
Administrator	129	4.1
Victim-witness specialist	88	2.8
Civil attorney	82	2.6
Trainer	63	2.0
Paralegal	35	1.1
Probation officer	26	0.8
Court personnel	21	0.7
Information technology specialist	8	0.2
Other	94	3.0

<sup>40</sup> Data from STOP subgrantees in Guam were received too late to be included in the aggregated database used for analysis for this report.

## Training

STOP Program subgrantees provide training to professionals on issues relating to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking to improve their response to victims/survivors and to increase offender accountability. These professionals include law enforcement officers, health and mental health providers, domestic violence and sexual assault program staff, staff in social services and advocacy organizations, prosecutors, and court personnel.

- Number of subgrantees using funds for training: 1,094 (46 percent of all subgrantees)
- Total number of people trained: 267,023
- Total number of training events: 16,025

**Table 11. People trained using STOP Program funds in 2007**

People trained	Number	Percent
All people trained	267,023	100.0
Law enforcement officers	75,281	28.2
Multidisciplinary group	31,320	11.7
Health professionals	21,910	8.2
Domestic violence program staff	16,803	6.3
Social service organization staff	16,415	6.1
Volunteers	15,453	5.8
Court personnel	9,725	3.6
Prosecutors	7,723	2.9
Mental health professionals	7,605	2.8
Faith-based organization staff	7,232	2.7
Correction personnel	7,077	2.7
Attorneys/law students	6,948	2.6
Sexual assault program staff	6,144	2.3
Government agency staff	5,671	2.1
Community advocacy organization staff	4,620	1.7
Sexual assault forensic examiners	4,058	1.5
Victim-witness specialists	3,242	1.2
Disability organization staff	2,558	1.0
Elder organization staff	2,017	0.8
Legal services staff	1,822	0.7
Immigrant organization staff	1,525	0.6
Domestic violence coalition staff	1,515	0.6
Batterer intervention program staff	1,478	0.6
Tribal government/tribal government agency	965	0.4
Sexual assault coalition staff	700	0.3



**Table 11. People trained using STOP Program funds in 2007**

People trained	Number	Percent
Supervised visitation and exchange center staff	179	0.1
Tribal coalition staff	96	<0.1
Other	6,941	2.6

The most common topics of training events were overviews of domestic violence, dating violence, and sexual assault; law enforcement response; advocate response; safety planning; domestic violence statutes/codes; confidentiality; protection orders; coordinated community response; mandatory reporting requirements; and criminal court procedures.

## Coordinated Community Response

STOP administrators engage in an inclusive and collaborative planning process to improve their states' response to victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking. STOP Program subgrantees closely interact with other community agencies or organizations; these CCR activities include providing and receiving victim/survivor referrals, engaging in consultation, providing technical assistance, and/or attending meetings with other agencies or organizations.

**Table 12. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to community agencies in 2007**

Agency/organization	Victim/survivor referrals, consultations, technical assistance			Meetings		
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly
Batterer intervention program	143	365	452	122	418	338
Community advocacy organization	74	180	378	27	382	246
Corrections	178	404	551	89	490	381
Domestic violence organization	927	565	336	373	792	440
Faith-based organization	76	288	542	30	318	350
Court	805	676	268	257	544	390
Law enforcement	970	636	288	354	760	435
Prosecutor's office	631	626	385	315	650	406
Government agency	292	397	438	59	320	293
Health/mental health organization	287	674	594	85	618	418
Legal services organization	372	584	469	80	452	348
Sexual assault organization	395	440	506	191	598	392

**Table 12. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to community agencies in 2007**

Agency/organization	Victim/survivor referrals, consultations, technical assistance			Meetings		
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly
Social service organization	549	673	389	137	692	378
Tribal government/tribal government agency	15	47	172	7	80	115
Other	54	90	75	26	152	65

## Policies

STOP Program subgrantees develop and implement policies and procedures specifically directed at more effectively preventing, identifying, and responding to sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking against women.

- Number of subgrantees using funds for policies/protocols: 522 (22 percent of all subgrantees)

**Table 13. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols in 2007**

Policy/protocol	Subgrantees using funds (N = 522)	
	Number	Percent
Appropriate response to underserved populations	213	41
Providing information to victims/survivors about victim services	210	40
Confidentiality	180	34
Victim/survivor informed about Crime Victims Compensation and Victim Impact Statements	175	34
Mandatory training	148	28
Appropriate response to victims/survivors who are elderly or have disabilities	147	28
Identifying primary aggressor/discouraging dual arrest	134	26

## Products

STOP Program subgrantees develop and/or revise a variety of products for distribution, including brochures, manuals, and training curricula and materials. The products are designed to provide standardized information to professionals; community agencies/organizations; and victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

- Number of subgrantees using funds for products: 560 (23 percent of all subgrantees)

**Table 14. Use of STOP Program funds to develop or revise products for distribution in 2007**

Product	Number developed or revised	Number used or distributed
All products	1,906	1,495,397
Brochures	617	933,857
Manuals	238	62,947
Training curricula	249	18,084
Training materials	436	79,675
Other <sup>41</sup>	366	400,834

STOP Program subgrantees developed, revised, or translated products in the following 24 languages:

Amharic	Gujarati	Russian
Arabic	Hindi	Somali
ASL	Hmong	Spanish
Bengali	Japanese	Tai Dam
Bosnian	Khmer	Urdu
Cape Verdean Creole	Korean	Vietnamese
Chinese	Marathi	
Creole	Nuer	
French	Portuguese	

## Data Collection and Communication Systems

STOP Program subgrantees develop, install, or expand data collection and communication systems relating to sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking against women. These systems link police, prosecution, and the courts for the

<sup>41</sup> Other products included factsheets, newsletters, website materials, flyers, referral cards, etc.

purposes of identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions.

- Number of subgrantees using funds for data collection and communication systems: 358 (15 percent of all subgrantees)

**Table 15. Use of STOP Program funds for data collection activities and/or communication systems in 2007**

Activity	Subgrantees using funds (N = 358)	
	Number	Percent
Manage data collection and communication	205	57
Develop/install/expand data collection/communication systems	176	49
Share information with other community partners	174	49
Purchase computers/other equipment	118	33
Link existing data collection/communication systems	46	13

**Table 16. Most frequently reported purposes of data collection and/or communication systems in 2007**

Purpose	Subgrantees reporting
Case management	195
Arrest	146
Evaluation/outcome measures	139
Protection orders	137
Incident reports	136
Prosecutions	134

## Specialized Units

STOP Program subgrantees develop, train, and/or expand specialized units of law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges (or other court staff), and probation officers who are specifically responsible for handling sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking cases.

- Number of subgrantees using funds for specialized units: 624 (26 percent of all subgrantees)

**Table 17. Use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities in 2007**

Activity	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Develop a new unit	23	13	4	0
Support, expand, or coordinate an existing unit	322	319	34	36
Train a specialized unit	57	36	8	7
Other	13	6	1	2

## System Improvement

To more effectively respond to the needs of victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking, STOP Program subgrantees engage in system improvement activities, including convening meetings between tribal and nontribal entities, making available language lines, translating forms and documents, and making facilities safer.

- Number of subgrantees using funds for system improvement: 304 (13 percent of all subgrantees)

**Table 18. Use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities in 2007**

Activity	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Evaluation	94	56	46	25	23
Interpreters	88	29	23	33	5
Language lines	16	4	2	1	1
Meetings between tribal and nontribal entities	14	10	6	3	3
Safety audits	26	13	9	8	6
Security personnel or equipment	15	16	5	2	0
Translation of forms and documents	98	21	18	20	2
Other	45	35	23	23	16

## Victim Services

During the 12-month reporting period, a total of 1,611 subgrantees (67 percent of all subgrantees) used funds for victim services. STOP Program subgrantees provided services to 505,171 victims/survivors (98 percent of those seeking services) to help them become and remain safe from violence; only 2 percent of victims/survivors seeking services from funded programs did not receive services from those

programs.<sup>42</sup> (See Tables 19 and 20 for information on the level of service provided and the types of victims/survivors served by subgrantees.)

- Number of subgrantees using funds for victim services: 1,611 (67 percent of all subgrantees)

**Table 19. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees in 2007, by level of service and type of victimization**

Level of service	All victims		Domestic violence victims		Sexual assault victims		Stalking victims	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All seeking services	515,896		436,108		66,633		13,155	
Not served	10,725	2	9,811	2	716	1	198	2
Served	486,485	94	410,616	94	63,473	95	12,396	94
Partially Served	18,686	4	15,681	4	2,444	4	561	4

NOTE: Partially served victims/survivors received some, but not all, of the services they sought through STOP Program-funded programs. Some of these victims/survivors may have received other requested services from other agencies.

**Table 20. Victims/survivors receiving services from STOP Program subgrantees in 2007, by type of victimization**

Type of victimization	Victims/survivors served	
	Number	Percent
All victimizations	505,171	100.0
Domestic violence	426,297	84.4
Sexual assault	65,917	13.0
Stalking	12,957	2.6

## Demographics of Victims/Survivors Served

Of the more than 505,171 victims/survivors served during the 12-month reporting period and for whom demographic information was reported, the majority were white (58.2 percent), female (89.7 percent), and ages 25-59 (63.8 percent).

<sup>42</sup> While STOP subgrantees do not report a reason for not serving or for partially serving individual victim/survivors, they do report reasons for not serving or partially serving victims/survivors in general. These reasons include the following: program reached capacity, services not appropriate for victim/survivor, did not meet eligibility or statutory requirements, services not appropriate for victims/survivors with mental health issues, and conflict of interest.

**Table 21. Demographic characteristics of victims/survivors served by STOP Program subgrantees in 2007**

Characteristic	Victims/survivors receiving services	
	Number	Percent
Race/ethnicity		
Black/African American	93,050	21.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	11,800	2.7
Asian	7,488	1.7
Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander	4,259	1.0
Hispanic/Latino	72,251	16.5
White	255,231	58.2
Unknown	66,633	na
Gender		
Female	429,962	89.7
Male	49,311	10.3
Unknown	25,898	na
Age		
0–17	31,428	7.2
18–24	113,001	25.9
25–59	278,186	63.8
60+	13,447	3.1
Unknown	69,109	na
Other		
Disabilities	24,527	4.9
Limited English proficiency	36,916	7.3
Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	22,820	4.5
Residents of rural area	134,898	26.7

na = not applicable

NOTES: Percentages for race/ethnicity, gender, and age are based on the number of victims/survivors for whom the information was known. STOP Program subgrantees provided services to 505,171 victims. Because victims/survivors may have identified with more than one race/ethnicity, the total number reported in race/ethnicity may be higher than the total number of victims/survivors served.

**Table 22. Relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds in 2007**

Relationship to offender	Domestic violence		Sexual assault		Stalking	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Current/former spouse or intimate partner	284,819	73.7	12,145	22.3	6,953	57.3
Other family or household member	37,845	9.8	12,278	22.6	767	6.3
Dating relationship	57,521	14.9	5,788	10.6	1,992	16.4
Acquaintance	5,074	1.3	17,711	32.5	1,884	15.5
Stranger	882	0.2	6,448	11.8	540	4.4
Unknown	51,301	na	17,317	na	3,520	na
Other	225	0.1	44	0.1	4	0.0
Total	437,667	100.0	71,731	100.0	15,660	100.0

na = not applicable

NOTES: The percentages in each victimization category are based on the total number of known relationships to offender reported in that category. Because victims/survivors may have been abused by more than one offender and may have experienced more than one type of victimization, the number of reported relationships in any one victimization category may be higher than the total number of victims/survivors reported as served for that victimization.

## Types of Services Provided to Victims/Survivors

STOP Program subgrantees provide an array of services to victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. These services include victim advocacy (actions designed to help the victim/survivor obtain needed resources or services, such as material goods and services, health care, education, finances, transportation, child care, employment, and housing), crisis intervention, counseling/support groups, and legal advocacy (assistance navigating the criminal and/or civil legal systems). Victim advocacy was the service most frequently provided by STOP Program subgrantees. In addition to the services listed in Table 23, STOP Program subgrantees routinely provide safety planning, referrals, and information to victims/survivors as needed.

**Table 23. Victim services provided by STOP Program subgrantees in 2007**

Type of service	Victims/survivors served (N = 505,171)	
	Number	Percent
Victim advocacy	237,920	47
Hotline calls	209,850	42
Crisis intervention	182,397	36
Criminal justice advocacy	146,828	29
Counseling/support group	128,228	25
Victim witness notification	126,708	25
Civil legal advocacy	122,303	24



**Table 23. Victim services provided by STOP Program subgrantees in 2007**

Type of service	Victims/survivors served (N = 505,171)	
	Number	Percent
Civil legal assistance	21,938	4
Hospital response	18,921	4
Other	6,032	1

NOTE: Detail does not add to the total number of victims/survivors because an individual victim/survivor may have been reported as receiving more than one type of service.

Number of victims/survivors receiving shelter services:

- 21,547 victims/survivors and 20,043 family members received a total of 798,960 emergency shelter bed days.
- 1,030 victims/survivors and 2,915 family members received a total of 174,742 transitional housing bed days.

## Protection Orders

The STOP Program funds activities that provide support to victims/survivors seeking protection orders, including providing advocacy in the courtroom, increasing police enforcement of protection order violations, and training advocates and judges on the effectiveness and use of orders. STOP Program subgrantees, whether they are providing victim services or engaging in criminal justice activities, are in a position to provide assistance to victims/survivors in the protection order process. In 2007, STOP Program-funded victim services, law enforcement, and prosecution staff assisted domestic violence victims/survivors in obtaining more than 211,028 temporary and final protection orders.

**Table 24. Protection orders granted with assistance of STOP Program-funded staff in 2007**

Provider	Total	Temporary	Final
All providers	211,028	128,281	82,747
Victim services staff	133,173	78,674	54,499
Law enforcement	45,858	29,589	16,269
Prosecution	31,997	20,018	11,979

Close to half (520) of all subgrantees using funds for training addressed the issue of protection order enforcement, and 223 developed or implemented policies and protocols relating to protection orders. These policies addressed the issues of protection order enforcement, immediate access to protection orders, violation of protection orders, full faith and credit, and mutual restraining orders. STOP Program subgrantees also used funds for data collection and communication systems for tracking and sharing information about protection orders: 137 subgrantees reported this, making it the fourth most frequently reported purpose for these systems.

## Criminal Justice

The STOP Program promotes a coordinated community approach that includes law enforcement, prosecution, courts, probation, victim services, and public and private community resources. Criminal justice data in this report reflect only those activities supported with STOP Program funds.

### Law Enforcement

The response and attitude of law enforcement officers can significantly influence whether victims/survivors report sexual assault, domestic violence, or stalking offenses, and whether appropriate evidence is collected to enable prosecutors to bring successful cases. Arrest, accompanied by a thorough investigation and meaningful sanctions, demonstrates to offenders that they have committed a serious crime and communicates to victims/survivors that they do not have to endure an offender's abuse.

Table 25 summarizes STOP Program-funded law enforcement activities during 2007. The most frequently reported activities were case investigations and incident reports.

- Number of subgrantees using funds for law enforcement: 356 (15 percent of all subgrantees)

**Table 25. Law enforcement activities funded by STOP Program in 2007**

Activity	Subgrantees responding	Total activities
Cases/incidents investigated	328	126,450
Incident reports	268	108,120
Referrals of cases to prosecutor	250	52,497
Arrests of predominant aggressor	259	40,321
Protection/ex parte/temporary restraining orders served	164	24,953
Protection orders issued	124	14,414
Enforcement of warrants	182	10,442
Arrests for violation of protection order	195	4,734
Dual arrests	132	2,152
Arrests for violation of bail bond	68	1,073
Referrals of federal firearms charges to federal prosecutor	34	1,102

### Prosecution

Prosecution of offenders varies by state, although city or county officials in municipal or district courts usually handle misdemeanor offenses, and county prosecutors in superior courts generally handle felony offenses. After police arrest a

suspect, it is usually up to the prosecutor to decide whether to charge the offender and prosecute the case.

Table 26 presents data on STOP Program-funded prosecutions of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking charges during 2007.

- Number of subgrantees using funds for prosecution: 307 (13 percent of all subgrantees)

**Table 26. Prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence, and related charges by STOP Program-funded prosecutors in 2007**

Charge	New charges filed		Charges disposed	Dispositions resulting in convictions	
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
All charges	162,908	100	129,879	80,391	62
Misdemeanor domestic violence	94,652	58	78,057	46,088	59
Felony domestic violence	21,434	13	17,604	11,696	66
Violation of protection order	16,126	10	12,836	8,514	66
Domestic violence ordinance	13,169	8	5,033	2,722	54
Violation of probation/parole	6,407	4	4,671	4,165	89
Felony sexual assault	4,060	2	3,074	1,812	59

NOTES: Nine tribal grantees referred 826 cases to a federal or state entity for prosecution. Detail does not add to total number of charges because not all categories of charges are shown.

## Courts

Judges have two distinct roles in responding to violence against women—administrative and magisterial. In their administrative role, judges are responsible for making courthouses safer and user friendly for victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking. In their magisterial role, they can be critical in holding offenders accountable and ensuring the safety of victims. Although frequently judges are ratifying plea agreements, they set the parameters as to what types of sentences they will accept, including whether they will allow diversion and deferred sentences. Courts monitor offenders to review progress and compliance with court orders.

Of the 18 courts (or court-based programs) that received STOP funding to conduct court activities,<sup>43</sup> 12 used STOP Program funds to conduct review hearings on offenders' compliance with conditions of probation and other court-ordered conditions:

- 2,378 offenders were monitored.
- 3,732 individual judicial review hearings were held.

<sup>43</sup> While 70 courts received STOP funding in 2007, only 18 of those courts used funds specifically for court activities. Other activities court subgrantees engaged in with STOP funding included training, CCR, policies, products, data/communication systems, security, interpreters/translators/language lines, etc.

The data in Table 27 reflect the consequences imposed by STOP Program-funded courts for violations of probation and other court orders. Three-quarters of the cases involving new criminal behavior and nearly three-quarters of the protection order violations resulted in partial or full revocation of probation.

- Number of subgrantees using funds for court: 18 (1 percent of all subgrantees)

**Table 27. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders by STOP Program-funded courts in 2007**

Violation	Verbal/written warning		Partial/full revocation of probation		Conditions added		Fine		No action taken	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Protection order (N = 100)	28	28	50	50	7	7	15	15	0	0
New criminal behavior (N = 165)	23	14	63	38	76	46	3	2	0	0
Failure to attend batterer intervention program (N = 289)	44	15	175	61	55	19	15	5	0	0
Other (N = 668)	31	5	571	85	48	7	15	2	3	0

NOTES: N is the number of dispositions reported for each category of violation. One offender may have received more than one disposition per violation and may have had multiple violations in the same 12-month period. Percentages may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

## Probation

Probation officers monitor offenders to review progress and compliance with court orders. They may meet with offenders in person, by telephone, or via unscheduled surveillance. If a probationer violates any terms of the probation, the officer has the power to return the probationer to court for a violation hearing, which could result in a verbal reprimand or warning, a fine, additional conditions, or revocation of probation. As arrests of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking offenders have increased, probation and parole officers have adopted policies and practices specifically targeted to offenders who commit violent crimes against women.

The total number of new and pending probation cases, or offenders, supervised by STOP-funded probation staff during 2007 was 6,211; these offenders received a total of 48,665 contacts, as shown in Table 29. In addition to offender monitoring, probation officers also contact victims/survivors as an additional strategy to increase victim safety. A total of 3,384 victims/survivors received 5,776 contacts from probation officers funded under the STOP Program during 2007.

Number of grantees using funds for probation: 25 (1 percent of all subgrantees)

**Table 28. Offender monitoring by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2007, by type and number of contacts**

Type of contact	Number of offenders	Number of contacts
Face-to-face	6,608	27,400
Telephone	4,003	14,270
Unscheduled surveillance	2,772	6,995

- Offenders completing probation without violations: 819 (55 percent of those completing probation)
- Offenders completing probation with violations: 674 (45 percent)

The data in Table 29 reflect the dispositions of violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff. Approximately 50 percent of offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff received partial or full revocation of their probation for violations of protection orders (54 percent) and new criminal behavior (47 percent).

**Table 29. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2007**

Violation	Verbal/written warning		Partial/full revocation of probation		Conditions added		Fine		No action taken	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Protection order (N = 301)	16	5	163	54	25	8	1	0	96	32
New criminal behavior (N = 717)	27	4	340	47	155	22	37	5	158	22
Failure to attend batterer intervention program (N = 831)	130	16	444	53	117	14	48	6	92	11
Other (N = 910)	106	12	541	59	166	18	36	4	61	7

NOTES: N is the number of dispositions reported for each category of violation. One offender may have received more than one disposition per violation and may have had multiple violations in the same 12-month period. Percentages may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.



## References

- Allen, N. E., Bybee, D. I., & Sullivan, C. M. (2004). Battered women's multitude of needs: Evidence supporting the need for comprehensive advocacy. *Violence Against Women, 10*(9), 1015-1035. doi:10.1177/1077801204267658
- Anderson, M. (1993). A license to abuse: The impact of conditional status on female immigrants. *Yale Law Journal, 102*, 1401-1430.
- Beaulaurier, R. L., Seff, L. R., Newman, F. L., & Dunlop, B. (2007). External barriers to help seeking for older women who experience intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*(8), 747-755. doi:10.1007/s10896-007-9122-y
- Belknap, J., Graham, D., Hartman, J., Lippen, V., Allen, G., & Sutherland, J. (2000). *Factors related to domestic violence court dispositions in a large urban area: The role of victim/witness reluctance and other variables* ( No. NCJ 184232). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Bhuyan, R., Mell, M., Senturia, K., Sullivan, M., & Shiu-Thornton, S. (2005). "Women must endure according to their karma": Cambodian immigrant women talk about domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*(8), 902-921. doi:10.1177/0886260505277675
- Bonomi, A., Anderson, M., Reid, R., Carrell, D., Fishman, P., Rivara, F., & Thompson, R. (2007). Intimate partner violence in older women. *The Gerontologist, 47*(1), 34-41.
- Bryson, A. J. (2004, August 15). A tide of violence. *Desert Morning News*, p. A01.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2006). *Criminal victimization in the United States, 2005 statistical tables: National Crime Victimization Survey* ( No. NCJ 215244). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Buzawa, E., Hotaling, G. T., Klein, A., & Byrne, J. (1999). *Response to domestic violence in a pro-active court setting – final report* ( No. NCJRS 181427). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Campbell, D. W., Sharps, P. W., Gary, F., Campbell, J., & Lopez, L. M. (2002). Intimate partner violence in African American women. *Online Journal of Issues in Nursing, 7*(1). Retrieved from <http://www.nursingworld.org/MainMenuCategories/ANAMarketplace/ANAPeriodicals/OJIN/TableofContents/Volume72002/No1Jan2002/AfricanAmericanWomenPartnerViolence.aspx>
- Campbell, R., Bybee, D., Ford, J., & Patterson, D. (2008). *Systems change analysis of SANE programs: Identifying the mediating mechanisms of criminal justice*

- system impact* ( No. NCJRS 226497). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/226497.pdf>
- Campbell, R., Patterson, D., & Lichty, L. F. (2005). The effectiveness of Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) programs: A review of psychological, medical, legal, and community outcomes. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 6*(4), 313-329. doi:10.1177/1524838005280328
- Casey, R., Berkman, M., Stover, C. S., Gill, K., Durso, S., & Marans, S. (2007). Preliminary results of a police-advocate home-visit intervention project for victims of domestic violence. *Journal of Psychological Trauma, 6*(1), 39-49. doi:10.1300/J513v06n01\_04
- Committee on Law and Justice, Petersilia, J., Foote, J., & Crowell, N. (2001). *Crime victims with developmental disabilities: Report of a workshop*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Crandall, C. S., & Helitzer, D. (2003). *Impact evaluation of a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) program* ( No. NCJRS 203276). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Crowe, A., Sydney, L., DeMichele, M., Keilitz, S., Neal, C., Frohman, S., Schaefer Jr, W. M., et al. (2009). *Community corrections response to domestic violence: guidelines for practice*. American Probation & Parole Association.
- Davis, R., & Maxwell, C. (2002). *Preventing repeat incidents of family violence: A reanalysis of data from three field tests* ( No. NCJRS 200608). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Davis, R., & Taylor, B. (1997). A proactive response to family violence: The results of a randomized experiment. *Criminology, 35*(2), 307-333. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.1997.tb00878.x
- Dugan, L., Nagin, D. S., & Rosenfeld, R. (2003). Do domestic violence services save lives? *National Institute of Justice Journal, 250*, 20-25.
- Eastman, B. J., Bunch, S. G., Williams, A. H., & Carawan, L. W. (2007). Exploring the perceptions of domestic violence service providers in rural localities. *Violence Against Women, 13*(7), 700-716. doi:10.1177/1077801207302047
- Elliott, L., Nerney, M., Jones, T., & Friedmann, P. (2002). Barriers to screening for domestic violence. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 17*(2), 112-116. doi:10.1046/j.1525-1497.2002.10233.x
- Elman, R. A. (2005, January). Confronting the sexual abuse of women with disabilities. VAWnet, a project of the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence/ Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence. Retrieved from [http:// www.vawnet.org](http://www.vawnet.org)
- Field, C. A., & Caetano, R. (2004). Ethnic differences in intimate partner violence in the U.S. general population: The role of alcohol use and socioeconomic status. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 5*(4), 303-317. doi:10.1177/1524838004269488
- Fleury, R. E., Sullivan, C. M., & Bybee, D. I. (2000). When ending the relationship does not end the violence: Women's experiences of violence by former partners. *Violence Against Women, 6*(12), 1363-1383. doi:10.1177/10778010022183695



- Friday, P. C., Lord, V. B., Exum, M. L., & Hartman, J. L. (2006). *Evaluating the impact of a specialized domestic violence police unit* ( No. NCJRS 215916). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Frye, V., Haviland, M., & Rajah, V. (2007). Dual arrest and other unintended consequences of mandatory arrest in New York City: A brief report. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*(6), 397-405. doi:10.1007/s10896-007-9094-y
- Frye, V., Hoselin, V., Waltermaurer, E., Blaney, S., & Wilt, S. (2005). Femicide in New York City 1990 to 1999. *Homicide Studies, 9*(3), 204-228. doi:10.1177/1088767904274226
- Gallagher, M. (2005, May 1). Domestic violence trials are rare. *Albuquerque Journal*. Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- Gallup-Black, A. (2005). Twenty years of rural and urban trends in family and intimate partner homicide: Does place matter? *Homicide Studies, 9*(2), 149-173. doi:10.1177/1088767904274158
- Gondolf, E. (2004). Evaluating batterer counseling programs: A difficult task showing some effects and implications. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 9*(6), 605-631.
- Gondolf, E. W. (2000). Mandatory court review and batterer program compliance. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*(4), 428-437. doi:10.1177/088626000015004006
- Gondolf, E. W., Fisher, E., & McFerron, J. (1990). The help-seeking behavior of battered women: An analysis of 6,000 shelter interviews. In E. Viano (Ed.), *The victimology handbook: Research findings, treatment and public policy* (pp. 113-127). New York, NY: Garland Publishing Company.
- Gordon, J. A., & Moriarty, L. J. (2003). The effects of domestic violence batterer treatment on domestic violence recidivism: The Chesterfield County experience. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30*(1), 118-134. doi:10.1177/0093854802239166
- Grama, J. L. (2000). Women forgotten: Difficulties faced by rural victims of domestic violence. *American Journal of Family Law, 14*(3), 173-189. doi:Article
- Greenfield, L. A., & Smith, S. K. (1999). *American Indians and crime* ( No. NCJ 173386). Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.worldcat.org/title/american-indians-and-crime/oclc/41178810?title=&detail=&page=frame&url=http%3A%2F%2Fpubl.access.gpo.gov%2FGPO%2FLPS34374%26checksum%3Dd00bef3079cf51e1827fbbc5d6da9253&linktype=digitalObject>
- Hamberger, L. K., Guse, C., Boerger, J., Minsky, D., Pape, D., & Folsom, C. (2004). Evaluation of a health care provider training program to identify and help partner violence victims. *Journal of Family Violence, 19*(1), 1-11. doi:10.1023/B:JOFV.0000011578.37769.c4
- Harrell, A., Castro, J., Newmark, L., & Visser, C. (2007). *Final report on the evaluation of the judicial oversight demonstration: Executive summary* ( No. NCJRS 215349). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

- Harrell, A., Schaffer, M., DeStefano, C., & Castro, J. (2006). *The evaluation of Milwaukee's judicial oversight demonstration, final research report* ( No. NCJRS 215349). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Hartley, C. C., & Frohmann, L. (2003). *Cook County Target Abuser Call (TAC): An evaluation of a specialized domestic violence court, revised executive summary* ( No. NCJRS 202944). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Hunnicut, G. (2007). Female status and infant and child homicide victimization in rural and urban counties in the U.S. *Gender Issues, 24*(3), 35-50. doi:10.1007/s12147-007-9046-0
- Jolin, A., Feyerherm, W., Fountain, R., & Friedman, S. (1998). *Beyond arrest: The Portland, Oregon domestic violence experiment, final report* ( No. NCJRS 179968). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Keilitz, S. (2004). *Specialization of domestic violence case management in the courts: A national survey* ( No. NCJ 199724). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Klein, A. (2004). *The criminal justice response to domestic violence*. Belmont CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Klein, A. (2006). *Enforcing domestic violence firearm prohibitions, a report on promising practices*. Washington, DC: Office on Violence Against Women & National Center on Full Faith and Credit.
- Klein, A., & Crowe, A. (2008). Findings from an outcome examination of Rhode Island's specialized domestic violence probation supervision program: Do specialized supervision programs of batterers reduce reabuse? *Violence Against Women, 14*(2), 226-246. doi:10.1177/1077801207312633
- Klein, A., Wilson, D., Crowe, A., & DeMichele, M. (2005). *An evaluation of Rhode Island's specialized supervision of domestic violence probationers*. Waltham, MA: BOTEK Analysis Corporation & American Probation and Parole Association.
- Klein, A. R. (2005). *Rhode Island domestic violence shelter and advocacy services: An assessment*. Sudbury, MA: Advocates for Human Potential, Inc. Retrieved from <http://www.rijustice.ri.gov/sac/Reports/Final%20ShelterEval%209-20-05.pdf>
- Klevens, J., Baker, C. K., Shelley, G. A., & Ingram, E. M. (2008). Exploring the links between components of coordinated community responses and their impact on contact with intimate partner violence services. *Violence Against Women, 14*(3), 346-358. doi:10.1177/1077801207313968
- Krishnan, S. P., Hilbert, J. C., & VanLeeuwen, D. (2001). Domestic violence and help-seeking behaviors among rural women: Results from a shelter-based study. *Family & Community Health, 24*(1), 28-38.
- Lee, M. R., & Stevenson, G. D. (2006). Gender-specific homicide offending in rural areas. *Homicide Studies, 10*(1), 55-73. doi:10.1177/1088767905283640
- Lee, R. K., Sanders Thompson, V. L., & Mechanic, M. B. (2002). Intimate partner violence and women of color: A call for innovations. *American Journal of Public Health, 92*(4), 530-534.

- Lewis, S. H. (2003). *Unspoken crimes: Sexual assault in rural America*. Enola, PA: National Sexual Violence Resource Center. Retrieved from [http://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/Publications\\_NSVRC\\_Booklets\\_Unspoken-Crimes-Sexual-Assault-in-Rural-America%20.pdf](http://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/Publications_NSVRC_Booklets_Unspoken-Crimes-Sexual-Assault-in-Rural-America%20.pdf)
- Logan, T., Shannon, L., & Walker, R. (2005). Protective orders in rural and urban areas: A multiple perspective study. *Violence Against Women, 11*(7), 876-911. doi:10.1177/1077801205276985
- Logan, T., Shannon, L., Cole, J., & Swanberg, J. (2007). Partner stalking and implications for women's employment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*(3), 268-291. doi:10.1177/0886260506295380
- Logan, T., Walker, R., Cole, J., Ratliff, S., & Leukefeld, C. (2003). Qualitative differences among rural and urban intimate violence victimization experiences and consequences: A pilot study. *Journal of Family Violence, 18*(2), 83-92. doi:Article
- Luna-Firebaugh, E. M., Lobo, S., Hailer, J., Barragan, D., Mortensen, M., & Pearson, D. (2002). *Impact evaluation of STOP grant program for reducing violence against women among Indian tribes, final report* ( No. NCJRS 195174) (p. 320). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/195174.pdf>
- Martin, S. L., Neepa, R., Sotres-Alvares, D., Kupper, L., Moracco, K., Dickens, P., Scandlin, D., et al. (2006). Physical and sexual assault of women with disabilities. *Violence Against Women, 12*(9), 823-837. doi:10.1177/1077801206292672
- McFarlane, J., & Malecha, A. (2005). *Sexual assault among intimates: Frequency, consequences and treatments* ( No. NCJRS 211678). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- McFarlane, J., Campbell, J., & Watson, K. (2002). Intimate partner stalking and femicide: Urgent implications for women's safety. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 20*(1-2), 51-68. doi:10.1002/bsl.477
- Miller, N., & Nugent, H. (2002). *Stalking laws and implementation practices: A national review for policymakers and practitioners*. Minnesota Center Against Violence and Abuse.
- National Center on Elder Abuse. (2005). *Fact sheet: Elder abuse prevalence and incidence*. Washington, DC: National Center on Elder Abuse.
- Nosek, M. A., Foley, C. C., Hughes, R. B., & Howland, C. A. (2001). Vulnerabilities for abuse among women with disabilities. *Sexuality and Disability, 19*(3), 177-189.
- Nosek, N., & Hughes, R. (2006). The personal side of abuse. *Violence against women with physical disabilities: Findings from studies conducted by the center for research on women with disabilities, 1999-2002*. Baylor College of Medicine. Retrieved September 20, 2010, from <http://www.bcm.edu/crowd/index.cfm?pmid=1409#pers>
- Officials push domestic violence initiatives. (2004, November 15). *Albuquerque Journal*, p. A10.

- Otto, J., & Quinn, K. (2007). *Barriers to and promising practices for collaboration between adult protective services and domestic violence programs: A report for the national center on elder abuse*. Written for the National Adult Protective Services Association. Retrieved from [http://www.ncea.aoa.gov/ncearoot/main\\_site/pdf/BarrierstoPromisingPractices.pdf](http://www.ncea.aoa.gov/ncearoot/main_site/pdf/BarrierstoPromisingPractices.pdf)
- Owens, S. M. (2004, November 26). Domestic violence cases fuel dispute. *Orlando Sentinel*, p. B1.
- O'Dell, A. (2008). Why do police arrest victims of domestic violence? The need for comprehensive training and investigative protocols. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 15(3), 53-73. doi:10.1080/10926770802097210
- Paranjape, A., Tucker, A., Mckenzie-Mack, L., Thompson, N., & Kaslow, N. (2007). Family violence and associated help-seeking behavior among older African American women. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 68(2), 167-172. doi:10.1016/j.pec.2007.05.019
- Pence, E., & Shepard, M. (Eds.). (1999). An introduction: Developing a coordinated community response. *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence: Lessons from Duluth and beyond*, Sage Series on Violence Against Women (pp. 3-23). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Puffett, N. K., & Gavin, C. (2004). *Predictors of program outcome and recidivism at the Bronx misdemeanor domestic violence court*. New York, NY: Center for Court Innovation.
- Raj, A., & Silverman, J. (2002). Violence against immigrant women: The roles of culture, context, and legal immigrant status on intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women*, 8(3), 367-398. doi:10.1177/10778010222183107
- Ramsey-Klawnsnik, H. (1991). Elder sexual abuse: Preliminary findings. *Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect*, 3(3), 73-90. doi:10.1300/J084v03n03\_04
- Rennison, C. (2001). *Violent victimization and race, 1993-1998* (No. NCJRS 176354). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Roberts, K. A. (2005). Women's experience of violence during stalking by former romantic partners: Factors predictive of stalking violence. *Violence Against Women*, 11(1), 89-114. doi:10.1177/1077801204271096
- Ruback, R. B., & Ménard, K. S. (2001). Rural-Urban differences in sexual victimization and reporting: Analyses using UCR and crisis center data. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 28(2), 131-155. doi:10.1177/0093854801028002001
- Salazar, L. F., Emshoff, J. G., Baker, C. K., & Crowley, T. (2007). Examining the behavior of a system: An outcome evaluation of a coordinated community response to domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 22(7), 631-641. doi:10.1007/s10896-007-9116-9
- Shepard, M. (1999). *Evaluating coordinated community responses to domestic violence*. Harrisburg, PA: VAWnet, a project of the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence/Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence. Retrieved from [http://new.vawnet.org/Assoc\\_Files\\_VAWnet/AR\\_ccr.pdf](http://new.vawnet.org/Assoc_Files_VAWnet/AR_ccr.pdf)

- Shepard, M., Falk, D., & Elliott, B. (2002). Enhancing coordinated community responses to reduce recidivism in cases of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*(5), 551-569. doi:10.1177/0886260502017005005
- Smith, B., Davis, R., Nickles, L., & Davies, H. (2001). *An evaluation of efforts to implement no-drop policies: Two central values in conflict, final report* ( No. NCJ 187772). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Smith, D. L. (2008). Disability, gender and intimate partner violence: Relationships from the behavioral risk factor surveillance system. *Sexuality and Disability, 26*(1), 15-28. doi:10.1007/s11195-007-9064-6
- Spitzberg, B., & Cupach, W. (2007). The state of the art of stalking: Taking stock of the emerging literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 12*(1), 64-86. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2006.05.001
- Teaster, P. B., Roberto, K. A., Duke, J. O., & Kim, M. (2001). Sexual abuse of older adults: Preliminary findings of cases in Virginia. *Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect, 12*(3&4), 1-16. doi:10.1300/J084v12n03\_01
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). *Stalking in America: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. National Institute of Justice and Centers for Diseases Control and Prevention Research Brief. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). *Full report of the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women survey* ( No. NCJRS 183781) (p. 74). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/183781.pdf>
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2006). *Extent, nature, and consequences of rape victimization: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey* ( No. NCJ 210346). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Townsend, M., Hunt, D., Kuck, S., & Baxter, C. (2006). *Law enforcement response to domestic violence calls for service* ( No. NCJRS 215915). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2003). *Disability status: 2000, Census 2000 brief*. U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/c2kbr-17.pdf>



# Appendix A





**Table A1: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2007**

	Number of subgrantee awards						Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$)					Total	ADM
	Total	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	OTH	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	OTH		
Alabama	41	19	10	8	1	3	730,442	480,276	439,958	87,991	87,990	1,826,657	489,808
Alaska	14	8	2	3	1	0	615,669	344,373	257,046	35,288	0	1,252,376	85,477
American Samoa	13	6	2	2	2	1	386,174	256,672	256,672	53,325	7,000	959,843	106,649
Arizona	26	16	5	3	2	0	951,682	455,667	307,502	190,321	0	1,905,172	195,426
Arkansas	48	8	15	16	2	7	339,593	312,115	379,980	57,584	237,736	1,327,008	25,058
California	188	132	30	22	1	3	3,374,951	1,676,850	2,576,582	452,558	816,159	8,897,100	681,270
Colorado	116	62	19	23	3	9	1,413,616	898,319	898,419	166,779	199,761	3,576,894	312,459
Connecticut	10	3	5	1	1	0	124,659	125,550	394,447	76,143	0	720,799	84,164
Delaware	37	15	16	2	4	0	714,023	499,188	396,680	168,539	0	1,778,430	125,411
District of Columbia	15	8	3	2	2	0	482,590	302,870	359,645	71,929	0	1,217,034	151,326
Florida	89	26	26	33	4	0	2,343,290	1,199,162	1,190,003	234,965	0	4,967,420	133,377
Georgia	60	29	15	13	3	0	1,418,950	575,372	696,665	158,779	0	2,849,766	148,309
Guam	11	7	1	1	1	1	173,702	144,752	144,752	28,950	86,852	579,008	64,334
Hawaii	26	9	11	5	1	0	522,751	369,090	141,039	43,290	0	1,076,170	33,461
Idaho	15	6	4	2	1	2	277,373	221,440	178,061	46,229	101,589	824,692	102,730
Illinois	55	6	11	9	6	23	1,450,255	1,000,412	573,614	252,217	839,715	4,116,213	689,368
Indiana	69	36	11	21	1	0	991,121	685,999	574,438	99,045	0	2,350,603	103,476
Iowa	70	24	31	11	2	2	502,329	364,652	330,167	69,649	88,013	1,354,810	71,075
Kansas	33	14	5	9	4	1	543,102	196,323	333,024	96,131	33,770	1,202,350	77,682
Kentucky	31	9	7	8	4	3	547,190	442,388	446,153	199,071	263,043	1,897,845	0
Louisiana	64	28	18	15	3	0	511,611	404,940	509,667	67,523	0	1,493,741	0
Maine	29	14	7	7	1	0	271,799	210,866	209,943	47,000	0	739,608	117,155
Maryland	113	41	25	20	6	21	700,506	628,780	545,589	89,110	327,380	2,291,365	0
Massachusetts	71	18	29	9	2	13	652,122	577,723	530,724	114,400	356,217	2,231,186	158,234
Michigan	356	88	90	90	88	0	1,254,397	936,558	980,790	193,162	0	3,364,907	168,211
Minnesota	66	16	20	19	8	3	659,219	682,503	682,503	99,490	332,337	2,456,052	813,468
Mississippi	95	51	28	15	1	0	1,627,361	854,950	592,219	39,867	0	3,114,397	69,136
Missouri	67	34	14	10	6	3	968,600	598,522	631,989	201,082	113,632	2,513,825	109,279

**Table A1: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2007**

	Number of subgrantee awards						Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$)					Total	ADM
	Total	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	OTH	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	OTH		
Montana	22	8	4	5	1	4	268,910	212,263	188,203	40,000	32,307	741,683	82,409
Nebraska	51	10	14	12	3	12	316,377	302,615	263,615	52,723	158,168	1,093,498	112,829
Nevada	41	16	9	9	2	5	314,729	257,278	393,974	27,040	185,204	1,178,225	56,789
New Hampshire	21	7	5	8	1	0	376,900	281,828	283,803	50,000	0	992,531	99,294
New Jersey	58	21	13	11	4	9	873,565	694,033	582,104	316,684	452,981	2,919,367	276,256
New Mexico	37	14	10	5	5	3	424,255	216,179	172,141	73,009	61,071	946,655	118,414
New York	133	60	41	31	1	0	2,298,302	1,489,047	1,493,984	245,990	0	5,527,323	0
No.Mariana Islands	10	2	4	2	2	0	130,205	100,534	130,205	20,106	0	381,050	43,122
North Carolina	38	8	9	7	2	12	572,752	819,837	883,771	48,504	1,020,210	3,345,074	140,810
North Dakota	153	39	38	33	7	36	429,768	356,375	349,869	75,197	239,677	1,450,886	115,021
Ohio	19	6	3	4	3	3	33,707	45,224	46,058	84,098	747,504	956,591	152,777
Oklahoma	46	16	13	8	4	5	453,842	411,277	398,753	92,750	226,538	1,583,160	153,846
Oregon	120	76	17	24	3	0	1,311,260	477,913	632,855	85,786	0	2,507,814	276,499
Pennsylvania	282	92	94	94	2	0	1,790,951	895,425	895,425	198,924	0	3,780,725	187,364
Puerto Rico	11	7	1	1	1	1	567,444	393,935	393,935	78,787	141,640	1,575,741	175,084
Rhode Island	18	4	10	2	2	0	702,857	459,515	412,515	82,503	0	1,657,390	0
South Carolina	33	13	9	7	1	3	560,952	526,709	419,038	81,246	158,911	1,746,856	169,119
South Dakota	78	52	6	18	2	0	636,486	401,694	411,444	114,052	0	1,563,676	79,802
Tennessee	53	30	9	10	4	0	960,095	452,811	539,237	99,974	0	2,052,117	226,460
Texas	85	41	20	21	1	2	3,133,741	1,545,085	1,739,129	250,000	83,319	6,751,274	403,181
Utah	50	16	15	11	1	7	436,862	325,771	301,688	49,061	223,964	1,337,346	140,743
Vermont	22	9	7	5	1	0	275,625	204,226	243,437	37,878	0	761,166	37,827
Virgin Islands	10	4	1	2	1	2	266,364	75,000	148,285	35,000	40,000	564,649	75,836
Virginia	90	36	21	16	5	12	820,758	673,313	619,988	125,720	293,654	2,533,433	288,728
Washington	165	70	48	45	2	0	1,018,730	648,370	684,181	115,914	0	2,467,195	136,305
West Virginia	70	16	21	21	1	11	337,230	296,575	323,419	53,465	149,419	1,160,108	74,200
Wisconsin	46	21	14	6	4	1	737,542	429,913	457,498	156,530	6,000	1,787,483	199,502
Wyoming	42	24	6	12	0	0	321,516	142,517	157,268	0	0	621,301	75,072
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,632</b>	<b>1,451</b>	<b>922</b>	<b>809</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>44,920,802</b>	<b>28,581,574</b>	<b>29,124,093</b>	<b>6,131,358</b>	<b>8,111,761</b>	<b>116,869,588</b>	<b>9,013,632</b>

NOTE: Because the award amounts reflect award activities during the calendar year, rather than the fiscal year, and include amounts returned unused by subgrantees that are then re-awarded during that year, percentages allocated to the individual categories of victims services (VS), law enforcement (LE), prosecution (PRO), and courts (CRT) may not meet the statutory mandates within that time frame

**Table A2. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2007**

<b>State</b>	<b>Sexual assault</b>	<b>Domestic violence</b>	<b>Stalking</b>	<b>Total</b>
Alabama	20	80	0	100
Alaska	21	73	6	100
American Samoa	50	50	0	100
Arizona	12	86	2	100
Arkansas	13	86	1	100
California	36	58	6	100
Colorado	27	71	2	100
Connecticut	30	70	0	100
Delaware	25	75	0	100
District of Columbia	35	65	0	100
Florida	27	71	2	100
Georgia	31	65	4	100
Guam	22	70	8	100
Hawaii	33	64	3	100
Idaho	15	80	5	100
Illinois	50	50	0	100
Indiana	21	76	3	100
Iowa	28	68	4	100
Kansas	20	75	5	100
Kentucky	55	45	0	100
Louisiana	41	50	9	100
Maine	33	64	3	100
Maryland	19	79	2	100
Massachusetts	8	90	2	100
Michigan	19	75	6	100
Minnesota	47	48	5	100
Mississippi	45	45	10	100
Missouri	15	81	4	100
Montana	20	75	5	100
Nebraska	15	84	1	100
Nevada	18	78	4	100
New Hampshire	20	75	5	100
New Jersey	40	60	0	100
New Mexico	29	58	13	100
New York	37	63	0	100
No.Mariana Islands	6	90	4	100
North Carolina	18	80	2	100
North Dakota	25	74	1	100
Ohio	15	81	4	100
Oklahoma	22	74	4	100

**Table A2. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2007**

<b>State</b>	<b>Sexual assault</b>	<b>Domestic violence</b>	<b>Stalking</b>	<b>Total</b>
Oregon	25	75	0	100
Pennsylvania	36	60	4	100
Puerto Rico	13	85	2	100
Rhode Island	35	60	5	100
South Carolina	35	55	10	100
South Dakota	24	75	1	100
Tennessee	9	88	3	100
Texas	21	76	3	100
Utah	24	70	6	100
Vermont	25	70	5	100
Virgin Islands	19	74	7	100
Virginia	16	81	3	100
Washington	35	55	10	100
West Virginia	15	75	10	100
Wisconsin	54	45	1	100
Wyoming	15	71	14	100

## Appendix B



**Table B1. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2007**

<i>State</i>	<i>Staff</i>	<i>Training</i>	<i>Policies</i>	<i>Products</i>	<i>Data collection and communication systems</i>	<i>Specialized units</i>	<i>System improvement</i>	<i>Victim services</i>	<i>Law enforcement</i>	<i>Prosecution</i>	<i>Courts</i>	<i>Probation and parole</i>
Alabama	31	15	4	7	7	10	4	21	9	8	0	1
Alaska	12	9	3	3	2	0	3	9	0	0	0	0
American Samoa	4	5	4	2	4	1	6	3	1	1	1	1
Arizona	24	12	9	3	5	6	3	19	3	2	1	2
Arkansas	28	4	1	1	0	14	0	19	8	2	0	0
California	156	68	28	21	11	39	12	136	20	19	0	7
Colorado	60	32	17	10	6	8	6	52	0	5	0	0
Connecticut	12	5	2	1	1	9	1	7	3	1	0	0
Delaware	16	6	1	3	6	4	1	14	0	1	0	1
District of Columbia	7	3	0	2	2	1	0	4	0	1	1	0
Florida	41	14	9	10	8	20	5	23	14	9	1	0
Georgia	55	28	19	19	9	17	16	35	11	8	0	0
Guam	11	7	1	5	7	0	3	8	1	0	0	1
Hawaii	12	11	1	0	4	11	5	7	2	3	0	0
Idaho	12	11	4	5	4	2	6	10	1	0	0	0
Illinois	16	13	4	6	4	5	5	20	5	5	0	4
Indiana	63	33	18	17	8	28	7	41	7	20	1	0
Iowa	63	28	11	5	8	36	6	26	26	10	0	0
Kansas	24	12	10	7	3	6	4	15	2	4	1	0
Kentucky	23	7	3	3	1	5	2	19	6	3	1	0
Louisiana	70	20	11	3	12	23	2	49	19	9	1	0
Maine	27	12	10	7	3	9	3	12	9	3	0	0
Maryland	63	26	21	14	10	15	10	42	5	3	0	0
Massachusetts	59	30	6	22	7	7	10	51	2	3	0	0
Michigan	46	27	13	12	7	5	10	44	2	3	0	0
Minnesota	26	18	15	9	11	3	15	12	1	0	0	0
Mississippi	40	4	2	5	3	13	2	22	11	5	0	0
Missouri	64	22	14	10	8	18	4	39	14	8	1	0
Montana	21	5	0	2	1	4	1	12	3	1	0	0

**Table B1. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2007**

<i>State</i>	<i>Staff</i>	<i>Training</i>	<i>Policies</i>	<i>Products</i>	<i>Data collection and communication systems</i>	<i>Specialized units</i>	<i>System improvement</i>	<i>Victim services</i>	<i>Law enforcement</i>	<i>Prosecution</i>	<i>Courts</i>	<i>Probation and parole</i>
Nebraska	15	11	7	5	3	6	4	11	3	4	0	1
Nevada	22	10	6	12	3	3	4	20	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	19	14	7	8	3	6	2	11	2	5	0	0
New Jersey	58	41	21	35	4	6	12	47	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	37	15	9	8	6	10	3	20	2	3	0	1
New York	116	72	40	46	26	32	16	97	11	22	1	3
North Carolina	45	29	20	13	16	19	12	17	16	5	3	0
North Dakota	40	13	8	2	15	3	4	33	1	1	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Ohio	106	38	22	15	14	30	14	78	16	14	1	0
Oklahoma	38	14	6	3	7	8	7	20	8	5	1	2
Oregon	66	20	5	10	1	6	8	58	4	3	0	0
Pennsylvania	44	36	21	17	9	28	8	41	24	31	0	0
Puerto Rico	8	2	2	2	1	2	0	6	1	1	0	0
Rhode Island	8	4	3	1	1	5	2	5	0	1	0	0
South Carolina	28	18	5	11	8	8	4	19	6	3	1	0
South Dakota	36	7	7	3	1	4	3	30	0	8	0	0
Tennessee	51	22	10	15	5	16	5	31	10	7	1	0
Texas	103	55	19	22	13	38	6	70	20	19	1	0
Utah	40	24	10	14	4	7	6	33	4	1	0	0
Vermont	8	7	4	2	0	7	2	8	5	5	0	0
Virgin Islands	7	6	1	1	2	1	0	4	0	1	0	0
Virginia	89	62	18	72	23	24	10	62	14	12	0	1
Washington	66	38	5	6	16	5	6	53	6	3	0	0
West Virginia	23	12	7	7	4	19	1	15	14	10	0	0
Wisconsin	37	27	13	13	9	8	11	14	3	5	0	0
Wyoming	37	9	5	2	2	4	2	35	1	1	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,235</b>	<b>1,094</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>560</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>624</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>1,611</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>25</b>



**Table B2. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2007**

State	Subgrants	Subgrantees using funds for victim services	Victims/survivors seeking services				Victims receiving services			
			Total	Served	Partially served	Not served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
Alabama	32	21	7779	7546	163	70	7709	6902	748	59
Alaska	13	9	1094	858	45	191	903	684	199	20
American Samoa	6	3	287	287	0	0	287	181	106	0
Arizona	24	19	6547	6030	235	282	6265	5862	392	11
Arkansas	28	19	4897	4465	285	147	4750	4488	257	5
California	173	136	14944	13478	1092	374	14570	9436	5069	65
Colorado	61	52	17944	17333	314	297	17647	14865	2505	277
Connecticut	14	7	5246	5246	0	0	5246	4710	536	0
Delaware	21	14	4547	4460	82	5	4542	3309	1200	33
District of Columbia	7	4	919	863	55	1	918	726	192	0
Florida	41	23	14371	13840	442	89	14282	12161	2030	91
Georgia	57	35	13618	13347	200	71	13547	8575	4406	566
Guam	13	8	3152	3089	10	53	3099	2406	653	40
Hawaii	22	7	2761	2761	0	0	2761	2752	9	0
Idaho	14	10	3006	2728	126	152	2854	2618	164	72
Illinois	29	20	12854	12163	615	76	12778	11059	1718	1
Indiana	68	41	11646	11513	85	48	11598	10427	987	184
Iowa	69	26	4763	4629	120	14	4749	3841	882	26
Kansas	24	15	7206	7098	101	7	7199	6350	293	556
Kentucky	26	19	6414	5959	337	118	6296	5931	343	22
Louisiana	76	49	23837	22992	299	546	23291	19998	3072	221
Maine	33	12	2662	2059	546	57	2605	2066	534	5
Maryland	68	42	10505	9551	838	116	10389	9392	867	130
Massachusetts	60	51	14956	13804	1009	143	14813	13409	1320	84
Michigan	46	44	18841	18704	125	12	18829	16058	1771	1000
Minnesota	27	12	2142	2047	66	29	2113	1264	788	61
Mississippi	40	22	6982	6637	234	111	6871	6040	584	247
Missouri	64	39	14031	13381	415	235	13796	11537	1374	885
Montana	21	12	2859	2859	0	0	2859	2161	429	269
Nebraska	15	11	3494	3386	107	1	3493	3176	307	10
Nevada	23	20	7725	7518	141	66	7659	5860	696	1103
New Hampshire	20	11	2124	1902	98	124	2000	1535	328	137

**Table B2. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2007**

State	Subgrants	Subgrantees using funds for victim services	Victims/survivors seeking services				Victims receiving services			
			Total	Served	Partially served	Not served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
New Jersey	61	47	12631	12552	31	48	12583	11258	1321	4
New Mexico	38	20	2325	2258	41	26	2299	2155	128	16
New York	116	97	38746	34988	3112	646	38100	32886	4983	231
North Carolina	54	17	3418	3295	64	59	3359	3177	152	30
North Dakota	49	33	1415	1314	59	42	1373	1190	170	13
Northern Mariana Islands	4	2	216	216	0	0	216	162	53	1
Ohio	106	78	35140	34204	753	183	34957	31451	2757	749
Oklahoma	39	20	4120	3866	160	94	4026	3483	470	73
Oregon	66	58	11017	10309	278	430	10587	7894	2469	224
Pennsylvania	45	41	24239	21989	1473	777	23462	17848	5231	383
Puerto Rico	8	6	2809	2792	17	0	2809	2786	8	15
Rhode Island	9	5	10523	10523	0	0	10523	9722	733	68
South Carolina	34	19	6884	6838	43	3	6881	6091	660	130
South Dakota	36	30	13090	12984	100	6	13084	10302	520	2262
Tennessee	51	31	5124	4993	92	39	5085	4151	788	146
Texas	105	70	34035	32036	1366	633	33402	29730	3135	537
Utah	42	33	16263	10834	1374	4055	12208	10342	1109	757
Vermont	9	8	2803	2803	0	0	2803	2100	637	66
Virgin Islands	10	4	350	347	2	1	349	338	11	0
Virginia	90	62	15724	14954	614	156	15568	13462	1817	289
Washington	79	53	5899	5765	108	26	5873	5127	613	133
West Virginia	26	15	5158	4894	247	17	5141	4772	281	88
Wisconsin	38	14	5099	4571	501	27	5072	2322	2646	104
Wyoming	37	35	4715	4627	66	22	4693	3769	466	458
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,387</b>	<b>1,611</b>	<b>515,896</b>	<b>486,485</b>	<b>18,686</b>	<b>10,725</b>	<b>505,171</b>	<b>426,297</b>	<b>65,917</b>	<b>12,957</b>

**Table B3. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2007**

State	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
	Black/ African American	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Hispanic/Lati no	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	0-17	18-24	25-29	60+	Unknown
Alabama	2938	10	18	10	121	4253	361	6589	972	148	286	1534	4019	142	1728
Alaska	42	243	88	30	129	284	91	820	62	21	66	226	530	28	53
American Samoa	35	5	13	223	1	10	0	226	61	0	16	123	123	13	12
Arizona	265	273	55	3	3202	2123	350	5703	521	41	333	1156	4180	219	377
Arkansas	1257	13	15	3	110	3378	13	4186	545	19	375	1242	2910	196	27
California	1173	626	372	51	5359	4741	2339	13252	1116	202	2016	3966	6565	226	1797
Colorado	787	453	158	29	4302	8487	3537	14848	2168	631	1555	3427	9201	458	3006
Connecticut	1603	2	29	20	1655	1866	71	4302	942	2	247	1084	3674	153	88
Delaware	859	0	18	3	340	2123	1208	3563	597	382	251	654	2351	216	1070
District of Columbia	728	0	8	0	150	23	10	895	23	0	4	454	436	18	6
Florida	2976	24	50	31	1929	7245	2302	10994	2431	857	1037	2972	7290	587	2396
Georgia	4505	5	278	15	874	4273	3608	10587	861	2099	1220	3189	5781	187	3170
Guam	24	5	229	2378	8	108	347	2368	598	133	556	509	1336	6	692
Hawaii	7	2	82	112	10	74	2474	2761	0	0	2	51	219	20	2469
Idaho	8	122	9	6	492	2122	139	2496	249	109	264	723	1662	29	176
Illinois	4171	20	156	6	1937	7705	226	11970	806	2	967	3345	8166	276	24
Indiana	2626	12	71	12	1105	7218	767	10779	692	127	637	2782	6885	191	1103
Iowa	382	25	26	9	642	3528	166	4322	424	3	500	1056	2662	75	456
Kansas	1353	32	104	10	1053	4055	592	5699	1059	441	418	1659	4287	143	692
Kentucky	769	4	25	0	289	4986	223	6021	264	11	266	1609	3993	203	225
Louisiana	7972	94	120	664	364	10564	3565	18412	1738	3141	1575	4681	12747	443	3845
Maine	91	69	34	3	48	2003	357	2383	203	19	120	491	1404	211	379
Maryland	3697	16	195	11	1438	4607	425	10068	297	24	134	2452	6865	286	652
Massachusetts	1697	18	268	7	3404	7968	1535	12782	1200	831	885	2769	9393	514	1252
Michigan	6146	180	55	7	489	11167	804	16432	2075	322	918	5903	10770	393	845

**Table B3. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2007**

State	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
	Black/ African American	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Hispanic/Lati no	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	0-17	18-24	25-29	60+	Unknown
Minnesota	49	852	19	0	220	798	251	1990	86	37	245	632	860	110	266
Mississippi	1926	271	26	0	136	2221	2440	4695	263	1913	470	1234	2702	70	2395
Missouri	2738	55	55	18	378	7634	3388	11772	990	1034	520	2459	7419	256	3142
Montana	10	532	10	0	80	2183	44	2463	368	28	335	1108	1362	47	7
Nebraska	265	147	20	5	414	2331	315	3231	262	0	112	991	1919	106	365
Nevada	744	104	253	43	1948	4391	176	5093	2556	10	316	1879	4627	635	202
New Hampshire	84	2	27	0	75	1596	334	1660	314	26	176	518	1086	63	157
New Jersey	2977	21	622	15	2294	5662	1047	11382	1128	73	439	2845	7997	381	921
New Mexico	20	137	6	2	1622	504	10	1980	319	0	81	516	1593	77	32
New York	8027	301	1274	95	5397	15899	8278	30303	4151	3646	2378	7375	19018	823	8506
North Carolina	861	4	11	3	491	1372	620	2829	495	35	171	625	1825	59	679
North Dakota	31	291	10	0	34	872	139	1280	90	3	38	395	863	31	46
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	116	119	0	1	8	204	12	0	3	57	150	6	0
Ohio	8516	55	66	13	1142	17456	7779	28381	2441	4135	1201	8744	18008	600	6404
Oklahoma	285	413	18	7	405	2756	346	3446	358	222	290	991	2434	71	240
Oregon	172	236	65	48	1557	6310	2251	9546	831	210	526	1539	5637	306	2579
Pennsylvania	3363	55	331	17	1808	14027	4044	21591	1536	335	1266	4865	14271	930	2130
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0	2778	23	8	2809	0	0	66	644	2031	61	7
Rhode Island	736	35	49	0	1086	6651	1971	6883	1622	2018	394	4379	3672	117	1961
South Carolina	2025	29	46	1	249	3920	615	6224	653	4	117	1294	4840	94	536
South Dakota	708	4783	25	0	199	6483	895	10269	2496	319	2252	1859	3049	594	5330
Tennessee	824	10	29	6	387	3728	102	4769	307	9	217	1292	3256	238	82
Texas	6683	173	346	34	13971	10100	2203	29808	3280	314	1843	7677	21247	667	1968
Utah	285	387	102	78	2736	7996	725	9437	1207	1564	813	2798	6852	278	1467
Vermont	36	22	12	7	32	1296	1398	2627	154	22	171	538	1278	55	761
Virgin Islands	199	0	0	0	113	38	0	281	68	0	76	51	212	6	4
Virginia	4368	20	283	16	1192	8938	886	13972	1367	229	633	3131	10460	405	939

Table B3. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2007

State	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
	Black/ African American	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Hispanic/Lati no	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	0-17	18-24	25-29	60+	Unknown
Washington	240	191	175	71	835	4317	44	5531	314	28	13	1716	3889	235	20
West Virginia	207	4	6	0	142	4440	348	4598	543	0	428	990	2968	455	300
Wisconsin	420	138	979	2	565	2729	330	4513	452	107	645	812	2261	242	1112
Wyoming	140	279	31	16	514	3648	128	3937	744	12	545	990	2951	196	11
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>93,050</b>	<b>11,800</b>	<b>7,488</b>	<b>4,259</b>	<b>72,251</b>	<b>255,231</b>	<b>66,633</b>	<b>429,962</b>	<b>49,311</b>	<b>25,898</b>	<b>31,428</b>	<b>113,001</b>	<b>278,186</b>	<b>13,447</b>	<b>69,109</b>



**Table B4. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2007**

<b>State</b>	<b>Disabled</b>	<b>Limited English proficiency</b>	<b>Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers</b>	<b>Live in rural areas</b>
Alabama	220	185	24	2179
Alaska	81	128	266	357
American Samoa	6	70	41	251
Arizona	149	1625	1254	1683
Arkansas	178	42	40	1568
California	734	1339	741	2228
Colorado	1188	1463	694	4819
Connecticut	212	633	64	77
Delaware	102	177	156	1276
District of Columbia	3	155	146	0
Florida	238	952	496	2168
Georgia	305	1015	1172	3126
Guam	87	280	17	399
Hawaii	9	38	32	220
Idaho	187	271	237	1800
Illinois	331	1136	59	1545
Indiana	416	936	537	2116
Iowa	388	492	456	3029
Kansas	88	580	109	2687
Kentucky	295	284	214	3159
Louisiana	2511	179	248	9941
Maine	263	58	33	1224
Maryland	449	1336	977	3469
Massachusetts	703	1856	1078	847
Michigan	926	114	306	3839
Minnesota	116	171	80	1195
Mississippi	232	65	24	1072
Missouri	1102	253	242	5107
Montana	393	0	0	883
Nebraska	204	208	78	1209
Nevada	364	1177	492	1464
New Hampshire	100	29	19	185
New Jersey	452	1656	660	546
New Mexico	122	700	622	1691
New York	1937	3742	3406	8038
North Carolina	122	454	87	1053
North Dakota	134	12	5	444

**Table B4. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2007**

<b>State</b>	<b>Disabled</b>	<b>Limited English proficiency</b>	<b>Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers</b>	<b>Live in rural areas</b>
Northern Mariana Islands	13	91	80	122
Ohio	1422	722	256	5912
Oklahoma	162	299	110	2421
Oregon	570	1188	838	5704
Pennsylvania	1356	974	504	6099
Puerto Rico	128	10	42	796
Rhode Island	0	375	0	0
South Carolina	152	246	81	3491
South Dakota	308	51	38	6298
Tennessee	386	341	322	2452
Texas	996	4135	2142	6496
Utah	461	1702	1370	2699
Vermont	366	17	8	2701
Virgin Islands	3	36	51	0
Virginia	939	834	774	4336
Washington	612	538	283	3095
West Virginia	401	24	2	2098
Wisconsin	349	1412	748	1116
Wyoming	556	110	59	2168
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>24,527</b>	<b>36,916</b>	<b>22,820</b>	<b>134,898</b>



**Table B5. Victim's relationship to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2007**

<b>State</b>	<b>Current/former spouse or intimate partner</b>	<b>Other family or household member</b>	<b>Dating</b>	<b>Acquaintance</b>	<b>Stranger</b>	<b>Relationship unknown</b>	<b>Other</b>
Alabama	3896	490	1103	334	54	2021	0
Alaska	662	146	114	66	26	26	0
American Samoa	45	72	103	28	27	22	0
Arizona	4257	848	216	221	95	703	0
Arkansas	2870	751	865	119	37	273	0
California	7794	1138	1436	2152	569	1773	0
Colorado	11130	1502	2223	789	234	2707	0
Connecticut	2606	879	395	170	56	1140	0
Delaware	2795	388	33	179	93	1129	0
District of Columbia	527	41	188	106	57	2	0
Florida	7720	1537	1591	622	264	2678	0
Georgia	6341	1596	2262	1060	351	2631	0
Guam	608	841	586	184	250	638	0
Hawaii	283	7	22	2	0	2451	0
Idaho	1836	533	790	249	73	167	0
Illinois	5225	1277	4852	508	270	671	0
Indiana	7902	633	1933	736	137	740	0
Iowa	3430	458	318	363	57	216	0
Kansas	4994	539	750	340	52	585	0
Kentucky	4098	553	1162	121	32	420	0
Louisiana	10984	2978	3110	1149	356	5099	0
Maine	1776	180	304	195	41	188	0
Maryland	6371	1168	2143	309	97	688	1
Massachusetts	8626	2075	3894	423	134	1105	0
Michigan	12884	1239	3650	1053	297	1097	0
Minnesota	1171	293	180	384	32	115	10
Mississippi	4975	1091	745	363	106	462	0
Missouri	7700	1306	1098	765	347	3156	0
Montana	2333	19	174	207	64	93	0
Nebraska	2399	155	596	167	23	166	0
Nevada	4189	1043	1337	290	105	717	0
New Hampshire	1071	287	266	201	18	178	0
New Jersey	7707	1188	2558	441	205	855	0
New Mexico	1825	188	173	93	28	24	0
New York	24159	3327	5018	1498	560	4906	0
North Carolina	2095	259	784	90	37	239	0
North Dakota	1051	88	102	139	22	19	0

**Table B5. Victim's relationship to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2007**

<b>State</b>	<b>Current/former spouse or intimate partner</b>	<b>Other family or household member</b>	<b>Dating</b>	<b>Acquaintance</b>	<b>Stranger</b>	<b>Relationship unknown</b>	<b>Other</b>
Northern Mariana Islands	122	29	3	55	0	9	0
Ohio	24821	2789	2616	1007	184	4263	256
Oklahoma	2395	570	836	359	121	555	0
Oregon	6144	847	735	588	461	2131	0
Pennsylvania	13346	3445	3491	1509	577	2420	0
Puerto Rico	2704	0	84	19	0	2	0
Rhode Island	1287	308	426	74	4	8924	0
South Carolina	5194	486	643	388	62	299	5
South Dakota	7106	913	195	162	34	4797	0
Tennessee	3794	568	337	292	101	106	0
Texas	23853	3781	3401	1177	262	2483	1
Utah	7727	1061	661	593	340	2162	0
Vermont	1810	244	562	196	19	410	0
Virgin Islands	267	25	1	14	2	43	0
Virginia	11568	1591	1364	691	250	838	0
Washington	3936	685	916	203	52	81	0
West Virginia	3479	835	550	122	18	196	0
Wisconsin	1195	1036	458	630	85	1883	0
Wyoming	2834	564	948	474	92	436	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>303917</b>	<b>50890</b>	<b>65301</b>	<b>24669</b>	<b>7870</b>	<b>72138</b>	<b>273</b>